

KANSAS STATE SENATE

14th District
State Capitol
Topeka, KS 66612
(785) 296-7678
forrest.knox@senate.ks.gov



17120 Udall Rd.
Altoona, KS 66710
(785) 783-5564
senatorforrestknox@gmail.com

FORREST J. KNOX

2015 Special Committee on Foster Care Adequacy

November 17, 2015

Chairman's Notes

The Importance of Family Structure in Children's Lives (The Politics of it!)

Plus...

November 16, 2015 - When "utah judge foster lesbian" was Googled – this was the 1st page of results:

In the news

[Utah judge rescinds order that lesbian couple can't keep foster child](#) [CNN](#) - 2 days ago A **Utah judge** reverses order to take a baby away from her same-sex ... "This is the first time there has been an attempt to deprive **gay foster** ...

[Utah Judge Drops Order on Lesbians' Foster Child](#) [New York Times](#) - 3 days ago n m

[Utah judge reverses his ruling on lesbian parents](#) [BBC News](#) - 3 days ago

[Utah judge reverses his ruling on lesbian parents - BBC News](#) www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-34813352

[BBC](#) 3 days ago - A **Utah judge** reverses his decision to move a baby from its **lesbian foster** parents and place it with a heterosexual couple.

[Utah Judge Drops Order on Lesbians' Foster Child - The ...](#) www.nytimes.com/.../utah-lesbian-couple-foster-child...The New York Times 3 days ago - Under fire from critics including **gay** rights activists and the state's Republican governor, a **judge** in **Utah** on Friday reversed, at least temporarily, ...

[Utah Judge Orders Lesbian Couple to Give Up Foster Child ...](#) www.nytimes.com/.../utah-lesbian-couple-foster-child...The New York Times 3 days ago - **Foster** Child Taken From **Gay** Couple in **Utah**. A **judge** ordered this week that a young **foster** child of April Hoagland and Beckie Peirce, ...

[Utah judge removes lesbian couple's foster child, says she'll ...](#) <https://www.washingtonpost.com/.../utah-judge-remov...>The Washington Post 4 days ago - A **judge** ordered that their **foster** child be removed from their Carbon County, **Utah**, home and placed with a heterosexual couple instead.

Utah judge stays order to remove foster child from home of ... <https://www.washingtonpost.com/.../utah-judge-stays-...>The Washington Post 3 days ago - A **Utah judge** has put a hold on his order to remove a **foster** child from the home of a married **lesbian** couple, whom he had said were unfit to ...

Utah judge's order to remove child from lesbian foster parents www.foxnews.com/.../utah-judge-order-to-remove-ch...
Fox News Channel 4 days ago - **Utah** state child welfare officials are reviewing a ruling by a juvenile court **judge** who ordered a baby to be taken from **lesbian foster** parents and ...

Utah Judge Orders Foster Child Removed From Lesbian ... www.npr.org/.../utah-judge-orders-foster-child-removed-from-lesbian-...NPR 4 days ago - A **judge** in **Utah** has ordered a **lesbian** couple to give up the infant **foster** child they were caring for, reportedly telling them that the girl would be ...

Utah to Challenge Order to Take Baby From Lesbians - ABC ... abcnews.go.com/.../governor-puzzled-judge-ordered-baby-lesbians-35145... 4 days ago - **Utah** state officials are challenging a decision made by a **Utah judge** to take a baby away from **lesbian foster** parents and place her with a ...

Lesbian couple's foster child ordered removed by Utah judge www.nydailynews.com/.../lesbian-couple-foster-child-ordered-r...Daily News 4 days ago - A married **lesbian Utah** couple's **foster** child was ordered removed Tuesday by a **judge** who claimed the baby girl would be better off with a ...

Following find information, conclusions of research, a general bibliography of articles, research, books, etc. of materials I found of interest. I include these for your general interest because copyrights kept us from providing all the published materials that we would of liked to include. Much is available on line.

From,
APA Amicus Brief (November 3, 2011) First Circuit U. S. Court of Appeals,
MASSACHUSETTS v. U.S.DHHS
<http://www.apa.org/about/offices/ogc/amicus/gill.pdf>
Arguments Related to the Children of Same Sex Couples.

