

# The Harms of Homosexual Adoption

(No al Proyecto del Senado de Puerto Rico PS 437)

Fieles a la Verdad

August 2013

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The Harms of Homosexual Adoption</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Homosexual adoption harms children . . . . .	2
2.2	Homosexual adoption harms women . . . . .	5
2.3	Homosexual adoption harms homosexuals . . . . .	6
2.4	Homosexual adoption commodifies persons . . . . .	7
2.5	Homosexual adoption violates religious, conscience and parental rights . . . . .	9
2.6	Homosexual adoption leads to indoctrination in the schools . . . . .	10
2.7	Homosexual adoption violates the legal and natural rights of children . . . . .	13
2.8	Homosexual adoption creates a vast legal limbo . . . . .	14
<b>3</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>16</b>

## 1 Introduction

Recent years have seen a campaign, by a loose coalition of secularists, liberal academics, antinatalists, and feminists, in favor of an agenda whose twin aims are the legalization of same-sex “marriage”<sup>1</sup> and the equalization of homosexual with heterosexual behavior in schools and other institutions. Those expressing legitimate reservations concerning this agenda have been labelled as “hateful”, “homophobic”<sup>2</sup> or “fundamentalist” [2] by, among others, a conformist, lockstep liberal media. This coercion has silenced many into acquiescence. In countries which have legalized same sex unions, opponents have been vilified, forced from their jobs, arrested, beaten, prosecuted and jailed.

Puerto Rico has not been exempt from these currents. Soon after a request for homosexual adoption was denied by the Puerto Rico Supreme Court [26], the Senate introduced legislation, PS 437 [3], which is intended to extend the privilege of adoption of children to homosexuals, bisexuals, and “transgendered” individuals. Senate hearings concerning this bill have so far focused on the desires and certain alleged rights of the LGBTTT community.

---

<sup>1</sup>Despite the fact that the Oxford Dictionary is currently considering redefining the word marriage, it still retains its status as the intellectual sign of the union of one man and one woman.

<sup>2</sup>Literally, fear of likeness.

Relatively little attention has been given to the real rights of other affected parties, in particular to the right of children to a mother and a father and the right to life itself. The purpose of this document is to outline some of the social, legal and ethical implications of legalizing homosexual adoption and the likely harms of approving bill PS 437.

## 2 The Harms of Homosexual Adoption

### 2.1 Homosexual adoption harms children

A principal justification given for the Senate project PS 437 is to better safeguard the welfare of minors. However, its intention to amend Article 138 of the Puerto Rico Civil Code to eliminate all gender distinction requirements, as obstacles to adoption, will have precisely the reverse effect.

In spite of the fact that many with same-sex attraction strive to be good parents, a careful scientific study by Regnerus [53] (see also [27]) shows clearly 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”.*

Regnerus’ study found significant disadvantages to children from same-sex families including:

- Lower academic performance.
- Higher incidence of depression.
- Higher arrest rates.
- More sexual partners.
- Higher incidence of extramarital relations.
- Higher incidence of the use of illegal drugs.
- Greater difficulty establishing social relations.
- Greater dependence on public welfare.
- Higher rates of unemployment.

Despite hostile attempts by liberal academics and leftists to discredit this research<sup>3</sup>, Regnerus’ methodology has withstood careful scrutiny. Moreover, his findings are supported by the recent research of Allen et al. [6], also published in a reputable journal.

---

<sup>3</sup>In reality, it is research prior to that of Regnerus’ which is problematic. Earlier studies, which fail to find evidence for the disadvantages of same sex parenting on children are seriously flawed by small, non-random, or convenience samples, often recruited from within organizations devoted to seeking “rights” for homosexuals. Such samples are biased and, therefore, totally useless for statistical purposes.

Fathers and mothers have different skills which complement each other in the raising of children. It is well known that instability in marriage translates into psychological difficulties for the child. Using data from an eight-decade study, Friedman and Martin [28] found that children of divorced couples have a life expectancy reduced by five years on average. According to the authors:

*“Parental divorce during childhood emerged as the single strongest predictor of early death in adulthood.”*

Mere common sense suggests that a similar outcome is likely for children adopted by homosexuals and transsexuals since such pairings are notoriously transient. As homosexual relationships dissolve, or their participants die prematurely (see section 2.3), we can also expect a corresponding increase in the number of children placed in social services as a result of divorce, abandonment, child abuse<sup>4</sup>, and neglect.

Indeed, the enormous burden thrust upon young children growing up with homosexual parents has been eloquently described by Dawn Stefanowicz [54] and Robert Oscar López [37], who were raised in such environments. If, as is frequently the case, children happen to be a product of reproductive technology, additional emotional suffering results from the fact that they do not know their biological origins. This is evidenced by the multiple websites<sup>5</sup> written by the children of such relationships, desperately seeking information about their forbears.

Homosexual adoption may lead to the direct killing of children by abortion. Homosexual union cannot naturally produce children. In countries such as Puerto Rico, where few women are willing to give up their children for adoption, artificial reproductive technology, such as *in vitro fertilization* (IVF), would necessarily be used by homosexuals.<sup>6</sup> However, IVF is abortive in nature since it involves the destruction of multiple human embryos [65].

The embryo is in reality a human life [32] and, therefore, possesses human rights [10]. IVF and related artificial reproductive technologies violate the most important of those rights; namely, the right to life. Embryos obtained by in vitro fertilization have an increased tendency to spontaneously abort and are associated with increased rates of miscarriage. Half of those that do survive occur in multiplets (twins, triplets, etc.). Such multiplets are often selectively reduced by abortion. They also suffer premature birth with its attendant medical problems. Children conceived by artificial reproductive technologies have an increased risk of major birth defects, autism, mental retardation, and other cerebral problems such as cerebral paralysis [65]. Often the weakest embryos are aborted for eugenic reasons<sup>7</sup>. Donors

---

<sup>4</sup>The massive National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS-4), 2004–2009 [56], finds lower rates of child sexual abuse for married biological parents (0.7 per 1,000 children) than for other groups whose corresponding rates were 3.4 per 1,000 children or above.

<sup>5</sup>E.g., <http://cryokidconfessions.blogspot.com> and <http://childofastranger.blogspot.com>

<sup>6</sup>According to statistics of the Human Fertilization and Embryology Authority [31], the numbers of single women and lesbians receiving IVF treatment in the UK tripled between 2007 and 2012.

