

Mass Resistance Legislation Package
Table of Contents

- I. Overview of Mass Resistance Texas's Sixteen Legislative Priorities for 2021..... pg. 2
- II. Appendices
 - a. APPENDIX 1: EQUAL PROTECTION AGAINST HARASSMENT...pg. 5
 - b. APPENDIX 2: MAINTAIN INTEGRITY OF RESEARCH...pg. 9
 - c. APPENDIX 3: PROTECTION OF MOTHERHOOD AND FATHERHOOD...pg. 11
 - d. APPENDIX 4: OVERSIGHT OF ACCREDITATION...pg. 13
 - e. APPENDIX 5: STOP CANCEL CULTURE...pg. 15
 - f. APPENDIX 6: LIABILITY FOR MALFEASANCE, INCOMPETENCE AND RECKLESSNESS IN COUNSELING...pg. 17
 - g. APPENDIX 7: ETHICAL AND COMPASSIONATE RESPONSES TO SEXUAL ASSAULT...pg. 19
 - h. APPENDIX 8: REASONABLE SCOPE OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS...pg. 21
 - i. APPENDIX 9: NULLIFICATION OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAWS....pg. 23
 - j. APPENDIX 10: ELIMINATE PRIDE EVENTS FROM SCHOOLS.....pg. 25
 - k. APPENDIX 11: BLOCK OBSCENITY FROM SCHOOLS AND CHILDREN'S LIBRARIES...26
 - l. APPENDIX 12: PROTECT WOMEN'S PRISONS AND SHELTERS.....pg. 28
 - m. APPENDIX 13: PRESERVATION OF WOMEN'S ATHLETICS...pg. 29
 - n. APPENDIX 14: FREEDOM IN COUNSELING, DISCIPLESHIP, AND THERAPY...pg. 30
 - o. APPENDIX 15: RESPONSIBLE USE OF SCHOOL FUNDING...pg. 31
 - p. APPENDIX 16: PROTECT INNOCENT SPOUSES OF TRANSGENDER PEOPLE...pg. 32

I. OVERVIEW

1. **Apply harassment protections equally and give such protections priority over SOGI inclusivity. (RPT Plank #195)** Legislation mandating equal protection in sexual harassment, sex abuse, grooming, sexual discrimination, and retaliation cases. No laws protecting SOGI can be construed as minimizing the claims of harm done by LGBT perpetrators or when both perpetrator and victim are of the same sex.
2. **Stop the dissemination of fake research. (RPT Plank #271, 134)** Legislation mandating that research claims are subject to investigation and penalties for negligent, fraudulent, or manipulated research. People knowingly presenting research that does not adhere to disciplinary standards and practices, or who present as common knowledge assertions that remain controversial, should be subject to penalties.
3. **Children have a right to a mother and father. (RPT Plank #294, 296, 299, 105)** Legislation responding to immigration crisis by asserting that children have a right to their mother and father and this claim must be reasonably considered by courts and lawmakers; there is a fundamental human value to the bond between a child and its mother and father, and wrongful denial of a child to the bond with its mother and father shall be assigned a harm value in civil and criminal litigation.
4. **Rein in accreditation agencies. (RPT Plank #61, 81, 95, 319, 9, 128, 129, 134, 137, 138, 140, 141, 174, 181, 182, 200, 203)** Legislation mandating that accreditation agencies and commissions must incorporate respect for Christian and conservative views, in evaluating schools and colleges for accreditation.
5. **Protect workers from cancel culture. (62)** Labor protection for conservative individuals working in fields of public interest, the "cancel culture" bill; making it a crime to target someone's livelihood or personal relationships as retaliation stemming from a political disagreement. This should be deemed as harassment or retaliation.
6. **Hold people and groups liable for malfeasance, incompetence, and recklessness in counseling. (248, 267, 270)** Liability protections and extended statutes of limitations for people who claim that they were pressured into LGBT activity and found it harmful.

7. Mandate sexual assault respondents to focus on the effects of assault rather than pushing pro-choice or pro-LGBT ideology.

(96, 128, 250, 271, 273, 274, 324, 325, 245, 317) Standalone sexual assault response bill - Mandating that caregivers and responders who are bound to provide care to sexual assault survivors must provide counseling and relief to such survivors based on knowledge of the long-term harms caused by assault.

8. Rein in the overreaching definition of "public accommodations."

(311) Public Accommodations Clarification- Mandating that public accommodations cannot be denied to people based on political ideology, partisan affiliation, or religion; and that "public accommodations" must be defined according to its definition in the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 14th Amendment.

9. Protect state citizens from the tyranny of unconstitutional federal mandates. (62, 90, 322) Nullification of

Unconstitutional Laws and Court Decisions- The citizens of the state of Texas, companies formed in Texas, and organizations based in Texas, will not be subject to federal legislation or federal court decisions that violate the Constitution of the United States; e.g. the Equality Act.

10. Stop forcing PRIDE celebrations on students (See planks that apply to Priority #1 and Priority #2, and 81). We must give Texas students the same respect and stop the offensive and disruptive pride celebrations in public schools. School sponsorship of pride celebrations are impermissible because students and faculty that are not adherents that they are outsiders.

11. Root out obscenity in children's schools and libraries/ AKA Stop Drag Queen Story Hour (See planks that apply to Priority #1 and Priority #2).

Stop Promoting Obscenity to Children in public schools and libraries: adult entertainers, operators of adult entertainment business/venues and adult entertainment of any kind shall not be promoted or part of planning and executing any educational programming in public schools or publicly funded libraries.

