Election 2004: A Rocky Road to Fairness

November 3 was not a happy day to wake up LGBT in America. Not only had 11 states passed referenda writing marriage discrimination into their constitutions, but pundits were tracing President Bush’s re-election back to “gay marriage” – specifically, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court’s November 2003 decision to stop denying equal marriage rights to same-sex couples.

Since November 3, when both Democrats and the LGBT community were smarting, cooler and more accurate analysis has emerged. According to Andrew Kohut of the Pew Research Center, the percentage of evangelical Christians voting in this election stayed the same as in 2000. The percentage of anti-abortion voters stayed the same. The percentage of voters who say they pray daily stayed the same. So it’s difficult to argue that the evangelical vote made a difference in Ohio or nationally.

Gary Langer, director of polling for ABC News, warned that the “poorly devised” exit poll “threatens to undermine our understanding of the 2004 election.” By asking voters to choose among taxes, education, Iraq, terrorism, economy/jobs, moral values or health care, the poll equated six concrete policy issues with one grab bag that could hold anything. Dick Meyer of CBS News agreed: “If one of the issues on the list was a combined ‘terrorism and Iraq,’ it would have been the top concern of 34 percent of the electorate and nobody would be talking about moral values. If ‘taxes, jobs and the economy’ was on the list as one item instead of two, it would have been the topper at 25 percent.”

As conservative columnist David Brooks argued in the New York Times, “Bush won because 53% of voters approved of his performance as President. Fifty-eight percent of them trust Bush to fight terrorism. They had roughly equal confidence in Bush and Kerry to handle the economy. Most approved of the decision to go to war in Iraq.” And when asked about specific issues – as opposed to amorphous “moral values” – voters in Ohio listed gay marriage second to last in their consideration of whether to vote for Bush or Kerry.

The exit polls did tell us that fairness is a bedrock value across the country: sixty-two percent of people support either marriage or civil unions for same-sex relationships. Even George Bush, in the final days of the campaign, softened his stance and spoke of being open to supporting civil unions.

Elections Across New England Show LGBT Gains

A famous Boston Herald headline following the Goodridge decision read “Gays A-OK in Bay State.” Based on local election results, it looks like voters in other New England states have also deemed that gays are A-OK.

Connecticut: Pro-equality candidates endorsed by the Political Action Committee of Love Makes A Family won decisively in key races, while anti-equality forces did not pick up one new vote. According to Anne Stanback, president of Love Makes A Family, “The clear take away message from Tuesday’s election is that if political candidates in Connecticut support discriminatory DOMA legislation, they do so at their own peril.”

Vermont: Despite eleventh hour efforts by anti-gay forces, Vermont’s incoming legislature looks fairer and gay-friendlier than ever. The Senate now boasts a very strong 21-9 pro-gay majority. In the House, local activists count at least likely 87 friends (out of 150) – including six Progressives, six Republicans, and 75 Democrats. This is especially good news in Vermont, which suffered a virulent anti-gay campaign in 2000, in the aftermath of approving civil unions, resulting in the loss of 17 pro-civil union incumbents.
GLAD Appeals to Allow Out-of-State Couples to Marry in Massachusetts

GLAD has filed an appeal in the case of Cote-Whitacre et al. v. Department of Public Health, which was originally filed on June 18, 2004, on behalf of eight non-resident same-sex couples seeking to marry in Massachusetts. The couples, from across New England and New York, had either married and faced claims that their marriages are null and void, or had been denied marriage licenses.

The case involves the so-called “1913 law,” (Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 207 Section 11), which town clerks were instructed to ignore for decades. “Governor Romney pulled it off the shelves just to deny marriage to some gay and lesbian couples,” said GLAD attorney Mary Bonauto. “Plainly stated, the Constitution trumps Section 11 under the Goodridge decision.”

On August 18, the Massachusetts trial court issued a decision denying immediate relief to the couples, who challenged the constitutionality and discriminatory enforcement of the law. At the same time, the court acknowledged that the law violates the spirit of Goodridge. The interlocutory appeal seeks to reverse the August 18 decision.