“...quoted passages from the floor debate on the Defense of Marriage Act: “fundamental, unavoidable fact of our human nature” that heterosexual marriage is “the ideal structure within which” to raise children... statements at the debate reflect a belief that permitting homosexuals to marry would harm the institution of marriage and be inimical to the welfare of children of same sex couples.”

“In fact, however, the claim that legal recognition of marriage for same–sex couples undermines the institution of marriage and harms their children is inconsistent with the scientific evidence. As we show below, that evidence supports the conclusion that homosexuality is a normal expression of human sexuality that is not chosen, that gay and lesbian people form stable, committed relationships that are equivalent to heterosexual relationships in essential respects, and that same-sex couples are no less fit than heterosexual parents to raise children and their children are no less psychologically healthy and well-adjusted than children of opposite sex parents.”

“The body of research presented below strongly supports the conclusion that discrimination by the federal government between married same-sex couples and married opposite-sex couples in awarding benefits unfairly stigmatizes same-sex couples. The research also contravenes the stereotype-based rationales that were advanced to support passage of DOMA and that the Equal Protection Clause was designed to prohibit.”

- A. Many Same-Sex Couples Are Currently Raising Children.
- B. The Factors That Positively Affect The Adjustment Of Children Are Not Dependent on the Gender of Parents.
- C. There Is No Scientific Basis for Concluding That Gay And Lesbian Parents Are Any Less Fit or Capable Than Heterosexual Parents, or That Their Children Are Any Less Psychologically Healthy and Well Adjusted.

From

APA Gay & Lesbian Parenting

<http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbt/resources/parenting-full.pdf>

Conclusion

In summary, there is no evidence to suggest that lesbian women or gay men are unfit to be parents or that psychosocial development among children of lesbian women or gay men is compromised relative to that among offspring of heterosexual parents. Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents. Indeed, the evidence to date suggests that home environments provided by lesbian and gay parents are as likely as those provided by heterosexual parents to support and enable children's psychosocial growth.

It should be acknowledged that research on lesbian and gay parents and their children, though no longer new, is still limited in extent. Although studies of gay fathers and their children have been conducted (Patterson, 2004), less is known about children of gay fathers than about children of lesbian mothers. Although studies of adolescent and young adult offspring of lesbian and gay parents are available (e.g., Gershon et al., 1999; Tasker & Golombok, 1997; Wainright et al., 2004), relatively few studies have focused on the offspring of lesbian or gay parents during adolescence or adulthood. Although more diverse samples have been included in recent studies (e.g., Golombok et al., 2003; Wainright et al., 2004), many sources of heterogeneity have yet to be systematically investigated. Although two longitudinal studies have been reported (Gartrell et al., 1996, 1999, 2000; Tasker & Golombok, 1997), longitudinal studies that follow lesbian and gay parent families over time are still needed. Thus, although a considerable amount of information is available, additional research would further our understanding of lesbian and gay parents and their children.

from

CDC – Family Structure & Children’s Health in the United States (December 2010)

http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr_10/sr10_246.pdf

Conclusion

The findings presented in this report indicate that children living in nuclear families—that is, in families consisting of two married adults who are the biological or adoptive parents of all children in the family—were generally healthier, more likely to have access to health care, and less likely to have definite or severe emotional or behavioral difficulties than children living in nonnuclear families. For example, children in nuclear families were generally less likely than children in nonnuclear families to be in good, fair, or poor health; to have a basic action disability; or to have learning disabilities or ADHD. They were also less likely than children in nonnuclear families to lack health insurance coverage, to have had two or more ER visits in the past 12 months, to have receipt of needed prescription medication delayed during the past 12 months due to lack of affordability, or to have gone without needed dental care in the past 12 months due to cost. Additionally, children living in nuclear families were less likely to be poorly behaved

or to have definite or severe emotional or behavioral difficulties during the past 6 months than children living in nonnuclear family types.

These findings are consistent with previous research that concluded that children living with two parents were advantaged relative to children living in other types of families (18–21). Using data from the Child Health Supplement of the 1988 NHIS, Dawson (18,19) reported that children living with two biological parents were less likely to experience behavioral or emotional problems than children living in other family types. Dawson found small and inconsistent differences in prevalence estimates by family structure for most chronic conditions and indicators of physical health, but noted that children living in households with two parents were less likely to have had chronic asthma in the past 12 months than children living in households without fathers (18). Heck and Parker (20) found that children in two-parent families were less likely than children living with single mothers to have unmet health care needs and more likely to have employer-sponsored health insurance. Bramlett and Blumberg (21) reported that children living with two biological parents were more likely than children in single-mother or grandparent-only families to be in excellent or very good health and less likely to have asthma-related health issues during the past year, to have ADHD, or to have moderate to severe emotional or behavior problems.