12. Protect women in prison and shelters (146). Sex Segregation in Prison and Shelter populations: Safety of women must be taken into account, prisoners and shelter residents have the right to privacy and safety. How can women be protected from voyeurism and indecent exposure by men who abuse women in this fashion with Self ID is the law?

13. Protect women's sports (148). Sex segregation in Sports: Maintain separation of biological sexes in competitive sports in publicly funded schools.

14. Protect freedom to get help, counseling, discipleship, and therapy (See Priority #6 and Priority #7).

15. Stop diverting school resources to unnecessary sex ed (See RPT Plank 146 and Priority #4). Sex ed is not mandated in public schools, now is time to ban it as it is a gateway for all kinds of perversion being taught in Texas schools. Banning of abortion groups from sharing materials in school sponsored after school activities.

16. Press Pause Protect Transwidows/Transwidowers (RPT Planks 8,62, 81) Protect spouses of transitioning transgender people from neglect, emotional abuse, invasion of privacy, endangerment, harassment, retaliation, and deprivation.

APPENDIX 1: EQUAL PROTECTION AGAINST HARASSMENT

1. Apply harassment protections equally and give such protections priority over SOGI inclusivity. (RPT Plank #195) Legislation mandating equal protection in sexual harassment, sex abuse, grooming, sexual discrimination, and retaliation cases. No laws protecting SOGI can be construed as minimizing the claims of harm done by LGBT perpetrators or when both perpetrator and victim are of the same sex.

FINDINGS

1. The issues of harassment, abuse, grooming, stalking, discrimination, and retaliation have gained national attention in recent decades.
2. Studies have found repeatedly that harassment impacts the ability of individuals to participate in and benefit from organizations such as schools, workplaces, and institutions.
3. Harassment can be directed at an individual or can be a general form of conduct that creates a hostile workplace or school environment.
4. While concern over harassment has grown, so has institutional preoccupation with spreading awareness of diverse sexual and gender identities. In many instances, open discussion of sexual practices (defined as practices that fulfill individuals' erotic desires) and gender identity (defined as identification as male or female) have become required for people who belong to organizations.
5. Workshops, training sessions, and general education classes have increasingly included sexual content that has a high likelihood of being received as unwelcome, discomfoting, and unnecessary for the organization's mission. During such discussions, individuals have to listen to discussion about sexuality, sexual behavior, genital characteristics, or gender stereotypes, which is unwelcome, makes participants uncomfortable, and does not bear substantially on the primary mission of the institution. Therefore three components warrant consideration in sexual discussions within organizations: if they are perceived or received as unwelcome, discomfoting, and unnecessary to any individual within the organization, then said sexual discussions are prohibited.

6. A current contradiction within sexual harassment law weakens the effectiveness of prevention efforts. While the law generally acknowledges that unwelcome, discomfoting, and unnecessary discussion of sexual matters can be harmful and assigns penalties to people who have been proved to do so, other laws have established "protected groups" consisting of multiple identity classes that are defined by sexual practices or beliefs that can discomfot others. Homosexuality as an identity is based on the pleasure one derives from specific sex acts. Since homosexual identity is based on pleasure, desire, and sexual gratification, many discussions that center around it can be received as sexual harassment. Transgenderism is based on individuals' perceptions of what constitutes the basic characteristics of genders—male and female—which are associated with biological sex. The genitalia that differentiate the sexes biologically are also sites of the human body associated with pleasure and reproduction. Therefore both sexual orientation and gender identity are topics that may make some individuals uncomfortable, for whom such discussion is unwelcome and who do not need to be involved in such discussions in order to participate in the mission of the organization. Put simply, many instances of unwelcome, discomfoting, and unnecessarily sexual discussions are difficult to prevent and/or adjudicate since laws allow organizations to force participants to engage in unwelcome, discomfoting, and unnecessary discussion of sexual matters for the purpose of protecting "protected" groups. The purpose of the present bill is to cure this contradiction by mandating that sexual harassment laws must take precedence over SOGI (sexual orientation and gender identity) laws.
7. Many prohibitions on sexual harassment associate harassment with both discrimination and retaliation. In order to comply with prohibitions against sexual harassment, protections of complainants and whistleblowers are necessary. Yet SOGI laws complicate compliance with anti-retaliation provisions because harassment that results from SOGI can sometimes be misconstrued as "protected" conduct. Individuals who voice objections to, refuse to participate in, or file complaints about unwelcome, discomfoting, and unnecessary discussion of sexual matters in the

- organization may experience fear of coming forward because they do not want to face retaliation that the organization may permit or encourage as part of SOGI policy implementation. The purpose of the current legislation is to clarify that whistleblower protections and prohibitions against retaliation must take precedence over all SOGI laws. No person who finds SOGI discussions unwelcome, discomfoting, or unnecessary should fear retaliation.
8. A standard in prohibitions on sexual harassment is that the standard for "unwelcome" and "discomfoting" is a subjective standard based on the perceptions of the person forced to be present or involved in such discussions. In other words, a defense against complaints about sexual harassment cannot be that the person who initiated such discussions or made unwelcome, discomfoting comments did not intend to offend anyone. Nor can one defend against complaints about unwelcome, discomfoting comments by claiming that one's identity is intended to create "inclusive," "welcoming," or "diverse" environments. If organizations find themselves stuck between two competing directives—(1) to create an environment free of discrimination, harassment or retaliation, and (2) to create an inclusive, welcoming, or diverse environment—organizations must be legally required to prioritize #1, the creation of an environment free of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation.
 9. When we reference "unwelcome, discomfoting, and/or unnecessary" discussions of a sexual nature, we must set the standard for "unnecessary" by an objective standard. If the mission of the organization does not directly involve an activity for which an individual participant's knowledge of the sexual habits or genitalia of other people is fundamental, then the discussion of a sexual nature must be deemed unnecessary. Standard language included in mission statements that the organization does not want to discriminate against people based on sexual orientation and gender should not be interpreted to mean that sexual discussions are part of the organization's mission.

