

**Documents
Related To The
Gay Activist
Agenda
For Our
Children**

Standard of Liberty Foundation
November 23, 2005



Standard of Liberty Foundation

4476 N Wedgewood Drive, Pleasant Grove UT 84062

Email: sgraham@standardofliberty.org Website: www.standardofliberty.org

Phone: 801.830.8418 Fax: 707.276.0456

Stephen F. Graham, President

In June 2005 Stephen and Janice Graham organized the Standard of Liberty Foundation in connection with our 3-year-old publishing company, Tidal Wave Books. Steve is an independent CPA and Tidal Wave Books publisher. Janice is an award-winning freelance writer for children and general audiences, editorial director of Tidal Wave Books, and author of four books. They have been married for 31 years, have seven children and seven grandkids, and belong to The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

The Standard of Liberty Foundation is a non-profit 501(c)(3) corporation providing education to counteract radical political activist movements which advance ideologies outside God's laws, this for the purposes of encouraging maximum individual health and progress, for preserving and protecting conjugal marriage and the natural family as the preferred ideal, and for restoring, defending, and upholding basic freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America in the faith and virtue-based traditions of our Founding Fathers.

This foundation and website are founded on gospel principles in keeping with The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and created in order to preserve and strengthen the Church organization and its members in truth, faith, and righteousness. Along with our fellow Church members, we invite our brothers and sisters everywhere of all denominations who care about preserving God, religion, freedom and family to our web site.

A passage of sacred scripture in The Book of Mormon is the inspiration for our foundation. It takes place in ancient times (73 B.C.) on the American continent at a period when a group of corrupt and godless men were attempting to gain power and control over the people for selfish purposes. A general named Moroni saw the danger.

"And it came to pass that [Moroni] rent his coat; and he took a piece thereof, and wrote upon it— In memory of our God, our religion, and freedom, and our peace, our wives, and our children, and he fastened it upon the end of a pole . . . and he bowed himself to the earth and prayed mightily unto his God for the blessings of liberty to rest upon his brethren, so long as there should a band of Christians remain to possess the land . . . for thus were all the true believers of Christ called . . . because of their belief in Christ who should come. . . And Moroni went forth waving the rent part of his garment in the air that all might see the writing which he had written upon [it], and crying with a loud voice, saying: Behold, whosoever will maintain this title upon the land, let them come forth in the strength of the Lord, and enter into a covenant that they will maintain their rights and their religion, that the Lord God may bless them . . . and thus Moroni planted the standard of liberty among the Nephites." Alma 46

This scripture is also the inspiration for our logo (upper left). It portrays a modern family against Moroni's ancient Standard of Liberty.

Utah Code -- Title 53A -- State System of Public Education

Chapter 03 -- Local School Boards

53A-3-419. Limitations regarding access for student clubs and organizations.

(1) A local school board may **limit or deny access to any student organization or club** as it determines to be necessary to:

- (a) **protect the physical, emotional, psychological, or moral well being of students and faculty;**
- (b) maintain order and discipline on school premises; or
- (c) prevent a material and substantial interference with the orderly conduct of a school's educational activities.

(2) (a) The Legislature finds that **certain activities, programs, and conduct are so detrimental to the physical, emotional, psychological, and moral well being of students** and faculty, the maintenance of order and discipline on school premises, and the prevention of any material and substantial interference with the orderly conduct of a school's educational activities, that local school boards shall deny access to any student organization or club whose program or activities would materially and substantially:

- (i) encourage criminal or delinquent conduct;
- (ii) promote bigotry; or
- (iii) **involve human sexuality.**

(b) Local school boards have authority to determine whether any student club or organization meets the criteria of Subsection (2).

(3) The State Board of Education and local school boards may adopt rules in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(4) If any one or more provision, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is found to be unconstitutional, the balance of this section shall be given effect without the invalid provision, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word.

Enacted by Chapter 10, 1996 Special Session 2

Utah Code --Title 53A-13-101 Instruction in health -- Parental consent requirements -- Conduct and speech of school employees and volunteers -- Political and religious doctrine prohibited.

(1) (a) The State Board of Education shall establish curriculum requirements under Section 53A-1-402, that **include instruction in:**

(i) community and personal health;

(ii) physiology;

(iii) personal hygiene; and

(iv) prevention of communicable disease.

(b) (i) That **instruction shall stress:**

(A) the importance of abstinence from all sexual activity before marriage and fidelity after marriage as methods for preventing certain communicable diseases; and

(B) personal skills that encourage individual choice of abstinence and fidelity.

(ii) (A) At no time may instruction be provided, including responses to spontaneous questions raised by students, regarding any means or methods that facilitate or encourage the violation of any state or federal criminal law by a minor or an adult.

(B) Subsection (1)(b)(ii)(A) does not preclude an instructor from responding to a spontaneous question as long as the response is consistent with the provisions of this section.

(c) (i) The board shall recommend instructional materials for use in the curricula required under Subsection (1)(a) after considering evaluations of instructional materials by the State Instructional Materials Commission.

(ii) A local school board may choose to adopt:

(A) the instructional materials recommended under Subsection (1)(c)(i); or

(B) other instructional materials as provided in state board rule.

(iii) The state board rule made under Subsection (1)(c)(ii)(B) shall include, at a minimum:

(A) that the materials adopted by a local school board under Subsection (1)(c)(ii)(B) shall be based upon recommendations of the school district's Curriculum Materials Review Committee that **comply with state law and state board rules emphasizing abstinence before marriage and fidelity after marriage, and prohibiting instruction in:**

(I) the intricacies of intercourse, sexual stimulation, or erotic behavior;

(II) the advocacy of homosexuality;

(III) the advocacy or encouragement of the use of contraceptive methods or devices; or

(IV) the advocacy of sexual activity outside of marriage;

(B) that the adoption of instructional materials shall take place in an open and regular meeting of the local school board for which prior notice is given to parents and guardians of students attending schools in the district and an opportunity for them to express their views and opinions on the materials at the meeting;

(C) provision for an appeal and review process of the local school board's decision; and

(D) provision for a report by the local school board to the State Board of Education of the action taken and the materials adopted by the local school board under Subsections (1)(c)(ii)(B) and (1)(c)(iii).

(2) (a) Instruction in the courses described in Subsection (1) shall be consistent and systematic in grades eight through 12.

(b) At the request of the board, the Department of Health shall cooperate with the board in developing programs to provide instruction in those areas.

(3) (a) The board shall adopt rules that:

(i) provide that the parental consent requirements of Sections 76-7-322 and 76-7-323 are complied with; and

(ii) require a student's parent or legal guardian to be notified in advance and have an opportunity to review the information for which parental consent is required under Sections 76-7-322 and 76-7-323.

(b) The board shall also provide procedures for disciplinary action for violation of Section 76-7-322 or

76-7-323.

(4) (a) In keeping with the requirements of Section 53A-13-109, and **because school employees and volunteers serve as examples to their students, school employees or volunteers acting in their official capacities may not support or encourage criminal conduct by students, teachers, or volunteers.**

(b) To ensure the effective performance of school personnel, the limitations described in Subsection (4)(a) also apply to school employees or volunteers acting outside of their official capacities if:

(i) they knew or should have known that their action could result in a material and substantial interference or disruption in the normal activities of the school; and

(ii) that action does result in a material and substantial interference or disruption in the normal activities of the school.