<sup>7</sup>IVF also subjects embryos to inhumane and degrading treatment: to freezing, and later cloning; to bizarre experiments involving chimera (human-animal hybrids); to be discarded as medical waste, allowed to grow so that vital organs can be harvested [20], or to be bought and sold on Internet trading sites [21]. As described by Mujeres por Puerto Rico [41], an attempt was made in 2007 to alter the PR Civil Code and legalize the pernicious practice of posthumous procreation (i.e., ‘necro-fertilization’—using genetic material

with traits such as high IQ, Asian, blond, etc., are much sought after. For instance, donors are sometimes required to provide SAT scores. Genetic testing prior to implantation can also damage embryos and doctors discard (i.e., kill) those deemed to be “defective”. Inadequate testing, on the other hand, allowed a Danish man to sire 43 children at 14 different IVF clinics in ten different countries, resulting in a genetic disorder being passed to at least five babies [61]. Some cultures, particularly in Asia, have a marked preference for male children and abort females<sup>8</sup>. Indeed, requests to abort “gay” (or perhaps “straight”) babies would perhaps also be common if not for the fact that the homosexual gene is a scientific fiction. However, there have occurred cases of deaf people demanding that their children be “selected” so as to have the same deaf gene.

Another harm to children from the legalization of homosexual adoption results from the current obsession with political correctness. Adoption has traditionally been a legally difficult and lengthy process. However, due to the societal pressure to be “tolerant” of all behavior<sup>9</sup>, and the current gender ideologies which reign in academia, there may exist a tendency for social workers [63] to be more lenient in cases of adoption applications of “sexual minorities”. According to U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Child Welfare Information Gateway [57]:

*“A growing number of adoption agencies and professionals have been proactive in welcoming LGBT adoptive families.”<sup>10</sup>*

Unfortunately, this also facilitates adoption by pedophiles, a group which is currently pushing for status as a “misunderstood sexual minority that does no real harm”. Research has shown that most pedophiles [30] are homosexual<sup>11,12</sup>. Legalization of adoption by homosexual couples will make it easier for pedophiles to adopt.

In reality, pedophiles are known to be responsible for some of the worst cases of child abuse<sup>13</sup>. Largely suppressed by the media in Puerto Rico was the horrific case [64] of North American Mark Newton who, together with his male “partner”, commissioned a baby boy from a surrogate in Russia. Between the ages of three weeks and six years, the child was sexually

---

extracted from the dead), thereby creating a situation of forced orphanhood and violating the natural rights of the child to a biological mother and a father.

<sup>8</sup>In China alone, about a million female babies are aborted annually and tens of thousands of female children “vanish”.

<sup>9</sup>Excepting Christianity —as evidenced by the forced closing of all Catholic adoption agencies in the UK for refusing to offer homosexual adoption [8].

<sup>10</sup>This makes it even harder for suitable heterosexual couples, seeking to adopt, to be able to do so.

<sup>11</sup>A study by Abel et al. [4] of 377 nonincarcerated, nonincest-related pedophiles, whose legal situations had been resolved, found that heterosexual pedophiles on average reported abusing 19.8 children and committing 23.2 acts, whereas homosexual pedophiles had abused 150.2 children and committed 281.7 acts.

<sup>12</sup>This was reflected in the “pedophile abuse crisis” in the Catholic Church which, on closer examination, turned out to be overwhelmingly an ephebophile crisis (i.e., one of adult males abusing adolescent males) —a fact downplayed by the media [25].

<sup>13</sup>In Scotland, homosexual “rights” campaigner James Rennie, chief executive of LGBT Youth Scotland and lobbyist for gay adoption, was sentenced to life imprisonment for systematically raping a baby between the ages of a few months up to four years [29]. He recorded the abuse and shared it with 7 other men. Subsequent investigations have led to the arrest of at least 60 individuals, and hundreds more pedophiles are believed to have been identified.

abused by his adoptive “fathers” and other men who were part of an international child-porn syndicate. The baby boy was offered to men in Australia, the US, France and Germany for sexual exploitation and the production of child pornography. Incredibly, Newton and his “partner” had been lauded by the Australian press and portrayed as an exemplary couple by advocates of homosexual adoption.

But what of the majority of homosexuals who are not pedophiles? Notwithstanding the fact that most adoptees with same-sex attraction act out of good intentions, this is not sufficient reason to justify legalizing adoptions by homosexual couples. Adoption is not a human right. The welfare of children, and their right to a mother and a father should take priority over any desire to adopt. The studies cited herein show that, on all measures, children do best when raised by parents in stable marriages consisting of one man and one woman. Even in this case, the current practice of forcible orphanization of children via surrogacy is, while legal, a total violation of the rights of the child (see Section 2.7). The legalization of gay adoption will likely increase this practice.

## **2.2 Homosexual adoption harms women**

Companies trading in genetic material use misleadingly altruistic language to attract “donors” by spreading the false notion that they are “helping” to cure fertility problems. An infertile woman or a homosexual couple is as infertile after IVF as before. IVF cures nothing but contributes much to the rapidly growing culture of disrespect for human life.

Downplayed is the fact that oocyte (egg) donation is an invasive, painful, and physically demanding procedure with dangerous side effects [22], [59]. Daily injections of follicle stimulating hormone, administered to hyper-stimulate the ovaries to produce multiple eggs, can lead to ovarian hyper-stimulation syndrome (OHSS). Common side effects of OHSS [45] include nausea and diarrhea, painful enlarged ovaries, shortness of breath, and abdominal bloating. More serious medical complications may include thrombosis, blood clots, kidney failure, fluid build-up in the lungs, and shock. The somewhat painful suctioning of up to two dozen eggs from the ovaries, via a needle inserted through the vagina, can lead to infections of the ovaries which, as a consequence, may have to be removed. An enlarged ovary can twist on its stalk cutting off its blood supply, a condition requiring immediate surgery and perhaps removal of the ovary. Fatal hemorrhages have also been reported. In addition to the aforementioned contraindications, the usual risks of stroke, aspiration, or death associated with any procedure requiring anesthesia are also present. A sexually active donor of ova also risks becoming pregnant with triplets or quadruplets. Conversely, since the total number of eggs produced by a woman is fixed, menopause may, conceivably, be hastened, producing premature infertility in the egg donor. Emotional problems can arise as hormonal side effects or when donors relinquish parental rights to children conceived with their eggs.

Adding to the health risks of artificial reproductive technology is the fact that 48 states allow the practice of sperm donation by HIV-positive males desiring to sire children. Although in the US the sperm is usually centrifugally cleansed, it is unlikely that a scientific claim of 100% reliability would survive careful scrutiny. And what of risks to the safety of technicians

who handle the sperm? What of the traumatization and orphanization of the resulting child when the HIV infected parent dies prematurely?

HIV transmission can result from the considerable unregulated Internet trade in genetic material such as sperm for artificial insemination<sup>14</sup>. Some of this material is of, to say the least, dubious origin, and likely untested for disease.

The biological process of gestation can create very strong mother-child bonds and surrogate mothers may have strong feelings of attachment to their babies even when they are not genetically related. The psychological impact on the mother of breaking these bonds has not yet been adequately studied. Some studies, which find few “psychological problems”, use very small samples and are geographically limited. Moreover, they exclude the psychological health of women who have been trafficked[18] for this purpose, or who have been enticed into surrogacy to escape destitution. Clearly, as evidenced by cases of mothers who do not wish to relinquish their babies, some surrogate mothers pay a very high emotional cost. The forceable rupture of the mother-child bond would be rightly labelled by many as cruelty.

