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The news was surprising: Latinos will be the largest minority by 2025, a shocking statement about a community bounced around the Census like the proverbial bald-headed step child of the nation it helped to build. You see, Latinas/os were white until the 1980 Census, the first to include a question about ethnic origin. At the time, we were 6.5 percent of the U.S. population. Today, we comprise 13.5 percent of the U.S. population. Our numbers have doubled in 20 years and far underrepresent our immigrant communities.

For years we have put food on our tables, sown the clothes many of us wear, and cleaned after ourselves and others in an effort to sustain our families in this country and abroad. We have done it diversely because we encompass many colors, genders and sexualities. We have done it proudly while also facing racism, xenophobia and expatriation.

We were called Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Colombians, Salvadoreans and Cubans until the Nixon administration lumped us together using the term “Hispanic.” From Cesar, the Brown Berets, Young Lords and other movements of ethnic pride emerged the names “Latino,” “Chicano,” “Tejano” and “Niuyorican.” These names are statements of pride, honor and validation for our ancestry. We are immigrants, migrants and native-born. We are a mix of colors, identities, foods, climates and temperaments. We are a gumbo, asopao and a stew. It is, simply, our moment in the sun.

As the largest minority in the US, we are now under the microscope. Yet, with all of this attention, I cannot escape feeling ignored as a Latina lesbian. Many inside our Latina/o community would rather deny our existence as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people, turning a blind eye to the reality that their daughter is still a “solterona,” (old maid) their son a “bachelor,” or that the person showing up on Sundays who used to be their son Juan now answers to Viktoria. The same can be said for many of our non-Latina/o counterparts, who somehow look for us to wear the LGBT label and forget our ethnic roots. I am no less Latina than I am a lesbian. I challenge you to forget neither.
This study shows our diversity and our similarities as Latinas/os regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. Latina/o same-sex couples are no different than any other loving couple. We form families, both immediate and the extended form of “familia.” As is true for members of the broader LGBT movement, we seek the freedom to marry and the legal recognition that comes from having our love validated. We yearn for our “familias” to openly embrace our love and walk with us in the struggle to eliminate not just xenophobia and racism, but homophobia, transphobia and heterosexism.

How do we accomplish such a feat? Not by hiding or running away, but by joining forces and walking proudly forward together with other Latino/a brothers and sisters. We must step out of the shadows reassuring ourselves that we must fight for what is rightfully ours: the recognition of our existence, the validation of our relationships through marriage or other forms of “familia,” and the unconditional love of our friends and family. We must be visible for ALL of us. We must understand the complex mix of their love, their fears and our collective shame and pride, while also challenging one another to remain visible as Latinas/os AND queers. We must challenge the organizations that claim to speak for us to do so inclusively, not exclusively. Justice must be all-encompassing. Civil rights struggles must strive for fairness and equality for all. We cannot be denied, erased, if you know we exist! Therefore, we will hold you accountable for our combined struggle.

To me nothing demonstrates that more than my familia. Twenty-five years into this journey I have gone through it all: from being closeted to having my partner receive the news that we would be aunts before I did. I accomplished inclusion and recognition by educating, demonstrating and demanding that my family recognize me for who I am as a woman, lesbian and Boricua. Today I demand the same from my fellow Latinas/os and queers. Discrimination is not selective. It is a corrosive force that destroys our humanity.

Latinas/os have refused to assimilate, keeping our tortillas, arroz con gandules, pernil, arepas, y churrascos just like immigrants of the past, making them part of the food landscape of this land. Yet, we have also embraced the hamburgers and fries of our guest land, of our homeland. Being Latina/o is not just about where we are born or where we come from. Years after coming to this country, after coming out, falling in love (several times) and isolating my familia (in Puerto Rico) from my family (in the US) I still call Puerto Rico home. It is that feeling; a spiritual music born within us that calls us to our ancestors across time and space. It is about the indigenous, the colonizer, and the descendents of Africa who were brought to America as a whole, not just the US. It is about the Asian, the European, the African, and others who came to the shores of our countries looking for riches, refuge, or solace and found home.

I encourage you to read this report, use the information to support your arguments on our behalf, and help us achieve justicia para todos! Remember, in Spanish, English or Spanglish we are Latinas/os, queer, LGBT or whatever name we choose for ourselves. We are proud, numerous and growing! If you open your ears you can hear the tambores, trompetas, maracas y guiros coming, making noise, making Latino music, changing the landscape and helping us to stand strong!

In solidarity,

Lisbeth Melendéz Rivera
National Latino/a Coalition for Justice
As the debate over same-sex marriage became a central political issue during the 2004 presidential election, Florida Senate candidate Mel Martinez, who would become the first Cuban American elected to the U.S. Senate, aired a radio ad in support of the Federal Marriage Amendment. In the ad Martinez said that he immigrated to the United States “to escape a totalitarian dictator who had no respect for the traditional values of family and faith.”

By linking the issue of same-sex marriage to the dictatorship of Fidel Castro, Martinez’s ad depicted marriage equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people not only as anti-democratic, but also, more subtly, as anti-Hispanic.

Anti-LGBT political and religious leaders often attempt to cash in on traditional Hispanic social conservatism by pitting Hispanics against LGBT people. The religious right, for example, frequently attempts to portray civil rights as a limited resource, claiming that equal rights for gay people would threaten the civil rights of people of color. This false claim ignores the existence of LGBT Hispanics who are harmed by anti-LGBT laws, such as laws banning same-sex marriage, laws banning more limited forms of partner recognition, and laws restricting parenting. It is also just one reason why documenting the experiences of Hispanic same-sex couple households is vital to understanding the impact of anti-LGBT policies on Hispanics.

Executive Summary

“Hispanic,” “Latino,” or both?

The following definitions are from the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2005):

**Hispanic:** of, relating to, or being a person of Latin American descent living in the US; especially one of Cuban, Mexican, or Puerto Rican origin.

**Latino:** 1) a native or inhabitant of Latin America; 2) a person of Latin-American origin living in the US.

The 2000 U.S. Census asked respondents if their ethnicity was “Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.” Respondents who marked “yes” were then asked to further identify as “Mexican, Mexican Am., Chicano,” “Puerto Rican,” “Cuban,” or “other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.”

According to a poll conducted in 2002 of nearly 300,000 Hispanics and Latinos in the US, the majority of Hispanics and Latinos (53 percent) do not have a preference between the terms “Latino” or “Hispanic.” Of those who do have a preference, 34 percent prefer the term “Hispanic,” and 13 percent prefer the term “Latino.”

Because 87 percent of Hispanics and Latinos either do not have a preference or prefer the term “Hispanic,” and in order to simplify what is already extremely complicated language, we use the term “Hispanic” in the body text to identify the population of households from the 2000 Census that we analyzed in this study.


informing the debate over equal rights for LGBT people. Anti-same-sex marriage state constitutional amendments are pending or are being considered in several states with large Hispanic populations, including Arizona, California, Florida, and Texas.

How do anti-LGBT family policies, including state constitutional amendments banning same-sex marriage, specifically affect Hispanic same-sex couple families?

**METHODOLOGY**

To answer this question, we conducted an analysis of data from the 2000 Census on Hispanic same-sex couple households in the continental US, Alaska and Hawaii. The research firm Lopez & Cheung, Inc. provided the data for our analysis, deriving them from a custom tabulation of the U.S. Census 5 percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS — see Technical Appendix).

This study sheds light on the 105,025 Hispanic same-sex couple households identified in the 2000 U.S. Census, including their basic demographics, immigration and citizenship status, residence patterns, parenting rates, use of public assistance, educational attainment, employment status, income, housing, and military service.

The Census gathers data on same-sex couple households through a series of questions that allow a householder to identify who else lives in the house and his or her relationship to them (see Table 1 for definitions of key terms used by the 2000 Census). Householders may select “husband/wife” or “unmarried partner” to describe another same-sex adult in the same household. Though the Census does not ask respondents to report their sexual orientation or gender identity, it is assumed that these same-sex unmarried partners are in amorous relationships of mutual caring and support. Most of the men and women in same-sex couples are likely to identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or some other term for homosexual. Bisexuals and transgender people are found in both opposite-sex and same-sex couples.

---


While the Census does allow individuals in same-sex couples who are living together in the same house to self-identify, it does not capture identifiable information on single LGBT people, individuals in same-sex relationships who are not living together, LGBT youth living with their parents, LGBT seniors living with their children and/or grandchildren who do not have a partner or do not live with their partner, LGBT homeless people, LGBT undocumented immigrants, and, of course, those not comfortable “ outing” themselves to a government agency to self-identify as being in a same-sex relationship. Due to these significant limitations, the Census does not reflect the actual number or the full diversity of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people in the US.7 Some researchers estimate that the true number of same-sex couples in the US is 10 to 50 percent higher than that reported by the Census.8 Despite those limitations, the 2000 Census amassed the largest, national, representative data set available on same-sex couple households.

To better understand how anti-LGBT family policies specifically impact Hispanic same-sex couples and their children, we compared data about Hispanic same-sex couple households from the 2000 Census to Census data on white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households, as well as Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households and Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households. Of the Hispanic same-sex couple households in this study, 61 percent include couples in which both partners identify as Hispanic. The remaining 39 percent are “inter-ethnic” couples, where one partner is Hispanic and the other is not (see Table 2 for household definitions). In this study, we sometimes make comparisons among households using these two subgroups.

Where applicable, after reporting the findings from our analysis of 2000 Census data we also briefly discuss their public policy implications. For example, information from the 2000 Census on income and parenting is important to informing the debate over the impact of anti-same-sex marriage constitutional amendments on Hispanic same-sex couples and their children, because many of the benefits and protections of marriage help families to care for each other financially, particularly in times of crisis.

---

Table 2: Household definitions

- **Hispanic same-sex couple household**: Either the householder or the unmarried partner is Hispanic and are the same sex
- **Same-sex couple household in which both partners are Hispanic**: A subset of Hispanic same-sex couple households, where both the householder and unmarried partner are Hispanic
- **Hispanic “inter-ethnic” same-sex couple household**: A subset of Hispanic same-sex couple households, where one partner is Hispanic and the other is not
- **White non-Hispanic same-sex couple household**: The householder and the unmarried partner are white and not of Hispanic ethnicity
- **Hispanic married opposite-sex couple household**: Either the householder or the husband/wife is Hispanic and are defined as living with a husband or a wife of the opposite sex
- **Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple household**: Either the householder or the opposite-sex partner is Hispanic and are defined as living with an unmarried partner of the opposite sex

---

KEY FINDINGS

Hispanic female same-sex couples are raising children under the age of 18 at over three-fourths the rate of Hispanic married opposite-sex couples.

- Fifty-four percent of Hispanic female same-sex couples report raising at least one child under the age of 18, compared to 70 percent of Hispanic married opposite-sex couples and 59 percent of Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples (see Figure 1).

Same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are more likely to be raising children under the age of 18 than white non-Hispanic same-sex couples.

- Male same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are raising children at more than three times the rate of white non-Hispanic male same-sex couples (58 percent vs. 19 percent — see Figure 2).9
- Female same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are raising children at over twice the rate of white non-Hispanic female same-sex couples (66 percent vs. 32 percent).

Policy implications

- Anti-LGBT political and religious leaders often portray parenting by same-sex couples as risky to children, despite the fact that the vast majority of professional

---

9. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.
medical organizations, including the American Academy of Pediatrics\textsuperscript{10} and the American Psychological Association,\textsuperscript{11} recognize that there is no inherent difference in the social functioning and emotional health of children raised by same-sex couple parents.\textsuperscript{12} Currently, six states restrict parenting by gay men and lesbians, same-sex couples, and unmarried cohabiting couples.\textsuperscript{13} There is no justification for these laws.

- Equitable adoption and parenting laws are important for same-sex couple families because if parents have no legal relationship to their children, they cannot include them in their health insurance coverage or make decisions about how they will be cared for if one parent dies or the couple separates. Approximately 100,000 Hispanic children nationwide are in foster care\textsuperscript{14} or are waiting to be adopted.\textsuperscript{15} Barring lesbians, gay men, same-sex couples, and cohabiting opposite-sex couples from adopting decreases the number of potential loving homes for children in need.

Hispanic same-sex couple households are disadvantaged compared to white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households in terms of income, homeownership, and disability.

- Female same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic earn over $24,000 less in median annual household income than white non-Hispanic female same-sex couple households and over $30,000 less than white non-Hispanic male same-sex couple households (see Figure 3).\textsuperscript{16}

- The median annual household income of male same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic is over $21,000 less than that of white non-Hispanic female same-sex couple households and over $27,000 less than that of white non-Hispanic male same-sex couple households.

- Seventy-two percent of white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households report owning their own homes, compared to only 48 percent of Hispanic same-sex couple households.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{Median annual household income of same-sex couple households}
\end{figure}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
Female & $60,000$	abularnewline
Male & $66,000$	abularnewline
$35,800$ & $39,000$	abularnewline
\hline
White (non-Hispanic) & Hispanic (both partners)\tabularnewline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}


\textsuperscript{12} There is little research on parenting by transgender people. Most anti-gay groups have only taken a position on parenting by gay and lesbian people.


\textsuperscript{16} These differences are statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Income data are collected in exact figures before taxes on the long form of the Census. Median household income was calculated using the household income variable provided by the Census. A weighted median was computed for each of the households we analyzed using the person weight provided by the Census for each household.
• Individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are almost twice as likely to report a disability as those in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples (21 percent vs. 11 percent).

Policy implications
• Our analysis of 2000 Census data indicates that same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic may be even more affected by the inability to marry than white non-Hispanic same-sex couples for a number of reasons, including the fact that they earn less, are less likely to own their home, are nearly twice as likely to report a disability, and are significantly more likely to be raising children. Access to the 1,138 federal protections and benefits of marriage would clearly help Hispanic same-sex couples provide for their children, save money, buy a house, or prepare for retirement. The federal benefits and protections of marriage that are currently only available to married opposite sex couples include filing their taxes jointly, Social Security survivor benefits, Medicaid spend-down protections and the ability to take time off from work to care for a sick or disabled partner under the Family and Medical Leave Act. Over a lifetime, the inability to marry means that all same-sex couples, regardless of race or ethnicity, often pay more in taxes but are unable to benefit from government policies designed to help maintain strong and healthy families.

Men and women in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are significantly more likely to report that they are not U.S. citizens than are men and women in Hispanic inter-ethnic or white non-Hispanic same-sex couples.

