

To the Representatives and Government body of the United States of America:

I am sending this letter to every representative, governor, elected official and of this nation that I can, so it may benefit all of you to read it in its entirety.

It continuously has been reported that the federal circuit has been overriding state laws concerning marriage citing, "failure to prove that traditional marriage will be harmed." While I will be the first to state that news sites are hardly accurate in their reporting, the quotes they relate are usually verbatim. So, as a citizen of this country, let me ask those judges... *Who* are you kidding?

I have followed this as carefully as any citizen with a busy schedule can. I have followed the efforts of Alliance Defending Freedom, the arguments of both sides, read court opinions and documents when I could find them... when has anyone said that traditional marriage would be harmed? If anything, it is *because* traditional marriage has *already* been harmed by both the court systems and the complacency of the American people that we are at this crossroads now, but that is not the issue at hand.

Let me first remind you of what your job is, if you ever knew, and please don't stop reading out of arrogant reaction to that statement. Part of your job is indeed to secure the God-given, natural rights of Americans. The courts lately seem to be awfully good at that. However, that is not the *purpose* of government. We citizens don't need your help to give us natural rights. The purpose of government is to establish order and law, and ensure and protect the security and well being of *all* its citizens as a whole. To quote Oliver Ellsworth, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in the very early 1800's, "The primary objects of government are the peace, order, and prosperity of a society..."

If you haven't noticed, the government has been doing a bang-up job of that lately, and the citizens... we ordinary citizens who aren't pooling together millions of dollars to sink in your campaigns, are becoming angry. Many of those citizens don't actually realize the threat this particular issue brings, because the homosexual lobby and the media have been so good at directing the "conversation," should it even be allowed. They truly have duped people into thinking this is about civil rights and discrimination, two things that pull on the hearts of the best of America. This issue, however, is exactly more of the same; that is, an issue on which the United States government as a whole is fouling up.

Allow me to start on the most fundamental argument this issue brings to the table: discrimination and appointing sexual "orientation" as a class. Since we are all pretty sickingly aware of the argument the homosexual lobby is presenting (unless you have been hiding under a rock), let me cut to the chase. Sexual "orientation." is not immutable. The scientific community has not proven that beyond a shadow of a doubt one way or another, but the evidence is more than enough that no credible body of government should be ruling on it as if it were.

I am not so pompous as to not believe that it isn't possible there are *some* people whose bodies were born to fire off the wrong signals as opposed to everyone else. Why, for any other case, would we call this an abnormality or disorder, but for this it is suddenly normal? That defies every scientific study ever conducted. We do not call something normal when it inhibits or

causes the person inflicted to be incapacitated or incapable of performing the natural functions that *is* normal for its species, in this case man. When someone does have an abnormality, we do, on a case by case basis, sometimes pass special rights for them... up front parking for the handicapped, special teachers for learning disorders, Braille for the blind, etc. These are aids to help them in life. They do not impede the quality of life for anyone else, unless you count the inability to find a decent parking space.

Sexual habits, however, are not limited to an abnormality. Being a behavior, it absolutely *can* be learned. Previous psychological studies could have pointed that out before even bringing homosexuality specifically into the picture. I am already aware that learned men of their field have been trying to warn you of the problems that might occur for children raised in homosexual households. The homosexual lobby has answered this by producing "research" indicating the children are fine. Before diving into the health aspects of the children, allow me to point out that the health of the children is irrelevant to the process of proving whether sexual "orientation" is immutable.

