

The “Born Gay” Hoax

This book is dedicated to the rising generation

The “Born Gay” Hoax

Ryan Sorba

Published by: _____
P.O. Box 2037
Wilmington DE, 92307

Copyright 2007 by Ryan Sorba Inc.
Box 571, Wilmington De, 19806

All Rights Reserved

First Edition

IBSN 0-9645-601-3-7

Contents

1. The Nature of Sodomy throughout History	[tbc]
2. The Origin of the “Gay” Identity	6
3. The Pro-Sodomy Movement in America	9
4. Alfred C. Kinsey	13
5. The Sexual Revolution	15
6. The Stonewall Riots and the Politicization of Sodomy	17
7. The Intimidation of the American Psychiatric Association	20
8. The “Born Gay” Hoax	28
9. The Studies Exposed	37
10. The Development of Same-Sex Attraction	45
11. Are Reversals Possible?	61
12. Hyprocisy and Change	74
13. The Intimidation of Reparative Therapists	80
14. Born Straight	88
15. Is Sodomy Natural because it Occurs in Nature?	91
16. What if Being “Gay” was Natural?	94
17. The Law of Nature	[tbc]
18. The Dangers of Sodomy	[tbc]
19. Recruitment	[tbc]

2

The Origin of the “Gay” Identity

“Uranians of the World, Unite!
(Activist Slogan)

A little over one-hundred and fifty years ago, the first concept of an inborn “homosexual” condition began to circulate in Germany. Prior to this time there is no known record of any human being ever claiming to have been born with same-sex attractions (SSA). The originator of the novel concept was Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825-95). Ulrichs, the “grandfather of the world ‘gay’ rights movement” was a lawyer, political activist, and known pedophile. At the age of fourteen Ulrichs was seduced by his riding instructor, a man about thirty years old.¹ Observers familiar with the high correlation between childhood sexual molestation and adult same-sex attraction might conclude that this youthful experience was the cause of Ulrichs’s fixation.

Circa 1860, in an effort to garner support to repeal Paragraph 175 of the German Penal Code which criminalized sodomy, Ulrichs began to spread a theory that defined individuals experiencing SSA as members of a “third-gender.” Ulrichs proposed that individuals who develop same-sex attraction do so because of a psycho-spiritual mix-up, in which a man’s body becomes inhabited by a woman’s soul (and vice versa for women). Ulrichs coined the terms “Urning” (male) and “Dailing” (female) to refer to members of this “third-gender,” which was neither male nor female, but a combination of both. The term “Uranian” was introduced in 1862 as a new designation for same-gender sexuality in general (both Urnings and Dailings). He took the term from Plato’s *Symposium*, in which same-sex Eros is said to fall under the protection of the ninth muse, Urania. Ulrichs reasoned that since same-sex attractions were natural, sodomy should not be criminalized.

Although Ulrichs was unable to abolish the sodomy law, his efforts were influential nonetheless, as evidenced by the swell of political activism and public sympathy for “Uranians” during his time. It was amidst this changing political

¹ Kennedy, Hubert. “Man/Boy Love in the Writing of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs” Kennedy in Pascal, Mark (ed.) p. 15.

climate that a German-Hungarian writer named Karoly Maria Benkert (1824-82) writing under the pseudonym Karoly Maria Kertbeny, coined the term “homosexual” in an open letter to the Prussian Minister of Justice in 1869.² Prior to this, men and women who engage in same-gender sex acts were known as “sodomites,” “pederasts,” or “Knabenschaender” (literally, boy ravishers).³

Ulrichs and Kertbeny understood that public opposition to sodomy sprang from the people’s understanding of it as an unnatural and irrational act. In order to counter the behavioral connotations inextricably linked with terms like “sodomite” and “boy ravisher,” Ulrichs and Kertbeny set out to coin new terms that would refer to a sexual identity, rather than a specific behavior. They were successful. In fact, their most influential accomplishments proved to be the coining of the terms “Uranian” and “homosexual.” During this time, German men who were engaging in sodomy began to refer to themselves as “Uranians,” and a militant slogan, “Uranians of the World, Unite!” was used internationally.⁴ Although Ulrichs’s identity-based term would fail to stick long term, Kertbeny’s term, “homosexual,” proved to have more lasting appeal.

Social critic Mark Steyn describes how the coining of terms by activists has played a central role in the movement to normalize same-gender sexual activity by subtly influencing public opinion via the lexicon. Historically, Steyn explains, moral concern for sexual activity between two persons of the same gender was identified as sodomy, an act. One can either think of sodomy as acceptable or unacceptable; either way, it is an act that someone chooses. Then, Steyn explains that in the late nineteenth century, the act was redescribed as a condition of certain persons, and it was termed “homosexuality.” Next (only a few decades ago) “homosexuality” was upgraded again, this time referring to a person’s very identity, so that now we identify people as being “gay,” or “straight,” or somewhere “in between.” Now the term describes who a person is. It has become as fundamental to one’s identity as race. Steyn explains, “Each formulation raises the stakes: One can object to and even criminalize an act; one is obligated to be sympathetic toward a condition; but once it’s a full fledged 24/7 identity, like being Hispanic or Inuit, anything less than wholehearted acceptance gets you marked down as a bigot.”⁵

Ulrichs’s socio-political strategy established itself as a working model in late-nineteenth-century Germany. However, oncoming political turmoil both

² Lauritsen, John, and Thorstad, David; The Early Homosexual Rights Movement: 1864-1935; New York, Times Change Press, 1974, p 6

³ Steakly, James D., The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany. New York, Arno Press, 1975 p. 13) -all terms referring to the act of sodomy.

⁴ Rutledge, Leigh W., The Gay Book of Lists. Boston, Alyson Publications Inc., 1987, pg 41 and pg.45 in Pink Swastika

⁵ Mark Steyn, “There’s No Stopping Them Now,” Chicago Sun-Times, July 13 2003, p.35

within the pro-sodomy movement and throughout Germany pushed his movement underground. Ulrichs's strategy was destined to lie explicitly dormant for nearly a century; yet its influence survived implicitly in the language. The "third-gender" theory established a new concept for the masses. This concept carried with it an entirely new blueprint for society's future.

3

The Pro-Sodomy Movement in America

“The positive goal...is the revival of Hellenic chivalry and its recognition by society. By chivalric love we mean in particular close friendships between youths and even more particularly the bonds between men of unequal ages.”⁶

(Adolf Brand, Activist)

Shortly after Ulrichs’s death in 1895, the pro-sodomy movement in Germany split into two separate and opposed factions. One faction followed Ulrichs’s successor Magnus Hirschfield, the other a young anarchist, Adolf Brand. What divided the movement was gender identity. Hirschfield and his followers embraced an effeminate identity, as in the tradition of Ulrichs, while Brand and his followers perceived themselves as hyper-masculine, as in the Greek tradition.

In 1897, Magnus Hirschfield formed the Scientific Humanitarian Committee (SHC). The SHC was dedicated to two Ulrichsian goals. The first was to overturn paragraph 175 of the German Penal Code which criminalized sodomy, and the second was to work to legitimize acts of sodomy within the German culture. Although Hirschfield was originally committed to Ulrichs’s “third-gender” theory of an inborn “Uranian” condition, he later abandoned it. Hirschfield believed persons experiencing same-sex attractions to be the sexual equivalent of handicapped, due to a hormonal imbalance. He also considered same-sex attraction to be curable, through hormone treatment. The acknowledgement of a curable same-sex attraction undoubtedly arose after Hirschfield observed the general sexual confusion of patients with same-sex attraction at his Institute for Sex Research in Berlin, which was the predecessor to Alfred Kinsey’s Institute for Sex Research in the U.S., founded in 1947.

Although Hirschfield’s “fem” faction dominated the early pro-sodomy movement in Germany, other activists, such as Adolf Brand and his followers, perceived themselves as fully masculine and despised everything effeminate. Soon, these opposing activists formed their own separate organization.

On May 1, 1902, three pederasts, Adolf Brand, Wilhelm Jansen, and

⁶ B. Friedlander: 259

Benedict Friedlander formed "The Community of the Special" (CS). The CS fashioned themselves as a modern incarnation of the warrior cults of ancient Greece, Sparta, Thebes, and Crete. Members of the CS were ultra-masculine, male supremacists and pederastic (devoted to man/boy sex). Brand once wrote that he wanted men who "thirst for a revival of Greek times and Hellenic standards of beauty after centuries of Christian Barbarism." The CS wanted German society to revert to pagan values: "The positive goal...is the revival of Hellenic chivalry and its recognition by society. By chivalric love we mean in particular close friendships between youths and even more particularly the bonds between men of unequal ages."⁷

Adolf Brand published the first pro-sodomy magazine in Germany, *Der Eigene* ("The Special"). In 1903, Brand was briefly jailed as a child pornographer for including pictures of nude boys in his magazine. Nevertheless, *Der Eigene* remained in publication until 1931, peaking at over 150,000 subscriptions during the years of the Weimer Republic. In addition to *Der Eigene*, Brand published a satirical journal entitled *Die Tante* ("The Fairy" or "The Auntie") which often ridiculed the effeminate Hirschfeld and his followers.⁸

As the rift between the hyper-feminine and hyper-masculine factions of the pro-sodomy movement widened, and as the revival of pagan Hellenic values began to transform German society, the hyper-masculine wing led by Brand became a serious political force. In 1919, Hans Kahnert along with other supporters of the hyper-masculine faction founded the "Society for Human Rights" (SHR). The "butches" "SHR" quickly outgrew the "fems" "SHC" and became the largest pro-sodomy organization in Germany during the 1920's.

The first pro-sodomy organization in the United States was an American chapter of Hans Kanherth's German-based "Society for Human Rights" (SHR). The American SHR was founded on December 10, 1924 in Chicago by the German-American, Henry Gerber (1892-1972).⁹ Gerber served with the U.S. occupation forces in Germany from 1920-23. While overseas, Gerber became involved with the German SHR. When Gerber returned to America, he legally chartered an SHR chapter together with a small group of "revolutionaries," without revealing its purpose to the state. Soon, they began publishing a pro-sodomy journal called *Friendship and Freedom*,¹⁰ patterned after the German chapter's publication of the same name.¹¹

In 1925, the organization collapsed when Henry Gerber, Vice President Al

⁷ B. Friedlander: 259

⁸ Oosterhais and Kennedy: 6

⁹ J. Katz: 388

¹⁰ *ibid.*:389

¹¹ *ibid.*:632n

Menninger, and another member were arrested on charges of sexually abusing a boy. All three were turned in by Menninger's wife. The *Chicago Examiner* ran the story: "Strange Sex Cult Exposed" and spoke of strange doings in Menninger's apartment. Menninger confessed, but Gerber claimed that the incident was a set-up, saying that their arrests were "shades of the Holy Inquisition."¹²

Upon Gerber's release from prison he continued his activism underground by writing under the pen-name "Parisex." He also retained his ties to the German SHR and published several articles in their publication. Gerber resurfaced in 1934, when he joined the staff of a pro-sodomy literary magazine called *Chanticleer*.¹³ In *Chanticleer*, Gerber revealed himself as a militant socialist who regarded capitalism and Christianity as the twin pillars of ignorance and repression of "sexual freedom."¹⁴ Despite Gerber's work, his chapter of the SHR was only an aberration. The demand and leadership for a sustaining pro-sodomy organization in the United States would not emerge until 1948.

On August 10, 1948, at the tail end of an eighteen year stint as an American communist party leader, Henry (Harry) Hay (1912-2002) who is regarded as the "founder of the modern 'gay' rights movement" began to organize a group that would eventually come to be known as the Mattachine Society.¹⁵ Although the society did not officially receive its name until the spring of 1951, it was seen from the beginning as a vehicle to destroy social restraints against sodomy in American culture.¹⁶

At the age of fourteen, Henry Hay, like Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, was sexually abused by an older man (in this case, a man about 25 years old).¹⁷ Later in life, Hay defined himself as a neo-pagan and participated in the occultic rituals at the "Los Angeles lodge of the Order of the Eastern Temple (O.T.O.), Aleister Crowley's notorious anti-Christian spiritual group."¹⁸ Hay also provided musical accompaniment to ceremonies performed by the "lesbian high priestess." He also founded a New Age group called "Radical Faeries," which met in an asram in the high desert of Arizona to offer invocations to pagan spirits.¹⁹ Hay also believed pederasty (man/boy sex) to be an essential part of the pro-sodomy movement in America and openly endorsed the "North American Man/Boy Love

¹² *ibid.*:392

¹³ *ibid.*: 633n

¹⁴ *ibid.*: 394

¹⁵ *ibid.*: 132

¹⁶ J. Katz: 412f

¹⁷ *ibid.*: 36

¹⁸ Timmons: 76

¹⁹ *ibid.*: 265

Association.”²⁰

Henry Hay was Karl Heinrich Ulrichs’s American counterpart in several ways. Both men launched enduring social movements in their respective cultures. The avowed purpose of each was to undermine the Judeo-Christian moral consensus in respect to acts of sodomy, and both had been sexually abused at a young age. Unlike Ulrichs, however, Hay became increasingly militant as time went on. Until in the 1980’s he participated in California’s notoriously violent “ACT-UP” (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power) demonstrations.²¹ Though Hay was in his 70’s and is not directly linked with any of the property destruction associated with ACT-UP, his presence validated the terrorist tactics of the group.

Henry Hay’s Mattachine Society spawned large-scale pro-sodomy political and social activism that soon outgrew both his expectations and control. Hay’s highly motivated activists operated in groups designed like communist cells, each a “secret fraternity” bound by a common vice. As Hay stated in a later interview, “[we wanted to] keep them underground and separated so that no one group could ever know who all the other members were.”²² Slowly at first, from innumerable obscure sources came theories, public statements, and actions in support of the social acceptance of “homosexuality.” And as the power of the pro-sodomy political lobby grew, so did the ugliness of its demands and its methods.

²⁰ *ibid.*: 296

²¹ *ibid.*: 292

²² J. Katz:410

4

Alfred C. Kinsey

“People seem to think that any (sexual) contact between children and adults has a bad effect on the child. I say this can be a loving and thoughtful, responsible sexual activity.”²³

(Wardell Pomeroy, Assistant to Alfred Kinsey)

While Henry Hay was preparing to take the pro-sodomy movement public with the Mattachine Society, pro-sodomy activism continued through hidden cell groups and individual activists. Alfred C. Kinsey, who is known today as the “Father of the Sexual Revolution,” was one such activist. In 1947, Kinsey secured funding from the Rockefeller Foundation and founded the Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University. The Institute, which later changed its name to the “Kinsey Institute,” should be recognized as the American counterpart and successor to pro-sodomy activist Magnus Hirschfield’s German-based “Institute for Sex Research.” So intertwined were the two that E. Michael Jones, editor of *Fidelity* magazine, once told author Dr. Scott Lively that he had perused documents from the Berlin Institute for Sex Research in the basement of the Kinsey building.

In the broad tradition of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, Magnus Hirschfield, and Adolf Brand, Alfred Kinsey and his assistants were dedicated to the normalization of sexual deviancy, including both sodomy and pederasty. Researchers Judith Reisman and Edward Eichel explain: “It is clear that he [Kinsey] shared [co-researcher Wardell] Pomeroy’s view that Christians inherited an almost paranoid approach to sexual behavior from the Jews.”²⁴

Having abandoned the Judeo-Christian sexual ethic, Kinsey and his assistant Pomeroy came to be known for their support of pedophilia. In a 1992 article on the subject, author Michael Ebert quotes Pomeroy as saying, “People

²³ (Ebert, Michael. “Pedophilia Steps into the Daylight;” *Focus on the Family Citizen*. November 16, 1992 Pg. 6f.)

²⁴ (Robinson in Reisman, Dr. Judith A., and Eichel, Edward W. Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People. Lafayette, Louisiana, Huntington House, 1990, 1992:204.)

seem to think that any (sexual) contact between children and adults has a bad effect on the child. I say this can be a loving and thoughtful, responsible sexual activity.”²⁵ Thus, it became the goal of Kinsey and Pomeroy to reinforce their views of sodomy, pedophilia, and other forms of sexual deviancy through their pseudo-scientific work at the so-called Institute for Sex Research.

In 1948, Kinsey released his culture-shattering book, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. The first major sex study of its kind, the *Kinsey Report* purported four discoveries, in graphic detail. First, the study claimed to have found that Americans were far more sexually promiscuous and sexually deviant than they said they were.²⁶ Second, the studies seven–point theoretical “Kinsey Scale,” in which an attraction to both sexes occupies a middle balanced position, attempted to establish sexual deviancy as a norm by definition. Third, Kinsey’s study is the basis for the enduring myth that ten percent of American men engage in sodomy. Fourth, Kinsey purported to show that adult/child sex is harmless.²⁷

Despite Kinsey’s unscientific method, the radical nature of his claims attracted attention and the press coverage following his studies release could not have been more exhaustive. While press coverage rocked the nation’s beliefs about itself, Kinsey, the previously unheard of zoologist, was catapulted almost overnight into limelight and prestige. In 1953, Kinsey released a companion volume entitled, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*.

For over forty years, Kinsey’s data went more or less unchallenged. His theory of sex as a mere outlet released human behavior from what Marcuse has called “the repressive order of procreative sexuality” and ushered in a new age of sexual utilitarianism. All forms of sexual expression were equalized in the Kinsey model. Although his studies continue to serve as the “scientific” justification for the so-called “sexual revolution,” Kinsey’s findings were not valid, and his methods were multifariously flawed.

TO BE CONTINUED

(First, promiscuity of Americans

Second, Kinsey scale establishing deviancy as a norm

Third, 10 percent myth

Fourth, pedophilia is natural myth

Fifth, wrap up with Kinsey’s other deviancy and untimely death)

²⁵ (Ebert, Michael. “Pedophilia Steps into the Daylight;” *Focus on the Family Citizen*. November 16, 1992 Pg. 6f.)

²⁶ (Reisman, Dr. Judith A., and Eichel, Edward W. *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People*. Lafayette, Louisiana, Huntington House, 1990, 1992:2)

²⁷ (Marotta, Toby. *The Politics of Homosexuality*; Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1981 Pg 36)

5

The Sexual Revolution

*"If Kinsey was the researcher of the sexual revolution, I was the pamphleteer."*²⁸

(Hugh Hefner)

Within five years of the Kinsey Report, Hugh Hefner launched *Playboy* magazine and with it came the modern pornography industry. Hefner himself is quoted as saying that if Kinsey were the researcher of the sexual revolution he was the pamphleteer.²⁹ The initial target audience of *Playboy* magazine was the very generation of young men whom Kinsey had been speaking to on his college lecture circuit. More significantly, the magazine popularized Kinsey's ethic of sexual licentiousness with much of the male population of America at the time.

Playboy magazine, then and now, serves as a social engineering tool, in that the existence of a thriving pornography industry morally corrupts the men who use it. It logically makes them less likely to oppose sodomy on moral grounds and more likely to support public policies which legitimize sexual license. Exposure to pornography at a young age has also been shown to be a gateway into struggles with both same-sex attraction and sodomy.

In a similar way, the pro-sodomy cause is advanced by a successful abortion industry, which arose in response to the "sexual revolution." The choice to murder one's own unborn child morally compromises both men and women, making them unwilling to criticize the choice to engage in other forms of immoral behavior. It also ensures that an unwanted child will not be a lasting deterrent to those who have chosen sexual license over family.

In addition, the acceptance of sexual indulgence as an important social value inevitably initiates a downward moral spiral in a culture. In American society, the selling of the idea of recreational sex to young men in the 1950's created a "market" for immodest and sexually adventurous young women, which in turn helped to legitimize the idea of female sexual promiscuity. In the

²⁸ Reisman, 1998: 108

²⁹ Reisman, 1998: 108

1960's, once immodesty and promiscuity became acceptable for some women, the pressure increased for all women, competing for the attentions of men, to adopt these behaviors. This was especially true of the youngest marriage-age women of that generation, whose personal morals and values had already been influenced by a decade of sex-saturated pop culture.

The wholesale entrance of woman into the world of sexual license created a number of societal demands. It created the demand for a "second wave" feminist movement to "liberate" women from societal expectations about marriage and child-rearing (National Organization for Woman formed in 1966); for contraception on demand (Griswold V Connecticut in 1966); for abortion on demand (Roe V Wade in 1973); and for "no-fault" divorce (state by state liberalization of divorce law began in the early 1970's). The result of these policies has been the achievement of a pansexualist goal as embodied by Kinsey's teachings: the progressive denormalization of marriage and the steady normalization of sexual license. The census data of 1998 showed a fourfold increase of divorce from 1970 to 1996, while the population of cohabiting couples, more than doubled.

Among the side-effects produced by these dramatic changes in American policy are the increase of violent and non-violent crime, the proliferation of sexually transmitted diseases, and the escalation of mental illness and chronic substance abuse. The Index of Cultural Indicators, devised by former Secretary of Education William J. Bennett, has tabulated statistical indicators of America's cultural collapse from 1960 to 1990. During this period, Bennett writes that there was a "560 percent increase in violent crime; more than 400 percent increase in illegitimate births; a quadrupling of the divorce rate; a tripling of the percentage of children living in single-parent homes; more than a 200 percent increase in the teenage suicide rate; and a drop of almost 80 points in SAT scores...The social regression of the last 30 years is due in large part to the enfeebled state of our social institutions and their failure to carry out a critical and time-honored task: the moral education of the young."

These, of course, are all results one would expect to find in a generation of citizens raised in unstable homes. Each and every one of these social problems is a direct consequence of embracing the "pansexual" "anything goes" attitude of sexual license popularized by Kinsey. Meanwhile, as the pursuit of sexual hedonism became the personal goal of an ever larger percentage of the population, the pro-sodomy movement continued its advance.

