



Target's Bathroom Policy: Politically Correct, But Dead Wrong

When Target announced that it “welcome[s] transgender team members and guests to use the restroom or fitting room facility that corresponds with their gender identity,” the company must not have imagined the backlash that would follow. Now, the nation’s second largest retailer will likely either eat crow, or continue to lose customers.



The announcement was made April 19 on the company’s [website](#). Within days the [Boycott Target Petition](#) was launched by the American Family Association (AFA) and #BoycottTarget began trending on [Facebook](#) with many posting pictures of Walmart receipts and Target REDcards cut into pieces. As of this writing, the petition has almost a million signatures. As of 2015, Target had 1,802 stores in the United States. That means the average store just lost *at least* an average of 555 customers. I say *at least* because that counts only the customers who have signed the petition.

Many people who don’t sign petitions have still taken a personal pledge to take their shopping elsewhere. Tracy Froehlich Patrowicz, a mother of three boys in Bumpass, Virginia, told *The New American* that she and her husband do not sign petitions because a friend was audited by the IRS shortly after signing a petition against an Obama policy, but added:

We are boycotting Target for their ignorance at their own statement. They “want all of their customers to feel safe and welcome in their store,” but have completely missed the boat. If my sons were to identify a female (that identifies as a male) walking into their restroom while using the urinal, I cannot imagine the discomfort they would have! The feeling of violation would be intense for my guys. It is *not* appropriate regardless of said transgender’s sexual preference.

Shouldn’t my boys’ feelings and need to feel secure *also* be a concern for Target?

As for myself, as a victim of sexual assault, I can tell you that I see so many scenarios coming out of this decision that can, and will, go bad. The ladies room should be a safe place.

That common sense seems lost on companies such as Target as they race to embrace the transgender trend in an effort to gain political correctness points for the sake of profits. It’s a shame that in an effort to make a small group of people who are confused about their external plumbing feel “accepted, respected and welcomed,” the corporate giant has made a larger group of loyal customers feel rejected,



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on April 28, 2016

disrespected, and shunned. In the end, this may cost the company more than it ever hoped to gain.

In response to the boycott and negative social media attention, Molly Snyder, a spokeswoman for Target, [told USA Today](#), “As a company that firmly stands behind what it means to offer our team an inclusive place to work — and our guests an inclusive place to shop — we continue to believe that this is the right thing for Target.” Snyder also said that many Target stores have “single-stall, family restrooms for those who may be more comfortable with that option.” Furthermore, some who are supportive of Target’s new policy point out that transgender people have supposedly been using the restrooms they identify with for years with no incident, so why all the fuss? But if this were true, then why the need for the policy?

If the issue here really is about being inclusive, wouldn’t it have made more sense to allow the smaller group (transgenders) to use those “single-stall, family restrooms” and leave the larger group (those who are not “comfortable” sharing — or having their children sharing — intimate facilities with persons of the opposite sex) free to use the restroom of their sex without being put in a position to feel unsafe?

Dan Hall, a father of eight in Mabank, Texas, agreed, telling *The New American* that he believes the policy makes no sense. He asked, “Why not create another bathroom strictly for those of the transgender orientation? That way everyone can have a place to feel comfortable in. I just don’t get why this issue has to be forced upon those who do not agree with it.” Hall has also not signed the petition but says he will no longer shop at Target because “I simply cannot feel comfortable sending my kids to the bathroom knowing that anyone could be in there.”

It seems there is something else here besides a push for an inclusive environment. As Patrowicz put it, “The continual push of radical extremists to diminish our moral reasoning and their need to toss out all logical process is enough to make me walk away from Target or any other business that wants to take away my right to privacy and safety.”