(c) Neither the State Office of Education nor local school districts may provide training of school employees or volunteers that supports or encourages criminal conduct.

(d) The State Board of Education shall adopt rules implementing this section.

(e) Nothing in this section limits the ability or authority of the State Board of Education and local school boards to enact and enforce rules or take actions that are otherwise lawful, regarding educators', employees', or volunteers' qualifications or behavior evidencing unfitness for duty.

(5) Except as provided in Section 53A-13-101.1, political, atheistic, sectarian, religious, or denominational doctrine may not be taught in the public schools.

(6) (a) Local school boards and their employees shall cooperate and share responsibility in carrying out the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Each school district shall provide appropriate inservice training for its teachers, counselors, and school administrators to enable them to understand, protect, and properly instruct students in the values and character traits referred to in this section and Sections 53A-13-101.1, 53A-13-101.2, 53A-13-101.3, 53A-13-109, 53A-13-301, and 53A-13-302 and distribute appropriate written materials on the values, character traits, and conduct to each individual receiving the inservice training.

(c) The written materials shall also be made available to classified employees, students, and parents and guardians of students.

(d) In order to assist school districts in providing the inservice training required under Subsection (6)(b), the State Board of Education shall as appropriate, contract with a qualified individual or entity possessing expertise in the areas referred to in Subsection (6)(b) to develop and disseminate model teacher inservice programs which districts may use to train the individuals referred to in Subsection (6)(b) to effectively teach the values and qualities of character referenced in that subsection.

(e) In accordance with the provisions of Subsection (4)(c), inservice training may not support or encourage criminal conduct.

(7) If any one or more provision, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word of this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is found to be unconstitutional, the balance of this section shall be given effect without the invalid provision, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or word.

Amended by Chapter 196, 2004 General Session

USCODE TITLE 20 - EDUCATION
CHAPTER 52 - EDUCATION FOR ECONOMIC SECURITY
SUBCHAPTER VIII--EQUAL ACCESS ACT

Sec. 4071. Denial of equal access prohibited

(a) Restriction of limited open forum on basis of religious, political, philosophical, or other speech content prohibited

It shall be unlawful for any public secondary school which receives Federal financial assistance and which has a limited open forum to deny equal access or a fair opportunity to, or discriminate against, any students who wish to conduct a meeting within that limited open forum on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech at such meetings.

(b) "Limited open forum" defined

A public secondary school has a limited open forum whenever such school grants an offering to or opportunity for one or more noncurriculum related student groups to meet on school premises during noninstructional time.

(c) Fair opportunity criteria

Schools shall be deemed to offer a fair opportunity to students who wish to conduct a meeting within its limited open forum if such school uniformly provides that--

- (1) the meeting is voluntary and student-initiated;
- (2) there is no sponsorship of the meeting by the school, the government, or its agents or employees;
- (3) employees or agents of the school or government are present at religious meetings only in a nonparticipatory capacity;
- (4) the meeting does not materially and substantially interfere with the orderly conduct of educational activities within the school; and
- (5) nonschool persons may not direct, conduct, control, or regularly attend activities of student groups.

(d) Construction of subchapter with respect to certain rights

Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to authorize the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof--

- (1) to influence the form or content of any prayer or other religious activity;
- (2) to require any person to participate in prayer or other religious activity;
- (3) to expend public funds beyond the incidental cost of providing the space for student-initiated meetings;

(4) to compel any school agent or employee to attend a school meeting if the content of the speech at the meeting is contrary to the beliefs of the agent or employee;

(5) to sanction meetings that are otherwise unlawful;

(6) to limit the rights of groups of students which are not of a specified numerical size; or

(7) to abridge the constitutional rights of any person.

(e) Federal financial assistance to schools unaffected

Notwithstanding the availability of any other remedy under the Constitution or the laws of the United States, **nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to authorize the United States to deny or withhold Federal financial assistance to any school.**

(f) Authority of schools with respect to order, discipline, well-being, and attendance concerns

Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to limit the authority of the school, its agents or employees, to maintain order and discipline on school premises, to protect the well-being of students and faculty, and to assure that attendance of students at meetings is voluntary.

(Pub. L. 98-377, title VIII, Sec. 802, Aug. 11, 1984, 98 Stat. 1302.)

Short Title

Section 801 of title VIII of Pub. L. 98-377 provided that: ``This title [enacting this subchapter] may be cited as `The Equal Access Act'."''

Court rules Texas school can forbid gay student club from meeting on campus

Federal judge upholds school's policy restricting discussions of sexual activity

http://www.pfox.org/Education_news.asp

© 2004 Student Press Law Center

March 8, 2004

TEXAS — A federal court has ruled that Lubbock Independent School District can restrict students' promotion of sex and sexuality in school-sponsored activities without violating their First Amendment right to free speech.

U.S. District Judge Sam R. Cummings ruled March 3 that the district's "abstinence-only" policy "restricting any discussion of sexual activity and birth control other than abstinence does not violate the First Amendment."

Two Lubbock High School students sued the school district after school officials denied their requests to promote the Lubbock Gay-Straight Alliance in school and to hold meetings on campus. The students sought permission from the school in September 2002 to advertise their organization's off-campus meetings by posting fliers and using the school's public announcement system, as did other student groups, according to court documents. The group's members then asked the school principal and assistant superintendent for permission to meet on campus in December 2002. Both requests were denied.

The court found that the school's actions did not constitute an attempt to silence a particular viewpoint, which the First Amendment would have prohibited. Rather, the court said the school's restrictions were reasonable efforts to enforce its abstinence-only sex discussion policy.

The court was concerned about the organization's Web site — mentioned on its fliers — which included links to Web sites that discussed sex and sexuality.

"This case has nothing to do with a denial of rights to students because of their sexual viewpoint," Cummings wrote in his decision. "It is an assertion of a school's right not to surrender control of the public school system to students and erode a community's standard of what subject matter is considered obscene and inappropriate."

The court cited the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier*, which allows high school administrators to censor some school-sponsored student publications by showing they have a legitimate educational reason for doing so. In his ruling, Cummings quoted *Hazelwood*, saying that "a school need not tolerate student speech that is inconsistent with its basic educational mission, even though the government could not censor similar speech outside of school."

Cummings' ruling suggests administrators at the school could also prohibit school-sponsored newspapers from publishing articles that conflict with the school's abstinence-only policy.

"If kids aren't allowed to discuss the benefits of fact-based sexual education, then the school has censored the people who are in best position to criticize school policy," Brain Chase, the students' lawyer, said of student journalists.

Chase, an attorney from Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, a national gay civil-rights organization, argued that the school district cannot deny the Gay-Straight Alliance the right to meet on campus simply

because of the district's abstinence-only policy.

"The judge seemed convinced this club was all about discussing sex, which isn't true," Chase said. "The kids listed many goals, [including discussing] discrimination and bullying, and the judge didn't mention any of those." (This is the lie GSA organizers always tell, that they're just talking about discrimination, etc., when homosex is about SEX.)

