

No. 12-307

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Petitioner,

v.

EDITH SCHLAIN WINDSOR

AND

BIPARTISAN LEGAL ADVISORY GROUP OF THE UNITED
STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Respondents.

**On Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals
for the Second Circuit**

**BRIEF OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN
HISTORIANS AND THE AMERICAN STUDIES
ASSOCIATION AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF
RESPONDENT EDITH WINDSOR**

CATHERINE E. STETSON*
MICHAEL D. KASS
ERICA KNIEVEL SONGER
MARY HELEN WIMBERLY
C. BENJAMIN COOPER
RYAN D. TAGGETT
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 637-5491
cate.stetson@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel of Record

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... | ii |
| STATEMENT OF INTEREST..... | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... | 3 |
| ARGUMENT..... | 6 |
| I. GAY AND LESBIAN PEOPLE HAVE BEEN SUBJECT TO WIDESPREAD AND SIGNIFICANT DISCRIMINA- TION IN THE UNITED STATES..... | 6 |
| A. The Historical Roots of Discrim- ination Against Gay People..... | 6 |
| B. Modern American History: 1890-1940..... | 7 |
| C. World War II and Its Aftermath..... | 12 |
| D. The Gay Rights Movement and Its Opponents in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s..... | 17 |
| E. The Persistence of Anti-Gay Dis- crimination from the 1990s to the Present..... | 20 |
| II. HISTORY PLAYS A CRITICAL ROLE IN THE COURT'S EQUAL- PROTECTION ANALYSIS..... | 35 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 37 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES:

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Baehr v. Lewin</i> , 852 P.2d 44 (Haw. 1993)..... | 31 |
| <i>Baehr v. Miike</i> , Civ. No. 20371, 1999 Haw. LEXIS 391 (Haw. Dec. 9, 1999) | 31 |
| <i>Boseman v. Jarrell</i> , 704 S.E.2d 494 (N.C. 2010)..... | 30 |
| <i>Bottoms v. Bottoms</i> , 457 S.E.2d 102 (Va. 1995)..... | 29 |
| <i>Bowen v. Gilliard</i> , 483 U.S. 587 (1987)..... | 3 |
| <i>Boy Scouts of America v. Dale</i> , 530 U.S. 640 (2000)..... | 26 |
| <i>City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr.</i> , 473 U.S. 432 (1985)..... | 35 |
| <i>Department of Agric. v. Moreno</i> , 413 U.S. 528 (1973)..... | 35 |
| <i>Ex parte H.H.</i> , 830 So. 2d 21 (Ala. 2002) | 30 |
| <i>Florida Dep't of Children & Families v.</i> <i>Adoption of X.X.G.</i> , 45 So. 3d 79 (Fla. Ct. App. 2010)..... | 20 |
| <i>Frontiero v. Richardson</i> , 411 U.S. 677 (1973)..... | 36 |
| <i>Hernandez v. Texas</i> , 347 U.S. 475 (1954)..... | 35 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|--|---------|
| <i>In re Marriage Cases</i> , 183 P.3d 384 (Cal. 2008)..... | 33 |
| <i>Lawrence v. Texas</i> , 539 U.S. 558 (2003)..... | 3, 36 |
| <i>Loving v. Virginia</i> , 388 U.S. 1 (1967)..... | 35, 36 |
| <i>One, Inc. v. Oleson</i> , 355 U.S. 371 (1958)..... | 17 |
| <i>Oyama v. California</i> , 332 U.S. 633 (1948)..... | 36 |
| <i>Palmore v. Sidoti</i> , 466 U.S. 429 (1984)..... | 29 |
| <i>Romer v. Evans</i> , 517 U.S. 620 (1996)..... | 22, 35 |
| <i>Strauss v. Horton</i> , 207 P.3d 48 (Cal. 2009)..... | 34 |
| <i>United States v. Virginia</i> , 518 U.S. 515 (1996)..... | 36 |
| <i>Varnum v. Brien</i> , 763 N.W.2d 862 (Iowa 2009)..... | 32 |
| STATE CONSTITUTION: | |
| HAWAII CONST. art. I, § 23..... | 31 |
| STATUTES: | |
| 1 U.S.C. § 7 | 31 |
| 8 U.S.C. § 1151(b)(2)(A)(i) | 24 |
| 8 U.S.C. § 1154 | 24 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| 28 U.S.C. § 1738C..... | 31 |
| Pub. L. No. 103-160, 107 Stat. 1547 (1993)..... | 23 |
| Pub. L. No. 104-199, 110 Stat. 2419 (1996)..... | 31 |
| FLA. STAT. ANN. § 63.042 (West 2001) | 19 |
| MISS. CODE ANN. § 93-17-3(2) | 30 |
| LEGISLATIVE HISTORY: | |
| S. REP. NO. 81-241 (1950) | 13, 14 |
| EXECUTIVE ORDERS: | |
| Exec. Order No. 10,450, 3 C.F.R. 936 (1949-1953) | 14 |
| Exec. Order No. 13,087, 63 Fed. Reg. 30,097 (May 28, 1998) | 23 |
| OTHER AUTHORITIES: | |
| AMERICAN BAR ASS'N, AN ANALYSIS OF THE LAW REGARDING SAME-SEX MARRIAGE, CIVIL UNIONS, AND DOMESTIC PARTNER- SHIPS (2005) | 31, 32 |
| American Psychiatric Ass'n, <i>Position Statement on Homosexuality and Civil Rights</i> (Dec. 15, 1973), <i>reprinted in</i> 131 AM. J. PSYCHIATRY 497 (1974)..... | 18 |
| JOHN-MANUEL ANDRIOTE, VICTORY DE- FERRED: HOW AIDS CHANGED GAY LIFE IN AMERICA (1999) | 20 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|---|------------|
| ALLAN BERUBE, COMING OUT UNDER FIRE: THE HISTORY OF GAY MEN AND WOMEN IN WORLD WAR TWO (1990)..... | 12, 13 |
| GREGORY D. BLACK, THE CATHOLIC CRU- SADE AGAINST THE MOVIES, 1940-1975 (1997)..... | 11 |
| KARLYN H. BOWMAN & ADAM FOSTER, AMERICAN ENTER. INST., ATTITUDES ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY AND GAY MAR- RIAGE (2008) | 24-25, 28 |
| NAN ALAMILLA BOYD, WIDE-OPEN TOWN: A HISTORY OF QUEER SAN FRANCISCO TO 1965 (2003)..... | 12, 13 |
| PAUL BOYER, URBAN MASSES AND MORAL ORDER IN AMERICA, 1820-1920 (1978)..... | 9 |
| Stacy Braukman, <i>“Nothing Else Matters But Sex”: Cold War Narratives of Devi- ance and the Search for Lesbian Teachers in Florida, 1959-1963</i> , 27 FEMINIST STUD. 553 (2001)..... | 15 |
| James Brooke, <i>Gay Man Dies From At- tack, Fanning Outrage and Debate</i> , N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 13, 1998 | 25 |
| CALIFORNIA SEC’Y OF STATE, OFFICIAL VOTER INFORMATION GUIDE: CALIFOR- NIA GENERAL ELECTION ON NOV. 4, 2008, PROP 8 (2008)..... | 33, 34, 35 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|--|---------------|
| Margot Canady, <i>Building a Straight State: Sexuality and Social Citizenship Under the 1944 G.I. Bill</i> , 90 J. AM. HIST. 935 (2003)..... | 13 |
| Rebecca Cathcart, <i>Boy's Killing, Labeled a Hate Crime, Stuns a Town</i> , N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 23, 2008 | 25 |
| <i>Cause for Concern (Adoption)</i> , FOCUS ON THE FAMILY (2009)..... | 30 |
| George Chauncey, <i>A Gay World, Vibrant and Forgotten</i> , N.Y. TIMES, June 26, 1994 | 10, 17 |
| George Chauncey, <i>From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: Medicine and the Changing Conceptualization of Female Deviance</i> , 58-59 SALMAGUNDI 114 (1982-1983)..... | 8 |
| GEORGE CHAUNCEY, GAY NEW YORK: GENDER, URBAN CULTURE, AND THE MAKING OF THE GAY MALE WORLD, 1890-1940 (1994)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| George Chauncey, <i>The Postwar Sex Crime Panic</i> , in TRUE STORIES FROM THE AMERICAN PAST (William Graebner ed., 1993) | 15, 16, 17 |
| GEORGE CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? THE HISTORY SHAPING TODAY'S DEBATE OVER GAY EQUALITY (2004)..... | <i>passim</i> |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|--|------------|
| DUDLEY CLENDINEN & ADAM NAGOURNEY, OUT FOR GOOD: THE STRUGGLE TO BUILD A GAY RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN AMERICA (1999) | 19 |
| Kenneth J. Cooper, <i>Placement of Foster Children with Gay Couple Is Revoked</i> , BOSTON GLOBE, May 9, 1985 | 19 |
| KAIER CURTIN, WE CAN ALWAYS CALL THEM BULGARIANS: THE EMERGENCE OF LESBIANS AND GAY MEN ON THE AMERI- CAN STAGE (1987) | 10 |
| John D’Emilio, <i>The Homosexual Menace: The Politics of Sexuality in Cold War America</i> , in <i>PASSION AND POWER: SEX- UALITY IN HISTORY</i> (Kathy Peiss <i>et al.</i> , eds. 1989)..... | 15 |
| JOHN D’EMILIO, SEXUAL POLITICS, SEXUAL COMMUNITIES: THE MAKING OF A HO- MOSEXUAL MINORITY, 1940-1970 (1981) .. | 14, 15, 17 |
| JOHN D’EMILIO & ESTELLE B. FREEDMAN, INTIMATE MATTERS: A HISTORY OF SEX- UALITY IN AMERICA (2d ed. 1997) | 9, 22 |
| Patti Doten, <i>They Want a Chance to Care; Gay Couple Still Hurts from Decision That Took Away Their Foster Children</i> , BOSTON GLOBE, Sept. 27, 1990 | 19-20 |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEF., REPORT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH A REPEAL OF “DON’T ASK, DON’T TELL” (2010) | 23 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| STEVEN EPSTEIN, IMPURE SCIENCE: AIDS, ACTIVISM, AND THE POLITICS OF KNOWLEDGE (1996) | 20-21 |
| William Eskridge, Jr., <i>Law and the Construction of the Closet: American Regulation of Same-Sex Intimacy, 1880-1946</i> , 82 IOWA L. REV. 1007 (1997) | 6-7 |
| Estelle Freedman, “ <i>Uncontrolled Desires</i> ”: <i>The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960</i> , 74 J. AM. HIST. 83 (1987) | 16 |
| JOHN GALLAGHER & CHRIS BULL, PERFECT ENEMIES: THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT, THE GAY MOVEMENT, AND THE POLITICS OF THE 1990S (1996) | 21, 23 |
| Richard Godbeer, “ <i>The Cry of Sodom</i> ”: <i>Discourse, Intercourse, and Desire in Colonial New England</i> , 52 WILLIAM & MARY Q. 259 (1995) | 7 |
| LARRY GROSS, UP FROM INVISIBILITY: LESBIANS, GAY MEN, AND THE MEDIA IN AMERICA (2001) | 18, 24 |
| <i>History of Nondiscrimination Bills in Congress</i> , NATIONAL GAY & LESBIAN TASK FORCE | 24 |
| THE HISTORY PROJECT, IMPROPER BOSTONIANS: LESBIAN AND GAY HISTORY FROM THE PURITANS TO PLAYLAND (1998) | 9, 11 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|--|---------|
| P.J. Huffstutter, <i>Police Raid at Gay Club in Texas Stirs Ugly Memories</i> , L.A. TIMES, July 6, 2009 | 28 |
| HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN, STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT LAWS & POLICIES (June 12, 2012) | 22 |
| HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN, STATEWIDE HOUSING LAWS & POLICIES (June 12, 2012) | 22 |
| DAVID K. JOHNSON, THE LAVENDER SCARE: THE COLD WAR PERSECUTION OF GAYS AND LESBIANS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (2004)..... | 14 |
| Philip W. Johnston, <i>Policy Statement on Foster Care</i> (May 24, 1985), reprinted in BOSTON GLOBE, May 25, 1985 | 19 |
| JONATHAN NED KATZ, GAY AMERICAN HISTORY: LESBIANS AND GAY MEN IN THE U.S.A. (1976) | 10, 11 |
| JONATHAN NED KATZ, GAY/LESBIAN ALMANAC (1983)..... | 6 |
| JONATHAN NED KATZ, THE INVENTION OF HETEROSEXUALITY (1995)..... | 7 |
| JOSEPH G. KOSCIW ET AL., GAY, LESBIAN & STRAIGHT EDUCATION NETWORK, THE 2011 NATIONAL SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY: THE EXPERIENCES OF LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER YOUTH IN OUR NATION’S SCHOOLS (2012)..... | 26 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| <i>LGBT-Inclusive Public Accommodations</i> | |
| <i>Laws</i> , HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN | 22 |
| Ralph H. Major, Jr., <i>New Moral Menace to</i> <i>Our Youth</i> , CORONET, Sept. 1950 | 16 |
| Richard Maltby, <i>The Production Code and</i> <i>the Hays Office</i> , in 5 TINO BALIO, GRAND DESIGN: HOLLYWOOD AS A MOD- ERN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE, 1930-1939 (Charles Harpole ed., 1993) | 11 |
| WAYNE VAN DER MEIDE, NAT'L GAY & LESBIAN TASKFORCE, LEGISLATING EQUALITY: A REVIEW OF LAWS AFFECTING GAY, LESBI- AN, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDERED PEO- PLE IN THE UNITED STATES (2000) | 18 |
| <i>NARTH and Civil Rights</i> , NATIONAL ASS'N FOR RESEARCH & THERAPY OF HOMO- SEXUALITY (NARTH) | 28 |
| <i>NARTH Mission Statement</i> , NARTH | 27 |
| <i>Our Track Record</i> , NARTH | 27-28 |
| Bill Rankin, <i>Employees to Fight Charges</i> <i>in Gay Bar Raid</i> , ATLANTA J.-CONST., Nov. 4, 2009 | 28 |
| NICHOLAS RAY, NATIONAL GAY & LESBIAN TASK FORCE, LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER YOUTH: AN EPIDEM- IC OF HOMELESSNESS (2006) | 25-26 |
| <i>Rudolph Reveals Motives</i> , CNN (Apr. 19, 2005) | 25 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