BE IT ENACTED:

1. Sexual harassment, discrimination, and retaliation shall be understood to include unwelcome, discomfoting and

- unnecessary discussions about sex, sexuality, sexual orientation, or gender, regardless of the sexual orientations of people who have offended others or have been offended by others.
2. Complaints, objections, or resistance to discussion about sex, sexuality, sexual orientation or gender, shall not count as discrimination or harassment.
 3. Individuals who are punished by organizations or have been denied the benefits of participation in organizations because they have complained about, objected to, or resisted discussion about sex, sexuality, sexual orientation or gender, have grounds to file a retaliation claim.
 4. Harassment, discrimination, and retaliation charges may be filed by anyone within organizations, regardless of whether the complainant is a member of a protected group or not. Organizations shall be liable for damages if they treat charges of harassment, discrimination, and/or retaliation less seriously in cases where the charges stemmed from unwelcome, discomfoting and/or unnecessary discussions about the sexual orientation or gender identity of sexual minorities.
 5. Organizations that have received multiple complaints about unwelcome, discomfoting, and/or unnecessary discussions about sexual orientation or gender identity, and which do not take steps to ameliorate the organizational climate, shall be subject to review and possible penalties imposed by the state.

APPENDIX 2: MAINTAIN INTEGRITY IN RESEARCH

2. Stop the dissemination of fake research. (RPT Plank #271, 134) Legislation mandating that research claims are subject to investigation and penalties for negligent, fraudulent, or manipulated research. People knowingly presenting research that does not adhere to disciplinary standards and practices, or who present as common knowledge assertions that remain controversial, should be subject to penalties.

FINDINGS

1. In many legislative hearings and court proceedings held in anticipation of decisions with far-reaching policy implications, expert witnesses are invited or called to advise the decision-making body.
2. When experts present research, they are often shown respect due to their credentials in a specific field and their references to research hold particular sway.
3. Many research findings in specific disciplines have been less indicative or trustworthy than experts have represented them as in official settings.
4. In some cases studies become retracted or unpublished due to failure to reproduce results or discoveries of dishonest practices.
5. In other cases, journal editors, disciplinary association officers, or peer reviewers fear retaliation if they question politically sensitive research, so they do not intervene or flag problematic research.
6. It is possible for experts who present untrustworthy research to mislead decisionmakers and influence policy in a negative direction, with no consequences for having offered misleading advisement.

BE IT ENACTED

1. People who refer to "research" or identify themselves as "experts" in court or legislative proceedings, must undertake due diligence to assure that their claims are based on high-quality research studies that meet high disciplinary standards in their respective fields.
2. When presenting research claims, expert witnesses must vouch for the quality of their research with a signed statement certifying that they have assessed the quality of their studies according to the standards and practices of specific disciplines. In social sciences, studies that make claims about trends within populations have to be based on adequately sized samples that are representative of the populations they purport to have studied. All due

- efforts must be made to account for bias such as the use of self-reported data, subjects who know about the political implications of studies and may have reason to support one conclusion over another, and vague metrics.
3. Expert witnesses who fail to disclose key information that would call into question their data may be subject to fines or prohibited from delivering expert witness testimony again in Texas.

APPENDIX 3: PROTECTION OF MOTHERHOOD AND FATHERHOOD

3. **Children have a right to a mother and father. (RPT Plank #294, 296, 299, 105)** Legislation responding to immigration crisis by asserting that children have a right to their mother and father and this claim must be reasonably considered by courts and lawmakers; there is a fundamental human value to the bond between a child and its mother and father, and wrongful denial of a child to the bond with its mother and father shall be assigned a harm value in civil and criminal litigation.

FINDINGS

1. Reports of children intercepted at the US border with Mexico and isolated from guardians have raised serious public concern about the US government's ability to retain the unity and integrity of the family unit, consisting of a child and his or her mother and father.
2. The extent of dismay expressed in the public over the thought of a child being separated from mother and father points to the widespread commitment in the United States to maintenance of an intact family unit of mother, child, and father, wherever possible.
3. While the raising of children has often required assistance from people other than a child's mother and father, as early as the fifth commandment in Exodus ("honor thy mother and they father"), the basic and universal elements of a family have always been understood as a child, his mother, and his father, wherever the male and female progenitors of a child are alive and capable.
4. American public policy faces challenges in conducting child welfare investigations of the kind that would be necessary at the US border because of recent political movements that have confused the integrality of the child-mother-father unit. Movements to redefine the family unit in order to accommodate same-sex couples' adoption of children have led to some supporters of LGBT rights actively opposing any statutory language establishing the child-mother-father triad as particularly important or unique relative to other relationships affecting a child's development.
5. In order to pursue family reunification as the basis for sound immigration policy, the United States must have a standard definition of "family," "mother," and "father in order to preclude as many abuses or harmful decisions as possible at the border.

