Montana State Legislature

Exhibit Number: 23

The following exhibit is several assorted documents that exceeds the 10-page limit therefore it cannot be scanned. A small portion has been scanned to aid in your research for information. The exhibit is on file at the Montana Historical Society and can be viewed there.

Montana Historical Society Archives, 225 N. Roberts, Helena, MT 59620-1201; phone (406) 444-4774. For minutes in paper format, please contact the Montana State Law Library, Justice Building, 215 N. Sanders, Helena, MT 59620; (406) 444-3660. Tapes and exhibits are also available at the Historical Society (tapes are retained for five years). Scanning done by: Susie Hamilton

EXHIBIT 23
DATE 3/16/05
SB 199

Dallas Erickson Testimony
House Judiciary Committee
SB 199 "Sexual Orientation"
March 16, 2005

Madam Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Dallas Erickson and I am a lobbyist for and represent the 4000 supporters of Montana Citizens for Decency through Law. We oppose this bill.

Let's agree that we're all against hate and abuse of anybody. But I hope that we can all agree that a business, Church, youth group or for that matter anyone should be able to decide whether they want to support people with "sexual orientations" that they do not agree with and feel are unhealthy and unsafe.

We are opposed to adding the words "sexual orientation" to ANY bill. There is NO DEFINITION TO "SEXUAL ORIENTATION" in Montana law. Because of testimony in the previous committee of all the perversions that fall under this term the sponsor tried to limit the definition. This bill tries to define what is meant by "sexual orientation" with these words: "FOR PURPOSES OF THIS TITLE, "SEXUAL ORIENTATION" MEANS HAVING A PREFERENCE FOR HETEROSEXUALITY, HOMOSEXUALITY, OR BISEXUALITY, HAVING A HISTORY OF ANY ONE OR MORE OF THESE PREFERENCES, OR BEING IDENTIFIED WITH ANY ONE OR MORE OF THESE PREFERENCES. THE USE OF THE TERM IN THIS TITLE MAY NOT BE CONSTRUED TO PROTECT OR RENDER LAWFUL ANY CONDUCT OTHERWISE PROHIBITED BY LAW." Can anyone explain to me what this definition means? I have talked with some of my lawyer friends and they can't figure it out. That is what you run into when you try to make a law based on perverse ways that people use their sex organs.

This definition is tempered by the words, "THE USE OF THE TERM ["sexual orientation"] IN THIS TITLE MAY NOT BE CONSTRUED TO PROTECT OR RENDER LAWFUL ANY **CONDUCT** OTHERWISE PROHIBITED BY LAW." These are interesting words but a close look at this attempt to limit the term "sexual orientation" shows that these words in no way exempt the many other perversions or fetishes or paraphilias from the intent of the law and that is to protect them from **discrimination.** Sure, these words indicate these other perverted activities are not legal but they do not exempt them from the discrimination laws

Heterosexuality of course is the only sexual orientation that is not a perversion and is the universal norm: sexual interaction with the opposite sex.

Using "homosexuality" and "bisexuality" in the definition STILL includes several fetishes or paraphilias that are illegal. Example:

Pedophilia: sexual orientation towards a prepubescent child (generally age 13 years or younger). Now yes that is illegal activity and it is plain that this definition attempts to say it is not legal but I propose to you that this attack on a child would be classified as a "homosexual" attack or a "bisexual" attack or a "heterosexual" attack according to how they used their genitals in the attack and what their personal preferences were in the attack. Pedophiles would still be included in this bill and it would be illegal to "discriminate" against them.

Partialism: Person is sexually oriented to a specific body part exclusive of the person. This could be considered a "homosexual" perversion or a "bisexual" perversion and orientation.

Incest: Sexual orientation towards a sibling or parent. This could be a "homosexual," or a "bisexual" issue. Again, according to their orientation.

Necrophilia: sexual arousal and/or orientation towards sexual activity with a corpse. Again, the same. This person could be included in the definition in the law according to the sexual preference or orientation.

This is just a partial list of those who you will add to Montana law if this bill is passed.

This bill makes it so the Boy Scouts would be forced to hire a pedophile or a pederast or a homosexual or be charged with discrimination.

