



COUNCIL OF CONSERVATIVE CITIZENS

DC/MARYLAND/VIRGINIA CHAPTER MONTHLY NEWSLETTER.

VOLUME 1. ISSUE 2. FEBRUARY, 2014.

The True Voice of the Conservative Movement!!!!!!!!!!

We believe in the traditional family as the basic unit of human society and morality, and we oppose all efforts by the state and other powers to weaken the structure of the American family through toleration of sexual licentiousness, homosexuality and other perversions, mixture of the races, pornography in all forms, and subversion of the authority of parents- Dr. Samuel Francis

This essay will argue that Paleo-conservatives should avoid using religious language to defend a traditional view of marriage. We would be more effective defending traditional marriage, by speaking in a scientific discourse about the benefits to children from being raised by both parents: one man and one woman. Then we can justify the claim that the state has an interest in acknowledging heterosexual marriage as a specially protected cultural norm.

Whether it is the West or other historically conditioned communities, all societies create a collective ethical life and expect their citizens to conform to it. All societies have some notion of the higher potentialities of human existence rooted in their customs and traditions. Since the social order is antecedent to the intellect, a society's social practices gives its people's lives meaning and purpose. A human being can only be fully human in cultures that set boundaries for what is noble and base. History teaches that part of the collective ethical life of any society includes presenting some type of family structure as being ideal. For more than 2400 years, Western man has defined marriage as a public institution between a man and woman for the purpose of

regulating sexuality and binding children to their biological parents. Kevin McDonald has compared family structures in the West with family structures in Confucian and Islamic societies and has argued that monogamy is part of a suite of traits that uniquely characterizes European civilization.¹

However, in less than two decades what once was a highly institutionalized norm in Western societies is now viewed by many Westerners, especially our youth, as antiquated. As an example, in 1996 most public opinion polls showed that a large majority of Americans still had a traditional view of marriage. However according to a poll conducted in 2013 by the Washington Post and ABC News, currently 58% of Americans support gay marriage and only 36% claim that it should remain illegal.² This is a stark contrast with public opinion polls from 2003 when a slim majority of Americans opposed gay marriage.³ Another disturbing trend is that young Americans are more likely to be pro-homosexual marriage than older Americans. According to the same poll conducted by the Washington Post/ABC News, 81 percent of 18-to-29-year-olds backed same-sex marriage, while only 44% of people above the age of 65 said they thought LGBT couples should be able to marry.⁴ Liberals want to redefine marriage as a private arrangement between consenting adults for the purpose of providing emotional and financial security. These trends toward a liberal notion of marriage should be disturbing news for any conservative who wants to rehabilitate a traditional Western society, because it illustrates that as time goes by the pro-gay marriage movement will get stronger as the older generation dies out and the new generation becomes old enough to vote. There are now currently 18 states, most recently Illinois, which have allowed homosexuals to get married.

Homosexual marriage is simply the final stage in the attack on traditional institutions surrounding the family by the cultural left, including Hollywood and the rest of the elite media. As an example, the mass wedding held at the 56th Annual Grammy Awards on Sunday night was an over the top political stunt to promote same-sex marriage. The mass wedding involved many homosexual couples on stage and took place as Macklemore & Ryan Lewis performed a rendition of their pro-gay marriage anthem 'Same Love.' The mass wedding was presided over and officiated by Queen Latifah, who was deputized by Los Angeles County to legally conduct wedding ceremonies. The organizers seem shocked that the pro-gay stunt has offended millions of average Americans. In the aftermath of the mass wedding, many fans took to twitter to complain about the hidden political agenda. This illustrates that often our opponents overextend themselves. Their best weapon is to

¹<http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2013/04/monogamy-and-the-uniqueness-of-european-civilization/>

²www.washingtonpost.com

³www.washingtonpost.com

⁴www.washingtonpost.com

slowly corrupt our culture, so that nobody realizes that our society is changing for the worse. If our enemies push too much change too fast, then people realize that their society is being destroyed. Then people are much more likely to rebel.

What can conservatives do to change public opinion on homosexual marriage? Catholic and Protestant fundamentalists may mean well by defending the traditional idea of marriage by stating “God made Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve.” Public opinion on homosexual marriage has shifted against us because the ethical arguments made to defend traditional marriage have not been updated to take into consideration how our society has evolved. At one time in the West homosexuality was considered a moral taboo. Classical liberals such as Thomas Jefferson compared homosexuality to rape in his book, *Notes on Virginia*. John Locke, the intellectual godfather of classical liberalism, in *First Treatise on Government* defends the traditional notion of marriage by claiming that “God made Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve.” He also claims that sodomy and adultery are abominations, compares them to cannibalism and infanticide, and he claims that people who engage in these acts are living outside the law that God made for man. However, like it or not, social conservatives must acknowledge that the sexual revolution and psychoanalysis have changed the way that Western societies think about the function of sexuality. Most people in Western societies are now skeptical of the value of social restraints on sexuality. Also, the economic emergence of woman has led to a change in women’s social status in Western nations. This has led to no fault divorces and an increase in the divorce rate. The easy access to divorce has contributed to most people no longer regarding marriage as a sacred institution embedded in a transcendent moral order. This explains why the argument that traditional marriage is a divinely inspired institution representing the bodily communion that only a man a woman can participate, is not persuasive because these arguments are not consistent with the previously mentioned changes that have occurred in our society.