“We’re confident that the appellate court will see its way clear to providing basic fairness to these couples,” said GLAD attorney Michele Granda. “Massachusetts should not allow its standards of fairness to be compromised by the unfair and discriminatory laws of other states.”

Of the plaintiff couples. A similar motion to intervene has been filed by two Connecticut town clerks, who assert that their religious principles would be violated should they be required to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples.

The couples represented in Kerrigan & Mock v Connecticut Department of Public Health are:

Beth Kerrigan and Jody Mock of West Hartford, parents of two-year-old twin boys; Janet Peck and Carol Conklin of Colchester, life-long Connecticut residents who share a relationship of 28 years; Jeffrey Busch and Stephen Davis of Wilton, who work in New York City and are raising their two-year-old son, Elijah; J.E. Martin and Denise Howard of Stratford, parents of seven-year-old Rachel and four-year-old Ross; Barbara and Robin Levine-Ritterman of New Haven, who along with their nine-year-old daughter and seven-year-old son are facing the challenge of Barb’s breast cancer; John Anderson and Garrett Stack of Woodbridge, who have a combined 55 years service to the Stratford public school system; and Geraldine and Suzanne Artis of Middletown, parents of a six-year-old and four-year-old twins.

The legal team for Kerrigan & Mock includes Maureen M. Murphy of Murphy, Murphy & Nugent in New Haven, Kenneth J. Bartschi of Horton, Shields & Knox in Hartford, and Annette M. Lamorueaux of the Connecticut Civil Liberties Union. The case may take up to three years to make its way to a final adjudication.

No rest—On to Connecticut

On behalf of seven same-sex couples from across Connecticut who were denied marriage licenses, GLAD filed suit in New Haven Superior Court on August 25, 2004. At a press conference held in Hartford, GLAD attorney Mary Bonauto said, “As a simple matter of equality, it is time for Connecticut to end its discrimination against same-sex couples and their families.”

With Kerrigan & Mock v. Connecticut Department of Public Health, GLAD continues to make progress on securing marriage rights across New England. Massachusetts is the only state where same-sex couples can legally marry, due to GLAD’s historic victory in Goodridge v. Department of Public Health. And as a result of Baker v. State of Vermont, a 1999 suit filed by GLAD, attorney Beth Robinson and attorney Susan Murray, Vermont is the only state to provide civil unions to same-sex couples.

The Connecticut suit relies on the state’s constitutional guarantees of equality and due process. “We claim that the equality provisions of the Connecticut Constitution forbid the state from denying marriage rights to gay and lesbian couples,” said Bonauto. “The plaintiffs must be treated equally under the law.”

The first legal skirmish took place on November 1 in New Haven Superior Court. The Family Institute of Connecticut, a conservative group has sought to become a party to the case. GLAD senior attorney Bennett Klein argued against the intervention, on behalf of the plaintiff couples. A similar motion to intervene has been filed by two Connecticut town clerks, who assert that their religious principles would be violated should they be required to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples.

The couples represented in Kerrigan & Mock v Connecticut Department of Public Health are:

Beth Kerrigan and Jody Mock of West Hartford, parents of two-year-old twin boys; Janet Peck and Carol Conklin of Colchester, life-long Connecticut residents who share a relationship of 28 years; Jeffrey Busch and Stephen Davis of Wilton, who work in New York City and are raising their two-year-old son, Elijah; J.E. Martin and Denise Howard of Stratford, parents of seven-year-old Rachel and four-year-old Ross; Barbara and Robin Levine-Ritterman of New Haven, who along with their nine-year-old daughter and seven-year-old son are facing the challenge of Barb’s breast cancer; John Anderson and Garrett Stack of Woodbridge, who have a combined 55 years service to the Stratford public school system; and Geraldine and Suzanne Artis of Middletown, parents of a six-year-old and four-year-old twins.

The legal team for Kerrigan & Mock includes Maureen M. Murphy of Murphy, Murphy & Nugent in New Haven, Kenneth J. Bartschi of Horton, Shields & Knox in Hartford, and Annette M. Lamorueaux of the Connecticut Civil Liberties Union. The case may take up to three years to make its way to a final adjudication.
**After Goodridge, the deluge.**

After the Supreme Judicial Court decided in favor of the Goodridge marriage plaintiffs, GLAD's work increased exponentially. Staff fought off legal challenges, filled informational gaps, and capitalized on educational opportunities.