Relative to children living in nuclear families, children in single-parent families clearly had higher prevalence rates for the various health conditions and indicators examined in this report. However, when compared to children living in other nonnuclear families, children living in single-parent families generally exhibited comparable prevalence rates with respect to child health, access to care, and emotional or behavioral difficulties. This report combined children living with single mothers, single fathers, or some other related single adult into one category because the vast majority of single adult families in 2001–2007 were headed by mothers. If single-parent families were disaggregated by type of parent (i.e., mother, father, or some other adult), it is possible that children living in single-mother families might have slightly higher rates of health problems and less access to health care than children in single-father families, as well as other nonnuclear families, as earlier research (18–21) has found.

Children living in blended (i.e., stepparent), cohabiting, unmarried biological or adoptive, extended, and other families were generally disadvantaged relative to children in nuclear families, and were, for the most part, comparable to children living in single-parent families regarding most health status and access to care measures. However, few, if any, consistent patterns emerged in the prevalence estimates of children living in nonnuclear families. Interestingly, children living in unmarried biological families share some of the health characteristics of both nuclear and cohabiting families. Results in this report suggest that children in unmarried biological families generally fared well in terms of the prevalence of asthma, hay fever, and allergies and they were also least likely to have had a problem requiring the regular use of a prescription medication for at least 3 months. Conversely, they were more likely than children in the remaining family types to have three or more ear infections in the past 12 months and least likely to have seen a dentist or had contact with an eye doctor in the past 12 months. Regarding some health measures, however, results were inconclusive due to the relatively small number of children in unmarried biological families. Additional research is needed to determine whether this particular family type is consistently and positively associated with indicators of child health, access to care, and behavioral or emotional well-being.

The association of children's health status, access to or utilization of care, and emotional well-being with family structure was mitigated in some instances by the introduction of various personal, social, and economic characteristics. Yet differences in child health and access to care by family structure generally persisted regardless of population subgroup, with children living in nuclear families remaining advantaged relative to children in nonnuclear families.

The findings in this report cannot be used to infer that family structure “caused” a particular child health outcome or that a child health outcome “caused” family structure. In fact, previous research has shown that causality may flow in both directions; that is, family structure may have consequences for child health outcomes, while children’s health may have consequences for family structure (42,43). Ideally, a methodological approach should be used that more accurately reflects how children’s health may select them into particular family structures, which, in turn, may have ramifications for their health outcomes. However, the cross-sectional design of NHIS and the lack of information in the data about marriage or union onset or duration makes this task impossible. However, there are certainly different ways to model family structure that are beyond the scope of this report. For example, analysts may wish to distinguish between mother-stepfather and father-stepmother families. Moreover, although the date at which marriages or unions began cannot be determined from NHIS, it is possible to determine whether single mothers have ever been married. It may make a difference whether children are living with a never-versus ever-married mother (44). A postdivorce mother may have more goods and resources (e.g., alimony and child support payments) available to her than a never-married mother. No attempt was made in the current analysis to determine the marital status of single parents (formerly married versus never married) or to distinguish between mother-stepfather, father-stepmother, mother-cohabiting male partner, or father-cohabiting female partner families. The 2001–2007 NHIS data do allow for these possibilities, however.

Despite the data limitations discussed previously, the findings summarized in this report remain important, particularly given the sweeping changes in family formation and living arrangements currently taking place in the United States. This report is based on 7 years of NHIS survey data that contain numerous child health and access to health care measures for a sample of nearly 84,000 children. In addition, this study incorporates a detailed indicator of family structure that takes into account both parental marital status and the nature of parent-child relationships (e.g., biological, step, etc.), making the identification of nontraditional families possible. Very few nationally representative data sources contain reliable measures of both family structure and child health. Thus, NHIS provides a unique opportunity to understand the complicated relationships that exist between family structure and child health in the United States today.