| | Page(s) |
|---|---------|
| Stephen T. Russell & Kara Joyner, <i>Adolescent Sexual Orientation and Suicide Risk</i> , 91 AM. J. PUB. HEALTH 1276 (2001) | 26 |
| VITO RUSSO, THE CELLULOID CLOSET: HOMOSEXUALITY IN THE MOVIES (1991) | 11 |
| Julie Shapiro, <i>Custody and Conduct: How the Law Fails Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children</i> , 71 IND. L.J. 623 (1996) | 20, 28 |
| KENNETH M. STAMPP, THE PECULIAR INSTITUTION: SLAVERY IN THE ANTE-BELLUM SOUTH (1956) | 2 |
| Karla J. Starr, <i>Adoption by Homosexuals: A Look at Differing State Court Opinions</i> , 40 ARIZ. L. REV. 1497 (1998) | 20 |
| <i>Statewide Votes on Same-Sex Marriage, 1998-Present</i> , NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES | 32 |
| MARC STEIN, CITY OF SISTERLY AND BROTHERLY LOVES: LESBIAN AND GAY PHILADELPHIA, 1945-1972 (2000) | 17 |
| A.G. Sulzberger, <i>Ouster of Iowa Judges Sends Signal to Bench</i> , N.Y. TIMES, Nov. 3, 2010 | 32 |
| <i>The Three Myths About Homosexuality</i> , NARTH | 27 |
| <i>Uniform Crime Reports, Hate Crime Statistics</i> , FBI | 25 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

Page(s)

Casey Wian & Michael Pearson, *Boy Scout
Leaders Put Off Vote on Gay Member-
ship*, CNN (Feb. 6, 2013) 27

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

No. 12-307

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Petitioner,

v.

EDITH SCHLAIN WINDSOR

AND

BIPARTISAN LEGAL ADVISORY GROUP OF THE UNITED
STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Respondents.

**On Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals
for the Second Circuit**

**BRIEF OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN
HISTORIANS AND THE AMERICAN STUDIES
ASSOCIATION AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF
RESPONDENT EDITH WINDSOR**

STATEMENT OF INTEREST¹

The Organization of American Historians (OAH) and the American Studies Association (ASA) respectfully submit this brief as *amici curiae* in support of Respondent Edith Windsor.

¹ No party or counsel for a party authored or paid for this brief in whole or in part, or made a monetary contribution to fund the brief's preparation or submission. All parties have filed blanket *amicus* consent letters.

Founded in 1907, the OAH is the largest scholarly organization devoted to promoting the study and teaching of American history. Its distinguished *Journal of American History*, annual meetings, and public service activities aim to promote excellence in the scholarship, teaching, and presentation of American history. The OAH is an international, nonprofit membership organization, whose 7,800 historian members include university and college professors in the United States and abroad, as well as individuals employed in a variety of scholarly and institutional settings, such as libraries, museums, and historical societies.

The ASA is the nation's oldest and largest association devoted to the interdisciplinary study of American culture and history. It exists to encourage the study of American culture—past and present. Chartered in 1951, the ASA now has 5,000 individual members and 2,200 institutional members. These members represent many fields of inquiry, including history, religion, philosophy, science, anthropology, sociology, gender studies, and popular culture, among others. The membership includes faculty, researchers, and students; museum directors and librarians; and public officials and administrators.