BE IT ENACTED:

1. Any agency dealing with immigration, child protection, or truancy, or in any other matter related to lodging or care for a child whose parents are in an uncertain location, must assume that the child has a mother and father and make all due diligence to ascertain the intentions of the child's mother and father with regard to custody of the child.
2. In cases where a formal adoption has taken place, the child's mother and father are assumed to correspond with the legal mother and father listed in adoption documents.
3. In cases where a formal adoption has taken place but documents provide no name for an adoptive father, or provide no name for an adoptive mother, authorities must not release the child into the care of guardians until said authorities have established the identity and whereabouts of both mother and father.
4. Children in the state of Texas shall be entitled to know the identity and whereabouts of their mother and father, and to have contact with their mother and father, except if a court of law has established that either the child's mother or the child's father has been ruled a danger to the child due to incompetence, violence, or addiction.
5. The child's right to know the identity and whereabouts of its mother and father shall not be dissolved or waived as a result of the mother or father having forfeited or sold their claims the child to another person.
6. A second mother listed as an adoptive parent or on a child's birth certificate shall not be taken as fulfillment of the child's right to a father.
7. A second father listed as an adoptive parent or on a child's birth certificate shall not be taken as fulfillment of the child's right to a mother.
8. Any citizen's contact with and knowledge his or her mother and father shall be considered a natural-born right that cannot be deprived without due process and compensation. Denial of the child's right to a mother and father is considered a harm that must be valued in litigation.

APPENDIX 4: OVERSIGHT OF ACCREDITATION

4. **Rein in accreditation agencies.** (RPT Plank #61, 81, 95, 319, 9, 128, 129, 134, 137, 138, 140, 141, 174, 181, 182, 200, 203) Legislation mandating that accreditation agencies and commissions must incorporate respect for Christian and conservative views, in evaluating schools and colleges for accreditation.

FINDINGS

1. Accreditation agencies such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) have significant power over education in Texas. Decisions by SACSCOC to accredit, probate, or suspend educational institutions determine which educators have opportunity to teach students and what educational opportunities students can avail themselves of.
2. The provenance of SACSCOC's authority poses troubling questions for Texas because the voting citizenry does not have means to hold the accreditors accountable. At the agency's website (www.sacscoc.org), the following description is provided to detail how the agency was commissioned: "The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges is the recognized regional accrediting body in the eleven U.S. Southern states (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia) and in Latin America for those institutions of higher education that award associate, baccalaureate, master's or doctoral degrees. The Commission on Colleges' Board of Trustees is the representative body of the College Delegate Assembly and is charged with carrying out the accreditation process."

To gain or maintain accreditation with the Commission on Colleges, an institution must comply with the standards contained in the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement and with the policies and procedures of the Commission on Colleges. The Commission on Colleges applies the requirements of its Principles to all applicant, candidate, and member institutions, regardless of type of institution (public, private for-profit, private not-for-profit)." While the website states that the Department of Education

"oversees" the accreditors, the links of accountability leading back to voters are too tenuous.

3. A significant body of literature has developed showing that schools and colleges in Texas suffer from systemic bias against conservatives, traditionalists, and Christians, not unlike the kind of discrimination practiced against people of color in similar institutional contexts. Faculty with traditional or religious views run a high risk of being targeted, endure a great deal of hostility, and do not prosper in academia in high numbers. The effect of this bias skews education from the highest to lowest levels of education.
4. While academic freedom is almost universally listed as an accreditation standard by agencies such as SACSCOC, both faculty and students do not have full academic freedom, and no significant actions have been taken to correct that by SACSCOC. Colleges and schools that endanger the employment of faculty and staff or endanger the academic standing because of their exercise of academic freedom should be subject to review and sanction by SACSCOC but this does not happen.

BE IT ENACTED

1. The State of Texas asks that SACSCOC provide a report on what changes it can make to its accreditation guidelines to ensure that its review of institutions will include scrutiny in the schools' commitment to academic freedom for faculty, students, and staff. This must include a review of institutional climate to see whether a hostile work environment exists for conservatives, traditionalists, or Christians; and to see whether discrimination, harassment, or retaliation has taken place against people for exercising their due academic freedom in expressing Christian, conservative, or traditionalist viewpoints.
2. If SACSCOC cannot or will not incorporate the actions stipulated in the preceding paragraph, then Texas colleges and schools shall not be subject to accreditation review by SACSCOC.

APPENDIX 5: STOP CANCEL CULTURE

5. **Protect workers from cancel culture.** (62) Labor protection for conservative individuals working in fields of public interest, the "cancel culture" bill; making it a crime to target someone's livelihood or personal relationships as retaliation stemming from a political disagreement. This should be deemed as harassment or retaliation.