## 2.3 Homosexual adoption harms homosexuals

As we will discuss in Section 2.6, a consequence of the legalization of homosexual civil unions and adoption will be the introduction of gender mainstreaming in all government institutions. Justified criticism of homosexual behaviours will be proscribed. School lessons will include topics such as the biological mechanics of anal sex. Notions of chastity may be declared “homophobic” and their teaching abolished to be replaced with training in the scientifically fraudulent notion of “safe” sex. The concomitant favorable portrayal of homosexual conduct will likely lead to increased promiscuity, the burden of which will be felt disproportionately by the homosexual population.

It is well known that same-sex sexual behavior entails grave risks for physical and mental health, especially for homosexual males [33]. Unfortunately, to mention this fact is considered “homophobic” and the health risks of same-sex behaviour go largely unreported. Yet, to hide or downplay such information discriminates against homosexuals. This censorship has led to many deaths.

According to Diggs, M.D., [24]:

*“It is well established that there are high rates of psychiatric illnesses, including depression, drug abuse, and suicide attempts, among gays and lesbians. This is true even in the Netherlands, where gay, lesbian and bisexual relationships are far more socially acceptable than in the US. Depression and drug abuse are strongly associated with risky sexual practices that lead to serious medical problems.”*

The sexually active homosexual population suffers disproportionately from HIV, anal cancer, chlamydia trachomatis, cryptosporidium, microsporidia, gonorrhoea, syphilis, herpes,

---

<sup>14</sup>In 2013, a UK woman was sentenced to five years for impregnating her 14-year-old adopted daughter with 21 consignments of frozen sperm purchased over the Internet [5].



hepatitis B and C, genital warts, scabies, HPV, and other conditions [24].

The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) [43] estimates that the transmission route for approximately 78% of new HIV diagnoses is men who have sex with men<sup>15</sup> (MSM), a group representing only 4% of the male population<sup>16</sup>. Thus, MSM infection rate is a staggering 8,500% higher than that of the non-MSM population<sup>17</sup>. It is unfortunate that these statistics are rarely mentioned by the mainstream media.

As a result, the average life expectancy of sexually active homosexual males is reduced by many years. Indeed, any other psychological condition which produced such a mortality rate would be classified as a disorder—as homosexuality was prior to 1973 when the American Psychiatric Association arbitrarily changed its classification [62].

## 2.4 Homosexual adoption commodifies persons

When an item is exchanged for money it is called a commodity. When a person is commodified it is called slavery. Homosexual adoption contributes to the commodification of persons in a variety of ways. In so far as it entails artificial reproductive practices such as sperm donation and surrogacy, it dehumanizes pregnancy, converting it into a service and babies into a product. As in commercial deals, customers specify their conditions before purchase. Moreover, as frequently happens in commercial dealings, an unscrupulous merchant may take advantage of naive or desperate customers, employees, or other parties. In many countries, baby harvesting and abduction-adoption are widespread [44].

A recent survey [15] of surrogacy in India<sup>18</sup> found that exploitation by physicians and their lawyers is common practice. Women are induced by unfavorable socio-economic circumstances to undergo the harmful and risky process of egg donation. Poor, destitute and illiterate<sup>19</sup> women are similarly persuaded to undergo difficult pregnancies with the increased risks of premature birth and multiple births. The commissioning couples or individuals, usually foreigners unable or unwilling to have their own children, are charged high prices for services such as sex selection. The bioethics news site BioEdge [20] lists the following highlights from the Report:

1. *Contracts between the women and the parents (not the clinics) were normally signed in the second trimester, after the pregnancy has been confirmed. But most mothers did not have a copy of their contract and were not aware of*

---

<sup>15</sup>Not all homosexual males fall in this category since some are celibate.

<sup>16</sup>In the UK, the corresponding MSM transmission route is 50% [55].

<sup>17</sup>It should be noted that massive promotion and distribution of condoms has only worsened this epidemic. There are mathematical explanations for this counterintuitive phenomenon [48].

<sup>18</sup>The situation in Nigeria is even worse than that in India. Human trafficking, including the selling of children, is now the third most common crime in Nigeria. In 2013, Nigerian police uncovered numerous “baby factories” in which enslaved girls are forcibly impregnated. The resulting children are sold to predatory adoptees, into slavery, and in some cases, ritually sacrificed [9].

<sup>19</sup>The report found that in 50% to 60% of cases, the surrogate mothers and their husbands were illiterate or with primary education, leaving them with little understanding of the medical and legal implications of surrogacy. Moreover, clinics did not even provide copies of legal documents to the surrogate mother.

its contents. “The freedom of the surrogate mother is an illusion,” says the Report.

2. If a baby had an abnormality or was the wrong sex, it was often chemically aborted, often without the surrogate mother’s consent or knowledge. According to the Report, “There have been instances where the contracting individual has specified the sex of the baby, refused to take the baby if it was not born normal and filed a suit against the surrogate saying she had broken the contract.”
3. Normally the mothers are paid only 1% or 2% of the fees charged by the clinic. If the baby is aborted or if the parents refuse to accept the child, mothers are paid only half the fee. Some women are not paid anything.
4. The fate of children with birth defects is unclear. Only 6% of commissioning parents in New Delhi and 26% in Mumbai said that they would take the baby.
5. An increasing trend is using more than one surrogate mother. Commissioning parents look upon it as a more economical option, since the clinics offer 2-mothers-for-1-guaranteed-pregnancy discounts.
6. Most of the women stayed in “shelter homes” during the pregnancy to avoid the stigma of being a surrogate and to avoid being infected with STDs during the pregnancy.
7. The Report contains the very disturbing anecdote of a couple who visited India for surrogacy in order to produce organs for transplant to their sick child.

The multibillion dollar US IVF industry is also highly exploitative<sup>20</sup>. Babies born by IVF in the US become the subject of complicated, legal tangles over parental rights or are rejected by the commissioning couple who may insist on an abortion. As elsewhere, the organs of babies aborted in this process are sold for commercial purposes, transplant<sup>21</sup> or to make shampoos, skin creams<sup>22</sup> or food flavorings<sup>23</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup>In Puerto Rico, the UPR publication *Diálogo* frequently includes advertisements exploiting poor, minority college students by offering them large pecuniary rewards for the harmful practice of oocyte donation [47].

<sup>21</sup>The state legislatures of California, New Jersey, and Ohio have attempted to go one step farther by trying to pass bills allowing the “harvesting” of all organs from live handicapped newborn babies! [19]

<sup>22</sup>The San Francisco cosmetics company Neocutis uses a product derived from fetal cells as an ingredient in its skin creams [16]. Some shampoo manufacturers derive collagen and placenta from the victims of abortion.