Christian “other-worldliness” prevents Catholic and Protestant fundamentalists from thinking critically about the role that identity plays in politics and acknowledging the changes that have occurred in our society. Catholic and Protestant fundamentalists have no historical sense for thinking about ethics. These people refuse to recognize as Edmund Burke does in his most famous book, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* that a society without the means of reforming itself is without the means of sustaining itself. Burke understood that human beings were a product of the social relations of their society. Humans do not have a trans-cultural a-historical self that can judge the moral worth of social practices and institutional arrangements separate from their own social circumstances. Their background culture shapes their concept of duty and their moral consciousness is shaped by the historically conditioned experiences of their own community.

Burke understood that if people do not modify their society’s social conventions to take into consideration the fact that their society is evolving, then their social conventions will lose meaning. This causes people to become alienated from their customs and traditions. Anyone who has had the misfortune of being forced to go to Catechism to hear dogmatic arguments in favor of the Catholic Fundamentalist belief in Transfiguration (that Communion bread and wine really is the body and bread of Christ) or, is forced to go to church every Sunday as a child to listen to dogmatic claims that the story in the book of Genesis should be taken literally, can readily attest to how terrible it is to feel that they are pressured to believe in an idea that does not make any sense. This actually makes people feel hostile to their own customs and traditions and is counter-productive for defending the merits of a traditional western society. It plays into the hands of our enemies who

then will take advantage of people's feelings of alienation by offering them a vision of society in which the highest social value is freedom from all forms of social restraints.



To give a few examples that these Catholic and Protestant fundamentalists have cognitive biases that distort the way that they process information, and prevent them from engaging in rational deliberation about fundamental political principles. As an example, one Catholic fundamentalist writer claims that people who argue for a traditional definition of marriage should not defend it's merits based on its consequences, because it under cuts the message that marriage is a "sacred institution."⁵ Instead this Catholic fundamentalist writer argues that people should defend marriage between one man and one woman by just making assertions that this statement is necessarily true and then claiming that Catholic fundamentalist doctrines that traditional marriage is a divinely inspired institution representing the bodily communion that only a man a woman can participate, can be universally known by everyone through reason.⁶ However, Catholic fundamentalism is rooted in dogmatic ideas about epistemology and metaphysics: that there is a good for us designed by nature, nature has a design and purpose understandable through reason, and that people can derive morality from knowledge. These ideas have been discredited by scientific naturalism, which developed in the 16th century. Therefore, these Catholic Fundamentalists live in a dream world, when they claim that their views are based on some a-historical rationality. The specific writer previously mentioned, demonstrates just how non-reflective he is for his own perspective by even citing Vatican documents which affirm that these ideas are necessarily based on reason and are knowable to anyone despite their religious or lack of religious beliefs.⁷

Another example, of religious fundamentalists making the idea of defining marriage between one man one woman appear silly and irrational is Phil Robertson from Duck Dynasty. "It seems like, to me, a vagina

⁵William B. May Getting the Marriage Conversation, Emmaus Road Publishing. 2012

⁶William B. May Getting the Marriage Conversation, Emmaus Road Publishing. 2012

⁷William B. May Getting the Marriage Conversation, Emmaus Road Publishing. 2012

would be more desirable than a man's anus,"⁸ Robertson told GQ magazine. "That's just me. I'm just thinking: There's more there! She's got more to offer. I mean, come on, dudes! You know what I'm saying? But hey, sin: It's not logical, my man. It's just not logical. Everything is blurred on what's right and what's wrong. Sin becomes fine,"⁹ he later added. "Start with homosexual behavior and just morph out from there. Bestiality, sleeping around with this woman and that woman and that woman and those men. Don't be deceived. Neither the adulterers, the idolaters, the male prostitutes, the homosexual offenders, the greedy, the drunkards, the slanderers, the swindlers -- they won't inherit the kingdom of God. Don't deceive yourself. It's not right."¹⁰In the opinion of this author, he meant well, and I do not have any animosity against Phil Robertson for his relatively unsophisticated remarks defending traditional marriage. By all accounts, Mr. Robertson seems to be a nice guy and have a nice family. At the Council of Conservative Citizens, we are happy that as result of the public outcry against the forces of repressive tolerance, Phil Robertson's suspension has been lifted. It is a testament that despite how the media always try to socially isolate real conservatives, there are millions of Americans who want to defend a traditional western society. These types of small successes should inspire us to unify into a social movement to take back our country and our culture.

However, like it or not, Phil Robertson's comments did not contribute to changing anyone's mind in the United States. His point of view just gets interpreted by the media as "hateful," and "homophobic." The average moderate independent does not have strong opinions on gay marriage. This type of person often relies on the judgment of others when making his or her own judgment. Given the way that the liberal media distorts the issue, this type of person will get the impression that everyone who is "respectable," thinks that gay marriage is OK.. This person might feel intimidated by speaking up and defending his point of view, because the media repeatedly pathologizes our point of view. He does not want to feel socially isolated, so he goes along with the crowd. What these types of people need is conservative leadership that can forcefully articulate arguments to justify defending a traditional Western definition of marriage. Well thought out arguments that take into consideration how our society is changing for the worse, will give the "mushy middle," the courage to defend their convictions. (However, it should be well known to all of us that we have not gotten any leadership in Washington on winning the culture war, with the exception of a few politicians such as Pat Buchanan and Tom Tancredo. The political elites within the Republican Party only care about getting re-elected in order to enhance their own power in Washington. They do not care about standing up for principle.)