FINDINGS

1. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution refers to free speech and freedom of the press.
2. While the First Amendment refers to limitations on the powers of Congress, the concepts of free speech and freedom of the press represent core values of the United States of America because societies flourish where pursuit of truth and honesty in expression abound, and societies decline and perish in states of censorship, repression, and dishonesty.
3. "Cancel culture" poses a threat to free speech in both governmental and non-governmental settings. If citizens fear that they will lose their livelihood, be separated from loved ones, or suffer social aggression as a result of expressing their thoughts and feelings honestly, they will opt for silence or dishonesty in order to protect themselves. Therefore places of employment, providers of essential services, and civic associations bear some responsibility to protect free speech by running their operations in ways that do not punish employees, customers, stakeholders, or owners for exercising their free speech or freedom of the press.
4. "Cancel culture" refers to the common practice of censorship by way of pressure over people's employment, finances, or personal relationships. In "cancel culture" those who would try to eliminate certain ideas or observations from public discourse apply pressure to people who have espoused such ideas or observations by interfering with their ability to live in ways such as these examples, which do not represent an exhaustive list: pressuring their businesses to be boycotted, pressuring their employers to fire or otherwise discipline them, pressuring hosting institutions to disinvite them for participating in events, pressuring investors to disinvest in their projects, pressuring friends or family to estrange them, pressuring social media sites to block or ban their accounts, pressuring

publications to unpublish their publications, pressuring financial institutions to deny them financial services, pressuring vendors to refuse them goods or services, or pressuring educational institutions to refuse them admissions or to expel them.

5. The pressure tactics applied in the preceding paragraph constitute forms of harassment and intimidation but are often not treated as illegal harassment by law.

BE IT ENACTED

1. In the state of Texas, any communications sent with the primary intent to harass, annoy, harm, defame, damage, deprive, or obstruct another person because of said person's viewpoints, in cases where there is no legitimate business reason for the communication, will be treated as harassment. For the purposes of this bill, this will be known as "political harassment."
2. Institutions that dismiss, demote, ban, block, suppress, or deny services to someone as a result of pressure from political harassers shall be treated as complicit in the harassment.
3. Harassment cannot be excused by claiming that the employee or member of an organization represents the values of the organization at all times. Employees or members can only be disciplined by organizations over exercise of free speech if the speech occurred during work time, was conveyed using the organization's resources, and/or constituted a serious crime such as defamation or harassment directly affecting the affairs of the employer or organization.
4. Employers and organizations cannot include in personnel handbooks or hiring contracts provisions that allow for employees or members to be dismissed for constitutionally protected speech.
5. Individuals who organize public campaigns or boycotts against organizations with the purpose of forcing the organization to discipline or expel an employee or member due to constitutionally protected free speech are committing illegal harassment.
6. Beliefs alone cannot be used as a reason to dismiss employees, except in cases where the organization is confessional and the belief in question denies the confessional articles of faith.

APPENDIX 6: LIABILITY FOR MALFEASANCE, INCOMPETENCE AND RECKLESSNESS IN COUNSELING

6. **Hold people and groups liable for malfeasance, incompetence, and recklessness in counseling. (248, 267, 270)** Liability protections and extended statutes of limitations for people who claim that they were pressured into LGBT activity and found it harmful.

FINDINGS

1. Many people in the position to counsel others, particularly young people, have been trained and licensed with certain assumptions about the basis of sexual identity and/or the benefits of sexual activity.
2. The causation of homosexuality and transgenderism remain disputed after decades of researchers' attempts to prove that these are innate, genetic, or biologically determined and ineradicable characteristics similar to left-handedness or eye color.
3. Counselors speaking to young people have often been trained to dismiss the dispute over the origins and course of homosexuality and transgenderism. Many counselors have been instructed to proceed with the assumption that homosexuality and transgenderism stem from biologically ineradicable and morally neutral development in humans predating puberty, and possibly even predating birth.
4. Because of the gap between the reality of uncertain origins for homosexuality/transgenderism, and the claims by counselors that there are certain origins for homosexuality/transgenderism, clients who receive counseling run a high risk of being told that they are gay, bisexual, or transgender when they are not. They also run the risk of being counseled by counselors to acquire an LGBT identity with the expectation that participation in the LGBT activities, culture, and identity will be salubrious for them. People may have received such counseling when they were young, confused, vulnerable, and dealing with many stresses that have nothing to do with sexual orientation or gender identity. They may have also suffered abuse or mistreatment by peers and have mistakenly attributed such difficulties to unresolved questions about their sexual orientation.

Cases now exist of people who responded affirmatively to counselors who encouraged them to embrace the LGBT identity, and then found that they were not gay or transgender. Also cases exist of people who entered into the LGBT community and/or developed habitual LGBT conduct, but found later that the community was not a healthy place for them and/or that the conduct harmed them.

BE IT ENACTED

1. People who serve in a counseling capacity, as mentors, counselors, ministry specialists, or therapists, must show caution and advisedness when counseling clients about how they should identify their SOGI and/or whether their clients should engage in LGBT conduct.
2. People who serve in a counseling capacity, as mentors, counselors, ministry specialists, or therapists, must refrain from misrepresenting the certainty of the origins of homosexuality and transgenderism when counseling clients.
3. People who have been counseled to assume an LGBT identity or to engage in LGBT conduct, and who find that such counsel was incorrect or ill-advised, and who find that they have suffered harm as a result of this poor counseling, may file suit against those who counseled them, for up to twenty-five years from the last counseling session in which such counsel was given.

APPENDIX 7: ETHICAL AND COMPASSIONATE RESPONSES TO SEXUAL ASSAULT

7. **Mandate sexual assault respondents to focus on the effects of assault rather than pushing pro-choice or pro-LGBT ideology.** (96, 128, 250, 271, 273, 274, 324, 325, 245, 317) Standalone sexual assault response bill - Mandating that caregivers and responders who are bound to provide care to sexual assault survivors must provide counseling and relief to such survivors based on knowledge of the long-term harms caused by assault.