Patrowicz isn’t alone in her sentiments. Fifteen-year-old Olivia Forrester (not her real name), who lives in a small town near Topeka, Kansas, told *The New American* that, although she also has not signed the petition, “I will stop shopping there because now I wouldn’t feel safe or comfortable going into a women’s restroom.” She said her greatest concern over this issue is that “all women are now being put in a situation where they no longer feel safe or comfortable, and could easily be taken advantage of in the restroom,” adding, “They no longer have the same privacy they did before.” As to why she would not feel safe, Forrester said that a man who claims he “identifies” as a woman “could mean no harm but we can’t know that just from looking at [him]. Target could be letting in criminal people and no one would be able to tell or be able to do anything about it.”

Chantal Lalande from Quebec, Canada, agrees. Though there are no Target stores in her area since the last one closed last year, she says that she would not shop there if the company returned. “I am concerned that this rule will become a silkscreen for assaults and put individuals at risk,” she told *The New American*, adding, “Let’s face it, there are some pretty sick people out there and who is to say they aren’t going to use it as an excuse to either get a peep show, or use it as an opportunity to rape someone?”

Forrester and Lalande are more right than they know. While the transgender apologists continue to repeat the dual mantras that “anyone who fears this policy is hateful and bigoted” and that “there is not a single case of a transgender person using a policy like this to assault anyone,” the reality is that men have already been arrested for taking advantage of women and young girls in restrooms and changing



rooms.

Last year, Richard Rodriguez was arrested in Fredericksburg, Virginia, for videoing a woman using the restroom. He was dressed as a woman and occupied the stall next to his victim so he could video under the edge of the wall separating the stalls. [This was at least the third time he was caught doing this.](#)

Also last year, Matthew Foerstel was arrested in Brentwood, Missouri, for secretly filming women in a Target dressing room. Let that sink in. This happened at a Target store. Again, this was not his first rodeo. As KMOV St. Louis [reported](#), “In 2013, Foerstel was convicted of invasion of privacy in St. Charles County for “knowingly and intentionally” filming an 11-year-old girl while she was partially nude inside a department store dressing room.”

As an aside, this story has been picked up by some disreputable Internet “journalists” as if it were a breaking story and happened as a result of Target’s new policy. That is not the case. Foerstel was arrested on April 23, 2015, almost a full year before Target announced the new policy. This writer reached out to KMOV and made them aware of the way their story was being misreported by these “journalists” and they have updated the story to show the 2015 date. Now those “journalists” will have to find another story to build their dishonest reporting around. The truth stands on its own; it doesn’t need to be propped up by dishonest reporting.

And while Foerstel does not “identify” as a woman, the fact remains that men with perverted natures often look for opportunities to take advantage of women and young girls. Target’s new policy will make it even easier for those men. The question of whether or not those men are transgenders will be of little comfort to their victims. It is a distinction without a difference.

An [article](#) on Breitbart lists 25 stories of men — some presenting as transgender and others not — that demonstrate the dangers of allowing men to use women’s bathrooms. The article ends by stating:

With all these stories, it is also apropos to ask just how many Americans these transgender policies would affect. By even the most generous estimations only .3 percent of the nation claims to be transgender. So, in the end, these extreme policies of bending over backwards for people who claim to be transgender are designed for less than half of one percent of Americans.

This goes to Patrowicz’s point that “They ‘want all of their customers to feel safe and welcome in their store’, but have completely missed the boat.” Causing danger and discomfort for the majority in an effort to pander to an extreme minority makes no sense.

Jordan Sheppherd, a 20-year-old guitarist in McKinney, Texas, agrees. “I encourage families with young children to avoid Target,” he told *The New American*. “My biggest concern regarding this issue is public safety,” he said, adding, “It boggles my mind that our society is willing to sacrifice the safety of the majority for the emotional gratification of the minority.”

Target has attempted to spin this as a matter of values. Of course the company’s statement that it “strive[s] to make our guests and team members feel accepted, respected and welcomed in our stores and workplaces every day” somehow does not apply to people who feel threatened or just uncomfortable using intimate facilities with members of the opposite sex.