**Legal challenges:** In order to allow the legislature time to adjust and respond, the Supreme Judicial Court ordered a 180-day stay before the decision would go into effect and same-sex couples would be able to marry. Marriage opponents – including the Catholic Action League, a group of legislators, and former Vatican Ambassador Ray Flynn - used the time to mobilize legal challenges attempting to extend the stay, vacate the judgment, or intervene in the case in some way. GLAD defended the decision from these challenges, all of which were defeated.

**Constitutional Convention:** When the state's constitutional convention took place in February and March 2004, marriage opponents attempted to gain support for an anti-marriage amendment to the state's constitution. As a coalition member of MassEquality, GLAD worked to stop discrimination from becoming a part of the state's constitution, strategizing with allies, crafting legal language, educating legislators, and reaching out to our community. Education staff worked on field activities to promote a positive environment for marriage. The path from GLAD to the State House was well worn.

**Education:** GLAD moved swiftly to inform same-sex couples about how to best act on their right to marry, producing literature, sending out emails, updating our website, handling an unprecedented number of hotline calls, and speaking to lawyers and lay people alike.

GLAD guided couples through government procedures, providing information on its website about town clerks, necessary forms and documents, and navigating waiting periods.

New publications included *How to Get Married in Massachusetts, Marriage Tips & Traps,* and two tax publications: *Navigating Income Taxes for Married Same-Sex Couples,* and *Taxes on Employment Benefits for Same-Sex Spouses. Warning for Same-Sex Binational Couples* was published in English, Spanish, Portuguese, Haitian Creole, and Chinese.

**May 17, 2004:** Despite all the efforts to derail the Goodridge decision, on May 17, couples were married all over the Commonwealth, and happiness broke out across the state. ▼

---

**GLAD Wins Tax Deduction for Sex Reassignment Surgery**

Following negotiations with GLAD on behalf of Rhiannon O’Donnabhain, the Internal Revenue Service has concluded that a transsexual woman may deduct expenses for sex reassignment surgery as a necessary medical expense.

The decision overturned a tax examiner’s refusal to allow O’Donnabhain’s claimed deduction because he viewed her sex reassignment surgery as “cosmetic.” As the Appeals Officer determined, however, O’Donnabhain’s surgery was medically necessary and an integral part of a professionally prescribed course of treatment for her diagnosed condition. The decision has important implications for other government programs as well as for private contracts of insurance.

“This decision recognizes that sex reassignment can be as medically necessary for some people as an appendectomy or heart bypass surgery,” stated GLAD attorney Karen Loewy. “The notion that medical treatment for a transgender person is purely cosmetic is based on prejudice, not medical science.”

Rhiannon O’Donnabhain underwent sex reassignment surgery in 2001 after having been diagnosed with gender dysphoria. She and her health care providers determined that sex reassignment surgery was a medically necessary step to enable her to live her life as a woman.

“I am greatly relieved by the Appeals Officer’s decision,” said Ms. O’Donnabhain. “While the money was important to me, so was the underlying principle. I hope this case sends a clear message that transgender people deserve dignity, respect and equal treatment for our medical care.” ▼

---

**Court Rules Non-Biological Mom has no Financial Obligation**

GLAD was disappointed by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court’s ruling in a case about the financial responsibilities of a non-biological parent to her child. The case involved a same-sex couple who decided to conceive and raise a child together by the insemination of one of the women.

In *T.F. v. B.L.*, the SJC ruled that after the couple’s breakup, the non-biological partner did not have an obligation to support the child, even though the Court acknowledged that she intentionally and purposefully acted to bring the child into the world. GLAD represented the biological mother, T.F.

“The Court’s decision is disappointing because it does not reflect the reality of children’s lives today,” said GLAD attorney Ben Klein. “Many couples, both gay and straight, use reproductive technologies to bring children into the world, where one parent has a biological relationship to the child and the other parent does not. These children deserve the same legal protections as other children.”