FINDINGS

1. Sexual abuse and sexual assault are serious issues that result in long-lasting harms to survivors.
2. It often takes a very long time to regain mental or emotional stability after abuse or assault. During the time prior to resolving the aftereffects of abuse or assault, survivors may be vulnerable to making decisions that they later regret.
3. One example of a regrettable decision in the aftermath of sexual abuse or assault is to embrace an LGBT identity. Males who have been abused by males may take a long time to understand that they are survivors of abuse, and prior to reaching this understanding, they may try to reconcile themselves to the abuse by taking on an LGBT identity that will not be sustainable over the full course of their lives. Females who have been abused by females may have reactions similar to females who have been abused by females. Lastly, females who have been abused by males may experience antipathy to males and heterosexuality, and may develop a lesbian conduct pattern as a reaction to their experience.
4. Another example of a regrettable decision in the aftermath of sexual abuse or assault is to seek an abortion. A female survivor of abuse deals with a multitude of traumas and stresses. During this time, she may reach an initial conclusion that an abortion will benefit her by helping her avoid the difficulties of pregnancy and childbirth. Later, however, she may find that the abortion did not alleviate the

fundamental traumas and stresses resulting from sexual assault, and she may determine that she would have been happier had she carried the child to term. The reasons for such regrets are multivariate and personal.

BE IT ENACTED

1. Professionals who provide frontline sexual assault and sexual abuse response must prioritize care and alleviation of trauma resulting from sexual assault or sexual abuse.
2. Clients of sexual assault or sexual abuse response services should introduce the question of LGBT identity or abortion, if either presents as an issue in the sexual assault or sexual abuse response.
3. Providers must not introduce the question of LGBT identity or abortion without being prompted by the client. Providers who introduce these topics without prompting, or who persist in suggesting an LGBT identity or abortion to the sexual abuse survivor, are guilty of malpractice. If they persist even when the client denies LGBT identity or declines abortion service, then the providers are guilty of sexual harassment.
4. Clients who have suffered malpractice by sexual assault and sexual abuse responders have a right to file suit against the provider.

APPENDIX 8: REASONABLE SCOPE OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

8. **Rein in the overreaching definition of "public accommodations."** (311) Public Accommodations Clarification—Mandating that public accommodations cannot be denied to people based on political ideology, partisan affiliation, or religion; and that "public accommodations" must be defined according to its definition in the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 14th Amendment.

FINDINGS

1. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was historic legislation that sought to counteract hundreds of years of racial discrimination in the United States.
2. The Republican Party's majority in Congress supported the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
3. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 sought to protect African Americans from social practices such as the denial of food and lodging.
4. Today, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been cited by activists, many tied to the LGBTQ movement, as a precedent to justify the extension of public accommodations protections to many groups that fall under the classification of LGBTQ.
5. Pro-LGBTQ initiatives such as the Equality Act not only seek to equate race to LGBTQ identity. These initiatives also seek to expand dramatically what qualifies as "Public accommodations" to include non-essential services such as web hosting, publications, continued learning workshops, or unofficial social gatherings.
6. Pro-LGBTQ initiatives such as the Equality Act also seek to expand the definition of discrimination and/or harassment to include failure to affirm controversial beliefs or the expression of dissenting views about the nature of sexual orientation and gender identity.
7. The modifications to the legal definitions of "protected class," "public accommodations," and "discrimination" pose serious problems for our democracy, since these modifications make many innocent people liable to sanction or prosecution for doing things that are not wrong and which are protected by the Constitution.

BE IT ENACTED

1. In the state of Texas, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall stand and remain in force, as a historic piece of legislation.
2. In the state of Texas, no definition of "protected class" shall be modified to include classes of people defined by sexual orientation or gender identity.
3. In the state of Texas, laws regarding "public accommodations" shall not be modified in order to redefine "public accommodations" to include businesses or activities outside the original meaning of "public accommodations" from the original Civil Rights Act of 1964.
4. In the state of Texas, silence about controversial issues regarding sexual orientation and gender identity shall not be construed as discrimination, harassment, or retaliation.
5. In the state of Texas, no statement about sexual orientation or gender identity, which would be constitutionally protected under the First Amendment, may be classified as discrimination, harassment, or retaliation, absent an illegal act such as defamation or harassment targeted at an individual, and absent an act that substantially harms another individual's benefits or participation in an organization of which the individual is part.

APPENDIX 9: NULLIFICATION OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAWS

9. Protect state citizens from the tyranny of unconstitutional federal mandates. (62, 90, 322) Nullification of Unconstitutional Laws and Court Decisions—The citizens of the state of Texas, companies formed in Texas, and organizations based in Texas, will not be subject to federal legislation or federal court decisions that violate the Constitution of the United States; e.g. the Equality Act.

FINDINGS

1. In the recent Supreme Court decision *Texas v. Pennsylvania et al.*, the Supreme Court declined a case based on the determination that Texas had no standing in national election questions or in the election practices of another state. Therefore one can surmise from this refusal by the Supreme Court that federal authorities and other states have no standing to enforce unconstitutional laws or court decisions on Texan citizens. If Texas has no way of challenging external acts and laws on its own citizens, then there is no reciprocal agreement that can fairly require Texas to subject its citizens to federal laws or court decisions.
2. In at least four areas there is a high likelihood that federal legislation, executive orders from the president, or federal court decisions, may attempt to impose laws on Texas citizens, which the people of Texas have a clear right to contest: gun control, immigration, policy on sexual orientation and gender identity, and laws curtailing fossil fuel production.