When we do get people in Washington who want to stand up for defending a traditional Western society, many of these people are just as unsophisticated as Phil Robertson. They often embarrass themselves and our

⁸http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/12/18/duck-dynasty-phil-robertson-gay_n_4465564.html

⁹http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/12/18/duck-dynasty-phil-robertson-gay_n_4465564.html

¹⁰http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/12/18/duck-dynasty-phil-robertson-gay_n_4465564.html

movement. As an example, during an appearance at the evangelical Liberty Counsel's Awakening 2013, Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-Minn.) told an audience of Christian conservatives that they must turn to "spiritual warfare" to fight against the powers of Satan. Bachmann urged attendees to keep up the fight against gay marriage, abortion and "Islamic jihad," claiming that God supported those campaigns.¹¹ She then took a line from the Bible's book of Ephesians to suggest that these battles are supernatural struggles against the forces of evil. In Ephesians 2:2, Satan is referred to as "prince of the power of the air." Bachmann's reference to Ephesians came after Thatcher's granddaughter, 19-year-old Amanda Thatcher, cited the Biblical passage during the former prime minister's funeral in April of 2013. As Bachman put it, "because we need to recognize the desperate situation of our condition, not only in the natural but also in the supernatural," she said.¹² "Because as the scripture was read from the pulpit at Margaret Thatcher's funeral, we fight not against this world, we fight against the powers and principalities and 'Prince of the Air'; that's where we need to focus as well, is on spiritual warfare..."¹³ These are just a few examples of how Christian other-worldliness prevents these Catholic and Protestant fundamentalists from thinking critically about how society has changed over the past several decades, and how social conservatives must update their ethical arguments in order to defend the virtues of a traditional western society.

A better way of trying to defend marriage as a traditional institution is to make socially scientific arguments that there will be negative consequences to society, if we redefine marriage from being a public institution between a man and a woman for the purpose of regulating sexuality and binding children to their biological parents, into a private arrangement between consenting adults. Socially conservative intellectuals must provide scientific evidence that the traditional definition of marriage is beneficial to the emotional and psychological well-being of children. Socially conservative intellectuals must provide scientific evidence that both mother and father make unique contributions to the emotional and psychological well-being of the child. They must demonstrate that if a child is not raised by both male and female parents, then social pathologies will occur within society that will undermine the collective ethical life of our community. They should not limit their discussion purely to economic terms when discussing the "social costs," to our society's collective ethical life, in considering how serious the moral decadence of our society is as a result of the influence of Cultural Marxism. They must show scientific evidence that traditional marriage civilizes men, furnishing them with a sense of purpose and social status. When marriage is strong, children and adults both tend to flourish; when marriage breaks down, every element of society suffers. Given the changes that have occurred in Western societies regarding the function of sexuality and the view that marriage is no longer viewed as a sacred institution, people will respond more positively to arguments that speak in a scientific discourse to defend the

¹¹http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/13/michele-bachmann-spiritual-warfare_n_3267831.html

¹²http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/13/michele-bachmann-spiritual-warfare_n_3267831.html

¹³http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/13/michele-bachmann-spiritual-warfare_n_3267831.html

benefits of the traditional definition of marriage rather than, “God made Adam and Eve, and not Adam and Steve.”



No self-respecting white nationalist would ever support gay marriage.

Can a same sex family provide the same emotional and psychological well-being to a child as a traditional family with a mother and a father? A recent study by sociologist Mark Regnerus, looks at 40 different variables measuring emotional and psychological well-being. He claims that there is a large disparity in “quality of life variables,” between children raised in families in which one or more parent has had a same sex relationship versus children raised in traditional families with one mother and one father. The author claims that previous studies claiming “no difference” between children raised by gay parents and children raised in a traditional family have been seriously flawed.¹⁴ These studies use the wrong research methods. He claims that these studies have a self-selection bias because they use nonrandom, non-representative data, and use small sample sizes.¹⁵ The author claims that the case study method does not allow for large scale generalizations about the entire homosexual population. He cites a study as an example, “The National Longitude Lesbian Family Study.” The study recruits subjects from homosexual pride parades, woman’s bookstores, and advertisements in Lesbian newspapers. He claims that this type of study has a self-selection bias because the type of person most likely to participate in the study are people with positive experiences of living in a family with one or more gay parents.¹⁶ The author also claims that using population sizes of 18, 33, and 44 are too small to confirm the null hypothesis that there is no statistically significant different between same sex couples and a traditional family structure’s effects on children.¹⁷ He also claims that it is poor social science to compare homosexual couples

¹⁴Mark Regnerus, “How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?” Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 753

¹⁵Mark Regnerus, “How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?” Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 754

¹⁶Mark Regnerus, “How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?” Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 755

¹⁷Mark Regnerus, “How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?” Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 755

raising children and heterosexual couples raising children using different statistical techniques.¹⁸ He cites as examples, several studies that compare the results of children being raised by homosexual couples using the case study method with a heterosexual population using a randomly generated sample.¹⁹

In contrast, in Doctor Regnerus' study the population size is 3000 and he uses a weighted probability sample from which meaningful statistical inferences can be drawn.²⁰ The study asks respondents numerous questions about their social behavior, health, and relationship experiences. It offers statistical comparisons between eight different family structures.²¹ This includes intact families with both mother and father, various other types of single family structures, and families in which the children were raised by parents who have had a same sex relationship. The author claims that there is a statistically significant difference in the "40 life quality variables" between children raised by parents who have been in same sex relationships compared with children who have been raised in traditional nuclear families. As an example, the author mentions that children raised by lesbian mothers were twice as likely to need counseling as children raised in intact two parent families.²² They are also less likely to identify themselves as heterosexual compared to children raised in traditional two parent families (61% to 91%).²³ The author also cites that children raised in traditional two parent families are less