While the decision was important, said Klein, it is “limited to narrow circumstances where an unmarried couple breaks up during a pregnancy.” ▼
“This is a ground-breaking decision for transgender people who have historically been excluded from many civil rights protections and continue to experience pervasive discrimination.”

- Levi

Vermont Police Officer Settles Transgender Discrimination Claim

After a precedent-setting ruling by the Vermont Attorney General stating that Vermont law prohibits discrimination against transgender people in employment, public accommodations, housing, and other areas, the Town of Hardwick settled a discrimination claim brought by former police officer Anthony Barreto-Neto. Vermont’s Attorney General had found probable cause that the town illegally terminated Barreto-Neto after learning that he is transgender. In addition to a payment of $90,000 to Mr. Barreto-Neto, the settlement requires the town to adopt a formal policy of nondiscrimination against transgender persons and train its employees on transgender issues.

Jennifer Levi of GLAD and Beth Robinson of Langrock, Sperry & Wool in Middlebury, VT represented Barreto-Neto. Levi said, “This is a ground-breaking decision for transgender people who have historically been excluded from many civil rights protections and continue to experience pervasive discrimination.”

Shortly after Barreto-Neto, an experienced officer, started working at the Hardwick Police Department in April 2002, town officials discovered that he is transgender. Barreto-Neto was subjected to a continuous pattern of harassment and inferior work conditions that became so severe he had to leave his job. A former police chief testified that a town official directed him to make Barreto-Neto so uncomfortable that he would leave the force.

Mr. Barreto-Neto commented, “I filed this case because I knew that transgender people like myself face discrimination in many aspects of our lives due to irrational fears and prejudices. I hope this decision means that employers will create a better understanding of transgender people in their workplaces.”

Election 2004 [continued from front page]

As Brooks noted in the Times, “There is a big middle on gay rights issues, as there is on most social issues.”

In fact, in Massachusetts, legislators who supported the Goodridge decision were returned to office – every one. And two legislators who had not supported Goodridge were defeated in their primaries. In Massachusetts, where everyone has seen same-sex couples marry, voters have recognized that marriages only bring joy and security, and they don’t threaten any one else’s marriages, or society in general. There were similarly positive results through out New England.

Growing acceptance of equal marriage is the result of a long, long process of public discussion and incremental legal and legislative progress on LGBT rights issues. Goodridge did not come out of the blue in Massachusetts: GLAD carefully assessed the chances of success, as in Vermont and now in Connecticut, before filing suit.

The time is right when there is a record of legislation and court decisions advancing lesbian and gay issues; when the public by and large recognizes the challenges facing same-sex families as legitimate; and when there is an an organized community of allies to support the issue politically.

Massachusetts is not an island or a miracle. It is a way forward. As we go forward seeking an end to discrimination in marriage for LGBT people no matter where they live, the one reliable and very powerful asset LGBT have is the same as any minority group has: the power to speak our truth in our own voices. That is what the seven couples we represent in Connecticut are doing: standing on the shoulders of Vermont and Massachusetts couples, and telling their stories.

But we cannot prevail on our own. We must win in the court of public opinion, where the support of non-LGBT people is essential. We are at a point of great challenge and great opportunity. Whatever our political background or life circumstances, all who believe in fairness and equality as fundamental American values must stand up to those who would further institutionalize discrimination against LGBT people, our families, and our children.

While it is important, always, for strategy to be timely, it is also important to recognize that oppressed people are always told to wait. And as Martin Luther King, Jr. reminds us in his Letter from a Birmingham Jail, time can be used for good or ill: “More and more I feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than have the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the hateful words and actions of bad people, but for the appalling silence of good people.”

We must all unequivocally condemn marriage discrimination against same-sex couples, answer every person who seeks to perpetuate it, and reassure everyone (including elected officials) that there is much to gain and nothing to fear from recognizing that LGBT people and families are fully part of our civil society.
Maine High Court Upholds Lesbian Parent’s Legal Rights

C.E.W. had no biological or adoptive relationship with the child whose birth she planned and who she raised with her partner, D.E.W. Yet in June 2004, Maine’s highest court ruled unanimously that C.E.W., represented by GLAD, is “as a parent” for the purposes of determining who has legal parental rights and responsibilities for him.