Studies of Homosexual Parenting: A Critical Review (2001): " (Cameron and Cameron) found that less than 6% of the males and 3% of the females in the general population claimed to be bisexual or homosexual, but by comparison, 75% of the adult male children and 57% of the adult female children reared by homosexual parents claimed that they had developed a bisexual or homosexual orientation.¹⁸⁹ 'Our results suggest that the sexual preference or orientation of the parent influences the preference of the child, and that whatever the mechanism, homosexual parents are associated disproportionately with homosexual children.'¹⁹⁰ "

The review also makes clear that the samples of homosexuals reporting are too small to be conclusive, even though Cameron and Cameron did their best to follow research methods. However, even with allowing that not all members of the population were being truthful regarding their answers, a jump from even 10% of the population to 50-60% is astounding, and completely blows the immutable argument right out of the water. It could possibly be argued that the trait is genetically inherited, if the scientific community had not already made it clear that there is no evidence of that, nor does it follow the pattern of inheritable traits. Children learn behavior from their parents and their environment. The average American citizen... never mind that, the highest part of the planet could have told anyone that for free. The term sexual "orientation," therefore, is complete tripe. Sexual preference is much more accurate.

To my knowledge, no federal laws have been written that specify sexual preference as a class... yet; however, there are new laws that act as though it has, along with many states who have, in fact, included sexual "orientation" in their discrimination laws. So please, allow me to point out the blaring problem of including a behavior as a protected class... any, and I mean any group will be able to argue the same argument, and because there is now an established law that allows one behavior to act as a protected class, *all* behaviors will now be able to use that same argument, and you will not lawfully be able to stop them. It is already happening. Imagine my surprise when I learned porn is now a degree at public universities. They aren't hurting anyone. It's just consensual adults. Same argument, same complete disregard of facts. As I pointed out earlier, the purpose of government is the security and well-being of all its citizens as a whole. Just how are you going to do that when you will not be able to lawfully stop destructive behavior? You do realize that stealing and/or causing someone to bleed is not the only way to

harm someone *or* to destroy a society... right? The destructive behavior related to this argument as a whole is already attempting to unravel the very freedoms of the Constitution and/or related rights... free speech (hate speech), religious rights ("discrimination" laws trumping the first right of the first amendment), and the right to privacy (the related transgender "rights" trumping the rights of citizens to gender-related facilities).

Allow me next to touch on civil rights. I am aware, that with the way the law is written, anyone regardless of who they are can essentially ask for due process. It is through this due process, I believe, that many of these rulings are being handed down. I first want to point out that when asked what civil rights they are being denied, there is little that the homosexual lobby is able to fire back. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have watched videos of dogs being set on Black crowds. I have seen the images of separate water fountains, separate bathrooms, separate seating. I have seen *pictures* of hanging Black people with the murderers who strung them up facing the camera completely unashamed. *That* was a civil rights struggle. When and where are the mobs of people preventing a self-professed gay person from sitting wherever he wants on the bus? Does it have to do with the rest of the bus getting up and moving away from him? Even if that were true, it is not a *civil rights* matter. There is exactly one matter in question, and it is also not a civil rights matter.

The definition of marriage, as understood by natural and common law over generations and generations of many, many cultures well existing before and up to America, has never included exclusively two people of the same sex, never even occurred to anyone to think so. Such relationships did indeed exist, but never once were they the cultural equivalence of marriage. This is important, because Natural Law, the Laws of Nature and Nature's God, is absolutely foundational to our laws. It is from these sorts of Natural Laws, among other things, that the Bill of Rights was formed. Natural Law precludes that people can have a reasonable right to an expectation to be allowed to marry. However, it does not preclude that people can have a reasonable right to expect to "marry" the same sex, because marriage has not once, *ever* meant that. Therefore, there *are* no civil rights being denied. All men in America have the same right to marry a woman of his choosing, and the opposite is true. The federal government, nor the states, is under no obligation to change that meaning. In fact, what you guys are under is an obligation to provide stability and prosperity to America. The only question you should be asking is whether homosexual marriage will accomplish that, or what affect *would* or could it have?