6

The Stonewall Riots and the Politicization of the “Gay” Identity

“Two, four, six, eight -- Smash the family, smash the state!”
(Popular slogan of 1970s pro-sodomy activists)³⁰

By 1969, the influence of a growing sexual subculture in America had spawned the demand for sexually deviant businesses in major cities. “Gay bars” sprang up in Los Angeles and New York, hosting a bizarre mix of “street queens,” drug addicts, and boy prostitutes.³¹ In New York men regularly engaged in public sex acts with anonymous partners “in the backs of trucks parked near the West Village piers”³² and in public restrooms. Sodomy occurred so frequently in the bushes of one public park that the authorities were forced to cut down the trees to stop it.³³ In response to police efforts to discourage this increasingly offensive behavior, participators began to organize to demand the “right” to public sodomy. Emboldened by their numbers, they began picketing businesses such as Macy’s department store, which had cracked down on sodomy in their restrooms.³⁴

On the evening of June 27, 1969, the pro-sodomy movement officially adopted terrorism as a means to achieve power when a surly mob of “drag queens, dykes, street people, and bar boys”³⁵ physically attacked police officers conducting a raid at the Stonewall Bar on Christopher Street in New York. The Stonewall Inn was “one of the best known of the Mafia controlled bars,”³⁶ and was being closed for selling alcohol without a license. It was also a haven for sexual deviants. As police began to take some bar patrons in for questioning, a mob of men gathered across the street. Pro-sodomy activist Toby Marotta’s *The*

³⁰ Oosterhuis and Steakley:2

³¹ Marotta:71

³² *ibid.*:93

³³ Adam:85

³⁴ *ibid.*:85

³⁵ Marotta:75

³⁶ Marotta:75

Politics of Homosexuality includes an eyewitness report by a writer for the *Village Voice*: “[A]lmost by signal the crowd erupted into cobblestone and bottle heaving...The trashcan I was standing on was nearly yanked out from under me as a kid tried to grab it for use in the window smashing melee. From nowhere came an uprooted parking meter—used as a battering ram on the Stonewall door. I heard several cries of “Let’s get some gas,” but the blaze of flame which soon appeared in the window of the Stonewall [where the police officers were trapped] was still a shock.”³⁷

By morning, the Stonewall bar was a burned-out wreck and four policemen were injured. Pro-sodomy leaders declared the violence a success. Interestingly, the anniversary of this event is known today as “Gay Pride Day” and features parades and other events most notable for their public sex acts and nudity.³⁸ It is ironic that the very activists who emerged from this new militant environment developed the strategy of claiming victim status through the use of such symbols as the pink triangle.”³⁹

The rise of militancy reflected the emergence of an aggressive “butch” faction of the American pro-sodomy movement, similar to that which occurred at the turn of the last century in Germany. Following the Stonewall riots, the Mattachine Action Committee of the Mattachine Society’s New York chapter clamored for “organized resistance.”⁴⁰ However, control of the movement was taken out of their hands by a still more radical group of activists, the “Gay Liberation Front” (GLF), so titled “because it had the same ring as National Liberation Front, the alliance formed by the Viet Cong.”⁴¹ At the heart of this new circle of power was Herbert Marcuse,⁴² a long time Socialist who had learned his politics (and perhaps sodomy) in pre-Nazi Germany. Pro-sodomy historian Barry D. Adam writes: “Herbert Marcuse, who had been a youthful participant in the 1918 German revolution and had been steeped in the thinking of the life-reform movements of the Weimar Republic, caught the attention of many gay liberationists. His *Eros and Civilization*, published in the ideological wasteland of 1955, bridged the prewar and postwar gay movements with its implicit vision of homosexuality as a protest ‘against the repressive order of procreative sexuality.’”⁴³

In the wake of the Stonewall riots, “Gay Liberation Fronts” sprang up

³⁷ibid.:72

³⁸ibid.:158

³⁹ Adam:86

⁴⁰Adams:81

⁴¹ibid.:91

⁴²ibid.:88

⁴³ibid.:84

across the country, using methods of intimidation and coercion to achieve political gains. Immediately they targeted the medical community, whose increasing effectiveness in treating same-sex attraction threatened the movement.⁴⁴ “Gay Liberation Fronts,” writes Adam, “stormed San Francisco, Los Angeles and Chicago conventions of psychiatry, medicine and behavior modification,” shouting down speakers and terrorizing audience members.⁴⁵ As extreme as it had itself become, the Mattachine Society predicted that the Gay Liberation Front’s “violent tactics” would fail to inspire the movement,⁴⁶ but they were wrong. Though the GLF collapsed in 1972, in part because of a conflict between “drag queens and machos” [“Fems” and “Butches”], their coercive philosophy prevailed.⁴⁷

⁴⁴Rueda:101ff

⁴⁵ Adam:87f

⁴⁶ Marotta:136

⁴⁷Adam:90

7

The Intimidation of the American Psychiatric Association

“It was never a medical decision—and that’s why I think the action came so fast...It was a political move.” “That’s how far we’ve come in ten years. Now we even have the American Psychiatric Association running scared.”

(Barbara Gittings, Pro-Sodomy Activist)

Prior to December 14, 1973 the American Psychiatric Association (APA) considered same-sex attractions disordered. The disorder was listed in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-II (DSM-II)* under the label, “Homosexuality.” Psychiatry’s authoritative voice influenced public opinion, which at the time was negative toward both sodomy and the types of people who engaged in such acts. Although public sexual activity in parks and public restrooms contributed to societies negative views, “scientific opinion” was crucial in the public attitude.

In an effort to remove “Homosexuality” from the *DSM* pro-sodomy activists began a program of intimidation aimed at the American Psychiatric Association circa 1970. Activist Franklin Kameny states the movement’s objective clearly, “I feel that the entire homophile movement...is going to stand or fall upon the question of whether or not homosexuality is a sickness, and upon our taking a firm stand on it...”⁴⁸ Franklin Kameny led the Washington D.C. chapter of the Mattachine Society during the 1960’s. In the tradition of Magnus Hirschfield and Alfred Kinsey, Kameny viewed one’s attraction to a specific gender as fluid, and viewed acts of sodomy as morally equivalent to natural sexual acts within the bounds of marriage. Led by radicals like Franklin Kameny, pro-sodomy activists attacked psychiatrists across America, as *Newsweek* describes:

“But even more than the government, it is the psychiatrists who have experienced the full rage of the homosexual activists. Over the past two years, gay-lib organizations have repeatedly disrupted medical meetings, and three months ago—in the movements most aggressive demonstration so far—a group

⁴⁸*The Gay Crusaders*, by Kay Tobin and Randy Wicker, p. 98

of 30 militants broke into a meeting of the American Psychiatric Association in Washington, where they turned the staid proceedings into near chaos for twenty minutes. 'We are here to denounce your authority to call us sick or mentally disordered,' shouted the group's leader, Dr. Franklin Kameny, while the 2,000 shocked psychiatrists looked on in disbelief. 'For us, as homosexuals, your profession is the enemy incarnate. We demand that psychiatrists treat us as human beings, not as patients to be cured!'"⁴⁹

Ironically, at the very moment Franklin Kameny was claiming that sodomy was healthy, safe, and natural a deadly virus was silently passing through communities of men all over the nation. Only a decade later, thousands of men would be dead or dying of AIDS.

On June 7, 1971, Franklin Kameny wrote a letter to the *Psychiatric News* threatening the APA with not only more, but worse, disruptions. In this letter he states, "Our presence there was only the beginning of an increasingly intensive campaign by homosexuals to change the approach of psychiatry toward homosexuality or, failing that, to discredit psychiatry."⁵⁰

Kay Tobin Lahausen, co-author of *The Gay Crusaders*, describes a variety of activism. "We did all sorts of protests...When the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations came out of some meeting and got in his big black limousine, I remember going crazy, rocking and beating on the limousine...He had never been besieged by a bunch of homosexuals before. But he had said something that got us going."⁵¹

Lahausen's lover, Barbara Gittings was a well known activist during this time as well. Although Gittings was not a librarian, she was the first head of the American Library Association's "Gay Task Force." Her objective was to bring books advocating sodomy to the attention of librarians, in hopes of having them included in their libraries. At one American Library Association meeting Gittings set up a same-sex kissing booth to attract attention to her cause. Gittings tells about her activism against the APA:

"Besides the ALA, I was also very involved, along with many other people, in efforts to get the American Psychiatric Association... to drop its listing of homosexuality as a mental illness. Psychiatrists were one of the three major groups that had their hands on us. They had a kind of control over our fate, in the eyes of the public, for a long time. Religion and law were the other two groups that had their hands on us. So, besides being sick, we were sinful and

⁴⁹*Newsweek*, 8-23-71, p.47

⁵⁰*The Gay Crusaders*, p. 130-131

⁵¹ *Making History: The Struggle for Gay and Lesbian Equal Rights, 1945-1990: an Oral History* by Eric Marcus p.216-217 (-Author Marcus has worked as an associate producer for "CBS This Morning" and "Good Morning America.")

criminal. But the sickness label infected everything that we said and made it difficult for us to gain any credibility for anything we said ourselves. The sickness issue was paramount.”⁵²

Gittings took place in disruptive “zap” attacks on the APA. She states, “I am not opposed to zap tactics. In fact, I spearheaded a zap at a psychiatrist’s meeting and I’m ready to do it again.”⁵³ Gittings recounts, “The 1970 convention in San Francisco was disrupted by a group of feminists and gay men who were enraged by what the psychiatrists were saying about them—and newspapers all around the country carried the story.”⁵⁴

The “Gay” Militants, a book about that time tells the story, “On May 14, 1970 psychiatrists became the hunted. An invasion by the coalition of ‘gay’ and woman’s liberationists interrupted the national convention of the American Psychiatric Association in San Francisco to protest the reading of a paper by an Australian psychiatrist on the subject of ‘aversion therapy,’ a system of treatment which attempts to change gay orientation by keying unpleasant sensations (such as electric shocks) to homosexual stimuli. By the time the meeting was over, the feminists and their gay cohorts were in charge...and the doctors were heckling from the audience.”⁵⁵

Pro-sodomy activists took over the podium and microphones. Then, “Konstantin Berlandt, of Berkeley GLF, paraded through the hall in a bright red dress. Paper airplanes sailed down from the balcony. With two papers still unread, the chairman announced adjournment.” As the meeting adjourned several arguments broke out between the psychiatrists who were angry about the disruption of the activists. One activist shouted to a Psychiatrist, “Don’t shake your fu**ing finger at me,” to which the psychiatrist replied, “I’ll shake whatever I please.”⁵⁶ As another argument arose, psychiatrist Dr. Irving Bieber stated that he believed persons experiencing same-sex attractions were the subjects of “misplaced sexual adjustment,” to which a pro-sodomy activist shrieked and called him a “mother fu**er.”⁵⁷ Several months later, *The Advocate* reported on other disruptions: “PSYCHOLOGISTS GET GAY LIB THERAPY.”

On June 23, 1970, activists disrupted another meeting of the American Psychiatric Association. This time in Chicago, they repeatedly shouted down the

⁵² Making History: The Struggle for Gay and Lesbian Equal Rights, 1945-1990: an Oral History by Eric Marcus p.221

⁵³ *The Gay Crusaders*, p.234

⁵⁴ *The Gay Crusaders*, p.216

⁵⁵ *The Gay Militants*, by Donn Teal, p.272-273

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p.274

⁵⁷ *ibid* p.275

main speakers discourse.⁵⁸ Again, in October, during a meeting at the University of Southern California, pro-sodomy activists shouted down a speaker and took over the stage and microphone.⁵⁹

Pro-sodomy activists continued to pressure the APA through 1973. A pro-sodomy magazine, *The Advocate*, talks of "...what happened in 1973...referring to the widespread protests by the gay and lesbian community that led to the APA's dropping homosexuality from the *DSM*."⁶⁰

Add that the resolution still called them bad and the newer negotiated verbiage, also add the other psychologist names that were elected to the board and how many persons annually serve on the board.

While activists were terrorizing psychiatrists, the APA's Board of Trustees was being stacked with members sympathetic to the pro-sodomy cause. Pro-sodomy psychiatrist and former president of the American Psychiatric Association Alfred M. Freedman recounts, "In the APA elections of 1972 and 1973 concern over social issues brought in a number of individuals as members of the Board of Trustees who were committed to change, including removal of homosexuality per se from the official APA nomenclature."⁶¹

Dr. Robert L. Spitzer M.D., a member of the APA Task Force on Nomenclature and Statistics was one of the psychiatrists committed to change. During this time, Dr. Spitzer began to organize meetings and symposiums to discuss the possible removal of "Homosexuality" from the *DSM*. One symposium, which took place at the APA annual meeting in Hawaii, included scores of pro-sodomy political activists. With evident biases going into the symposium, Dr. Spitzer concluded upon its end that action was necessary for the removal of "Homosexuality" from the *DSM*.

Spitzer then brought the issue to the attention of Dr. Henry Brill, who was the chair of the Task Force on Nomenclature and Statistics for the American Psychological Association. Dr. Brill then assigned Dr. Spitzer to prepare a "scientifically sound" and "persuasive" memo and resolution, to be presented to the APA's Council on Research and Development, Reference Committee, and the Assembly Board of Trustees.⁶²

After being given the assignment, Dr. Spitzer quickly drafted, presented, and obtained approval for his three page same-sex attraction affirming resolution by the APA's Council on Research and Development and Reference Committee.

⁵⁸Ibid., 275

⁵⁹Ibid., pp.276-280

⁶⁰*The Advocate*, 12-28-93, p.40

⁶¹Alfred M. Freedman M.D. *Psychiatric News*, September 2001, *Recalling APA's Historic Step*, <http://www.psych.org/pnews/00-09-01/recalling.html>

⁶²ibid

In order to secure unanimous passage among the Board of Trustees however, certain compromises had to be made. Although Spitzer's first draft, which states that, "homosexuality is a normal variant of human sexuality" was rejected, his second draft, which states, "xxxx" was eventually adopted. This draft, it should be noted, did not affirm same-sex attraction, but rather.....

An article appearing in *Psychiatric News* about this time recalls that pro-sodomy activists were beginning to speak of unyielding psychiatrists as "war criminals,"⁶³ with obvious implications. Possibly in fear for their safety, and certainly wearied by constant harassment, on December 15, 1973, the Board of Trustees of the American Psychiatric Association capitulated to the demands of the radicals and adopted Spitzer's resolution by voting to downgrade "Homosexuality" as an illness to the milder category of "Sexual Orientation Disturbance."

Add what "disorder meant, how the definition changed, and which is more accurate and why. Also, debunk the definition that is less accurate and note why all of science suffered.

The fact the Board was influenced and intimidated is no secret. In fact, pro-sodomy journalist Andrew Sullivan wrote that in December of 1973 the APA, "...under intense political pressure...removed homosexuality from its official list of psychiatric disorders..."⁶⁴ Activist Mark Thompson writes, "Just before the first of the year, the American Psychiatric Association's Board of Trustees declared we were no longer sick."⁶⁵

After the vote by the American Psychiatric Association's Board of Trustees, many members of the APA were outraged at the Board for caving in, and changing psychiatry solely as a result of political pressure. In response to the Board's decision many psychiatrists, led by Dr. Charles Socarides filed a petition for a referendum to reverse the action of the Board. They called for a full vote by the APA's 17,905 members.⁶⁶ On April 9, 1974, the results of the vote were announced. Only 10,555 of the 17,905 APA members voted in the election. The results were as follows,

Total APA members eligible to vote: 17,905
Number of APA members that actually voted: 10,555
Number of members that "Abstained": 367
Number of "No" votes -votes to keep "homosexuality" in the DSM as a mental disorder: 3,810

⁶³ibid.:88

⁶⁴*Love Undetectable*, Andrew Sullivan, 1998, p. 107

⁶⁵*The Long Road to Freedom*, ed. by Mark Thompsan 1994, p.97

⁶⁶*The Long Road to Freedom*, ed. by Mark Thompsan 1994, p.104

Number of “Yes” votes-votes to remove “homosexuality” from the DSM as a mental disorder: 5,854

It should be noted that the number of “Yes” votes, 5,854, made up only 32.7 percent of the total membership of the APA. Only slightly less than one-third of the APA’s membership approved the change. It should be further noted that the vote was partially controlled by the “National Gay and Lesbian Task Force” (NGTLF). The “NGTLF” was able to obtain APA member addresses and with-out identifying itself as an organization send out letters to all members urging them to vote to remove “homosexuality” from the DSM. Bruce Voeller, the head of the “NGTLF” admits, “Our costly letter has perhaps made the difference.”⁶⁷

The pro-sodomy activists won the vote and the new official definition of “Homosexuality” as a disorder was downgraded to include only those who were “unhappy with their sexual orientation.”⁶⁸ But was this vote a scientific decision, or was it a political one? Pro-sodomy historian Enrique Rueda writes, “This vote was not the result of scientific analysis after years of painstaking research. Neither was it a purely objective choice following the accumulation of incontrovertible data. The very fact that the vote was taken reveals the nature of the process involved, since the existence of an orthodoxy in itself, contradicts the essence of science.”⁶⁹ Indeed, when activists publicly claim that the vote was a scientific decision they hide three years of deceit and intimidation. In pro-sodomy publications however, activists are remarkably candid about the reality of the vote.

Pro-sodomy activist’s Kay Lahusen and Barbara Gittings know what really happened to the APA. In the book *Making History* they are quite open about the reality.

Kay: “This was always more of a political decision than a medical decision.”

Barbara: “It never was a medical decision—and that’s why I think the action came so fast. After all, it was only three years from the time that feminists and gays first zapped the APA at a behavior therapy session to the time that the Board of Trustees voted in 1973 to approve removing homosexuality from the list of mental disorders. It was a political move.”⁷⁰

The APA was thoroughly intimidated. In 1974, after the APA’s vote, Gittings was interviewed by pro-sodomy movement historian Jonathan Ned

⁶⁷*The Long Road to Freedom*, ed. by Mark Thompsan 1994, p. 105-106

⁶⁸Adam:88

⁶⁹Rueda:106

⁷⁰*Making History*, p.224

Katz. Gittings brags, "That's how far we've come in ten years. Now we even have the American Psychiatric Association running scared."⁷¹

Anytime a scientific organization endorses sodomy, remember Gittings words: They are "running scared." Pro-sodomy activists have learned that intimidation and strategic alliances work, and they are never hesitant about using intimidation and psychological manipulation to reach the goals of their radical agenda.

Adopting terrorism as a means, pro-sodomy activists set their vicious sights on Dr. David Reuben, one of the best-known psychologists in the area of human sexuality in 1974. Unbeknownst to Dr. Reuben, pro-sodomy activists were lying in wait outside one of his lectures and his physical safety was at risk. Pro-sodomy author Leigh Rutledge describes the attack in his book *The Gay Decades*, "June 16, A fist fight broke out at a Philadelphia playhouse when ten gay activists interrupted a lecture by Dr. David Rueben and denounced him as 'a criminal' for his views on male homosexuality. One policeman and a protestor are injured in the melee."⁷² On that same page, the book tells us that, "The Centers for Disease Control estimate that gay or bisexual men account for as much as one-third of the syphilis cases in the U.S."

Apparently, the American Psychological Association also got the message of intimidation when they caved in to the demands of pro-sodomy activists in 1975. In the book, *The Long Road to Freedom* the author writes, "January...The American Psychological Association and American Association for the Advancement of Science echoed the American Psychiatric Association in deeming homosexuality not an illness."⁷³ The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) publishes the scientific journal *Science*, intimidation by pro-sodomy activists was over for them. "Under pressure from gay scientific groups, *Science* magazine banned anti-gay bias in its staff hiring and advertisement."⁷⁴

Could the AAAS have been thinking about pressure from pro-sodomy groups when they published the poorly done studies by LeVay ("gay" brains) and Hamer ("gay" gene)? Two scientists who protested the LeVay study raise serious questions about AAAS, *Science*, and pro-sodomy activists. The scientists state that, "The appearance of LeVay's paper highlights a serious issue in *Science* public policy. Should such a study, based on a questionable design, with subjects drawn from a small, highly selected and non-representative sample, receive the

⁷¹*Gay American History*, by Jonathan Ned Katz, 1992, p.427. This interview was taped July 19, 1974

⁷²*The Gay Decades*, by a man that engages in same-gender sex and writer, Leigh W. Rutledge, 1992, p.69

⁷³*The Long Road to Freedom*, pp.115

⁷⁴*The Long Road to Freedom*, pp.214

kind of international attention and credibility that publication in a journal with the stature of *Science* lends?"⁷⁵

If Dr. LeVay was not able to draw a proper sample and to fulfill other basic requirements for a scientific study, why did he conduct the study at all? If the study was not done for scientific reasons it must have been done for political reasons. Indeed, LeVay's study was part of a massive public relations campaign designed to convince the public to believe that individuals are "born gay." The masthead of *Science* must have been intimidated to risk the publication's own legitimacy by publishing such an unscientific work. When unethical political movements dominate science, pushing science in unscientific directions, science suffers and leads society astray.

One lesson drawn from the facts outlined in this chapter is unmistakable: every time a scientific group repeats a pro-sodomy talking point, you may, with justifiable skepticism, suspect that these groups are acting out of intimidation. Another unmistakable lesson is that pro-sodomy activists are so desperate to cover their deeply dysfunctional condition that they will stop at nothing to hide the facts about their condition from the public. Award-winning writer and pro-sodomy activist Randy Shilts describes the denial that exists among many men who engage in sodomy, about the reality of their irresponsible and unhealthy lifestyles causing AIDS to be epidemic, when he writes, "...the desperation of denial: how when something is so horrible you don't want to believe it, you want it out of your mind and insist it isn't true, and how you hate the person who says it is."⁷⁶

Desperate denial; this seems to be what drives the pro-sodomy movement's deceit, psychological manipulation, and intimidation of scientific groups and other apposing members of society.

⁷⁵*Science*, 11-1-91, p.630

⁷⁶*And the Band Played On*, 1988, p. 182

8

The Born “Gay” Hoax

“It is time to learn from Madison Avenue and to roll out the big guns. . . . We are talking about propaganda.”

(Activists, Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen)

The born “gay” hoax was invented in 1985 by Marshall Kirk and Dr. Hunter Madsen. Marshall Kirk graduated magna cum laude from Harvard University in 1980 majoring in psychology and went on to become a writer and researcher in neuropsychiatry. Dr. Hunter Madsen earned a PhD in politics from Harvard University in 1985, then went on to become an expert on public persuasion tactics, social marketing, and has designed commercial marketing on Madison Avenue. He has also served as a consultant to pro-sodomy media campaigns across America.

In 1985, Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen co-authored an article entitled *The Gay Agenda* in a pro-sodomy magazine called *Christopher Street*. In short, the article emphasized the strategic importance of shifting the central issue in the debate over “homosexuality” away from sodomy and toward a sexual pseudo-identity called “gay.” The goal of *The Gay Agenda* was to force opponents of sodomy into a position where they would be seen as attacking the civil rights of so-called “gay” citizens, rather than opposing a specific antisocial behavior. *The Gay Agenda* also briefly outlined the strategy that would eventually be used to convince the public that individuals are born “gay.”

Initially, there was no enthusiasm for *The Gay Agenda* within the pro-sodomy movement. In fact, many activists considered the proposed strategy degrading because they viewed “rights related to sexuality as analogous to the constitutional rights to association, expression, or religion.”⁷⁷ Initially, there were strong reservations in against adopting the strategy. However, these initial reservations would not last for long.