Ann Manning, the school district's lawyer, said the district was pleased by the ruling because the court upheld the school's abstinence-only policy. She said the abstinence-only policy does not discriminate against gay students because it applies to all students.

Manning would not discuss how the district's abstinence-only policy affects student journalists.

The students have not decided whether they will appeal the ruling, Chase said.

For More Information: Caudillo v. Lubbock Indep. School District, 5:03-CV-165-C (Northern Dist. Texas, March 3, 2004)

Caudillo v. Lubbock Independent School District, No. 03-165 (N.D.Tex. March 3, 2004)

A federal district court in Texas has ruled that a school district did not violate the First Amendment or the federal Equal Access Act (EAA) when it denied a gay student club's request for access to school fora. Students at Lubbock High School formed a club that became known as the Lubbock Gay Straight Alliance (LGSA).

They requested permission from Lubbock Independent School District (LISD) to pass out club flyers, use the public address system, and meet on campus. Their request stated LGSA's goals, which included educating youth about safe sex. The proposed flyer contained the address for LGSA's Web site, which in turn linked to two other Web sites that provide detailed information on sexual matters. When officials denied the request, the students sued. Addressing their free speech claim first, the district court found that LISD had not engaged in impermissible viewpoint discrimination for two reasons. First, LISD policy forbids discussion of sexual matters and applies to both heterosexual and homosexual viewpoints. Based on *Bethel School District No. 403 v. Fraser*, 478 U.S. 675 (1986), LISD has the authority to exclude sexually explicit, indecent, or lewd speech.

The court concluded that both the discussion of safe sex and the websites linked to LGSA's site are speech of an indecent nature contemplated in *Fraser* and, therefore, that LISD engaged in permissible, viewpoint-neutral exclusion of sexual subject matter. An important factor was that children as young as 12 attend the school.

Second, under *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier*, 484 U.S. 260 (1988), LISD has the authority to ban speech that is "inconsistent with its basic educational mission." LISD exercised that authority when it rejected the LGSA's request, because the group's goal of discussing safe sex is inconsistent with LISD's "abstinence only" policy. Turning to the EAA claim, the court found out that LISD had created a "limited open forum" under EEA, which requires LISD to give LGSA the same access it provides any other noncurricular student club unless one of EEA's exceptions applies. The court concluded that EEA's "maintain order and discipline" exception applied, the court ruled, because LGSA was proposing to discuss illegal activity, i.e., sex by minors. The "well being of the students" exception also applied, because the online material and the group's goals are at odds with the district's compelling interest in protecting students from the harms associated with sexual activity by minors and their exposure to sexual matters.

Time Magazine, School Event Expose Massive Cultural Campaign to Promote Homosexuality to Kids

10/7/2005

By Robert Knight and Benjamin Frichtl

<http://www.pfox.org>

“Coming out” age has dropped to 10 for boys, 12 for girls, academic says.

A TIME magazine cover story and a recent pro-homosexual school event should leave no doubt that homosexual activists are recruiting kids into homosexual sex and a “gay” identity, using “tolerance” as a ruse.

The TIME October 10 piece, “The Battle Over Gay Teens,” which includes not a single reference to the extremely dangerous medical consequences of homosexual behavior, especially for boys, includes these details:

- A cocktail party in Manhattan with billionaire liquor magnate Edgar Bronfman, Sr. and Clinton political strategist David Mixner was held in May to raise money for the Point Foundation, a scholarship program to turn “gay” kids into homosexual activists.
- From 100 gay/straight alliance (GSA) clubs in schools in 1997, the number has grown to “at least 3,000...nearly 1 in 10 high schools has one, according to the Gay Lesbian Straight Education Network (GLSEN).”
- The average age of males “coming out” as homosexual has “dropped to 10 for gays and 12 for lesbians,” according to the chair of Cornell University’s human-development program.
- “Gay kids can now watch fictional and real teens who are out on shows like *Desperate Housewives*, the dating show *Next* on MTV and *Degrassi* (a high school drama on the N network whose wild popularity among adolescents is assured by the fact that few adults watch). Publishers like Arthur A. Levine Books (of Harry Potter fame) and the children’s division of Simon & Schuster have released something like a dozen novels about gay adolescents in the past two years...Gay kids can now subscribe to the 10-month-old glossy YGA Magazine (YGA stands for ‘young, gay America’) and meet thousands of other little gays via [young gay america. com](http://younggayamerica.com) (sic) or outproud.org.”
- **“‘We’re gonna win,’ says [GLSEN founder Kevin] Jennings, speaking expansively of the gay movement, ‘because of what’s happening in high schools right now.’ ... Jennings recalls that when he first started raising money more than a decade ago, ‘the attitude was either “Isn’t it cute that you’re working with kids?” or “Why are you working with kids? What are you, f----- crazy?”’”**

Editor’s note: In other settings Jennings has used the “f-word” to dismiss faith-based opponents, and has said he envisions a day when the schools openly embrace homosexuality. **At a GLSEN conference, a teacher said she thought it was important to acquaint pupils with homosexuality beginning in kindergarten because “that’s when the saturation process begins.”**

- At a youth retreat, the Point Foundation gave out gift bags to students containing, among other things, “a DVD of the film *Hedwig and the Angry Inch*, in which a teenage boy is masturbated by an adult” and “the Aug. 16 issue of the gay magazine *The Advocate*, whose cover featured a shirtless man and blared, **SUMMER SEX ISSUE.**”
- “Because he routinely sees young gays on MTV or even at school, a 14-year-old may now feel comfortable telling friends that he likes other boys, but that doesn’t mean he is ready to enfold himself in a gay identity.”

The article, to its credit, includes passages about the growing ex-“gay” movement, particularly for youths, and quotes Exodus International Youth Director Scott Davis about his group’s ministry, and Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays and Gays (PFOX) Executive Director Regina Griggs about the discrimination faced by groups that help people overcome homosexual desires.

But the overall impact of the article helps validate the idea of “gay kids,” and will undoubtedly induce some to act out their sexual curiosity since so many others appear to be doing so. The constant focus on homosexuality becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, much as TIME’s frequent articles during the 1960s and 1970s about the “growing phenomenon” of illicit drug use helped spur some kids to try marijuana and LSD.

A Week-Long Effort in the Schools

GLSEN, meanwhile, has been extremely active in the schools. Their most recent effort, “National Ally Week,” was held September 19-24.

According to GLSEN’s Web site, more than 300 gay/straight alliance groups registered to pass out buttons, organize gender education activities, and promote the homosexual lifestyle. Ally Week encourages the recruitment of “straight” students as allies in the fight against bullying of LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered) students. The “straight” allies are encouraged to speak out in defense of homosexuality.

GLSEN passed out “I am an ALLY” buttons through the GSAs, and the Web site encouraged students to arrange more specific activities to promote acceptance of “gay” students. The listed events included:

- “Organizing LGBT pizza parties, and after-school activities like LGBT Jeopardy or LGBT bingo.
- Informative tabling in school cafeterias.
- Student and/or teacher training workshops.
- Asking allies to attend regular GSA meetings.
- Constructing pro-LGBT bulletin boards.
- Bringing a local LGBT speaker to the school.”