• More than half (51 percent) of the men in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic report that they are not U.S. citizens, compared to only 3 percent of men in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples and 8 percent of men in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples (see Figure 4). In other words, men in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are 17 times more likely than men in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples, and over six times more likely than men in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples, to report that they are not U.S. citizens. Women in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are also significantly more likely than men and women in white non-Hispanic same-sex


18. Following the death of a spouse in a nursing home or assisted care facility, Medicaid regulations allow the surviving widow or widower of a married heterosexual couple to remain in the couple’s home for the rest of his or her life without jeopardizing the right to Medicaid coverage. Upon the survivor’s death, the state may then take the home to recoup the costs of terminal care. Because same-sex couples cannot marry they are not eligible for this protection, and they may be forced to choose between their home and life’s savings or medical coverage. See Dean, L., et. al. (2000, January). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender health: Findings and concerns. Journal of the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association. 4(3), pp. 102-151. Retrieved August 30, 2005, from http://www.glma.org:16080/pub/glma/vol4/3j4text.pdf

19. The Family and Medical Leave Act, a federal law passed in 1993, provides job-loss protection and up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for a variety of reasons, including after the birth or adoption of a child, to facilitate recovery from a “serious health condition,” or to care for an immediate family member who is extremely sick. However, the term “family” in the law is defined specifically as being headed by opposite-sex couples or single parents, and excludes those headed by gay men or lesbians. This prevents same-sex couples from taking care of their families on equal terms with families headed by opposite-sex couples, and exposes them to additional vulnerabilities in the workplace. See 29 CFR 825.800. Available at http://www.dol.gov/dol/allcfr/ESA/Title_29/Part_825/29CFR825.800.htm
couples to report that they are not U.S. citizens.

Policy implications

- U.S. immigration policy is largely based on the principle of “family unification,” which allows U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents to sponsor their spouses for immigration purposes. However, same-sex partners of U.S. citizens are not considered “spouses,” and cannot be sponsored by their partners for family-based immigration. This places many same-sex, bi-national couples in limbo, forcing them to find ways to stay together illegally and live in fear of deportation.

- The Uniting American Families Act (S.1278), formerly known as the Permanent Partners Immigration Act and introduced in Congress in 2005, would add “permanent partner” to the federal Immigration and Nationality Act, enabling same-sex domestic partners to be treated the same as opposite-sex married spouses for purposes of immigration rights and benefits. Access to the institution of marriage recognized by both the federal and state governments would also allow immigration rights for bi-national same-sex couples, as well as more than a thousand other benefits and protections. Proposed federal and state anti-same-sex marriage constitutional amendments further enshrine this discrimination in immigration and many other family policies.

Hispanic same-sex couple families are in many respects similar to other Hispanic families.

- Hispanic same-sex couples live in the same areas of the country where most Hispanic Americans live, with the highest concentrations in California, Florida, Texas and the New York City metropolitan area.

- Hispanic same-sex couple households are nearly as likely to report Spanish as their primary household language as Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households (77 percent vs. 81 percent).

- Individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples (39 percent) are almost as likely as individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples (48 percent) and significantly more likely than individuals in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples (24

---

percent) to report living in the same residence as five years earlier (see Figure 5).

- Hispanic same-sex couples report raising nonbiological (foster or adopted) children at nearly the same rate as Hispanic married opposite-sex couples (5 percent vs. 4 percent).

- Individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples work full-time (71 percent vs. 67 percent) and in the public sector (10 percent vs. 11 percent) at similar rates compared to those in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples.

**Policy implications**

- Data from the 2000 Census show that Hispanic same-sex couples have family patterns that are similar to other Hispanic families. For example, Hispanic same-sex couple families live in the same areas of the country where most Hispanic Americans live. They also speak Spanish at home and parent foster or adopted children at nearly the same rate as Hispanic married opposite-sex couples. Additionally, individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are significantly more likely than individuals in Hispanic cohabiting (unmarried) opposite-sex couples to report living in the same home for the previous five years, an indicator of relationship and family stability.

- Domestic partner policies can provide municipal and state (public sector) employees with health and other benefits for their same-sex partners and children. Anti-same-sex marriage state constitutional amendments recently enacted in a number of states could overturn domestic partner policies, causing many same-sex partners and their children to lose their health and other benefits. For example, as a result of the broad anti-same-sex marriage state constitutional amendment that passed in Michigan in 2004, domestic partnership benefits language was removed from contracts for Michigan state employees.21

Hispanic women in same-sex couples report military service at a disproportionately high rate despite the risk of losing their income and benefits because of the ban on lesbian, gay and bisexual people serving openly.

- Hispanic women in same-sex couples report military service at six times the rate of

---


22. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Hispanic women married to men (6 percent vs. 1 percent — see Figure 6),\(^{22}\) and at six times the rate of all women nationwide.\(^{23}\)

**Policy implications**

- Since Hispanic women in same-sex couples serve in the military at disproportionately higher rates than women in general, “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” which bans openly lesbian, gay and bisexual people from serving, has been used to discharge them from the military at a disproportionately high rate. Although Hispanic women make up just 0.3 percent of all servicemembers, they comprise 0.6 percent of those discharged under the policy.\(^{24}\)

**CONCLUSION**

As of October 2005, 17 states have passed anti-same-sex marriage constitutional amendments. A number of states, including Arizona, California, Florida, and Texas, which are among the states with the highest population of Hispanic same-sex couple households, are expecting to vote on similar amendments before the end of 2006. During a local television news broadcast in Austin, Texas, a lobbyist named David Contreras claimed to be advocating for the state’s anti-same-sex ballot measure on

---


behalf of Hispanics, stating, “It’s very important to us as Hispanics, Latinos, when
issues pertain to the family, we are for traditional family values.”\textsuperscript{25} Contreras’ statement
ignores the existence of Hispanic lesbian, gay or bisexual people who will be affected
by the proposed ballot measure, and it implies that “family values” somehow exclude
the protection of thousands of same-sex couples families and their children who live
in communities throughout Texas. This is just one example of why it is important to
document the demographics of Hispanic same-sex couple families.

Data from the 2000 Census refute common stereotypes that lesbian and gay people
are predominantly white, wealthy, do not have children, and are unable to maintain stable, long-term relationships.\textsuperscript{26} In fact, there
are over 100,000 Hispanic same-sex couple households in the US, and one of the most important findings of this study is that nearly
half of them are raising children, which has many implications for the debate over the legal recognition of same-sex couple families.

Data from the 2000 Census show that Hispanic same-sex couple households are in many respects similar to other Hispanic house-
holds. For example, they are raising adopted or foster children at similar rates, work in the public sector at similar rates, and report
similar rates of living in the same home for the previous five years, which is an indicator of relationship and family stability. Hispanic
same-sex couples live where most Hispanic couples live, and they are part of their respective communities, sending their children to
local schools and dealing with the same issues other Hispanic couples face.

This report also documents that Hispanic same-sex couple households are disadvantaged compared to white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households in terms of education, income, homeownership and disability. Individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are also significantly more likely than those in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples to not be U.S. citizens. As a result of these differences, Hispanic same-sex couples are disproportionately affected by anti-LGBT laws and policies, including those that prevent them from accessing the benefits and protections of marriage. Allowing all same-sex couples to legally formalize their relationships and commitments to care for each other and their children will allow them greater economic security, legal protection, and peace of mind. This is especially important as couples age or during times of crisis, such as a partner’s illness or death.

For many reasons, including higher rates of parenting, lower relative income, lower home ownership rates, and greater prevalence of having partners who are not U.S. citizens, Hispanic same-sex couple households are disproportionately impacted by anti-
LGBT family legislation, and will be further harmed if proposed anti-same-sex marriage state and federal constitutional amendments become law.

\textsuperscript{26} For example, see “What’s wrong with ‘gay rights? You be the judge!’ (1992). Colorado For Family Values. Campaign leaflet in
lesbians, gay men and bisexuals as a threat to civilization. Cambridge, MA: Author. For an analysis of the myth of gay affluence, see
statement ignores the fact that white, wealthy and privileged people can experience discrimination based on their real or perceived
sexual orientation or gender identity.
"An amendment of this type is divisive, discriminatory and seeks to treat one group of citizens differently than everyone else. As a community that knows discrimination all too well, we oppose any constitutional amendment that is intended to deny rights to anyone."
—National Hispanic Leadership Agenda
Statement against the proposed Federal Marriage Amendment, March 5, 2004

"Latinos must be cautious about accepting any form of legal discrimination. If it becomes acceptable to write discrimination into our Constitution, who will be the next group selected out for unequal treatment — immigrants? Latinos? We cannot be bystanders in this debate. We must protect those in the minority; by doing so, we are protecting ourselves."
—Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
Statement against the proposed Federal Marriage Amendment, May 12, 2004

As the debate over same-sex marriage became a central political issue during the 2004 election, Florida Senate candidate Mel Martinez, who would become the first Cuban American elected to the U.S. Senate, aired a radio ad in support of the Federal Marriage Amendment. In the ad Martinez stated that he immigrated to the US “to escape a totalitarian dictator who had no respect for the traditional values of family and faith.” By linking the issue of same-sex marriage to the dictatorship of Fidel Castro, Martinez’s ad depicted marriage equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people not only as anti-democratic, but also, more subtly, as anti-Hispanic.

Other anti-LGBT politicians and religious leaders have similarly attempted to cash in on traditional Hispanic social conservatism by pitting Hispanics against LGBT people. The religious right, for example, frequently attempts to portray civil rights as a limited

---

resource, claiming that equal rights for LGBT people threaten the civil rights of people of color. This false claim ignores the fact that civil rights are not a limited pie, nor are they something enjoyed only by people of color. It also ignores the millions of LGBT people of color who are harmed by anti-LGBT laws. This is just one of the reasons why documenting the experiences of Hispanic same-sex couples is vital to informing the debate over equal rights for LGBT people.

Many Hispanic leaders have recognized that the entire Hispanic community, including its LGBT members and their children, stands to lose from anti-LGBT policies and legislation. At the 1987 March for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Washington, D.C., Mexican-American labor organizer Cesar Chavez said, “Our movement has been supporting lesbian and gay rights for over 20 years. We supported lesbian and gay rights when it was just a crowd of 10 people.”

Just as Chavez did in the 1970s and 1980s, contemporary Hispanic leaders recognize that civil rights for people of color and for gay people are part of a larger struggle against all forms of discrimination. In 2004, when President George W. Bush announced his support for a federal constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage, Hispanic leaders issued strong statements against it. For example, in March 2004, the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda (NHLA), a non-partisan organization comprised of 40 major Hispanic national organizations and distinguished Hispanic leaders, said:

The Constitution and its subsequent amendments were designed to protect and expand individual liberties. If an amendment such as the currently proposed [Federal Marriage Amendment], or another like it, makes it through the process necessary to amend the Constitution, this would be the first time in history that the Constitution was amended to restrict the rights of a whole class of people, in conflict with its guiding principle of equal protection [original emphasis].

Other prominent Hispanic leaders and organizations opposing the Federal Marriage Amendment include Representatives Charles A. Gonzalez (D-TX), Xavier Becerra

“Hispanic,” “Latino,” or both?
The following definitions are from the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2005):

Hispanic: of, relating to, or being a person of Latin American descent living in the US; especially one of Cuban, Mexican, or Puerto Rican origin.

Latino: 1) a native or inhabitant of Latin America; 2) a person of Latin-American origin living in the US.

The 2000 U.S. Census asked respondents if their ethnicity was “Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.” Respondents who marked “yes” were then asked to further identify as “Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano,” “Puerto Rican,” “Cuban,” or “other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino.”

According to a poll conducted in 2002 of nearly 300,000 Hispanics and Latinos in the US, the majority of Hispanics and Latinos (53 percent) do not have a preference between the terms “Latino” or “Hispanic.” Of those who do have a preference, 34 percent prefer the term “Hispanic,” and 13 percent prefer the term “Latino.”

Because 87 percent of Hispanics and Latinos either do not have a preference or prefer the term “Hispanic,” and in order to simplify what is already extremely complicated language, we use the term “Hispanic” in the body text to identify the population of households from the 2000 Census that we analyzed in this study.


---


(D-CA), and Raúl Grijalva (D-AZ), as well as the National Council of La Raza, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, the League of United Latin American Citizens, and the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement. On this issue, most Hispanics agree: a September 2004 study of 800 Latino registered voters nationwide found that a majority (55 percent) oppose a federal constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage.33

Though many Hispanic leaders support full equality for LGBT people, and most Hispanics oppose a federal constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage, the Hispanic population at large tends to be more socially conservative than the general population (see religion and political participation section). This is one of the reasons why documenting the experiences of Hispanic same-sex couples is vital to informing the debate over same-sex marriage, particularly now that anti-same-sex marriage state constitutional amendments are expected to be on the ballot in states with large Hispanic populations, including Arizona, California, Florida, and Texas. Although they represent an important constituency across the nation, little research has been conducted on the experiences of Hispanic same-sex couples.

Methodology

How do anti-LGBT family policies, including current and proposed state constitutional amendments against same-sex marriage, specifically affect Hispanic same-sex couple families?

To answer this question, we conducted an analysis of data from the 2000 Census on Hispanic same-sex couple households in the continental United States, Alaska and Hawaii. This study sheds light on the basic demographics of Hispanic same-sex couple households, including immigration and citizenship status, residence patterns, parenting rates, use of public assistance, educational attainment, employment status, income, housing, and military service. The research firm Lopez & Cheung, Inc. provided the data for our analysis deriving them from a custom tabulation of the U.S. Census 5 percent Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS — see Technical Appendix).

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key terms used by the 2000 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household:</strong> A household includes all the people who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Householder:</strong> The person who filled out the Census form on behalf of him or herself and the other people who live in the household. The Census Bureau prefers that the householder be the person, or one of the people, in whose name the home is owned, being bought, or rented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Same-sex couple household:</strong> Household in which the householder identifies his or her “husband/wife” as someone of the same sex or in which the householder indicates that he or she lives with an “unmarried partner” of the same sex to whom he or she is not legally married.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Census gathers data on same-sex couple households through a series of questions that allow a householder to identify who else lives in the house and his or her relationship to them (see Table 1 for definitions of key terms used by the 2000 Census). Householders may select “husband/wife” or “unmarried partner” to describe another adult of the same-sex in the same household.\textsuperscript{34} Though the Census does not ask respondents to report their sexual orientation or their gender identity, it is assumed that these same-sex unmarried partners are in amorous relationships of mutual caring and support. Most of the men and women in same-sex couples are likely to identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or some other term for homosexual.\textsuperscript{35} Bisexuals and transgender people are found in both opposite-sex and same-sex couples.\textsuperscript{36}

While the Census does allow individuals in same-sex couples who are living together in the same home to self-identify, it does not capture identifiable information on single LGBT people, individuals in same-sex relationships who are not living together, LGBT youth living with their parents, LGBT seniors living with their children and/or grandchildren who do not have a partner or do not live with their partner, LGBT homeless people, LGBT undocumented immigrants, and, of course, those not comfortable “outing” themselves to a government agency as being in a same-sex relationship. Due to these significant limitations, the Census does not reflect the actual number or the full diversity of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people in the United States.\textsuperscript{37} Some researchers estimate that the true number of same-sex couples in the U.S. is 10 to 50 percent higher than that reported by the Census.\textsuperscript{38} Despite these limitations, the 2000 Census amassed the largest national, representative data set available on same-sex couple households.