In 1986 the pro-sodomy movement lost *Bowers v. Hardwick*; the United States Supreme Court case which upheld the rights of individual states to criminalize sodomy. The loss was devastating. Desperate, angry, and galvanized

⁷⁷ *The Advocate*, 3-24-92 p.62 quotation (Pat) mine

pro-sodomy activists learned that if they could make a compelling case that they were born “gay,” they could become eligible for “Minority Status” as a “Suspect Class” under the 1964 Civil Rights Act. If Minority Status were granted, it would force the courts to overturn *Bowers v. Hardwick*, thus legalizing sodomy. It should be noted however, that the Civil Rights Act recognizes Minority Status only for those groups who:

- 1) Have suffered a long history of discrimination
- 2) Are powerless to help themselves as a community
- 3) Are *born that way*

The legalization of sodomy by way of “Minority Status” is the secret to understanding why pro-sodomy activists adopted the strategy outlined in “*The Gay Agenda*” in the late 80’s and began to promote the Ulrichsian-type claim that people are born “gay.”

Wasting little time, Marshal Kirk and Hunter Madsen (Madsen writing under the pseudonym Erastes Pill) published a follow-up to *The Gay Agenda* entitled *The Overhauling of Straight America*. This article, which appeared in the pro-sodomy publication *Guide* in November of 1987, outlined a point-by-point strategy that could be used to convince “straight America” that men and women who develop same-sex attractions are born “gay.”

In the following year, 1988, a “War Conference” of 175 leading pro-sodomy activists, representing organizations from every part of the United States convened in Warrenton, Virginia. The purpose of the conference according to Kirk and Madsen was to establish an official agenda for the newly conceived “gay” movement. At this “War Conference” pro-sodomy activists adopted the identity politic strategy outlined *The Gay Agenda* and *The Overhauling of Straight America*. The born “gay” hoax was born.

Subsequently, in 1989, Marshal Kirk and Hunter Madsen expanded their article *The Overhauling of Straight America* into a book entitled *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of the Gays in the 90s*. In this deliberately deceitful agenda for America Kirk and Madsen write that they intend to “get tough” on straights. They further write, “. . .it is time to learn from Madison Avenue and to roll out the big guns. . . . *We are talking about propaganda.*” Kirk and Madsen explained the central tenant of their strategy: “The public should be *persuaded* that gays are victims of circumstance, that they no more chose their sexual orientation than they did, say, their height, skin color, talents, or limitations. (We argue that, for all *practical* purposes, gays should be considered to have been ‘born gay’--*even though sexual orientation, for most humans, seems to be the product of a complex interaction between innate predispositions and environmental*

factors during childhood and early adolescence.)”⁷⁸

Here, the authors admit that human sexuality “seems to be the product of a complex interaction between innate predispositions and environmental factors,” yet they urge readers to abandon the truth for “practical purposes,” i.e. furthering “*The Gay Agenda*.” The propagandists could not have been clearer about their plan to deceive Americans. *The “Gay” Agenda*, its cumulative post-luminaries, and efforts to employ the tactics outlined in these documents are what I refer to as The “Born Gay” Hoax. The following excerpts from the *After the Ball* will exemplify the manipulative tactics Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen enticed pro-sodomy activists employ.

“The first order of business is desensitization of the American public concerning gays...To desensitize the public is to help it view homosexuality with indifference instead of with keen emotion. Ideally we would have the straight register differences in sexual preference the way they register different tastes for ice cream...”⁷⁹

“The masses should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself...the imagery of sex should be downplayed...”⁸⁰

“...gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the role of protector...”⁸¹

“...make use of symbols which reduce the mainstream’s sense of threat, which lower its guard...”⁸²

“...replace the mainstream’s self-righteous pride about its homophobia with shame and guilt...”⁸³

“Talk about gays and gayness as loudly and as often as possible...” “The principal behind this advice is simple: almost all behavior begins to look *normal* if you are exposed to enough of it at close quarters and among your

⁷⁸ Kirk and Madsen, *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of the Gay’s in the 90s*, p.184

⁷⁹ Ibid p.7

⁸⁰ ibid p.8

⁸¹ Ibid.p.8

⁸² ibid p.8

⁸³ ibid p.10

acquaintances.”⁸⁴

Unfortunately, this social learning principle has proven itself time and time again throughout history, as various inhumane and outrageous behaviors have become commonplace and ordinary. The authors continue.

“Constant talk builds the impression that public opinion is at least divided on the subject...”⁸⁵

Madsen and Pill (Kirk) explain their scheme in greater depth when they write:

“Where we talk is important. The visual media, film and television, are plainly the most powerful image-makers in Western civilization. The average American household watches over seven hours of TV daily. Those hours open up a gateway into the private world of straights, through which a Trojan horse might be passed. As far as *desensitization* is concerned, the medium is the message--of *normalcy*. So far, gay Hollywood has provided our best covert weapon in the battle to *desensitize* the mainstream.”⁸⁶

“Not so many years ago, all of these statements would have been unbelievably offensive to most Americans, even if they contained no reference to ‘homosexuality,’ precisely because they all advocate coercive tampering with peoples most private domain, their thoughts, opinions, and beliefs, Kirk and Madsen call it ‘transforming the social values of straight America...’”⁸⁷ Let’s look at the mechanics of their strategy for ‘transforming’ society into what they feel would be a more acceptable form. The authors continue.

“Would a *desensitizing* campaign of open and sustained talk about gay issues reach every rabid opponent of homosexuality? Of course not. While public opinion is one primary source of mainstream values, religious authority is the other. When conservative churches condemn gays, there are only two things we can do to confound the homophobia of true believers. First, we can use talk to muddy the moral waters. This means publicizing support for gays by more moderate churches, raising theological objections of our own about conservative

⁸⁴ *ibid* p. 7

⁸⁵ *ibid*, p.8

⁸⁶*ibid*. p.8

⁸⁷*ibid*. p.14

interpretations of biblical teachings, and exposing hatred and inconsistency. Second, we can undermine the moral authority of homophobic churches by portraying them as antiquated backwaters, badly out of step with the times and with the latest findings of psychology. Against the mighty pull of institutional Religion one must set the mightier draw of Science & Public Opinion (the shield and sword of that accursed "secular humanism"). Such an unholy alliance has worked well against churches before, on such topics as divorce and abortion. With enough open talk about the prevalence and acceptability of homosexuality, that alliance can work again here."⁸⁸

"...the campaign should paint gays as superior pillars of society. Yes, yes, we know – this trick is so old it creaks"⁸⁹

"...it will be time to get tough with remaining opponents. To be blunt, they must be vilified."⁹⁰

"...we intend to make anti-gays to look so nasty that average Americans will want to dissociate themselves from such types..."⁹¹

"Each sign will tap patriotic sentiment; each message will drill a seemingly agreeable position into mainstream heads..."⁹²

"The public should be shown images of ranting homophobes whose secondary traits and beliefs disgust middle America...the Ku Klux Klan demanding that gays be burned alive or castrated; bigoted southern [sic] ministers drooling with hysterical hatred to a degree that looks both comical and deranged; menacing punks, thugs and convicts...Nazi concentration camps..."⁹³

This behavior-modification mentality, combined with the isolation of "straights" and others as groups or classes who assume the status of dehumanized targets of one sort or another continues, undisturbed in intensity.

"These images (of anyone opposed to homosexual behavior) should be combined with those of their gay victims by a method propagandists call the

⁸⁸ Ibid.p.9

⁸⁹ Ibid.p.9

⁹⁰ibid. p.10

⁹¹*ibid. p.10*

⁹² *ibid p.11*

⁹³ *ibid. p.10*

'bracket technique.' For example, for a few seconds an unctuous beady-eyed Southern preacher is seen pounding the pulpit in rage about 'those sick, abominable creatures.' While his tirade continues over the soundtrack, the picture switches to pathetic photos of gays who look decent, harmless, and likable; and then we cut back to the poisonous face of the preacher, and so forth. The contrast speaks for itself. The effect is devastating."⁹⁴

A group called Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG) actually used this technique in an advertising campaign in the fall of 1995 against Pat Robertson, Jesse Helms, and Jerry Falwell. As reported in the *San Francisco Examiner*, Sunday, November 12, 1995... "a new television ad campaign [portrays scenes of] a teenage girl contemplating suicide with a handgun, [and] a young man being beaten by a gang as his attackers shout slurs...interspersed with actual clips of the Rev. Pat Robertson and other conservatives deploring homosexuality. Most stations turned down the ads, but they ran in Tulsa, and Washington D.C. A print version of the ad (much less emotionally effective) was run in *USA Today*, November 21, 1995."

It is absolutely appalling to hear the tactics promoted by Marshall Kirk (MCKusick) and Hunter Madsen. Pro-sodomy activists who have employed these techniques have nothing to be proud of. These soi-disant propagandistic tactics and even the verbiage in which they are couched represent a twisted and fascist, deceitful and degrading approach to the winning of mainstream American mind.

In specialized press pro-sodomy activists speak candidly about the movement's purely "practical purposes" for promoting the idea the people are "born gay." In doing so, they admit that public "born gay" rhetoric is fabricated propaganda, contrived and carried out for specific political ends; mainly, the overturning of *Bowers* and the normalization of sodomy.

Dr. Lillian Faderman, who has won the Monette/Horwitz Award from the pro-sodomy activist group Lambda Literary Foundation, states: "And we continue to demand Rights, ignoring the fact that human sexuality is fluid and flexible, acting as though we are all stuck in our category forever." She further states, "The narrow categories of identity politics are obviously deceptive." It becomes obvious later in the article from which the above quotes are pulled that Dr. Faderman sees a political threat from the truth, from the fluidity of human sexuality. "I must confess that I am both elated and terrified by the possibilities of a bisexual moment. I'm elated because I truly believe that bisexuality is the natural human condition. But I'm much less happy when I think of the

⁹⁴ *ibid.* p.13-14

possibility of huge numbers of homosexuals (two-thirds of women who identify as lesbian for example) running off to explore the heterosexual side of their bisexual potential and, as a result, decimating our political ranks.” Dr. Faderman also writes that, “The concept of gay and lesbian identity may be nothing but a social construct, but it has been crucial, enabling us to become a political movement and demand the rights that are do to us as a minority. What becomes of our political movement if we openly acknowledge that sexuality is flexible and fluid, that gay and lesbian does not signify ‘a people’ but rather a ‘sometime behavior’?”⁹⁵

Dr. John DeCecco is a psychologist, Director of the Center for Research and Education in Sexuality at San Francisco State University, and Editor of *The Journal of Homosexuality*. Dr. DeCecco calls himself “gay” but insists that such attractions are a changeable preference not an orientation. He explains in his book entitled, *If You Seduce A Straight Person You Can Make Them Gay*, that, the whole born gay and immutable characteristic idea is just “gay and lesbian politics” and is aimed at achieving “gay” rights.⁹⁶

Dr. Vera Whisman writes in her book, *Queer by Choice: Lesbians, Gay Men, and the Politics of Identity*, “The political dangers of a choice discourse go beyond the simple (if controversial) notion that some people genuinely choose their homosexuality. Indeed, my conclusions question some of the fundamental basis upon which the gay and lesbian rights movement has been built. If we cannot make political claims based on an essential and shared nature, are we not left once again as individual deviants? Without an essentialist [born gay] foundation, do we have a viable politics?”⁹⁷

Lesbian writer Jennie Ruby admits, “I don’t think lesbians are born...I think they are made... The gay rights movement has (for many good, practical reasons) adopted largely an identity politics.”⁹⁸

Jan Clausen, lesbian author of the book *Apples and Oranges* writes, “What’s got to stop is the rigging of history to make the either/or look permanent and universal. I understand why this argument may sound erotic to outsiders for whom the public assertion of a coherent, unchanging lesbian or gay identity has proved an indispensable tactic in the battle against homophobic persecution.” Later, Clausen quotes the popular lesbian poet Audre Lorde, who admits the lies associated with the born “gay” hoax as well, when she writes, “I do not believe

⁹⁵ *The Advocate*, 9-5-95, p.43

⁹⁶ *If You Seduce A Straight Person You Can Make Them Gay*, John DeCecco, pg. 17-18

⁹⁷ *Queer by Choice: Lesbians, Gay Men, and the Politics of Identity*, By Dr. Vera Whisman; New York: Routledge, 1996 p.132

⁹⁸ *Off Our Backs*, Oct. 1996, p.22

our wants have made all our lies holy.”⁹⁹

Lesbians Lyne Harne and Elaine Miller explain their feelings regarding the born “gay” hoax: “There’s nothing natural in lesbianism, ‘it’s a positive choice,’ and a political one.”¹⁰⁰ Yet another admission appeared in the homosexual magazine *Girlfriends*; it states, “No wonder lesbians are so nervous. What makes the lesbian movement strong is the formation of a collective identity, unified behind sexual orientation as a category. If bisexuality undoes that, it kicks the lesbian movement where it really hurts: in the heart and soul of identity politics.”¹⁰¹

The National Center for Lesbian Rights (NCLR) is one of the homosexual activist organizations that pressure the American Psychiatric Association to reject homosexual reparative therapy. The NCLR claims that the “gay” identity is innate and unchangeable. JoAnne Loulan is one of the psychotherapists who served on the board of directors for this organization. Loulan made hypocritical headlines on the February 18, 1997 edition of the homosexual magazine *The Advocate* because she reportedly changed her own sexual orientation when she, fell in love with a man...?

Further, Kate Kendall, the Director of the NCLR, who in the spirit of Ulrichs, Kirk, and Madsen argued that the so-called “gay” person was endowed with a fixed, innate, and unchangeable, “sexual orientation” and commanded the American Psychiatric Association to halt all forms of reparative therapy for all people, including those desperately looking for help, actually wrote an article for *Frontiers Magazine*, arguing that sexual orientation is *fluid*, not fixed.¹⁰²

Kate Kendall and Joanne Loulan stood before the American Psychiatric Association with straight faces declaring reparative therapy to be the dangerous equivalent of pouring bleach on a black person’s skin to make them white. Then, one of these self-proclaimed “gays” went out and changed her own so-called “sexual-orientation” by falling in love with a man and the other took the time to write an article for an insiders’ magazine arguing that sexuality is *changeable*. *Is it possible, for us to continue to trust these activists when say that they are “born gay?”*

Those who have been tricked by the propaganda have little for which to be ashamed. There is no shame in believing a lie until you learn the truth. The truth is that beginning in 1985, *The Gay Agenda* was sold to the American public by pro-sodomy propagandists. The carefully calculated lies of these propagandists are blatant, and have been admitted in numerous pro-sodomy

⁹⁹

¹⁰⁰ *Lambda Book Report*, Oct. 1996, p.11, “Commenting on All the Rage: Reasserting Radical Lesbian Feminism”

¹⁰¹ *Girlfriends*, May/June, 1996, p. 40

¹⁰² *Frontiers*, 4-19-96, pg. 31

publications. It is obvious however, that born “gay” propagandists from Kirk and Madsen on, keep the fact of sexual fluidity secret from the straight community for *political* reasons. Pro-sodomy activists however, as evidenced by their own articles, talk about the born “gay” hoax and the realities of sexual choice regularly amongst themselves.

9

The Studies Exposed

“‘Gay Gene’ Research Doesn’t Hold Under Scrutiny, Chicago Tribune’s John Crewdson Uncovers Possible Scientific Misconduct by NCI Researcher.”¹⁰³

“I felt if I didn’t find anything, I would give up a scientific career altogether.”¹⁰⁴
(Simon LeVay, Activist)

By 1986 sentiments were galvanized in favor of implementing the strategy outlined in *The Gay Agenda* to combat the legal precedent left in the wake of *Bowers v Hardwick*. As the public relations campaign began to unfold, media headlines led many to believe that same-sex attractions are innate and unchangeable. Pro-sodomy activists capitalized on multiple pseudo-scientific studies to mislead the public. The following analyses will expose these illegitimate studies and the men who conducted them, beginning with the three most cited.

The Hypothalamus Study

The hypothalamus study was conducted in 1991 by Dr. Simon LeVay who worked at the Salk Institute for Biological Studies in La Jolla, California. LeVay’s study analyzed size differences in neurons in the anterior hypothalamus of the brains of cadavers. LeVay publicized his study in an effort to convince the world that same-sex attractions are fixed, and caused by the size of the hypothalamus in the brain.

LeVay, it should be noted, had strong personal and political incentives to pursue research in this area. According to a *Newsweek* cover story in 1992, LeVay had developed same-sex attractions, engaged in sodomy, and lost his partner to AIDS. The article states that when his partner, “Richard Heresey, died of AIDS, LeVay went into deep depression. Hospitalized for two weeks, he began reevaluating his goals. ‘It makes you think of what your life is about,’ he says. Around that time, a UCLA lab announced its finding that a portion of the male hypothalamus was more than twice as large as woman’s. Suddenly, it seemed

¹⁰³ *New York Native*, 7-10-95, p.25

¹⁰⁴ *Newsweek*: February 24, 1992 p.49

LeVay had a research area to pursue: was it also larger than that of gays?" LeVay told reporters: "I felt if I didn't find anything, I would give up a scientific career altogether."¹⁰⁵

LeVay also seemed to understand the impact that his study would have on society. In reference to this study he writes, "It's important to educate society. I think this issue does affect religious and legal attitudes." *The Advocate*, a pro-sodomy movement magazine asked LeVay if he thought "that grounding homosexuality in biology could help win political equality?" LeVay responded: "All the civil rights legislation passed in the '60s is based on the knowledge that there is a genetic and immutable difference between blacks and whites. Of course, blacks are still discriminated against, but the legal advances they've made are based on those genetic differences. And I think that is a major stumbling block for our gaining the same protection as other groups. There is a survey in the *New York Times* that broke down people on the basis of whether they thought gays and lesbians were born that way or whether it was a lifestyle choice. Across the board, those who thought gays and lesbians were born that way were more liberal and gay friendly."

LeVay's hypothalamus study received widespread media attention and as a result catapulted the idea that some men are born "gay" into prominence. Although the misinformed still quote the study today as proof that some men are born "gay," it was actually discredited shortly after its release for several reasons.

First, LeVay compared the brains of nineteen men whose sexual habits he did not know, (he only knew that they had died of AIDS, which is known to ravage the brain) with the brains of thirteen men whose sexual habits he did not know. It is therefore impossible to draw any conclusion from his study. Second, although LeVay argued that a small INAH3 (hypothalamus) "caused" men to be "gay," some of the men who, according to his guess work, had sex with men, had a hypothalamus that was larger than the average size of the hypothalamus of the men that, according to his guess work, had sex with women. Further, some of the men who, according to his guess work had sex with women had a hypothalamus that was smaller than the average size of the men who, according to his guess work had sex with men. So, some of his "gay" subjects should have been straight, and vice-versa. Third, Simon LeVay himself admitted in 2001 that the study was inconclusive, "*It's important to stress what I didn't find. I did not prove that homosexuality is genetic, or find a genetic cause for being gay. I didn't show that gay men are born that way, the most common mistake people make in interpreting my*

¹⁰⁵ *Newsweek*: February 24, 1992 p.49

work. Nor did I locate a gay center in the brain.”¹⁰⁶ Fourth, the results of the hypothalamus study are *not* repeatable. Simon LeVay’s hypothalamus study confused the public. Hopefully the truth will set the record straight.

The “Gay” Gene Study

The next and most influential study reported a “gay” gene and was conducted in 1993 by pro-sodomy activist Dr. Dean Hamer and his team of geneticists at the National Cancer Institute. Hamer and his colleagues reported that a “gay” gene seemed to be maternally linked and could be found on the Xq28 stretch of the X chromosome. Hamer, who has testified in opposition to Colorado’s Amendment 2, which sought to keep men who have sex with men from winning minority class status, has played an enormous role in the born “gay” hoax. Then Senator Robert C. Smith (R-New Hampshire) knew this and even accused the doctor of “actively pursu[ing] a gay agenda.”¹⁰⁷

Immediately after Hamer’s “gay gene” study was published a media explosion ensued. But, like LeVay’s hypothalamus study, Hamer’s results were a fraud. The title of an article appearing in the pro-sodomy movement magazine the *New York Native* explains:

*“‘Gay Gene’ Research Doesn’t Hold Under Scrutiny, Chicago Tribune’s John Crewdson Uncovers Possible Scientific Misconduct by NCI Researcher.”*¹⁰⁸ The article begins: “In addition to the political and social firestorm Hamer’s research has ignited, he has also been criticized by numerous scientists for not performing what seems to be an obvious control experiment: examining the genes of heterosexual brothers. Those scientists, including two prominent geneticist/biologists at Harvard University [Richard Lewontin and Ruth Hubbard], were not government researchers.”¹⁰⁹

This omission is significant. If Hamer was refusing to use a control group in his experiment, he must have refused for a reason. But, what could that reason have been? According to the article, another researcher who worked on the project had attacked Hamer’s integrity over this issue. The article continues:

“Even worse for Hamer, the National Institute of Health’s Office of

¹⁰⁶ As quoted in Byrd, et al., 2001, emp. added

¹⁰⁷ Joyce Price, “Federal Cancer Lab Hunts for Gay Gene,” *The Washington Times*, 3 April 1994

¹⁰⁸ *New York Native*, 7-10-95, p.25

¹⁰⁹ *New York Native*, 7-10-95, p.28

Research Integrity is now investigating his 'gay gene' research, according to Crewdson. The inquiry concerns allegations that Hamer was selective about which data he chose to report (i.e., that he ignored data that didn't support his contention that homosexuality is genetically determined). The data manipulation was reported to NIH's integrity office by a junior researcher who performed research crucial to Hamer's claimed discovery, according to Crewdson."¹¹⁰

Aside from the fact that it appears as though Hamer threw out cases which contradicted his pre-planned experimental outcome, if a study such as his is scientifically valid other researchers should get the same results with duplicate experiments. But this has not happened. The article continues:

"'It troubles some scientists that Hamer has not published his original data,' according to Crewdson. Additionally, at least one lab that has tried hard to replicate his findings has been unsuccessful." "Only one independent laboratory has reported attempting such a replication, and it has found no evidence to support Hamer," Crewdson reported. "We can't reproduce Hamer's data," said George Ebers, a neurogeneticist from the University of Western Ontario, who has searched unsuccessfully for a Hamer-style genetic link to homosexuality in more than 50 pairs of gay Canadian brothers. In fact, Ebers found the genetic markers cited by Hamer in "exactly half of his brother pairs" according to Crewdson—precisely what the laws of chance would predict, if the 'markers' had no significance."¹¹¹

Only four months after the *New York Native* article was printed, the November 1995 edition of *Scientific American* reported that Hamer was "being charged with research improprieties and was under investigation by the National Institute of Health's Federal Office of Research Integrity." According to allegations by a junior researcher on his team, Hamer deliberately and deceitfully excluded pairs of brothers whose genetic makeup contradicted his pre-planned experimental outcome. NIH never released the results of the inquiry, but Hamer was shortly thereafter transferred to another section. He had done his "gay" gene research under a grant to work on Kaposi's sarcoma, a skin cancer that inordinately afflicts men who have sex with men.