From

**How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships?
Findings from the New Family Structures Study (July 2012)**

Mark Regnerus, Department of Sociology and Population Research Center, University of Texas at Austin

Conclusion As scholars of same-sex parenting aptly note, same-sex couples have and will continue to raise children. American courts are finding arguments against gay marriage decreasingly persuasive (Rosenfeld, 2007). This study is intended to neither undermine nor affirm any legal rights concerning such. The tenor of the last 10 years of academic discourse about gay and lesbian parents suggests that there is little to nothing about them that might be negatively associated with child development, and a variety of things that might be uniquely positive. The results of analyzing a rare large probability sample reported herein, however, document numerous, consistent differences among young adults who reported maternal lesbian behavior (and to a lesser extent, paternal gay behavior) prior to age 18. While previous studies suggest that children in planned GLB families seem to fare comparatively well, their actual representativeness among all GLB families in the US may be more modest than research based on convenience samples has presumed.

Although the findings reported herein may be explicable in part by a variety of forces uniquely problematic for child development in lesbian and gay families—including a lack of social support for parents, stress exposure resulting from persistent stigma, and modest or absent legal security for their

parental and romantic relationship statuses—the empirical claim that no notable differences exist must go. While it is certainly accurate to affirm that sexual orientation or parental sexual behavior need have nothing to do with the ability to be a good, effective parent, the data evaluated herein using population based estimates drawn from a large, nationally-representative sample of young Americans suggest that it may affect the reality of family experiences among a significant number.

Do children need a married mother and father to turn out well as adults? No, if we observe the many anecdotal accounts with which all Americans are familiar. Moreover, there are many cases in the NFSS where respondents have proven resilient and prevailed as adults in spite of numerous transitions, be they death, divorce, additional or diverse romantic partners, or remarriage. But the NFSS also clearly reveals that children appear most apt to succeed well as adults—on multiple counts and across a variety of domains—when they spend their entire childhood with their married mother and father, and especially when the parents remain married to the present day. Insofar as the share of intact, biological mother/father families continues to shrink in the United States, as it has, this portends growing challenges within families, but also heightened dependence on public health organizations, federal and state public assistance, psychotherapeutic resources, substance use programs, and the criminal justice system.

From the book, **U Turn** by **George Barna & David Barton**, published by Front Line, 2014 - All data sources for claims made in the book are fully supported and referenced in the book.)Statistical effects on children of living without both their biological father and mother.

From Chapter 6 (U Turn)

Children pay a high price for the rejection of the traditional family structure by their natural parents. These fall into at least three groups in which the effects of children not growing up with a father and a mother can be readily assessed:

(1) Children born outside of marriage and raised in single-parent homes.

- Educational attainment is significantly lower,
- almost twice as likely to repeat a grade in school, and more than twice as likely to be suspended or expelled from school.
- Young men from these homes are twice as likely to end up in jail.
- seven times as likely to be delinquent,
- twice as likely to have pulled a knife or a gun on someone in the past year.
- Gang involvement is almost twice as high.
- 90 percent of the increase in violent crime between 1973 and 1995 was committed by those born out of wedlock and raised in a single-parent home,
- 75 percent of juvenile criminals come from those homes.
- The highest murder rate is among those born out-of-wedlock.
- have less family income and are more likely to be poor than children in married-parent households.
- The annual average income - traditional family is \$101,000, a single-mother family is \$35,000.

(2) Children from divorced homes,

- Experience lower scores in school, higher absenteeism, and a dropout rate of 31%, (compared to only 13% for children from intact homes).
- 50% more likely to develop health problems.
- Suffer higher rates of depression, addiction, and arrest.

- 11% of boys ended up in prison before they are age 32, (only 5% from intact homes).
- 33% of girls become teen mothers, (only 11% of girls from intact homes).
- Divorced women & daughters of the divorced have higher incidents of poverty.
- Some 30% of single-mother families live in poverty, (only 7% of married couples with children are poor).
- Adult children of divorce tend to have: lower paying jobs and less college than their parents; unstable father-child relationships; a history of vulnerability to drugs and alcohol in adolescence; fears about commitment and divorce; and negative memories of the legal system.
- The adult children of divorce are 89% more likely to divorce than those raised in intact families.
- While 79% of the children of married parents felt emotionally safe when growing up, only 44% of children of divorced couples felt the same.
- Lifespan for children of divorce averages five years less than those who grew up in intact families.