<sup>23</sup>In 2012, PepsiCo, the maker of Pepsi Cola, proposed using human embryonic kidney (HEK-293) to produce flavor enhancers for its beverages. <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/boycott-ends-pepsico-will-not-use-aborted-fetal-cell-lines-for-flavor-enhanc>.



## 2.5 Homosexual adoption violates religious, conscience and parental rights

Homosexual adoption is predicated on the legalization of civil union for gays. According to Messner, Visiting Fellow in the Center for Religion and Civil Society at the Heritage Foundation [40]:

*“... in a society that redefines marriage to include same-sex unions, those who continue to believe marriage is a relationship between a man and a woman can expect to face three types of burdens:*

*First, institutions that support the traditional understanding of marriage may be denied access to several types of government benefits, and individuals who work in the public sector may face censorship, disciplinary action, and even loss of employment. Second, those who support the traditional understanding of marriage will be subject to even greater civil liability under nondiscrimination laws that prohibit private discrimination based on sexual orientation, marital status, and gender. Third, the existence of nondiscrimination laws, combined with state administrative policies, can invite private forms of discrimination against religious individuals who believe that marriage involves a man and a woman and foster a climate of contempt for the public expression of their views.”*

A radical undermining of liberty of religious, conscience, and parental rights has followed wherever such legislation has been implemented. Civil penalties and job losses await ministers, priests, judges and others who refuse to participate in so called “wedding” ceremonies.

The following are just a few of thousands of examples of cases in which freedom of expression and religious and parental rights have been attacked:

1. In Canada, criticism of homosexual sexual activities is now identified as hate speech. The various Human Rights Commissions (CHRC) regularly investigate and jail —often on the basis of frivolous accusations— those who believe that certain behavior traits are intrinsically disordered. They have become a serious threat to freedom of speech. In his official testimony [12], Alberta CHRC “hate speech” investigator Dean Steacy stated:

*“Freedom of speech is an American concept, so I don’t give it any value...  
It’s not my job to give value to an American concept.”*

To mention just one example, in 2005 a pastor was fined \$7,000 and ordered never again to speak publicly about the issue of homosexuality. His “crime” was to write a letter to the editor of a local newspaper criticizing the homosexual agenda in schools [7].

2. In Sweden where criticism of homosexuality is legally a “hate crime” a Christian pastor was sentenced to one month in prison for “inciting hatred” for preaching against homosexual behavior [58].
3. In the US, a Massachusetts father was jailed after protesting because his son —a

kindergarten student— was given a book about same-sex couples. In the same state, courts have ruled that male students can, in spite of biological evidence to the contrary, declare themselves to be female and use school facilities such as toilets and changing rooms previously reserved for females. In Texas, San Antonio City Council has recently officially proposed an ordinance [17] which proposes removing from office “any person who has **prior to his appointment** expressed opposition to homosexuality.” Contradicting the laws of logic, the ordinance states that “Violation of this standard shall be considered malfeasance **in office**”. [Emphasis added].

4. In France, thousands of pro family demonstrators, including women, children and the elderly, have been violently beaten, gassed, arbitrarily arrested and detained, for peacefully protesting against homosexual “marriage” or merely for wearing the T-shirt of a pro family organization which shows the outline of a mother and a father with two children. Complaints have been filed against France in the UN Human Rights Council for brutalizing peaceful demonstrators. Even members of the French National Assembly have been arrested and fined for expressing opinions contrary to “homosexual marriage” [60].
5. In the UK all Catholic adoption agencies have been forced to close because of their policy against homosexual adoption. The Anglican Church is currently being sued for refusing to marry a pair of homosexual activists. Many street preachers have been arrested. Private citizens have been harassed by police<sup>24</sup>.

The above comprises just a small subset of the thousands of violations of religious, conscience and parental rights which have followed the legal recognition of homosexual civil union and adoption. It is apparent that many homosexual civil rights activists show little regard for the civil rights of others.

## 2.6 Homosexual adoption leads to indoctrination in the schools

Experience in other countries shows that the legalization of homosexual civil union and adoption is rapidly followed by the introduction into school curricula of topics such as the biological mechanics of homosexual sex. Following the dictates of tolerance and political correctness, notions of chastity are abolished. Mention of the massive disparity in risk between homosexual practice and married sexual union is proscribed, to be replaced by training in scientifically fraudulent notions of “safe” sex.

Such training is already widespread. The result has been generalized promiscuity and an unprecedented epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs). The US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) [14] estimates that, despite massive condom distribution, there are now more than 110 million cases of just 8 common STDs: chlamydia, gonorrhea, hepatitis B virus (HBV), herpes simplex virus type 2 (HSV-2), human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), human papillomavirus (HPV), syphilis, and trichomoniasis. The CDC estimates

---

<sup>24</sup>For example, one lady was warned by police that she was being registered as responsible for a “homophobic incident” after criticizing gay adoption on BBC Radio [1].

that “each year there are 20 million new infections, half of which occur among young people.” The annual economic cost is estimated to be \$16 billion. According to CDC statistics [13], men who have sex with men (MSM) accounted for 63% of primary and secondary syphilis cases in 2008 and were 17 times more likely to develop anal cancer than heterosexual men.

The CDC states explicitly that “condom use cannot provide absolute protection against any STD” and that “there is no treatment that can cure viral STDs, such as HPV and genital herpes.” In addition, “no barrier methods for use during oral sex have been evaluated as effective by the Food and Drug Administration. It would appear that those pushing for so called “safe sex” education using condoms and the normalization of oral and anal sex have blood on their hands.

According to Dr. Edward C. Green, director of the AIDS Prevention Research Project at the Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies,

*“There is a consistent association shown by our best studies, including the U.S.-funded “Demographic Health Surveys,” between greater availability and use of condoms and higher (not lower) HIV-infection rates.”*

The mathematical reasons for this counterintuitive outcome are simple. Promoters of condoms claim that there is a reduction in virus transmission probability per coital act when condoms are used. This statement, however, is false in the case of celibate persons or those in a monogamous marital relation. For such persons, virus transmission probability is exactly zero. In practice, promotion and distribution of condoms lead to increased promiscuity, which in turn leads to increased infection rates. Mathematically, repeated use of condoms with a  $p\%$  failure rate is statistically equivalent to a game of Russian Roulette with a  $100/p$  chambered revolver<sup>25</sup>. By the binomial theorem, the probability of at least one failure approaches a limit of 1 as the number of coital acts increases [48]. This same theorem explains not only the massive increase in sexually transmitted diseases, but also why the majority of women who abort their children are actually using some form of contraception.

In Puerto Rico, attempts have already been made to introduce gender-based curricula in the schools. Such curricula, which normalize homosexual behavior, induce children to adopt harmful lifestyle choices. After all, children do not have fully developed brain pathways. Their emotions are less stable and their perceived sexual identity is malleable and more easily subject to manipulation.