The late Kenneth M. Stamp, historian and past president of OAH, wrote: "With the historian it is an article of faith that knowledge of the past is a key to understanding the present." *THE PECULIAR INSTITUTION: SLAVERY IN THE ANTE-BELLUM SOUTH* vii (1956). Both the OAH and the ASA adhere to this principle, and both organizations have an interest—not as advocates of a particular legal standard, but as stewards of history—to ensure that the Court is presented with an accurate description of the history

of discrimination against gay men and lesbians in America.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

In answering the question presented in this case, the Court will consider, among other things, whether “[a]s a historical matter” a particular class of persons “ha[s] been subjected to discrimination.” *Bowen v. Gilliard*, 483 U.S. 587, 602 (1987) (citation omitted). *Amici* offer this Brief as historians to inform the Court that gay and lesbian people have been subject to widespread and significant discrimination and hostility in the United States.

Sexual intimacy between people of the same sex has been condemned by “powerful voices” for centuries. *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 571 (2003). In twentieth century America, discrimination against gay people reached remarkable proportions. In the 1920s, for example, the State of New York prohibited theaters from staging plays with lesbian or gay characters. Beginning in the 1930s and 1940s, many states prohibited bars and restaurants from serving gay people. In the 1950s, the federal government banned homosexuals from employment, insisted that its private contractors ferret out and dismiss gay employees, and prohibited gay citizens of other countries from entering the country or securing American citizenship. Until the 1960s, all states outlawed sexual intimacy between men. And throughout the twentieth century, many municipalities launched police campaigns to suppress gay meeting places and sought to purge gay civil servants from employment. These policies worked to create and reinforce the belief that gay men and lesbians com-

prised an inferior class of people to be shunned by other Americans.

Discrimination at the state and federal levels was accompanied by private condemnation of homosexuality and discrimination against gay people, with a similarly enduring negative effect. In the 1930s, for example, Hollywood studios enacted a censorship code that for decades prohibited the discussion of gay issues or the appearance of gay or lesbian characters in film. In the 1940s and 1950s, state officials and the press fostered frightening stereotypes of homosexuals as child molesters. And until the 1970s, leading physicians and medical researchers claimed that homosexuality was a pathological condition or disease. These stereotypes have had profound consequences, and they continue to inspire public fears and hostility.

Gay men and lesbians saw their situation begin to improve in the 1970s—but also saw many of their gains reversed when they precipitated a powerful opposition movement. Movie censorship relaxed in the 1960s, but Hollywood studios still made few films featuring gay or lesbian characters; even into the 1990s, television networks were subject to boycott threats if they featured such characters. Beginning in the mid-1970s, gay activists persuaded some towns and cities to enact civil rights protections for gay people, but that soon prompted a series of referendum campaigns to repeal or prohibit such protections. And in the 1980s, the early press coverage of AIDS reinforced the view that homosexuals were diseased and threatened other Americans.

Discrimination continues today. In most states, gay men and lesbians still lack protection from discrimination in schools, employment, housing, and

public accommodations. Gay men and lesbians cannot sponsor their same-sex spouses for immigration purposes. Same-sex spouses of service members are ineligible to receive certain survivorship and health insurance benefits available to their heterosexual counterparts. State laws discriminating against gay men and lesbians remain on the books. Two states formally prohibit adoptions by same-sex couples, and adoption agencies in many other states continue to favor heterosexual couples over same-sex couples. Well over a thousand gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgendered people are the victims of hate crimes every year.

Despite social and legal progress in the past thirty years, gay men and lesbians continue to live with the legacy of anti-gay laws and hostility. When marriage emerged as the new flashpoint in debates over gay civil rights, the debate was shaped by this legacy—one that initially prompted many Americans to respond to the idea of same-sex marriage with the same hostility with which they previously greeted the idea of gay teachers or television characters. Opponents of marriage equality have deployed enduring anti-gay stereotypes to great effect. The approval of Proposition 8 in California, and similar laws and constitutional amendments in a total of forty-one states, demonstrates the continuing influence of anti-gay hostility and the persistence of ideas about the inequality of gay people and their relationships. No other group in American history has been confronted with as many referenda designed to take away its rights.

The federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), the subject of this litigation, also is among the present-day legacies of this long history of discrimination

against gay men and lesbians. DOMA prohibits the federal government from recognizing and providing tax, social security, and other marriage-related benefits to lawfully married same-sex couples.

The brief for Respondent Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group (BLAG) mentions this long and pervasive history of discrimination barely in passing. *See* BLAG Br. 56-57. BLAG's arguments give impermissibly short shrift to the historical record of widespread and insidious discrimination faced by gay men and lesbians, only one manifestation of which is the denial of equal marriage rights.

ARGUMENT

I. GAY AND LESBIAN PEOPLE HAVE BEEN SUBJECT TO WIDESPREAD AND SIGNIFICANT DISCRIMINATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

A. The Historical Roots of Discrimination Against Gay People

The first laws against sex between men in the American colonies were rooted in the earliest settlers' understanding of ancient Judeo-Christian prohibitions against sodomy and "unnatural acts." In the Massachusetts Bay Colony, for example, sodomy was prohibited since 1641 by a statute with language taken directly from Leviticus: "If any man lyeth with mankind, as he lyeth with a woman, both of them have committed abomination; they both shall surely be put to death." JONATHAN NED KATZ, *GAY/LESBIAN ALMANAC* 76-78 (1983) (citation omitted). The southern and middle colonies, for their part, generally drew on the secular laws against "buggery" enacted by the English Reformation Parliament of 1533. Wil-

liam Eskridge, Jr., *Law and the Construction of the Closet: American Regulation of Same-Sex Intimacy, 1880-1946*, 82 IOWA L. REV. 1007, 1012-13 (1997).

“Sodomy” did not mean precisely the same thing as today’s “homosexual conduct,” and colonial laws penalized many other forms of non-procreative sexual behavior. But Puritan clergy vigorously condemned the “unnatural uncleanness * * * when men with men commit filthiness, and women with women,” in part because they worried that all people were subject to such temptations. Richard Godbeer, *“The Cry of Sodom”: Discourse, Intercourse, and Desire in Colonial New England*, 52 WILLIAM & MARY Q. 259, 264-265 (1995).

B. Modern American History: 1890-1940

Most historians now agree that the concept of the homosexual and the heterosexual as distinct categories of people emerged only in the late nineteenth century. JONATHAN NED KATZ, *THE INVENTION OF HETEROSEXUALITY* 10 (1995). The dramatic growth of American cities in the same period permitted homosexuals to develop an extensive collective life. Some Americans responded to the growing visibility of gay life with fascination and sympathy, regarding it as one more sign of the freedom from tradition characteristic of a burgeoning metropolitan culture. Many others regarded the growing visibility of lesbian and gay life with dread. Prosecutions for sodomy and related offenses increased dramatically in the late nineteenth century, and the policing of gay life escalated considerably in the first decades of the twentieth century. See GEORGE CHAUNCEY, *GAY NEW YORK: GENDER, URBAN CULTURE, AND THE MAKING OF*

THE GAY MALE WORLD, 1890-1940, at 132-141, 147, 256, 271-273 (1994).

Hostile Medical and Religious Views Encouraged the Escalation of Anti-Gay Policing. Hostility to homosexuals was at times motivated by uneasiness about the dramatic changes underway in gender roles at the turn of the last century. In this era—indeed until 1973—homosexuality was classified as a disease, defect, or disorder. Many physicians initially argued that the homosexual (or “sexual invert”) was characterized as much by his or her violation of conventional gender roles as by sexual interests. Numerous doctors identified suffragists, women entering the professions, and other women challenging the limits placed on their sex as victims of a medical disorder. Thus, doctors explained that “the female possessed of masculine ideas of independence” was a “degenerate” and that “a decided taste and tolerance for cigars, * * * [the] dislike and sometimes incapacity for needlework * * * and some capacity for athletics” were all signs of female “sexual inversion.” Similarly, a doctor thought it significant that a male “pervert” “never smoked and never married; and was entirely averse to outdoor games.” George Chauncey, *From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: Medicine and the Changing Conceptualization of Female Deviance*, 58-59 SALMAGUNDI 114, 119-121, 124, 139-141 (1982-1983) (brackets, citations, and quotation marks omitted).

Doctors for decades continued to identify homosexuality per se as a “disease,” “mental defect,” “disorder,” or “degeneration.” Such medical pronouncements provided “a powerful source of legitimation to anti-homosexual sentiment, much as medical science had previously legitimized widely held (and subse-

quently discarded) beliefs about male superiority and white racial superiority.” GEORGE CHAUNCEY, *WHY MARRIAGE? THE HISTORY SHAPING TODAY’S DEBATE OVER GAY EQUALITY* 17 (2004).