The statistics regarding children from these atypical family structures makes a strong case that the best arrangement for all involved is what is called the “nuclear family” – that is, a family built around a central nucleus of a father, mother, and children. Statistics regarding the typical traditional family arrangement make the case for this proposition even more airtight. For example:

- Children from intact families have higher literacy and graduation rates, lower teen pregnancy and juvenile offender rates, and also experience higher rates of marital success.
- Children from intact homes are five times less likely to live in poverty. Significantly, only 22% of children in married households experience one year of poverty in their lives compared with 81% in other households.
- Nearly all of the increase in child poverty since the 1970s can be attributed to family breakdown, and its direct public costs now exceed \$112 billion a year.
- In traditional intact families, children are *less* likely:
 - To be abused
 - To end up in jail as adults
 - To suffer depression
 - To be expelled from school
 - To repeat a grade
 - To have behavior problems
 - To use drugs
 - To carry weapons
 - To be sexually active
- Statistically speaking, “if the United States enjoyed the same level of family stability today as it did in 1960, the nation would have 750,000 fewer children repeating grades, 1.2 million fewer school suspensions, approximately 500,000 fewer acts of teenage delinquency, about 600,000 fewer kids receiving therapy, and approximately 70,000 fewer suicide attempts every year.”

The statistics are clear and unequivocal. The modern experiments to change the traditional family ignore the well-being of those involved, especially children and mothers, and thus weaken the long-term strength and health of the culture.

Statistical effects on society (and children) of rejection of traditional Judeo/Christian, Biblical, moral behaviors.

From Chapter 7 (U Turn)

In one example, the Bible explicitly condemns homosexual behavior, but aside from that, the scientific evidence of the results of this behavior on society is unequivocal. Based purely on medical evidence and

not morals, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) prohibit men who have sex with other men (MSM) from donating blood because MSM . . .

have an HIV prevalence (the total number of cases of a disease that are present in a population at a specific point in time) 60 times higher than the general population, 800 times higher than first time blood donors and 8,000 times higher than repeat blood donors (American Red Cross). . . . [and] also have an increased risk of having other infections that can be transmitted to others by blood transfusion. For example, infection with the Hepatitis B virus is about 5-6 times more common, and Hepatitis C virus infections are about 2 times more common in [MSM] than in the general population.

Furthermore, even though homosexuals comprise less than 2 percent of the population, they account for 63 percent of all syphilis cases. And statistics show that HIV/AIDS is almost exclusively a homosexual disease. In fact, when it was originally identified in 1982 by the Centers for Disease Control, it was named GRID5 (Gay Related Immune Deficiency Syndrome), also called Gay Compromise Syndrome or gay cancer. When it subsequently spread into the heterosexual community through transfusions of infected blood that had been donated by homosexuals, and by women having sex with bisexual men who had previously had sex with other men, the name of the disease was changed to AIDS. The scientific evidence is unequivocal, and homosexual leaders openly affirm that HIV/AIDS is indeed a homosexual disease. Significantly, it is increasing *only* in the homosexual community and decreasing in all others. According to the CDC and FDA:

Men who have had sex with other men represent approximately 2% of the US population, yet. . . . MSM accounted for at least 61% of all new HIV infections in the U.S. and an estimated 77% of diagnosed HIV infections among males were attributed to male-to-male sexual contact. Between 2008 and 2010, the estimated overall incidence of HIV was stable in the U.S. However the incidence in MSM increased 12%, while it decreased in other populations. The largest increase was a 22% increase in MSM aged 13 to 24 years.

Clearly, there is a conspiracy of silence about these types of scientific facts in the media, education, and political arenas.

But beyond the direct health dangers of homosexual behavior, there are also substantive economic consequences. For example, in 2013 alone, the federal government appropriated \$29.7 billion to deal with the consequences of this “gay disease” (and this does not include state and local expenditures). In fact, the lifetime medical treatment cost just for the new cases diagnosed annually is projected at \$16.6 billion, and that cost is repeated for each year’s new diagnoses. Additionally, \$12.5 billion of the taxpayer-funded Medicare and Medicaid expenses this year was for HIV/AIDS, and the average expense for an HIV/AIDS patient is much higher than for other patients, including even seniors, who are often represented as being the biggest economic drain on such programs. For example, concerning Medicaid, “enrollees with HIV were significantly more expensive than their non-HIV positive counterparts, with per capita [annual] costs almost five times greater (\$24,867 compared to \$5,091).” Indisputably, both the taxpayer-born economic costs as well as the societal consequences of this behavior are inconsistent with a healthy culture and sound public policy.