Indeed such education has been ongoing in Puerto Rico schools for many years. External organizations, of various ideological stripes, find it all too easy to obtain access to the public schools. The notorious abortion provider Planned Parenthood, via its Puerto Rico affiliate PROFAMILIA, has for many decades organized workshops and training<sup>26</sup> for young children on topics such as contraception, abortion and homophobia. By promoting premarital and homosexual sex, and propagating the deluded notion that so called “safe sex” is really “safe”, they have contributed greatly to the current epidemics of venereal disease, teen pregnancy and abortion in Puerto Rico [36] while, no doubt, reaping handsome profits in their abortion

---

<sup>25</sup>For example, a 20% failure rate would correspond to Russian Roulette with a five-chambered revolver.

<sup>26</sup>In reality, some PPF training material is indistinguishable from pornography.

clinics.

This pernicious organization actually boasts of its ability to “penetrate” the kindergartens of Puerto Rico. According to a PPF newspage [51] downloaded in 1994:

*“Our first stop was at a fabulous elementary school<sup>27</sup> in Carolina, PR, where we received a warm welcome and gracious hospitality from the principal. Our Global Planning Team witnessed a three-hour education session, called “PESA PROJECT”, provided by PROFAMILIA. PESA PROJECT provides educational programs on sexuality and the prevention of child abuse and neglect to children between the ages of 4–12. This program is offered to school children, parents, local communities, and, quite often, workshops are arranged for professionals. We were all impressed with PROFAMILIA’s ability to not only penetrate, but be well received, within the kindergarten to 6th grade elementary school districts.”*

More recently, PROFAMILIA has used “flash mobs” to promote so called “reproductive rights” such as abortion<sup>28</sup> to the Boys and Girls Club in Carolina Puerto Rico.

In the US, videos [35] by the investigative organization Live Action have exposed Planned Parenthood for:

- Covering up and facilitating the sexual exploitation of minors.
- Providing medical misinformation.
- Using manipulative coercion.
- Facilitating race and sex-based abortions.

The PPF is not alone in “penetrating” the schools of Puerto Rico. United Nations Clubs are also present in many schools and these will likely facilitate the current government’s plan for gender based education [42]. In Brazil in 2011, a United Nations-approved “anti-bullying” program “Schools without Homophobia”, designed to convince children and adolescents to accept homosexual behavior and transsexualism, had to be withdrawn due to public pressure because of its explicit pornographic content. Similar events can be expected in Puerto Rico.

Also currently active in Puerto Rico and possessing links to Planned Parenthood is the Sierra Club. This organization also boasts a strong pro abortion, antinatalist agenda, which it pushes under the aegis of terms such as “sustainability” and climate change [49]. In the US, the Sierra Club organizes conferences on themes such as “*Sex and the Environment*,” which promote an antinatalist agenda and, unsurprisingly, Planned Parenthood representatives are often present [52].

Last, but far from least, among organizations operating within the schools of Puerto Rico is Sapiensis. For almost ten years Sapiensis has been creating a network of “change agents” by

---

<sup>27</sup>The article contains photos taken at the Escuela Luis Muñoz Rivera.

<sup>28</sup>In February 2013, the United Nations Human Rights Council released a report in which the Committee against Torture (CAT) equates lack of access to abortion as “torture and ill-treatment” of women. See <http://pennance.us/?p=521>

providing “leadership” training to the students and staff of many schools. It is not known where this leadership training has led since academic scores seem to be as low as ever. Of greater far concern is the fact that, according to Marino [39]:

*“throughout 2009, the group has expanded its work to include a long-term education plan, unifying the eight (plans) that the Puerto Rico Education Department had at the time into one, and **setting priorities**. It also pushed to have a permanent council, composed of education, government and community officials, to give structure and continuity to those plans. Those efforts are now being directed toward the 10-year education plan the group wants all three political parties to support.”* —[emphasis added]

According to Sapiientis Executive Director Laura López:

*“We want the plan to have the power of law so that no matter who is in power, it will have to be carried out.”*

Thus, Sapiientis will be crucially involved in a “grand unification” of Puerto Rico educational plans. Some of the aforementioned educational plans, including those of the current government [42], mention as priority a “gender perspective”<sup>29</sup>. It is imperative, therefore, to understand Sapiientis’ philosophy on this matter. That Sapiientis is far from neutral ideologically is strongly suggested by the thousands of dollars that its founders and some key board members have contributed to controversial politicians of the US Democratic Party, which officially supports homosexual “marriage” and adoption.<sup>30</sup>

It has often been the case in Puerto Rico that, despite parents’ and taxpayers’ right to know, ill conceived and ideologically based educational plans and experiments have been concocted and implemented with little or no advance warning to the public [50]. It is hoped that this is not a case of history repeating itself.

## 2.7 Homosexual adoption violates the legal and natural rights of children

Homosexual adoption contradicts the natural origins of persons by ignoring the fact that children come from the relationship between one man and one woman. The associated reproductive technology denies personhood by destroying embryos and unborn babies and

---

<sup>29</sup>Sometimes included under the vague term *temas transversales*. According to Department of Education *Carta Circular Núm. 10* (2012–13), dated February 22 2013, “*cada programa académico se asegurará del desarrollo de los temas transversales y el fortalecimiento de los valores universales como parte de la transformación curricular que se percibe.*”

<sup>30</sup>For example, Vadim Nikitine, co-founder and board member of Sapiientis donated \$20,000 to the Obama Victory Fund in 2012 [11]. Sapiientis founder, Kristin Ehrgood, has been a contributor to the Hillary Clinton for President Campaign. She is also President and Board Chair of the Flamboyant Foundation which has been the largest donor to Sapiientis. Another key board member of the Flamboyant Foundation and an ex board member of Sapiientis, Rea Carey, is a donor to the Obama for America Campaign. She also serves as Executive Director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force —the principal organization behind the political power of the LGBT movement.

damages the health of those who survive. Homosexual adoption commodifies and orphanizes children, converting them into accoutrements to be purchased. It breaks biological ties and relations of kinship. It encourages surrogacy, an arrangement which destroys the emotional mother-child bond by transferring natural activities, such as breastfeeding, from the birthing mother to the contracting couple. It affects the health and psychosocial well-being of children. It facilitates predatory adoption and has been linked to the trafficking of children and embryos.