“This ruling is a common-sense acknowledgement that children in all families need their parents’ love and commitment, whether or not those parents are biologically or adoptively related to them,” said GLAD attorney Mary Bonauto, who represented C.E.W., along with attorney Patricia A. Peard of Portland. “It would have been tragic for the Court to discount one of the parents this child has known his entire life.”

C.E.W. and D.E.W. had been together two years when they had their son. Both took care of him, and they signed a joint parenting agreement assuring that each would be involved in the child’s life no matter what their circumstances. They also obtained a legal co-guardianship order so that C.E.W. would have some legal rights to make medical and school decisions for their son.

C.E.W. brought the case to establish her rights and responsibilities toward her son after D.E.W. went to the Probate Court in 2000 to end the co-guardianship, a move that would have allowed D.E.W. to bar contact between C.E.W. and their son.

In its opinion, the Court noted that the Maine courts have recognized de facto parental rights “for persons who have played an unusual and significant parent-like role in a child’s life” in several opinions over the last sixty years. The Court stated that de facto parents should be limited to “those adults who have fully and completely undertaken a permanent, unequivocal, committed, and responsible parental role in the child’s life.”

Maine’s ruling joins similar rulings in other states, including Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Wisconsin. Courts in each of these states have upheld the right of ongoing contact in situations like the one C.E.W faced. The national and highly influential American Law Institute has recommended states recognize de facto and other parental relationships based on conduct rather than merely on marriage and biology.

AIDS Law Project Tackles Access to Care

GLAD’s AIDS Law Project continues to work on critical insurance and access to health care issues for people living with HIV:

Medicaid: Babies born with HIV, who at one time had little chance for long-term survival, are now living to adulthood. But the new HIV medications that make this possible can have debilitating side effects. GLAD is representing a 15-year-old girl who developed a large abnormal fat deposit on her neck as a side effect from her HIV medications. The fat deposit, known as “buffalo hump,” causes back pain, neck pain and headaches and causes her to be bent over. Unless the fat deposit is removed, she will develop permanently malformed posture. The Massachusetts Office of Medicaid has refused to pay for liposuction, the standard procedure to remove the buffalo hump, claiming that the procedure was cosmetic and not medically necessary.

Disability insurance: In spite of some improvement in their condition, some people with HIV remain unable to work due to severe fatigue and side effects from medications. GLAD continues to take on disability insurers that terminate benefits for people in this situation. Most recently, we have filed an appeal on behalf of man who was cut off by his disability insurer even though his doctor explained to the insurance company that he is a “very sick patient whose body is under significant assault from advanced HIV disease.”

“ This ruling is a common-sense acknowledgement that children in all families need their parents’ love and commitment, whether or not those parents are biologically or adoptively related to them”

-Bonauto

GLAD was the Grand Marshal in Boston’s 2004 Gay Pride Parade
Transgender and Disabled People Protected by Connecticut’s Hate Crimes Law

Transgender and disability rights took a step forward in May when Connecticut’s legislature amended the state’s hate crimes statute to cover people targeted for violence because they are transgender or disabled.

“Transgender people and people with disabilities have long been the target of violence and hate crimes,” said GLAD attorney Jennifer Levi. “The newly amended law lets the police, prosecutors, courts and the general public know that targeting individuals for violence because they are transgender or disabled is intolerable.”

GLAD worked with the Connecticut Hate Crimes Network toward passage of the bill. Levi authored the original bill that led to the legislation signed by Governor John Rowland in May.

Portland Domestic Partnerships Upheld in Maine

In May, GLAD successfully fought back a challenge to the city of Portland’s (Maine) domestic partner ordinance. The Center for Marriage Law, the Alliance Defense Fund Law Center, and a dozen Portland citizens filed suit against Portland, claiming that Maine’s anti-gay marriage restriction prevented Portland from providing municipal benefits to committed, unmarried families living and working in the city.

Cumberland County Superior Court Justice Thomas Humphrey ruled in favor of Portland, represented by GLAD and Mittel Asen, a Portland-based law firm.