BE IT ENACTED

1. The state of Texas will not enforce laws that a reasonable person would consider unconstitutional, and will not enforce court decisions decided at the federal level if they conflict with constitutional principles.
2. This act applies in particular to federal court decisions and laws that seek to abridge second amendment rights to bear arms; federal court decisions and laws that seek to force Texas to violate immigration laws or that seek to prevent Texas from enforcing immigration laws; federal court decisions and laws that seek to abridge the First



Amendment rights of free speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion in the name of advancing equality or inclusivity for LGBTQ people; and laws that abridge the state rights in Article IV to draw from natural resources and utilize fossil fuels for energy needs.

APPENDIX 10: ELIMINATE PRIDE EVENTS FROM SCHOOLS

10. Stop forcing PRIDE celebrations on students (See planks that apply to Priority #1 and Priority #2, and 81).

Pride celebrations create a hostile and uncomfortable learning environment for students with sincerely held religious beliefs are in contrast to the LGBTQ behaviors celebrated. These celebrations cause said students to lose the benefits of participation and access in public education. Pride celebrations in schools are a form of coercion and indoctrination. In any other setting the unwelcome discussion of homosexual behavior and gender identities would be considered a form of sexual harassment. We must give Texas students the same respect and stop the offensive and disruptive pride celebrations in public schools. School sponsorship of pride celebrations are impermissible because students and faculty that are not adherents that they are outsiders.

Opting out is not a remedy because the students lose the benefit of public education for the duration of celebrations and they are still subject to the content of the celebrations. There should also be no retaliation for students who report PRIDE activities taking place at their school. Violations by school districts should incur penalties of lost revenue for each day of PRIDE celebrations. 100% participation in pride parades by district schools has become a goal for some districts that is imposed on them by LGBTQ activist organizations who shame the entire campuses that do not participate.

**APPENDIX 11: BLOCK OBSCENITY FROM SCHOOLS AND CHILDREN'S
LIBRARIES**

**11. Root out obscenity in children's schools and libraries/
AKA Stop Drag Queen Story Hour** (See planks that apply to Priority #1 and Priority #2). Stop Promoting Obscenity to Children in public schools and libraries: adult entertainers, operators of adult entertainment business/venues and adult entertainment of any kind shall not be promoted or part of planning and executing any educational programming in public schools or publicly funded libraries.

Furthermore, the obscenity exception shall be removed from the Texas Penal Code Ann. 43.24. There are no compelling reasons for government to expose children to adult entertainment. (aka stop drag queen story hour).

Whereas, adult entertainers and their businesses in which they operate are for ages 18+; and,

Whereas, adult entertainers put on lewd, erotic, sexually explicit shows centered around fetishes, kink,

and adult sexuality; and,

Whereas, adult entertainment is inappropriate for minor children and there is no acceptable reason to

promote lewd and lascivious behaviors or adult sexuality towards children, it is not appropriate in

education, for scientific or governmental purposes to promote adult entertainment to children,

Whereas, it is morally reckless and irresponsible to promote adult entertainment to children,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that adult entertainers, operators of adult entertainment businesses and

venues, and adult entertainment of any kind shall not be part of educational programming in public

schools, libraries or any other taxpayer funded program for children.

Therefore, BE IT RESOLVED, that the obscenity exception be removed from the Texas Penal Code Ann.

43.24 Regarding "Sale, Distribution, or Display of Harmful Material to a Minor". There are no

educational, scientific, or governmental reasons for exposing children to adult entertainment.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that any library, school, or other publicly funded entity hosting programming

for children including adult entertainers, adult entertainment themes, characters, personas, or

promoting entertainment that is primarily adult in nature (such as drag queen story hour) shall be

defunded of tax dollars and cut off from any public endowments.

APPENDIX 12: PROTECT WOMEN'S PRISONS AND SHELTERS

12. Protect women in prison and shelters (146).

Sex Segregation in Prison and Shelter populations: Safety of women must be taken into account, prisoners and shelter residents have the right to privacy and safety. How can women be protected from voyeurism and indecent exposure by men who abuse women in this fashion with Self ID is the law?

WHEREAS, biological sex is real, and, WHEREAS, women are at risk of being attacked and have been attacked in prison and shelter populations by biological men, and, WHEREAS, the state has the duty to ensure the safety of all prisoners incarcerated and, WHEREAS, prisoners and shelter residents have the right to bodily privacy, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that biological males may not be incarcerated in the female prison populations, likewise, women's shelter's are may not be legally compelled to accept biological men who identify was women into women's shelters.

APPENDIX 13: PRESERVATION OF WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

13. Protect women's sports (148). Sex segregation in Sports: Maintain separation of biological sexes in competitive sports in publicly funded schools.

WHEREAS, biological sex is real and there are differences between the two sexes; and WHEREAS, distinctions between the two sexes gives male athletes an advantage over female athletes in sports; and, WHEREAS, females worked hard to carve out competitive athletic programs of their own; and, WHEREAS, females competing with males puts women at a disadvantage physically and puts them at a physical risk in contact sports; and, WHEREAS, males competing in women's sports are taking the rewards, scholarships and sports related opportunities away from females, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that competitive sports in public schools and state universities shall be segregated by biological sex.

APPENDIX 14: FREEDOM IN COUNSELING, DISCIPLESHP, AND THERAPY

14. Protect freedom to get help, counseling, discipleship, and therapy (See Priority #6 and Priority #7). Cognitive, Behavioral, Talk Therapy - no banning of therapy that a patient or his/her caregivers want to explore for purposes of finding comorbidities, underlying contributing disorders or factors and comorbidities. Bans that prohibit therapy that is faith based and guided by the patient's own religious faith is a violation of 1A. 15.