To better understand how anti-LGBT family policies specifically impact Hispanic same-sex couples and their children, we compared information about Hispanic same-sex couple households from the 2000 Census to Census data on white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households, as well as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Household definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic same-sex couple household:</strong> Either the householder or the unmarried partner is Hispanic and are the same sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Same-sex couple household in which both partners are Hispanic:</strong> A subset of Hispanic same-sex couple households, where both the householder and unmarried partner are Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic “inter-ethnic” same-sex couple household:</strong> A subset of Hispanic same-sex couple households, where one partner is Hispanic and the other is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White non-Hispanic same-sex couple household:</strong> The householder and the unmarried partner are white and not of Hispanic ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic married opposite-sex couple household:</strong> Either the householder or the husband/wife is Hispanic and are defined as living with a husband or a wife of the opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple household:</strong> Either the householder or the opposite-sex partner is Hispanic and are defined as living with an unmarried partner of the opposite sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households and Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households. Of the Hispanic same-sex couple households in this study, 61 percent include couples in which both partners identify as Hispanic. The remaining 39 percent are “inter-ethnic” couples, where one partner is Hispanic and the other is not (see Table 2 for household definitions). In this study, we sometimes make comparisons between households using these two subgroups.

Where applicable, after reporting the findings from our analysis of 2000 Census data we also discuss their public policy implications. For example, information from the 2000 Census on income and parenting is important to informing the debate over the impact of anti-same-sex marriage constitutional amendments on Hispanic same-sex couples and their children.

Before presenting our findings and their policy implications, we first review research on the demographics and experience of Hispanic Americans, gay and straight (for additional information on our study methodology, see Technical Appendix).

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, as of July 1, 2004 the nation’s Hispanic population reached 41.3 million. Among this population, approximately 67 percent are of Mexican origin, 14 percent are Central and South American, 9 percent are Puerto Rican, 4 percent are Cuban, and the remaining 7 percent are of other Hispanic origins. With a growth rate that is over three times that of the general population (3.6 percent vs. 1 percent), Hispanics of any race accounted for approximately one half of the nation’s population growth of 2.9 million between July 2003 and July 2004. By 2010, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates that the Hispanic population will grow to almost 48 million, comprising nearly 16 percent of the total U.S. population. In comparison, the Census Bureau estimates that by 2010 African Americans will comprise just over 13 percent of the U.S. population.

---

On average, Hispanics are more likely than white non-Hispanics to live in large cities and metropolitan areas, to be under age 18, and to live in larger households. In 2002, 40 percent of the Hispanic population of the US was foreign born, with over half (52 percent) of that group entering the country within the preceding 12 years. Given these facts, it is not surprising that Hispanic voters are less likely than other Americans to support restrictions on immigration.

The Census Bureau does not specifically define the demographic characteristics of the Hispanic undocumented migrant population that may have been counted in the 2000 Census. However, the Pew Hispanic Center estimated that the total undocumented migrant population reached nearly 11 million as of March 2005. Approximately 57 percent of those undocumented migrants — more than 6 million — come from Mexico. According to Pew, 1.7 million or 17 percent of undocumented migrants are children under the age of 18.

EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME DISPARITIES

According to the U.S. Census, Hispanic Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity/expression, are significantly disadvantaged in terms of education, wealth and income, and other measures. Hispanics are far less likely than white non-Hispanics to obtain higher levels of education. Eighty-nine percent of white non-Hispanics have a high school diploma, compared to 71 percent of Cubans, 67 percent of Puerto Ricans, and only 51 percent of Mexicans. Only 11 percent of all Hispanics have obtained a college degree, compared to 29 percent of white non-Hispanics.

Hispanics are much more likely than white non-Hispanics to be unemployed. Some 8 percent of Mexicans, 10 percent of Puerto Ricans, 7 percent of Central and South Americans, and 9 percent of Cubans in the civilian labor force age 16 or over are unemployed, compared to 5 percent of the white non-Hispanic population. Those Hispanics who are employed tend to work at lower paying jobs in less skilled sectors (such as service occupations) than white non-Hispanics. Over half (54 percent) of white non-Hispanics earn over $35,000 per year, compared to just 26 percent of Hispanics.

According to the Census Bureau, the median annual household income in 2003 for white non-Hispanics was $48,000, compared to just $33,000 for Hispanics. Only

47. Ibid.

**RELIGION AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION**

According to the Pew Hispanic Center, even though Hispanics accounted for half of the population growth in the US between the 2000 and 2004 presidential elections, they comprised only one tenth of the increase in total votes cast. Pew suggests that this is primarily due to the fact that a high percentage of Hispanics are either too young to vote or are ineligible because they are not citizens. In fact, only 39 percent of the Hispanic population was eligible to vote in the 2004 election, compared to 76 percent of white non-Hispanics and 65 percent of African Americans.\footnote{Suro, R., Fry, R. & Passel, J. (2005, June 27). Hispanics and the 2004 election: Population, electorate and voters. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved August 29, 2005, from http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/48.pdf} The political participation of the Hispanic population in the US that is eligible to vote is influenced by a variety of factors. Specifically, National Exit Poll (NEP) data show that understanding religious faith in Hispanic communities is vital to understanding their political participation and position on anti-same-sex marriage amendments and other anti-LGBT legislation.

According to the Pew Hispanic Center’s analysis of NEP data, George W. Bush’s share of the Hispanic vote grew from 34 percent in 2000 to 40 percent in 2004.\footnote{Ibid.} This increase is partially attributed to evangelical Protestant Hispanic voters, who comprised 25 percent of the Hispanic vote in 2000, but increased to 32 percent in 2004. The evangelical Protestant segment of the Hispanic electorate voted even more heavily in favor of President Bush in 2004; 56 percent supported Bush in 2004 compared to 44 percent in 2000. In comparison, President Bush’s share of the Hispanic Catholic vote remained the same in both elections at 33 percent. Given these findings, just how important is religious faith in the Hispanic electorate in determining which party they vote for and their position on contentious social issues, including same-sex marriage?

According to a report released by the Gallup organization in July 2005, approximately 90 percent of Hispanics identify with a Christian religion, which is slightly higher than

President Bush received the support of 56 percent of evangelical Protestant Hispanic voters in 2004, versus only 33 percent of Catholic Hispanic voters.
the 84 percent of Americans in general. Sixty-three percent of Hispanics identify as Catholic, 16 percent as Protestant, 10 percent identify with other Christian faiths and only 6 percent report no religious affiliation at all. According to Gallup, the fact that such a large majority of Hispanics identify with a Christian religion does not mean that they are also likely to identify as Republicans. A plurality (48 percent) of Hispanics identify as independents. Thirty-five percent identify as Democrats and 18 percent identify as Republicans.\footnote{Lyons, L. (2005, July 19). Where do Hispanic-Americans stand on religion, politics? Nearly two-thirds identify as Catholic. Princeton, NJ: The Gallup Organization. Retrieved August 26, 2005, from http://www.gallup.com/poll/content/default.aspx?ci=17404}

With the exception of Cuban Americans, Hispanic voters have historically cast more ballots for Democratic candidates than for Republicans since the 1930s.

Though the majority of Hispanic Americans still identify as Democrats or independents, their religious beliefs often translate into social conservatism. In 2003 the Institute for Latino Studies at the University of Notre Dame released a report that found over half of all Latinos believe that religious leaders should try to influence public affairs, and that strong majorities support policies like the faith-based initiatives, school prayer and teaching creationism in public schools.\footnote{Espinosa, G., Elizondo, V. & Miranda, J. (2003, March). Latino churches in American public life: summary of findings. Interim Reports. Notre Dame, IN: Institute for Latino Studies, University of Notre Dame. Retrieved August 17, 2005, from http://www.nd.edu/~latino/research/pubs/HispChurchesEnglishWEB.pdf}


However, poll data also indicate that Hispanics may be less likely to support constitutional amendments banning same-sex marriage.


If Hispanic Americans are more socially conservative, then why do they not vote for conservative candidates? This may be due in part to the fact that Hispanic voters weigh other concerns more heavily than homosexuality and other contentious social issues. Hispanic voters consistently rate education and the economy as their top policy issues.
They rate “moral values” issues like same-sex marriage as one of the least likely to decide their vote. Even Hispanics who identify as born-again/evangelical Christians prioritize the economy and jobs over “moral values;” only 13 percent of Hispanic evangelicals in a 2004 national poll said that “moral values” were first among their domestic concerns, compared to 37 percent of white non-Hispanic evangelicals.

Conservative political and religious leaders have stated their intent to help Hispanics bridge the gap between their traditional social conservatism and actually voting for conservative candidates. In a speech before Catholic and Hispanic leaders in Miami, Florida, Republican National Committee (RNC) Chairman Ken Mehlman said, “I will continue to make it clear that the GOP offers Latino and Catholic Americans the best choice — with our compassionate conservative policies that uphold the sanctity of life, marriage and social justice.” The RNC hopes to build upon the gains made with the Hispanic electorate in 2004 by attracting more Hispanic voters using conservative wedge issues like same-sex marriage.

According to the 2000 Census, 9 percent of all households in the US are Hispanic households. Similarly, 12 percent of all same-sex couple households in the US are Hispanic same-sex couple households. Hispanic LGBT people in the US constitute a large but under-researched population, which often faces additional disadvantages due to the intersection of their status as racial, sexual and socioeconomic minorities.

A 2001 study of roughly 1,200 Hispanic gay and bisexual men found that 64 percent of respondents experienced verbal harassment during their childhood for being gay/effeminate, and 20 percent were harassed by police because of being gay. Respondents also reported powerful messages — both explicit and covert — in their communities.
telling them that their homosexuality made them “not normal” or “not truly men;” that they would grow up alone without children or families; and that ultimately their homosexuality was dirty, sinful and shameful to their families and loved ones. Many opted for exile and migration in order to live their lives openly and honestly away from their loved ones. Hispanic gay and bisexual men also reported experiencing racism not only from society at large but also the LGBT community, whether in the form of exclusion from social venues or sexual objectification by white non-Hispanic same-sex partners or lovers.67

**Hispanic Same-Sex Couple Families**

**A profile of Anaberta “Bertie” Lozano and Matilde Slate**

Anaberta “Bertie” Lozano, 49, and Matilde Slate, 44, have been together for over 10 years. They live in a home that they own in Tucson, Arizona, where Matilde works as a criminal defense attorney and Bertie works as a program manager of HIV/STD services for the Pima County Health Department. They have dedicated their lives to giving back to their families and their communities.

Bertie is the only member of her family to have graduated from college. Likewise, out of Matilde’s six brothers and sisters, she is one of only two who have gone to college, and she is the only one to have a graduate degree. Bertie puts these academic accomplishments into perspective. “Coming out was very, very hard. Because it was so difficult for me, when I was young, I became suicidal. This made school extremely difficult. So, I’m speaking from personal experience. I think it’s particularly difficult for Latino LGBT youth because of the powerful influence of the Catholic Church and its opposition to homosexuality.”

Bertie and Matilde have used their education to achieve successful careers with decent compensation. Their combined annual salary is $125,000. This may make them appear financially affluent, but in fact, they say that they struggle financially. Bertie explains, “It’s our culture to help our families no matter what. When our sisters or nieces and nephews are struggling, we’re there. These family obligations pull substantially from our...
incomes. I don’t mind at all; it’s a blessing, but it’s how it is.”

Bertie and Matilde cared for Matilde’s father and mother during the last four years of Matilde’s parents’ lives. “It’s weird how people think, ‘You’re the two gay people, you can afford it.’ Last time I checked, there are other siblings, too. I didn’t mind it, but financially, it really took a toll.” Bertie and Matilde alone assumed all the healthcare costs not covered by governmental programs. In spite of the burdens of caregiving, Bertie describes it as one of the best experiences of her life. She explains, “You get blessed in different ways. Some things you cannot put a dollar value on.”

Today, Bertie and Matilde participate in their community as well as in their families. They were one of five couples that fought and won domestic partner benefits for Pima County government employees. Bertie sits on the City of Tucson Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Issues. In spite of this work, Bertie says that they feel disempowered by the current political climate for LGBT people. “They say that we have the same rights, but not in choosing my life partner. We’re taxpayers, voters, and volunteers; what else do they want from us? I’ve always considered myself to be a good American, but now I feel so unprotected, like we’re second class citizens.”

According to our analysis of 2000 Census data, some 105,025 households in the US identify as Hispanic same-sex couple households. In comparison, the 2000 Census counted nearly 460,000 white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households, over 6 million Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households, and over 770,000 Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households.68

**AGE**

Because the couples in the households we analyzed are of different ages on average, some of the findings in this study could be the result of the life-stage differences people experience as they age. For example, income often increases with age until late in life, as does the likelihood of home ownership. However, the median age differences between the partnered men and women in the households we analyzed are not that large. This decreases the likelihood that our findings are affected by differences in age. Where appropriate, we also considered age when we reported differences between households to ensure that those differences were statistically significant.

Figure 1 illustrates the median age by sex of individuals in the various types of Hispanic couples we considered in this analysis. On average, individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples are slightly older than those in Hispanic same-sex couples, who are in turn older than those in Hispanic cohabiting (unmarried) opposite-sex couples. Married women report the highest median age of all women in the study (38), followed by women in same-sex couple households (36), and women in cohabiting opposite-sex couples (30). Married Hispanic men report the highest median age (40), followed by Hispanic men in same-sex couples (37) and Hispanic men in cohabiting opposite-sex couples (31).

As illustrated in Figure 2, the majority of individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are between the ages of 25 to 44 years: 58 percent of individuals same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are between the ages of 25 to 44, compared to 54 percent of individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples and 69 percent of individuals in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples. Individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples (21 percent) are more likely to be age 55 or older than individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic (14 percent). Likewise, individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are more likely to be age 55 or older than individuals in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples (8 percent).
Policy implications: Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender elders

While all lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people are harmed by anti-LGBT laws, including anti-same-sex marriage laws and constitutional amendments, LGBT elders are among the most vulnerable. For example, same-sex couples are unable to access Social Security survivor benefits, which provide support to the surviving spouse of an opposite-sex married couple based on the deceased spouse's income history. Everyone who pays Social Security taxes, including single individuals and unmarried couples, contributes toward this benefit. However, same-sex couples are not eligible regardless of how long they have been together.69

Same-sex couples are also ineligible for Medicaid spend-down protections. Following the death of a spouse in a nursing home or assisted care facility, Medicaid regulations allow the surviving widow or widower of a married opposite-sex couple to remain in the couple’s home for the rest of his or her life without jeopardizing the right to Medicaid coverage. Upon the survivor’s death, the state may then take the home to recoup the costs of terminal care. Because same-sex couples cannot marry they are not eligible for this protection, and they may be forced to choose between their home and life's savings or medical coverage.70

Additionally, same-sex couples are not eligible to participate in the Family and Medical Leave Act, a federal law passed in 1993 that provides job-loss protection and the right to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for a variety of reasons, including after the birth or adoption of a child, to facilitate recovery from a “serious health condition,” or to care for an immediate family member who is extremely sick. “Family” in the law is defined specifically as being headed by opposite-sex married couples71 or single parents, and excludes those headed by same-sex couples. This prevents same-sex partners from taking care of their families on equal terms with families headed by opposite-sex married couples, and it exposes them to additional vulnerabilities in the workplace. Unlike married opposite-sex couples, same-sex couples have to spend thousands of dollars to create legal contracts that protect their relationships in sickness and death.72

ETHNICITY AND RACE

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, “Race and Hispanic origin (also known as ethnicity) are considered distinct concepts and therefore require separate questions in censuses and surveys. Hispanics or Latinos may be any race.”73

Of the Hispanic same-sex couple households analyzed in this study, 61 percent include couples where both partners identify as Hispanic, and 39 percent are “inter-ethnic” couples in which one partner identifies as Hispanic and the other does not (see Figure 3). Hispanic same-sex couples are approximately one-third more likely to be inter-ethnic than Hispanic married opposite-sex couples (see Figure 4).