Local governments and the state would also be precluded from allowing the Boy Scouts, or any individual or group that are opposed to homosexual lifestyle, from using government facilities or lands.

A known person whose "sexual orientation" was any of the perversions mentioned above could not be discriminated against for rental of an apartment as another example.

Further more "Unless based on reasonable grounds" is found throughout the bill. That, in relation to the term "sexual orientation" and the goofy definition, would be interpreted by the courts and the drafter knows that is where the pro-homosexual issues are won. Never, as yet, in the legislature. The court is where the sponsor and others would like this issue because they are their friends and they like to legislate these issues from the bench and this bill would help them get that chance.

This bill needs to be tabled permanently. It is a terrible bill that in itself is discriminatory against those who feel homosexuality and other sexual orientations are unsafe and destructive.

Thank you.

Dallas Erickson
Montana Citizens for Decency Through Law, Inc.
P.O. Box 4071
Missoula MT 59806
(406)777-5862
E-mail: montanahome@in-tch.com

EXHIBIT [redacted]
DATE 3/16/05
SB 199

Madame Chair and members of the Judiciary committee, my name is Becky Stockton and I live in Helena and I represent myself.

I am in strong opposition of SB 199. I have family members who practice this lifestyle, so we have studied and researched this issue for a long time. We love these members of our family, but we hate their sin and the behavior that is associated with it. Here are two books that everyone should read and I will enter them on the record for this committee to read, When Homosexuality Hits Home by Joe Dallas, (who is an ex-homosexual who left the lifestyle and is married now. He also is the past president of Exodus International, which is an organization to support homosexuals who have left the lifestyle) and Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth by Jeffery Satinover, M.D. and I quote, "The best book on homosexuality written in our lifetime..." – Congressional Record, May 1996. These books prove that homosexuality is not caused by a genetic gene. I have copied chapter five in Dr. Satinover's book regarding twin brothers. The research shows that if identical twins have all the matching genetic make-up, then both would be either homosexual or heterosexual, but they have found that about 50% are homosexual and 50% are heterosexual. If you have any questions about this subject, please contact me because I have identical twin brothers and I can prove that the statistics the homosexuals put out for the media to use that it is genetic is completely false. I know environmental factors are involved in the equation. Also I have included in my testimony a copy of pages in Joe Dallas' book of quotes of gay researchers who claim there is no homosexual gene. Homosexuality is a behavior choice that can be changed at any time if the individual wants to change and that is shown in the definition in this bill that was amended in the Senate when they added bisexual. How can a person be both homosexual and heterosexual at the same time and claim that it is genetic? This does not add up.

The homosexuals have jumped on the bandwagon of thinking their rights are civil rights. This group has never been denied their civil rights. I quote Elizabeth Wright, "No labor unions were ever formed to keep homosexuals out of the workplace, as was done to black men. No laws were put on the books to stymie economic development and prevent the expansion of businesses beyond segregated communities. No regulations were ever concocted to keep homosexuals from voting. No laws ever forbade homosexuals from riding in the front of the bus. As a group homosexuals have always enjoyed their full constitutional rights. This is demonstrated by the fact that they enjoy higher than average incomes than most Americans and that is because they are not married and do not have children, and they are more likely to hold advanced college degrees and more prestigious occupations than any other group. In actuality, homosexuals are rarely discriminated against in the job market or when seeking housing, in spite of their anecdotal stories to the contrary. In most places, they have reputations as reliable workers and good rent-paying tenants. But the concept of "discrimination," which associates them with blacks and other "downtrodden" unfortunates, is a powerful one, guaranteed to arouse public sympathy. The activist homosexual strives for the advantages that come with being officially recognized as a bona fide "protected minority" in America's weird patchwork of ethnic favoritism. Even without this designation, through dogged perseverance, homosexuals have intruded their political agenda into the platforms of major religious denominations, into the policies of major corporations and government agencies, and, as we know, into the curriculums of schools and colleges around the country."