Each of the aforementioned consequences of homosexual adoption is a violation of one or more of the following:

- Article 2 of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child:

*The child shall enjoy special protection, and shall be given opportunities and facilities, by law and by other means, to enable him to develop physically, mentally, morally, spiritually and socially in a healthy and normal manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. In the enactment of laws for this purpose, the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration.*

- Article 6 of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child:

*The child, for the full and harmonious development of his personality, needs love and understanding. He shall, wherever possible, grow up in the care and under the responsibility of his parents, and, in any case, in an atmosphere of affection and of moral and material security; a child of tender years shall not, save in exceptional circumstances, be separated from his mother.*

- Article 11 of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child:

*The child shall be protected against all forms of neglect, cruelty and exploitation. He shall not be the subject of traffic, in any form.*

- Article 11 of the 1998 Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the Human Genome:

*Practices against human dignity, such as cloning with purposes of reproducing human beings, shall not be allowed.*

## 2.8 Homosexual adoption creates a vast legal limbo

As has been well documented by the organization Mujeres por Puerto Rico [41], legalizing homosexual civil union and adoption will have numerous serious implications for the Puerto Rico Civil Code. The following are just a few of the many issues that will need to be taken into account.

Imagine a male-male civil union in which one partner has a girl, adopted during a previous relation. The poor girl, on top of suffering the aforementioned effects of “divorce”, will have to deal with the confusion engendered (please excuse the pun) by as many as 4 “daddies” only one of whom is biological! With each succeeding divorce, the number of step-fathers will increase by one. According to Doug Mainwaring [38]:



*“while same-sex marriage proponents suggest that the government should perhaps just stay out of their private lives, the fact is, now that children are being engineered for gay and lesbian couples, a process that involves multiple other adults who have potential legal custody claims on these children, the potential for government’s involvement in these same-sex marriage households is staggering.*

*Solomon only had to split the baby in two. In the future, judges may have to decide how to split children into three, four, or five equal pieces.”*

Mainwaring notes that, already, judges are ordering that birth certificates indicate more than two parents.

It is not hard to imagine custody and immigration cases for bio-engineered children involving 6 or more<sup>31</sup> biological or legal parents in different countries; for example:

1. the male who sired the child —perhaps a sperm donor.
2. the female(s) who sold her(their) oocytes.
3. the surrogate who gave birth to the child.
4. the two male homosexuals who initially adopted the girl.
5. the new civil partner of one of the homosexuals after their divorce (add 1 for each succeeding divorce).

Such legal problems will create a vacuum into which the state can enter in order to assume the role of arbiter of children’s rights —as it already has in Sweden and Germany [34] where children are permanently and cruelly removed from their married parents for little or no reason. In Puerto Rico, as in Europe, parental rights will be supplanted by legal “rights”. The justice system can also expect to see an increasing number of petitions for information concerning their biological heritage from bio-engineered children with a strong desire to know their biological parents.

Paradoxically, recognition of homosexual union will also result in a loosening of divorce legislation for heterosexuals. In order to accommodate the difficulties in legislating for such matters as sexual neglect, non-consummation, and adultery —which are difficult, if not impossible, to define in the case of a union between two persons of the same sex. Existing marriage laws will inevitably be loosened. In the UK, for example, the government has considered replacing the concept of marital faithfulness in favor of so named “open marriage”<sup>32</sup>. The result of this will be to further undermine the commitment and stability needed for the optimal nurture of children.

G.K. Chesterton once warned us that:

---

<sup>31</sup>In the US, children formed from the genetic material of one father and two mothers are already reaching their teens [46]. The controversial technique involved was carried out repeatedly in total disregard of the unknown risks to the children. Already, at least one of the children has been diagnosed with Pervasive Developmental Disorder.

<sup>32</sup>Previously known as “adultery”.



*“The obvious effect of frivolous divorce will be frivolous marriage. If people can be separated for no reason they will feel it all the easier to be united for no reason.”*

The damage to children from divorce has been outlined in Section 2.1. The enormous economic and social harm to society resulting from the lack of two-parent households is widely known.

### 3 Conclusion

The Senate of Puerto Rico’s PS 437 claims to safeguard the welfare of minors. This analysis has clearly demonstrated that legalizing homosexual adoption, far from promoting the welfare of children and of society, will:

- lead to the forced orphanization of children.
- strip children of their right to a mother and a father.
- cause long term damage to the physical and psychological health of children.
- encourage the spread of abortive artificial reproductive technologies, such as IVF<sup>33</sup>, which disconnect children from their biological heritage reducing them to merchandise to be “designed”, returned, trafficked, predatorily adopted, discarded and their right to life violated.
- further weaken marriage as the lifelong union of one man and one woman, which is, by far, the optimum arrangement for the wellbeing of children.
- lead to the introduction of school curricula based on a perspective of gender with all the concomitant harm to children and society resulting from the likely increase in promiscuity and risky sexual practices.
- increase the probability of adoption by paedophiles, a small but pernicious “sexual minority”.
- encourage surrogacy which depersonalizes and exploits women by converting them into mere “incubators”.
- damage the health of poor women who are exploited for their genetic material.
- lead to violation of religious, conscience and parental rights.
- create legal complications of a nature that will permit state power to override parental rights.

A fundamental role of government is to promote the general welfare. This requires that prudential limitations be placed on activities which are injurious to the wellbeing of society.

---

<sup>33</sup>The fact that practices such as IVF are already legal does not justify legislation which leads to their further extension. Rather, this Pandora’s box should be completely closed. For married couples who have real fertility problems, an ethical solution might be NaPro-technology (<http://www.naprotechnology.com>), which boasts a very high rate of cure.

The act of driving is legal but drunk driving is not. Such restrictions are not discrimination since they apply to different situations. A sober driver cannot be equated to a drunk driver. Hence the state, in the interests of society, limits the privilege of driving to the former. Likewise, a married union is not the same as a partnership of homosexuals. The latter is, by its very nature, sterile since it is missing one of the two sexes. Spousal union, on the other hand, produces children and families<sup>34</sup>, the building blocks of society. Hence the state, in the interests of society, limits the privilege of marriage and adoption to heterosexual couples and, even then, not just to any. Other legal requirements apply. Such restrictions are proper discrimination since they apply to different situations. Moreover, a homosexual already has the same right as everyone else to marry a person of the opposite sex, and sire or adopt children. Prudence demands that this path, like all marriages, should only be adopted by mature persons, who are capable of remaining faithful for life in such an arrangement.<sup>35</sup>

Legislators should carefully evaluate the full implications of this Bill, as well as revisit previous legislation [3] which has resulted in a weakening of the family and significant damage to society.

Our arguments are not based on religion. While consistent with the Catholic position that all sexual activity outside marriage is contrary to the doctrine of Christ, only arguments based on natural law and science have been used in this analysis of PS 437. A separation of Church and State has been adhered to.

All persons, including people with same-sex attractions, deserve due compassion, respect and sensitivity. Every sign of unjust discrimination must be avoided. Limiting adoption to carefully screened persons in stable heterosexual marriages is not discrimination against other groups, but is, rather, based on the natural rights of the child and the best interests of society. Passing PS 437 would be an act of unjust discrimination.

## References

- [1] Fieles a la Verdad, *Código Civil nuevo: ¿democracia o totalitarismo?*, <http://fielesalaverdad.org/el-borrador-del-libro-segundo-del-codigo-civil-democracia-o-totalitarismo/>, 2007.