Then in April of 1999, George Rice and George Ebers, both neurogeneticists' from the University of Western Ontario discredited Hamer's results when they published their review of Hamer's study in *Science Magazine*.

¹¹⁰ *New York Native* 7-10-95, p.28, (emphasis added)

¹¹¹ *New York Native*, 7-10-95, p.25, 28

The scientists stated that the results of Hamer's study "did not support an X-linked gene underlying male homosexuality."¹¹² They found that the brothers observed by the Hamer group were no more likely to share the Xq28 markers than would be expected by chance. These results officially sounded the death-knell for Hamer's outrageously effective yet deliberately deceptive "gay" gene study. Another group of researchers (Sanders, et al.) eventually tried to replicate Hamer's study yet again; they too failed to find a genetic connection to homosexuality.¹¹³

Some once believed that a "gay" gene would be found hiding amidst other chromosomes analyzed in the Human Genome Project. However, according to the National Center for Bio-Technology Information, upon the completion of the Human Genome Project, we know that neither the map for the X nor the Y chromosomes contains a "gay" gene.

Hamer was eventually forced to admit that his study did not support a genetic cause for homosexuality and that female homosexuality was "culturally transmitted, not inherited" and that "There is not a single master gene that makes people gay...I don't think we will ever be able to predict who will be gay," he says.¹¹⁴ However, Hamer continued to publicly claim that male "homosexuality" was about 50 percent genetic, 50 percent environmental. Where did he get this 50 percent statistic from? Hamer's claim that male "homosexuality" is about 50 percent genetic is based on the "gay" twin study, which has also been discredited.¹¹⁵

The "Gay" Twins Study

The "gay" twins study was conducted by doctors Michael Bailey and Richard Pillard from Boston University in December of 1991. *The Advocate* reported the results:

"Bailey and Pillard "found that 52% of the identical twin brothers of gay men were gay, as were 22% of fraternal twin brothers, and 11% of genetically unrelated brothers."¹¹⁶

Once released, these results were spun into sales as magazine covers,

¹¹² Rice et al., 1999 and Wickelgren, 1999

¹¹³ Dean H. Hamer, George Rice, Neil Risch, and George Ebers, et al. "Genetics and Male Sexual Orientation" (Technical Comment), *Science* 285 (6 August 1999: 803a.)

¹¹⁴ *The Washington Blade*, 1-30-98, p.114

¹¹⁵ *The Washington Blade*, 1-30-98, p.14

¹¹⁶ *The Advocate*, 3-24-92, p.61

newscasters, and radio broadcasters cited the results as proof that same-sex attractions are genetic. In scientific circles however, problems were beginning to surface.

First, in order to show that “homosexuality” is genetic using identical twins, one must demonstrate that when one twin is “gay” the other will also be “gay” 100% of the time. The results of this twins study however, fell a long way short of the mark. Further, genetics tells us that if one *fraternal* (non-identical) twin is “gay,” then other *non-twin* brothers should also be “gay” exactly as often as are the non-identical twin brothers, since non-identical twins and regular brothers are equally genetically different. In this study, 22 percent of fraternal (non-identical) twins both claimed to be “gay.” Therefore, their non-twin brothers should also have claimed to have been “gay” 22 percent of the time. If the non-twin percentage was lower, some environmental cause must have been at fault, not a hidden “gay” gene. But this was not the case. Yet readers could not have known that this was not the case because Bailey and Pillard left the numbers for the genetically related non-twin brothers out of their original report. Why? If this data had supported their agenda, would they not have included it as well?

According to *The Advocate* the researcher’s withheld important information about the non-twin brothers in their study. The Advocate reports:

“According to Bailey, a heterosexual, the released data did not include another group in the study: 142 genetically related non-twin brothers of gay men, of whom only 13—or about 9 percent were also gay.”¹¹⁷

Ironically, this study shows that *unrelated* step-brothers are both “gay” more often than genetically *related* brothers. Obviously, if this data had been released with the original results, it would have been immediately clear that Bailey and Pillard did not prove the existence of a “gay” gene. The percentage of homosexuality in non-twin brothers is so low (9 percent) that had the study been properly conducted and reported, it would actually have demonstrated that same-sex attraction and sodomitic behaviors are *not* caused by a “gay” gene. This study, had it been properly reported, actually demonstrates that environment is a cause for same-sex attraction, not genes.

As if this were not enough, the pro-sodomy magazine *The Advocate* reported another error. The twins study did not have a proper sample: “Bailey and Pillard’s study has come under attack in scientific circles...Gay scholars have called their sample, culled through advertisements in gay and lesbian

¹¹⁷ *The Advocate*, 3-24-92, p.61

newspapers, unrepresentative and their data inconclusive.”¹¹⁸

Not only did these “scientists” use unrepresentative samples, they also used a curious, self-serving definition of “gay.” Bailey admits that he and “Pillard ‘lumped the bisexuals in with the gay men.’”¹¹⁹ This is critical. If the men that Bailey and Pillard were using to show that same-sex attractions are genetic and unchangeable were actually still attracted to opposite sex, then this not only destroys their results, but it destroys their credibility as scientists as well.

Conclusion

In conclusion, all studies which have claimed to have found an immutable cause for same-sex attractions and sodomy have crumbled under the scrutiny of peer review. Same-sex attractions are not genetic -there is no scientific evidence which shows that they are, none, not a single person has been found with any innate “gay” gene, organ, hormone, chemical, or combination thereof.

In the light of truth one can see why activists failed to overturn *Bowers v Hardwick* by way of minority status. They failed to scientifically demonstrate that person’s who develop same-sex attraction are born that way. This is because the concept was completely fabricated.

While the “born gay” hoax failed in one sense it prevailed in another. Individual emotions and opinions are not as solid, girded for work, or hard-pressed to correspond with reality as science. As years went by the public was never told the truth behind the headlines, and America fell under the spell of the propaganda of *The Gay Agenda*.

Because the studies have largely gone publicly unchallenged a generation has grown amidst the lies, which appear in college textbooks across the nation. These pseudo-scientific studies have both directly and indirectly convinced millions; including one judge in Texas that persons struggling with same-sex attractions must be “born gay,” and that for this reason sodomy ought to be decriminalized.

In 2003, *Bowers v. Hardwick* was overturned by one activist judge in *Lawrence v. Texas*. Under the full faith and credit clause of the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, *Lawrence v. Texas* took the power to criminalize sodomy away from every state in the union. Now, sodomy is legal in every state. “Born gay” propagandists know they will never prove scientifically that anyone is “born gay,” so they have largely abandoned their direct quest for traditional

¹¹⁸ *The Advocate*, 3-24-92, p.61

¹¹⁹ *The Advocate*, 3-24-92, p.62

minority status.

Thus, ironically, after the legalization of sodomy activists slammed the brakes on the “born gay” hoax –*The “Gay” Agenda*. Today the once unimpeachable propaganda has been set aside by its own inventors. Elite activists are now turning their attention toward a new goal: recruitment and retention. As a result, a far more brutal lie lurks just over the horizon of mainstream American consciousness: “Queer Theory.”

“Queer Theory” holds that there is no such thing as gender or a fixed sexual affiliation. The contemporary “Queer” holds that his or her identity is a fluid social construct. In other words, the “Queer” identity is actually the negation of an intrinsic identity altogether. In order to understand that recruitment is possible by way of “Queer Theory,” and through general recruitment and desensitization via the mass media and porn industries, we must identify some of the contemporary and classic causes of both same-sex attraction and sodomy. We must also become aware of how the late modern “gay” identity and its opposite, the post-modern “queer” anti-identity, actually develop. Further, we must acknowledge that reversals are possible and the ways in which political activists use public ignorance about the fluidity and potential irrationality of sexuality to their advantage, as they work a generation ahead, in their efforts to recruit unsuspecting youth.

10

The Development of Same-Sex Attraction (SSA)

Despite the essentialist “born gay” caricature painted by late-twentieth century political activists, the real storyline remains indelible. The majority of clinical research on SSA reveals that the condition can be explained by biological, psychological, and social factors interacting in various complex ways.

Any explanation however for SSA ought to be considered an antecedent rather than a cause. Of course the temperament, world view, and values that one brings to an experience will effect development significantly. These individual differences throw a wrench into the spokes of predictability. Further, the antecedents listed are not necessarily clear-cut and distinct, nor are they the only antecedents possible. In addition, causes may overlap, and you can expect some effects to become new causes, reinforcing their original cause and producing the same effect in an intensified form and so on indefinitely. An analogy: “A man may take a drink because he feels himself to be a failure, and then fail all the more completely because he drinks.” (George Orwell, *A Word on Words*) The process is reciprocal, and the embedded point is that if SSA is wrought by abuse and/or a disordered psychology, then the behavior can be extinguished once an individual’s psychological baggage is checked, their loads are lifted, and their center reordered.

While reading the following categories notice that they are not focused exclusively on SSA, but rather on related past experiences. Since many causes of SSA have their tap-root in related issues, treatment for SSA may not lie solely in “treating SSA” or extinguishing behaviors such as sodomy (which are more effects than they are causes), but in also treating the unresolved core-issue which originally drove the individual to the unnatural and therefore dysfunctional lifestyle.

Heterophobic Sexual Dysfunction

Heterophobic sexual dysfunction might be described as a persistent and irrational fear and/or detestation of the opposite sex (perfective gender) in

relation to sexuality. In this case, persistent fear frustrates the individual's natural and normative sexual inclination. As a result, substitutive sexual desires develop for members of the same sex (non-perfective gender). Significant clinical research supports this theory, which indicates that sexually abused children are significantly more likely to develop same-sex attraction and engage in sodomy in adolescence and adulthood than are non-sexually abused children.

In the most comprehensive study of human sexuality in America to date, Dr. Edward Lauman and his research team found that individual's who experience sexual abuse as children are more than 3 times as likely to develop same-sex attraction in adulthood and describe themselves as "gay" in adolescence and adulthood, than are those who have not been sexually abused.

Supporting Lauman's results is a study conducted by researchers Diane Shrier and Robert Johnson. This study found that 58 percent of boys who experience sexual abuse in the teen-age years will experience same-sex attraction and describe themselves as "homosexual" or "bisexual" in adulthood. In sharp contrast, 90 percent of non-sexually abused teen boys will describe themselves as heterosexual in adulthood.

Other studies highlight this correlation as well, including (), (), (), and (). Significantly, the aforementioned results indicate that in many cases, sexual abuse in early childhood and adolescence is a significant factor in the development of SSA and sodomitic type behaviors in adulthood. For complex reasons many victims of sexual abuse will fear and/or detest members of the opposite/perfective gender in adulthood.

The heart-wrenching story of Ellen Degeneres, whose same-sex attraction may very well be rooted in abuse, illustrates this point starkly. According to the book *A Mother/Daughter Journey*, by Betty Degeneres, the mother of the now self-described "gay" talk-show host Ellen Degeneres, her daughter Ellen actually started out attracted to males. In fact, Ellen's mother writes that, "*She (Ellen) would tell me about her crushes--mainly on rock stars.*" Ellen's mother also writes that, "*In high school El had the usual dates and boyfriends.*" "*In her senior year, there was even a promise ring with a tiny diamond chip from a nice looking boy. They went steady for a couple of months.*" (Ibid p.117) What then, could have pushed Ellen to develop same-sex attractions, engage in sodomy, and adopt the so-called "gay" identity?

There were three awful incidents in Ellen's life which may have influenced her development. First, Ellen's mother Betty told Judd Rose on his Prime Time Live Profile of her, that "*the divorce and our constant moves were very hard on Ellen—she was always having to adjust to a new group of kids.*" The next two tragedies were later revealed, when Betty told Ellen that she was thinking about divorcing her stepfather, (who they call 'B' in the book *A Mother Daughter*

Journey). After learning of the impending divorce, Ellen made a startling revelation of previous molestation to her mother.

Ellen's mother Betty writes, "Unbeknownst to me until 1981, Ellen had been keeping another secret, about two ordeals she had suffered with B. when she was in high school. Had I been in a happy, healthy marriage, she may have chosen never to tell me. As it was, on one visit I told her that B. and I weren't getting along well, but the last thing I wanted was another marital failure. I confided in Ellen that I just didn't have the resolve to leave and live on my own.

Ellen's face showed her disappointment. 'You deserve better mother,' she said.

'El,' I said, 'he has his good qualities. And we love our home.' And besides, I added, 'Whatever his faults, I know he loves me a lot.'

That's when Ellen shook her head, sighed, and told me what had happened one day not long after my mastectomy, when she was seventeen years old. The words didn't come easily.

She began. 'He asked to feel my breast. You were taking a shower.'

She stopped. I looked at her incredulously. What was she saying? Ellen went on.

'He said you were worried about your other breast and he wanted to feel mine to see if yours was like mine.'

I felt sick to my stomach. What a horrible experience for her! How could she say no? She was only seventeen at that time, and she was used to confiding in me about everything. But for five years she had said nothing. Now I spoke with effort, asking, 'Why didn't you tell me this before?' (Ibid. p.164)

Ellen started to cry, 'After what you'd been through, I couldn't hurt you like that...and then...' Her voice trailed off.

'Something else?' I asked. El looked around helplessly, as if wishing she didn't have to tell me. Then she nodded. There was something else, she said, a lot worse, that happened about a year later. One weekend, when I had to fly down to New Orleans because Mother was ill, B. gave Ellen a ride home from the movies and made a pass at her. Still crying, El said, 'I pushed him away. He let it go but when we got home, inside the house, he tried again.' She paused, composing herself. I was furious, confused, and bewildered.

'And then what happened?' I asked with dread.

'I ran into my room and locked the door. I was terrified. When he tried to force it open, I climbed out the window' and, 'spent that night at a friend's house.'

'Oh, Ellen, I am so sorry,' I said, hugging her. 'I'm so sorry.'

The pain of what she had gone through tore me up. It hurt even more to know that she had carried the burden of her secret, unable to tell anyone, and it

touched me beyond words that she had done so because her concern for me and my well-being was so great. It is as painful for me to write this today as it was to hear about it almost two decades ago. Of course, I was angry and disgusted with B. But more than anything I blamed myself. Most of all I blamed myself for being oblivious. 'I should have known,' I kept saying, 'I should have known.' (Ibid, p.165) I thought back to El's senior year when she suddenly wanted to drop out of school and return to New Orleans. Absolutely not, I had said, putting my foot down and insisting that she graduate. It made no sense to me at the time. Now I understand why she was so anxious to get away." (Ibid, p.166) (A Mother/Daughter Journey by Betty Degeneres New York, Rob Weisbach Books, 1999)

Betty is right, Ellen did have several horrible experiences, and the language Ellen uses to describe her experiences shows that they caused her a great deal of pain. She was forced to live with a man ("B") for several years, an authoritative figure in her life, who had tried to molest her several times. Ellen had to look into B's eyes daily, knowing what he had done, and perhaps was still thinking about doing. The constant anxiety and fear must have been overwhelming at times. She did "carry the burden of her awful secret," so much so that Ellen wanted to drop out of high school and leave home. And it was only after these incidents that Ellen also decided that she would no longer seek affections from boyfriends. She now turned to women for affection for the first time. It is likely that Ellen generalized her feelings of fear and mistrust toward B. to all males, after her horrific experiences. It is likely that Ellen Degeneres acquired a type of hetero-phobia and developed substitutive same-sex attractions as a result.

Surprisingly, despite Ellen's high school boyfriends and unsolicited remarks regarding the rock star "Sting" prior to her experiences with "B," Ellen's mother Betty insists that Ellen was born "gay." But Betty's belief that Ellen was born "gay" despite evidence to the contrary must be a symptom of denial. In fact, in her biography, Betty reveals a personal weakness for denial when dealing with problems in her life, especially about Ellen, and how this tendency has only made things worse in their lives. On page 166 Betty explains her regrets about this past denial: "In all honesty, I would rather not have included these events in my story of myself as Everymom. That probably comes from my old tendency for denial, for a pretense of normality in which such things just do not happen. Well, they did and they do. And, after some deliberation, I chose to talk about them in this context in the hope that some other mother—or any reader—who might be in denial will pay attention to instinct and act on it...(Ibid. p.166)

Denial, it may very well be that Betty still has her "old tendency for denial." Only now she is trying to make "a pretense of normality" for Ellen's

lesbianism. Despite obvious evidence that Ellen was clearly heterosexual until the incidents of molestation, Betty has desperately swallowed the born "gay" excuse, in order to explain a major symptom of Ellen's abuse. It appears as though Betty has been sucked into a co-dependent relationship with her daughter and with the pro-sodomy movement in general as a result of motherly guilt, and has become an active part of their desperate denial.

Betty's belief that some men and woman are born "gay" further conflicts with the life-story of Ellen's girlfriend Anne Heche, who considered herself heterosexual until she first experienced same-sex attraction when she met Ellen Degeneres. Like Ellen, Anne had a confusing childhood. Anne's father left her mother one day in order to pursue sex with other men and soon her father contracted HIV-AIDS. (The Advocate, 6-24-97, pg.43) Then, one dysfunctional life intersected with another: Anne met Ellen, and Betty Degeneres continued in denial.

Betty writes, "After all, up until that night, Anne was known as heterosexual. But Anne's position was and is that love and attraction aren't about distinctions." -A Mother/Daughter Journey, Ibid. p.247) Despite Betty's acknowledgement of Heche's clearly non-biologic admission, she continues to ignore the lessons of experience, reason, and testimony, which show that children learn through example, imitation, fear, etcetera. And that dysfunctional examples can and do lead to dysfunctional ways of life. Unresolved guilt over her daughters traumatic experiences seem to have kept Betty from acknowledging the obvious; that neither Anne Heche's life-story, nor Heche's fathers, nor Ellen's, align themselves with her beliefs that same-gender sexual impulses are fixed, innate, and natural.

When Betty Degeneres, Anne Heche, and millions of other mothers and fathers around the country proclaim that their child was born "gay," remember Kirk and Madsen's *"The Gay Agenda,"* and remember Betty, and how in trying to excuse and justify the dysfunctional condition of Ellen Degeneres, she found a new closet to hide in, -the closet of denial and co-dependency. Keep these stories in mind when pro-sodomy activists try to drag the media and the public into the same closet of denial and co-dependency. The truth is that Ellen was not born "gay." Examples like Ellen's, of childhood sexual abuse, and Heche's, of poor parenting, seem to be common to many of the life stories of those who have developed same-sex attraction and engage in sodomy.

An article appearing in the pro-sodomy movement magazine *Diva*, describes the early childhood abuse of Donna Minkowitz, a self-described "lesbian," and how that abuse contributed to her values about same-sex attractions and sodomy: "As a child growing up in a violent home environment, Minkowitz was often forced to bill and coo over her mother's floaty chiffon

dresses and often *fell foul of her father's own anger*. Consequently Minkowitz spent her teen years resisting her parents, associating heterosexuality with repression. As a political activist Minkowitz resented the notion of femininity. Lesbianism appealed to her sense of radicalism, she says, because it confounded the idea that women were dependent upon men--plus she could dress as she pleased." (Diva, March 1999, Page 32 Article about Donna Minkowitz)

We usually think of "lesbians" as women who are attracted to other women, but the term heterophobic may be more substantive for some. These women may call themselves "lesbian" but actually, they started out fearing one man, and then generalized this fear to all men. Since these women cannot overcome this fear and/or anger, they cannot develop healthy heterosexual relationships, and the end result is a disdain for heterosexuality in general. Nevertheless, some of these women may remain attracted to a type of masculine ideal--a quasi-heterosexual attraction. They long for the masculine but without the danger of linking it to real men. These "lesbians" tend to look for pseudo-men or transgendered women instead. It may very well be that in the past of many who develop same-sex attraction, a fear of the opposite sex was internalized--as with Ellen Degeneres and Donna Minkowitz and their fear of their abusive fathers.

(Describe how if experience is good by member of same sex they are likely to remain that way and if bad by member of same sex molestation likely to change)

Attention Based Sexual Dysfunction

The category of "Attention Based Sexual Dysfunction" (ABSD) can be used to describe any person, male or female, who consistently performs sexual acts specifically for the sake of attention, whether it is for public attention or the private attention of a mate.

Some people engage in same-sex erotic behavior in order to gain attention public or private attention. After engaging in this behavior, some of these people will develop lasting same-sex attractions and others will not. The determining factors are related to the quality of the experience, the values by which a person later interprets the experience.

Further, some people develop same-sex attractions due to a lack of attention. Sometimes normal levels of attention will reduce and extinguish these attractions, and sometimes they will not. In this section I will provide one example of two women who chose to engage in homo-erotic behavior in order to receive public attention, and two examples of persons who claim to have developed same-sex attractions after experiencing a lack of attention from a

same-sex parent.

In recent years, it seems to have become popular for females to perform homo-erotic acts on one another in public for attention. Take Brittany Spears and Madonna for example, the two women were quickly becoming yesterdays news, so in an attempt to solve this problem they resorted to shock and exploited themselves by performing a same-sex-erotic act on national television for attention. They are not the only ones. It has also become popular for college aged girls to perform same-sex-erotic acts on one another in order to receive attention from their peers. They want to be perceived as edgy. In order to compete for similar attention from peers, younger college age girls may imitate them. Some of these will develop same-sex attraction after performing the act, or a certain number of the acts, while others will not. This process is called operant conditioning.

Deeper, more serious forms of attention based homo-eroticism have been the subject of clinical research. The following exemplifies this type. The first were taken discuss this.

First we have a study conducted by Dr. Richard Green from ----- illustrates the story of one young patient and his struggle for attention from other males. The following narrative exemplifies both the struggle and apparent success of this patient in overcoming his attention-based homosexual desires. Let's listen in:

Dr. Green--"A couple of years ago you told me that you had some sexual feelings about males. To what extent did that evolve over the last couple of years?

Patient-- It's disappeared. Almost completely. In fact, I think my relationship with guys has become much more sure. For example, I don't feel self conscious hugging a very good friend if he's male, but I wouldn't sleep with another guy or have any kind of sex with another guy. That's just not something I do right now.

Dr. Green-- How strong were your feelings a couple of years ago?

Patient-- Sometimes they were very strong.

Dr. Green-- Why do you think they decreased?

Patient-- Because, I think I have found the attention I need from guys though my friends, and I have discovered how much fun girls can be, so the sexual or romantic interest has declined.