As a devout Christian, I am against this bill because it says that gay right issues are more important than religious freedom, which is protected under the 1st Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and under this bill. Legislators, who do not believe that homosexuality is not a sin, do not have the right to take away the freedom of churches to speak against the sin. This bill would outlaw the Bible, which has been around since the beginning of time and would require the churches to hire practicing homosexuals.

We also are a family that is very involved in Boy Scouts. My father-in-law and husband were Boy Scouts and leaders for troops. Presently our son is an Eagle Scout and Lodge Chief of the OA, which makes him the highest ranking Boy Scout of the State of Montana and we are very proud of him and all the hard work he does to represent all the Boy Scouts of the state and all of his volunteer service he does in the name of Boy Scouts. Under this bill, the Boy Scouts would not be able to use public lands and do service oriented work for others on these lands. When you try to stop discrimination against one special group (homosexuals) you discriminate against other citizens of our state like the churches that believe homosexuality is a sin and Boy Scouts, who limit their membership to protect the children in their organization.

Please vote no on SB 199. Thank you.

Becky Stockton

Becky Stockton
1430 Boston Road
Helena, MT 59602
406/449-3670
mbarrm@bresnan.net

EXHIBIT [redacted]
DATE 3/16/05
SB 199

To the House Judiciary Committee: RE SB 199

My daughter who now has foster children used to run a day care. She was very aware of the concern of the parents for the safety and well-being of their children. She had to use discrimination in choosing help. If SB 199 had been law it would have ruined her business.

The First Amendment says Congress shall make no law that prohibits the free exercise of religion.

My husband recently served on the board of our church and was involved in interviewing pastoral candidates. The Bible says homosexuality is an abomination. Our church believes the Bible is truth - it is the basis of our Christian faith. The church board would have used discrimination in not hiring a gay pastor. If SB 199 had been law, our board would have been in violation of it, but that law would be in violation of our First Amendment right of free exercise of religion.

As a state, we should not take a path of trying to compromise with something that is wrong. It will not help strengthen our state or our nation. All it does is serve to drag down the population as a whole to a lower level.

Please vote in opposition to this bill. Common sense says it is bad legislation.

Merry Nelson
530 Aero Lane
Bigfork, MT 59911

406-837-4874

In the Name of "Civil Rights" Homosexuals Remake Society

EXHIBIT [redacted]
DATE 3/16/05
SB HB

By Elizabeth Wright

[Reprinted from Issues & Views Spring 1996]

As we blacks examine the frenetic activity of the homosexual lobby in this country, just one question need be asked. How is the effort to reconstitute our families and decimated communities served by any involvement with this interest group?

Of what value is it to us to assist homosexual activists in achieving their agenda, much of which is already well on the way to becoming fixtures in the country's social fabric? This agenda includes, among many items, the implementation of homosexual curriculum at all school levels, homosexual adoption of children (including access to foster care programs), supervisory access to all youth groups (homosexuals are now engaged in a legal battle with the Boy Scouts of America over this issue), the lowering of the age of consent for sex between children and adults, inclusion of sex-change operations in all universal health plans, open homosexuality in the military, and redefining the nature of the family, where for the first time in documented history, legal recognition is granted to "marriage" of members of the same sex.

Do you see anything in that list that could possibly benefit the cause of American blacks or inspire the alienated among us to higher endeavor? Apparently, our wise leadership does. True to their political chicanery, without benefit of referendum or poll, black elites continue to ally our cause with those who care nothing about the long-term progress of blacks.

Over the decades, these cynical dignitaries have made pacts with labor unions, although many of these unions were formed primarily to break the back of a labor force composed of skilled and unskilled black laborers. To this day, biased laws that were passed in the 1920s and 1930s, specifically to deny black men employment are still on the books, and continue to be supported by labor unions and black leaders.

Black elites are also strongly tied to teachers unions, whose membership is most responsible for the dumbing down of America's children, and for creating programs that sidetrack black children, label and drug them. Members of teachers unions are in the forefront of the fight to block all attempts to create alternative education for poor children.

Through our illustrious leadership, blacks are also committed to support extreme feminist policies that have proved devastating to family life in general, and have brought havoc to the fragile black family (or what's left of it). Yet black leaders eagerly work to implement the detrimental policies of what author George Gilder calls "welfare feminism."