Homosexual lobbyists have tried hard to paint the picture that there would be no difference between a homosexual union and a hetero one. Such a position doesn't just defy logic, it defies science. Of course, if they didn't say that, they couldn't propagandize a discrimination charge. Something that several in our communities seem to be forgetting (and a shocking amount of them supposedly connected with "higher" education), is that not *all* forms of discrimination are bad. We discriminate on a daily basis, for very valid reasons. When you went to work this morning, chances are you chose to ride in a car rather than on a bicycle. Why discriminate against the bicycle? Discrimination, even within the realm of dealing with people, has its place. When even science backs up fundamental differences between different aspects of the same species, is it *smart* to ignore them? Let's again cut to the chase shall we? *Can* a homosexual couple fulfill the job of a marriage?

In studies brought up by the homosexual lobby, they say that children raised in a home by

homosexual couples as opposed to a hetero one have the same grades, stay out of trouble... are basically the same as those raised in traditional families. Before even locating rebuttals on that information, I knew from deep personal experience that good grades hardly reflect the whole picture of adjustment. My parents divorced when I was three, my step-father was abusive, and my mother raised us on her own after that divorce, never to remarry. My four other siblings and I also got generally satisfactory grades, stayed out of trouble, and have been contributing adult citizens. If anyone were to ask us at the time, we'd probably all tell you we were fine. But we weren't fine. All five of us went through severe depression. All five of us have had psychological problems that has affected our lives. While I was younger, I couldn't have put a name on it, never having experienced anything different. For me it was "normal." Today, however, older and wiser, I know that hole in me was a girl missing her father. It was not until I was an adult that someone came into my life that I instinctively made into a surrogate father of sorts (I never thought of him as my father or even a replacement, necessarily), and through him some of the hole in my soul was soothed and filled. Because it happened, I was then able to recognize it for what it was.

My family may have turned out to be "well adjusted citizens" through the hard-work and dedication of our mother to raise us (and she did try ever hard), but that did not stop our souls from knowing something was wrong. I would not wish that on *any* child. Had we had different a different upbringing, and/or different personalities, it could have turned out a very different way. For my part, I was scared of men. Raised differently, I could see my fears turning to a complete rejection of men. Interesting that society as a whole seems to be doing something of the same. Do you believe that is healthy? From the get-go, *every* child that a homosexual couple brings into the household will be a member of a broken home. There is no equivalenting with a heterosexual home and union. To paraphrase quote a ruling made by a judge fairly early in this debate, an adoption is what is done after a child's home fails. It is not the same, not at all.

Now, combine the idea of that not only will the children of a homosexual household be deprived of either a mother or a father, but they will also be subjected to confusion on their sexuality. Can you imagine the hardship a boy would go through thinking he was gay only to years later as an adult realize he is not? Homosexual activists argue that gay children go through this... but does it make any sense that they would have no regard for the reverse? Even if they do not, we must. It does not make sense to pass a law that throws into chaos the natural, *scientific*, order of a society for the 2 or 3 % the law means to "help."

Going back to those studies, they have been challenged with all kinds of flaws such as lack of control groups, lack of clear objectivity (in some of the studies, the "researchers" didn't even talk to the children, only the parents), and particularly, lack of homosexual households to participate, making a random sample of people very hard to gather in order to obtain accurate data.

I especially would like to point out this:

(Studies of Homosexual Parenting: A Critical Review) "Among the **twenty-seven** studies of homosexual parents, **twenty-six** (96%) used a research procedure which was contaminated by selfpresentation bias. In discussing the methodological problems of a longitudinal study of homosexual families, Gartrell, Hamilton, Banks, Mosbacher, Reed, Sparks and Bishop wrote: Some may have volunteered for this project because they were motivated to demonstrate that

lesbians were capable of producing healthy, happy children. To the extent that these subjects might wish to present themselves and their families in the best possible light, the study findings may be shaped by self-justification and selfpresentation bias.¹⁰⁰

Because of the widespread awareness of general social taboos against homosexuality and because of the obvious self-interest of homosexual parents, such self-presentation bias would be present in studies in which the subjects explicitly identified themselves as homosexual parents on the research instruments. For example, rather than assessing the children directly, the research method of Wyers involved "self-presentation bias" by asking homosexual parents if their child had knowledge about their homosexuality and whether learning this fact had an "overall positive impact" or "overall negative impact" upon their child, and whether this knowledge had enhanced their parent-child relationship."