Religiously inspired hostility to homosexuality also inspired an escalation in anti-gay policing. In the late nineteenth century, native-born Protestants organized numerous “anti-vice” societies to suppress what they regarded as the sexual immorality and social disorder of the nation’s burgeoning Catholic and Jewish immigrant neighborhoods. Although these organizations focused on female prostitution, they also opposed the growing visibility of homosexuality, which they regarded as an egregious sign of the loosening of social controls on sexual expression under urban conditions. In New York City in the 1910s and 1920s, for instance, the Society for the Suppression of Vice (also known as the Comstock Society) worked closely with the police to arrest several hundred men for homosexual conduct. In Massachusetts, the Watch and Ward Society, established as the New England Society for the Suppression of Vice, conducted surveillance on virtually all the popular gay bars and gathering places of the time. *See* PAUL BOYER, *URBAN MASSES AND MORAL ORDER IN AMERICA, 1820-1920*, at 207 (1978); CHAUNCEY, *GAY NEW YORK* 137-141, 146-147, 249-250; JOHN D’EMILIO & ESTELLE B. FREEDMAN, *INTIMATE MATTERS: A HISTORY OF SEXUALITY IN AMERICA* 150-153 (2d ed. 1997); THE HISTORY PROJECT, *IMPROPER BOSTONIANS: LESBIAN AND GAY HISTORY FROM THE PURITANS TO PLAYLAND* 121-122 (1998).

Police Harassment. Responding to pressure from Protestant moral reform organizations, municipal police forces began using misdemeanor charges—

disorderly conduct, vagrancy, lewdness, loitering, and the like—to harass homosexuals and keep them from meeting in public. CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 10. In 1923, the New York State Legislature specified that a man’s “frequent[ing] or loiter[ing] about any public place soliciting men for the purpose of committing a crime against nature or other lewdness” was a form of disorderly conduct. Many more men were arrested and prosecuted under this charge than for sodomy; in the next forty years, there were more than 50,000 arrests on this charge in New York City alone. CHAUNCEY, GAY NEW YORK 172; George Chauncey, *A Gay World, Vibrant and Forgotten*, N.Y. TIMES, June 26, 1994, at E17.

The earliest gay activists also fell victim to police harassment. In 1924, for example, Chicago police raided the home of the founder of the nation’s earliest known gay political group and seized the group’s files. JONATHAN NED KATZ, GAY AMERICAN HISTORY: LESBIANS AND GAY MEN IN THE U.S.A. 385, 388-391 (1976).

Censorship. The growing visibility of lesbian and gay life in the early twentieth century precipitated censorship campaigns designed to curtail gay people’s freedom of speech and the freedom of all Americans to discuss gay issues. In 1927, police arrested the cast of “The Captive,” an acclaimed Broadway drama exploring one woman’s unrequited love for another. New York State then passed a “padlock law” forbidding theaters from staging plays with gay or lesbian characters; any theater violating the law would be shut down for a year. CHAUNCEY, GAY NEW YORK 352; KAIER CURTIN, WE CAN ALWAYS CALL THEM BULGARIANS: THE EMERGENCE OF LESBIANS AND GAY MEN ON THE AMERICAN STAGE 100 (1987);

KATZ, *GAY AMERICAN HISTORY* 83, 87. Officials in other cities also took up the cause. In 1935, for instance, Boston's Mayor banned "The Children's Hour," a play dealing with lesbianism, because, in his words, it "showed moral perversion, the unnatural appetite of two women for each other." *THE HISTORY PROJECT, IMPROPER BOSTONIANS* 121-122.

Censorship had even wider-reaching effects when it spread to the movies. A mass movement led by religious leaders threatened the Hollywood studios with boycotts and restrictive federal legislation if they did not begin censoring their films. This prompted the studios to establish a production code that, beginning in 1934, prohibited the inclusion of gay or lesbian characters or even the "inference" of "sex perversion" in Hollywood films. This code remained in effect for some thirty years, effectively prohibiting discussion of homosexuality in one of the nation's most powerful media for more than a generation. *CHAUNCEY, GAY NEW YORK* 353 & n.57. *See generally* GREGORY D. BLACK, *THE CATHOLIC CRUSADE AGAINST THE MOVIES, 1940-1975* (1997); Richard Maltby, *The Production Code and the Hays Office*, in 5 TINO BALIO, *GRAND DESIGN: HOLLYWOOD AS A MODERN BUSINESS ENTERPRISE, 1930-1939*, at 37-72 (Charles Harpole ed., 1993); VITO RUSSO, *THE CELLULOID CLOSET: HOMOSEXUALITY IN THE MOVIES* (1991).

Constraints on Freedom of Association. New regulations began to curtail gay people's freedom of association at the same time they were pushed off the stage and screen. The New York State Liquor Authority, for instance, issued regulations shortly after Prohibition's repeal in 1933 prohibiting bars, restaurants, cabarets, and other establishments with liquor licenses from serving or employing homosexuals or

even allowing them to congregate on their premises. When courts rejected the Authority's argument that the mere presence of homosexuals made an establishment "disorderly," the Authority began using evidence of unconventional gender behavior or homosexual solicitation to establish a bar's "disorderly" character, closing hundreds of bars on this basis in the next thirty years. CHAUNCEY, GAY NEW YORK 335-349. Similar regulations and laws were enacted elsewhere. In the 1950s, for example, California's Alcoholic Beverage Control Board ruled that acts of touching, women wearing mannish attire, and men with limp wrists, high-pitched voices, and/or tight clothing were evidence of a bar's "dubious character" and grounds for closing it. NAN ALAMILLA BOYD, WIDE-OPEN TOWN: A HISTORY OF QUEER SAN FRANCISCO TO 1965, at 136-137 (2003).

C. World War II and Its Aftermath

Many gay men and lesbians served honorably in the Armed Forces in the first half of the twentieth century. See ALLAN BERUBE, COMING OUT UNDER FIRE: THE HISTORY OF GAY MEN AND WOMEN IN WORLD WAR TWO 3 (1990). But discrimination against gay men and lesbians by federal and state governments dramatically increased during the Second World War and postwar years.

Discrimination in the Military. The U.S. military had long criminalized homosexual sodomy. But during World War II, the Armed Forces decided for the first time to exclude gay people as a class from military service. Officials put in place new screening mechanisms designed to identify homosexuals during the induction process. Military authorities also collaborated with local police to monitor gay bars near

bases; servicemen caught in these establishments risked discharge. BERUBE, COMING OUT UNDER FIRE 2, 8-18, 121-126, 143-148, 260-262; BOYD, WIDE-OPEN TOWN 113-117.

Despite these barriers to service, many gay men and lesbians served heroically in the military during the War. But the Veterans Administration denied G.I. Bill benefits to soldiers undesirably discharged for being homosexual. These gay veterans thus were denied the educational, housing, and readjustment allowances provided to millions of their peers. *See* Margot Canady, *Building a Straight State: Sexuality and Social Citizenship Under the 1944 G.I. Bill*, 90 J. AM. HIST. 935, 937, 947 (2003).

Discrimination in the Federal Government. The persecution of gay men and lesbians dramatically increased at every level of government after the War. In 1950, following Senator Joseph McCarthy's denunciation of the employment of gay people in the State Department, a Senate subcommittee conducted a special investigation into "the employment of homosexuals and other sex perverts in government." S. REP. NO. 81-241, at 1 (1950). The subcommittee recommended excluding gay men and lesbians from all federal employment. To support this recommendation, the subcommittee stated that "those who engage in overt acts of perversion lack the emotional stability of normal persons" and that homosexuals "constitute security risks." *Id.* at 3, 4. The subcommittee also portrayed homosexuals as predators: "These perverts will frequently attempt to entice normal individuals to engage in perverted practices." *Id.*

The Senate investigation and report were only one part of a massive anti-homosexual campaign

launched by the federal government after the war. The Senate subcommittee reported that “between January 1, 1947, and August 1, 1950, approximately 1,700 applicants for Federal positions were denied employment because they had a record of homosexuality or other sex perversion.” *Id.* at 9. In 1953, President Eisenhower issued an executive order banning gay men and lesbians from civilian and military employment and requiring private corporations with federal contracts to ferret out and discharge their homosexual employees or risk losing their contracts. Exec. Order No. 10,450, 3 C.F.R. 936 (1949-1953); JOHN D’EMILIO, *SEXUAL POLITICS, SEXUAL COMMUNITIES: THE MAKING OF A HOMOSEXUAL MINORITY, 1940-1970*, at 44, 46-47 (1981). At the height of the McCarthy era, the State Department discharged more homosexuals than communists. DAVID K. JOHNSON, *THE LAVENDER SCARE: THE COLD WAR PERSECUTION OF GAYS AND LESBIANS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT* 76 (2004).

Two years after the Senate subcommittee recommended that homosexuals be purged from government employment, Congress further signaled its conviction that gay men and lesbians had no place in American society by denying them entry into the country. In 1952, Congress prohibited homosexuals (whom it called “psychopaths”) from entering the United States, much as it previously had prohibited immigration from Asia and curtailed the immigration of Jews and Catholics from eastern and southern Europe. CHAUNCEY, *WHY MARRIAGE?* 21.