It was a pitiful irony to watch black elites spouting politically correct jargon at this year's "Stand For Children" rally in Washington, DC. How proudly they joined the very people whose policies have helped bring about the demise of the two-parent family, which is the core reason for the existence of poor children.

The reason behind all these alliances is the same. Lacking any real financial power, black elites are truly powerless people. Except, that is, in the political sphere. It is here that they have carved out a niche for themselves, that sometimes seems formidable. Such power can be maintained, however, only by diligently working to widen the network of supporters and financial contributors. To maintain and expand their little bases of power, black leaders must ally with any constituency available, even if it wears the horns of the Devil.

Hitching to the Civil Rights Star

When homosexual activists appeared on the public scene, some black leaders could hardly wait to offer up the cause of the black masses to the newest "social struggle" in town. Jesse Jackson was among the first to grandstand in demanding "justice" for the "gays." In 1981, Washington, DC's Mayor Marion Barry eagerly obliged the homosexual lobby by leading the drive to remove laws against sodomy from the books.

In 1993, over the protests of members of local chapters, the national board of the NAACP passed a resolution in support of homosexual advocates, thereby giving official support to the homosexual agenda. Blacks who picketed that year's NAACP annual convention, to oppose this action, were denounced by then executive director Benjamin Chavis as "rightwing reactionaries." This year, San Francisco's Mayor

they treated what the APA-by political fiat in 1973 and not through scientific evaluation-now considers a non-disorder."

The homosexual who wishes to be freed from his abnormal behavior faces the possibility of a confrontation with the homosexual lobby. Anthony Falzarano, a member of an organization of former homosexuals, denounces political "gays" who work to coerce their agendas on scientific research organizations, and says, "For the American Psychological Association to even consider denying homosexuals the right to choose to seek help for their disorientation is outrageous and is baseless in science."

Psychiatrist Jeffrey Satinover, author of Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth writes, "The debate over homosexuality has been profoundly affected by the current culture of complaint. Many areas of political, social and scientific life today are being profoundly influenced by the various competing claims to victimhood. The normalization of homosexuality was a classic example where the American Psychiatric Association knuckled under to a victim group's pressure tactics."

The "gene" theory

What about the claims being made about biology? The research studies that supposedly suggest a possible link to inborn homosexual traits turn out to be more fantasy than reality. But homosexuals are used to making it up as they go along. The 1993 Hamer study which purported to find a "gay gene" in humans and was eagerly disseminated by a willing liberal media, is looked at askance by most other scientists, and considered by some to be fraudulent.

Since independent researchers have been unable to replicate the data supposedly discovered by Hamer, the claim for a genetic basis for homosexuality is considered more wishful thinking than science. The Hamer data is now being closely investigated.

Even though this "research" is under a cloud of doubt and considered by many to be bogus science, the homosexual lobby is successfully using this widely publicized study anyway. In the courtrooms of sympathetic judges, homosexuals are finding the "gene" argument useful in supporting their positions in certain legal cases, that end up bolstering the homosexual agenda.

When a body of knowledge gets in their way, the homosexual lobby simply revises it, says Linda Tebedo of Colorado for Family Values, an organization that has been a front line opponent of homosexual proselytizing. "Homosexual activists have made a science out of comprehensively revising any body of knowledge standing in their way: revising biology, revising psychology, revising genetics, revising the U.S. Constitution," says Tebedo.

Psychiatrist William Byne, after questioning the accuracy of studies that claim genetic origins of homosexuality, was subjected to the usual vitriolic verbal attacks. However, he claims there is something worse than being smeared with the homophobic label. "More troubling is that some of the more senior and influential figures in sex research have openly suggested that it is politically incorrect for anyone to criticize the biological, deterministic data pertaining to homosexuality."

As General Colin Powell attempted to say, before being shouted down, homosexuals should not be allowed to equate inborn characteristics of ethnicity with what is nothing more than a behavior pattern-a way of doing sex. Homosexuals are nothing more than members of an interest group that wants a voice in setting public policy.