HOMOSEXUAL MARRIAGE

So, too, with homosexual marriage. Nearly three dozen foreign countries currently grant marital rights to homosexual individuals, and statistics from those countries provide clear warnings to America.

Only a small percentage of individuals are homosexual. Just as less than 2 percent of Americans are homosexual, Wikipedia, which is very positive toward homosexuality and homosexuals, reports the same generally low incidence in other countries that keep such statistics (e.g., 1 percent of the population in Great Britain, 1 percent in New Zealand, 4 percent in Ireland, 2.5 percent in Australia, 1 percent in

Canada, etc.) But not only are the numbers of homosexuals very low, the statistics from those other nations show that only a very small percentage from within that small group marry when given the opportunity.

For example, according to statistics from Iceland, while there are some 315,000 citizens in that nation, in 2011 only 36 homosexuals in the entire nation married, and 10 homosexuals divorced. These low numbers are not that unusual, for in all nations allowing homosexual marriage, the percentage of homosexual marriages falls below the percentage of homosexual representation in that country.

Additionally, “while a high percentage of [traditional] married couples remain married for up to 20 years or longer, the vast majority of homosexual relationships are short-lived and transitory. A study in the Netherlands, one of the most ‘gay-tolerant’ nations on earth, and which has legalized gay marriage, found that the average duration of a homosexual relationship was 1.5 years.” And lesbians seemed particularly inclined to a lack of commitment, for although only 40 percent of homosexual marriages involve lesbians, 70 percent of homosexual divorces do. (By the way, lesbians experience a rate of domestic violence four times greater than that of traditionally-married women.)

Furthermore, “while a high percentage of [traditional] married couples remain faithful to each other, homosexual couples typically engage in a shocking degree of promiscuity. The same Dutch study found that ‘committed’ homosexual couples had an average of 8 sexual partners (outside of the relationship) per year.”

So for citizens in the countries witnessing such casual arrangements whereby a “committed” homosexual marriage involves so many extra-marital partners and ends so quickly, the conclusion is inescapable that marriage itself is generally meaningless. Consequently:

Marriage is slowly dying in Scandinavia. A majority of children in Sweden and Norway are born out of wedlock. Sixty percent of first-born children in Denmark have unmarried parents. Not coincidentally, these countries have had something close to full gay marriage for a decade or more.

Similarly, since Great Britain adopted homosexual marriage, the marriage rate has now hit its lowest levels since measurements began in 1862.

Some homosexual activists and leaders candidly acknowledge that their ultimate goal is the elimination of all marriage, and that homosexual marriage is merely a first step toward that objective. Regardless of whether or not such an agenda is reflective of homosexuals in general, the overall effect has nevertheless been a rapid and precipitous movement away from marriage of any type. Statistics from other nations clearly demonstrate that weakening heterosexual marriage increases out-of-wedlock births, and the extreme adverse societal consequences of children being raised outside of a home with a father and a mother were extensively documented in the previous chapter.

Thus, the 5,500 year old definition of marriage has been rewritten, and cultures have been completely upended and restructured merely to accommodate the wishes of a small percentage from within a small percentage of the population. That accommodation has not resulted in so-called marriage equality but rather a destruction of marriage for traditionalists. This is a radical cultural change simply to accommodate the personal inclinations of a tiny fraction of the population. By the way, “inclination” is deliberately used here to indicate a personal choice, for science continues to affirm that there is *no* homosexual gene, so the oft-heard claim that “I can’t help being homosexual, just as a person can’t help being black, female, or tall,” is fallacious and not backed by scientific evidence.