18Mark Regnerus, "How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?" Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 756

19Mark Regnerus, "How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?" Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 757

20Mark Regnerus, "How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?" Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 758

21Mark Regnerus, "How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?" Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 761

22Mark Regnerus, "How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?" Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 762

23Mark Regnerus, "How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?" Social Science Research 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 762

likely to be abused than children raised by Lesbian parents.²⁴ In the study female respondents were much more likely to answer yes to the question, “Have you ever been forced to have any type of sexual activity against your will?” The difference between the respondents coming from traditional two parent family and children raised by a lesbian family was 46% to 81%.²⁵ He also cites evidence that children raised by parents who have been in a same sex relationship are more likely to be depressed than children raised by two parent families.²⁶ Author claims that his study illustrates that there is a large diversity of experiences in same sex families. He claims that his research, showing that there is a statistically significant difference between the emotional and psychological development of children, allows for more research to be done to uncover the relationship between family structure and the quality of life in children.

Mark Regnerus’s study, provides a challenge to the broad scholarly consensus that there is no statistically significant difference between the experiences of children raised by gay or lesbian parents compared to the experiences of children in traditional two parent families. It is important to remember that the author is only making the modest claim of correlation. They offer reasonable arguments that (1) more caution is needed when drawing strong conclusions based on the available science; and (2) that data based on probability samples might lead to different findings than are currently drawn from available data. The author does not attempt to weigh in on the question of causation. Author claims that future sociologists must develop research designs testing different hypotheses about the cause of these statistically significant differences regarding the emotional and psychological well-being of children raised in families with a parent engaging in a same sex relationship compared to a traditional two parent family.

Although none of these studies that I am about to cite in this next few pages draws comparisons between traditional families and same sex parents, there is an abundance of evidence that children are happier and healthier in two parent families with both a father and mother, as compared to other family structures. This should give us the confidence that social conservatives can make the case to the “mushy middle” that two parent traditional families should remain a highly institutionalized norm in our culture and the State has an interest in defining marriage as a public institution between a man and a woman for the purpose of regulating sexuality and binding children to their biological parents. Children reared in intact, married homes are significantly more likely to be involved in literacy activities such as being read to by adults or learning to recognize letters as

24 Mark Regnerus, “How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?” *Social Science Research* 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 763

25 Mark Regnerus, “How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?” *Social Science Research* 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 763

26 Mark Regnerus, “How Different are the Adult Children of Parents who have same Sex Relationships?” *Social Science Research* 41 (2012) Pg 752-770 Pg 763

preschool children, and to score higher in reading comprehension in elementary school.²⁷ According to Elizabeth Marquardt, in her book “Family Structure and Children’s Educational Outcomes,” School-aged children raised in an intact two parent family are approximately 30 percent less likely to cut class, be tardy, or miss school altogether.²⁸ The cumulative effect of family structure on children’s educational performance is most evident in high school graduation rates. Children reared in intact, married households are about twice as likely to graduate from high school, compared to children reared in single-parent or step-families. One study found that 37 percent of children born outside of marriage and 31 percent of children with divorced parents dropped out of high school, compared to 13 percent of children from intact families headed by a married mother and father.²⁹

Marriage also plays a central role in fostering the emotional health of children. Children from stable, married families are significantly less likely to suffer from depression, anxiety, alcohol and drug abuse, and thoughts of suicide compared to children from divorced homes.³⁰ One recent study of the entire population of Swedish children found that Swedish boys and girls in two-parent homes were about 50 percent less likely to suffer from suicide attempts, alcohol and drug abuse, and serious psychiatric illnesses compared to children reared in single-parent homes.³¹ (Despite all of the excessive coddling of the Swedish nanny state!!!!) A journal studying the subject of child well-being found that family structure was more consequential than poverty in predicting children’s psychological and behavioral outcomes.³² Children who are reared by their married

²⁷Elizabeth Marquardt. 2005a. Family Structure and Children’s Educational Outcomes. New York: Institute for American Values.

²⁸Elizabeth Marquardt. 2005a. Family Structure and Children’s Educational Outcomes. New York: Institute for American Values.

²⁹Sara McLanahan and Gary Sandefur. 1994. Growing Up with a Single Parent. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

³⁰Wilcox et al. 2005. Elizabeth Marquardt. 2005b. Between Two Worlds: The Inner Lives of Children of Divorce. New York: Crown.

³¹Gunilla Ringback Weitoft, Anders Hjern, Bengt Haglund, and Mans Rosen. 2003. “Mortality, Severe Morbidity, and Injury in Children Living with Single Parents in Sweden: A Population-Based Study.” The Lancet 361: 289–295.

³²Sara McLanahan. 1997. “Parent Absence or Poverty: Which Matters More?” In G. Duncan and J. Brooks-Gunn, Consequences of Growing Up Poor. New York: Russell Sage.

biological parents are more likely to have a secure sense of their own biological origins and familial identity. Partly as a consequence, girls reared in single-parent or step-families are much more likely to experience a teenage pregnancy and to have a child outside of wedlock than girls who are reared in an intact, married family.³³ One study found that only 5 percent of girls who grew up in an intact family got pregnant as teenagers, compared to 10 percent of girls whose fathers left after they turned six, and 35 percent of girls whose fathers left when they were preschoolers.³⁴ Research also suggests that girls are significantly more likely to be sexually abused if they are living outside of an intact, married home in large part because girls have more contact with unrelated males if their mothers are unmarried, cohabiting, or residing in a stepfamily.³⁵ Boys also benefit in unique ways from being reared within stable, married families. Research consistently finds that boys raised by their own fathers and mothers in an intact, married family are less likely to get in trouble than boys raised in other family situations. Boys raised outside of an intact family are more likely to have problems with aggression, attention deficit disorder, delinquency, and school suspensions, compared to boys raised in intact married families.³⁶ Some studies suggest that the negative behavioral consequences of marital breakdown are even more significant for boys than for girls. One study found that boys reared in single-parent and step-families were more than twice as likely to end up in prison, compared to boys reared in an intact family.³⁷ Clearly, stable marriage and paternal role models are crucial for keeping boys from self-destructive and socially destructive behavior.