Last April, GLSEN sponsored the annual “Day of Silence,” in which kids are supposed to remain silent all day in support of their “gay” classmates. April 26, 2006, is the next “Day of Silence.”

This past January, GLSEN headed the coalition sponsoring “No-Name Calling Week,” another platform for discouraging resistance to the promotion of homosexuality to school kids, with the next edition slated in January 2006. In effect, schoolchildren across the nation are being subjected to homosexual propaganda in schools via an event every few months.

GLSEN encourages teachers to organize and participate in GSA events. The group provides a web link that supplies educators with pro-LGBT resources. These include “gender liberation” coloring books; “gay” cartoon posters; and several posters challenging traditional views of gender. Teachers can download signs with inverted, rainbow-colored triangles proclaiming “Safe Zone” to put on their classroom door. They can also print off discussion kits on how to organize gender education sessions and start conversations about homosexuality with the children.

One poster, titled, “Things you can do to eradicate gender or multiply it exponentially,” features cross-dressing, and has these suggestions:

- “Think twice before you ask people if their child is a boy or a girl.
- Spend a day in drag.
- Refer to everyone by the incorrect pronoun.
- Challenge binary gender paradigms over Thanksgiving dinner.
- Hang out with children and teach them how to cross dress Barbie and G.I. Joe.
- Refuse to check off your sex when filling out forms.”

Clearly, the homosexual movement's effort to recruit children has never been stronger than it is now.

###

Robert Knight is director of the Culture & Family Institute (CFI), an affiliate of Concerned Women for America. Benjamin Frichtl is a CFI intern and a student at Patrick Henry College.

The Overhauling of Straight America

STRATEGIES OF THE HOMOSEXUAL MOVEMENT: "The Overhauling of Straight America"

http://www.article8.org/docs/gay_strategies/overhauling.htm

The following article titled "The Overhauling of Straight America" was written by Marshall K. Kirk and Erastes Pill and appeared in Guide Magazine, a homosexual publication, in November 1987. This landmark article has become a "bible" of the homosexual movement, and has since been widely re-published on the Internet and elsewhere. It outlines strategies and techniques for a successful widespread propaganda campaign to confuse and deceive the American people and demonize opponents. Like all propaganda, their methods are based not on solid intellectual arguments, but instead upon emotional manipulation of the public in an attempt to gain widespread sympathy and approval for homosexual behavior.

As you read this, keep in mind that it was written in 1987 -- less than two decades ago -- and look around to see how far the homosexual movement has gotten using these techniques.

The Overhauling of Straight America

by Marshall K. Kirk and Erastes Pill

The first order of business is desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights. To desensitize the public is to help it view homosexuality with indifference instead of with keen emotion. Ideally, we would have straights register differences in sexual preference the way they register different tastes for ice cream or sports games: she likes strawberry and I like vanilla; he follows baseball and I follow football. No big deal.

At least in the beginning, we are seeking public desensitization and nothing more. We do not need and cannot expect a full "appreciation" or "understanding" of homosexuality from the average American. You can forget about trying to persuade the masses that homosexuality is a good thing. But if only you can get them to think that it is just another thing, with a shrug of their shoulders, then your battle for legal and social rights is virtually won. And to get to shoulder-shrug stage, gays as a class must cease to appear mysterious, alien, loathsome and contrary. A large-scale media campaign will be required in order to change the image of gays in America.

And any campaign to accomplish this turnaround should do six things.

STEP 1: TALK ABOUT GAYS AND GAYNESS AS LOUDLY AND AS OFTEN AS POSSIBLE.

The principle behind this advice is simple: almost any behavior begins to look normal if you are exposed to enough of it at close quarters and among your acquaintances. The acceptability of the new behavior will ultimately hinge on the number of one's fellows doing it or accepting it. One may be offended by its novelty at first-- many, in times past, were momentarily scandalized by "streaking," eating goldfish, and premarital sex. But as long as Joe Six-pack feels little pressure to perform likewise, and as long as the behavior in question presents little threat to his physical and financial security, he soon gets used to it and life goes on. The skeptic may still shake his head and think "people are crazy these days," but over time his objections are likely to become more reflective, more philosophical, less emotional.

The way to benumb raw sensitivities about homosexuality is to have a lot of people talk a great deal about the subject in a neutral or supportive way. Open and frank talk makes the subject seem less furtive, alien, and sinful, more above-board. Constant talk builds the impression that public opinion is at least divided on the

subject, and that a sizable segment accepts or even practices homosexuality. Even rancorous debates between opponents and defenders serve the purpose of desensitization so long as "respectable" gays are front and center to make their own pitch. The main thing is to talk about gayness until the issue becomes thoroughly tiresome.

And when we say talk about homosexuality, we mean just that. In the early stages of any campaign to reach straight America, the masses should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the imagery of sex should be downplayed and gay rights should be reduced to an abstract social question as much as possible. First let the camel get his nose inside the tent--only later his unsightly derriere!

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. Bit by bit over the past ten years, gay characters and gay themes have been introduced into TV programs and films (though often this has been done to achieve comedic and ridiculous affects). On the whole the impact has been encouraging. The prime-time presentation of *Consenting Adults* on a major network in 1985 is but one high-water mark in favorable media exposure of gay issues. But this should be just the beginning of a major publicity blitz by gay America.

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 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.

STEP 2: PORTRAY GAYS AS VICTIMS, NOT AS AGGRESSIVE CHALLENGERS.

In any campaign to win over the public, gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the role of protector. If gays are presented, instead, as a strong and prideful tribe promoting a rigidly nonconformist and deviant lifestyle, they are more likely to be seen as a public menace that justifies resistance and oppression. For that reason, we must forego the temptation to strut our "gay pride" publicly when it conflicts with the Gay Victim image. And we must walk the fine line between impressing straights with our great numbers, on the one hand, and sparking their hostile paranoia-"They are all around us!"--on the other.

A media campaign to promote the Gay Victim image should make use of symbols which reduce the mainstream's sense of threat, which lower it's guard, and which enhance the plausibility of victimization. In practical terms, this means that jaunty mustachioed musclemen would keep very low profile in gay commercials and other public presentations, while sympathetic figures of nice young people, old people, and attractive women would be featured. (It almost goes without saying that groups on the farthest margin of acceptability such as NAMBLA, [Ed note -- North American Man-Boy Love Association] must play no part at all in such a campaign: suspected child-molesters will never look like victims.)

Now, there are two different messages about the Gay Victim that are worth communicating. First, the mainstream should be told that gays are victims of fate, in the sense that most never had a choice to accept or reject their sexual preference. The message must read: "As far as gays can tell, they were born gay, just as you were born heterosexual or white or black or bright or athletic. Nobody ever tricked or seduced them; they never made a choice, and are not morally blameworthy. What they do isn't willfully contrary - it's only natural for them. This twist of fate could as easily have happened to you!"