Whether or not homosexuality is rooted in nature or in one's early social environment is of no consequence. Many abnormalities are due to nature, but that does not place them on a par with what is universally accepted as normal. What sane society would allow its abnormal members to set the community's standards?

Psychologist Charles Socarides, a founder of NARTH, says, "In essence, this movement has accomplished what every other society, with rare exception, would have trembled to tamper with: a revision of the basic code and concept of life that men and women normally mate with those of the opposite sex, and not with each other." He warns that those who attempt to redraw the male-female design are "playing a mind game that dares to exempt humankind from the sexual bipolarity that runs up the entire ladder of earthly being."

The Real Goal

If homosexuals really believed the "gene" theory, they would not push so hard to have access to children. In spite of their lies to the contrary, their end goal is recruitment. Common sense tells us this

The homosexual lobby strives to make criticism of homosexuality a "hate crime" in order to silence all opposition. Many of the laws that have been proposed, to stifle dissent, are vague and open to interpretation. If such laws are ever passed, homosexuals themselves would get to decide just what constitutes a "hate crime." Such laws are already in place in Canada, Germany, Sweden and France. Just to the north of us, Canadian citizens are fined and sometimes jailed for publicly criticizing the homosexual establishment.

In Belgium, a bill has been introduced that would forbid anyone from being a member of an organization (secular or religious) that "differentiates between people on the basis of their sexual conduct or relational preference." If this law is passed, or others like it that have been introduced in other Western countries, homosexuals will be able to prosecute any priest, minister or religious teacher, who instructs his congregation in the teachings of the Bible on homosexuality.

Falling in line

Most Americans are still unaware of the homosexual lobby's power to make even well-respected organizations beg, apologize and cave in to demands. Stories like the following are happening all around the country. Earlier this year, in San Francisco, when a group of homosexuals attempted to intrude into policy making at the Salvation Army, the organization issued a statement claiming that homosexuality presents "a serious threat to the integrity, quality and solidarity of society as a whole."

Salvation Army officials had not counted on the city's Board of Supervisors holding up a federal grant of $65,000, as punishment for their "homophobia." Unprepared to take the loss of money, officers of the Salvation Army fell into line, as many before and since have been forced to do. Gritting their teeth, they not only pledged to change their policies concerning "gays," but also set up "sensitivity" sessions to indoctrinate staff members into correct thinking on the subject.

At a Denver hospital, the government mandated that "sensitivity" sessions be held to re-educate its staff on homosexuality. All employees were instructed to wear buttons saying, "It's Okay to be Gay," pinned to their clothing. Those employees who refused were publicly humiliated for their stubbornness.

At Denver's Metro State College, the Civil Rights Commission threatened to shut down a religious Jewish student group, if it refused to accept openly homosexual members. It may soon be that a group's refusal to alter its membership requirements will constitute a "hate crime" and carry a jail term.

Along with feminists, homosexuals are now close to dominating all the power centers of our society. It is because of the vast power they have accumulated that they now feel confident to make their preposterous demand for same-sex "marriage." However many times the demand to legalize their "partnerships" is defeated, the homosexual lobby will return to resurrect it-until such a law is passed.

Thanks to the media, American society is now being bathed, if not drowned in homosexual propaganda. From television sitcoms and soap operas to movies and daily newspaper features, we are awash in the ethos of "gayness." Outright, even fervent approval of homosexual behavior is now a litmus test demanded from all straights.

Dr. Socarides, writes, "Movies have been routinely censored by a gay Hollywood review board for the last seven to eight years; other films critical of homosexuality have been boycotted at the box office; books which portray homosexuality in any unfavorable way have not been published, and many such books have been removed from library shelves in universities and public libraries."

Describing what he calls "heavily political and polemical" literature on homosexuality, psychiatrist Joseph Berger says, "Because most people do not have a detailed knowledge of the scientific literature on homosexuality, they are vulnerable to the vast amount of incorrect and often deliberately misleading information that receives disproportionate publicity in the media." Dr. Berger warns the ordinary reader not to give in unthinkingly to what is "one of the most powerful propaganda exercises of modern times."