“The City of Portland cannot change the fact that the State of Maine continues to deny marriage rights to committed gay and lesbian families,” said GLAD attorney Michele Granda. “But the City can rightfully provide a safety net of municipal benefits – including health insurance, family leave, and family discounts to its own employees, and encourage other employers to do the same.”

Elections Across NE [continued from front page]

New Hampshire: State Senator Russell Prescott introduced a bill in 2004, SB427, to prohibit New Hampshire from recognizing same-sex marriages, civil unions and/or domestic partnerships that are legal in other states. In November, he was voted out of office, and all state senators who voted against SB427 were re-elected, including three openly gay candidates.

Maine: State senate candidates endorsed by Equality Maine did well, giving hope to Maine’s LGBT community. Advocates are preparing for the coming legislative session and an expected constitutional amendment to deny marriage rights to committed same-sex couples.

Rhode Island: In agreement with the state’s LGBT community, voters decided not to hold a constitutional convention in 2005. LGBT advocates had opposed a convention because of the strong possibility that an anti-marriage amendment would be considered.

Massachusetts: Every pro-equality legislator won re-election, mostly by large margins. Pro-equality candidates won six of eight open seats where the opponent was in favor of the constitutional amendment that would bar marriage equality for same-sex couples. “These victories position us extremely well for next year’s constitutional convention,” said Marty Rouse, campaign coordinator for MassEquality, which organized extensively to support pro-equality candidates.
Andrea Macleod, Hotline Volunteer

The Legal Information Hotline is staffed by 20 volunteers, each of whom has strong personal reasons for helping GLAD carry out its mission. Each volunteer goes through an intensive 20 hour training program conducted by the Hotline Coordinator and GLAD’s legal team. After the training, the volunteer is asked to make a minimum six-month commitment working one afternoon each week.

Andrea Macleod has been working on the Legal Information Hotline since April 2004. She grew up in London in the socially conscious, turbulent sixties and attended a Marxist university in Belgium. Andrea has been married to her husband since 1978 and has two children, aged 21 and 25.

With a master’s degree in Adult and Organizational Learning, she provides corporate training in “soft skills” such as communication, negotiation, and writing. Her job combines her interest in psychology with her skills as a writer and teacher, and allows her to travel in the United States, Russia and Poland.

Andrea has always had a strong sense of social justice. She met GLAD attorney Ben Klein while doing trainings for HIV/AIDS organizations and she was immediately impressed by GLAD’s work. “GLAD was making a real impact,” she said. She wanted to make a contribution, and the Hotline was an ideal fit.

Juggling a hectic work schedule and dedication to her family, Andrea has chosen to commit one afternoon a week to work with callers who are experiencing discrimination, forming families, or seeking benefits and protections under the law. Andrea’s compassion, strong sense of social justice, British sense of humor, and skills as a communicator all contribute to the way in which she is able to offer not only information, but also comfort and understanding to hotline callers.

In recent days, in addition to calls involving employment discrimination, health benefits, and immigrations concerns, Andrea has taken several calls from people who are concerned about the pushback that is coming from the religious right over the gains in equal rights, specifically regarding marriage rights for same-sex couples. Andrea, a die-hard Democrat, says “The election is a wakeup call for everyone who cares about justice and equality.”

NEW Publications

The following new publications are available from GLAD, either on-line (www.glad.org) or in hard copy. To order a free hard copy of a publication, email your request to bbell@glad.org.

BOOKLETS

Marriage Tips and Traps: Lays out legal matters for couples to consider, including finances, estate planning, benefits, family issues, immigration concerns, and military issues.

Vermont Overview of Legal Issues for Gay Men, Lesbians, Bisexuals and Transgender People: Covers anti-discrimination protections, family law, hate crimes, student rights, and police issues in the Green Mountain state.

How to Get Married in Massachusetts: A step-by-step guide to eligibility, blood tests, forms, name changes and more.

OUTREACH MATERIALS

Hey Transgender Students! Informs transgender students who go to school in Massachusetts of their rights to physical safety and gender expression, and how to get help if they need it.

Hey LGBT Students! Informs LGBT public school students of their rights: to physical safety, to freedom of speech, and to form gay-straight alliances.

Domestic Partnership Benefits Still Matter in the Age of Equal Marriage: Explains why employers should continue to offer domestic partner benefits to same-sex couples.