State and Local Discrimination. Many state and local governments also sought to ferret out and fire their gay employees; countless state employees, teachers, hospital workers, and others lost their jobs

as a result. *Id.* at 7. A 1958 investigation at the University of Florida, for instance, led to the interrogation of hundreds of suspected gay men and lesbians and the dismissal of sixteen faculty and staff members. Stacy Braukman, “*Nothing Else Matters But Sex*”: *Cold War Narratives of Deviance and the Search for Lesbian Teachers in Florida, 1959-1963*, 27 FEMINIST STUD. 553, 555 (2001); D’EMILIO, SEXUAL POLITICS, SEXUAL COMMUNITIES 46, 48.

The policing of gay life sharply escalated across the country in the 1950s and 1960s. Police departments from Seattle and Dallas to New Orleans and Baltimore stepped up their raids on bars and private parties attended by gay men and lesbians, and police made thousands of arrests for “disorderly conduct.” By 1950, Philadelphia had a six-man “morals squad” arresting more gay men than the courts knew how to handle, some 200 a month. In the District of Columbia alone, there were more than a thousand arrests every year. In 1955, officials in Boise, Idaho, interrogated 1400 people in the course of an investigation of gay men in the community. Police raids on gay bars were so common that some bars posted signs announcing “We Do Not Serve Homosexuals.” George Chauncey, *The Postwar Sex Crime Panic*, in TRUE STORIES FROM THE AMERICAN PAST 177 (William Graebner ed., 1993); CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 7-8; John D’Emilio, *The Homosexual Menace: The Politics of Sexuality in Cold War America*, in PASSION AND POWER: SEXUALITY IN HISTORY 226, 231 (Kathy Peiss *et al.*, eds. 1989); D’EMILIO, SEXUAL POLITICS, SEXUAL COMMUNITIES 182-84, 208.

Demonization and Censorship. The harassment of gay people was justified by a series of police and press campaigns in the 1940s and 1950s that fo-

mented demonic stereotypes of homosexuals as child molesters intent on recruiting the young into their way of life. See Estelle Freedman, *“Uncontrolled Desires”: The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960*, 74 J. AM. HIST. 83, 92 (1987); see also Chauncey, *The Postwar Sex Crime Panic* 172. A Special Assistant Attorney General of California claimed in 1949, for example, that “[t]he sex pervert, in his more innocuous form, is too frequently regarded as merely a queer individual who never hurts anyone but himself. All too often we lose sight of the fact that the homosexual is an inveterate seducer of the young of both sexes, and is ever seeking for younger victims.” Chauncey, *The Postwar Sex Crime Panic* 170-171. In 1950, *Coronet*, a popular national magazine, claimed that “Some male sex deviants do not stop with infecting their often-innocent partners: they descend through perversions to other forms of depravity, such as drug addiction, burglary, sadism, and even murder.” Ralph H. Major, Jr., *New Moral Menace to Our Youth*, CORONET, Sept. 1950, at 101-108. Vicious stereotypes of homosexuals as child molesters fostered by such campaigns continue even today to stoke public fears about gay teachers and parents. CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 150-151.

Between the late 1930s and late 1950s, public hysteria prompted more than half the states to enact laws empowering the police or courts to force people convicted of certain sexual offenses—or, in some states, merely suspected of being “sexual deviants”—to undergo psychiatric examinations. In some cases, those examinations could result in indeterminate civil confinements for individuals deemed in need of a “cure” for their homosexual “pathology.” See Freedman, *“Uncontrolled Desires,”* 74 J. AM. HIST. at 95-

98; MARC STEIN, CITY OF SISTERLY AND BROTHERLY LOVES: LESBIAN AND GAY PHILADELPHIA, 1945-1972, at 124-127 (2000); Chauncey, *The Postwar Sex Crime Panic* 166-167.

Censorship, government-sanctioned discrimination, and the fear of both made it difficult for gay people to organize and speak on their own behalf. In 1954, Los Angeles postal officials banned an issue of the first gay political magazine, *One*, from the mail. D'EMILIO, SEXUAL POLITICS, SEXUAL COMMUNITIES 115. Although the ban was overturned by this Court in 1958, *One, Inc. v. Oleson*, 355 U.S. 371 (1958), police in some cities warned newsstands not to carry the magazine. A few weeks after the Mattachine Society—the most significant gay-rights organization in the 1950s—held a national convention in Denver and staged its first press conference, police raided the homes of three of its organizers; one lost his job and was jailed. D'EMILIO, SEXUAL POLITICS, SEXUAL COMMUNITIES 119-121.

D. The Gay Rights Movement and Its Opponents in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s

Gay people received more support in some parts of the country in the 1960s and 1970s, but the pace of change varied enormously. In 1966, New York's Mayor Lindsay put an end to the widespread police entrapment of gay New Yorkers. *Id.* at 206-207; Chauncey, *A Gay World*, at E17. New York and California state court rulings finally curtailed the policing of gay bars in the 1960s, although in other parts of the country the police continued to raid gay bars well into the 1970s. CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 36. Forty municipalities passed laws protecting gay people from certain forms of discrimination in the 1970s,

and another forty did so in the 1980s. *Id.* at 45; WAYNE VAN DER MEIDE, NATIONAL GAY & LESBIAN TASKFORCE, LEGISLATING EQUALITY: A REVIEW OF LAWS AFFECTING GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDERED PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES (2000). The Hollywood studios became free to make films with gay characters in the early 1960s—but few did so. *See* CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 52-53; LARRY GROSS, UP FROM INVISIBILITY: LESBIANS, GAY MEN, AND THE MEDIA IN AMERICA 60-61 (2001). The American Psychiatric Association voted to remove homosexuality from its list of mental disorders in 1973—although dissident psychoanalysts continued to contest that opinion. American Psychiatric Ass’n, *Position Statement on Homosexuality and Civil Rights* (Dec. 15, 1973), *reprinted in* 131 AM. J. PSYCHIATRY 497, 497 (1974). In the 1970s, seven mainline Protestant denominations affirmed that homosexuals should enjoy equal protection under criminal and civil law. But those denominations accounted for only about ten percent of the American population; at the same time, leaders of Catholic and evangelical Protestant faith traditions, who had five times as many adherents, stepped up their opposition to gay civil rights. CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 37, 40.

As the gay movement grew stronger in the late 1960s and 1970s, so, too, did its opponents. Beginning in the late 1970s, the initial success of the gay movement in securing local gay-rights legislation provoked a sharp reaction. The anti-gay-rights campaign of this era was effectively launched in 1977, when the prominent Baptist singer Anita Bryant led a campaign to “Save Our Children” by repealing newly enacted civil-rights protections for gay men

and lesbians in Dade County, Florida. The “Save Our Children” campaign warned about the influence openly gay teachers might have on young students and relied heavily on the stereotype of the homosexual as child molester: One of its full-page advertisements warned that the “OTHER SIDE OF THE HOMOSEXUAL COIN IS A HAIR-RAISING PATTERN OF RECRUITMENT AND OUTRIGHT SEDUCTIONS AND MOLESTATION.” DUDLEY CLENDINEN & ADAM NAGOURNEY, *OUT FOR GOOD: THE STRUGGLE TO BUILD A GAY RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN AMERICA* 291-299, 303-304 (1999). Bryant’s campaign succeeded, and her victory prompted other groups to start similar campaigns. In the next three years, local laws extending civil rights protections to gay men and lesbians were repealed in more than a half-dozen bitterly fought referenda. Gay-rights supporters won only two referenda. CHAUNCEY, *WHY MARRIAGE?* 39.

The “Save Our Children” campaign had other far-reaching effects. The day after the Dade County vote, Florida’s governor signed into law a ban on adoption by gay men and lesbians—the first such statewide prohibition. FLA. STAT. ANN. § 63.042 (West 2001). Similarly, in 1985 the Massachusetts Department of Social Services removed two boys from their foster care placement with a gay male couple and implemented a policy of preferred placement in “traditional family settings.” Philip W. Johnston, *Policy Statement on Foster Care* (May 24, 1985), *reprinted in* BOSTON GLOBE, May 25, 1985, at 24; Kenneth J. Cooper, *Placement of Foster Children with Gay Couple Is Revoked*, BOSTON GLOBE, May 9, 1985, at 1. Massachusetts’ ban was reversed in 1990 as a result of litigation. *See* Patti Doten, *They Want*

a Chance to Care; Gay Couple Still Hurts from Decision That Took Away Their Foster Children, BOSTON GLOBE, Sept. 27, 1990. The Florida ban remained in effect until 2010. See *Florida Dep't of Children & Families v. Adoption of X.X.G.*, 45 So. 3d 79, 81 (Fla. Ct. App. 2010).