Straight viewers must be able to identify with gays as victims. Mr. and Mrs. Public must be given no extra excuses to say, "they are not like us." To this end, the persons featured in the public campaign should be decent and upright, appealing and admirable by straight standards, completely unexceptionable in appearance--in a word, they should be indistinguishable from the straights we would like to reach. (To return to the terms we have used in previous articles, spokesmen for our cause must be R-type "straight gays" rather than Q-type "homosexuals on display.") Only under such conditions will the message be read correctly: "These folks are victims of a fate that could have happened to me."

By the way, we realize that many gays will question an advertising technique, which might threaten to make homosexuality look like some dreadful disease, which strikes fated "victims". But the plain fact is that the gay community is weak and must manipulate the powers of the weak, including the play for sympathy. In any case, we compensate for the negative aspect of this gay victim appeal under Principle 4. (Below)

The second message would portray gays as victims of society. The straight majority does not recognize the suffering it brings to the lives of gays and must be shown: graphic pictures of brutalized gays; dramatizations of job and housing insecurity, loss of child custody, and public humiliation: and the dismal list goes on.

STEP 3: GIVE PROTECTORS A JUST CAUSE.

A media campaign that casts gays as society's victims and encourages straights to be their protectors must make it easier for those to respond to assert and explain their new protectiveness. Few straight women, and even fewer straight men, will want to defend homosexuality boldly as such. Most would rather attach their awakened protective impulse to some principle of justice or law, to some general desire for consistent and fair treatment in society. Our campaign should not demand direct support for homosexual practices, should instead take anti-discrimination as its theme. The right to free speech, freedom of beliefs, freedom of association, due process and equal protection of laws--these should be the concerns brought to mind by our campaign.

It is especially important for the gay movement to hitch its cause to accepted standards of law and justice because its straight supporters must have at hand a cogent reply to the moral arguments of its enemies. The homophobes clothe their emotional revulsion in the daunting robes of religious dogma, so defenders of gay rights must be ready to counter dogma with principle.

STEP 4: MAKE GAYS LOOK GOOD.

In order to make a Gay Victim sympathetic to straights you have to portray him as Everyman. But an additional theme of the campaign should be more aggressive and upbeat: to offset the increasingly bad press that these times have brought to homosexual men and women, the campaign should paint gays as superior pillars of society. Yes, yes, we know--this trick is so old it creaks. Other minorities use it all the time in ads that announce proudly, "Did you know that this Great Man (or Woman) was _____?" But the message is vital for all those straights who still picture gays as "queer" people-- shadowy, lonesome, fail, drunken, suicidal, child- snatching misfits.

The honor roll of prominent gay or bisexual men and women is truly eyepopping. From Socrates to

Shakespeare, from Alexander the Great to Alexander Hamilton, from Michelangelo to Walt Whitman, from Sappho to Gertrude Stein, the list is old hat to us but shocking news to heterosexual America. In no time, a skillful and clever media campaign could have the gay community looking like the veritable fairy godmother to Western Civilization.

Along the same lines, we shouldn't overlook the Celebrity Endorsement. The celebrities can be straight (God bless you, Ed Asner, wherever you are) or gay.

STEP 5: MAKE THE VICTIMIZERS LOOK BAD.

At a later stage of the media campaign for gay rights-long after other gay ads have become commonplace-it will be time to get tough with remaining opponents. To be blunt, they must be vilified. (This will be all the more necessary because, by that time, the entrenched enemy will have quadrupled its output of vitriol and disinformation.) Our goal is here is twofold. First, we seek to replace the mainstream's self-righteous pride about its homophobia with shame and guilt. Second, we intend to make the antigays look so nasty that average Americans will want to dissociate themselves from such types.

The public should be shown images of ranting homophobes whose secondary traits and beliefs disgust middle America. These images might include: the Ku Klux Klan demanding that gays be burned alive or castrated; bigoted southern ministers drooling with hysterical hatred to a degree that looks both comical and deranged; menacing punks, thugs, and convicts speaking coolly about the "fags" they have killed or would like to kill; a tour of Nazi concentration camps where homosexuals were tortured and gassed.

A campaign to vilify the victimizers is going to enrage our most fervid enemies, of course. But what else can we say? The shoe fits, and we should make them try it on for size, with all of America watching.

STEP 6: SOLICIT FUNDS: THE BUCK STOPS HERE

Any massive campaign of this kind would require unprecedented expenditures for months or even years--an unprecedented fundraising drive.

Effective advertising is a costly proposition: several million dollars would get the ball rolling. There are 10-15 million primarily homosexual adults in this country: if each one of them donated just two dollars to the campaign, its war chest would actually rival that of its most vocal enemies. And because those gays not supporting families usually have more discretionary income than average, they could afford to contribute much more.

But would they? Or is the gay community as feckless, selfish, uncommitted, and short-sighted as its critics claim? We will never know unless the new campaign simultaneously launches a concerted nationwide appeal for funding support from both known and anonymous donors. The appeal should be directed both at gays and at straights who care about social justice.

In the beginning, for reasons to be explained in a moment, the appeal for funds may have to be launched exclusively through the gay press--national magazines, local newspapers, flyers at bars, notices in glossy skin magazines. Funds could also come through the outreach of local gay organizations on campuses and in metropolitan areas. Eventually, donations would be solicited directly alongside advertisements in the major straight media.

There would be no parallel to such an effort in the history of the gay community in America. If it failed to generate the needed capital to get started; there would be little hope for the campaign and little hope for major

progress toward gay rights in the near future. For the moment let us suppose that gays could see how donations would greatly serve their long-term interest, and that sufficient funds could be raised. An heroic assumption.

GETTING ON THE AIR, OR, YOU CAN'T GET THERE FROM HERE.

Without access to TV, radio, and the mainstream press, there will be no campaign. This is a tricky problem, because many impresarios of the media simply refuse to accept what they call "issue-advertising" -- persuasive advertising can provoke a storm of resentment from the public and from sponsors, which is bad for business. The courts have confirmed the broadcaster's right to refuse any "issue advertising" he dislikes.

What exactly constitutes "issue advertising"? It evidently does not include platitudinous appeals to the virtues of family unity (courtesy of the Mormons) neither does it include tirades against perfidious Albion courtesy of Lyndon LaRouche); neither does it include reminders that a Mind-Is-a Terrible Thing to Waste (courtesy of the United Negro College Fund); neither does it include religious shows which condemn gay "sinners"; neither does it include condemnations of nuclear war or race discrimination--at least not in Massachusetts. Some guys get all the breaks.

What issue advertising does include these days is almost any communiqué presented openly by a homosexual organization. The words "gay" and "homosexual" are considered controversial whenever they appear.

Because most straightforward appeals are impossible, the National Gay Task Force has had to cultivate quiet backroom liaisons with broadcast companies and newsrooms in order to make sure that issues important to the gay community receive some coverage; but such an arrangement is hardly ideal, of course, because it means that the gay community's image is controlled by the latest news event instead of by careful design--and recently most of the news about gays has been negative.

So what can be done to crash the gates of the major media? Several things, advanced in several stages.