Dr. Green-- How did that displace the sexual and romantic needs with guys you had earlier?

Patient-- Probably through a very complicated process. That is a feeling I have. As I came to be friends with people with whom I can discuss very personal feelings, then the need to perhaps have sex with them, disappeared. Because I

think often sex and romantic feelings are simply an extension of very deep personal feelings.

Dr. Green-- It's not like your saying their substitutes?

Patient-- Not necessarily substitutes, but an extension, and if you can deal with--perhaps a substitute is a better word, now that I think about it--but if you can deal with the emotions themselves, then you don't need to extend.

Dr. Green-- It sounds like if one went up, the other went down.

Patient-- Yes.

Dr. Green-- You found yourself more able to relate comfortably to males, and sexual feelings to males decreases?

Patient-- Right.

Dr. Green-- Were you feeling a deprivation of being able to relate comfortably to males?

Patient-- Not a deprivation. Well, deprivation is a very strong word. But say that I knew that I did not share many common interests with other guys my age, and I had a sense that that was wrong. Now, I have common interests with my friends. I know longer have a sense of the way I was, not being interested in sports or things like that, as bad, as negative." ("The Sissy Boy Syndrome", p.366)

Dr. Greens study of cross gender behavior identification in boys found the following results; 27.3%--eventually became heterosexual, 31.8%-- became bisexual, 40.9%-- became homosexual ("The Sissy Boy Syndrome", p.366) From this study, one might conclude that early cross gender behaviors may make it hard for young boy's to relate to their male peers, and that the later sexual need for males is sometimes a substitute, or "extension" for a lack of non-sexual attention from males.

Another study, conducted by Irving Barber and his colleagues, highlights this point as well. The study apparently found a 'triangular' pattern in the family backgrounds of many male homosexuals. These men reported an emotionally detached or hostile father and enmeshed, 'close binding' mother who tended to 'minimize' her husband."* This study is another indication that homosexuals may be desperately searching for the male attention they were deprived of by other men, including their fathers.

Dr. Joseph Nicolosi, from -----acknowledged attention-based homosexuality when he wrote that male "homosexuality is a developmental problem that is almost always the result of problems in family relations, particularly between father and son. As a result of failure with the father, the boy does not internalize male gender-identity, and develops homosexuality. This is the most commonly seen clinical model. (Nicolosi, 1991:25)

Yet another researcher, "Marvin Siegelman, found a similar dynamic

when he compared the families of 307 homosexual males, with a control group of 138 heterosexual males. He stated that, 'the homosexuals, in contrast to the heterosexuals, reported their father to be more rejecting and less loving...the homosexuals reported less closeness to their fathers than the heterosexuals.' (The Case for Marriage)

Human beings learn through example and imitation. Human beings also learn through positive and negative social and physical reinforcement. Theoretically then, young boys, whose fathers are rarely around, are raised predominately by their mothers. If sheltered by a close binding single mother, the boy will have few examples other than her from which to imitate and learn how to act. Just as the "Wild Child" of the 1980's, raised by wolves, tended to walk and act like wolves, young men with only their mother around during their formative years, may develop mostly female mannerisms. When the boy enters school, he may have trouble relating to the other boys. Further, this child may be shunned by the other boys. At this point, the boy may come to the realization that "he is different." As years roll by the child may develop close relationships with girls, and boys may become distant and difficult to talk to, and therefore socialize with. As the other boys socialize normally together over the years, the gap may widen between the now effeminate boy and the others may widen.

A human beings will tend to desire what he r she sees others desiring. This phenomenon is called mimetic desire. If the effeminate boy is around girls - relate to the girls and not the boys. -the other notice that he speaks and acts more like the girl -learn at a very young age by watching their mothers. In fact, one interview suggests just that.

Question: Mike, can you tell us how you believe your same-gender attraction first developed?

Mike: It goes back very early. My father, because of his definition of masculinity being athleticism, pushed me quite hard and in doing so would verbally ridicule me as "Michelle" rather than Michael and calling me his third daughter. He thought it would toughen me up, but it only hurt. And so a healthy invitation to masculinity was not present at a very young age, and I became a momma's boy. I think that I wasn't able to meet an emotional need to be accepted. That God-given homo-emotional need that we all have to fir in with our same-sex peers was never met, and so that was the geneses of it.

Question: When you began to identify more with the feminine, were you identifying with your mom or your tow sisters?

Mike: Probably both. More with my sisters because I really loved them. They were ten to twelve years older than me, and they were very popular in high school-cheerleaders and homecoming types. I was used to being around older people, and I had a hard time bonding with my peer group because I was used to

hanging out with girls and older people, who I bonded with. I never wanted to be a girl, but part of it was that the environment around me was so strongly feminine because Dad worked all the time. He owned sporting good stores and was trying to keep food on the table. My world was feminine because when I was five, six, seven, my sisters were fifteen, sixteen, seventeen. What is a girl's dream at that age? All they ever talked about was boys, boys, boys, and so part of me always wondered if I was also modeled to look at young boys as well because I so identified with my sisters' world.

Question: Because they were looking at boys and talking about boys?

Mike: Yes, because they were always looking at boys, making comments about them and totally intrigued about the masculine. I know that that had to have played into my confusion-wondering why everything was fixated on masculinity-and sixteen-and seventeen-year old girls were definitely fixated on men and boys. I think some of that drew out my own mystique I had toward the masculine world, because I was definitely not comfortable there. It was "other" for me, just like it was for my sisters.

Question: When did you first sense that you were attracted to the same-sex?

Mike: Very, early, frankly. Before even puberty hit I realized that I had attraction there, that I had intrigue there. I was involved in childhood sex play from a very early age. I really kicked into gear at the age of eleven when that man abused me.

Question: Why don't you share that important part of your story?

Mike: It really kicked in at the age of eleven when a man who worked with my father in his sporting goods store began to pay a lot of attention to me. He kind of pulled me in, was very friendly toward me took me surfing and invested in my life. A couple of months later the attention turned sexual. And at that stage of life a prepubescent male child is very interested in the sexual component of life. When you are introduced to these things from a very early age they hold a lot of weight, power, and significance, and so he was very sexually active with me, and that played a lot into the intrigue. I think the homosexuality took root in my life in that period.

Question: You use the word intrigue, and we have heard other former homosexuals talk of the mystery or intrigue of the same-sex. You are really not sure who you are. You wonder what it's really like to be a boy or man. Does that resonate with you?

Mike: Yes, absolutely. If you think about how a normal child develops-I hate to use that word "normal" but you know what I mean-a child that develops in a healthy way is identified with his same-sex peer group. So, let's take a young boy. He grows up and is identified in a healthy way with his same-sex peers, and

when puberty kicks in for him, he is drawn to the object of difference or the object of curiosity-the "other." For a well-adjusted young boy that would be the female society. Girls are different, and he doesn't know their world; he doesn't know who they are.

But for me, and most pre-homosexual boys (as we tend to call them), they feel insecure, and the male holds a lot of "mystique," to use that word again. They don't feel identified, like they fit in there, but yet they know that's where they are supposed to be. And so often when puberty kicks in, that unmet emotional need or that desire is sexualized, and that's often how we see homosexuality take root in most boys. But then you add the sexual abuse, such as in my case and many, many boys like me. And then there is the peer labeling. A huge component is when you are labeled on campus as "fag" or "fag," and that label tends to be the one that makes sense even though you hate it. It tends to be one that kind of defines you, and that can be incredibly solidifying in a person's identity even if you want to reject it with everything in you.

Question: This sexual abuse occurred from age eleven until eighteen. Tell us what happened when you went in to your high school counselor and confessed that you thought you might have same-sex attraction.

Mike: ...I went to see her because it was a safe haven, and I shared with her what was going on with me and what I was feeling. I didn't share the sexual abuse because I smart enough to know that it would get this man in trouble, but it didn't feel abusive to me. This was a place where there was an older man paying attention to me, and that was something I needed. Sure, sex was a component, but what teenage boy isn't interested in sex? So I sat with her and shared with her what I was thinking, what I was feeling, that I didn't feel like one of the guys and that I was enjoying the sexual component of it all. Her response to me was that, from everything that she understood about the issue of homosexuality, you were born this way to live a healthy, productive life. From what I remember of the conversation, she said, "I know that you come from a religious family," and she encouraged me not to worry that my religious beliefs might be offended by the way I was living and that I should live true to who I am.

Question: So basically she was saying not to let your religious beliefs interfere with your feelings?

Mike: Right. Basically, she was saying to live a healthy, productive life, you are going to have to rid yourself of the homophobia that you have learned religiously; to state it in narrow terms. This was again in the 1980's, so this has been going on for years and years. Thousands of students go to school counselors just as I did. Ask them to show you the resource list they use to help such students. You will be given completely pro-gay resources. You will never be

told about NARTH-the National Association of Research and Therapy of Homosexuality-which is the most prolific organization of professionals that help men and women walk away from homosexuality from a clinical/psychological standpoint. You will never hear about Exodus International, which again is the largest Christian organization with hundreds of ministries worldwide that help men and women walk away from homosexuality and minister to the families as well. Help like this, which has helped thousands of people, is missing. Most counselors have never been told about it.

What impacted me so deeply was this counselor telling me I was born this way. It made sense to me when I was told there was a gay gene. That was the explanation for all this—nature.

Question: Back up. You said, “It made sense when I was told there was a gay gene.”

Mike: Right. It made sense when I was told there was a gay gene, because it seemed that I had always felt this way from as long as I can remember. I never chose to be gay. I only seemed to come to terms with it. And this news only confirmed it for me. But in a way it made me depressed for a while because I thought I really wanted a wife and kids. I wanted normalcy. But since I “had this gay gene,” I thought, “well, this is who I am going to have to be the rest of my life.” At that point I had pretty strong resolve as a person, and I think it worked against me. And I set my heart on the fact that I was going to be gay, and all there was now was to make the best of it.

Question: So you went full bore into living homosexuality?

Mike: Absolutely. For the next twelve years, from the age of sixteen to twenty-eight, I was completely involved in the gay community and lived a double life, and finally I just completely came out and pretty much left my faith behind. I wanted nothing more to do with Christianity from a number of years. I was living as a gay man, going from relationship to relationship. It was what all of my gay friends did.

This same principle may very well apply to female homosexuality as well. Young girls with mothers who are rejecting and less loving appear to be more likely to develop same gender sexual desires, perhaps as a substitute or “extension” for a lack of non-sexual attention from their mothers and/or other females.

One such example is the rock and roll icon Melissa Etheridge, a homosexual who publicly claims to have been “born gay” but, in one specialized homosexualist publication she admits that a significant contribution to her homosexual feelings came in her early environment. She concedes: “My relationship with my mother. It was strained as a child, and I think that adds to my attraction to women. It’s about what I didn’t get as a child: that female

energy I crave.”

Even Melissa Etheridge, who claims to have been “born gay,” also contradictorily, admits to being attracted to men. Just read her conversation about the rock star “Sting” which took place during an interview between three supposed “exclusive” “lesbians” - Judy Wieder (interviewer from the homosexual magazine the Advocate) Melissa Etheridge and Julie Cypher:

Etheridge: Oh, there’s a crush! I opened a few shows for him.

Wieder: Oh, well, we’ve all had that crush- -jeeze.

Etheridge: I know, I know. He’d brought me up to sing ‘Every Breath You Take.’ And it was his first encore, so he’d taken off his shirt. He’s so beautiful. I just wanted to touch him.

Cypher: And you did.

Etheridge: Yes, I did a couple of times. I appreciate beauty in all its forms- -male and female, all energies. But as far as relationships go or really falling in love, I’ve only been attracted to women.

These supposed “exclusive” “lesbians” sound just like a group of Jr. High teeny boppers drooling over the Backstreet Boys. These women were supposed to have been born homosexual, universally incapable of heterosexual attractions; yet, they are all sexually attracted to Sting. So, how then can they claim to have been “born exclusively homosexual?” This is a blatant contradiction, one suppressed by denial. Sexual confusion seems to be a staple of the homosexual community, not fixed categorical certainty.

Hetero-Repugnant Homo-Narcissism

The category of Hetero-Repugnant Homo-Narcissism may be used to describe any person, male or female, who has developed a deep and generalized hate toward, or, pride based, prejudicial view of the opposite sex, and as a result of this “pride” or “prejudice,” they develop same gender sexual attractions.

Examples of hetero-repugnant homo-narcissism have been common in world history. For, example, the “Greek ideal” was a culture of pederastic male supremacy. Male homosexuality, especially between men and boys, was considered a virtue in Hellenic (Greek) society. The ultra-masculine militaristic ideal of Greece subjugated women, who were believed to be a lower species. Thus, heterosexuality was relegated to procreative ends, while homosexuality was considered a virtue.

An example of one man discussing his hetero-repugnant-homo-narcissism in more recent times can be found in the transcripts of the January 3, 1992 edition of the Phil Donahue Show. On that episode, a prominent homosexual writer, Frank Aqueno, admitted his internalized hetero-repugnant homo-narcissism

when he said, "When you were five or four or three—I'll speak for myself—I was absorbing the society around me. I noticed when I was growing up that women were not my equals. That was absorbed. I couldn't talk about it. I couldn't speak about it. I didn't have the words for it. But I absorbed it...Later on, when the juices started flowing and I started to have fantasies, they were about men because they were my equals." (Donahue Transcript, 1-3-92, p.5)

Coincidentally, in a May 16th 1997 issue of the homosexualist magazine *Frontiers* a lesbian admitted her revulsion for men and heterosexuality in general for that matter, when she stated that men are the "enemy." For this reason, she self-admittedly changed her preference from heterosexual to homosexual. This woman says, "The impact of my leap from straight girl to radical dyke was cushioned by the woman's movement, in which context lesbian was not only considered normal but preferable, the exemplary choice. Straight women were suspect for giving comfort to the 'enemy,' while lesbians were seen as the natural vanguard in the struggle against male supremacy. Woman and men were believed to occupy two different and hostile worlds, with lesbians and gay men standing at the polar extremes of each." (*Frontiers*, 5-16-97, p.60)

Fortunately, this lesbian goes on to explain that she later somewhat modified her anti-male motivations, which prompted her to change from "straight girl to radical dyke." "I've also had the chance to grow more comfortable with male sexuality," she says, "for which, as a radical feminist, I had developed both a theoretical and a visceral distaste." (*Frontiers*, 5-16-97, p.61)

Another lesbian, Rita Mae Brown (author of the best-selling lesbian book "Rubyfruit Jungle" and a former lover of tennis pro Martina Navratilova) also declares that her lesbianism is the result of her repugnance for the social standing of men. "I became a lesbian because the culture that I live in is violently anti-woman. How could I, a woman, participate in a culture that denies my humanity? To give a man support and love before giving it to a sister is to support that culture, that power system." (Lillian Faderman, *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers*, p. 207)

Jan Clausen, the prominent lesbian author, talked about how hard it was for her to abandon her environmentally acquired hetero-repugnant feminist lesbian identity in her book *Apples and Oranges* after falling in love with a man. "But now the pain I was experiencing as what had seemed a solid identity unraveled, leaving a vertiginous absence of plausible narrative structure...Surely it couldn't put me through any more mental anguish than what I'd felt weeping in a shabby hotel room where my new male lover and I had spent an ardent weekend, as I bitterly confessed, 'I hate the institution of heterosexuality—and I'm in love with you.'" (Jan Clausen, *Apples and Oranges: My Journey to Sexual*

Identity, pp. xvii-xviii)

Parentally and Culturally Transmitted Sexual Dysfunction -any person, male or female, that experiments with homosexual behaviors, and/or develops homoerotic desires because of cultural or familial influence.

Again, children learn through imitation, this process is called mimesis. Further, people in general, tend to desire what they see others desiring, this phenomenon is called mimetic desire. If mimesis and mimetic desire are real phenomenon, then evidence ought to be available, which indicates that children raised in families or cultures which have normalized same-gender sexuality should be more likely to engage in same-gender sex themselves. The question is, can we find any such evidence? Indeed.

Cultures in which the practice of same-gender sex and even same-gender sex with children became normal and widespread include the ancient Greek culture, the ancient Roman culture -fourteen of the first fifteen Roman emperors engaged in same-gender sex, Tuscany and Northern Italian culture (during the Renaissance), Aztec culture (prior to the Spanish conquest of Mexico), pre-modern Japan (from the medieval period until the end of the 19th century-before the Meiji Restoration) and there are more, many more. Egypt, Persia, Carthage, Babylon, and Assyria were all steeped in man-man and man-boy sexual traditions. And the ancient empires of the Mongols, Tartars, Huns, Teutons, Celts, Incas, Aztecs, Mayans, Nubians, Mings, Canaanites, Samaritans, and Zulus likewise celebrated same-gender sex. Same-gender sex was endemic amongst the ancient followers of Baal and in Tahiti there were special divinities for same-gender sexual worship.

In light of these facts it becomes obvious that the belief in a "gay gene" or the search for other biological explanations for same-gender sexual desires reveals a deep ignorance of history. Same-gender sex activist and author Lillian Faderman makes this point starkly when she writes:

"Maybe the scientific eye that is stuck to the microscope just cannot be expected to scrutinize history or anthropology or cultural theory. Do the 'gay gene' scientists know how common lesbian relationships are among the co-wives of the polygamous Zande tribe of central Africa? Do they know that the Australian Aboriginal female was expected to form a relationship with her female cross cousin, whose family would then give her their son to marry? Do they know that among Tahitian women mutual mouth-genital contact and mutual masturbation is common and does not preclude their engaging in heterosexual behavior?" (Lillian Faderman; *The Advocate*- February 6th 1996, Pg. 72) The foregoing were but a few examples of cultures which have encouraged homosexual and pederast behavior, and as a result homosexuality and pederasty (child molestation) became widespread.

The testimony of history is clear, and its message has been recognized by research. According to the *American Sociological Review*, a startling 64% of young adults, males and females, raised by lesbian mothers have considered entering into homosexual relationships either in the past, now or in the future. In sharp contrast, only 17 percent of young adults who grew up in natural family environments reported considering the same thing. The authors of this study conclude that there is a moderate degree of parent to child transmission of sexual orientation. So, yes, undoubtedly, children raised by homosexual parents are significantly more likely to develop same-gender sexual inclinations and engage in same-sex in adolescence and adulthood.

Same-gender sex activist and literary savant Jennifer DiMarco is one such example. In a 1993 interview with *Deneuve Magazine* she told reporter Diane Anderson that her father died when she was only five. "Her biological mother, a female construction worker and children's book author eventually settled down with another woman. 'I saw lesbians as strong women, warriors,' she said. 'When I was little, 'I'd say, 'Boy, you're such a lesbian' when I meant that someone was strong.'" At the time this interview was conducted, DiMarco was dating Yoshiko, a woman. DiMarco, it seems became nearly a clone of her mother, she, like her mother, worked construction in the summers, was a writer, and engaged in same-gender sex. This is a great example of how, when a person admires an authoritative figure in their life, they strive to emulate that person, sometimes to the extreme. (*Deneuve*, November/December, 1993 p. 40)

11

Are Reversals Possible?

"It's been a few years since I first heard the word hasbian used to describe a lesbian who had gone back to men."
(Activist, Lyndsy Gelder)¹²⁰

Pop star Sinéad O'Connor shocked the world in June of 2000 when she said, "I'm a lesbian... although I have not been very open about that, and through out most of my life I've gone out with blokes (men) because I haven't been terribly comfortable about being a lesbian. But I actually am a lesbian."

Then, O'Connor counter-shocked the pro-sodomy world that had applauded her "coming out" when she withdrew from participating in a "lesbian" music festival because of her marriage to British Press Association reporter, Nick Sommerlad...a man! Sinéad O'Connor seems to have genuinely changed her so-called "sexual-orientation" twice, in less than two years.

Similarly, an article appearing in *The Advocate*, about the now separated couple Ellen Degeneres and Anne Heche states, "Although the couple has never publicly discussed the reason for their break up, it has been heavily rumored that Heche decided to go back to heterosexuality."¹²¹

The rumors turned out to be true. Heche married a man on September 1st 2001. *The Advocate* tells of Heche shocking Oprah Winfrey by proclaiming, "I was not gay before I met her..." (Ellen). This phenomenon causes the writer of the article to ask, "With straights falling for gays, lesbians dating men, and gay men falling in love with women, isn't anybody anything anymore?" The writer refers to Heche's feelings as, "fluid sexuality...changing sexuality...the sexuality that causes all sorts of problems in a gay movement in which some spokespeople for years have been insisting that, 'We're born this way, we can't change.'"¹²²

These women are not the only ones to change the supposedly "unchangeable." Bruce Bawer, most famous for his book *A Place at the Table* admitted to changing his "sexual-orientation" when he told a *New York Native*

¹²⁰*Off Our Backs*, Dec. 1996 pg. 13

¹²¹ *The Advocate*, June 24th 1997, Pg. 28

¹²² *The Advocate*, June 24th 1997, Pg. 28

reporter that he was “left cold by Bob and Rod, but hot for Catherine Deneuve.”¹²³

In his book *Breaking the Surface*, former Olympic diving champion Greg Louganis, states: “what made things more confusing was that I found girls attractive, I thought that if you were gay girls were supposed to repulse you, but that wasn’t the case, I was sexually involved with one girl from a very early age.”¹²⁴

But falling for a member of the opposite sex can be seen as treason within the pro-sodomy movement, as it was for pro-sodomy author Jan Clausen. When she fell for a man she paid for it. “After 12 years in a lesbian marriage, Jan Clausen fell in love with a man. Since her identities as writer and lesbian were intertwined, all hell broke loose. Clausen’s books are yanked off college reading lists. She loses friends, community, and status. One feels sympathy for a good writer ostracized from the culture she helped create. Leaving a lesbian for a man she muses ‘is still the equivalent of a mortal sin.’”¹²⁵

The second “coming-out,” the coming out of the so-called “gay” lifestyle can be controversial. Pro-sodomy activist Amber Hollibaugh states: “it’s very controversial, to talk about having sex with men” in her book *Dyke Life*.¹²⁶ Not only is the second coming out controversial, ex-“gays” will often face hostility and discrimination. Author Karen Kerner tells us of one previously “gay” woman’s mountain climbing expedition, during which she began an affair with a male climber, “Dave,” and after which she faced rejection.