WHEREAS, "conversion therapy bans" are a misnomer and simply ban therapy that is consistent with the worldview of the patient, and, WHEREAS, therapy bans get in the middle of a patient and his or her doctor/therapist resolving issues for the patient in the best interest of the client and limit exploring comorbid conditions and exploring legitimate causes and sound therapies for such causes, and, WHEREAS, every client/patient has a right to pursue therapy that is consistent with her/her worldview in an effort to resolve issues that interfere with their daily life, and, WHEREAS, bans result in limiting therapist/doctor from inquiry as to a client's goals and prevent them from resolving underlying disorders, comorbid issues and causation, and, WHEREAS, bans result in stifling free speech and religious speech in Christian therapists' offices sought out by Christian clients, and, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that there shall be no therapy bans as there already exists legal remedy for harmful or unsound practices and a means for complaints to be recorded, as well as disciplinary actions available for unsound practices.

APPENDIX 15: RESPONSIBLE USE OF SCHOOL FUNDING

15. Stop diverting school resources to unnecessary sex ed (See RPT Plank 146 and Priority #4). Sex ed is not mandated in public schools, now is time to ban it as it is a gateway for all kinds of perversion being taught in Texas schools. Banning of abortion groups from sharing materials in school sponsored after school activities.

Whereas, Sex Ed is not mandated to be taught in public school in Texas; and Whereas, children must be safeguarded, parental trust honored, and values of individual families respected; and Whereas, it is the right of the parents to instruct and direct the educational and moral instruction of their children; and, Whereas, sex education has morphed into the teaching of a whole range of behaviors, fetishes, kink, erotica which clearly violates the values of many parents; and, Whereas, sex ed in public schools endorses behaviors that lie outside the moral and religious values of many taxpayers that fund public schools; and, Whereas, students who opt out of sex ed programs are still exposed to the materials by peers at school, and, Whereas, Sex ed in public schools routinely usurps the rights of parents to instruct the moral instruction of children and violates the sacred trust parents place in the education system; THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that sex ed should not be taught in public schools as part of classroom instruction; and, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that where programs re offered at the campus, after school hours, and promoted through school media, handouts, posters, email, social media, etc., they may only promote a program consistent with the state guidelines for sex ed which are abstinence until marriage based and shall not promote LGBTQ behavior or identities or any other aspect of Comprehensive Sex Education such as (transgender ideology, sex toys, kink, fetishism, porn, homosexuality, bisexuality, pansexuality, etc.) and shall not promote unhealthy and immoral behaviors; and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that programs offered on campus, after school, and promoted through school media, handouts, posters, email, social media, etc. must not be provided by an abortion provider or an organization working for or with an abortion provider.

APPENDIX 16: PROTECT INNOCENT SPOUSES OF TRANSGENDER PEOPLE

16. Press Pause Protect Transwidows/Transwidowers (RPT Planks 8,62, 81)

Definitions: "transwidow/transwidower" - a person whose spouse is or has transitioned socially, legally, or surgically to identify as the opposite sex.

A Bill to Be Entitled An Act to pause the legal change of gender identifiers on legal documents issued by the State of Texas; to require the spouse to be informed of medical/surgical treatments for the purposes of transitioning to the opposite sex or preparing to live as the opposite sex.; to prohibit government compelled speech; to prevent the emotional and mental battery of a petitioner or respondent in family court; to prevent penalties to petitioner/respondent in family court due to not using a "preferred pronoun" or a new name that has been acquired by respondent/petitioner prior to or in the course of divorce without the consent and knowledge of both parties; to require informed consent of spouses of those pursuing legal document changes for purposes of changing "gender identity"; to require informed consent from the spouse of a patient prior to any medical or surgical procedure relating to the "sexual reassignment", "gender identity" or for the purposes of identifying as the opposite sex; to pause legal/medical/surgical procedures until the divorce is finalized where a trans-identifying spouse seeks legal/medical/surgical changes for purpose of identifying as the opposite sex.

Whereas, biological sex is immutable, and

Whereas, one spouse has not consented to be part of a homosexual marriage arrangement, and,

Whereas, legal gender and name changes for trans-identifying individuals can be attained without the knowledge and consent of the spouse, and

Whereas, legal documents are currently able to reflect the desired sex of those who are transitioning to be identified as the opposite of their biological sex, and

Whereas, the legal change of a gender prior to divorce creates a situation where a spouse will be compelled to affirm in legal documents (i.e. custody, legal, financial papers) the preferred

gender identifying pronouns and preferred name of their spouse prior to being legally divorced, and

Whereas, the legal change of a gender on documents may compel a judge to force a spouse to violate their sincerely held religious convictions and violate their conscience by ordering the use of preferred pronouns and new legal name granted by the state prior to divorce, and

Whereas, it is emotionally abusive and damaging to the spouse to be compelled by the state to use the preferred pronouns and new legal name of a transitioning spouse prior to divorce, and

Whereas, a spouse may incur fines and be held in contempt of court for violating a judge's order to use the preferred pronouns and new legal name taken by a spouse prior to divorce during divorce proceedings, and

Whereas, government compelled speech is a first amendment violation,

Whereas, it is unethical for a doctor / surgeon to help a patient transition without first having the consent of the patient's spouse if that patient is married;