In addition:

"The studies of child adjustment of children reared in homosexual homes versus married couple homes are further confounded by the fact that the children in homosexual homes have spent a significant part of their childhood in married couple homes before divorce and often maintain significant contact with non-custodial fathers. In the study by Golombok, Spencer, and Rutter for example, one-third (twelve subjects) had spent at least five years in a home with mothers and fathers before living in a homosexual setting, another one-third had lived in a married couple home for at least two years.³⁹ Moreover, only three children had never lived in a married couple home.⁴⁰

Golombok, Spencer, and Rutter found no difference in gender identity, sex role, and sexual orientation between the homosexualreared versus heterosexual mother-reared children they studied.⁴¹ However, gender identity is established in the preschool years⁴² when most of the subjects in both groups had been still residing with their mother and father, and there are theoretical relationships between gender identity, sex role, and sexual orientation.

The fact that children in the homosexual homes previously spent a considerable portion of their childhood in married couple homes is in addition to the nonparallel experience of the children in heterosexual homes living with a single parent and with larger numbers of siblings. Therefore, the research design is stacked against the child reared by the heterosexual parent in several respects, and the children reared by homosexuals have more adults present in the home (with partners and other adults in the household) and have had significant prior experience in a married couple home in most cases."

The homosexual agenda has been fraught with inaccuracies, bullying, and deception. It is no stretch to think their "studies" have more of the same. Not only is there not sufficient evidence to show that a child turned out of a homosexual union will be the same as a hetero one, the union also by its nature deprives children of their natural right to be raised by their biological mother and father whenever possible.

Next, let's touch on the stability of homosexuality. Homosexual lobbyists have done the very best they can to erase any negative reports surrounding their preferences. Again referencing *Studies of Homosexual Parenting: A critical review* (as it uses a collection of various studies):

"This study (Cameron and Cameron) also reported a disproportionate percentage (29%) of the adult children of homosexual parents had been specifically subjected to sexual molestation by that homosexual parent, compared to only 0.6% of adult children of heterosexual parents having reported sexual relations with their parent.' Having a homosexual parent(s) appears to increase the risk of incest with a parent by a factor of about fifty.'¹⁹³ This finding, and the findings reviewed by Cameron and Cameron suggest a 'disproportionate association between homosexuality and pedophilia and a correspondingly disproportionate risk of homosexual incest. . . for children reared by homosexuals.'¹⁹⁴ Sixty-seven percent of the males who had been reared by homosexual parents reported a homosexual first sexual experience compared to 8.5% of the males reared by heterosexual parents.¹⁹⁵ Pointing out a parallel with other studies of sexual victimization of boys, these investigators reported that 67% of the small number of boys who had reported having been molested by their fathers also became bisexual or homosexual themselves.¹⁹⁶

Moreover, while the adults reporting having been reared by a homosexual parent constituted only 0.3% of the total random sample, they reported 10% of the undesired homosexual experiences imposed upon them as a child for the entire study sample.¹⁹⁷ Children reared by homosexual parents also experience disproportionately higher rates of having both homosexual and heterosexual relations with other caretakers, relatives, and other authority figures.¹⁹⁸ 'Males appeared to fare especially poorly in terms of experiencing sexually undesirable events when parented by a homosexual.' "

I want to cover two points with this. One, reports that homosexuals were often molested as children is not new, and as far as I know, they still haven't really contested that. Two is that, while they *have* contested that homosexual "parents" do not molest their children more than heterosexual, not only is this not proven, research done well before this has already established that a child sexually abused by his parents will often sexually abuse his own children. So, how does that equate? If a significant number of children who were abused will become homosexual, and sexually abused children statistically become abusers, how can it stand to reason that those now adults wouldn't abuse their children? And how would it not outweigh hetero abusers? Need I remind, when the research of sexually abused children was started, there was no smear agenda one way or another.