“When Greta arrived back home, “the climate chilled for more reasons than autumn. As the news of her sexual affair spread (and a former lesbian lover called to confirm the rumor), she “felt suddenly watched, judged. While queers worried about hiding their sexualities in this homophobic little town, my concerns went the other way. I didn’t want the lesbian community I cared about to monitor me holding hands with Dave, laughing with him, having breakfast.”¹²⁷

John Preston, co-author of the book *Sister and Brother* and one time editor of the pro-sodomy news magazine *The Advocate* discussed a stumbling block that he once faced, -his fear of being rejected by his peers for revealing that he had once been attracted to two female roommates. Preston reminisces: “We also quickly learned that such thoughts and activities were best kept to ourselves. The

¹²³ *New York Native*, 9-4-95, pg. 32

¹²⁴ xxxxxxxxxx

¹²⁵ *The Advocate*, April 27th 1999, pg. 88

¹²⁶ (*Dyke Life*, By Dr. Karen F. Kerner, Edited by Dr. Karla Jay, Director of the Woman’s Studies Department at Pace University pg 320)

¹²⁷ *Dyke Life* pg 261

gay and lesbian community didn't want its leaders to be indulging in any exploration of heterosexuality. It was best to put our attractions and our occasional explorations into a new closet."¹²⁸

Yes, surprisingly, the pro-sodomy community has closets of its own; and the community hides their secret heterosexual escapades and attractions beneath layers of public "born gay" propaganda and lies. They don't want word to get out that the "born gay" identity is really a fluid social construct. Notice however, how ironically open pro-sodomy activists discuss the changeable nature of sexuality amongst themselves, in their own private publications.

"*OUT*," a leading pro-sodomy publication, gives its opinion of the previously mentioned book, *Sister and Brother*...a book about so-called "gay" men and "lesbian" woman sleeping together: "Compiled by two of our most noted cultural historians; this rich anthology ponders the inextricable and complex bond between lesbians and gay men. In 30 essays by writers both known and new, tales unfold of remarkable friendships that are sometimes adversarial, sometimes romantic, and more than occasionally, sexual."¹²⁹

The *Lambda Book Report*, a leading pro-sodomy publication gives its take: "In private, of course, the lives of many gay men and lesbians have always overlapped, as the stories collected in *Sister and Brother* attest...They have been allies at work, siblings in families, partners in community affairs, business, and parenting. Sometimes, they have been husbands and wives, and occasionally lovers."¹³⁰

Another pro-sodomy publication, *The New York Native*, also endorses the book that highlights starkly the changeable nature of sexual desire. The *New York Native* begins its column on the Lambda Literary Awards with the following caption: "'*Sister and Brother*' sets the tone for seventh annual gay and lesbian book awards." The column continues, "Inclusiveness was the theme of this year's Lambda Literary Award winners. Many of the books selected this year defy the breakdown into either gay male or lesbian--or, for that matter, into simple dichotomies of gay and straight. The connections between lesbians and gay men unite other winners. That, in fact, is the theme of Nonfiction Anthology award winner *Sister and Brother*, edited by Joan Nestle and John Preston..."¹³¹

Genre, another pro-sodomy publication aimed at men, also gave a positive review: "The late John Preston made something of a specialty of anthologies. His final effort, co-edited with lesbian historian Joan Nestle, is original and an

¹²⁸ *Sister and Brother: Lesbians and Gay Men Write about their Lives Together*, ed. By John Nestle and John Preston; New York: Harper Collins, 1994, pp.5-6

¹²⁹ *OUT*, Dec/Jan 1995, p.70

¹³⁰ *Lambda Book Report*, Nov/Dec 1994, p.17

¹³¹ *New York Native*, 7-10-95, p.58

absolute must-read. *Sister and Brother*...address's through personal anecdote and memoir the experiences that bind gay men and lesbians together...It is a revelation to see how many gay men and women share complex and abiding relationships."¹³²

The pro-sodomy publication *The Advocate* is intrigued by one particular "gay"/"lesbian" sexual affair recorded in the book *Sister Brother*: "These are as unpredictable as the range of gay-lesbian relationships. Bernard Cooper's story 'Truth Serum' is a knockout. A selection from his forth-coming memoirs (and winner of 1995's O. Henry Award), it portrays his long-lasting heterosexual love affair, which began in the heat of sexual passion and thrives years later as a lifelong friendship. Although Cooper becomes a practicing homosexual, his place, he tells us, remains forever with his friend Bia Lowe."¹³³

Note that *The Advocate* has no difficulty applying both the terms "heterosexual" and "homosexual" to Bernard Cooper. They understand and accept the fluidity of sexual desire. Analyzing excerpts from Bernard and Bia's essays will shed further light.

Bia begins, "How can I explain to my mother...How can I tell her, without her thrilling to false hopes, that, having loved a man, having mated with a man, I know I could still? I still find men attractive, and I still recall, with sexual excitement, my escapades into heterosexual sex..."

Bernard, Bia's supposedly "gay" boyfriend, tells us about the relationship from his perspective, "I'd been living with a woman for three years, a woman whom I loved, and with whom I had a sex life both playful and pleasurable...I'm not sure at which point friendship turned to love—our relationship remained platonic for nearly a year--but I'm sure we would have had sex much earlier if both of us hadn't harbored longings for people of the same gender...We confided these guilty attractions late one night during a marathon conversation. Once they were aired, our admissions seemed less shameful, less significant, and I began to feel that sleeping with Bia was inevitable; who better to sleep with than the keeper of your secrets? Besides, as a side effect of our heated discussions, her translucent skin and hazel eyes had begun to excite me."¹³⁴

All the reviewers of the leading sodomy magazines knew well the heterosexual content of the supposedly "born gay" men and women's stories in Preston's book, and they had no problems with such ideas. The "born gay" propagandists always deny the reality and legitimacy of heterosexual feelings in ex-"gays." But, notice that no one in the pro-sodomy community questions the

¹³² *Genre*, Nov. 1994, p.72

¹³³ *The Advocate*, 11-29-1994, p.75 (emphasis mine)

¹³⁴ *Sister and Brother*, p. 137

heterosexual desires of people that continue to define themselves as “gay,” that is, as being in the circle of the “gay” political party. These propagandists are hypocrites. But worse than that, as political activists, they are shameless, calculating, pathological liars. No matter how many times pro-sodomy propagandists lie, however, so-called “lesbians” and “gays” can and do change their so-called “sexual-orientation.”

After the revelations in the book *Sister Brother*, what pro-sodomy activist Nan Golden writes in *The Advocate* is no surprise: “Things are more three-dimensional and less compartmentalized than they once were,” she says “Maybe that has to do with getting older and understanding the ambivalence of things. At the moment I’m actually dating a man. And I’ve known people who were active in ACT UP and were very defined as lesbian or gay but who were secretly sleeping together. I think people are more complicated than those categories. Being gay to me isn’t just who I sleep with, it’s how I live my life.”¹³⁵

Can you imagine these radical ACT UP activists, an organization founded in 1987 by Larry Kramer, a known pederast,¹³⁶ at demonstrations screaming, “We’re here, we’re queer, get used to it!” and then going home to their heterosexual relationships--homosexual men having affairs with their so-called “queer” or “lesbian” lovers. What irony. What dishonesty!

OUT magazine tells the story of one ACT UP “queer” man who fell in love with a straight woman. The headline on the front cover makes the announcement:

“HOW QUEER, SHE’S STRIAIGHT, HE’S GAY, THEY’RE TOGETHER”

The inside title of the article on page 51 is shocking as well:

“HE KISSED A GIRL; HOW A JOURNEY THROUGH THE HEYDAY OF GAY IDENTITY POLITICS LED TO A STRAIGHT ROMANCE”¹³⁷

OUT magazine provides other interesting information on pro-sodomy author Sara Miles. “SARA MILES, an *OUT* contributing writer, sheds new light on sexuality this month by exploring the complex relationship between a gay man and his girlfriend. ‘I knew a lot of women who had been lesbians and then got involved with men,’ says Miles, ‘but I didn’t know any gay men involved

¹³⁵ *The Advocate*, 10-15-96, p.72

¹³⁶ Kramer: 234

¹³⁷ *Out*, July 1999, p.51

with women. This man's story is fascinating..."¹³⁸ *OUT* recounts the startling story of "Bro" and Lisa:

"Williams 'Bro' Broberg first visited New York City in those days, as a tall, gangly 21-year old with a desire to put the world right. Bro was born in Carrolton, Kentucky, to a 16-year-old mother and a 17-year-old father, and he spent a working-class childhood moving back and forth between them and his grandparents. By the time he was 12, Bro decided he was gay; by 16, he was driving at night for hundreds of miles through Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana, seeking out bars rumored to be queer. 'I knew something else was out there,' he says, 'and my strategy was just to get through high school as quickly as possible so I could find it.'

At Antioch College in Ohio, Bro found his first close gay friends. He translated his restlessness and passion into political meaning, came out to his parents, and started to look beyond the perimeters of his own life. In a work-study semester in which students designed direct-service programs for people with AIDS, Bro became radicalized...

In 1990, Bro dropped out of Antioch and moved to Manhattan to become part of a radical gay community. ACT UP, where decisions were made by consensus and there were no formal leaders, was a perfect place for him to jump in. As it turned out, Bro knew how to plan, mobilize, and execute; he found a calling in the strategic challenges of organizing. 'Bro was best at the quick and dirty,' says Esther Kaplan, an early ACT UP activist and now editor at *POZ* magazine. 'He had a conspiratorial mind and a lot of creative energy.'"¹³⁹

POZ is a magazine directed mainly at men who have sex with men, who are HIV-positive. According to this magazine Bro found a lover at ACT UP, but there was only one problem...she was a woman.

"At an ACT UP meeting, Bro met photographer Charlie Welch. 'He was talented, cute, and smart, and we moved in together within a month,' says Bro. 'We were together about three years.'

Their relationship became harder to maintain as Bro branched out from ACT UP. He was working as many as 20 hours a day on the campaign to free HIV-positive Haitians at Guantanamo...Bro came home one night and found Charlie strangely calm. 'I'd missed some party with our friends for the gazillionth time,' Bro says. 'Charlie just said, 'Look, it's time for us to break up.' 'I didn't want to admit it, but I knew it was true.'

¹³⁸ *OUT* July 1999 p.12

¹³⁹ *OUT* July 1999, p.51f

By 1993, Bro had moved into a tiny sublet on Avenue C, and a lawyer he'd met on the Guantanamo case had become his inseparable companion. The two would talk endlessly, leaning in close over toast and eggs at a grimy diner. They'd ride the sweaty local trains to Brooklyn for a meeting, exhausted, embracing, one resting a head on the others shoulder. They'd stay up discussing their organizing strategy until the clubs closed at 4 a.m., fall asleep together on the bed in Bro's room, then get up again to wheat paste at dawn, along the slowly brightening streets.

'They were living and breathing for their relationship,' says Kaplan. 'It was the intense political comradeship, plus an even more intense emotional connection.' ...It was a late November afternoon in 1993 when Bro stumbled out of a Tribeca restaurant to the curb where the lawyer was sitting, head in hands, after a devastating, ugly argument. Bro reached out. He started to cry. In a voice breaking with desire and grief, he'd said what he'd been trying to say for so long. 'If you were a man,' Bro told Lisa Daugaard, 'I'd be with you for the rest of my life.'

The lovers tell the story now, sitting next to each other in a comfortable booth at a café in Seattle's gay neighborhood. They have been together for five years. Bro is finishing law school at Cornell, where he was president of the LAMBDA Law Students association, while Lisa works in the Seattle public defender's office, representing homeless and indigent clients.

Gay men and lesbians have always had to wrestle with the question of whom we love and how--with the answer, for a lot of us, defining our identities. For many, it has been possible to finesse the line between preference and orientation...That story became more difficult to manage after last year's media blitz when 'ex-gays' Ann and John Paulk announced their conversion to belief in Christian marriage... Many gays, trying to defend our choices of whom we love, were tempted to draw the lines more strictly between straight and gay: Genuine gays and lesbians never looked back, never felt any attraction to the opposite sex, and never lived with uncertainty.

'Well, isn't that convenient for everyone?' says Bro. 'There's just this binary--straight and gay. What do we think we'll lose if we admit life is complex?'"¹⁴⁰

So, the vicious attacks by the so-called "gay" community on ex-gays--and on pro-family groups who acknowledge that change is possible in sexuality--was a reaction of denial against the truth--people can change, and gays know that, but fear it. What an admission by activists like "Bro" and Sara Miles! Bro describes his own internal conflict in this process of newly loving a woman.

¹⁴⁰ *OUT*, P.52

“Bro’s confession of love that night on the curb made the reality of their feelings ‘unavoidable,’ says Lisa. ‘But it was hugely painful.’ Bro nods. ‘We fell in love,’ he agrees. ‘But there was this huge thing to negotiate, i.e., that I’m gay. It was a long process. I’d deny the attraction, go to the edge of it, peak over, and run back the other way.’

The first kiss is at the center of most romantic narratives, but the moment when Bro and Lisa’s actual sexual relationship began is fairly mundane, overshadowed by all the political and emotional drama that preceded it. ‘I think we were at her parents’ house one night,’ says Bro, ‘and we were sleeping on this fold out bed, and I gave her a kiss, and then we kept going...’

Bro lights another cigarette, remembering how he first began to tell his new friends about his new lover. ‘I used to get angry if people said they were bisexual. Now I had to tell people that, yes, I was gay, and yes, I was in love with a girl.’¹⁴¹

Kaplan says she wasn’t surprised. ‘There was a lot of this happening among our circle,’ she says. ‘Women started seeing men; other people, including me, came out as bisexual. And it was threatening: If we were defecting, who’d be left to be gay anymore?’¹⁴²

Another ACT UP activist, Juan M. Mendez (who has also been a journalist for the Spanish language newspapers *El Diario* and *La Prensa*), recalls hearing about Bro’s changes: “Mendez remembers the spring afternoon when he heard Bro’s news. ‘We were on the bus going uptown,’ he says, ‘and I was telling Bro how disappointed I was that a lesbian friend of ours from ACT UP was getting married to a man. I was talking very intimately about how it felt to me to have our whole East Village queer family breaking up.’ Mendez pauses. ‘And then Bro looked at me and said that he was seeing Lisa.’”¹⁴³ The interview ends poignantly.

“Lisa speaks. ‘Look,’ she says, ‘life is short, and love is rare.’ Bro takes her hand. ‘The world is complicated,’ Bro says. ‘It just seems like a very bad idea to sell out true love because you don’t ideologically understand how you can be feeling it.’”¹⁴⁴

Jan Clausen, in an earlier work (*Beyond Gay or Straight*), speaks to the complexities of human sexual desires. Jim Van Buskirk, who has been the head of the pro-sodomy “Hormel Library,” explains Clausen’s views: “Jan Clausen attempts the nearly impossible by trying to demystify the complexities of human

¹⁴¹ *OUT*, p.94

¹⁴² *OUT*, p. 94f

¹⁴³ *OUT*, p.95

¹⁴⁴ *OUT*, p.96

sexuality. She begins her explorations with three basic questions: 'Is sexual orientation an inborn trait, or does it somehow develop in the unfolding of personality? Is it an unchanging characteristic, or one that is liable to shift over time? Is it present in all cultures, even those that appear to organize sexuality quite different from the way we do, or is it simply the way in which certain societies (especially Western, urbanized ones) currently think about personal sexual identity?'"¹⁴⁵

"Clausen ends with the same questions with which she began, this time allowing her personal perspective. Advocating 'sensitivity to the diversity of sexuality,' Clausen suggests that in addition to biological research, researchers need to pay far more attention to the psychology, sociology, and anthropology of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and heterosexual identities. Quoting Gloria Andalzua's poetic formulation 'Identity is a River' she remains unswayed by the possibility that admitting the flexibility of sexual orientation may give ammunition to bigots. Finally, she reminds readers that most cultures have not shared the modern Euro-American sexual system in which people are divided into distinct types based on the gender of their preferred sexual partners. Clausen has knowingly entered into dangerous emotionally charged waters..."¹⁴⁶

Indeed, pro-sodomy propagandists are strongly fearful of the public expression of such sentiments. However, as we have seen, mentioning this fact in "private" pro-sodomy contexts is acceptable; this truth of "fluid sexuality" cannot be denied.

Frontiers magazine has explored the notion of changeable sexuality through a dialogue between so-called "gay" men and "lesbians." One woman evaluates this contemporary issue: "In fact, one of the most cutting-edge issues in the gay scene today is that some gay men and lesbians are actually having sex with each other." "What is that?" ... "I heard about this from a friend of mine who went to a workshop on the subject at one of the 'Creating Change' conferences. Talk about change!"¹⁴⁷

"I also know people who have experimented with their best friends. These people are apparently finding themselves curious and attracted and playing with each other to see what they're missing. I can understand; I mean, curiosity made me try out all those guys in my youth. Who else could heal the pain between men and women better than us queers? We have very few societal models and therefore less pressure to conform. Wouldn't that be something if enough of us

¹⁴⁵ *Lambda Book Report*, Oct. 1996, p.29f

¹⁴⁶ *Lambda Book Report*, Oct. 1996, p.30

¹⁴⁷ *Frontiers*, 5-16-97, p.55f

got turned on to the opposite sex and blew the mainstream away by showing them how to love each other equally?...”¹⁴⁸

One psychiatrist with same-sex attractions tells how he and some of his clients have come to terms with sexual activity between so-called “gay” men and “lesbians.” “Many of my clients are going through a second coming out...Lorna, a 41-year-old African American client, came to see me because she had been out as a lesbian for almost a decade, but now she was having a sexual relationship with a gay friend. ‘Not an in-love relationship,’ she told me. ‘We just like to fool around.’ Her friends were scandalized. Lorna was not coming out as bisexual, according to her own definition. She still considered herself a lesbian...she needed strategies for figuring out where her community might be now that she was facing rejection by lesbians...she needed time to talk through her pain at having to experience it in the gay lesbian community, a place she had fought to make her home.”¹⁴⁹

Two pages later the author continues, “Back in the 60s and 70s, coming out meant making a break from heterosexuality. But in the late 1990s, we are now witnessing a break from gayness and lesbianism. Many lesbians I know talk about lesbian therapist JoAnne Loulan, author of *Lesbian Sex and Lesbian Passion*, who a year ago went on the Oprah Show and revealed that her new partner is a man. Their confusion and discomfort with Loulan and other lesbians’ seeming defection is not surprising. What do we make of people like Lorna, who want to be lesbians who sleep with men? How do we understand the many gay men who have been out for years and then decide to marry women? The new wave of coming out almost looks like a going back in. A growing number of gay men and lesbians are marrying one another. It’s as if we’re seeing a challenge to the old, modernist way of thinking: ‘This is who I am, period,’ and a movement toward a post-modern version, ‘This is who I am right now.’”¹⁵⁰

Diva, a British pro-sodomy magazine directed at woman contained a long article on this phenomenon in its June, 1996 issue. The article was entitled *ALL IN THE FAMILY?* and carried the byline, “What do you call a lesbian who sleeps with men? Straight? Bisexual? Lesbian? Hasbian? Gillian Rodgerson examines the complicated business of sexual liaisons.”¹⁵¹

“As long ago as 1983, Pat Califia wrote a cover piece for *The Advocate* about a subject that, at the time, most lesbians I knew dismissed as just another weird U.S. fad: gay men and gay women having sex together. Only in San

¹⁴⁸ *Frontiers*, 5-16-97, p.56

¹⁴⁹ *In the Family*, a pro-sodomy magazine, July 1998, p.9

¹⁵⁰ *In the Family*, a homosexual magazine, July 1998, p.11

¹⁵¹ *Diva*, June 1996, p.43

Francisco, we thought, figuring that if you really want to be a pervert, you'll break any taboo just to stay on the wild side. But when queer politics hit Britain in a big way in the early nineties, lots of previously water-tight categories began to ooze and the mind bending business of utopian pan-sexuality opened-up like some glittering Pandora's Box. Rumors have always circulated that this or that well-known queer dyke was really sleeping with this or that well-known queer gay man on the side."¹⁵²

Note that as long ago as 1983, a cover article in *The Advocate* was written on sex between so-called "gay" men and "lesbian" woman. This is not a new phenomenon. It has been discussed openly in the so-called "gay" community as long as there has been a "gay" community, which is not very long in fact, at all. Notice also the use of the word "hasbian." This fact of sexual change is so common and so well-known that it is discussed worldwide and there are nicknames to refer to defectors.

Diva magazine continues the stories: "Nevertheless, some women whose previous sexual attachments focused on other women are now talking about their activities with men, both as isolated experiences and as more long-term relationships. Cath from Manchester remembers being 'terribly embarrassed to be seen in public holding a man's hand...She explains the confusion she felt at that time. 'When I met my girlfriend at 21, I defined myself completely as a lesbian, but when she went off with someone else I met this man bloke and found myself falling for him, totally out of the blue. I used to think 'this is ridiculous, I'm a lesbian!'"¹⁵³

"The experience of Lucy Scher, a club promoter in Manchester, was less accidental and more thorough than Cath's. She says she knows the scene and says 'hundreds' of women who previously defined themselves as dykes are now experimenting with sex with men. She doesn't identify as a lesbian, preferring the term 'queer,' but her boyfriend still thinks of himself as gay. They both left same-sex partners when they got together, though Lucy had had other recent experiences with men. When a powerful businessman made a pass at her one night, knowing she was a lesbian, she accepted it. 'If there's someone you shouldn't sleep with, I do,' she says, not especially ruefully... the experience 'split me and my girlfriend and got me interested in boys again...'

So what's the difference between Lucy and her boyfriend and any other straight couple treading the streets of Manchester holding hands? 'I've walked down the street holding hands, thinking 'My God, I'm normal...' Heterosexuals never have those thoughts, because they've never experienced anything else.'"

¹⁵² *Diva*, June 1996, p.43

¹⁵³ *Diva*, June 1996, p.43-44

Lisa Power, a long time lesbian activist who happily admits to a sexual affair with a gay male friend, says she still 'absolutely' identifies herself as a dyke and doesn't believe her experience is all that unique. 'It's great to be tedious telling the truth about lesbians having sex with men,' she notes, saying it's the only piece of gossip anyone relays about her anymore. 'I thought gay liberation was about getting people to be less freaked out about who you slept with,' she says."¹⁵⁴

Robin Gorna, of the British organization Terrence Terrance Higgins Trust, wrote the book, *Vamps, Virgins and Victims: How Women Can Fight AIDS*. She openly cites statistics, obtained at London's Audre Lorde Clinic which, "revealed that 35 percent of the lesbian clients had had sex with men in the last six month's."