The trust and commitment associated with marriage also give a man and a woman a sense that they have a future together, as well as a future with their children. Marriage is particularly important in binding fathers to their children. For men, the father's role is more discretionary in our society than the mother's role, it depends

³³McLanahan and Sandefur. 1994. Bruce Ellis et al. 2003. "Does Father Absence Place Daughters at Special Risk for Early Sexual Activity and Teenage Pregnancy?" *Child Development* 74: 801–821.

³⁴McLanahan and Sandefur. 1994. Bruce Ellis et al. 2003. "Does Father Absence Place Daughters at Special Risk for Early Sexual Activity and Teenage Pregnancy?" *Child Development* 74: 801–821.

³⁵McLanahan and Sandefur. 1994. Bruce Ellis et al. 2003. "Does Father Absence Place Daughters at Special Risk for Early Sexual Activity and Teenage Pregnancy?" *Child Development* 74: 801–821.

³⁶Marquardt. 2005a. Paul Amato. 2005. "The Impact of Family Formation Change on the Cognitive, Social, and Emotional Well-Being of the Next Generation." *The Future of Children* 15: 75–96.

³⁷Cynthia Harper and Sara McLanahan. 2004. "Father Absence and Youth Incarceration." *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 14: 369–397. 22 Harper and McLanahan. 2004.

more on the normative expectations and social supports provided to fathers by marriage.³⁸ Marriage positions men to receive the regular encouragement, direction, and advice of the mother of his children, and encourages them to pay attention to that input.³⁹ Not surprisingly, cohabiting fathers are less practically and emotionally invested in their children than are married fathers.⁴⁰ Nonresidential fathers see their children much less often than do married, residential fathers, and their involvement is not consistently related to positive outcomes for children.⁴¹ By contrast, married fathers can exercise an abiding, important, and positive influence on their children, and are especially likely to do so in a happy marriage.⁴²

Biology also matters because men and women bring different strengths to the parenting enterprise. The biological relatedness of parents to their children has important consequences for the young, especially girls. Although there is a good deal of overlap in the talents that mothers and fathers bring to parenting, the evidence also suggests that there are crucial sex differences in parenting. Studies suggest that mothers are more sensitive to the cries, words, and gestures of infants, toddlers, and adolescents, and, partly as a consequence, they are better at providing physical and emotional nurture to their children.⁴³ These special capacities of mothers seem to have deep biological underpinnings as a result of pregnancy and breastfeeding. Fathers excel when it comes to providing discipline, ensuring safety, and challenging their children to embrace life's opportunities and confront life's difficulties. The greater physical size and strength of most fathers, along with the pitch and

38Sandra Hofferth and Kermyt Anderson. 2003. "Are All Dads Equal? Biology Versus Marriage as a Basis for Paternal Involvement." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65: 213–232. Wilcox et al. 2005.

39Ross Parke. 1996. *Fatherhood*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. p.101.

40Sandra Hofferth and Kermyt Anderson. 2003. "Are All Dads Equal? Biology Versus Marriage as a Basis for Paternal Involvement." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65: 213–232. Wilcox et al. 2005.

41Valarie King and Holly Heard. 1999. "Nonresident Father Visitation, Parental Conflict, and Mother's Satisfaction: What's Best for Child Well-Being?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61: 385–396. Elaine Sorenson and Chava Zibman. 2000. *To What Extent Do Children Benefit from Child Support?* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute

42Paul Amato. 1998. "More Than Money? Men's Contributions to Their Children's Lives." In Alan Booth and A.C. Crouter, (Eds.), *Men in Families: When Do They Get Involved? What Difference Does It Make?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

43Eleanor Maccoby. 1998. *The Two Sexes: Growing Up Apart, Coming Together*. Cambridge: Harvard University.

inflection of their voice, give them an advantage when it comes to discipline. An advantage that is particularly evident with boys, who are more likely to comply with their fathers' than their mothers' discipline.⁴⁴ Likewise, fathers are more likely than mothers to encourage their children to tackle difficult tasks, endure hardship without yielding, and seek out novel experiences.⁴⁵ These paternal strengths also have deep biological underpinnings: Fathers typically have higher levels of testosterone a hormone associated with dominance and assertiveness—than do mothers. Although the link between nature, nurture, and sex-specific parenting talents is undoubtedly complex, one cannot ignore the overwhelming evidence of sex differences in parenting. The traditional ideal of marriage as a public institution between a man and a woman for the purpose of regulating sexuality and binding children to their biological parents creates highly institutionalized norms that serve the best interests of the moral and emotional development of children.

