



Clanking Chains: The Demand for Tolerance: How & Why Legalization of Homosexuality Threatens America's Children

- 69- This brings us to two more definitions from Kohl that are important to our study:

Kohl, *From Archetype to Zeitgeist*, 137:

Ethnocentrism is an attitude by which one evaluates other cultures or societies in light of the values of one's own culture. Ethnocentrism is a problem for anthropologists, historians, and sociologists ... who study cultures other than their own. Anthropologists, for example, have been known to observe other cultures while believing in the superiority of Western European culture, and therefore rank these cultures according to how closely they resemble European culture. The societies that are closest in resemblance are considered sophisticated and those that differ are ranked in orders of primitivity. School social studies and history texts are some of the worst offenders in their ethnocentrism.

- 70- The major problem-solving device that is supposed to combat ethnocentrism is "tolerance." More help is provided by:

Kohl, *From Archetype to Zeitgeist*, 171:

Tolerance is the capacity to bear or endure stress or pressure. There is (an) ordinary usage of the word *tolerance*, one ... very central to the idea of what life in a democracy should be like. In that use, tolerance consists of not interfering with something that you might find disagreeable or unpleasant but that is legal and does not hurt you or anybody else. There is a difference, for example, between religious freedom and religious tolerance. Freedom of religion does not imply a criticism of the religions of free people, whereas religious tolerance implies that religious differences exist and that groups consider each other wrong but agree for the sake of peace to coexist.

- 71- The hypocrisy of this idea is reflected abundantly in the cultural struggle that exists between traditionalists or "reactionaries," and progressives or "radicals." Example: Traditionalists are said to be intolerant by progressives who are offended by conservative's "reactionary" idea that homosexuals are involved in sinful behavior and thus should not be granted social, political, or legal standing. However, progressives are not required to be tolerant of traditionalists when they are offended by the "radical" effort to present homosexuality as a normal lifestyle in sex-education classes.
- 72- The progressive definition of tolerance is "not interfering with something that you might find disagreeable or unpleasant but that is legal and does not hurt you or anybody else."
- 73- In its "long march through the institutions" of Western culture, the philosophy of the Frankfurt School has enabled the homosexual agenda to acquire the legal standing it needs to become an accepted lifestyle in the United States.
- 74- A couple of examples will illustrate several points: (1) Cultural Marxism is very patient but relentless, (2) it employs a Fabian approach in its "long march," and (3) the premise that true democracy demands total equality for all citizens regardless of community standards.
- 75- The first example regarding the compartment of "homosexual rights" is the 1973 decision by the American Psychiatric Association that deleted homosexuality from its list of mental disorders. The following statement is posted on the APA's Web site:



In December 1973, the American Psychiatric Association's Board of Trustees deleted homosexuality from its official nomenclature of mental disorders. The action was taken following a review of the scientific literature and consultation with experts in the field. For a mental condition to be considered a psychiatric disorder, it should either regularly cause emotional distress or regularly be associated with clinically significant impairment of social functioning. These experts found that homosexuality does not meet these criteria.

See APA Web site: http://www.psych.org/public_info/homose~1.cfm

- 76) And I agree. The problem with homosexuality is not that it is a “psychiatric disorder” but that it is deviant behavior. What the APA ruling did however was give the green light to the Supreme Court to classify it as a legally-protected lifestyle. An example is the dissenting opinion of Justice John Paul Stevens in the case of:

**BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA AND MONMOUTH COUNCIL, et al., PETITIONERS v.
JAMES DALE [June 28, 2000]**

The State of New Jersey has decided that people who are open and frank about their sexual orientation are entitled to equal access to employment as school teachers, police officers, librarians, athletic coaches, and a host of other jobs filled by citizens who serve as role models for children and adults alike. Dozens of Scout units throughout the State are sponsored by public agencies, such as schools and fire departments, that employ such role models. BSA's affiliation with numerous public agencies that comply with New Jersey's law against discrimination cannot be understood to convey any particular message endorsing or condoning the activities of all these people.²⁶

Unfavorable opinions about homosexuals “have ancient roots.” *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 U.S. 186, 192 (1986). Like equally atavistic opinions about certain racial groups, those roots have been nourished by sectarian doctrine. *Id.*, at 196—197 (Burger, C. J., concurring); *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 3 (1967).²⁷ See also *Mathews v. Lucas*, 427 U.S. 495, 520 (1976) (Stevens, J., dissenting) (“Habit, rather than analysis, makes it seem acceptable and natural to distinguish between male and female, alien and citizen, legitimate and illegitimate; for too much of our history there was the same inertia in distinguishing between black and white”). Over the years, however, interaction with real people, rather than mere **adherence to traditional ways of thinking** about members of unfamiliar classes, have modified those opinions.

A few examples: The American Psychiatric Association's and the American Psychological Association's removal of “homosexuality” from their lists of mental disorders;²⁸ a move toward greater understanding within some religious communities;²⁹ Justice Blackmun's classic opinion in *Bowers*;³⁰ Georgia's invalidation of the statute upheld in *Bowers*;³¹ and New Jersey's enactment of the provision at issue in this case. Indeed, the past month alone has witnessed some remarkable changes in attitudes about homosexuals.³²

That such prejudices are still prevalent and that they have caused serious and tangible harm to countless members of the class New Jersey seeks to protect are established matters of fact that neither the Boy Scouts nor the Court disputes. That harm can only be aggravated by the creation of a constitutional shield for a policy that is itself the product of a habitual way of thinking about strangers. As Justice Brandeis so wisely advised, “we must be ever on our guard, lest we erect our **prejudices** into legal principles.”

If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold. I respectfully dissent.

This dissenting opinion by Justice John Paul Stevens, who was joined by Justices David Souter, Ruth Ginsburg, and Stephen Breyer, came within one vote of giving homosexuals legal equality in every aspect of our society. And who assisted Justice Stevens in reaching his opinion? Pastors and rabbis! The following statement is supported by a footnote giving it theological credence:



Insofar as religious matters are concerned, BSA's bylaws state that it is "absolutely nonsectarian in its attitude toward ... religious training." App. 362. "The BSA does not define what constitutes duty to God or the practice of religion. This is the responsibility of parents and religious leaders." *Id.*, at 76. In fact, many diverse religious organizations sponsor local Boy Scout troops. Brief for Petitioners 3. Because a number of religious groups do not view homosexuality as immoral or wrong and reject discrimination against homosexuals,³ it is exceedingly difficult to believe that BSA nonetheless adopts a single particular religious or moral philosophy when it comes to sexual orientation. This is especially so in light of the fact that Scouts are advised to seek guidance on sexual matters from their religious leaders (and Scoutmasters are told to refer Scouts to them); BSA surely is aware that some religions do not teach that homosexuality is wrong.

³ See, e.g., Brief for Deans of Divinity Schools and Rabbinical Institutions as *Amicus Curiae* [Latin: **A friend of the court. A by-stander (usually a counselor) who interposes and volunteers information upon some matter of law in regard to which the judge is doubtful or mistaken. Implies friendly intervention of counsel to remind court of legal matter which has escaped its notice, and regarding which it appears to be in danger of going wrong. Henry Campbell Black. *Black's Law Dictionary*. 4th ed. (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1968), 107.] 8 ("The diverse religi[ous] traditions [?] of this country present no coherent moral message that excludes gays and lesbians from participating as full and equal members of those institutions. Indeed, the movement among a number of the nation's major religious institutions for many decades has been toward public recognition of gays and lesbians as full members of moral communities, and acceptance of gays and lesbians as religious leaders, elders and clergy"); Brief for General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church et al. as *Amicus Curiae* 3 (describing views of The United Methodist Church, the Episcopal Church, the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, the United Church Board of Homeland Ministries, and the Unitarian Universalist Association, all of whom reject discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation).**

<http://supct.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/99-699.ZD.html>

- 77- As far as the dissenting justices are concerned, parents, in order to avoid being classified as intolerant, must knowingly place their sons under the supervision of homosexuals or withdraw them from participation in an organization that would otherwise benefit their development as good citizens of the community.
- 78- Once the Supreme Court gets a five-to-four majority on a key homosexual rights case, then parents will have no means of protecting their children from homosexual propaganda and solicitation. When it becomes classified as a normal lifestyle with no negative moral implications then its practitioners may freely and with impunity recruit children into the lifestyle and eventually into its behavior. The sex-education curricula in the federal schools must teach it as a normal "sexual orientation" with attendance mandated since to opt out would show intolerance.
- 79- Parents simply do not realize the extent of immoral horror to which their children will be exposed when homosexuality achieves full legal approval. Whether by consent from altered beliefs or from social pressure to be politically correct, parental tolerance toward this lifestyle will signal open season on their children to these purveyors of perversion.