![Figure 3: Hispanic same-sex couple households](image1)

![Figure 4: Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households](image2)

Figure 5 illustrates the racial breakdown of individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic. These individuals are about as likely to report “some other race” (49 percent) as they are to report that they are white (47 percent). Two percent report that they are African American, 1 percent is American Indian or Alaska Native, and 1 percent is Asian (for more on how we analyzed data on ethnicity and race from the 2000 Census, see Technical Appendix).

Some 97 percent of all those who checked “some other race” on the 2000 Census also report that they are Hispanic, a fact that, according to Hispanic advocates, indicates the population’s desire to see Hispanic included as a racial category rather than as a question of ethnic origin.74 Responding to considerable pressure from Hispanic advocacy organizations, the Census Bureau abandoned a plan to drop the “some other

---

race” category from the 2010 Census. The Bureau claims that dropping the category will improve the accuracy of the Census’s racial data, but many Hispanic advocates are concerned that eliminating the category would exclude Hispanics who do not identify by standard racial classifications.

These disputes reflect the Census Bureau’s decades-long difficulty with ethnic and racial categories for Hispanic people, which began in 1930 with the introduction of Mexican as a racial category in an attempt to address the growing Mexican population in the southwestern US. Since Census data are used to monitor voting rights and civil rights enforcement, and are often cited by researchers and politicians, the question of Hispanic race and ethnicity is a major concern to Hispanic advocates and policymakers.

COUNTRY/REGION OF ORIGIN

Individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples report similar countries/regions of origin to those in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples. As shown in Figure 6, individuals in Hispanic same-sex and Hispanic married opposite-sex couples are equally likely to report South America (approximately 4 percent), Central America (approximately 5 percent), and Cuba (approximately 4 percent) as their country/region of origin. They also report similar rates of “other Latino” origin, including origin from Spain (approximately 12 percent).

Reported rates of Mexican and Puerto Rican heritage varied slightly between individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples and those in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples, with individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples reporting slightly lower rates of Mexican descent and slightly

75. The countries included in the South American region are: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. The countries included in the Central American region are Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama and El Salvador.
higher rates of Puerto Rican descent than those in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples. Individuals in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples are less likely to report Mexican heritage, but are slightly more likely than those in the other couple types to report Puerto Rican heritage.

**LANGUAGE**

The 2000 Census allowed the householder to report whether Spanish is the primary “household language” (language primarily spoken in the home). The householder could also report whether Spanish is the “primary personal language” (language primarily spoken by the individual) for the householder as well as anyone else who lived in the home, including a spouse or same-sex partner.

As Figure 7 illustrates, Hispanic same-sex couple households are nearly as likely (77 percent) to report Spanish as their primary household language as Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households (81 percent) and Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households (75 percent). However, figure 8 illustrates that individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples are more likely to report Spanish as their primary personal (i.e. individual) language (73 percent) than those in Hispanic same-sex couples (65 percent) and those in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples (63 percent). There is little difference between the Hispanic couple household types we analyzed in both household and personal language use by sex.

![Figure 7: Hispanic couple households reporting Spanish as their primary household language](image1)

![Figure 8: Individuals in Hispanic couples reporting Spanish as their primary personal language](image2)
Differences in reported language use were greater when we analyzed same-sex couple households in more detail (see Figure 9). Same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic are far more likely than Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couple households to report Spanish as their primary household language (94 percent vs. 52 percent). Spanish is the primary household language in only 3 percent of white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households.

As Figure 10 illustrates, Spanish is the primary personal language of 87 percent of individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic. Individuals in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples (32 percent) are far less likely to report Spanish as their primary personal language. Only 2 percent of individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples report speaking Spanish as their primary personal language.
There is little difference in both household and personal language use between individuals in Hispanic female same-sex couples and those in Hispanic male same-sex couples.

When asked to rate their English ability on a four-point scale — ranging from “very well” to “not at all” — non-native English speaking individuals in the Hispanic couples we analyzed report similar responses. Some 32 percent of the individuals in Hispanic couples say that they speak English “very well” (see Figure 11). Analysis by sex revealed few differences in English language speaking ability.

More nuanced trends in English language speaking ability were revealed when we compared individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic to individuals in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples (see Figure 12). Thirty-two percent of non-native English speaking men and 39 percent of non-native English speaking women in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic report that they speak English “very well.”

Non-native English speaking men in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are most likely to report that they do not speak English at all (15 percent). Individuals in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples are the least likely to report that they are non-native English speakers and also are the least likely to report that they speak English “not well” or “not at all.”
Figure 13 illustrates the percentage of men and women in Hispanic couples reporting a disability, which was similar for partnered men and women across all household types.

Individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are about twice as likely to report a disability as individuals in Hispanic inter-ethnic and white non-Hispanic same-sex couples (see Figure 14). Further research is needed to explore why individuals in sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are so much more likely to report having a disability.

![Figure 13: Individuals in Hispanic couples reporting a disability](image)

![Figure 14: Individuals in same-sex couples reporting a disability](image)
HISPANIC SAME-SEX COUPLE FAMILIES

A profile of Ramona Gatto, Arzu Akkus-Gatto, and Marina

Ramona (Salvadoran-American), Arzu (German immigrant) and their daughter, Marina Gatto, have been a family for eight years. They live in San Carlos, Calif., a suburb of San Francisco, in a home that Ramona has owned for more than 15 years. Marina is Ramona’s biological child from a prior marriage, but has grown up considering Arzu as her mother, too.

Epilepsy makes work impossible, so Ramona must depend on Social Security to support herself and her family. Arzu’s immigration status compounds the burdens imposed by Ramona’s disability. As a non-citizen in the US on a student visa, Arzu pays more than U.S. citizens for school, does not qualify for financial aid, and can work legally only under very limited conditions. Ramona describes Arzu’s situation as a catch-22. Although school is a means to be with her family legally, being a student also imposes significant restrictions.

“The financial difficulties that Arzu’s immigration status and school adds are just impossible,” Ramona says. When asked if her family struggles economically, she replies, “Absolutely. We survive on such little money. It’s amazing we somehow manage to get by.”

Ramona elaborates on the complexity of their situation as a same-sex couple family: “Because my disability limits me severely, it would make a huge difference if Arzu could get full-time work. People keep telling us that Arzu should marry a man for citizenship to solve our problems. But, we won’t do it. We won’t give up our dignity and our pride. We would never teach our daughter to lie about who she is, so how could we set a bad example as her parents?”

In an essay written three years ago, when she was 14, Marina demonstrated her appreciation for these values instilled by her mothers: “My moms have taught me that you never combat hate with hate. Instead, educate, love, and lead by example. The greatest difference I think I make, and my family makes, is by just being who we are.”

“One of my moms I have no biological connection to,” Marina says. “I don’t have her eyes, her nose or her hair, but she couldn’t be any more my mom if we were biologically related. She loves me just like moms do.”

The Gattos are a happy, loving family that also confronts multiple obstacles, particularly around Ramona’s health and the toll it takes on their finances.

Ramona was a professional kickboxer who today holds more world titles than any woman fighter in U.S. history. However, the cumulative effect of kickboxing left her disabled, forcing her into retirement at 36. Most notably, she suffered brain trauma that left her with epilepsy. Ramona can have multiple seizures in a single day and thousands of seizures over the course of a year. The brain trauma forces Ramona to rest constantly and has a profound impact on her life.

In an essay written three years ago, when she was 14, Marina demonstrated her appreciation for these values instilled by her mothers: “My moms have taught me that you never combat hate with hate. Instead, educate, love, and lead by example. The greatest difference I think I make, and my family makes, is by just being who we are.”
As illustrated in Figure 15, individuals in same-sex couples report rates of full-time and part-time employment in the previous year (1999) similar to those in the other couples we analyzed. Seventy-one percent of individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples report that they are employed full-time, compared to 74 percent of individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples and 67 percent of individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples. Seventy-six percent of individuals in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples report working full time in 1999.

As illustrated in Figure 16, individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples (10 percent) report working in the public sector at rates comparable to those in Hispanic married opposite-sex (11 percent) and Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples (8 percent). Individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are slightly less likely to work in the public sector than those in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples (10 percent vs. 13 percent).

**Figure 15: Full-time and part-time employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in Hispanic couples</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16: Public sector employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals in Hispanic couples
Individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples report rates of not working similar to those reported by individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex and white non-Hispanic same-sex couples (see Figure 17). The Census does not track unemployment rates like the Department of Labor. Individuals who report working zero hours in the previous year are categorized as “not working.” Twenty-two percent of individuals in same-sex couples report that they did not work in 1999, as do 26 percent of individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples and 19 percent of individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples. Seventeen percent of individuals in cohabiting opposite-sex couples report not working in 1999.

Policy implications: Nondiscrimination ordinances and the impact of anti-same-sex marriage amendments on domestic partner benefits for public sector employees

Census data on public sector employment have important policy implications. First, executive orders or laws banning discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in public sector employment, such as those enacted in 2003 by the governors of Pennsylvania and Kentucky, offer protection for individuals in same-sex couples who work in the public sector. Some 11 states have such executive orders covering sexual orientation. Three of these also include gender identity/expression protections. As of July 2005, 16 states and Washington, DC, have laws that prohibit discrimination in the workplace on the basis of sexual orientation in the private sector as well.76

Second, domestic partner policies that cover municipal or state employees could provide health and other benefits to the partners of many individuals in same-sex couples who work in the public sector. Anti-same-sex marriage state constitutional amendments recently enacted in several states could overturn these policies, causing many same-sex partners and their children to lose their health and other benefits. For example, in late 2004, Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm stripped state employees of domestic partner health insurance, claiming that she was forced to do so because


Michigan voters approved the state's broad anti-same-sex marriage amendment in November 2004. In April 2005, Michigan State Attorney General Mike Cox ruled that domestic partner benefits offered by the city of Kalamazoo to municipal employees also violated the amendment, and city leaders plan to end those benefits at the end of 2005. The attorney general’s ruling likely means the end of domestic partner benefits for public sector employees in Ann Arbor, Washtenaw County, and other localities throughout Michigan. In total, approximately half a million individuals in families led by same-sex or cohabiting opposite-sex couples are now ineligible for domestic partner benefits in Michigan.

HISPANIC SAME-SEX COUPLE FAMILIES
Carolina Cordero Dyer, Claudia Glazer, Carmen and Diego

Carolina Cordero Dyer, 47, a white Latina, and Claudia Glazer, 44, a German immigrant, have been together for six years. They live in Staten Island, N.Y., in a house that Carolina has owned for 20 years. Claudia holds an associate’s degree and Carolina has an MBA in management. As associate director of a nonprofit organization, Carolina directs the finance, administration and business enterprises of its work dedicated to helping people in the criminal justice system. Claudia, who worked for 10 years as a county police dispatcher supervisor in upstate New York, is currently a stay-at-home mother who takes care of their 7-month-old twins, Carmen and Diego.

When Carolina and Claudia decided to have children, they chose in-vitro insemination for Claudia. The process wasn’t easy. It took several attempts and it was difficult getting their insurance company to cover any of the process. They were ultimately successful. As Carolina explains, “Thank god I have domestic partner coverage, because I don’t know what I’d do without it. I’m limited in what employers I can work for and even what state I can work in because of benefits.”

As Claudia’s pregnancy progressed, the couple was terrified by the lack of legal and financial protection for Claudia and their children. Although they would be completely dependent on Carolina while Claudia cared for the children full time, Carolina has no legal obligations

Educational attainment

Individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic report significantly lower levels of educational attainment than those in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples and those in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples (see Figure 18).\(^79\) Only 23 percent of individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic report completing some level of postsecondary (beyond high school) education. In comparison, 66 percent of individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples and 72 percent of individuals in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples report that they completed any education beyond high school.

\(^79\) Educational attainment was averaged for both partners in the same-sex couple, regardless of their race. 2000 Census data do not indicate which individual in the same-sex inter-ethnic couple is Hispanic and which is not.
Figure 19 illustrates that individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are more likely to access post-secondary education (43 percent) than individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples (36 percent). Individuals in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples are least likely to access any education beyond high school.

The fact that individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic report significantly lower educational attainment than those in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples warrants further research as to its impact on the job options and life experience of Hispanic same-sex couples.

Figure 18: Educational attainment of individuals in same-sex couples
As illustrated in Figure 20, Hispanic female same-sex couple households ($43,000) report a median household income comparable to that of Hispanic married ($44,000) opposite-sex couple households. Hispanic male same-sex couple households ($49,800) report the highest median household income relative to the other Hispanic couple households we analyzed. Further analysis revealed an interesting story about these income differences, particularly between male same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic and male same-sex couple households in which one partner is Hispanic and the other is not.

As Figure 21 illustrates, Hispanic inter-ethnic male same-sex couple households report a median annual household income that is significantly higher than any of the other households we analyzed. In fact, Hispanic inter-ethnic male same-sex couple households report a median annual household income that is over $31,000 higher than the median annual household income of male same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic. This difference may be attributable to a variety of factors. For example, men in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples report accessing some form of post-secondary education (e.g. college and graduate school) at a much higher rate than any of the other households we analyzed (see education section for more detail). They are also the least likely family type to report that they are raising children. Consequently, men in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples may have access to higher paying jobs with dual incomes because they have higher levels of post-secondary education. They are also more likely to be working full time, possibly because they are not burdened by the responsibility of raising children.

Income

Figure 20: Median annual household income of Hispanic couple households

80. Income data are collected in exact figures before taxes on the long form of the Census. Median household income was calculated using the household income variable provided by the Census. A weighted median was computed for each of the households we analyzed using the person weight provided by the Census for each household.
This fact may also help to explain the income differences between Hispanic inter-ethnic male and female same-sex couple households, because Hispanic inter-ethnic female same-sex couples are three times more likely to be raising children than Hispanic inter-ethnic male same-sex couples (see parenting section for more details). This finding warrants further research that could focus on additional reasons for this disparity, including the gender gap in pay.

When we separated out the significantly higher income of Hispanic inter-ethnic male same-sex couple households, a far more realistic picture of the income disparity between Hispanic and white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households was revealed.

Male same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic earn more than female same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic, but far less than white non-Hispanic male same-sex couple households (see Figure 21). Female same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic earn over $24,000 less than white non-Hispanic female same-sex couple households, and over $30,000 less than white non-Hispanic male same-sex couple households.

Male same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic also earn significantly less, with a difference of $27,000 between them and white non-Hispanic male same-sex couple households, and a difference of $21,000 between them and white non-Hispanic female same-sex couple households.