Hall said that if respecting the values of customers is what motivates Target, the company should take into account that many parents — including himself — have values that do not mesh well with the aberrant behavior associated with transgenderism. “It truly would be nice if *all* values were respected and not just the chosen few,” he said.



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on April 28, 2016

Reba Stanislawski-Reeves from Waukegan, Illinois, has three grown children and one 11-year-old daughter. She is also the grandmother of six ranging in ages from 18 months to seven years. She has signed the petition, but said she did so only after “Target’s ridiculous response to the initial AFA boycott.” She told *The New American*, “I have emailed the company, posted on their Facebook page and called the company. I will no longer shop at Target.” Her reasons are different from the others who spoke to us about this. “Unlike a lot of the concerned shoppers, I am not worried about a rise in the number of molestations/rapes/problems; I am very concerned about conservative Americans not taking a stand and the liberals bulldozing this into our schools and that within a couple of years my daughter will be in high school & forced to shower/change for PE class with boys,” she said.

Shepherd also does not feel personally threatened but does see the danger. He says that as a single young man he has not signed the petition and plans to continue shopping at Target because he feels confident he could defend himself if he needed to, but was quick to add, “If I had a child, I would certainly not allow them to be using [Target’s] bathroom facilities, and would see fit to take my business elsewhere.” He also told *The New American* that he can see why others have signed the petition and pledged to boycott Target. He says he believes the new policy “is a huge compromise to the safety of the majority of our population.”

So, while many do see this as a matter of danger, it is not about unfounded fear. It’s also not about hate. Jamie O’Hare from Wheeling, West Virginia, told *The New American* that her concern “as a very pragmatic and protective mom of a kid on the autism spectrum and 3 other kids” is simply that “I want all of my kids to be able to use the restroom without anything creepy happening to them by pedophiles,” adding “This is not the same thing as worrying about LGBTQ people.” That doesn’t sound like fear-mongering or hate. That sounds like logic and reason.

Katie (who asked that we not use her last name or location) told *The New American* that she believes that those who think Target’s policy is a good idea miss the point of what it really means to love and value people. “The way we, as a society, are looking at transgender people is decidedly unloving,” she said, adding, “You don’t take a 90-pound teenager who sees herself as fat to the gym and give her diet pills. When a person has body dysmorphia and feels their arm doesn’t belong to them we don’t hand them a chain saw. That’s not kind.” Since the issue at the core of this is that [some people “identify” as the opposite sex](#), she says, “When a person’s mind is telling them they aren’t what they truly are, we need to act in a loving way and help them to reconcile their mind with their body.”

Katie, who says she will continue to shop at Target, but will use (and allow her children to use) only the family bathrooms, went on to say, “It’s not loving to agree with a person who hates their body. It’s not hateful to tell the person ‘you are fearfully and wonderfully made and I want you to see the wonderful young man that I see and that God sees.’”

Carmela Shuler-Franklin agrees that resisting this policy is not a matter of hatred and bigotry. The 45-year-old mother from Scottsdale, Arizona, said she has signed the petition and will no longer shop at Target. She told *The New American*, “It is totally improper for a little boy/girl to be exposed to opposite gender adult genitalia in a public bathroom. At minimum, it is confusing, in some situations it would be downright traumatic.” She added that her concerns are not that “people in the LGBT community will come into the restroom that does not align with their birth certificate/driver’s license and attack women and children,” but that it “will take away a tool that police and prosecutors can currently use to hold dangerous predators while they gather the evidence needed to file the more serious charges that apply.”



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on April 28, 2016

There's that logic and reason again. And — though perhaps it *should* be able to go without saying — that is what is missing in Target's policy. In fact, it is conspicuous by its absence. Shepherd said it well: "The only thing that our society considers wrong is telling someone that they are wrong. Tolerance has overpowered common sense and logic. If we can bring back those two things, we will start to see things change."

God help us.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe