

## Arkansas Supreme Court Favors Homosexuality Over Wellbeing Of Children

June 30, 2006

By Patrick Briney

President, [Arkansas Republican Assemblies](#)

President, [Leadership Training Institute of America](#)

The Arkansas Supreme Court has once again shown a serious lack in judgment and a disregard for the welfare of children. This time the Court upheld Pulaski County Circuit Judge Timothy Fox's 2004 ruling that it is unconstitutional for the Child Welfare Agency Review Board to disqualify homosexuals from serving as foster parents. The child welfare board instituted the ban in March 1999.

The child welfare board correctly asserts that children are more likely to thrive when raised in traditional two-parent homes. In contrast, the four Arkansans who are suing to allow homosexuals into the foster care parenting program argue that they are being discriminated against and that their right to privacy and protection are being violated.

The privacy claim in the suit exposes the real homosexual agenda in this controversy. It is not about the welfare of the children. It is about publicizing and promoting homosexual privileges, and the Supreme Court failed to protect the children. Instead they chose to favor the homosexual agenda over the welfare of children. Can anything be more despicable than forsaking the welfare of posterity?

On behalf of homosexual interests, a brief was submitted to argue for moral relativity. Bishop Larry E. Maze of the Episcopal Diocese of Arkansas agreed to use his name and title to represent a "Christian" clergyman's perspective. However, no "Christian" argument was made. No Bible verse like Romans 1:27, which says, "... likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly..." was mentioned. Instead Bishop Maze, et al. argue that moral judgment is whatever people choose it to be, and therefore the Court has no standard by which to judge morality. Ironically, this argues against biblical morality, which is the Christian standard and authority.

On behalf of the scientific community, a brief was submitted with the supportive credential of national and state psychology associations and the National Association of Social Workers and its Arkansas chapter. Little Rock lawyer George Wise stated, "There is a wealth of peer review scientific information out there which indicates that children are not harmed in any way by being parented or foster-parented by gay or lesbian parents or couples."

However, in contradiction to this claim, Dr. Paul Cameron of the Family Research Institute reported peer reviewed findings in an article titled, "Errors by the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association...", published in a 1996 issue of the Psychological Reports, a peer reviewed journal, that the claim, "...that homosexuals, including homosexual teachers, do not disproportionately molest children, [and] that children of homosexual parents are not more likely to become homosexuals are inconsistent with the scientific literature."

Further, Dr. Cameron reported results in a 2005 issue of the Psychological Reports in an article titled, "Child Molestations by Homosexual Foster Parents: Illinois 1997-2002" showing that homosexual practitioners were proportionately more apt to abuse foster or adoptive children sexually.

On behalf of the New York based organization Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Children of Lesbians & Gays Everywhere, the National Gay & Lesbian Task Force, and the Stonewall Democratic Club of Arkansas, Susan Sommer submitted a brief arguing that allowing homosexuals to be foster parents is

consistent with the 2002 Arkansas Supreme Court ruling against the state's anti-sodomy law. However, she failed to make the case that the Court's ruling automatically entitled homosexuals to foster parenting rights and privileges. The fact is that the stronger argument is against homosexual foster parents because child rearing should be left to those who procreate, namely heterosexuals. Children are the result of heterosexual relationships and therefore should be exclusively reared by heterosexuals. Homosexuals choose to forfeit heterosexual relationships and therefore forfeit rights and privileges afforded to heterosexuals such as child rearing and marriage. This is not discrimination. Married couples with children are granted certain privileges (e.g., tax deductions) in society for the benefit of the children. Such decisions are for the children's sake not for the adults. The homosexual position is selfish and greedy, which reflects a corrupt and anti-social character. If they want privacy rights, then they should practice privacy and stop pushing their agenda on the children of others.

On behalf of the Child Welfare League of America and The Evan B. Donaldson Adoption Institute, Julie Munsell, a spokeswoman for the Arkansas' Health and Human Services Department, submitted a brief arguing that the state has no legal authority to set guidelines that exclude homosexuals from fostering parenting. She reportedly said, "We believe that the board had the authority to make regulations that fit the interests of children in state foster care. If you had to pick an ideal situation, what would it look like?" Obviously, if the child's best interest is the foremost concern, then foster parents should be screened according to the benefit and potential risk they pose to the children.

Here are reasons to disqualify homosexuals from the foster parenting program:

1. Children are the fruit of heterosexual relationships, therefore heterosexual couples are the preferred, natural, and rightful fit to raise children. A facetious mantra for child advocates to consider is, "let them raise their own children."
2. Homosexuals have chosen a lifestyle that is unnatural and unfruitful in producing children and therefore are an unnatural fit for raising children.
3. Exposure to homosexuality increases the risk of corrupting a child's moral bearings. In a "Random-probability sampling in Los Angeles, Denver, Omaha, Louisville, and Washington, DC 4,340 adults answered an extensive questionnaire regarding sexual attitudes, activities, and experiences.... The results show that bisexuals or homosexuals claimed much more frequent sexual contact with caretakers, and homosexuality was disproportionately implicated in sexual events under caretakers' charge" (Psychological Reports, 1986, 58, 327-337).
4. Exposure to homosexuality increases a child's risk to harm. "Analyzing data from the 1996 National Household Survey of Drug Abuse (N = 12,381) and comparing those who engaged in four recreational activities — homosexual sex, illegal drug use, participation in prostitution, and smoking — against those who abstained, participants (1) were more frequently disruptive (e.g., more frequently criminal, drove under the influence of drugs or alcohol, used illegal drugs, took sexual risks), (2) were less frequently productive (e.g., less frequently had children in marriage, more frequently missed work), and (3) generated excessive costs (e.g., more promiscuous, higher consumers of medical services). Major sexuality surveys have reported similar findings for homosexuals" (Psychological Reports, 2005, 96, 915-961).
5. Exposure to homosexuality increases the risk of emotional difficulties to the child. Analysis of published reports show that "children of homosexuals ... differ appreciably from those who live with married parents" (**Children of Homosexual Parents Report Childhood Difficulties**, Psychological Reports, 2002, 90, 71-82).
6. Children raised by homosexual parents increase the risk of being subjected to social abuse, specifically to ridicule, rejection, and embarrassment.
7. Children raised by homosexual parents are at greater risk of lacking an appreciation for natural design and purpose.

8. Homosexual lifestyle threatens the social structure (other children) to which children are exposed and contribute. When a child carries into society an acceptance of a harmful lifestyle, this anti-social perspective (meme) spreads to others like an infectious germ. “Are homosexuals ‘not dangers to society’ and is homosexuality ‘compatible with full health’? Published findings show that, “ ... Bisexuals and homosexuals ... as compared to heterosexuals: (1) more frequently exposed themselves to biological hazards (e.g., sadomasochism, fisting, bestiality, ingestion of feces); (2) exposed themselves sexually to more different bodies (e.g., more frequently admitted to participating in orgies, reported considerably larger numbers of sexual partners); (3) more frequently reported participating in socially disruptive sex (e.g., deliberate infection of others, cheating in marriage, making obscene phone calls); and (4) more frequently reported engaging in socially disruptive activities (e.g., criminality, shoplifting, tax cheating). From the standpoints of individual health, public health and social order, participating in homosexual activity could be viewed as dangerous to society and incompatible with full health” (Paul Cameron, Kirk Cameron, and Kay Proctor. Effect of Homosexuality Upon Public Health and Social Order. Psychological Reports, 1989, 64, 1167-1179).
9. Placing the priority of a social agenda over a child’s welfare is socially, morally, and legally irresponsible.

*{end}*