There is substantial evidence that the decline of two parent families has done a lot of damage to our society. The increase in the divorce rate reduces the collective welfare of our children, strains our justice system, weakens civil society, and increases the size and scope of governmental power. The numbers are indeed staggering. Every year in the United States, more than one million children see their parents divorce and 1.5 million children are born to unmarried mothers. The collective consequences of this family breakdown can be demonstrated by a myriad indicators of social well-being. As an example, one recent Brookings survey indicates that the increase in child poverty in the United States since the 1970s is due almost entirely to declines in the percentage of children reared in married families, primarily because children in single-parent homes are much less likely to receive much material support from their fathers.⁴⁶ Using child well-being as another example, Penn State sociologist Paul Amato estimated how adolescents would fare if our society had the same percentage of two-parent biological families as it did in 1960. His research indicates that this nation's adolescents would have 1.2 million fewer school suspensions, 1 million fewer acts of delinquency or violence, 746,587 fewer repeated grades, and 71,413 fewer suicides.⁴⁷ Similar estimates could be done for the collective effect of family breakdown on teen pregnancy, depression, and high school dropout rates. The bottom line is this: children have paid a heavy price for adult failures to get and stay married.

⁴⁴Wade Horn and Tom Sylvester. 2002. *Father Facts*. Gaithersburg, MD: National Fatherhood Initiative. P. 153. Popenoe. 1996. P. 145. Thomas G. Powers et al.1994. "Compliance and Self-Assertion: Young Children's Responses to Mothers Versus Fathers." *Developmental Psychology* 30: 980–989.

⁴⁵Pruett. 2000. Pp. 30–31. Popenoe. 1996. Pp. 144–145.

⁴⁶Adam Thomas and Isabel Sawhill. 2005. "For Love and Money? The Impact of Family Structure on Family Income." *The Future of Children* 15: 57–74.

⁴⁷Amato. 2005. p. 89.

Public safety and our justice system have also been affected by the retreat from marriage. Even though crime rates have fallen in recent years, the percentage of the population in jail has continued to rise: from .9 percent of the population in 1980 to 2.4 percent in 2003, which amounts to more than 2 million men and women.⁴⁸ Public expenditures on criminal justice—police, courts, and prisons—rose more than 350 percent in the last 20 years, from \$36 billion in 1982 to \$167 billion in 2001.⁴⁹ Empirical research on family and crime strongly suggests that crime is driven in part by the breakdown of marriage. George Akerlof, a Nobel laureate in economics, argues that the crime increase in the 1970s and 1980s was linked to declines in the marriage rate among young working-class and poor men.⁵⁰ Harvard sociologist Robert Sampson concludes from his research on urban crime that murder and robbery rates are closely linked to family structure. In his words: “Family structure is one of the strongest, if not the strongest, predictor of variations in urban violence across cities in the United States.”⁵¹ The close empirical connection between family breakdown and crime suggests that increased spending on crime-fighting, imprisonment, and criminal justice in the United States over the last 40 years is largely the direct or indirect consequence of marital breakdown. Public spending on social services also has risen dramatically since the 1960s, in large part because of increases in divorce and illegitimacy. Estimates vary regarding the costs to the taxpayer of family breakdown, but they clearly run into the many billions of dollars. One Brookings study found that the retreat from marriage was associated with an increase of \$229 billion in welfare expenditures from 1970 to 1996.⁵² Another study found that local, state, and federal governments spend \$33 billion per year on the direct and indirect costs of divorce—from family court costs to child support enforcement to TANF and Medicaid.⁵³ Increases in divorce also mean that family judges and child support

⁴⁸Charles Murray. 2005. “The Hallmark of the Underclass.” *Wall Street Journal* Sept. 29: A18.

⁴⁹<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/glance/tables/exptyptab.htm>

⁵⁰George A. Akerlof. 1998. “Men Without Children.” *The Economic Journal* 108: 287–309.

⁵¹Robert J. Sampson. 1995. “Unemployment and Imbalanced Sex Ratios: Race Specific Consequences for Family Structure and Crime.” In M.B. Tucker and C. Mitchell-Kernan (eds.). *The Decline in Marriage among African Americans*. New York: Russell Sage. P. 249.

⁵²Isabel V. Sawhill. 1999. “Families at Risk.” In H. Aaron and R. Reischauer, *Setting National Priorities: the 2000 Election and Beyond*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

⁵³David Schramm. 2003. *Preliminary Estimates of the Economic Consequences of Divorce*. Utah State University.

enforcement agencies play a deeply intrusive role in the lives of adults and children affected by divorce, setting the terms for custody, child visitation, and child support for more than a million adults and children every year.

Clearly, when the family fails to govern itself, the government steps in to pick up the pieces. The link between the size and scope of the state and the health of marriage as an institution is made even more visible by looking at trends outside the United States. Countries with high rates of illegitimacy and divorce, such as Sweden and Denmark, spend much more money on welfare expenditures, as a percentage of their GDP, than countries with relatively low rates of illegitimacy and divorce, such as Spain and Japan.⁵⁴ Although there has been no definitive comparative research on state expenditures and family structure, and despite that factors such as religion and political culture may confound this relationship, the correlation between the two is suggestive. Of course, at the Council of Conservative Citizens, we suspect that the relationship between state size and family breakdown runs both ways. For instance, earlier research on Scandinavian countries by sociologists David Popenoe and Alan Wolfe suggests that increases in state spending are associated with declines in the strength of marriage and family.⁵⁵ Taken together, the retreat from marriage seems to go hand in hand with more expensive and more intrusive government; family breakdown goes hand in hand with growing hardship in disadvantaged communities, making the call for still more government intervention even more irresistible. It is a pathological spiral that we must work much harder to reflect on why this occurs in the first place.