START WITH THE FINE PRINT

Newspapers and magazines may very well be hungrier for gay advertising dollars than television and radio are. And the cost of ads in print is generally lower. But remember that the press, for the most part, is only read by better-educated Americans, many of who are already more accepting of homosexuality in any case. So to get more impact for our dollars, we should skip the New Republic and New Left Review readers and head for Time, People, and the National Enquirer. (Of course, the gay community may have to establish itself as a regular advertising presence in more sophisticated forums first before it is accepted into the mass press.)

While we're storming the battlements with salvos of ink, we should also warm the mainstream up a bit with a subtle national campaign on highway billboards. In simple bold print on dark backgrounds, a series of unobjectionable messages should be introduced:

IN RUSSIA, THEY TELL YOU
WHAT TO BE. IN AMERICA
WE HAVE THE FREEDOM
TO BE OURSELVES...
AND TO BE THE BEST.

Or

PEOPLE HELPING INSTEAD
OF HATING--THAT'S
WHAT AMERICA IS ALL ABOUT.

And so on. Each sign will tap patriotic sentiment, each message will drill a seemingly agreeable proposition into mainstream heads - a "public service message" suited to our purposes. And, if their owners will permit it, each billboard will be signed, in slightly smaller letters, "Courtesy of the National Gay Task Force" - to build positive associations and get the public used to seeing such sponsorship.

VISUAL STAGE 1: YOU REALLY OUGHTTA BE IN PICTURES

As for television and radio, a more elaborate plan may be needed to break the ice. For openers, naturally, we must continue to encourage the appearance of favorable gay characters in films and TV shows. Daytime talk shows also remain a useful avenue for exposure.

But to speed things up we might consider a bold stratagem to gain media attention. The scheme we have in mind would require careful preparations, yet it would save expense even while it elevated the visibility and stature of the gay movement overnight.

Well before the next elections for national office, we might lay careful plans to run symbolic gay candidates for every high political office in this country. (Such plans would have to deal somehow with the tricky problem of inducing gays and straights to sign enough endorsement petitions to get us on the ballot.) Our 50- 250 candidates would participate in such debates as they could, run gay-themed advertisements coordinated at our national headquarters, and demand equal time on the air. They could then graciously pull out of the races before the actual elections, while formally endorsing more viable straight contenders. (With malicious humor, perhaps, in some states we could endorse our most rabid opponents.) It is essential not to ask people actually to vote Yea or Nay on the gay issue at this early stage: such action would end up committing most to the Nay position and would only tally huge and visible defeats for our cause.

Through such a political campaign, the mainstream would get over the initial shock of seeing gay ads, and the acceptability of such ads would be fortified by the most creditable context possible; and all this would be accomplished before non-electoral advertising was attempted by the gay community. During the campaign all hell would break loose, but if we behaved courageously and respectably our drive would gain legitimacy in and case and might even become a cause celebre. If all went as planned, the somewhat desensitized public and the major networks themselves would be 'readied for the next step of our program.

VISUAL STAGE 2: PEEKABOO ADVERTISING

At this point the gay community has its foot in the door, and it is time to ask the networks to accept gay sponsorship of certain ads and shows. Timing is critical: The request must be made immediately after our national political ads disappear. Failing that, we should request sponsorship the next time one of the networks struts its broad-mindedness by televising a film or show with gay characters or themes. If they wish to look consistent instead of hypocritical, we'll have them on the spot.

But the networks would still be forced to say No unless we made their resistance look patently unreasonable, and possibly illegal. We'd do just that by proposing "gay ads" patterned exactly after those currently sponsored by the Mormons and others. As usual, viewers would be treated to squeak-clean skits on the importance of family harmony and understanding --this time the narrator would end by saying, "This message was brought to you by --the National Gay Task Force." All very quiet and subdued. Remember: exposure is everything, and the medium is the message.

The gay community should join forces with other civil liberties groups of respectable cast to promote bland messages about America the Melting Pot, always ending with an explicit reference to the Task Force of some other gay organization. Making the best of a bad situation, we can also propose sympathetic media appeals for gifts and donations to fund AIDS research--if Jerry Lewis and the March of Dimes can do it, so can we. Our next indirect step will be to advertise locally on behalf of support groups peripheral to the gay community: frowzy straight moms and dads announcing phone numbers and meeting times for "Parents of Gays" or similar gatherings. Can't you just see such ads now, presented between messages from the Disabled Vets and the Postal Workers Union?

VISUAL STAGE 3: ROLL OUT THE BIG GUNS

By this point, our salami tactics will have carved out, slice by slice, a large portion of access to the mainstream media. So what then? It would finally be time to bring gay ads out of the closet. The messages of such ads should directly address lingering public fears about homosexuals as loathsome and contrary aliens. For examples, the following are possible formats for TV or radio commercials designed to chip away at chronic misperceptions.

Format A - for Familiarization: The Testimonial.

To make gays seem less mysterious, present a series of short spots featuring the boy-or girl-next-door, fresh and appealing, or warm and lovable grandma grandpa types. Seated in homey surroundings, they respond to an off camera interviewer with assurance, good nature, and charm. Their comments bring out three social facts:

1. There is someone special in their life, a long-term relationship (to stress gay stability, monogamy, commitment);

2. Their families are very important to them, and are supportive of them (to stress that gays are not "anti-family," and that families need not be anti-gay.)

3. As far as they can remember they have always been gay, and were probably born gay; they certainly never decided on a preference one way or the other (stressing that gays are doing what is natural for them, and are not being willfully contrary). The subjects should be interviewed alone, not with their lovers or children, for to include others in the picture would unwisely raise disturbing questions about the complexities of gay social relations, which these commercials could not explain. It is best instead to take one thing at a time.

Format B - for Positive Associations: The Celebrity Spot.

While it might be useful to present celebrity endorsements by currently popular gay figures and straight sympathizers (Johnny Mathis? Marlo Thomas?), the homophobia climate of America would make such brash endorsements unlikely in the near future. So early celebrity spots will instead identify historical gay or bisexual personalities who are illustrious and dignified...and dead. The ads could be sardonic and indirect. For example, over regal music and a portrait or two, a narrator might announce simply: Michelangelo (an art class), Tchaikovsky (a music class), Tennessee Williams (a drama class), etc.

Format C - for Victim Sympathy: Our Campaign to Stop Child Abuse.

As we said earlier, there are many ways to portray gays as victims of discrimination: images of brutality, tales of job loss and family separation, and so on. But we think something like the following 30-second commercials would get to the heart of the matter best of all.

The camera slowly moves in on a middle-class teenager, sitting alone in his semi-darkened bedroom. The boy is pleasing and unexceptional in appearance, except that he has been roughed up and is staring silently, pensively, with evident distress. As the camera gradually focuses in on his face, a narrator comments: It will happen to one in every ten sons. As he grows up he will realize that he feels differently about things than most of his friends. If he lets it show, he'll be an outsider made fun of, humiliated, attacked. If he confides in his parents, they may throw him out of the house, onto the streets. Some will say he is "anti-family." Nobody will let him be himself. So he will have to hide. From his friends, his family. And that's hard. It's tough enough to be a kid these days, but to be the one in ten... A message from the National Gay Task Force.