Re-educating the Third World

Like all other interest groups, homosexuals have their sights trained on blacks. Often black homosexuals are sent forth to be spokesmen for the latest "gay" demand. Although the leadership has fallen right in line, the black masses are not viewed as especially tolerant of the homosexual camp. If anything, as a group, blacks are disdained by the homosexual lobby as notoriously "homophobic." Much work, therefore, is required in the area of re-education to bring their backward notions into sync with the times.

This year, the Village Voice newspaper, a long-time forum for New York City's homosexual community,

"Leaders of that country [the United States] are scared of losing their positions of power. That's why they give in to homosexuals, so that they can vote for them." In further reference to American politicians, Mugabe claimed, "Their positions are more important than moral behavior and the word of God. Their position is more important than our humanity."

Mugabe went on to suggest that it might be necessary to form an "international anti-gay" movement. This idea was seconded by a Zimbabwe women's group, whose leader, Oppah Rusheska, expressed concern about "foreign behavior" infiltrating the country. "Human rights should not be allowed to dehumanize us," she declared.

The Gay and Lesbian Association claimed that the intent of the book display was to "increase awareness of how Zimbabwean gays are shunned." Officers of the homosexual association were miffed because none of the 14 African organizers of the fair quit to protest Mugabe's action; only four foreigners did. A spokesman claimed that this lack of support was a sorry show, and lamented, "They [the Africans] didn't consider gay rights a cause worthy of defending."

In neighboring South Africa, where, thanks to government support, the homosexual movement is alive, strong and thriving, activists demonstrated in front of the Zimbabwe Consulate in Cape Town, to protest Mugabe's tough stand. It is no surprise to learn that 70 members of the United States Congress sent an official protest to Mugabe, accusing him of "bigotry." Mugabe responded, "Let the gays be gays in the United States and Europe."

Zimbabwe's Vice president Joshua Nkomo clearly overreacted this year, when accusing Western whites of bringing AIDS to Africa, to wipe out blacks. Grieving for his son, who had just died of the disease, Nkomo declared that, "AIDS was brought to Zimbabwe by white people who intended to wipe out the black population and take its land and wealth." Few would concede a conspiracy to the origin of AIDS, but it is instructive to know of the drive for political power in Zimbabwe by homosexuals, and of the association of AIDS with homosexual behavior in the West. Nkomo's rage may be incorrectly focused, but is understandable.

Hidden population agenda

Writer Janne Matlary, an observer at the Beijing women's conference, tells of the cunning guile of Western delegations during discussions of topics, and says, "While the Western states were good at the game, many delegations from other parts of the world did not understand what was really going on. Their reliance on languages other than English was a severe handicap because the battles over the hidden agendas were all fought in English."

About the true intent of policies designed to lower the rate of growth of the world's population, Matlary writes, "Once you know that in the year 2020 it is forecast that 80% of world population will be in the developing regions, you know something essential about fundamental interests in population policy that are never spelled out in a UN conference."

The last straw?

One of the reasons blacks are resented in this country, is because Americans have learned that, whatever the latest liberal or "progressive" fad, black leaders and "intelligentsia" will soon join in support of it, and mobilize the masses to do the same. Because, you see, if a crusade is not "conservative," then it must be a correct and worthy crusade. Under the cover of struggling for "social justice," blacks are encouraged to get in step behind policies once considered repugnant, no matter how destructive such policies may be to the traditions and even constitutional rights of others.

Having chosen to throw away their own best traditions, those that were forged during the close-knit "segregation" period, most blacks now hold all other traditions suspect. Further, to the great many blacks who are conditioned to look upon all white traditions as "racist," it matters not what devices are used to bring them down.

Egged on by an opportunistic elite, and court decisions that overstep constitutional bounds, many blacks accept the notion that whites are not supposed to engage in any activity that fails to include blacks. Over the years, feminists, homosexuals and all varieties of leftists have made good use of this peculiar mode of thinking among blacks, readily enlisting them in anti-social and anti-religious campaigns against mainstream America.

Fearful of legal prosecution, most whites have given up their constitutional right of freedom of association, whether in private social clubs, all-male schools, or even in their churches. Time and again, the average American complies with whatever is demanded of him, even turning over his children for "multicultural" indoctrination.