There is also an abundance of evidence that illustrates that the life style of gay men is unhealthy. Homosexual activists attempt to portray their lifestyle as normal and healthy, and insist that homosexual relationships are the equivalent in every way to their heterosexual counterparts. However, this can be easily demonstrated as false. Reports at a national conference about sexually transmitted diseases indicate that gay men are in the highest risk group for several of the most serious diseases.⁵⁶ The increased number of sexually transmitted diseases (STD) cases is the result of the risky sexual practices by gay men. Instability and promiscuity typically characterize homosexual relationships. These two factors increase the incidence of serious and incurable STD. In addition, some homosexual behaviors put practitioners at higher risk for a variety of ailments, as cataloged by a variety of research data. Despite two decades of intensive efforts to educate homosexuals against the dangers of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) and other STD, the incidence of unsafe sexual practices that often result in various diseases is on the rise. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), from 1994 to 1997 the proportion of homosexuals reporting having

⁵⁴For family trends, see Timothy M. Smeeding, Daniel P. Moynihan, and Lee Rainwater. 2004. "The Challenge of Family System Changes for Research and Policy." In D.P. Moynihan, T. M. Smeding, and L. Rainwater (eds.), *The Future of the Family*. New York: Russell Sage. For information on state spending around the globe, see <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/>.

⁵⁵Popenoe. 1988. Wolfe. 1989.

⁵⁶Bill Roundy, "STD Rates on the Rise," *New York Blade News*, December 15, 2000, p. 1.

had anal sex increased from 57.6 percent to 61.2 percent, while the percentage of those reporting "always" using condoms declined from 69.6 percent to 60 percent.⁵⁷ The CDC reported that during the same period the proportion of men reporting having multiple sex partners and unprotected anal sex increased from 23.6 percent to 33.3 percent. The largest increase in this category (from 22 percent to 33.3 percent) was reported by homosexuals twenty-five years old or younger.⁵⁸ A study presented July 13, 2000 at the XIII International Aids Conference in Durban, South Africa disclosed that a significant number of homosexual and bisexual men with "HIV "continue to engage in unprotected sex with people who have no idea they could be contracting HIV."⁵⁹ Researchers from the University of California, San Francisco found that thirty-six percent of homosexuals engaging in unprotected oral, anal, or vaginal sex failed to disclose that they were HIV positive to casual sex partners.⁶⁰ A CDC report revealed that, in 1997, 45 percent of homosexuals reporting having had unprotected anal intercourse during the previous six months did not know the HIV status of all their sex partners.⁶¹

A Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health study of three-hundred-sixty-one young men who have sex with men (MSM) aged fifteen to twenty-two found that around 40 percent of participants reported having had anal sex.⁶² Thirty-seven percent said they had not used a condom for anal sex during their last same-sex encounter.⁶³ Twenty-one percent of the respondents reported using drugs or alcohol during their last same-

57"Increases in Unsafe Sex and Rectal Gonorrhea among Men Who Have Sex with Men--San Francisco, California, 1994-1997," Mortality and Morbidity Weekly Report (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), January 29, 1999, p. 45.

58"Increases in Unsafe Sex and Rectal Gonorrhea among Men Who Have Sex with Men--San Francisco, California, 1994-1997," Mortality and Morbidity Weekly Report (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), January 29, 1999, p. 45.

59Ulysses Torassa, "Some With HIV Aren't Disclosing Before Sex; UCSF Researcher's 1,397-person Study Presented During Aids Conference," The San Francisco Examiner (July 15, 2000).

60Jon Garbo, "Gay and Bi Men Less Likely to Disclose They Have HIV," GayHealth News (July 18, 2000). Available at: www.gayhealth.com/templates/o/news?record=136.

61Jon Garbo, "Gay and Bi Men Less Likely to Disclose They Have HIV," GayHealth News (July 18, 2000). Available at: www.gayhealth.com/templates/o/news?record=136.

62Jon Garbo, "Risky Sex Common Among Gay Club and Bar Goers," GayHealth News (January 3, 2001). Available at: www.gayhealth.com/templates/97863827496203.../index.html?record=35.

sex encounter.⁶⁴ A five-year CDC study of 3,492 homosexual males aged fifteen to twenty-two found that one-quarter had unprotected sex with both men and women. Another CDC study of 1,942 homosexual and bisexual men with HIV found that 19 percent had at least one episode of unprotected anal sex--the riskiest sexual behavior--in 1998 and 1997, a 50 percent increase from the previous two years.⁶⁵

Studies indicate that the average male homosexual has hundreds of sex partners in his lifetime. A.P. Bell and M.S. Weinberg, in their study of male and female homosexuality, found that 43 percent of white male homosexuals had sex with 500 or more partners, with 28 percent having 1,000 or more sex partners.⁶⁶ In their study of the sexual profiles of 2,583 older homosexuals published in *Journal of Sex Research*, Paul Van de Ven et al., found that only 2.7 percent claimed to have had sex with one partner only.⁶⁷ The most common response, given by 21.6 percent of the respondents, was of having a hundred-one to five hundred lifetime sex partners.⁶⁸ A survey conducted by the homosexual magazine *Genre* found that 24 percent of the respondents said they had had more than a hundred sexual partners in their lifetime. The magazine noted that several respondents suggested including a category of those who had more than a thousand sexual partners.⁶⁹ In his study of male

63Jon Garbo, "Risky Sex Common Among Gay Club and Bar Goers," *GayHealth News* (January 3, 2001). Available at: www.gayhealth.com/templates/97863827496203.../index.html?record=35.

64Jon Garbo, "Risky Sex Common Among Gay Club and Bar Goers," *GayHealth News* (January 3, 2001). Available at: www.gayhealth.com/templates/97863827496203.../index.html?record=35.