---

<sup>34</sup>Although an individual marriage may fail to produce children, it is to institutions, based on their benefit to society, to which states accord certain privileges.

<sup>35</sup>In reality, many homosexuals are merely faking an interest in marriage. According to homosexual “rights” activist Masha Gessen [23],

*“It’s a no-brainer that (homosexual activists) should have the right to marry, but I also think equally that it’s a no-brainer that the institution of marriage should not exist. . . . Fighting for gay marriage generally involves lying about what we are going to do with marriage when we get there —because we lie that the institution of marriage is not going to change, and that is a lie. The institution of marriage is going to change, and it should change. And again, I don’t think it should exist. And I don’t like taking part in creating fictions about my life. That’s sort of not what I had in mind when I came out thirty years ago.*

- [2] ———, *¿Fundamentalistas?*, <http://fielesalaverdad.org/fundamentalistas/>, 2013.
- [3] ———, *Puerto Rico Guía Electoral Pro vida y Familia Medidas Legislativas*, <http://fielesalaverdad.org/guia-electoral/legislacion/>, 2013.
- [4] G. G. Abel, J. V. Becker, M. Mittelman, J. Cunningham-Rathner, J. L. Rouleau, and W. D. Murphy, *Self-reported sex crimes of nonincarcerated paraphiliacs*, J. Interpers. Violence, 2:3–25, 1987, <http://jiv.sagepub.com/content/2/1/3>.
- [5] Ayesha Ahmad, *Mother forces 14-year old to become pregnant with donor sperm*, [http://www.bionews.org.uk/page\\_293897.asp](http://www.bionews.org.uk/page_293897.asp), May 7, 2013.
- [6] Douglas W. Allen, Catherine Pakaluk, and Joseph Price, *Nontraditional families and childhood progress through school: A comment on Rosenfeld*, Demography 50:955-961, 2013, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs13524-012-0169-x>.
- [7] Kirsten Anderson, *Sen. Ted Cruz: Gay “marriage” could lead to Christian beliefs being punished as “hate speech”*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/sen.-ted-cruz-gay-marriage-could-lead-to-christian-beliefs-being-punished-a/>, 2012.
- [8] Thaddeus Baklinski, *Last UK Catholic adoption agency loses final appeal over homosexual adoption*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/last-uk-catholic-adoption-agency-loses-final-appeal-over-homosexual-adoptio/>, November 2, 2012.
- [9] BBC, *Nigeria “baby farm” girls rescued by Abia state police*, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-13622679>, June 2011.
- [10] Francis Beckwith, *Defending life: A moral and legal case against abortion choice*, Cambridge University Press, 2011, <https://bearspace.baylor.edu/FrancisBeckwith/www/FrancisBeckwith.com/Books.html>.
- [11] Campaign Money, *Political campaign contributions 2012 election cycle*, <http://www.campaignmoney.com/political/contributions/vadim-nikitine.asp?cycle=12>.
- [12] Canadian Human Rights Tribunal, *Transcript of Case T1073/5405, Pages 4592–4861*, [http://richardwarman.com/transcripts/2007-01-Marc\\_Lemire/May\\_10\\_2007.pdf](http://richardwarman.com/transcripts/2007-01-Marc_Lemire/May_10_2007.pdf), 2007.
- [13] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Gay and bisexual men’s health: Sexually transmitted diseases*, <http://www.cdc.gov/msmhealth/STD.htm>, 2010.
- [14] ———, *Incidence, prevalence, and cost of sexually transmitted infections in the United States*, <http://www.cdc.gov/std/stats/STI-Estimates-Fact-Sheet-Feb-2013.pdf>, 2013.
- [15] Centre for Social Research, Vasant Kunj, India, *Surrogate motherhood- ethical or commercial*, [https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B-f1XIdg1JC\\_dFJRdjRDQlRKU1E/edit](https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B-f1XIdg1JC_dFJRdjRDQlRKU1E/edit), 2013.

- [16] Children of God for Life, *Neocutis response*, <http://cogforlife.org/neocutispublicresponse.htm>, 2001.
- [17] Christian News, “Unprecedented” ordinances could prohibit Christians from working in San Antonio City Government, <http://christiannews.net/2013/07/26/unprecedented-ordinances-could-prohibit-christians-from-working-in-san-antonio-city-government/>, July 26, 2013.
- [18] Michele Clark and Jennifer Lahl, *Egg donors and human trafficking*, <http://www.firstthings.com/onthesquare/2008/04/egg-donors-and-human-trafficki>, April 1, 2008.
- [19] Brian Clowes, *Fetal experimentation and tissue transplantation: The history of fetal organ harvesting*, <http://www.hli.org/cloning/662-facts-of-life-chapter-14-fetal-experimentation-and-tissue-transplantation-the-history-of-fetal-organ-harvesting>, 2001.
- [20] Michael Cook, *Survey of Indian surrogacy reveals shocking abuses*, [http://www.bioedge.org/index.php/bioethics/bioethics\\_article/10612](http://www.bioedge.org/index.php/bioethics/bioethics_article/10612), 2013.
- [21] ———, “I found my embryos on Craigslist”, [http://www.bioedge.org/index.php/bioethics/bioethics\\_article/10055](http://www.bioedge.org/index.php/bioethics/bioethics_article/10055), May 12, 2013.
- [22] Council for Responsible Genetics, *Egg donor dangers*, <http://www.councilforresponsiblegenetics.org/ViewPage.aspx?pageId=103>, 2005.
- [23] Johanna Dasteel, *Homosexual activist says gay “marriage” isn’t about equality, it’s about destroying marriage*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/homosexual-activist-says-gay-marriage-isnt-about-equality-its-about-destroy/>, May 1, 2013.
- [24] John R. Diggs Jr., M.D., *The health risks of gay sex*, Corporate Resource Council, <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/homosexuality/ho0075.html>, 2002.
- [25] Bill Donohue, *Data prove no sex abuse crisis*, <http://www.catholicleague.org/data-prove-no-sex-abuse-crisis/>, May 2013.
- [26] Monseñor Daniel Fernández Torres, *Ponencia con motivo de la decisión del Tribunal Supremo de Puerto Rico que denegó la adopción homosexual*, <http://fielesalaverdad.org/images/arecibo437.pdf>, April 4, 2013.
- [27] Bryan Fischer, *Same-sex parenting is bad for kids, period*, <http://www.afa.net/Blogs/BlogPost.aspx?id=2147522801>, 2012.
- [28] Howard S. Friedman and Leslie R. Martin, *The longevity project: Surprising discoveries for health and long life from the landmark eight-decade study*, Hudson Street Press, 2011.