It is perplexing why America embraces and encourages behavior that indisputably weakens and undermines its culture, and it is astonishing how quickly such behavior has become mainstream and “moral.” After all, it was only a decade ago that the Supreme Court first struck down laws limiting homosexuality and that the first state permitted homosexual marriage. But today, just a few short years later, civil courts not only protect homosexuality but openly enforce punitive penalties against those who refuse to affirm and celebrate it. In fact, scores of cities have now adopted policies like that in San Antonio, Texas, which places a \$500 per day fine and a permanent exclusion from ever running for public office on any citizen who criticizes homosexuality or homosexual marriage.

From

Research by Walter R. Schumm, Ph.D., Professor of Family Studies in the School of Family Studies and Human Services at Kansas State University. (schumm@k-state.edu)

Dr. Schumm received his bachelor of science in physics from the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va., his master's in family and child development from Kansas State University and his doctorate in family studies from Purdue University. He joined K-State in 1979 and teaches family theories, marital interaction and various research courses. Schumm has over 300 published journal articles, book chapters and technical reports. He is the editor of the journal Marriage and Family Review and an associate editor or reviewer for numerous family studies and/or psychology journals. He is a Fellow with the National Council on Family Relations and a certified Family Life Educator.

A brief list of published articles follows:

(found at [http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/multiple_author/Walter R. Schumm](http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/multiple_author/Walter_R_Schumm))

Scholarly “consensus” isn’t always valid

26 Mar 2014

http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/scholarly_consensus_isnt_always_valid/13802

Judges who cite academic journals in support of same-sex parenting should be alert to bias.

Unpacking the slogans

8 Aug 2013

http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/unpacking_the_slogans/12580

Boosters of same-sex parenting rely heavily on sociologists’ surveys. But do these really prove their case?

Not so fast!

8 Jun 2013

http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/not_so_fast/12304

A one-page report on the success of same-sex parenting was reported around the world this week. How reliable is it?

A controversial gay parenting study revisited

13 Nov 2012

http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/a_controversial_gay_parenting_study_revisited/11486

Mark Regnerus, New Family Structures Study

... and found to have much in common with less controversial gay parenting studies.

On our best behaviour

27 Jul 2012

http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/on_our_best_behaviour/11028

You don’t need religion to work out what a good moral decision would be. A proposed scheme.

Does it really make no difference if your parents are straight or gay?

15 Jun 2012

http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/does_it_really_make_no_difference_if_your_parents_are_straight_or_gay/10844

New data from a well-designed study suggest that it does, and it's not good news for the kids of same-sex couples.

Flawed evidence about gay marriage

6 Aug 2010

http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/flawed_evidence_about_gay_marriage/7727

The evidence shows that gay marriage is equal to or better than traditional marriage, according to a Federal Court judge. But what sort of evidence?

The other story about same-sex parenting

29 Jun 2010

http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/the_other_story_about_same-sex_parenting/7483

Research showing the risks of lesbian and gay parenting is ignored in the race to make a political case.

Miscellaneous Articles

New Study On Homosexual Parents Tops All Previous Research

By [Peter Sprigg](#) Senior Fellow for Policy Studies, Family Research Council

<http://www.frc.org/issuebrief/new-study-on-homosexual-parents-tops-all-previous-research>

How Heroin is Hitting the Foster Care System

October 09, 2015 By Sophie Quinton

<http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2015/10/09/how-heroin-is-hitting-the-foster-care-system>

Why presume a child raised by a gay couple will be emotionally damaged?

[Eleanor Morgan](#)

<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/apr/02/why-presume-child-raised-by-gay-couple-emotionally-damaged>

Same-Sex Parenting: Child Abuse?

by [Robert Oscar Lopez](#)

within [Marriage](#) July 8th, 2013

<http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2013/07/10474/>

Single-parenting and divorce have always been understood as a breakdown of the married mom and dad ideal, but the demand to view same-sex parenting as “normal” imposes a silence on children about the wound caused by the loss of one parent or the other.

Was the Regnerus Study on Gay Parenting Defective?

WALTER R. SCHUMM NOVEMBER 15, 2012

<http://www.crisismagazine.com/2012/was-the-regnerus-study-on-gay-parenting-defective>

Articles in the Past

Eye on Kansas March 3, 2010

<http://liftingtheveil.org/eyeonkansas.htm>

LOCAL NEWS COVERAGE

[Privatization called 'failure' by Demos](#)

Roger Myers, *Capital-Journal*, August 17, 2000.

[Former SRS Secretary Keeps Eye on Agency](#)

Jim McLean, *Capital-Journal*, March 23, 1999.