I am not at all saying at all that every single professed homosexual is a predator, but I have seen our society jump over the simplest things involving children. Should not even a hint of this deserve a complete and thorough investigation before sanctioning thousands of homosexual couples as the same as parents? If homosexuality is elevated to a class, it will make it that much harder to investigate these crimes. Even if two sexually abused homosexuals do not engage in such crimes against children in their custody, is it really wise to unilaterally legalize and sanction such unions as a stable backbone of our nation? Isn't it important to understand why homosexuality occurs, before recklessly making laws regarding it?

To discover the truth, I can start you with this. It is common, very, very common, in discussions with people and gays I and they have met, that those gays have come from broken homes and/or had a father issue. That is *not* the setup for a stable marriage, or a stable country. I believe homosexuality is becoming more common directly as a result of the instability of

marriage and families in our nation in the first place. You will not re-stabilize our country by making a legal union out of behavior commonly produced by instability and even crime. It is necessary that they confront their psychological issues, not hide behind them.

Let me also offer another true life example. I know a girl who is a product of a broken home. As a teenage child, she declared herself to be a lesbian. We all knew this was about rebellion, not "orientation," but to ask her, she would have spouted off every talking point in the homosexual lobby book. About a year later, still underage, she gave birth to a child. The child up to now has been raised mostly by the child's grandmother, although there are signs that the child's mom might finally be getting her life together. Today, it's possible she might still call herself a lesbian, and she is more than capable of going before a judge with another girl, and smiling sweetly, saying "I just love her and want to live my life." I dare say that she may even believe it. The nature of confusion is that you really don't know what is going on, but it is also human nature to say that you do anyway. Our system being what it is, the judge would probably know nothing of her background. This is a far cry from the squeaky clean image the homosexual lobby would have you believe, but like most things in hollywood, that image defies reality.

As long as this letter is, I still have only touched the surface on the problems with this. I have barely or not at all addressed children with "three parents," sexual promiscuity, the burden on an already over-burdened population that *more* sexual deviation and promiscuity will cause, the related transgender confusion, school propaganda, subversion of the rights of parents, the burden on religious rights (especially when it never should have lawfully been an issue in the first place), and etc.

So, please allow me to pull some of this together:

There is no evidence to suggest that homosexuality is strictly immutable, and plenty to suggest environment plays a large role in its manifestation. It is not genetically passed. As such, it does not qualify as a class. Passing laws that elevate it to the status of a class sets a dangerous precedent, and is already interfering with the rights of the rest of the populace. I'd also like to note, that because there is no evidence it is immutable, and because a homosexual couple does not fit the same parameters of a hetero one, there is no comparison to this and interracial marriage. An interracial couple can still have their own child. The biological difference between race is non-existent compared to the biological differences between sexes.

At best, some few might have a true abnormality, but until a genetic marker can identify such individuals the way missing limbs or blindness can identify those afflictions, there is no justification to grant special rights, especially if and when they burden the general populace.

Because marriage in nearly all if not all societies has only ever meant the joining of men and women for the purposes of starting a new household and all that goes with that, especially including the raising of children, there is no right of civil expectation of marriage to mean the joining of the same sex. A homosexual couple by their very definition cannot be considered as the same, nor can they serve the same function, as a heterosexual one. In addition to that, should a homosexual couple wish to join merely for legal purposes, civil unions already existed in many states before the argument became nationwide. Identifying such couples as civil unions provided the distinction needed to denote the difference between the two types of unions, and

offered legal protections or at least the potential for legal protections for all parties possibly involved, including but not limited to: marriage, children, adoption, religious rights, and businesses.

Children have the natural right to be raised by their biological parents whenever possible, but should that not be possible, they should also have the right to grow up in a family that will not confuse their sexual expectations, potentially setting them up for psychological pain for the rest of their lives. While this is ironically an argument of the homosexual lobby, the fact that so few children ever manifest such homosexual expectations under normal heterosexual conditions makes it completely illogical, not to mention irresponsible, to subject an unknown number of children to sexual confusion for the sake of those few.