What is nice about such an ad is that it would economically portray gays as innocent and vulnerable, victimized and misunderstood, surprisingly numerous yet not menacing. It also renders the "anti-family" charge absurd and hypocritical.

Format D - for Identification with Victims: The Old Switcheroo.

The mainstream will identify better with the plight of gays if straights can, once in a while, walk a mile in gay shoes. A humorous television or radio ad to help them do this might involve a brief animated or dramatized scenario, as follows.

The camera approaches the mighty oak door of the boss's office, which swings open, and the camera (which represents you the viewer) enters the room. Behind the oversized desk sits a fat and scowling old curmudgeon chomping on a cigar. He looks up at the camera (i.e. at the viewer) and snarls, "So it's you, Smithers. Well you're fired!" The voice of a younger man is heard to reply with astonishment, "But--but--Mr. Thomburg, I've been with your company for ten years. I thought you liked my work." The boss responds, with a tone of disgust, "Yes, yes, Smithers your work is quite adequate. But I've heard rumors that you've been seen around town with some kind of girlfriend. A girlfriend! Frankly I'm shocked. We're not about to start hiring any heterosexuals in this company. Now get out." The younger man speaks once more: "But boss, that's just not fair! What if it were you?" The boss glowers back as the camera pulls quickly out of the room and the big door slams shut. Printed on the door: "A message from the National Gay Task Force."

One can easily imagine similar episodes involving housing or other discrimination.

Format E - for Vilification of Victimiziers: Damn the Torpedoes.

We have already indicated some of the images which might be damaging to the homophobic vendetta: ranting and hateful religious extremists neo-Nazis, and Ku Klux Klansmen made to look evil and ridiculous (hardly a difficult task).

These images should be combined with those of their gay victims by a method propagandists call the "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.

Format F - for Funds: SOS

Alongside or during these other persuasive advertisements, we would have to solicit donations so that the campaign might continue. Direct appeals from celebrities (preferable living ones, thank you) might be useful here. All appeals must stress that money can be given anonymously (e.g. via money orders) and that all donations are confidential. "We can't help unless you help," and all that.

The Time Is Now

We have sketched out here a blueprint for transforming the social values of straight America. At the core of our program is a media campaign to change the way the average citizens view homosexuality. It is quite easy to find fault with such a campaign. We have tried to be practical and specific here, but the proposals may still have a visionary sheen.

There are one hundred reasons why the campaign could not be done or would be risky. But there are at least 20 million good reasons why some such program must be tried in the coming years: the welfare and happiness of every gay man and woman in this country demand it. As the last large, legally oppressed minority in American society, it is high time that gays took effective measures to rejoin the mainstream in pride and strength. We believe that, like it or not, such a campaign is the only way of doing so anytime soon.

And, let us repeat, time may be running out. The AIDS epidemic is sparking anger and fear in the heartland of straight America. As the virus leaks out of homosexual circles and into the rest of society, we need have no illusions about who is receiving the blame. The ten years ahead may decide for the next forty whether gays claim their liberty and equality or are driven back, once again, as America's caste of detested untouchables. It's more than a quip: speak now or forever hold your peace.

Two years after "The Overhauling of Straight America" appeared, the book "After the Ball -- How America will conquer its fear and hatred of Gays in the 1990's", by Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, was published. After the Ball expanded on these ideas, largely from the standpoint of psychological manipulation and persuasion tactics of Americans toward the homosexual cause, complete with sample print ads to use, as well as suggestions for radio and TV spots.

School Districts, Children and Gay Straight Alliances

Protecting Children Empowering Parents

Written by: Joseph Platt, Esq., Cincinnati, Ohio
David Miller, Vice President of Citizens for Community Values, Cincinnati, Ohio

Introduction and Background

The Threat

Over the past several decades, children have been introduced to issues involving sexuality at earlier and earlier ages. One of the most threatening to their physical and mental health is society's growing acceptance of homosexuality, and often, it is in the public education setting where the most aggressive proselytizing takes place.

The Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) recently boasted that the number of active Gay Straight Alliances (GSA) in secondary schools is approaching 3000, claiming to be reaching children as young as 12 years of age with "assistance" in helping them discover and explore their sexuality, sexual orientation and gender identity. The creation of these clubs accompanies an explosion in the public school system of policies ostensibly designed to secure the "safety" of students in their charge. But the true intent and affect of these policies serves not to promote "safety" but to establish a singular orthodoxy which is often anti-family, anti-religious and which firmly enshrines the homosexual agenda in our nation's schools.

Several organizations consistently appear at the forefront of this issue when it arises in communities across America: GLSEN, Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), LAMBDA Legal. Participants in GSAs are regularly assisted by organizations like GLSEN with organizing resources and referrals to centers for teen outreach. These centers operate as a means to introduce and encourage experimentation by school age children with a lifestyle that can be devastating to a young person. Information describing the painful medical and psychological realities of the gay and lesbian lifestyle, as well as possible legal liability for school districts permitting the formation of GSAs, may be found in the report *The Legal Liability Associated with Homosexuality Education in Public Schools* which can be downloaded from the website of Citizens for Community Values at: http://www.ccv.org/Legal_Liability_of_Homosexuality_Education.htm

The Proposed Gay Straight Alliance

A Gay Straight Alliance (GSA) is not merely another club. A newly established GSA often becomes a springboard for pro-homosexual advocacy seeking to alter curriculum and silence dissent through restrictive student speech and conduct codes. An overview of the purpose of a GSA as described by the Gay Straight Alliance Network describes them as an activist club seeking to, "get Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning (LGBTQ) issues in the curriculum, LGBTQ related books in the library, and progressive non-discrimination policies implemented at a district level." GSAs may "organize a Pride Week or LGBTQ Awareness Event" or "participate in the Day of Silence" remaining silent as a means of protesting "homophobia." According to the Gay Straight Alliance Network, "GSAs organize a 'Teach the Teachers' staff development day which focuses on teaching school staff how to be better allies for LGBTQ students."¹

Through GSAs, students are encouraged to freely access a multitude of resources online through websites such as GLSEN.org which are designed to aid them in their efforts to establish an on-campus organization and begin to transform their school's curriculum and environment. Students may download a letter authored by an ACLU whose intent is to allow students to bully school official.² They may also download manuals on how to start a GSA, sample mission statements and club constitutions all as part of a series of "Jumpstart" manuals covering such topics as "Teaching the Teacher", "Framing a Message" and "Understanding Power, Privilege and Oppression".³

Regardless, whether a student is involved with a GSA, he or she *will* be affected when the school's curriculum reflects the suggestions of an organization such as GLSEN or the ACLU or when the code of conduct or speech is re-written to suppress opinions which are not affirming of the gay lifestyle. Parents whose children attend a private school or whose children are now adults or individuals without children all have a stake in this battle. After all, our public schools shape the minds and morality of tomorrow's citizens, politicians, and teachers using the dollars they collect from each and every taxpayer today.

Background: Why are schools permitting GSAs to form in secondary schools?

¹ From www.gsannetwork.org Overview of Gay-Straight Alliances-What is a Gay Straight Alliance?