[Graves Agreeable to Bailout of Foster Care and Adoption](#)

Jim McLean, *Capital-Journal*, March 14, 1999.

[Foster Care, Adoption Need Funding Infusion](#)

Jim McLean, *Capital-Journal*, March 12, 1999.

[Foster care crisis needs attention](#)

Jim McLean, *Capital-Journal*, February 2, 1999.

[Senate Leader Proposes Fixes for Care 'Crisis'](#)

Jim McLean, *Capital-Journal*, January 28, 1999.

[Bill Would Protect Whistle Blowers from Contractors](#)

Jim McLean, *Capital-Journal*, January 20, 1999.

[Critics Find Flaws in New Foster Care](#)

Ric Anderson, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, August 17, 1998.

[SRS Renews Foster Care Contracts](#)

Roger Myers, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, February 5, 1998.

[Report: Compliance of SRS Low](#)

Roger Myers, *Capital-Journal*, January 7, 1998.

[State Conference Influences Georgia's Privatization Plan](#)

Roger Myers, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, November 27, 1997.

[SRS Drafts Plan to Tackle Child-Welfare Ills](#)

Roger Myers, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, November 25, 1997.

[Judge Questions Program Benefits](#)

Roger Myers, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, November 5, 1997.

[Task Force Urged to Find Remedy for Foster Care](#)

Steve Fry, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, April 24, 1997.

[Jury Still Out on Privatization of Foster Care and Adoption](#)

Muneera Naseer, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, April 10, 1997.

[Heat is on for Answers](#)

Topeka Capital-Journal, March 24, 1997.

[Child Advocate Seeks Compliance by State](#)

Associated Press as reported in *Topeka Capital-Journal*, March 5, 1997. Editorial, "Children Will Pay: Kansas can't afford to sit back and wait for its privatized foster care system to get better," *Lawrence Journal World*, May 3, 1998

Mike Shields, "Critics Say Kansas Foster Care Experiment Failing," *Lawrence Journal World*, as posted April 26, 1998, noting that: "Several critics of the privatized foster care initiative say it has made a historically inadequate system worse than ever."

RELATED READING

Joint Committee on Children's Issues, [Report of the Joint Committee on Children's Issues to the 2010 Kansas Legislature](#), Kansas, December 2009.

[Cover letter from Rep. Mike Kiegerl](#) concerning the Final Report of Joint Committee on Children's Issues to the 2010 Kansas Legislature, March 12, 2010.

Earl Glynn, [Compelling stories from parents and grandparents about problems with placement and removal of children](#), *Kansas Watchdog*, December 4, 2009.

Earl Glynn, [Parents, grandparents ask why children removed from homes](#), *Kansas Watchdog*, December 1, 2009.

Lara Wozniak, "Advocates for children urged to give all to privatization plan," *St. Petersburg Times*, September 2, 1998.

Office of Inspector General, Florida Department of Children and Families, [Annual Report](#), Fiscal Year 1999.

Associated Press, "Boy's Death Prompts Review of Foster-care Agencies," *Telegraph Herald*, March 15, 1998, in which Cook County Public Guardian Patrick Murphy criticized DCFS for its rapid privatization of child care, warning that many of the start-up agencies were ill prepared for the task that more such tragedies may follow.

David Olinger, "Foster care for profit may shortchange youths," *Denver Post*, February 28, 1999.

Lezlee E. Whiting, "3 Removed From Duchesne Foster Home," *Deseret News* February 12, 1998.

David L. Lewis, "Foster Agencies Get Low Marks," *Daily News*, April 17, 1998.

Marcia Robinson Lowry, "Protecting Children from Abuse and Neglect: Four Commentaries," *The Future of Children*, Vol. 8 No. 1, Spring 1998. (Other commentators included Douglas Besharov, Leroy Pelton, and Michael Weber).

Ann Scott Tyson, "Kansas Pioneers a Solution to Child-Welfare Woes," *Christian Science Monitor*, August 15, 1997.

[Kansas Talk Back: Early Responses To The Move To Privatization of Child Welfare Services](#)

National Association of Social Workers, Kansas Chapter, October 1997.

[Kansas First to Reform Foster-Care and Adoption](#)

University of Kansas Office of University Relations, June 16, 1997.