Differences in income between Hispanic same-sex couple households and white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households mirror trends in the general population. Hispanic Americans are three times as likely as white non-Hispanic Americans to live in poverty. In 2003, Hispanic families reported a 3 percent decline in real income — from $33,600 in 2002 to $33,000 in 2003 — which was still only 69 percent of the median income of white non-Hispanic families. The 2000 Census found that the median net worth for all Hispanic householders is $9,750 as opposed to $79,400 for white non-Hispanic householders, a difference of almost $70,000.

Figure 21: Median annual household income of same-sex couple households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same-sex couple households</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic inter-ethnic (both partners)</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic inter-ethnic</td>
<td>$59,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (for a definition of statistical significance see Technical Appendix).
82. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (for a definition of statistical significance see Technical Appendix).
Policy implications: The financial impact of discrimination

Anti-LGBT leaders often argue that gay and lesbian people do not need protection from discrimination because they are wealthier than heterosexuals. For example, a pamphlet titled “What’s wrong with ‘gay rights’? You be the judge!” distributed by Colorado for Family Values, claims that “gays:

...have an average household income of more than $55,400 — nearly $23,000 more than average American households, and a whopping $43,000 more than African Americans with 1-3 years of high school education. Gays are three times more likely to be college graduates. Three times more likely to hold professional managerial jobs. Four times more likely to be overseas travelers. Almost four times more likely to earn over $100,000 annually.86

To the contrary, an analysis of General Social Survey data and 1990 Census data found that same-sex couples and gay, lesbian, and bisexual people actually earn about the same or less than opposite-sex married couples. Economist Lee Badgett found that gay and bisexual men earned from 13 percent to 32 percent less than heterosexual men after controlling for factors like education and age. Lesbian and bisexual women earned the same or slightly more than heterosexual women, but because of the gender gap in pay, lesbian couples earned less, on average, than married heterosexual couples.87 2000 Census data on same-sex couples also refute the stereotype that gay and lesbian people are wealthier and more privileged than heterosexuals, particularly for Hispanic same-sex couple households.

The extent of same-sex couples’ economic disadvantage is actually understated because the Census collects pre-tax data on income. Since same-sex couples often pay more in state and federal taxes than their heterosexual peers because they cannot file jointly,88 the true income differences between same-sex couples and opposite-sex married couples are not recorded by the Census. For example, same-sex couples must report domestic partner health insurance as income and pay taxes on it, while married opposite-sex couples are not taxed on spousal health insurance. Furthermore, same-sex partners do not have access to their partners’ pensions or Social Security survivor benefits when one of them dies, and they must pay taxes on assets they inherit even if those assets include a house in which both partners lived and owned jointly for many years. There are 1,138 federal benefits and protections available to married couples that same-sex couples cannot access.89 States, municipalities and private entities also offer many benefits contingent upon marital status.


89. General Accounting Office. (2004, January 23). Report to Senate Majority Leader William Frist. GAO-04-353R. This represents an increase since 1997, when the GAO issued its first report that listed 1,049 federal laws and benefits that only married couples can access.
HISPANIC SAME-SEX COUPLE FAMILIES
A profile of Silvia Evans, Dilcia Molina, Obdulio and Manuel

Dilcia Molina is one of the first immigrants to the US to qualify for political asylum on the basis of sexual orientation. She and her children, Obdulio, 9, and Manuel, 7, received political asylum in 2002 after enduring a severe attack in their home in Honduras. Their attackers stormed the family’s home, insisting that they were going to “change” Dilcia from being a lesbian. When Dilcia went to the police to report the assault, they told her that there was nothing they could do and that she wasn’t safe anywhere in the country.

Dilcia, Obdulio and Mauricio fled to the US and to the home of Dilcia’s girlfriend, Silvia Evans, within 10 days of the attack. Silvia’s salary as an executive at a nonprofit organization suddenly had to support all four of them. Dilcia didn’t have the right to work, and the children needed intensive care to cope with the trauma they had endured. Then, the organization where Silvia worked abruptly closed, and Silvia lost her job. Silvia describes the situation, “We were desperate. I applied for jobs everywhere. I had always done LGBT work, so I’m sure that homophobia was a part of the problem. Plus, I am an immigrant and not having U.S. academic credentials made things much harder. I did whatever work I could get. I cleaned houses, did people’s taxes, sold books at schools, did office temp work, whatever. It was a very, very difficult time for us.”

Dealing with the radical changes of trauma, immigration and job loss has had a profound impact on the family’s life choices. Because she didn’t find other work, Silvia ultimately opened her own business, a botanica in Fredericksburg, Va. She and Dilcia had to sell their home to raise money for the business. Today, the family’s financial situation has improved over those early days. The botanica is now up and running, and Dilcia has since become a psychologist and researcher at La Clinica del Pueblo, a Latino health clinic. Both Obdulio and Manuel are also much better.

Although they have survived the attack on their physical security, the question for them remains of how to create other kinds of security for their family. Silvia and Dilcia have not taken care of adoption, wills and power of attorney, critical components of same-sex couple families’ legal and financial security. Silvia explains, “We’ve not taken as many steps as we would like in terms of formal protections. We’ve been dealing with immediately pressing issues instead. Also, these formal protections require hiring an attorney, which means we would have to invest time and money that we don’t have right now. For our kids to grow up healthy, we’ve focused more on creating a positive social environment around them. Protecting our family right now means just trying to survive. However, we wish we had feasible long-term strategies to protect our family on all counts.”
The U.S. government measures wealth and poverty in terms of income. While there is a significant racial and ethnic gap in income, the gap is even greater when assets are considered. Key among these assets is home ownership. Anti-LGBT political and religious leaders often claim that same-sex relationships are unstable and short-term, and are therefore unworthy of the benefits and protections of marriage. For example, in written testimony submitted to the Wisconsin Legislature in support of the state’s anti-same-sex marriage ballot measure, the Family Research Council claimed that “the vast majority of homosexual relationships are short-lived and transitory.” To the contrary, Census data on home ownership and the residential patterns of same-sex couples provide evidence of stability and commitment.

As Figure 22 illustrates, male and female Hispanic same-sex couple households (46 percent and 50 percent respectively) are more likely to report owning their homes than Hispanic cohabiting (unmarried) opposite-sex couple households (30 percent). Hispanic female same-sex couple households (50 percent) report homeownership rates that are lower than the rate reported by white non-Hispanic female same-sex couple households (73 percent) and Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households (60 percent).

Figure 22: Home ownership rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic couple households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic couple households</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposite-sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

households (60 percent). White non-Hispanic same-sex couple households report the highest home ownership rates: 73 percent for female same-sex couple households and 72 percent for male same-sex couple households.

Even when accounting for differences in age, Hispanic same-sex couple households are like Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households in that they are significantly more likely to own their homes than Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households.91

The Census asks a number of questions that can be used to analyze the residential patterns of Hispanic couple households, including the length of time couples have lived in their current home. Overall, the residence patterns of individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are more like those of Hispanic married opposite-sex couples than those of Hispanic cohabiting (unmarried) opposite-sex couples.

Figure 23 illustrates that individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are significantly more likely than those in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples to report living in the same residence as five years earlier (39 percent vs. 24 percent). Individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples report living in the same residence as five years earlier at a lower rate than those in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples (39 percent vs. 48 percent).

The fact that individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are nearly two-thirds more likely than individuals in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples to report living in the same home as five years earlier is an indicator that their relationships may be more stable and

---

91. This was determined by estimating a logistic regression predicting homeownership from age and type of Hispanic couple household with Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households as the reference category. Indicator variables were created for Hispanic same-sex couple and married opposite-sex couple households. Hispanic male and female same-sex couple and married opposite-sex couple households' t-values were greater than 1.96, significant for a two-tailed test at the 0.05 level. The fact that these coefficients are positive and statistically significant means that Hispanic same-sex couple households are statistically more likely than Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households to report that they own their own homes.
long-term. Even when accounting for age this difference is statistically significant.92

Individuals in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are nearly as likely as those in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples to report living in the same residence as five years earlier, with little difference by sex. As shown in Figure 24, 43 percent of men and women in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic report living in the same residence as five years earlier. Thirty-three percent of women and 31 percent of men in inter-ethnic same-sex couples report living in the same residence as five years earlier, compared to 47 percent of men and 45 percent of women in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples.

Figure 24: Individuals in same-sex couples reporting that they live in the same residence as five years earlier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (both partners)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic inter-ethnic</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. This was determined by estimating a logistic regression predicting residence from age and type of Hispanic couple with cohabiting Hispanic couples as the reference category. Indicator variables were created for Hispanic same-sex and married opposite-sex couples. The same independent variables were used as for homeownership. Hispanic same-sex and married opposite-sex couples’ t-values were greater than 1.96, significant for a two-tailed test at the 0.05 level. The fact that these coefficients are positive and statistically significant means that individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are statistically more likely than individuals in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples to report living in the same residence as five years earlier.
Trinidad Castro, 44, a Mexican immigrant and U.S. citizen, and Johan Demeualenere, 45, Belgian, have been together for 10 years and see themselves as life partners. However, this November marks three consecutive years that they’ve lived apart.

Trinidad and Johan met when Johan came to the US on vacation from his home in Belgium. When the vacation ended, Johan returned to Belgium, while Trinidad remained at home in Santa Cruz, Calif. However, they started writing and phoning each other constantly. After six months, Johan told Trinidad that he wanted to find a legal way to come to the US to be with him permanently.

Johan came to the US on a student visa while he pursued a degree in desktop publishing. After Sept. 11, 2001, however, the Immigration & Naturalization Services (INS) announced that it would become stricter with student visas. During this time, Johan went back to Belgium to visit his mother. Although he was in compliance with visa requirements, the U.S. Consulate in Belgium chose not to renew his visa. Johan had no way to return to his partner in the US.

Three years and more than $250,000 later, the couple is still struggling to overcome immigration obstacles to be together. Because Trinidad and Johan already had an antiques business, the most viable option seemed to be to pursue a trader’s visa.

“Being a bi-national gay couple absolutely makes us struggle financially,” says Trinidad. “It's not ‘can we pay the bills?’ but ‘how can we invest in the business sufficiently so that INS will grant Johan a trader's visa?’ If we could marry, we wouldn’t be dealing with any of this. Johan would automatically gain citizenship rights through me.”

Being apart imposes a huge burden on the couple, but Trinidad running the business in the US single-handedly also takes an enormous toll. Trinidad has a full-time job in addition to his constant work to support their business.

Even though Trinidad hasn’t lived in Mexico since he was a child, the couple is considering moving there if Johan doesn’t qualify for a visa. Trinidad would commute back and forth to the US for work.

“Relocating to Mexico and commuting would mean that we’d basically have to start over from scratch,” Trinidad explains. “But, if we become any more desperate than we already are, even an imperfect option would become a viable consideration. Johan and I have spent the last decade building our lives around our commitment to each other, and we’re not going to let homophobic immigration policy ruin all that we’ve built.”
The 2000 Census documents that there are Hispanic same-sex couple households in virtually every state, with most concentrated in Arizona, California, Florida, Texas and the New York City metropolitan area (see Figure 25). This pattern mirrors that of the Hispanic population overall, where, according to the 2000 Census, over half of the Hispanic population lives in two states, California and Texas, and over three-fourths live in seven states: California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, Arizona and New

**Figure 25: Hispanic same-sex couple households in the United States**

**Key:**
1 dot=10 Hispanic same-sex couple households

Map by Lopez & Cheung, Inc.
Data: 2000 U.S. Census, Summary File 4
Jersey. Hispanic same-sex couples live where most Hispanic couples live, and are part of their respective communities, sending their children to local schools and dealing with the same issues other Hispanic households face.

The top 10 metropolitan areas with the highest number of Hispanic same-sex couple households are Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County, CA; New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA; Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL; San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA; Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI; Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX; Dallas-Fort Worth, TX; Phoenix-Mesa, AZ; San Diego, CA; and San Antonio, TX (see Figure 26).

The top 10 metropolitan areas with the highest proportion of Hispanic same-sex couple households among all same-sex couple households are concentrated in the Southwest, California and Washington state. In fact, six out of the 10 are located in Texas, which has important policy implications. In November 2005, Texans will vote on a ballot measure prohibiting same-sex marriage. Texas already passed a law in 2003 that not

---

**Figure 26: Top 10 metropolitan areas by number and share of Hispanic same-sex couple households in the United States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Name</th>
<th>Total Number of Hispanic Same-Sex Couple Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange</td>
<td>13,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose</td>
<td>3,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL</td>
<td>2,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>1,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa, AZ</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>1,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston-Galveston-Brazoria, TX</td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chicago-Gary-Kenosha, IL-IN-WI</td>
<td>3,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-CT-PA</td>
<td>9,786 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Miami-Fort Lauderdale, FL</td>
<td>4,158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93. The Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area (CMSA) for New York, NY, an area defined by the Office of Management and Budget as a federal statistical standard, also includes Long Island and parts of New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania. The New York, NY CMSA does not include Philadelphia.
only prohibits same-sex marriage, but also may prohibit other forms of partner recognition, including civil unions and domestic partnerships. ⁹⁴

The metropolitan areas outside of Texas with the highest proportion of Hispanic same-sex couple households over all same-sex couple households include Las Cruces, New Mexico; Yuma, Arizona; Visalia-Tulare-Porterville, California; and Yakima, WA (see Figure 27). The map below indicates that 93.7 percent of all same-sex couple households in the Laredo, TX area are Hispanic same-sex couple households, and so on for the other areas.

Figure 27: Top 10 metropolitan areas by proportion of Hispanic same-sex couple households among all same-sex couple households in the United States

Key:
Metropolitan area name: Proportion of Hispanic same-sex couple households among all same-sex couple households

Map by Lopez & Cheung, Inc.
Data: 2000 U.S. Census, Summary File 4

Magdalena Trujillo, 48, and Alicia Chavez, 51, are a Mexican-American lesbian couple living in San Antonio, Texas. Magdalena works for the San Antonio Department of Health as a health program specialist, where she has conducted fieldwork on communicative diseases for the last 18 years. For the past 23 years, Alicia has worked as a licensed vocational nurse (LVN) with a pediatric doctor. The women found each other late in life, but today, make their lives together while remaining devoted mothers and grandmothers.

Alicia has three grown children — a son who is 30, a daughter who is 28 and a son who is 26 — and 13 grandchildren ranging from three months to 13 years old. Her children are from a 17-year marriage to her then-husband. Her sexuality was not a factor in their divorce. Today, Alicia has the support of her whole family — her children, grandchildren, and even her mother.

Magdalena has a different kind of family story. She co-parented her ex-girlfriend’s son from the time he was 8 years old.

“Sometimes I’m referred to as the ‘godmother’ or the ‘stepmother’ to distinguish me from his birth mother. Sometimes we both just say, ‘Yes, we are his mothers.’ For me, it’s simple. I just call him my son,” she says.

When Magdalena and her ex-girlfriend separated, they worked through their differences to continue their family dynamic.