- [29] Kathleen Gilbert, *Pedophile ringleader was top advisor to Scottish Government on homosexuality and children*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/archive//ldn/2009/may/09051411>, May 14, 2009.
- [30] Ryan Hall and Richard Hall, *A profile of pedophilia: Definition, characteristics of offenders, recidivism, treatment outcomes, and forensic issues*, Mayo Clinic Proceedings 82:457-471, 2007.  
<http://focus.psychiatryonline.org/article.aspx?articleID=53036>.
- [31] Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority, *Latest UK data: Egg, sperm and embryo donor statistics in the UK*, <http://www.hfea.gov.uk/fertility-treatment-trends.html>, 2013.
- [32] Jerome Lejeune, *Jerome Lejeune's expert court testimony regarding the nature of human embryos*, <http://www.sedin.org/propeng/embryos.htm>, 1989.
- [33] Lifesite News, *Same-sex "marriage" a health risk doctors warn parliamentarians*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/archive//ldn/2005/feb/05021709>, February 17, 2005.
- [34] ———, *Sweden revokes parental rights of homeschooling family after three year ordeal*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/sweden-revokes-parental-rights-of-homeschooling-family-after-three-year-ord>, February 17, 2005.
- [35] Live Action, *Investigations*, <http://www.liveaction.org/projects/>, 2013.
- [36] Magaly Llaguno, *La dañina influencia de "Profamilia" en Puerto Rico*, <http://fielesalaverdad.org/la-danina-influencia-de-profamilia-en-puerto-rico-2/>, 1999.
- [37] Robert O. López, *Growing up with two moms: The untold children's view*, <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2012/08/6065/>, August 6, 2012.
- [38] Doug Mainwaring, *I'm gay and I oppose same-sex marriage*, <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2013/03/9432/>, March 8, 2013.
- [39] John Marino, *We have to break this cycle: Sapientis pushes 10-year education plan*, Caribbean Business, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/80138593/Special-Coverage-Education-Sapientis>, January 26, 2012.
- [40] Thomas M. Messner, *Same-sex marriage and the threat to religious liberty*, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2008/10/same-sex-marriage-and-the-threat-to-religious-liberty>, 2008.
- [41] Mujeres por Puerto Rico, *Ponencia presentada por Sra. Yolanda Miranda en torno al Borrador del Libro Segundo sobre el Derecho de Familia en el Código Civil de Puerto Rico*, <http://fielesalaverdad.org/documents/mppr.pdf>, 2007.

- [42] ———, *Las plataformas 2012*, <http://fielesalaverdad.org/documents/mpr.pdf>, 2012.
- [43] NARTH, *Latest CDC statistics on HIV: Homosexual and bisexual men at high risk*, <http://narth.com/2013/07/latest-cdc-statistics-on-hiv-homosexual-and-bisexual-men-at-high-risk/>, July 26, 2013.
- [44] New Directions in Adoption, *International baby harvesting and adoption-abduction*, [http://www.adoption-articles.com/harvesting\\_babies.htm](http://www.adoption-articles.com/harvesting_babies.htm), 2013.
- [45] New York State Department of Health, *Becoming an egg donor*, <http://www.health.ny.gov/publications/1127/>, 2009.
- [46] Angela O’Brien, *Genetically modified 3-parent children hitting their teens*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/genetically-modified-3-parent-children-hitting-their-teens/>, July 26, 2012.
- [47] Philip Pennance, *The cost of human eggs: Warning to Puerto Rico students*, <http://pennance.us/the-cost-of-human-eggs-warning-to-puerto-rico-students/>, 2007.
- [48] ———, *Condom roulette*, <http://pennance.us/condom-roulette/>, 2009.
- [49] ———, *Articles on climate ideology*, <http://pennance.us/climate-ideology-2/>, 2013.
- [50] ———, *Mathematics Standards of the Puerto Rico Department of Education: Analysis and Recommendations*, [http://pennance.us/home/documents/pr\\_standards.pdf](http://pennance.us/home/documents/pr_standards.pdf), 2013.
- [51] Planned Parenthood, *PPF news: Visit to Puerto Rico*, <http://www.pphp.org/takeaction/news/20040113090126-00474.asp>, Downloaded in 2004.
- [52] Pro Ecclesia, *Global alarming update: Focus on so-called “carbon footprint” anti-family*, <http://proecclesia.blogspot.com/2007/11/global-alarming-update-focus-on-so.html>, 2007.
- [53] Mark Regnerus, *How different are the children of parents who have same-sex relationships?*, *Social Science Research* 41(4):752–770, 2012, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X12000610>.
- [54] Dawn Stefanowicz, *Out from under: The impact of homosexual parenting*, WinePress Publishing, 2013.
- [55] UK Health Protection Agency, *Sexually transmitted infections in Men who have Sex with Men (MSM) in the United Kingdom: 2011*, [http://www.hpa.org.uk/webc/HPAwebFile/HPAweb\\_C/1317131687416](http://www.hpa.org.uk/webc/HPAwebFile/HPAweb_C/1317131687416), 2011.
- [56] US Department of Health and Human Services, *Fourth National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS- 4) REPORT TO CONGRESS*, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/>

- [sites/default/files/opre/nis4\\_report\\_congress\\_full\\_pdf\\_jan2010.pdf](#), January 15, 2010.
- [57] US Department of Health and Human Services: Child Welfare Information Gateway, *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender families in adoption*, [https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/f\\_profbulletin/f\\_profbulletin.pdf](https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/f_profbulletin/f_profbulletin.pdf), January 2011.
  - [58] John-Henry Westen and Terry Vanderheyden, *Homosexual hate crime trial of Swedish pastor used as an opportunity for evangelization*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/archive//ldn/2005/nov/05111504>, November 15, 2005.
  - [59] Hilary White, *Barely studied risks of egg-donation come under scrutiny*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/archive//ldn/2006/aug/06081106>, August 11, 2006.
  - [60] ———, *Police used systematic violent force against French traditional marriage demonstrators: Report*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/police-used-systematic-violent-force-against-french-pro-family-demonstrator/>, June 26, 2013.
  - [61] ———, *Sperm donor father of 43 children passed on genetic disorder*, <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/sperm-donor-father-of-43-children-passed-on-genetic-disease/>, September 25, 2012.
  - [62] N.E. Whitehead, *Homosexuality and mental health problems*, <http://www.narth.com/docs/whitehead.html>, 2001.
  - [63] Wintery Knight, *Child’s complaints of sexual abuse by gay couple were ignored by social workers*, <http://winteryknight.wordpress.com/2013/04/01/childs-complaints-of-sexual-abuse-by-gay-couple-were-ignored-by-social-workers/>, 2013.
  - [64] ———, *Two dads are better than one”: pro-gay adoption ABC profile of convicted pedophile*, <http://winteryknight.wordpress.com/2013/07/01/why-two-dads-are-better-than-one-pro-gay-adoption-abc-profile-of-convicted-pedophile-mark-newton/>, 2013.
  - [65] Zenit, *In vitro children and the risks they face: Interview with neonatologist Carlo Bellieni*, <http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/in-vitro-children-and-the-risks-they-face>, June 6, 2004.