65"Bisexuals Serve as 'Bridge' Infecting Women With HIV," *Reuters News Service* (July 30, 2000). Available at: www.mb.com/ph/scty/2000%2D07/sc073004.asp.

66A. P. Bell and M. S. Weinberg, *Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978), pp. 308, 9; see also Bell, Weinberg and Hammersmith, *Sexual Preference* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1981).

67Paul Van de Ven et al., "A Comparative Demographic and Sexual Profile of Older Homosexually Active Men," *Journal of Sex Research* 34 (1997): 354.

68Paul Van de Ven et al., "A Comparative Demographic and Sexual Profile of Older Homosexually Active Men," *Journal of Sex Research* 34 (1997): 354.

homosexuality in *Western Sexuality: Practice and Precept in Past and Present Times*, M. Pollak found that "few homosexual relationships last longer than two years, with many men reporting hundreds of lifetime partners."⁷⁰

Promiscuity among Homosexual Couples is rampant. Even in those homosexual relationships in which the partners consider themselves to be in a committed relationship, the meaning of "committed" typically means something radically different from marriage. In *The Male Couple*, authors David P. McWhirter and Andrew M. Mattison reported that in a study of a hundred-fifty-six males in homosexual relationships lasting from one to thirty-seven years, only seven couples have a totally exclusive sexual relationship, and these men all have been together for less than five years.⁷¹ In *Male and Female Homosexuality*, M. Saghir and E. Robins found that the average male homosexual live-in relationship lasts between two and three years.⁷² *Unhealthy Aspects of "Monogamous" Homosexual Relationships*. Even those homosexual relationships that are loosely termed "monogamous" do not necessarily result in healthier behavior. The journal *AIDS* reported that men involved in relationships engaged in anal intercourse and oral-anal intercourse with greater frequency than those without a steady partner.⁷³ Anal intercourse has been linked to a host of bacterial and parasitical sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS. The exclusivity of the relationship did not diminish the incidence of unhealthy sexual acts, which are commonplace among homosexuals. An English study published in the same issue of the journal *AIDS* concurred, finding that most "unsafe" sex acts among homosexuals occur in steady relationships.⁷⁴

⁶⁹"Survey Finds 40 percent of Gay Men Have Had More Than 40 Sex Partners," *Lambda Report*, January/February 1998, p. 20.

⁷⁰M. Pollak, "Male Homosexuality," in *Western Sexuality: Practice and Precept in Past and Present Times*, edited by P. Ariès and A. Bejin, pp. 40-61, cited by Joseph Nicolosi in *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality* (Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc., 1991), pp. 124, 25.

⁷¹David P. McWhirter and Andrew M. Mattison, *The Male Couple: How Relationships Develop* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1984), pp. 252, 3.

⁷²M. Saghir and E. Robins, *Male and Female Homosexuality* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1973), p. 225; L.A. Peplau and H. Amaro, "Understanding Lesbian Relationships," in *Homosexuality: Social, Psychological, and Biological Issues*, edited by J. Weinrich and W. Paul (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982).

⁷³A.P.M. Coxon et al., "Sex Role Separation in Diaries of Homosexual Men," *AIDS*, July 1993, pp. 877-882.

⁷⁴G. J. Hart et al., "Risk Behaviour, Anti-HIV and Anti-Hepatitis B Core Prevalence in Clinic and Non-clinic Samples of Gay Men in England, 1991-1992," *AIDS*, July 1993, pp. 863-869, cited in "Homosexual Marriage: The Next Demand," Position Analysis paper by Colorado for Family Values, May 1994.

Human Papillomavirus (HPV), is a collection of more than seventy types of viruses that can cause warts, or papillomas, on various parts of the body. More than twenty types of HPV are incurable STDs that can infect the genital tract of both men and women. Most HPV infections are subclinical or asymptomatic, with only one in a hundred people experiencing genital warts. HPV is extremely common among homosexuals. According to the homosexual newspaper The Washington Blade: "A San Francisco study of Gay and bisexual men revealed that HPV infection was almost universal among HIV-positive men, and that 60 percent of HIV-negative men carried HPV."⁷⁵ HPV can lead to anal cancer. At the recent Fourth International AIDS Malignancy Conference at the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Andrew Grulich announced that "most instances of anal cancer are caused by a cancer-causing strain of HPV through receptive anal intercourse. HPV infects over 90 percent of HIV-positive gay men and 65 percent of HIV-negative gay men, according to a number of recent studies."⁷⁶

By showing scientific evidence that homosexual marriage cannot provide the proper moral environment central to a child's psychological development, and that the homosexual lifestyle is not healthy for anyone, we can change people minds regarding homosexual marriage. Since the 1960s, the quality of life in our society has declined by all measurable standards. It is the ultimate irony that the cultural left is now pleading that homosexual marriage is good for the children. Gay marriage is just a way for homosexuals to compete for social status and gain prestige for what tends to be a relatively promiscuous lifestyle. It should be obvious to everyone that our political opponents do not care about the well-being of our society. We need to roll up our sleeves and get to work defending our nation and our culture.

⁷⁵Bill Roundy, "STDs Up Among Gay Men: CDC Says Rise is Due to HIV Misperceptions," The Washington Blade (December 8, 2000). Available at: www.washblade.com/health/a.

⁷⁶Richard A. Zmuda, "Rising Rates of Anal Cancer for Gay Men," Cancer News (August 17, 2000). Available at: cancerlinksusa.com/cancernews_sm/Aug2000/081700analcancer.