Across the country, the unfounded fear that homosexuals posed a threat to children *itself* threatened children being raised by gay men and lesbians. In a growing number of child-custody battles, the courts took custody away from mothers and fathers whose estranged husbands and wives used their former spouses' gay identities against them. See Julie Shapiro, *Custody and Conduct: How the Law Fails Lesbian and Gay Parents and Their Children*, 71 IND. L.J. 623, 660-664 (1996). Some courts confronting such disputes articulated a "per se" rule denying all custody and visitation claims made by gay and lesbian parents, holding as a matter of law that homosexuality was inherently inconsistent with parenthood. Karla J. Starr, *Adoption by Homosexuals: A Look at Differing State Court Opinions*, 40 ARIZ. L. REV. 1497, 1501-03 (1998).

E. The Persistence of Anti-Gay Discrimination from the 1990s to the Present

Inequality Under State Law. The spread of AIDS and the debate over gay rights led to increasing national polarization over homosexuality in the 1980s and 1990s. The media's initial sensationalist coverage of AIDS frequently depicted homosexuals as bearers of a deadly disease threatening others. See, e.g., JOHN-MANUEL ANDRIOTE, VICTORY DEFERRED: HOW AIDS CHANGED GAY LIFE IN AMERICA 65-71 (1999); STEVEN EPSTEIN, IMPURE SCIENCE: AIDS, AC-

TIVISM, AND THE POLITICS OF KNOWLEDGE 52 (1996). Cities and states that had passed gay-rights laws found those laws under attack from an increasingly well-organized and well-funded opposition. In the twenty-five years after Anita Bryant's campaign in Florida, anti-gay activists introduced and campaigned for more than sixty anti-gay-rights referenda around the country. Gay-rights supporters lost almost three-quarters of these contests. CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 45-46. *See generally* JOHN GALLAGHER & CHRIS BULL, PERFECT ENEMIES: THE RELIGIOUS RIGHT, THE GAY MOVEMENT, AND THE POLITICS OF THE 1990S (1996).

Following Anita Bryant's lead, anti-gay-rights activists frequently fomented public fear of gay people by deploying vicious stereotypes of homosexuals as perverts threatening the nation's children and moral character. Two videos repeatedly screened in churches and on cable television in the early 1990s, "The Gay Agenda" and "Gay Rights, Special Rights," juxtaposed discussions of pedophilia with images of gay teachers and gay parents marching with their children in Gay Pride parades. This message was reinforced by mass mailings and door-to-door distribution of anti-gay pamphlets supporting the anti-gay-rights campaign efforts, all of which fostered a climate of hostility and fear. CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 47; GALLAGHER & BULL, PERFECT ENEMIES 26, 46, 52, 115, 171, 266.

In 1992, Colorado voters passed Amendment Two, which amended the state constitution to prohibit any municipality or government unit from enacting anti-gay-discrimination ordinances or policies. Amendment Two repealed ordinances already enacted by Denver, Boulder, and Aspen, and it removed from

the Colorado political arena any future effort to secure anti-discrimination legislation for gay people. This Court struck down the amendment for violating the Equal Protection Clause, explaining that the amendment unconstitutionally “classifie[d] homosexuals not to further a proper legislative end but to make them unequal to everyone else”—a “denial of equal protection of the laws in the most literal sense.” *Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 633, 635-636 (1996). As the Court put it, “laws of the kind now before us raise the inevitable inference that the disadvantage imposed is born of animosity toward the class of persons affected.” *Id.* at 634.

A number of states now have extended basic anti-discrimination protections to gay men and lesbians. But more than half the states lack any statutory protection against such discrimination in employment, housing, or public accommodations, and twenty have no statutory or administrative protection against such discrimination in state government employment. HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN, STATEWIDE EMPLOYMENT LAWS & POLICIES (June 12, 2012);² HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN, STATEWIDE HOUSING LAWS & POLICIES (June 12, 2012);³ *LGBT-Inclusive Public Accommodations Laws*, HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN.⁴

Discrimination in the Federal Government and the Military. Although the outright ban on hiring gay

² http://www.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/Employment_Laws_and_Policies.pdf.

³ http://www.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/Housing_Laws_and_Policies.pdf.

⁴ <http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/lgbt-inclusive-public-accommodations-laws1> (last visited Feb. 26, 2013).

federal employees ended in 1975, federal agencies remained free for over two decades after that to discriminate against gay people in employment. D'EMILIO & FREEDMAN, *INTIMATE MATTERS* 324. It was not until 1998 that President Clinton issued an executive order forbidding such discrimination. *See* Exec. Order No. 13,087, 63 Fed. Reg. 30,097 (May 28, 1998).

Discrimination against gay people remained solidly entrenched in the military until very recently. In 1992, then-candidate Bill Clinton called for an end to the military's policy banning gay men and lesbians from serving in the military. The proposal sparked a national firestorm, with calls to Congress and the White House running a-hundred-to-one against the plan. President Clinton and Congress implemented a compromise called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell," which required the military to discharge gay men or lesbians if they acknowledged their sexual orientation under any circumstance—even during private counseling. Pub. L. No. 103-160, 107 Stat. 1547 (1993); GALLAGHER & BULL, *PERFECT ENEMIES* 129-131, 149, 157. More than 13,000 service members were discharged during the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" era. The law's repeal in 2011 did not restore their careers, nor those of the 19,000 other active-duty service members discharged since 1980 on the basis of their sexual orientation. *See* DEPARTMENT OF DEF., *REPORT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH A REPEAL OF "DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL"* 23 (2010).⁵

⁵ [http://www.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/DADTReport_FINAL_20101130\(secure-hires\).pdf](http://www.defense.gov/home/features/2010/0610_dadt/DADTReport_FINAL_20101130(secure-hires).pdf).

Federal law continues to leave gay men and lesbians exposed to anti-gay discrimination in schools, employment, housing, and public accommodations. The Employment Non-Discrimination Act, which would extend employment protections to sexual orientation, has been introduced in Congress repeatedly since 1994. It has never been passed. *See History of Nondiscrimination Bills in Congress*, NATIONAL GAY & LESBIAN TASK FORCE.⁶ Government-sanctioned discrimination against gay men and lesbians also still exists in federal immigration law, which prohibits gay and lesbian Americans from sponsoring their same-sex spouses or registered partners from other countries for immigration purposes. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1151(b)(2)(A)(i), 1154.

Public Awareness and Targeted Violence. Starting in the 1990s, the visibility of gay people on television and in movies significantly increased. GROSS, UP FROM INVISIBILITY 156-183. The urgency of the AIDS crisis and the relative openness of the 1990s also prompted many more Americans to “come out” to their families, friends, and colleagues. In 1985, only a quarter of Americans reported that an acquaintance had told them they were gay; more than half believed they did not know anyone gay. Fifteen years later, three-quarters reported that they knew someone openly gay—a shift that led many heterosexuals to become more supportive of gay people. But a significant majority of Americans still expressed moral disapproval of homosexuality. KARLYN H. BOWMAN & ADAM FOSTER, AMERICAN EN-

⁶ <http://www.thetaskforce.org/issues/nondiscrimination/timeline> (last visited Feb. 26, 2013).

TER. INST., ATTITUDES ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY AND GAY MARRIAGE 2, 4, 17-18 (2008).⁷

Some expressed that view violently. The FBI documented more than a thousand hate crimes based on perceived sexual orientation every year from 1996 to 2011, the most recent year for which this data is available. *See Uniform Crime Reports, Hate Crime Statistics*, FBI.⁸ In 1997, a lesbian nightclub in Atlanta was bombed by a man who called homosexuality “aberrant sexual behavior.” *Rudolph Reveals Motives*, CNN (Apr. 19, 2005).⁹ The following year, Matthew Shepard, a gay Wyoming college student, was tied to a fence, beaten with a pistol, and abandoned. He died a few days later from his injuries. James Brooke, *Gay Man Dies From Attack, Fanning Outrage and Debate*, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 13, 1998. Ten years later, Larry King, an openly gay 15-year-old student in Oxnard, California, was shot and killed at school by a fellow student. Rebecca Cathcart, *Boy’s Killing, Labeled a Hate Crime, Stuns a Town*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 23, 2008.

The most vulnerable victims of discrimination are youth. A 2001 national study found that gay and lesbian youths were more than twice as likely to attempt suicide and more likely to suffer from depression and alcohol abuse than their heterosexual peers.

⁷ <http://www.aei.org/files/2008/06/03/20080603-Homosexuality.pdf>.

⁸ http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr#cious_hatecrime (last visited Feb. 26, 2013).

⁹ http://articles.cnn.com/2005-04-13/justice/eric.rudolph_1_emily-lyons-pipe-bomb-attack-eric-robert-rudolph?_s=PM:LAW.