While not all or even a majority of those with a homosexual preference have indicated that they were sexually abused as children, enough of these cases exist to cause concern. Homosexuality has in the past been associated with a number of self-destructive psychological problems. While the homosexual lobby contends that these problems are caused by social rejection, reports are silent as to the current mental health of homosexuals. Even if such reports are being conducted, the manner in which such research is being done is not reliable, and must be subjected to scrutiny. I'd also like to mention that while the homosexual lobby cites other past cultures that have had open homosexuality as normal, they fail to mention that in many of these cultures the norm was men and young boys or teens, which would be child molestation in our culture. The records are also pretty silent on how those young boys felt about it. Even stepping outside of molestation, there could be evidence that a number of those claiming to be homosexual come from broken and/or unstable families, while other studies *have* shown that children in traditional heterosexual families will be much, much less likely to call themselves homosexual. This *still* points to ties with psychological and stability problems, and does not lend credibility to homosexuality being normal or healthy for civilization.

In conclusion... it is not *traditional marriage* that is harmed. It is the very fabric of our civilization. It is the further eroding of our government. It is our future. They say one must have legal standing to present an argument in court... this issue concerns every single American. We *must* have a healthy civilization for our nation to survive. So many people blind to the fact that such social issues are directly related to the fiscal and economical ones. Structure and discipline starts in the family. Just how is sanctioning broken families going to help the failing future security of America?

I am just a simple housewife. I do not have millions to spend on your campaigns. I don't have networks and news sites to seek out and print my words. I don't have special influence anywhere. My education is modest. High school, some college. By no means do I think I know everything, nor can I hope to have read every court proceeding, every report ever conducted on this issue. I'm sure some of you could and would take me to task, telling my why I'm wrong, looking up laws, etc. Please make sure none of it includes any of the talking points used to date, because I assure you that even if I have not mentioned them here, I have heard them all.

I realize that there are some homosexual couples out there that really do make a home for themselves and are happy in their lives, minding their own business. As one American to another, I respect that. Let them live their lives without interference. I expect some like that

have come forward in this movement, and probably did not have any malicious intent towards anyone else. Government should not be callous, so I respect hearing their cases as well.

But my understanding for the direction of events stops there. I expect members of the government to be compassionate, but I also expect them to be responsible. I expect them to consider other things besides the people in front of them, *especially* for something this foundational. I expect them to not just know the law, but know the spirit of the law, and the purpose of law.

I am a simple housewife, and yet here I am writing you what should be your job to consider and think about for the sake of America. That is what we hire you for, is it not? I have other things to do besides research this. I shouldn't have to. Yet all of you seem to be failing, big time. I suppose many think this is small beans compared to the big, fat open border. I suppose in some ways it is. All your incompetence won't mean ducky if and when there is a massive attack on American soil. Still, if we are to survive that, we will need a strong populace not ruled by psychological confusion and emotion, as is taking place right this very moment. We have a generation that does not understand what Law, natural or civil, means, or its purpose. They don't understand, because that understanding is learned through the most basic example of civil law known to man, the joining of Mars and Venus... that is, the completely opposite ends of man and wife, in Holy Matrimony. Even if one does not believe in God, they can understand the natural law this represents.

I know some of you could possibly be elected by constituents that want marriage to mean hetero and homosexual unions. I absolutely respect that you must represent the constituents of your area. I also, however, ask that you consider what is said here. Your constituents may not have ever had a chance to hear the other side of things. You yourself may even be a part of the homosexual lobby I have been referring to through out this letter. In that case, /wave ^.^ (since it can be hard to tell in a letter, I will state that was not sarcasm).

Do your job, reps. Introduce and protect /aw, not social experiments with that have no scientific or factual backing.

Written by a citizen of the United States and of the Great State of Alabama <--- everyone who just took a deep breath... you shouldn't stereotype.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Daniel Anderson