Warning for Same-Sex Binational Couples: Notifies couples of the complications involved in marriage where one member of a couple is a foreign national. Available in English, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Haitian Kreyol, and Chinese.

What’s the Difference? Compares the rights, benefits, and responsibilities of marriage and civil unions.

Taxes on Employment Benefits for Same-Sex Spouses: Helps couples sort out the tax issues involved in sharing their spouse’s employment benefits.

Navigating Income Taxes for Same-Sex Couples: A guide through the legal uncertainties and complexities of this brand-new field.
More than 900 friends of GLAD showed their enthusiastic support at this year’s Spirit of Justice Dinner, which took place at the Westin Copley on October 1. The evening raised a record $350,000, and featured a slide show of wedding pictures, remarks by Mary Bonauto, and a keynote speech by Nancy Walsh, who lost her life partner in the 9/11 attacks, and won compensation with GLAD’s help.

GLAD honored Tim Gill of the Gill Foundation with the Spirit of Justice Award. Tim was recognized for his consistent and visionary support of gay and lesbian organizations across the country. Community activists Tom Bombardier and John Fowler of Provincetown were also honored for their dedication to GLAD and the gay community.

GLAD attorneys (L-R) Michele Granda, Ben Klein, and Mary Bonauto

Legal director Gary Buseck with keynote speaker Nancy Walsh
GLAD Launches Legacy Society

Planned gifts, such as naming GLAD in your will, as a beneficiary of retirement accounts or establishing a charitable remainder trust are an important way to support GLAD’s work into the future. We wish to recognize and thank the following people who have recognized GLAD’s work in their estate planning. Please let us know if you have made such provisions or would like to know more about how to do so by calling the development office at 617-426-1350.

Anonymous
Gloria & Linda Bailey-Davies
David Brown
Estate of Larry Brown
Estate of Esther Carty
Abby & Mary Diamond-Kissiday
Lisa Drapkin & Debbie Lewis
Robert Ellsworth & Arthur Lipkin
Estate of Ada R. Ersken
Estate of Earle Raymond Hopkins
John D. Kane
Richard D. McCarthy
Estate of Russell Miller
Estate of Joan Schneider
Estate of Cameron Smith
Kenneth Stilwell
Estate of Ray Sullivan
Anthony Volponi

GLAD received the 2004 Greater Boston Business Council’s Founders Award

(L-R) Goodridge plaintiffs Julie Goodridge, David Wilson, and Hillary Goodridge

(L-R) Honorees John Fowler and Tom Bombardier with interim executive director Margaret Williams

(L-R) Spirit of Justice Co-chair David Brown, honoree Tim Gill, and Co-chair Renda Mott
Welcome
GLAD HAS WELcomed A NUMBER OF NEW STAFF MEMBERS IN 2004:

Hotline Coordinator Bruce Bell spent 33 years at Cape Cod Community College, first as a mathematics professor and then as Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences.

GLAD’s former Executive Director Gary Buseck has returned as GLAD’s Legal Director after a stint with Lambda Legal in New York.

Carisa Cunningham, Director of Public Affairs and Education, has worked at Harvard AIDS Institute, AIDS Action Committee, and Gay Men’s Health Crisis.

Emily Douglas, Bilingual Educator/Advocate for the AIDS Law Project, comes to GLAD from Harvard University, where she studied comparative literature.

Legal Assistant Cori Gentilesco comes to GLAD after graduating from Wellesley College, where she studied classics.

Peter Hogan, the new Special Events Director, comes to GLAD after organizing events at the Omega Institute.

Amy Killelea joined GLAD as a Legal Assistant after graduating from Smith College, where she studied sociology and government.

Database and Gifts Coordinator Margaret Pearl graduated from Cambridge College and worked in the development office of Beth Israel-Deaconess Medical Center before coming to GLAD.

Shane Tatten, Development Assistant, also works part-time at Boston’s AIDS Action Committee.

Legal Assistant Alex Wood, a 2002 graduate of Princeton University, joins GLAD after two years of teaching in Vietnam.

Mary Bonauto was named one of the 2004 “Out 100” by Out Magazine