Stephen T. Russell & Kara Joyner, *Adolescent Sexual Orientation and Suicide Risk*, 91 AM. J. PUB. HEALTH 1276, 1278 (2001). A thorough 2006 study discovered that 20 to 40 percent of all homeless youth identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT). NICHOLAS RAY, NATIONAL GAY & LESBIAN TASK FORCE, LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER YOUTH: AN EPIDEMIC OF HOMELESSNESS 1 (2006).¹⁰ And according to a national 2011 study, 63.5 percent of LGBT students felt unsafe at school because of their sexual orientation. A stunning 81.9 percent of LGBT students reported verbal harassment, 38.3 percent reported physical harassment, and 18.3 percent were physically assaulted in the past year because of their sexual orientation. JOSEPH G. KOSCIW ET AL., GAY, LESBIAN & STRAIGHT EDUCATION NETWORK, THE 2011 NATIONAL SCHOOL CLIMATE SURVEY: THE EXPERIENCES OF LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER YOUTH IN OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS xiv-xv (2012).¹¹

Continued Condemnation of Homosexuality. Gay people also continue to face discrimination and opprobrium from highly regarded private organizations. The Boy Scouts of America, a federally chartered group, continues to take the position that “homosexual conduct is not morally straight,” and refuses to allow gay boys and men into the organization. *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale*, 530 U.S. 640, 651 (2000) (citation omitted). Earlier this year, when the Boy Scouts announced that it would consider chang-

¹⁰ <http://www.thetaskforce.org/downloads/HomelessYouth.pdf>.

¹¹ http://www.glsen.org/binary-data/GLSEN_ATTACHMENTS/file/000/002/2105-1.pdf.

ing its policy to permit local leaders to decide whether to allow openly gay participants, the proposal drew a firestorm of opposition. Dozens of conservative and religious groups lobbied against the proposed change as a “grave mistake” and petitioned the Boy Scouts to “show courage” and “stand firm for timeless values”; the Boy Scouts have delayed a vote on the issue. Casey Wian & Michael Pearson, *Boy Scout Leaders Put Off Vote on Gay Membership*, CNN (Feb. 6, 2013).¹²

Although the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its list of mental disorders in 1973, dissident psychiatrists and psychologists established the National Association for Research & Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) in 1992. Disagreeing with prevailing professional opinion, NARTH continues to disseminate materials claiming a scientific basis for believing that homosexuality is a psychological disorder and a “potentially deadly lifestyle,” and that homosexuals can be “healed.” NARTH also lectures, partners with religious organizations, supports conversion therapy activities, and files amicus briefs in court cases. *The Three Myths About Homosexuality*, NARTH;¹³ see also *NARTH Mission Statement*, NARTH;¹⁴ *Our*

¹² <http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/06/us/boy-scouts-policy>.

¹³ <http://narth.com/menus/myths.html> (last visited Feb. 26, 2013).

¹⁴ <http://narth.com/menus/mission.html> (last visited Feb. 26, 2013).

Track Record, NARTH;¹⁵ *NARTH and Civil Rights*, NARTH.¹⁶

Police harassment of gay men and lesbians and their meeting places is not as common as it once was—but it still occurs. In 2009, for example, there were highly publicized police raids of gay bars in Atlanta, Georgia, and Fort Worth, Texas, where one patron was critically injured. See Bill Rankin, *Employees to Fight Charges in Gay Bar Raid*, ATLANTA J.-CONST., Nov. 4, 2009; P.J. Huffstutter, *Police Raid at Gay Club in Texas Stirs Ugly Memories*, L.A. TIMES, July 6, 2009.

Discrimination in Parenting and Family Life. Increasing numbers of gay men and lesbians revealed their homosexuality to their families, friends, neighbors, and co-workers in the 1990s. See BOWMAN & FOSTER, ATTITUDES ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY 16-17. But parents who came out to their family members took a serious risk, since many states did not provide equal parenting rights to gay people. This was particularly dangerous in custody cases, where courts had to evaluate the “fitness” of each parent when making decisions on custody or visitation rights. See Shapiro, *Custody and Conduct*, 71 IND. L.J. at 628, 659. A 1996 national study of custody cases revealed that many were decided against the gay parent due to the presiding judge’s prejudice against homosexuality. Courts were especially disapproving of gay

¹⁵ <http://narth.com/menus/history.html> (last visited Feb. 26, 2013).

¹⁶ <http://narth.com/menus/civil.html> (last visited Feb. 26, 2013).

parents who were honest with their children about their sexual orientation. *Id.* at 660-664.

In a widely publicized case, for example, a Virginia trial court granted a grandmother's petition to take a lesbian's two-year-old son away from her because, as the trial court judge explained, the mother's "conduct is illegal * * * in the Commonwealth of Virginia." *Bottoms v. Bottoms*, 457 S.E.2d 102, 109 (Va. 1995) (Keenan, J., dissenting). The trial judge declared "that it is the opinion of this Court that [the mother's] conduct is immoral" and "renders her an unfit parent." *Id.* Virginia's Supreme Court upheld the trial court's decision, concluding that the mother's lesbianism would subject her child to social condemnation and disturb the child's relationships with peers. *Id.* at 107-109. This reasoning harkens back to prior courts' removals of children from the homes of divorced white mothers who married or lived with black men—before this Court ruled the practice unconstitutional. *See Paltrow v. Sidoti*, 466 U.S. 429, 433 (1984).

Other courts have offered religious justifications for discriminatory custody rulings. As recently as 2002, when the Supreme Court of Alabama reversed the Alabama Court of Civil Appeals' decision to grant a lesbian mother custody of her children, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama said this in his concurring opinion:

Homosexuality is strongly condemned in the common law because it violates both natural and revealed law. * * * The law of the Old Testament enforced this distinction between the genders by stating that "[i]f a man lies with a male as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination." *Leviticus*

20:13 (King James). * * * The common law designates homosexuality as an inherent evil, and if a person openly engages in such a practice, that fact alone would render him or her an unfit parent. [*Ex parte H.H.*, 830 So. 2d 21, 33, 35 (Ala. 2002).]

Prominent “traditional family values” group Focus on the Family continues to staunchly oppose adoption by same-sex couples as “threaten[ing] the adoption arena and children’s best interests,” asserting that such adoptions “deny God’s design for the family.” *Cause for Concern (Adoption)*, FOCUS ON THE FAMILY (2009).¹⁷

State and popular efforts that began in the 1970s to ban gay men and lesbians from adopting or serving as foster parents continued throughout the 1990s and 2000s. For example, in 2000, Mississippi’s legislature passed, and the governor signed, a ban on adoption by same-sex couples. *See* MISS. CODE ANN. § 93-17-3(2). And some states refuse to allow a biological parent’s same-sex partner to adopt the children they raise together. *See Boseman v. Jarrell*, 704 S.E.2d 494, 505 (N.C. 2010) (invalidating a second parent adoption by a woman’s same-sex partner, on the ground that North Carolina law prohibits a same-sex partner from adopting a child without also terminating the biological parent’s parental rights).

Marriage. Gay men and lesbians are still prohibited from marrying in the vast majority of states.

Same-sex marriage first reached the national stage in 1993, when Hawaii’s Supreme Court ruled that

¹⁷ <http://www.focusonthefamily.com/socialissues/social-issues/adoption/cause-for-concern.aspx>.

the state's ban on marriages between same-sex couples presumptively violated the state's equal rights amendment and remanded the case. *Baehr v. Lewin*, 852 P.2d 44, 67-68 (Haw. 1993). By 1996, when a second trial began in the lower court, the prospect of gay couples winning the right to marry had galvanized considerable opposition. CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 125-126. Ultimately, while the litigation was pending, Hawaii amended its constitution to give the legislature the authority to limit marriage to different-sex couples, *see* HAWAII CONST. art. I, § 23, which it did. The Hawaii Supreme Court then dismissed the case as moot. *Baehr v. Miike*, Civ. No. 20371, 1999 Haw. LEXIS 391, at *1, 6, 8 (Haw. Dec. 9, 1999) (taking notice of constitutional amendment).

Under pressure from organizations proclaiming support for “traditional family values,” and in the throes of an election year, the bill that became the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) was introduced in Congress. The Senate passed DOMA on the day the Hawaii trial began; it was later signed into law. Pub. L. No. 104-199, 110 Stat. 2419 (1996); CHAUNCEY, WHY MARRIAGE? 125-126. DOMA provides a federal definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman, and declares that no state needs to give “full faith and credit” to “same-sex marriages” licensed in another state. 1 U.S.C. § 7; 28 U.S.C. § 1738C. DOMA also denies tax, social security, pension, immigration, and other federal benefits to such married couples. Fourteen states passed state-level prohibitions of same-sex marriage recognition that year, and another nine passed similar statutes the following year. AMERICAN BAR ASS'N, AN ANALYSIS OF THE LAW REGARDING SAME-SEX MAR-

RIAGE, CIVIL UNIONS, AND DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS 33-36 (2005).¹⁸

In 2004, when Massachusetts became the first state to permit gay couples to marry, thirteen states passed constitutional amendments banning such marriages. (Twelve of those states already had enacted statutory same-sex marriage prohibitions.) *Statewide Votes on Same-Sex Marriage, 1998-Present*, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES;¹⁹ AMERICAN BAR ASS'N, AN ANALYSIS OF THE LAW 33-36. In many states where same-sex marriage became legal, public backlash followed shortly thereafter. In 2009, for example, a unanimous Iowa Supreme Court struck down the exclusion of qualified same-sex couples from civil marriage. *Varnum v. Brien*, 763 N.W.2d 862 (Iowa 2009). In response, national organizations opposed to same-sex marriage, such as the National Organization for Marriage and the American Family Association, campaigned to remove three of the judges who had joined that decision. The campaign was successful; all three were ousted from the bench the following year. A.G. Sulzberger, *Ouster of Iowa Judges Sends Signal to Bench*, N.Y. TIMES, Nov. 3, 2010.