In 1995, a *Newsweek* cover story reported on a survey conducted by self-identified "lesbian" Paula Rust, who found that two-thirds of women who self-identified as lesbian, also said that they were currently attracted to men, and 90 percent of them had been in a sexual relationships with a man.¹⁵⁵

Peering deeper into the second secret closet of the "lesbian" community, we find studies revealing that supposedly exclusively "lesbian" women will, on average, have more male sex partners throughout their lifetime than all other woman will. In fact, a study appearing in *The Washington Blade* showed that the average self-described "lesbian," will have double the number of lifetime male sex partners than all other women will.¹⁵⁶

Perhaps it was such facts that caused the British pro-sodomy movement magazine *Rouge* to concur with the "choice" idea: "Green's analysis of homosexuality rejects the view that it is inborn—our only point of agreement ..."¹⁵⁷

Perhaps it was such facts that caused *The Advocate* to report (after a 1997 volunteer poll of its readers) that 54 percent of its own respondents did not believe in a fixed sexual orientation.¹⁵⁸ Perhaps it was such facts that caused self-defined "lesbian" author Rebecca Walker, daughter of the self-defined "bisexual" author Alice Walker, who wrote *The Color Purple*, to write, "I do my best to help people understand that sexuality doesn't have much to do with prescribed notions of gender...But that gets back to the question of 'What is a lesbian?'

¹⁵⁴ *Diva*, June 1996, p.44

¹⁵⁵ *Newsweek*, July 17th 1995 p.50

¹⁵⁶ *Washington Blade*****

¹⁵⁷ *Rouge*, Issue 16, 1994, p.16

¹⁵⁸ *The Advocate*, 7-22-97, p.6

Because you look at studies now, and obviously lesbians are sleeping with men. I think we are beating our heads against these categories right now."¹⁵⁹

Later, the article in which Walker's quote appeared, reinforces her observation, "two studies of lesbians have been conducted from 1978 through 1989 and found that between 74% and 81% had engaged at some point in heterosexual intercourse, the...unified safe-and-secure 'lesbian community' begins to look like one big bisexual closet."¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁹ *Girlfriends*, May June, 1996, pg. 21

¹⁶⁰ *Girlfriends*, May June, 1996, pg. 23

12

Hypocrisy and Change

“Lesbian Avengers” is a radical “direct-action” political organization founded by former ACT UP activist Sarah Schulman.¹⁶¹ Two incidents involving the “Lesbian Avengers” reveal the insecurity of its members in regard to their supposedly fixed “sexual-orientation.” In an article entitled, “A PLAGUE ON YOU!” *Deneuve* magazine documents one incident:

“Locusts weren’t available, so they settled for crickets. The San Francisco Lesbian Avengers recently unleashed a good ol’ fashioned plague on Exodus International, an umbrella agency for groups that aim to transform homosexuals into heterosexuals. *The Avengers* released approximately a thousand crickets into the Bay Area office of Exodus.”¹⁶²

Ironically, this quote, printed in “*Deneuve*” magazine, which aims to humiliate Exodus International simply for offering help to men and women struggling with same-sex attractions, includes a review of the book, *Sister and Brother* just two pages before, a book which as we have seen provides true stories of relationships, even sexual ones, between so-called “lesbian” women and “gay” men. Let us review two of this magazine’s comments on *Sister and Brother* and observe the twisted hypocrisy of its writers and editors:

1. “These days it’s not uncommon for dykes and fags to close enjoy friendships with one another, live, play and work together, or even sleep together.”¹⁶³

2. “An old ‘family secret’--the existence of a sexual component in queer girl-boy friendships—is a feature of several pieces...”¹⁶⁴

If the pro-sodomy community understands the fluid nature of same-sex attraction, why would the “Lesbian Avengers” brake into an office of Exodus International and release crickets simply because they offer help to persons seeking change? It seems as though the only rational explanation is that they

¹⁶¹ *My American History*, by Sarah Schulman, pp. xvii, xix, 279ff; this book was a finalist for a gay Lambda Literary Award in 1995. (*Lambda Book Report*, May/June 1995, p.13)

¹⁶² *Deneuve*, a lesbian magazine now called *Curve*, (*Deneuve*, May/June, 1995, p.14)

¹⁶³ *Deneuve*, May/June, 1995, p.12

¹⁶⁴ *Deneuve*, May/June, 1995, p.13

were engaged in a campaign of hate and intimidation against Exodus for failing to reaffirm the activist's sexual behavior. *Diva* magazine writes about a second and equally hypocritical incident involving the "Lesbian Avengers," this time on the other side of the Atlantic.

"A British chapter of the Lesbian Avengers disrupted a meeting of pro-family groups, which refuse to recognize the normalcy of homosexuality and who acknowledge that gays can change." Lesbian Avenger, Alexis Harvey, describes the confrontation, "Lesbian Avengers burst in shouting 'Avenge the hate, avenge the homophobia' while the conference goers sat there stunned and an Avenger was pushed to the ground."¹⁶⁵

Again, why would the Lesbian Avengers do these things if they know and admit that change is possible? Even the Lesbian Avengers' founder, Sarah Schulman, believes that SSA is changeable and that sodomy is a choice. Just read the statement she makes on page 26 of her book, *My American History*:

"We fear that unless progressive movements can challenge compulsory heterosexuality and recognize lesbianism as a positive choice for women our issues will be rendered secondary."

Sarah Schulman clearly states that lesbianism is a choice, and she is clearly hateful toward pro-family groups, not because they believe that sexual preferences are fluid, but because they are open about the fact that sexual preferences are fluid, and because they do not affirm Schulman's sexual behavior, due to their knowledge of the moral, mental, physical, and social consequences associated with it.

As evidenced by the examples in this chapter there are serious questions and doubts being openly raised—even by pro-sodomy leaders—about "sexual orientation;" ACT UP is a hotbed of heterosexual activities; other famous so-called "gays" and "lesbians" have been involved in heterosexual relationships and one of the "Lesbian Avengers'" founders, Sarah Schulman even views lesbian sexuality as a "choice."

With this uncertainty about their own identity, it must be psychologically intolerable for so-called "lesbians" and "gays" when such "change" concepts are carried to their logical conclusion by groups like Exodus International. Exodus and other groups openly facilitate the changes in sexual preference recognized privately as valid by the pro-sodomy community. Plagued by self-doubts,

¹⁶⁵ *Diva*, Feb/Mar 1995, p.16

“lesbian” and “gay” insecurity explodes into fascist-style attacks on groups who would make public, what the pro-sodomy community talks about only in private.

Eric Pollard is a former member of the homosexual organization ACT UP. Eric criticizes pro-sodomy activists for their techniques. He calls ACT UP a “truly fascist organization.” He says that their disruptive techniques have an ominous source—they were, “subversive tactics, drawn largely from the voluminous *Mein Kampf*, which some of us studied as a working model.”¹⁶⁶ *Mein Kampf* is, of course, Adolf Hitler’s book on fascist ideas and strategy.

Schulman learned her fascist lessons well from ACT UP. “Lesbian Avengers” follows its parent group, ACT UP, whose philosophy and techniques are fascist, their objective is to suppress dissent and their motivation is the “desperation of denial,” as pro-sodomy activist Randy Shilts has so aptly put it, “...the desperation of denial: how when something is so horrible you don’t want to believe it, you want to out it out of your mind and insist it isn’t true, and how you hate the person who says it is.”¹⁶⁷ Desperate denial; this seems to be what drives the pro-sodomy movement’s deceit, psychological manipulation, and intimidation of scientific groups and other apposing members of society.

Wayne Besen, formerly of the “Human Rights Campaign,” a pro-sodomy political organization, displays his explosive and fascist denial when denounces any therapist or organization that dares help persons seeking to change their own sexual preference as misery mongers, when he states:

“They take people with extremely low self-esteem and make them feel even worse about themselves...The amount of conflict, turmoil, suffering and human misery these groups cause people is astounding... [Q]uit simply, ex-gays don’t exist.”¹⁶⁸

Wayne’s comments echo what we have heard time and time again from the pro-sodomy political community, but can they be trusted? And could it be true that Wayne Besen has *never* heard of a single person ever changing their so-called “sexual orientation,” so as to qualify his statement? Wayne worked for the “Human Rights Campaign,” one of the leading pro-sodomy activist organizations in America. For him not to have heard of Anne Heche, or Greg Louganis, or “Bro” Broberg, or “Bia,” or filmmakers Gregg Araki, Elain Hollman,

¹⁶⁶ The Washington Blade, 1-31-92, p.39

¹⁶⁷ *And the Band Played On*, 1988, p. 182

¹⁶⁸ *Wayne Besen: Exposing Scandals Behind the Ex-Gay Myth’* an interview by Raj Ayyar, *Gay Today* 8, no. 87 March 27, 2004” (Case For Marriage, 150)

Maria Maggenti, or “lesbian” literary award winning authors Joanne Loulan, and Jan Clausen, or even the award winning book *Sister Brother*, would be virtually impossible. These are all well-known members of the so-called “gay” community, members who were very defined as either “gay” or “lesbian,” and in most cases for many years, yet all changed their so-called “sexual-orientation.” It seems that it would be impossible for “Wayne Besen” to be unaware of these well-known cases. In all likelihood, the man is a calculating and manipulative liar. Besen isn’t the only liar.

Pro-sodomy political organizations nationwide have promulgated equally offensive lies. One such pro-sodomy political organization is “The National Organization of Social Workers” (NASW). In its “Policy Statement on Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Issues,” it states:

“Social stigmatization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual people is wide-spread and is a primary motivating factor in leading some people to seek sexual ‘orientation’ changes....No data demonstrate that reparative or conversion therapies are effective, and in fact they may be harmful....NASW discourages social workers from providing treatments designed to change sexual ‘orientation’ or from referring practitioners or programs that claim to do so.”¹⁶⁹

This NEA resolution could not be further from the truth. In the words of Dr. Stanton Jones, the provost and former chair of the psychology department at Wheaton College, “anyone who says there is no hope [for change] is either ignorant or a liar.”¹⁷⁰

Camille Paglia, a very prominent lesbian author agrees, “Gay activists are guilty of Stalinist disinformation when they assert that homosexuality is no different than and equivalent to heterosexuality...is the gay identity so fragile that it cannot bear the thought that some people may not wish to be gay?”¹⁷¹

Dr. Robert Spitzer, one of the very psychologists who led the movement to have homosexuality removed from the American Psychological Association’s list of Psychological Disorders in 1973, acknowledged this as well in his 1973 Position Paper on Nomenclature when he wrote that “Modern methods of treatment enable a significant number of homosexuals who wish to change their sexual orientation to do so.” In 1991, Dr. Spitzer found similar results when he studied 153 men and 47 women who reported successful counseling for unwanted sexual attractions and maintained a change in behavior and fantasies

¹⁶⁹(emphasis ours) “*Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Issues*,” *Social Work Speaks*, Jan. 1st 2003, p.230)

¹⁷⁰ Stanton Jones, ‘*The Loving Opposition*’, *Christianity Today*, JULY 19, 1993, p. 25

¹⁷¹ (Camille Paglia, *Vamps and Tramps* (New York: Vintage Books,1994), pp.71, 77.)

for 5 years, 76% of the men and 47% of the women eventually married.¹⁷² Spitzer reconfirmed his position once again in 2001 in a presentation made in front of the American Psychiatric Association entitled "200 Subjects Who Claim to Have Changed Their Sexual Orientation from Homosexual to Heterosexual."

The director of the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training, Dr. Reuben Fine understands that "gays" and lesbians" change their sexual preferences. In fact, he was attacked back in the mid 1970's for advocating this truth. He states, "I have recently had occasion to review the results of psychotherapy with homosexuals, and been surprised by the findings, it is paradoxical that even though the politically active homosexual group denies the possibility of change, all studies, from Schrenck-Notzing and on, have found positive effects, virtually regardless of the kind of treatment used ...".¹⁷³

In another interview, Dr. Fine sounds a bit more troubled over the effect pro-sodomy politics have had on people with same-sex attraction. He demonstrates his concern when he states, "... Whether with hypnosis ..., psychoanalysis of any variety, educative psychotherapy, behavior therapy, and/or simple educational procedures, a considerable percentage of overt homosexuals became heterosexual ... If the patients were motivated, whatever procedure is adopted, a large percentage will give up their homosexuality. In this connection, public education is of greatest importance. The misinformation spread by certain circles 'that homosexuality is untreatable by psychotherapy' does incalculable harm to thousands of men and women."¹⁷⁴

Dr. Edmund Bergler discusses the effects of the "born gay" hoax on people's motivations to change their behavior when he writes in his book *Homosexuality: Disease or Way of Life*, "The homosexual's real enemy is ... his ignorance of the possibility that he can be helped, plus his psychic masochism which leads him to shun treatment."¹⁷⁵

In an article appearing in the *American Handbook of Psychiatry* Dr. Socarides echoes the concerns of Dr. Fine and Bergler when he writes, "The major challenge in treating homosexuality, from the point of view of the patient's resistance, has, of course, been the misconception that the disorder is innate or inborn."¹⁷⁶

¹⁷² Nicolosi, J., *Reparative Therapy of the Male Homosexual*. (Northvale, N.J.:Aronson, 1991)

¹⁷³ [R. Fine (1987) *Psychological Theory, Male and Female Homosexuality: Psychological Approaches*, p. 84, Diamant L, ed., Hemisphere Publishing: Washington, D.C]

¹⁷⁴ (Ruben Fine, *Psychoanalytic Theory*, in *male and female homosexuality :Psychological Approaches*, ed. Louis Diamante (New York: Hemisphere 1987), pp. 84-86.)

¹⁷⁵ Edmund Bergler (1962) *Homosexuality: Disease or Way of Life?*, p. 67, Collier: New York

¹⁷⁶ Charles W. Socarides (1974) "*Homosexuality*," *American Handbook of Psychiatry*, 2nd Edition, Volume 3, Arieti S., Brody E.B., eds., p. 309, Basic Books: New York

Dr. Robert Kronemeyer writes in his book, *Overcoming Homosexuality* that, "From my 25 years' experience as a clinical psychologist, I firmly believe that homosexuality is a learned response to early painful experiences and that it can be unlearned. For those homosexuals who are unhappy with their life and find effective therapy, it is 'curable.'"¹⁷⁷

Dr. Nicolosi, another researcher in this area has stated, "The assumption that people can't change is a political conclusion rather than a scientific one."¹⁷⁸

The foregoing remarks clearly demonstrate that for at least three decades competent mental health professionals have suggested that the false notion that same-sex attraction and sodomy cannot be overcome is a major stumbling block to sexual recovery. Further, we have now seen in numerous pro-sodomy sources that so-called "lesbians" and "gay" men can also be attracted to the opposite sex. Sometimes these sexual/romantic attractions are even toward other pro-sodomy activists of the opposite sex. "Born gay" propagandists tell us that this phenomenon is impossible, but it happens and is well-documented. Further, while thousands of articles exist relating to the development and treatment of same-sex attraction, there is no biological evidence showing that same-sex attraction is innate. Future decisions regarding policies about, and/or treatment of, persons struggling with same-sex attraction should reflect this knowledge.

(In closing, British lesbians Lynne Harne and Elaine Miller reflect the thesis of this entire book perfectly in a *LAMBDA Book Report*, "Insisting that 'sexual desire and pleasure are socially constructed,' these women who lay claim to radical lesbian feminism leave little room for debate in the nature – nurture debate. "There's nothing natural in lesbianism, 'it's a positive choice,' and a political one."¹⁷⁹)

¹⁷⁷ [R. Kronemeyer (1980) *Overcoming Homosexuality*, p. 7, Macmillan Publishing: New York]

¹⁷⁸ Nicolosi, J., *Reparative Therapy of the Male Homosexual*. (Northvale, N.J.: Aronson, 1991)

¹⁷⁹ *Lambda Book Report*, Oct. 1996, p.11, *Commenting on All the Rage: Reasserting Radical Lesbian Feminism*

Intimidating Reparative Therapists

"I feel that the entire homophile movement...is going to stand or fall upon the question of whether or not homosexuality is a sickness..."

(Franklin Kameny, Pro-Sodomy Activist)

In the late 1960's, a number of pro-sodomy activists began to pressure the American Psychiatric Association and the American Psychological Association to ban the treatment of SSA and sodomy, claiming that treatment would lead to inner-conflict, turmoil, suffering, and human misery. But as we have seen, not only are these claims false, they are calculated lies designed to accomplish very specific political goals. Remember pro-sodomy activist Franklin Kameny's words, "I feel that the entire homophile movement...is going to stand or fall upon the question of whether or not homosexuality is a sickness..."¹⁸⁰ One goal then, of pro-sodomy activists is the removal of "Homosexuality" as a psychological disorder, and another must be the social acceptance of a non-reparative "gay" identity.

Standing in opposition to both of these goals however, is a successful reparative therapy industry. Since the very existence of "reparative" therapy implies a previous "degenerative" state, and since change is the negation of the permanent, it follows that in order for pro-sodomy activists to legitimize their claim that homosexuality is not a sickness; they must de-legitimize reparative therapy. Using a three-pronged strategy of intimidation, inside connections, and pseudo-science, this is exactly what they have tried to do.

Beginning in the early 1990's for example, Shannon Minter, an attorney for the "National Center for Lesbian Rights," launched a campaign of intimidation when she began to spearhead legal attacks on therapists offering assistance to persons struggling with same-sex attraction. A 1993 article appearing in the pro-sodomy magazine *The Advocate* explains:

"Her plan of attack over the next two years includes bringing lawsuits against institutions that have been accused of forcing reparative therapy on adolescents, pushing the APA to take a hard-line stand against reparative therapy, and lobbying to implement due process rights for minors. She also intends to draw as much public attention as she can to the abuses she feels are

¹⁸⁰ *The Gay Crusaders*, p.98

being perpetrated against gay and lesbian teens in hopes of fueling an all-out public war against the mental health industry.

‘What needs to happen is what happened in 1973,’ says Minter, referring to the widespread protests by the gay lesbian community that led to the APA’s dropping homosexuality from the DSM. ‘We won a really important victory, but the resistance is still there. We have a long way to go.’¹⁸¹

Minter’s words are clear and her claim that the APA ought to take a “hard-line stance against reparative therapy” implies a personal belief that change is nearly impossible and that therapist’s who facilitate change cause only harm. But are Minter’s concerns genuine? Let us contrast Shannon Minter’s strong public statements and litigating motives with her personal experiences and see if a deeper reality of hypocrisy doesn’t surface.

Shannon Minter was an attorney for the “National Center for Lesbian Rights” at the time she made the aforementioned statement, an organization which pressures the American Psychiatric Association to abandon reparative therapy. Minter’s boss, Kate Kendall, was the director of this organization. Hypocritically, while Shannon Minter and Kate Kendall were publicly working together to have reparative therapy denounced by the APA, Kate Kendall was simultaneously writing articles for specialized pro-sodomy magazines arguing that sexual orientation is *fluid*, not fixed.¹⁸²

Kendall writes, “We have much to lose from gay science if we fail to acknowledge that our sexual orientation is a mix of factors, part emotional, part physical, part values, part philosophical, part politics, and perhaps part nature. It is precisely the complexity of sexual orientation that creates the real homophobes—those so hostile to us because of fears about their own passing or not-so-passing attractions. And the idea that sexual orientation is fixed from birth is unconvincing precisely because so many of us –gay, lesbian, bi, straight – have at some point felt our own sexuality was less than fixed.”¹⁸³

If this admission that the “gay” identity is fluid by the director of Minter’s organization is not enough, the February 18, 1997 edition of *The Advocate* reported that JoAnne Loulan, who sat on the board of directors of the organization, actually changed her own supposedly permanent “sexual orientation” when she fell in love with a man.

Given these details, is it possible that Shannon Minter really believed what she said about the impossibility of change by way of reparative therapy? It cannot be possible. As noted, Minter worked with at least one woman who

¹⁸¹ *The Advocate*, 12-29-93, p.40

¹⁸² *Frontiers*, 4-19-96, pg. 31

¹⁸³ *Frontiers*, 4-19-96, p.31

changed her own so-called “sexual orientation,” JoAnne Loulan, and another who wrote at least one article challenging the permanency of sexual orientation, Kate Kendall. What hypocrisy.

Is it possible to continue to trust these activists when they say that the “gay” identity is permanent and reparative therapy impossible?” It is not. It seems obvious by now that activists are eager to shun reparative therapists not because they likewise understand sexual preferences to be fluid, but because many reparative therapists do not affirm these activists’ sexual behavior. This is a moral conflict, not a scientific one.

While Shannon Minter was suing reparative therapists, Dr. Robert Cabaj (pronounced “sa-bye”) a pro-sodomy activist and chairman of the “Caucus of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Psychiatrists” launched his own effort to pressure the APA to declare reparative therapy unethical. Cabaj’s first effort failed however, because it was seen as infringing on psychiatrists’ constitutional rights to free speech. *The Washington Blade* gives details:

“It was the Assembly members who refused, in 1994, to take action on a resolution that sought to have the organization on record as disapproving ‘reparative therapy.’ Dr. Robert Cabaj (pronounced “sa-bye”), the homosexual psychiatrist who led the 1994 effort, said the position statement got entangled in a controversy involving a psychiatrist who opposed the statement because he contended his First Amendment right to freedom of speech would be jeopardized.”¹⁸⁴

Radically, Cabaj wanted reparative therapy declared “unethical” so that psychiatrist’s treating persons seeking help would be de-legitimized by the American Psychiatric Association. Dr. Jeffrey Satinover, a psychiatrist who practices and supports reparative therapy, provides the specifics of Cabaj’s proposal:

1. “APA labeling reparative therapy (conversion) therapy as unethical,
2. A continuing effort to have reparative therapy labeled an abuse or misuse of psychiatry, and
3. Finding a way to isolate the National Organization for Research and Therapy...of Homosexuality (NARTH), a group whose members feel conflicted homosexuals can and should be changed to Heterosexuals.”¹⁸⁵

Note here that the word “Therapy” is incorrect in point number three. The correct word is “Treatment.” Cabaj did not even know the name of the organization he was attacking. Fortunately, Dr. Cabaj’s first attack failed in 1994. However, several years of lobbying by the “Caucus of Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual

¹⁸⁴ *Washington Blade*, 12-11-1998, p. 21

¹⁸⁵ *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*, a book by Dr. Jeffrey Satinover, 1996, p.182

Psychiatrists" paid off in 1998. The pro-sodomy newspaper *The Washington Blade* tells the story:

"Cabaj, who also wrote the California-based Gay and Lesbian Medical Association's position paper on the controversial therapy, said proponents of the APA's statement have spent the past four years soliciting support for it among psychiatrists nationwide.

'The Board has been more understanding and aware of this issue for quite a while,' he said. 'They supported (the resolution opposing reparative therapy) in 1994.'

The ground work laid by supporters of the statement could find no scientific study to prove reparative therapy is or is not effective.