“A lot of divorced parents have animosity between each other, but we don’t want to be like that. We want to be grandparents and role models for whatever our son and his wife go through,” Magdalena explains. “They are my family, and my family comes first.”

Today, Magdalena and her ex-girlfriend are jointly the grandparents to their son’s daughter and the son he has on the way.

“My current family is my partner, my partner’s family, my ex, my son, his wife and of course my grandchildren,” she says. “Latino culture is very family-oriented, so being together as lesbians, parents, and grandparents is just a natural part of our lives.”

Magdalena with her ex-partner Yolanda, and their family (Alicia not pictured.)
Back (L–R): Ky (the wife of their son Jose Miguel), Jose Miguel, and Jackie (Ky’s mother)
Front (L–R): Magdalena, Elisa (Jose Miguel and Ky’s daughter), Yolanda
Immigration and citizenship status

Immigration policy is consistently cited as a top concern for Hispanic communities nationwide.\(^{95}\) Our analysis of 2000 Census data indicates that immigration issues are also a significant factor in the lives of Hispanic same-sex couples and their children.

As Figure 28 illustrates, individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are 10 times as likely as individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples to report that they were born outside of the US (51 percent vs. 5 percent). Fifty-seven percent of individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples and 45 percent of individuals in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples also report that they are foreign born.

---

As illustrated in Figure 29, individuals in Hispanic same-sex couples are 15 times as likely as individuals in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples to report not being U.S. citizens (30 percent vs. 2 percent). Individuals in Hispanic married opposite-sex couples (32 percent) and individuals in Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples (29 percent) report similar rates of not being U.S. citizens.

Figure 30 further illustrates how immigration issues disproportionately affect same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic compared to Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples and white non-Hispanic same-sex couples. These data are also broken down by sex.

Men and women in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are far more likely to report not being U.S. citizens than men and women in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples. In fact, men in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are about 17 times more likely than men in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples and over six times more likely than men in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples, to report not being U.S. citizens. More than half (51 percent) of men in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic report not being U.S. citizens, compared to only 3 percent of men in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples and 8 percent of men in Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples.

Though women in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic report not being U.S. citizens at a lower rate than men in same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic (38 percent vs. 51 percent), the rate is still significantly higher than the rate reported by the partnered men and women in the other same-sex couple households we analyzed.

Policy implications: Treating same-sex partners the same as opposite-sex married spouses for the purposes of immigration rights and benefits

As illustrated by data from the 2000 Census, Hispanic couples, gay and straight, are affected by citizenship status and resulting immigration issues. However, unlike Hispanic opposite-sex couples who are able to legally marry, existing anti-same-sex marriage laws and the federal Defense of Marriage Act prevent same-sex couples in which only one partner is a citizen from sponsoring their non-citizen partner for immigration purposes.

Fifteen countries, including Canada, Denmark, Israel, South Africa, France and the United Kingdom, recognize same-sex couples for the purposes of immigration. Even though U.S. immigration policy is largely based on the principle of “family unification,” which allows U.S. citizens and legal permanent residents to sponsor their spouses
(and other immediate family members) for immigration purposes, same-sex partners of U.S. citizens and permanent residents are not considered “spouses,” and cannot be sponsored by their partners for family-based immigration. This places many same-sex, bi-national couples in limbo, forcing them to find ways to stay together illegally and live in fear of deportation. Many same-sex couples are forced to move to Canada or elsewhere to stay together.

In the summer of 2005, the Uniting American Families Act (S.1278), formerly known as the Permanent Partners Immigration Act, was introduced in Congress by Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-VT). The bill would add “permanent partner” to the federal Immigration and Nationality Act, enabling same-sex domestic partners to be treated the same as opposite-sex married spouses for purposes of immigration rights and benefits. The bill defines permanent partner as an individual who is 18 years or older, unmarried and in a financially interdependent, committed, lifelong intimate relationship with another individual 18 years or older.

Access to the institution of marriage recognized by both the federal and state governments would also allow immigration rights for bi-national same-sex couples, as well as thousands of other benefits and protections. Proposed federal and state anti-same-sex marriage constitutional amendments further enshrine this discrimination in immigration and many other family policies.

HISPANIC SAME-SEX COUPLE FAMILIES

A profile of “Juan” and “Geraldo”

“Juan,” 34, grew up in Matamoros, Mexico, a town across the border from Brownsville, Texas. He feared that coming out as gay in Matamoros would shame his parents and would cause them to disown him. The barrage of homophobic jibes he experienced from close family friends also made him afraid. Juan was so desperate to live safely and openly as a gay man that he decided to move to the US, which he perceived to be accepting of homosexuality.

“It’s not that I wanted to leave my family or my community, but it seemed like the only way to protect myself, my parents, and our relationship with each other,” he says.

Although he migrated to live as an openly gay man, the option that seemed best to make his status in the US legal was to marry an American female friend. The two were married for nine years. All of their legal and financial arrangements were held jointly, from their apartment lease to their bank accounts.
"We made so many concessions based on my need to be in the US legally. We were always terrified of the INS canceling my paperwork. We lived in constant fear," says Juan, who has since divorced. Yet, due to his marriage, he remains a legal resident, and one who will become a U.S. citizen next year.

Upon his arrival in the US, Juan sought support as a Latino immigrant and gay man. This led him to the Asociación de Latino Men for Action (ALMA), where he found the support he needed. ALMA was a particularly important reinforcement because Juan discovered the US was not as free of homophobia and other forms of discrimination as he dreamt it would be. For instance, he is in a long-term relationship with "Geraldo," 36, a Puerto Rican American. Yet, Juan has been frustrated to experience the many ways that his relationship with Geraldo has less legal recognition than did his marriage.

"I have experienced the full spectrum of what a community organization like ALMA offers," he says. "When I first came to the US, I desperately needed its assistance. Today, I'm giving back what I was given when I first came here."

According to the 2000 Census many Hispanic same-sex couples are raising children under the age of 18, including biological and nonbiological children. The Census defines biological children as children who are the "natural born" offspring of the householder in the same-sex unmarried partner household. The Census defines nonbiological children as a) blood relatives of the householder, such as a niece, nephew, or grandchild, or b) foster children or adopted children who are not a blood relation to the householder.

As illustrated in Figure 31, more than half (54 percent) of Hispanic female same-sex couples report raising at least one child under the age of 18 compared to 70 percent of Hispanic married and 59 percent of Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couples. Hispanic male same-sex couples (41 percent)
are least likely to report that they are raising children.\footnote{Gates and Ost describe a measurement error in 2000 Census data resulting from opposite-sex married couples inadvertently checking the incorrect sex of one of the partners in the household. Though this error is small, it could impact some of the characteristics of same-sex couple households. For example, estimates of parenting could be overstated as a result of this measurement error because opposite-sex couples, in general, are more likely to have children. Gates and Ost suggest that the magnitude of the error is not easy to ascertain, but provide an example of its potential impact on parenting rates. While national, unadjusted figures show that 28.2 percent of same-sex couples are raising children, a more accurate estimate that accounts for this measurement error is 27.5 percent, a slight difference of less than 1 percent. The estimates of parenting in this study do not adjust for this form of error and may therefore slightly overstate this characteristic. See Gates, G.J. & Ost, J. (2004). The gay and lesbian atlas. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press. p. 13-15.}

A more accurate picture of parenting in Hispanic same-sex couples is revealed when Hispanic inter-ethnic same-sex couples are compared to same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic. Figure 32 illustrates that male same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic (58 percent) are raising children at more than three times the rate reported by white non-Hispanic male same-sex couples (19 percent).\footnote{This difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (for a definition of statistical significance see Technical Appendix).} Hispanic-interethnic male same-sex couples report the lowest rates of raising children (16 percent). Female same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are raising children at the highest rate (66 percent), followed by Hispanic inter-ethnic female same-sex couples (35 percent) and white non-Hispanic female same-sex couples (32 percent).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure32.png}
\caption{Same-sex couples raising at least one child under the age of 18}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Biological and nonbiological children under age 18 being raised by same-sex couples}
\end{figure}
Figure 33 illustrates parenting rates by type of child, biological or nonbiological. We see similarities by sex, with female same-sex couples parenting at generally higher rates than male same-sex couples. Female same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic are most likely to be raising biological children (51 percent), followed by male same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic (49 percent), and inter-ethnic Hispanic female same-sex couples (29 percent). Male same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic (49 percent) are almost three times more likely than white non-Hispanic male same-sex couples (17 percent) and almost four times more likely than Hispanic inter-ethnic male same-sex couples (13 percent) to report raising a biological child.

As illustrated in Figure 34, Hispanic same-sex couples report raising non-biological children at similar rates to Hispanic married opposite-sex couples. Non-biological children can include adopted children, foster children, grandchildren, nephews, and nieces (who are biologically related to the householder who is their grandparent, aunt or uncle but are not technically biological children of the householder).

Policy implications: Anti-gay parenting and adoption laws in the US

Political and religious leaders who oppose same-sex marriage often argue against allowing gay and lesbian people to adopt children. For example, in January 2003 Focus on the Family ran a full-page ad in the Boston Globe warning that gay and lesbian parenting is “a massive, untested social experiment with coming generations of children.” The Family Research Council argues that “the homosexual lifestyle is inconsistent with the proper raising of children,” and that only a “small minority of homosexual couples choose to raise children.” At the 2004 Republican National Convention, Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney said, “Because every child deserves a mother and a father …marriage should be between a man and a woman.”

Six states now prohibit or restrict foster and/or adoptive parenting by gay and lesbian people or same-sex couples, and courts around the country also take sexual orienta-
Utah prohibits adoption by “cohabiting” unmarried couples, which applies to same-sex couples in Utah and 48 other states. Mississippi bans “same-sex couples” from adopting. While Arkansas does not explicitly prohibit gay men, lesbians and bisexuals from adopting, since 1999 its Child Welfare Agency Review Board has banned them from foster parenting. Adoption law in North Dakota allows agencies that receive state contracts and licenses to refuse to place children with prospective parents whom they object to on religious grounds, including those who are gay, lesbian or bisexual. Oklahoma passed an anti-gay adoption law banning the recognition of an adoption by more than one individual of the same sex from any other state or foreign jurisdiction in May 2004.\footnote{Cahill, S., Ellen, M., & Tobias, S. (2002). Family policy: Issues affecting gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender families. New York: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute. pp. 73-77. Retrieved August 17, 2005, from http://www.thetaskforce.org/reslibrary/familypolicy.cfm}

Due in part to Anita Bryant’s “Save Our Children” campaign, which overthrew a sexual orientation-inclusive nondiscrimination law in Miami-Dade County in 1977, adoption by “homosexuals” has been explicitly banned since 1977 in Florida. Given that the Miami-Ft. Lauderdale metropolitan area ranks third among metropolitan areas with the largest number of Hispanic same-sex couple households, the policy implications of Census data on parenting are extremely important.

Following the success of 13 anti-same-sex marriage state constitutional amendment ballot measures in 2004, anti-LGBT political and religious leaders have signaled their intent to pursue anti-gay parenting and adoption laws, which could threaten the integrity of hundreds of thousands of same-sex couple families with children, including those that are Hispanic. In 2005, anti-gay parenting legislation was proposed but either died in committee or was defeated in one chamber of the legislatures in six states — Arkansas,\footnote{HB 1119 (2005) would have banned adoption by individuals who are “cohabiting,” including same-sex partners. The bill passed in the state House of Representatives 78-13, but died in a state Senate committee.} Alabama,\footnote{SB 57 (2005) would have amended state adoption law so that “no adult person may adopt a minor if the adult person is a homosexual.” The bill died in a state Senate committee.} Indiana,\footnote{SB 580 (2005) would have mandated that “only a married couple that consists of individuals of the opposite sex are eligible to adopt.” SB 585 (2005) would have banned adoption and foster parenting by “homosexuals.” Both bills died in a state Senate committee.} Oregon,\footnote{SB 1924/HB 2230 would have banned foster care placement with “homosexuals” or in homes with homosexuals in them. All of these bills died in committee.} Tennessee,\footnote{Am. 60 to SB 6 would have banned “homosexuals” and “bisexuals” from being foster parents. The bill died in committee.} and Texas\footnote{HB 2921 passed in the state House of Representatives 71-24 but died in a state Senate committee.} (the bill proposed in Texas is one of a few that also explicitly banned adoption by “bisexuals”). Legislation was also proposed in Virginia\footnote{HB 2401 (2005) would have amended adoption law, mandating preference for placing children in married-couple households over unmarried or same-sex couple households. The bill died in committee.} that would have required courts to inquire whether a prospective adoptive parent is gay or lesbian. The bill passed in the state House of Representatives but died in a state Senate committee.

Adoptions that codify the parental relationship of both parents are essential to ensuring the rights and security of the children of same-sex couples. When a child is not biologically related to either parent, a joint adoption allows both parents to simul-
taneously adopt a child. Joint adoption is currently allowed in the District of Columbia, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York and Vermont, and it has also been granted at the trial court level in a number of jurisdictions. A second-parent adoption allows the biological or adoptive parent to retain his or her parental rights while consenting to the adoption of the child by his or her partner. Though courts in 20 states have permitted second-parent adoptions by same-sex partners, and laws in three states explicitly permit them, the children of same-sex couples in most states are still faced with the emotional and economic insecurity of not having their relationship to their second father or mother legally recognized. In fact, in four states courts have ruled that the state’s law does not permit second-parent or stepparent adoptions by same-sex partners.

Equitable adoption and parenting laws are important to same-sex couple families because if parents have no legal relationship to their children, they cannot, for example, include them in their health insurance coverage or make decisions about how they will be cared for if one parent dies or the couple separates. Additionally, if the child of a same-sex couple becomes sick, the legal parent’s partner may be unable to authorize medical treatment, or could even be denied hospital visitation rights.

Laws that restrict gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, same-sex couples, or cohabiting opposite-sex couples from adopting or foster parenting also harm children in need of a good home. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, there are over 100,000 children waiting to be adopted nationwide, and over 10,000 of them are Hispanic. Approximately 523,000 children are currently in foster care. Seventeen percent of children in foster care are Hispanic, equaling their proportion of all children in the United States. Sadly, many children age into adulthood while in foster care, and are more likely to have emotional problems, delinquency, substance abuse, and academic problems. This is not surprising given that some children in foster care live in 20 or more homes by the time they are 18 years old.

The vast majority of medical and mental health professional organizations, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, the National Association of Social Workers and the American Psychological Association (APA), recognize that there is no inherent difference in the social functioning and emotional health of children raised by same-sex couples, gay men, or lesbians. According to the APA, “not a single study has

Hispanic Same-Sex Couple Families

A profile of Alicia Vega and Maria Cuevas

After three years together, Alicia Vega, 35, Mexican-American, and Maria Cuevas, 38, Puerto Rican-American, have begun planning to have a child. They're methodically developing a plan for every contingency that a lesbian family can encounter. Alicia knows firsthand the risk involved for lesbian families without legal rights; she’s been burned before. When Alicia and her prior girlfriend separated, Alicia wanted to continue her relationship with her ex-girlfriend’s son, whom she helped raise from his birth through his 7th birthday. Yet, when the couple separated, her ex-girlfriend wouldn’t allow Alicia to see the boy. The former partner occasionally tells Alicia that she can spend time with the boy, only to back out at the last minute. Alicia spent a year trying to find a lawyer who would take her case to gain visitation rights.

“Everyone told me that I had no rights to the child that I’d helped raise,” she says. To date, she’s been unsuccessful in obtaining visitation rights to the boy she considers her stepson.

Alicia is happy to now be planning a family with Maria, but they face considerable financial burdens. They’d like for one of them to be a stay-at-home mom. As domestic partners, both Maria’s job as an underwriting manager and Alicia’s job as a social worker would permit them to cover the other’s health insurance. However, they don’t know if they can manage; domestic partner benefits are taxed as additional income on federal and state taxes, which they cannot afford. In addition, insemination costs and the legal steps the couple would need to take to protect their family would all be significant out-of-pocket expenses.

Today, Alicia and Maria’s greatest priority is how to plan for second-parent adoption. They live in Bowling Brook, a suburb of Chicago.
where the district’s predominantly conservative judges are less likely to rule in favor of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) families.

“LGBT family experts are telling us to plan to have our baby within the Chicago city limits. If we don’t, we run the risk that conservative judges in our area will prevent the second-parent adoption … Planning our child’s birth is focused on something that shouldn’t even be a consideration — legal jurisdiction,” Alicia says.

Alicia and Maria have figured out which city hospital is closest to their home so they can rush over the city border as soon as labor begins. They are fearful of taking such a gamble for adoption rights but also fearful of the health implications of not being close to a hospital, especially should complications arise. To ensure their family’s safety, the couple is thinking of relocating to Alicia’s parents’ house within the city limits around the time of the birth.

Alicia Vega (L) and Maria Cuevas at their wedding on August 6, 2004, in Oakbrook, Ill.
**HISPANIC SAME-SEX COUPLE FAMILIES**

**A profile of The Wooley-Larrea family**

“I came here with my parents and brothers and sisters, as a refugee from Cuba, when I was a child. I grew up in a family where family comes first. Love, loyalty, support were a part of the fabric of our daily lives. It gave me the confidence that every child should have and that is what we want to give to our children. I don’t want my children growing up with a feeling of insecurity or uncertainly. I don’t want them to have parents who are living in fear, in legal limbo, or are insecure about the safety of their lives.”

—Maria Woolley-Larrea

Stephanie, an English teacher, and Maria, a family court clinical psychologist, live in South Florida. When the two women met nine years ago they knew with certainty that they wanted to create a family together and have children. Stephanie wanted two; Maria wanted four. Two and one-half years ago they had triplets – Tobie, Brennen and Amelia. Stephanie is the birth mother.

Maria and Stephanie live in Florida, the only state to absolutely prohibit “homosexuals” from adopting children. When first contemplating a family and then when the children were born, they felt grave concern for the security of their children.

“I didn’t want to keep waking up every morning with a knot of dread in my stomach,” Maria said. “What if something happened to one of us? Would our children be taken away? What if Stephanie died? Would I be declared a biological stranger by the court and my own children sent off into foster care?”

These were real, terrifying, and haunting concerns. The family decided to relocate to Massachusetts, where they married and Maria formally adopted her children. However, unable to secure work in Massachusetts after nearly a year of searching, they returned to their home community in Miami.

The whole process of making their family secure and protecting their children cost them tens of thousands of dollars that heterosexual families do not have to spend. When asked how they were able to afford all these expenses, the two women, clearly people of modest means, said they had cashed-in Maria’s retirement fund.

Maria said, “I would have preferred to have kept it for our kids’ education and for our future, but we really had no choice if we wanted to keep our family safe. I work with family court. I see every day the terrible things that can happen.”

Stephanie holding Brennen, and Maria, with Amelia and Tobie in front.
“Public assistance,” as measured in the 2000 Census, includes the use of general assistance and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) in 1999, commonly referred to as welfare. It does not include Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or separate payments received for hospital or other medical care.

As illustrated in Figure 35, Hispanic female same-sex couple households (8 percent) and Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households (10 percent) are more likely to report that they receive public assistance than Hispanic male same-sex couple households (5 percent) and Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households (4 percent).

Among same-sex couple household types, female same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic receive public assistance at a much higher rate (10 percent) than white non-Hispanic female same-sex couple households (3 percent) and Hispanic inter-ethnic female same-sex couple households (6 percent) (see figure 36). Census data do not explain why female same-sex couple households in which both...
partners are Hispanic report receiving public assistance at a higher rate. This finding may be due to the fact that they also report the lowest median annual household income, and are also more likely to be parenting children than other same-sex couple households (see income and parenting sections for more details). Given that a low income and the presence of children are main TANF eligibility requirements, female same-sex couple households in which both partners are Hispanic are more likely to be eligible for such assistance.

Policy implications: Heterosexual marriage promotion, fatherhood promotion and the faith-based initiative

The Bush-Cheney administration has promoted heterosexual marriage, fatherhood and an increased role of faith-based service providers as key components of welfare reform and solutions to long-term poverty. These policies pose a particular threat to low-income same-sex couples raising children, and especially those receiving public assistance.

Heterosexual marriage and fatherhood promotion programs, on which the Bush administration has tried to spend at least $1.6 billion over five years,125 assume that all low-income single parents are heterosexual and/or desire to marry a person of the opposite sex. Of course, this leaves out lesbians, gay men and many bisexuals. Some key welfare policymakers appointed by President George W. Bush, such as Wade Horn and Andrew Bush of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, have recently advocated policies that privilege married opposite-sex couples and penalize other kinds of families.126

Heterosexual marriage promotion policies devote limited funds toward activities of questionable value that fail to acknowledge that there are people on welfare who are unable to marry because of official, discriminatory public laws. In nine states, cash bonuses or other marriage incentives are offered to married low-income couples.127 Lesbians and gay men on welfare are not eligible. Fatherhood initiatives, which argue that children who are not raised by a married mother and father are disadvantaged relative to their peers, stigmatize lesbian and gay couple families, especially lesbian-headed families. Some proposals — such as a ban on donor insemination of unmarried women — may make it harder for same-sex couple families to form in the first place. Compulsory paternity establishment and child support cooperation could force a lesbian or bisexual woman on welfare to allow her child’s biological father to co-parent in order to be eligible for benefits. Women who do not or cannot establish paternity risk a 25 percent cut in benefits, and even termination of all assistance. And this policy involves a basic double standard: there is no requirement that a single father, gay or straight, with a child establish “maternity” or any other parental obligation on penalty of having his Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits decreased or terminated.

Some key welfare policymakers appointed by President George W. Bush have recently advocated policies that privilege married opposite-sex couples and penalize other kinds of families.

Other proposals — such as the promotion of adoption as the first option for children born out-of-wedlock\textsuperscript{128} — could threaten families headed by lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people. While programs intended to help low-income families achieve and maintain stable family arrangements are appropriate and laudable, these proposals should be re-conceptualized to promote stable families and responsible parenthood by supporting the involvement of two, loving parents regardless of gender, and providing women the skills and education necessary to provide for their children as single parents. Millions of single mother families and lesbian couple families with children exist in the United States and deserve fair treatment under the social safety net. They are not intrinsically pathological, as those promoting heterosexual marriage and fatherhood as solutions to poverty often claim, either explicitly or implicitly.

Faith-based initiatives involve the shifting of public funds for social services formerly provided by a government agency or a secular nonprofit group to sectarian religious organizations. Under the 1996 welfare reform law, religious organizations are explicitly permitted to discriminate on the basis of religion, even with TANF funds. Unfortunately, experience demonstrates that religion-based discrimination can be a proxy for discrimination based on sexual orientation. In Kentucky and Georgia, lesbian employees have lost human service jobs under the faith-based initiative.\textsuperscript{129} Low-income same-sex couple families could also experience discrimination, as well as evangelization, when they try to access services.

The faith-based initiative proposals supported by the Bush administration threaten to make such discrimination against LGBT people by religious-based providers explicitly legal. An internal Salvation Army document, exposed in 2001, stated that the White House had made a “firm commitment” to the Salvation Army to issue a regulation protecting such charities from state and city laws banning sexual orientation discrimination.\textsuperscript{130} Although the White House denied knowledge of the Salvation Army deal, President Bush explicitly called on Congress in 2003 to allow religious entities to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation in hiring and to ignore local nondiscrimination laws, arguing that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 allows religious entities to discriminate in hiring on the basis of sexual orientation, even if they are receiving federal funds. The Bush-Cheney administration characterized this anti-gay discrimination with tax dollars as religious freedom.


According to the U.S. Department of Defense, 9.9 percent of all active-duty enlisted personnel and 4.7 percent of active-duty officers are Hispanic. Additionally, Hispanics make up 9.1 percent of enlisted personnel and 4.3 percent of officers in the reserves. Hispanic same-sex couples also include many individuals who report military service, and they are among the many lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in the military who risk their lives to fight for a country in which they do not have equal rights and protections.

As illustrated in Figure 37, Hispanic women in same-sex couple serve at six times the rate of Hispanic women living with a husband or cohabiting with a male partner. Hispanic men in same-sex couples serve at about half the rate of Hispanic men married to a woman (9 percent vs. 16 percent) and at about the same rate of Hispanic men cohabiting with a woman (10 percent). Overall, according to the 2000 Census, approximately 1 percent of women and 25 percent of men nationwide are veterans.

Figure 37: Men and women in Hispanic couples reporting military service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same-sex Individuals in Hispanic couples</th>
<th>Opposite-sex Individuals in Hispanic couples</th>
<th>National average regardless of race or ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

133. Six percent of Hispanic women in same-sex couples report military service compared to just 1 percent of Hispanic married women. This difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level (for a definition of statistical significance see Technical Appendix).
134. The 2000 Census counted approximately 281.4 million Americans. Approximately 108.2 million are women age 18 and over (See U.S. Census Bureau. (2001, October 3).
Six percent of women in Hispanic same-sex couples report military service, a higher rate than married Hispanic women. However, figure 38 shows that they serve at a lower rate than white non-Hispanic women in same-sex couples (9 percent). Hispanic men in same-sex couples are also less likely to report military service than white non-Hispanic men in same-sex couples (9 percent vs. 18 percent).

Policy implications: “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”

Since Hispanic women in same-sex couples serve in the military at disproportionately higher rates than most other women, discriminatory military policies also affect the Hispanic community at a disproportionate rate. For example, “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” — which bans openly lesbian, gay and bisexual people from serving — has been used to discharge Hispanic women from the military at a higher rate than other groups. In fact, Hispanic women are discharged under “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” at two times the rate that they serve in the military. Although Hispanic women make up just 0.31 percent of servicemembers, they comprise 0.60 percent of those discharged under the policy.135

Lesbian, gay and bisexual military personnel and veterans suffer from discriminatory military policies, especially when military discharges lead to loss of employment, pay and benefits. During the first 10 years of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” more than 10,000 service members have been discharged at an estimated cost of $1.2 billion in taxpayer dollars.136 Even when lesbian, gay and bisexual servicemembers are able to hide their sexual orientation and avoid being discharged, discriminatory military policy still prevents their same-sex partners from accessing a myriad of veterans' benefits because they are not legally married. Discrimination against these veterans continues throughout their lives.

A growing majority of Americans supports allowing gays and lesbians to serve openly in the U.S. military. According to a poll conducted in July 2005 by the Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life and the Pew Research Center, 58 percent of Americans


135. Service Members Legal Defense Network. (2003, March 25). Conduct unbecoming: The ninth annual report on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Don’t Pursue, Don’t Harass.” Washington, DC: Servicemembers Legal Defense Network. Retrieved August 17, 2005, from http://www.sldn.org/binary-data/SLDN_ARTICLES/pdf_file/837.pdf; Discharge data are for fiscal year 2001. People can be discharged under “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” even if they are not gay or lesbian. This report suggests that women are disproportionately affected by the policy because men accuse women who refuse unwanted sexual advances of being lesbians, or because the women are successful and some men do not want to serve under them.

support lifting the ban, an increase from 52 percent in 1994. The poll also found that those who strongly oppose gays and lesbians serving openly fell from 26 percent in 1994 to just 15 percent in 2005. Support for lifting the ban is even high regardless of religious affiliation. The poll found that along with a solid majority of secular Americans (72 percent), 72 percent of white Catholics and 63 percent of white mainline Protestants believe that gays and lesbians should be allowed to serve openly in the military.

In the face of documented, widespread anti-LGBT harassment and violence, as well as the challenges presented by “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” data from the 2000 Census indicate that Hispanic same-sex partners, particularly women, have chosen to serve their country in the military at high rates. Revoking “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” would allow them and their families to enjoy the benefits they deserve as servicemembers and veterans. They would no longer have to serve in fear of being exposed and losing their careers and incomes.

### Comparing Black and Hispanic Same-Sex Couples

**Men and women in same-sex couples reporting military service**

![Graph comparing men and women in same-sex couples reporting military service.](chart)

*Source: Lopez & Cheung, Inc., analysis of 2000 Census data – PUMS 5 percent sample. Black same-sex couples are defined as couples in which at least one partner is black.


HISPANIC SAME-SEX COUPLE FAMILIES
Braulio Carvajal Veloz and Miguel Hernandez Rodriguez

Braulio “Brad” Carvajal Veloz, 57, and Miguel “Mike” Hernandez Rodriguez, 46, both Mexican-American, have been together for 27 years. For the last 13 years, they’ve lived in Mike’s hometown of San Antonio, Texas. As youngsters, both men’s families received public assistance; Brad and Mike grew up to become adults with deep commitments to giving back to their country through public service.

Brad was drafted and then enlisted in the U.S. Navy when he was 18, serving from 1967 to 1969. He describes his experience in the Navy as “great.”

“I really think I would have stayed in the Navy if it wasn’t for its homophobic policies,” he says. “But I didn’t want to be kicked out, so I chose to leave at the end of my term.”

Brad went on to work for the federal government for 32 years, and today is a retired civil servant. Mike has worked for the federal government for the past 16 years. Because they are not legally married, Mike and Brad have no legal entitleent to each other’s retirement benefits. Brad, who was previously married, is frustrated by how differently his two relationships have been treated.

“If I were to die tomorrow, my partner of 27 years would not be eligible for any portion of my retirement,” he says. “My earnings would just go back into the general pot, rather than going to the well-being of my surviving partner.”

Brad and Mike have taken steps to protect their relationship in as many ways possible. They have spoken with both of their families about their wishes in case of emergency. They have invested considerable time and money on attorneys’ fees to establish living wills, medical directives and powers of attorney.

“We feel pretty much protected in our relationship because we’ve literally done all we can, but we know the limitations of these steps compared with all of the benefits provided by marriage, so there’s always a lingering feeling of uncertainty,” Brad says.
As of October 2005, 17 states have passed anti-same-sex marriage constitutional amendments. A number of states, including Arizona, California, Florida, and Texas, which are among the states with the highest population of Hispanic same-sex couple households, are expecting to vote on similar amendments before the end of 2006. During a local television news broadcast in Austin, Texas, a lobbyist named David Contreras claimed to be advocating for the state’s anti-same-sex ballot measure on behalf of Hispanics, stating, “It’s very important to us as Hispanics, Latinos, when issues pertain to the family, we are for traditional family values.” Contreras’ statement ignores the existence of Hispanic lesbian, gay or bisexual people who will be affected by the proposed ballot measure, and it implies that “family values” somehow exclude the protection of thousands of same-sex couples families and their children that live in communities throughout Texas. This is just one example of why it is important to document the demographics of Hispanic same-sex couple families.

Data from the 2000 Census refute common stereotypes that lesbian and gay people are predominantly white, wealthy, do not have children, and are unable to maintain stable, long-term relationships. In fact, there are over 100,000 Hispanic same-sex couple households in the US, and one of the most important findings of this study is that nearly half of them are raising children, which has many implications for the debate over the legal recognition of same-sex couple families.

Data from the 2000 Census show that Hispanic same-sex couple households are in many respects similar to other Hispanic households. For example, they are raising adopted or foster children at similar rates, work in the public sector at similar rates, and report similar rates of living in the same home for the previous five years, which is an indicator of relationship and family stability. Hispanic same-sex couples live where most Hispanic couples live, and they are part of their respective communi-


ties, sending their children to local schools and dealing with the same issues other Hispanic couples face.

This report also documents that Hispanic same-sex couple households are disadvantaged compared to white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households in terms of education, income, homeownership and disability. Men and women in Hispanic same-sex couples are also significantly more likely than men and women in white non-Hispanic same-sex couples to not be U.S. citizens. As a result of these differences, Hispanic same-sex couples are disproportionately affected by anti-LGBT laws and policies, including those that prevent them from accessing the benefits and protections of marriage. Allowing all same-sex couples to legally formalize their relationships and commitments to care for each other and their children will allow them greater economic security, legal protection, and peace of mind. This is especially important as couples age or during times of crisis, such as a partner's illness or death.

For many reasons, including higher rates of parenting, lower relative income, lower home ownership rates, and greater prevalence of having partners who are not U.S. citizens, Hispanic same-sex households are disproportionately impacted by anti-LGBT family legislation, and will be further harmed if proposed anti-same-sex marriage state and federal constitutional amendments become law.
GENERAL INFORMATION

This report is based on data from the 2000 U.S. Census. In 1990 and 2000, cohabiting same-sex couples were able to self-identify as “unmarried partners.” In this study we compare Hispanic same-sex couple households to white non-Hispanic same-sex couple households. We also compare Hispanic same-sex couple households to Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households, and to Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex (unmarried) couple households. While the Census does not gather information about individuals’ sexual orientation or gender identity, it is likely that most of the individuals in same-sex couples identify as “gay,” “lesbian,” “homosexual,” or some other similar designation. Some identify as bisexual or transgender, as do some individuals in cohabiting or married opposite-sex couples.

PUMS DATA AND STUDY METHODOLOGY

Socioeconomic information was compiled through a custom tabulation of the Census Bureau’s 5 percent Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS). We chose to use these data because the sample of the 2000 Census long form provides us with the ability to examine smaller populations in-depth. With these data, Hispanic same-sex couple households can be created and further studied confidentially. For example, PUMS data allow researchers the ability to aggregate households based on children’s biological relationships within households.

In the construction of same-sex couple households, we used the householder and those residing in the same unit defined as “unmarried partner” of the same-sex, as well as any children residing in the same unit. We selected the records of either householders or unmarried partners that were of “Spanish/Hispanic/Latino” origin regardless of race. Only one Hispanic person was needed to construct a Hispanic household. Hispanic cohabiting opposite-sex couple households were constructed similarly, except the partners were of the opposite sex. In Hispanic married opposite-sex couple households, “husband/wife” was used instead of “unmarried partner.” Subsets of these data were created such as Hispanic “inter-ethnic” same-sex couple households, where one partner is Hispanic and the other is not, and same-sex couples in which both partners are Hispanic.

2000 Census Summary File 4 (SF4) data were used for mapping purposes since these
data are available by county and can be easily placed geographically for the entire US. PUMS metropolitan areas were constructed using the county equivalents of the Public Use Microdata Areas (PUMAs) as defined. More detailed information about PUMS and PUMAs can be found on the Census Bureau’s website.

PUMS data were processed by Lopez & Cheung, Inc. using the weights provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. This report does not include data collected by the Census Bureau in Puerto Rico or other American territories.

ETHNICITY AND RACE

The 2000 Census asked two consecutive questions to determine ethnicity and race. The first asked whether the respondent’s ethnicity is Spanish/Hispanic/Latino. If the respondent marked “yes,” he or she could also indicate whether he or she is Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano; Puerto Rican; Cuban; or other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino. The coding for these responses was performed by the Census, and this report uses those Census definitions.

The second question asked the respondent to indicate one or more racial categories to which he or she belongs: white; black, African American, or negro; American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian Indian; Chinese; Filipino; Japanese; Korean; Vietnamese; other Asian; Native Hawaiian; Guamanian or Chamorro; Samoan; other Pacific Islander; or some other race.

In this study, we created racial categories that include respondents who marked just one race, as well as those who marked more than one race. These categories are:

- white alone or in combination with one or more other races
- black or African American alone or in combination with one or more other races
- American Indian and Alaska Native alone or in combination with one or more other races
- Asian (includes Asian Indian; Chinese, Filipino; Japanese; Korean; Vietnamese; or other Asian) alone or in combination with one or more other races
- Native Hawaiian and other pacific islander (includes Guamanian or Chamorro; and Samoan) alone or in combination with one or more other races
- some other race alone or in combination with one or more other races

For example, a respondent who marked that he or she is African American and Filipino is included in the category we created called “black or African American alone or in combination with one or more other races,” as well as the category we created called “Asian alone or in combination with one or more other races.” These categories enabled us to more clearly report the racial breakdown of the individuals in the couples we analyzed, instead of creating a broad “multi-racial” category for those who marked more than one race. The totals of our racial categories are tallies of responses rather than the number of respondents. As a result, the sum of the responses in these categories totals more than the actual number of respondents. However, the proportion of respondents only adds up to 100 percent.
More detailed information concerning race and ethnicity can be found on the Census Bureau’s website.

**STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE**

Tests of statistical significance were performed on select findings in order to determine whether or not the relationship between certain variables happened by chance. In other words, we wanted to know whether the statistical result was a “fluke.” To report the extent of any statistically significant differences, statistical procedures and “cut-off” points widely accepted in social science research were used. If the difference was likely to happen by chance less than one time out of 100, it was noted in a footnote to be “significant at the 0.01 level.” If the difference was likely to happen by chance less than one time out of 500, it was noted in a footnote to be “significant at the 0.05 level.” The statistical methods used to determine significance were chosen based on appropriateness for the various types of data in this study. These methods include proportion comparisons based on the binomial distribution, t-tests, weighted linear regression, and weighted logistic regression.
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LEGACY CIRCLE BEQUESTS
In fond memory of Legacy Circle donors
$1 Million+
Estate of Clarence E. Anderson (2002)

$150,000 to $999,999
Estate of Lawrence J. & Salina Messenger (1997)
Estate of Harry R. Rowe, M.D. (1989)
Estate of Thomas F. Talley (1994)

$25,000 to $149,999
Estate of Stephen D. Clover (2001)
Estate of James A. Davidson (1997)
Estate of Richard D. Evans (1993)
Estate of John R. O'Leary (1993)
Estate of Lee S. Ross (2005)
Estate of Glenn Strutz (1995)
Estate of John Shelby Topp (1994)
Estate of Morgan Thomas (1996)

$5,000 to $24,999
Estate of Jack E. Aaronson (1990)
Estate of William T. Bebemeyer (1992)
Estate of Warren W. Berger (1993)
Estate of Paul Blackwood (1997)
Estate of Paul R. Cahir (1992)
Estate of Robert F. Diem (1997)
Estate of Jeffrey A. Ferst (1993)
Estate of Scott Fisher (1993)
Estate of Ronald D. Good (1998)
Estate of Charles O. Hall III (1995)
Estate of Miles R. Jacobs (1987)
Estate of Kenneth E. Kesselring (1997)
Estate of Craig H. Lindhurst (2001)
Estate of Donald K. Morgan (1989)
Estate of Thomas A. Roeder (1991)
Estate of William Sabella (1992)
Estate of William Samuel (1994)
Estate of Dale N. Shaw (1996)
Estate of Allan B. Truax (1995)
Estate of Tripp Van Woodward (1993)
Estate of Craig J. Witt (1997)
Estate of Jaroslav Zivney (2001)

LEGACY CIRCLE MEMBERS
The following individuals have named the Task Force in their estate planning.
David Abramson
Bertram H. Behrens
Dixie Binning
Luke Farrell
Richard Fremont-Smith
Stephen Glassman, AIA
Sharon Gomes
John A. Hubschmitt
Jerrold J. Hagerty
Marilyn Lamkay
Lester H. London
John H. Moe
Charles Robbins, CFRE
Anthony G. Rominski
Fred B. Schaeffer, Jr.
Claudia Scott
Black Same-Sex Households in the United States
A REPORT FROM THE 2000 CENSUS
by Alain Dang and Somjen Frazer

Political and religious leaders often claim that LGBT people do not need protection from discrimination because they are white, wealthy, and privileged. This study breaks that myth through an analysis of the almost 85,000 black same-sex households that self-identified in the 2000 U.S. Census. This study shows that black same-sex couples and their children are disproportionately impacted by anti-LGBT policies and have more to lose when anti-same-sex marriage amendments are on the ballot. (October 2004; 46 pp.; $10.00; www.thetaskforce.org/library/)

Education Policy

ISSUES AFFECTING LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER YOUTH
by Jason Cianciotto and Sean Cahill

Education Policy provides a comprehensive overview of social science research on the extent and impact of harassment and violence against LGBT students, as well as the public policy interventions that support LGBT students and make schools safer. It includes the first in-depth analysis of how President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act affects LGBT students, profiles eight students who stood up to anti-LGBT abuse, and articulates an agenda for future research and policy analysis. (November 2003; 168 pp.; $20.00; www.thetaskforce.org/library/)

Selling Us Short
HOW SOCIAL SECURITY PRIVATIZATION WILL AFFECT LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER AMERICANS
by Mandy Hu

Selling Us Short highlights the disproportionate impact of President Bush's plan to privatize Social Security on LGBT Americans. LGBT Americans, on average, have lower incomes than their heterosexual counterparts, and they are less able to keep what they earn. This translates into lower Social Security payments in retirement. This report also explains how the cuts in retirement benefits for all but the poorest workers inherent to Bush's plan will disproportionately hurt LGBT elders. (August 2004; 31 pp. Available at www.thetaskforce.org/library/)

A Report From “Love Won Out: Addressing, Understanding, and Preventing Homosexuality”
by Cynthia Burack and Jyl J. Josephson

This report provides a first-hand account of an “ex-gay” conference sponsored by the evangelical Christian group Focus on the Family. The report’s authors detail the theories and world views espoused by the presenters and “ex-gay” leaders who spoke at the conference, one of at least four sponsored annually by Focus on the Family around the country. It also provides information and analysis about the “Love Won Out” ministry, and concludes with some political implications of the “ex-gay” movement for LGBT people. (May 2004; 20 pp. Available at www.thetaskforce.org/library/)

Caregiving
AMONG LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER ELDERS IN NEW YORK
by Marjorie H. Cantor, Mark Brennan, and R. Andrew Shippy

The largest-ever study of caregiving among LGBT people 50 and older documents how central older gay people are to caregiving, both for family of origin members as well as for same-sex partners and close friends. It also examines unequal treatment under key policies such as the Family and Medical Leave Act. (June 2004; 108 pp.; $10.00; www.thetaskforce.org/library/)

Transitioning our Shelters
A GUIDE FOR MAKING HOMELESS SHELTERS SAFE FOR TRANSGENDER PEOPLE
by Lisa Mottet and John M. Ohle

The problem of unsafe shelters for transgender people is pervasive. Transitioning our Shelters is a guide designed for shelters that want to provide safe shelter for transgender people but are not sure how to do so. A joint publication of the Task Force and the National Coalition for the Homeless, the Guide provides many answers to concerns about safety and privacy for transgender residents based on successes at real shelters across the country, the bulk of which are addressed without monetary expenditures. (January 2004; 56 pp.; $10.00; www.thetaskforce.org/library/)
Other Task Force Publications

Family Policy

ISSUES AFFECTING GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER FAMILIES

This report by Sean Cahill, Mitra Ellen, and Sarah Tobias examines family policy as it relates to LGBT people and their loved ones. It provides information useful to those advancing supportive legislation and policy, particularly at the state and local levels. Covers partner recognition; antigay adoption and foster policies; youth and elder issues; health care and end-of-life concerns; and the impact of welfare reform and the faith-based initiative. (December 2002; 216 pp.; $20.00; www.ngltf.org/library )

Say it Loud: I’m Black and I’m Proud

THE BLACK PRIDE SURVEY 2000

This largest-ever study of Black LGBT people is the result of a two-year collaboration between nine Black LGBT Pride organizations, the Task Force Policy Institute, and five African-American researchers. The survey of nearly 2,700 respondents documents significant and often surprising demographics, experiences, and policy priorities of Black LGBT people. (March 2002; 86 pp.; $10.00; www.ngltf.org/library )

Campus Climate

FOR GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER PEOPLE: A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Based on a survey of nearly 1700 students, faculty, and staff at 14 colleges and universities across the country, this report, by Susan R. Rankin, documents anti-LGBT bias and harassment, along with levels of institutional support for LGBT people. It highlights differences in experiences between various identity groups and concludes with recommendations for creating an inclusive and supportive environment for LGBT people. (May 2003; 70 pp.; $10.00; www.ngltf.org/library )

Leaving Our Children Behind

WELFARE REFORM AND THE GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER COMMUNITY

This report, by Sean Cahill and Kenneth T. Jones, describes the reactionary agenda of senior policymakers in the Bush administration to change social service provision in the United States. It examines welfare reform and the impact of marriage and fatherhood initiatives, abstinence-only-until-marriage education, and the faith-based initiative on the LGBT community. (December 2001; 112 pp.; $10.00 www.ngltf.org/library )

Social Discrimination and Health

THE CASE OF LATINO GAY MEN AND HIV RISK

This report, by renowned AIDS researchers Rafael Diaz and George Ayala, documents the correlations among homophobia, racism, poverty, and HIV risk, and has significant implications for prevention strategies. Although Latinos were the subject of this case study, the findings are relevant to other communities of color and marginalized groups. Available in English and Spanish. (July 2001; SOLD OUT; download at www.ngltf.org/library )

Outing Age

PUBLIC POLICY ISSUES AFFECTING GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL AND TRANSGENDER ELDERS

This groundbreaking report reviews social science literature and explains what we do and do not know about the demographics of LGBT elders. Outing Age outlines major public policy issues facing LGBT seniors—including federal aging programs, disability, long-term care and caregiving, nursing homes, and Social Security—and presents recommendations for advocacy to move public policy toward equal treatment of this population. (Nov. 2000; SOLD OUT; download at www.ngltf.org/library )
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