California provides an especially pertinent example of the contentious nature of state-level marriage debates. In 2000, California voters passed Proposition 22, providing that “[o]nly marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.” *In*

¹⁸ <http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/family/reports/WhitePaper.authcheckdam.pdf>.

¹⁹ <http://www.ncsl.org/legislatures-elections/elections/same-sex-marriage-on-the-ballot.aspx#3> (last visited Feb. 26, 2013).

re Marriage Cases, 183 P.3d 384, 409 (Cal. 2008). In February 2004—three months after the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court issued *Goodridge*—the City of San Francisco began issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples. *Id.* at 402. A few weeks later, the California Supreme Court directed the city to stop the practice, ultimately holding that the San Francisco City officials had “exceeded their authority in issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples in the absence of a judicial determination” and voiding the approximately 4,000 same-sex marriages performed in San Francisco. *Id.* at 403.

Meanwhile, plaintiffs filed suit challenging California’s laws prohibiting same-sex marriage. *Id.* at 402-403. In May 2008, the California Supreme Court held that same-sex couples had the right to marry under the state constitution’s equal protection clause. *Id.* at 433-434, 451-453. In the wake of the court’s decision, “California counties issued more than 18,000 marriage licenses to same-sex couples.” Pet. App. 25a, *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, No. 12-144 (U.S.) (hereinafter “*Perry* Pet. App.”).

Also in the wake of the ruling, five California residents petitioned the state government to place Proposition 8 on the 2008 ballot. *Perry* Pet. App. 25a-26a. In the combative campaign that followed, proponents of Proposition 8 drew heavily on the historic demonization of gay people as threats to children to win support for the measure. Key talking points in the Proposition 8 voter pamphlet echoed Anita Bryant’s “Save Our Children” campaign: “[The proposition] *protects our children* from being taught in public schools that ‘same-sex marriage’ is the same as traditional marriage.” CALIFORNIA SEC’Y OF STATE, OFFICIAL VOTER INFORMATION GUIDE: CALIFORNIA GEN-

ERAL ELECTION ON NOV. 4, 2008, PROP 8, at 56 (2008).²⁰ Some public statements supporting Proposition 8's passage overtly asserted the immorality or perversion of gay people. *See, e.g.*, J.A. Exh. 97, *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, No. 12-144 (U.S.) (hereinafter "*Perry J.A.*") (transcript of campaign event asserting that if same-sex couples can marry, "any combination would have to be allowed," including marriages to children and horses); *Perry J.A.* Exh. 177 (print materials claiming that "[h]omosexuality is linked to pedophilia" and that "[h]omosexuals are 12 times more likely to molest children"); *Perry J.A.* Exh. 81 (claiming that same-sex relationships "harm the body of society"); *Perry J.A.* Exh. 103 (message from official proponent that the "gay agenda" is "Satan[ic]" and wishes to "legalize prostitution" and "legalize having sex with children"). The last line of the Proposition 8 pamphlet summed it up: "Voting YES *protects our children.*" CALIFORNIA SEC'Y OF STATE, OFFICIAL VOTER INFORMATION GUIDE 56 (emphasis added).

The tactics worked. In November 2008, voters passed Proposition 8 by a slim margin. *See Strauss v. Horton*, 207 P.3d 48, 68 (Cal. 2009).

The approval of Proposition 8, along with similar laws and constitutional amendments in forty other states, demonstrates the enduring influence of anti-gay hostility and the persistence of ideas about the inequality of gay people and their relationships. These state constitutional amendments serve as a firewall against changes in public opinion; such amendments make it very difficult for gay couples to

²⁰ <http://vig.cdn.sos.ca.gov/2008/general/argu-rebut/pdf/prop8-a-and-r.pdf>.

obtain the right to marry even if public opinion continues to shift in their favor.

II. HISTORY PLAYS A CRITICAL ROLE IN THE COURT'S EQUAL-PROTECTION ANALYSIS.

This Court gives great weight to the presence of historical discrimination against an identifiable group in evaluating the constitutionality of a challenged law—regardless of the level of scrutiny ultimately applied.²¹ See *Hernandez v. Texas*, 347 U.S. 475, 477-480 (1954) (relying in part on historical segregation to determine that Mexican-Americans constituted a distinct class denied equal protection); *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432, 450 (1985); *id.* at 454 (Stevens, J., concurring); *id.* at 461-464, 473 (Marshall, J., concurring in the judgment in part and dissenting in part).

In *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967), for instance, the Court observed that anti-miscegenation laws “arose as an incident to slavery”; the Court ultimately held that “restricting the freedom to marry solely because of racial classifications violates the

²¹ History also helps determine whether a particular statute or constitutional amendment is based on animus toward the affected class. This Court has, in the past, taken a particularly hard look at such laws and amendments. See, e.g., *Romer*, 517 U.S. at 632 (“[T]he amendment seems inexplicable by anything but animus toward the class it affects.”); *Cleburne*, 473 U.S. at 450 (holding unconstitutional an ordinance that “appears to us to rest on an irrational prejudice against the mentally retarded”); *Department of Agric. v. Moreno*, 413 U.S. 528, 534 (1973) (holding unconstitutional a statutory provision “intended to prevent so called ‘hippies’ and ‘hippie communes’ from participating in the food stamp program” (citation omitted)); see also CALIFORNIA SEC’Y OF STATE, OFFICIAL VOTER INFORMATION GUIDE 56 (urging that “Voting YES protects our children”).

central meaning of the Equal Protection Clause.” *Id.* at 10; *see also, e.g., Oyama v. California*, 332 U.S. 633, 650-663 (1948) (Murphy, J., concurring) (detailing the history of racist discrimination against Japanese-Americans in an equal-protection analysis).

The Court similarly has evaluated government action differentiating between men and women through the lens of the “Nation[s] long and unfortunate history of sex discrimination.” *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 531-532 (1996) (citation omitted); *see also Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677, 685 (1973) (plurality opinion) (acknowledging that “the position of women in America has improved markedly in recent decades,” but observing that “throughout much of the 19th century the position of women in our society was, in many respects, comparable to that of blacks under the pre-Civil War slave codes”). This Court’s previous gay-rights decisions also emphasize the historical record undergirding the analysis. The majority opinion in *Lawrence* devotes nearly a third of its pages to the history of anti-sodomy laws. *See Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 567-573. The Court acknowledged that the *Bowers* majority had erred in “rel[ying] upon” “historical premises [that] are not without doubt and, at the very least, are overstated.” *Id.* at 571. After correcting this historical record, the Court concluded that *Bowers* was wrongly decided. *Id.*

As professional organizations devoted to the study of American history and culture, *amici* are not before the Court to advocate a particular legal doctrine or standard. But they wish to advise the Court that the historical record is clear. Gay men and lesbians in America have been subjected to generations of intense, irrational, and often violent discrimination,

commencing as soon as they emerged as a group into American public consciousness and continuing today.

CONCLUSION

Today the civil rights enjoyed by gay and lesbian Americans still vary substantially from region to region and still are subject to the vicissitudes of public opinion. And like other minority groups before them, gay men and lesbians often must rely on judicial decisions to secure equal rights over public opposition. In 1948, when the California Supreme Court became the first in the nation to overturn a state law banning interracial marriage, it ruled in the face of majority public opposition to such marriages. This Court in 1967 overturned the remaining state bans on interracial marriage in *Loving*; it took more than thirty years after that decision to reach the point where more Americans approved than disapproved of interracial marriage. History has vindicated the judges with the courage and foresight to declare certain emerging truths to be self-evident, even in the face of majoritarian hostility.

Respectfully submitted,

CATHERINE E. STETSON*
 MICHAEL D. KASS
 ERICA KNIEVEL SONGER
 MARY HELEN WIMBERLY
 C. BENJAMIN COOPER
 RYAN D. TAGGETT
 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
 555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20004
 (202) 637-5491
 cate.stetson@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel of Record

Counsel for Amici Curiae

FEBRUARY 2013