'We collected published information showing poor or no results,' he said. 'And many studies that claimed (reparative therapy) does work were done by religious-based groups with out real follow up to see if there was a change in sexual orientation.'

In addition, Cabaj said most of the studies collected emphasized a change in sexual behavior but not a change in sexual orientation.'

The other strategy used by proponents of the position statement involved discussing the proposal with psychiatrists who make up the APA's voting body and reside in 75 geographic districts across the country. Cabaj noted that those who support the position statement conducted a much broader educational effort with their colleagues this time.

'In 1994, they didn't know what we were talking about at all and they reacted conservatively,' he said. 'With the background research we did, and by making more personal appeals, we were hoping it would make it easier.'"¹⁸⁶

Indeed it did, and on December 11, 1998 the 21-member Board of Trustees of the APA adopted a position statement which speaks negatively of reparative therapy.

But was this a scientific decision or a political one? Recall the words of activist Barbara Gittings from 1974 in reference to the APA's dropping of "Homosexuality" as a mental disorder, "That's how far we've come in ten years. Now we even have the American Psychiatric Association running scared."¹⁸⁷ Was the APA "running scared" in 1998 as well?

According to the *Washington Blade*, Robert Cabaj, "also wrote the California-based Gay and Lesbian Medical Association's position paper on the

¹⁸⁶ *Washington Blade*, 12-11-1998, p.25

¹⁸⁷ *Gay American History*, by Jonathan Ned Katz, 1992, p.427. This interview was taped July 19, 1974

conversional therapy..."¹⁸⁸ Note the use of the word "also" in this statement. A pro-sodomy activist and member of a pro-sodomy pressure group wrote a statement consistent with *The Gay Agenda*. What else is new? Pro-sodomy activists still have the APA intimidated and controlled. If the APA were not controlled why would they allow such an openly biased individual to write a politically rather than scientifically motivated position statement; an individual who engaged in sodomy himself? Why would they not look for a more neutral psychologist? Why would they not require more proof?

What might the scientific consequences of such an unscientific statement be? Looking at one part of Cabaj's "Position Statement on Psychiatric Treatment and (so-called) Sexual Orientation" we find that it, "stipulates that the potential risks of 'reparative therapy' are great, including depression, anxiety, and self-destructive behavior, since therapists alignment with societal prejudices against homosexuality may reinforce self-hatred already experienced by the patient."¹⁸⁹

If young psychiatrists accept this statement, it may lead them to refuse to treat persons with same-sex attractions who seek help. If this were to happen it would be a shame. Not only because the statement is political rather than scientific but because the statement actually says nothing. Take a closer look. Notice how the aforementioned statement appears to state negative facts about reparative therapy. However, also notice the use of qualifying terms such as "potential," "risks," and "may reinforce." Note also the use of the term "prejudices." This statement actually says nothing. In addition, this same *Washington Blade* article notes that the American Psychological Association has not explicitly condemned reparative therapy because, "...researchers have yet to demonstrate conclusively that reparative therapy is harmful."¹⁹⁰ The APA's premature adoption of Cabaj's proposal then, was a political move, meant to pander to activists, not a directive scientific decision.

Despite the adoption of this political position, positive studies associated with reparative therapy are plentiful. Dr. Jeffrey Satinover relates this fact to readers in his book *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth* through graphs and tables: "As the following tables illustrate," he states, "homosexuality has long been recognized as treatable. The tables include a selection of reports dating from 1930 to 1986 that discuss a variety of treatable methods. These tables are but a representative cross section of the entire 60 sixty-year literature that activists condemn as wholesale 'lies.' Recall that in the eight years between 1966 and 1974

¹⁸⁸ *Washington Blade*, 12-11-98, p.25

¹⁸⁹ *Washington Blade*, 12-11-98, p.21

¹⁹⁰ *Washington Blade*, 12-11-98, p.21

alone, just the Medline database—which excludes many psychotherapy journals—listed over a thousand articles on the treatment of homosexuality.”¹⁹¹

Dr. Satinover provides a diverse list of nine representative studies and their success rates. “Note that the composite of these results gives an overall success rate of over 50 percent—where success is defined as ‘considerable’ to ‘complete’ change. These reports clearly contradict claims that change is flatly impossible. Indeed it would be more accurate to say that all the existing evidence suggests strongly that homosexuality is quite changeable. Most psychotherapists will allow that for the treatment of any condition, a 30 percent success rate may be anticipated.”¹⁹²

Two of the studies listed in Dr. Satinover’s book, one older, one newer, were longitudinal. That is, they followed patients for several years to see if the reparative effect lasted. Satinover notes that, “One of the last articles on homosexual change in a major journal was published in 1976 (before the chill effected the APA) and is not included in the above sample. The researcher examined carefully not only the immediate results of combined behavioral and psychotherapeutic interventions, but long term follow up. The author found that, ‘Of 49 patients...31 (63 percent) were contacted for follow up. The average period since the end of treatment was 4 years. Nineteen subjects (61 percent) have remained exclusively heterosexual, whereas nine (29 percent) have had homosexual intercourse. Heterosexual intercourse was reported in 28 (90 percent), including the previous 9 subjects. Three (10 percent) subjects have had neither homo nor heterosexual intercourse.’ In 1984, the Masters and Johnson program similarly reported a five-year follow-up success rate of 65 percent.”¹⁹³

Reparative therapy is a proven success. Once again, pro-sodomy political activists cannot be trusted; even when propaganda is “approved” by the APA’s politicized 21-member Board. These facts about the success rate of reparative therapists come as no surprise to those within the pro-sodomy movement, but they reject the results publicly because reparative therapists tend to have a moral problem with the activists sexual behavior, not a scientific one.

As evidenced by countless numbers of their own articles, pro-sodomy activists know the truth, but are incapable of telling it publicly. As we have seen above, the American Psychological Association’s statement that there is no scientific evidence that reparative therapy works, and that it only does harm is pure propaganda. One organization that has been instrumental in creating such

¹⁹¹ *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*, p.185

¹⁹² *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*, p.186

¹⁹³ *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*, p.187

negative perceptions is the “National Lesbian and Gay Health Association” (NLGHA).

In 1996, the “National Lesbian and Gay Health Association” commissioned a pseudo-scientific study specifically designed to establish reparative therapy as a failure. Biased researchers Dr. Michael Schroader and Dr. Ariel Shidlo ran the “study.” The methodology of this study was flawed in many ways. For example, in their public advertisements, these psychologists should have said that they were using a balanced, objective approach to determine whether reparative therapy works or does not work. But when these men were recruiting their “subjects” (persons who have been through reparative therapy), strongly biased ads were placed in pro-sodomy publications. The text of the ad appears below.

HELP US DOCUMENT
THE DAMAGE OF
HOMOPHOBIC THERAPIES

In association with the National Lesbian and Gay Health Association, we are conducting research on the outcome of treatments that claim to “cure” homosexuality. Our purpose is to document damage that we believe occurs when a lesbian, gay, or bisexual client receives psychological help from a provider who promises to change a person’s sexual orientation.¹⁹⁴

This blatantly biased ad appeared on page 27 of the pro-sodomy publication, *In the Family*, in April of 1996. There is no intent here to determine whether reparative therapy might work. That issue is already settled in the minds of the researchers and their pro-sodomy activist sponsors (“we believe”), before the study even began. This strong bias controls the entire study: “Our purpose is to document the damage...” Two things were done which guaranteed that reparative therapy would be presented in bad light. First, the inflammatory rhetoric used in these ads guarantees that only “failures” need apply. Notice the use words like “DAMAGE” and “HOMOPHOBIC” which incite only disgruntled failures to respond. Note also, that their clearly stated purpose is not to determine whether, and to what extent reparative therapies work. Instead their “purpose” is to “document the damage.” This strong negative rhetoric is guaranteed to produce only negative results. Second, advertisements were placed only in pro-sodomy publications which would not be read by people who had gotten over same-sex attraction. Obviously only “failures” would continue

¹⁹⁴ *In the Family*, April 1997 pg. 27

to read pro-sodomy publications for an extended period, and thus, only failures would respond to the ads.

In an interview with one of the nations leading pro-sodomy newspapers, the *Washington Blade* –psychologists Shroader and Shidlo describe their approach, in their own words: “Shidlo and Schroader said they have interviewed about 100 people for their study, most of whom they found in local Gay newspapers and magazines.¹⁹⁵ These two men are clear about their methodology. But Schroader also reveals that he engages in sodomy himself, raising further the question of experimental bias: “‘And since most people come to these treatment programs during their coming out process,’ said Schroader, ‘of course they told them that they were unhappy. Most of us were miserable at that point.’”¹⁹⁶

Note that by using the term “us,” Schroader clearly indicates that he engages in sodomy himself, which raises further questions about the study. In closing, in evaluating this important study which was commissioned to help legitimize the political position held by pro-sodomy activists we can safely conclude that only two possibilities exist. Either the psychologists who conducted the study are grossly incompetent in using improper methods to collect their “sample” (if it can even be called a sample) of individuals that have been through reparative therapy, or else these “psychologists” (if they can even be called psychologists) are really propagandists and were being deliberately deceitful in order to produce results that would benefit *The Gay Agenda*.

¹⁹⁵ *Washington Blade*, 7-7-98, p.21

¹⁹⁶ *Washington Blade*, 7-7-98, p.21, emphasis mine

14

Born Straight

"Nature exists whether academics like it or not. And in nature, procreation is the single relentless rule... Our sexual bodies were designed for reproduction... No one is born gay. The idea is ridiculous... Homosexuality is an adaptation, not an inborn trait."
(Pro-Sodomy Activist, Camille Paglia)

All human beings, with the rare exception of hermaphrodites, are born with a biological reproductive system that is self-evidently genetic and unchangeably heterosexual. Male bodies have male sex organs. Female bodies have female sex organs. DNA self-evidently ordered the production of these complimentary sexual parts, and, the only reason human bodies have sexual feelings at all, is because of the chemical and hormonal processes rooted in its procreative heterosexual design.

By definition, all men who engage in sodomy have male sex organs, designed by nature to fit the sex organs of females, not other males. Therefore, if some men develop sexual desires for other men, rather than for women, it is clear that however they developed those desires, they are contrary to their natural physical provision.

Just think, wouldn't we consider it unnatural if someone had perfectly healthy eyes but could not see, or fully functioning ears but could not hear?" This may be something psychological, but certainly not biological. Biologically speaking everything is working fine. "Why then, would we deem it natural for a person to have perfectly healthy, fully functioning male or female reproductive organs, but then be dispositionally incapable of ever using them to accomplish their natural reproductive purpose with the opposite sex?"¹⁹⁷

To make the point another way, imagine that you are looking out at a lake from a room upstairs; it is obvious (once you think about it) that you are looking through a window. But if it is the lake that interests you, you may look at it for a long time without once thinking of the window. When you are reading a book it is obvious (once you attend to it) that you are using your eyes: but unless your eyes begin to hurt you, or the book is a text book on optics, you may read all

¹⁹⁷ Gregory Koukl, Stand to Reason

evening without once thinking of eyes.”¹⁹⁸ In a similar way, a person may go on engaging in sodomy or any number of other perversions for many years, yet never attend to the fact that the only reason he or she has sexual organs and sexual feelings at all, is because of the chemical and hormonal processes rooted in his or her body’s procreative, heterosexual design.

It seems then that sometimes that which is in one sense the most obvious and primary, and through which alone a person has access to all else, may be precisely the one that is most easily forgotten--forgotten not because it is so remote or abstruse but because it is so near, so obvious, so self-evident. “For as bats’ eyes are to daylight,” wrote Aristotle, “so is our intellectual eye to those truths which are, in their own nature, the most obvious of all. (Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, I (Brevior) i)

Indeed, the belief that males are designed for reproduction and therefore females, rather than can-openers, snakes, cow rectums, or any other object by which one may be perversely conditioned to fetish is warranted not as the conclusion of any argument, but as one of the prerequisites for any sound argument whatsoever. It is the very premise, the very axiom by which we can reason about the subject at all. And axioms neither solicit nor demand proofs beyond their own integrity. Masters and Johnson agree.

Together, William Masters and Virginia E. Johnson are known as the twentieth century’s most renowned research team in the field of human sexuality. Masters and Johnson began their work in psychology and human sexuality in the late 1950’s and continued their research well into the 1990s. They began their work at the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology at Washington University in St. Louis. Then, in 1964, the researchers founded an independent not-for-profit research institute in St. Louis called the Reproductive Biology Research Foundation, which later changed its name to the Masters and Johnson Institute. Over the course of their career, Masters and Johnson trained thousands of psychologists, authored two classic texts on the issue of human sexuality, and were even inducted into the St. Louis “Walk of Fame.”

In an article entitled *Homosexuality in Perspective* Masters and Johnson make the following statement about men and women who are struggling with same-sex attraction: “When dealing with problems of sexual preference, it is vital that all health-care professionals bear in mind that the homosexual man or woman is basically a man or woman by genetic determination and is homosexually oriented by learned preference.”¹⁹⁹ Dr. John DeCecco agrees.

¹⁹⁸ C.S. Lewis, *Miracles*

¹⁹⁹ [W.H. Masters, V.E. Johnson (1979) *Homosexuality in Perspective*, Little, Brown and Company: Boston]

Pro-sodomy activist, Dr. DeCecco, is the editor of the *Journal of Homosexuality*, a professor of psychology at San Francisco State University, and has been honored by the GLBT Historical Society.²⁰⁰ In an article entitled *A Biologic Theory for Sexual Preference* which appeared in *USA Today*, DeCecco dismisses the notion that anyone is born “gay” when he states: “The move towards 'biologizing' homosexuality isn't the result of a scientific consensus, but a political consensus by those eager to label people gay or straight.” Homosexuality,” he says, is a “behavior, not a condition,” and “something that some people can and do change.”²⁰¹

Dr. Camille Paglia is a professor of Humanities and Media Studies at the University of the Arts in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Paglia is also a prominent and award winning author and has been ranked number 20 in a list of the worlds “Top 100 Public Intellectuals” by the UK’s *Prospect Magazine*. She defines herself as a “Feminist Bisexual Egomaniac.” In her book, *Vamps and Tramps*, Paglia starkly defends the reproductive nature of males and females when she writes: “Homosexuality is not normal. On the contrary it is a challenge to the norm...Nature exists whether academics like it or not. And in nature, procreation is the single relentless rule. That is the norm. Our sexual bodies were designed for reproduction...No one is born gay. The idea is ridiculous... Homosexuality is an adaptation, not an inborn trait.”²⁰²

Lastly, in the words of one of the most influential thinkers of the twentieth century, C.S. Lewis, “The design of the human body is screaming to us, that its two halves, the male and the female, were made to be combined together in pairs, not simply on the sexual level but on all levels, and when I say this, I am not expressing a mere sentiment, but stating a fact –just as a person is stating a fact when they say that a lock and its key are one mechanism, or that a violin and a bow are one musical instrument; the male and female are designed to come together, and function as a single organism.”²⁰³

Pro-sodomy activists, having failed to make the case in the physical sense of the term natural, have by sleight of hand turned our attention toward a different definition of the term natural: the “natural” world.

²⁰⁰ http://www.sfbaytimes.com/index.php?sec=article&article_id=4645

²⁰¹ K. Painter, (March 1, 1989), *A Biologic Theory for Sexual Preference*, *USA Today* p. 4D

²⁰² Camille Paglia, *Vamps and Tramps* (New York Vintage Books, 1994), pp.70-72

²⁰³ C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*

Chapter 15

“But isn’t Same-Gender Sex Natural because it Occurs in Nature?”

“In an effort to portray sodomy as a common and widespread phenomenon, activists are turning society’s attention to the natural world. Their strategy is fairly straightforward: Simply compile evidence of animals engaging in same-gender sex, -as many gay geese, lesbian lizards, queer quail, and transgendered tigers as you can find, and claim that the acts indicate that sexuality has no norm.

Recently, there was a whole exhibit devoted to this subject at the Oslo Natural History Museum in Norway, titled, “Against Nature?” The show included photographs of one male giraffe mounting another, apes stimulating others of the same-gender, and two aroused whales rubbing against each other. The purpose of this exhibit, according to Petter Bockman, a zoologist who assisted in the exhibit’s organization was to “help demystify” sodomy “among people” -“to reject the all too well known argument that” sodomy “is a crime against nature.”

Mr. Bockman is not the only activist using this strategy. Another, pro-sodomy activist, Joan Roughgarden, a self-described “transgendered” professor of biology at Stanford University has tried to make the same argument in virtually the same way. He has actually attempted to catalogue the various permutations of sodomy in the animal kingdom in his book *Evolution’s Rainbow*. It is his, I mean her, contention, that the sodomy documented in over 450 vertebrate species is not only a ‘normal’ (in the distributive sense of the word) aspect of life but a necessary one, providing in some species, such as the Japanese macaque, the social stability needed for long-term survival. (It should be noted that the author of the study on which Roughgarden bases this straw-man argument, Dr. Paul Vasey, rejects Roughgardens’ conclusions.)

There are many ways to explain why the claims of Bockman and Roughgarden are erroneous. Here I will provide four. Let us begin first with a mere technicality. Even if sodomy has been observed in 1,500 species, as some scientists maintain, that still leaves over 14 million animal species that engage exclusively in procreative-type behaviors. Can we really say that something is “normal,” in the distributive sense of the word, as Mr. Roughgarden does, when it occurs in only .01% of animal species?

This straw-man is also flawed on a secondary level, because it assumes that erotic behavior in other mammals is the same as perceived “homosexual” desire and identity in human beings. Men have sex with men and/or fall in love

not merely because of an attraction to a physical body part (women have that body part too), but rather because of an attraction to a gender. They are male-erotic, and sodomy is an expression of that desire. Does the animal kingdom display this kind of same-gender eroticism or perceived sexual identity? When a male dog mounts another male dog, is it because he's attracted to the male gender of the other dog? Would this dog consider himself a "homosexual?" Does he bark with a lisp?

I don't think so. This same poor pooch will slavishly mount sofas or shrubs or anything else available, including the leg of your dinner guest. None of these things are the object of the canine's sexual lust; they are merely the subject of it. The dog does not desire your unfortunate visitor. He simply desires to be stimulated. This may prove that dogs masturbate. It does not prove that they have same-sex attraction in any way parallel with human beings.

Third, and most pertinently, why would we want to model our sexual behavior after that of animals? It is not as if we look to them in other matters, consulting our pets whenever we need advice on permissible conduct. If we did so, we would soon find ourselves eating feces, engaging in incest, and marking our territory each time we entered a new room. To take our cue from animals is to imply that we are likewise mere beasts, which is no doubt the assumption that under-girds the latest push to legitimize sodomy. Indeed, it is only when man has been stripped of his meaning and purpose-when he is reduced to his bestial appetites that such appeals to animalism can even begin to make sense.

Fourth, the view asserts that simply because a condition or behavior "occurs in nature" that it is "natural." But by this use of the word all sorts of things would be natural, humans mating with animals, children drinking cleaning fluid, rain forests being replaced with concrete, because all would be occurring 'in nature.' Human beings are a part of nature by this definition, and therefore all and any human conduct would be natural. Virtually nothing could ever be considered unnatural on these terms. Generally we mean something else when we say that replacing virgin forests with parking lots, imbibing poison, copulating with beasts or with members of one's own gender are not natural.

Things are natural if they fit the pre-technological, natural order of things; they are functioning according to their primitive design, pattern, or purpose, and that is key. A natural and normative sexual desire, then, is a desire that serves to accomplish a sexual goal in the primitive order of things. However, this definition of "natural" doesn't help the sodomy advocate either. According to the primitive natural order of things, the natural purpose of sex is reproduction, getting one's genes into the next generation. But men who have sex with men don't reproduce, so sodomy can't be "natural" on this definition either.

Sodomy does not seem to be natural in any meaningful sense of the word. Those advocating for the behavior have failed to make the case that sodomy and same-sex attraction are natural in the narrow sense, determined by physical constitution, or natural in the broad sense, a normal occurrence in nature.” Sodomy activists have no natural direction left to turn. It seems clear by now that Same-sex attraction is the product of a disordered and disintegrated psyche, irrational impulses, and self-destructive inclinations. Same-sex attraction may be psychological, but never natural. Eventually, pro-sodomy activists will have to face the facts and concede the point.

Chapter 16

What if being “Gay” was Natural? Nature and Morality

Ostensibly unaware of *The Gay Agenda*, pro-sodomy columnist Robert Scheer has noted that, “Homosexuality in the vast majority of cases is a condition that is given and not chosen, and must therefore be honored as part of the natural order of things.” Scheer’s comments reflect a standard misconception about sodomy and ethics: If we can find a connection between same-sex attraction and nature, then we must surrender our moral objections to same-sex relationships and sodomy as an expression of that attraction. The error is in thinking that one has anything to do with the other. It doesn’t.

Philosophers David Hume and George Edward Moore argue that it is impossible to produce a deductively valid argument with factual premises and an ethical conclusion. In short, you can’t get an “ought” from an “is.” This is called the naturalistic fallacy. In layman’s terms, just because a behavior or feeling comes “natural” does not make it right. This becomes obvious on a moment’s reflection. Does a natural tendency towards violence justify assault? Does a natural desire for food justify theft? Does a natural aversion to men and women who engage in sodomy justify “gay”-bashing?

Ethicist C. Ben Mitchell agrees when he writes, “... even if researchers found a so-called ‘gay’ gene, that would not change the immorality of homosexuality. Science cannot do moral work. That is, science does not have the power to determine what’s right and wrong.” If, for example, a genetic link to alcoholism is proven, Mitchell noted that it would just “make it more urgent to avoid taking the first drink.”

Animals do what comes naturally. We are not mere beasts, but human beings protected by morality from the tyranny of our irrational “natural” appetites, impulses, and inclinations. The difference between “just doing what comes naturally” and principled self-restraint is called civilization.

Further, persisting in this line of reasoning annihilates the argument for adoption rights for the so-called “homosexual” couples. If sodomy is right because it is natural, then allowing so-called “homosexuals” to adopt must be wrong because it is unnatural for them to have children. If nature alone dictates morality, and the natural consequence for those who engage in sodomy is to be childless, then it is unnatural and therefore immoral for so-called “homosexuals” to have and raise children. Artificial insemination of “lesbians” or adoptions by

“homosexual” couples would be wrong by their own argument. The same principle governs both issues; they can’t pick and choose. That’s cheating.

My goal here has not been to prove that sodomy is immoral just yet; although I am convinced that it is, but rather to refute one of its common justifications. The morality of sodomy can never be defended by any appeal to nature, but only by an appeal to moral rules. Nature alone can never provide us with those. Pro-sodomy activists will have to find another way to make their case.