² [Http://www.glsen.org/cgi-bin/iowa/all/library/record/310.html](http://www.glsen.org/cgi-bin/iowa/all/library/record/310.html)

³ See GLSEN Jumpstart activity guides at <http://www.glsen.org/cgi-bin/iowa/all/news/custom/jump.html>

The Equal Access Act and bible clubs

In 1984, Congress acted to end a divisive debate occurring in several federal circuit courts regarding the permissibility of high school students organizing and participating in non-curricular bible clubs. In passing the Equal Access Act (20 USC § 4071, *et seq*), Congress sought to end inconsistent treatment by the courts. The Equal Access Act (EAA) requires that bible clubs receive the same treatment as other non-curricular, secular clubs if a school receiving federal funding permits one non-curricular club to use its facilities.

But proponents of GSAs, attempting to extend the reach of the EAA, continue to argue that Congress intended to permit students to organize any and all non-curricular groups regardless of the intentions of the students or the subject matter that the club members would involve themselves. This logic can only lead one to think that by enacting the EAA, Congress sought to divest a school board, principals and administrators from all control over their students within the non-curricular environment, which clearly is not the case. The fact is, a simple reading of the EAA itself shows that it is clearly designed to permit a school district to act in such a way to secure the welfare of its students.

A student's absolute right?

GSA proponents generally point to the first section of the Equal Access Act as support for the proposition that minor children may organize a club discussing whatever topic or advocating whatever activity they wish on school property without restraint. Section 4071(a) states:

It shall be unlawful for any public secondary school which receives Federal financial assistance and which has a limited open forum to deny equal access or a fair opportunity to, or discriminate against, any students who wish to conduct a meeting within that limited open forum on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech at such meetings.

By arguing for the absolute right of a student to organize any club, GSA advocates willfully ignore two “safe harbor” provisions within the EAA which grant school districts the right to exercise discretion regarding the formation of non-curricular clubs.

First, Section **4071(c) (4)** of the Equal Access Act requires that a meeting not “***materially and substantially interfere with the orderly conduct of educational activities within the school.***”⁴ Those who argue that a school district has no interest in the manner in which a non-curricular activity impacts a school’s ability to carry out its educational mission ignore the plain meaning of the statute.

Secondly, and more significantly, § **4071(f)** of the act emphatically declares that the authority of the school shall not be compromised as it seeks to, “***maintain order and discipline***” or to, “***protect the well being of students.***”⁴ Reliance by a school board upon an advocacy group’s assertions that any and all clubs be allowed to meet is an absolute refusal of the express intent of Congress as contained in the Act.

Could the school district be liable?

The statute unambiguously states that it does not prohibit any action taken by a school district to secure, among other things, the well-being of students, nor does the Act serve to insulate a school district from any action it may take in reliance upon an erroneous interpretation of the statute. School officials should be aware of the significant mental and physical health risks associated with same sex sexual behavior in order to protect those minors under their care and prevent exposing the tax payers of the district to significant financial liability should those under their care be harmed.

Opposing the formation of a Gay Straight Alliance in your Secondary School

Framing the Argument

The Equal Access Act

⁴ 20 USC 4071(b)(4). Section 4071(f) of the Equal Access Act states, “Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to limit the authority of the school, its agents or employees, to maintain order and discipline on school premises, to protect the well-being of students and faculty, and to assure that attendance of students at meetings is voluntary. (emphasis added)”

Upon first learning of the possible formation of a Gay Straight Alliance (GSA) in your local high school, a concerned parent or taxpayer should become familiar with the Equal Access Act of 1984. Consisting of only four sections, the law is readable and easy to understand. It is the incomplete presentation of all of the provisions of the Act that permits advocates of GSAs to sway school boards into the belief that they have no other option than to permit the formation of these clubs. A complete copy is available in the appendix of this handbook.

Prepare your Argument/Know your Audience

There are very strong, biblically sound, moral arguments to be made regarding the homosexual lifestyle. Regardless- even if the superintendent, board members or school officials agree with your religious principals without reservation- such arguments will not be *legally* sufficient. The fact that homosexual behavior is associated with disease, mental illness, depression, shortened lifespan, and that a GSA represents an introduction to these sexual practices is what is generally relevant to government officials.

As important as it is to know the provisions of the Equal Access Act, knowing the health statistics is just as important. Presenting the ***Legal Liability*** report to your school administrators and being able to cite to specific examples of potential, life-threatening harm due to same sex behavior presents you with a significant advantage when arguing against the formation of a GSA or the adoption of a curriculum that affirms the homosexual lifestyle.

It should be noted that “homosexuality” is not a viewpoint per se, any more than anorexia or drug abuse are viewpoints. It’s a life-threatening behavior which schools have no business implicitly or explicitly endorsing. A GSA holds dangers for EVERY student just by its existence, and the seeming acceptance by the school that there is validity in this behavior. So opting out is the last option. Excluding the GSA is the optimal choice.

A Note Concerning Faith

The tenets of your faith may not sustain a legal argument but you do have constitutional rights as a parent and student. A school district may not establish a religious orthodoxy for all nor suppress a religious viewpoint of any. School board policies like speech or conduct codes which act to prevent students from expressing themselves regarding their religious beliefs or convictions could be unconstitutional. Training programs that offer a one sided view regarding the acceptability of homosexuality or infringing on parental rights to instill moral values in their children may also be held unconstitutional. There are an increasing number of public interest law firms that have undertaken as their ministry the protection and advancement of the rights of Christians to hold, express and pass along to their children their religious viewpoints. Should you feel that your rights or the rights of your child have been compromised by the actions of a school board, contact an attorney or one of those organizations.

Protecting your children: Five Smooth Stones

1. Parental Notification Policies

Often, participation of children in a GSA is permitted by a parent under a false assumption of the purpose of the club born by the lack of information regarding the club’s goals and objectives. Preventing school officials and parents from obtaining the truth about the ultimate goals of a GSA is critical to the success of such clubs.

Recently in Ashland, Kentucky, the Boyd County Public Schools District capitulated to the demands of the ACLU regarding the formation of a GSA by entering into a consent decree. Prominent among the terms of the agreement between the District and the ACLU is a provision ***prohibiting the school district from requiring parental notification or permission for a minor child’s participation in a GSA!***

Such a prohibition is contrary to a growing desire whereby state legislators, school districts and others have sought to enhance the cooperative relationship between parents and educators by requiring parental notification of the goals, objectives and activities of all non-curricular groups with which their children choose to involve themselves.

Parents whose school has an existing GSA or who is contemplating the threat of the creation of such a club should immediately lobby for the adoption of a parental notification

policy. If local school officials are unwilling to consider the policy, a state legislator or state school board member should be approached to provide protection at the state level. Such a policy should inform a parent of the club's mission, purpose, topics to be discussed and whether and in what manner individuals outside of the school community will come in contact with club members.

Below are examples of parental notification policies requiring informed parental consent before their children may involve themselves in the activities of an extracurricular club.

Utah Code Section 53A-3-420
Activity disclosure statements

- (1) A local school board shall require the development of activity disclosure statements for each school-sponsored group, club, or program which involves students and faculty in grades 9 through 12 in contests, performances, events, or other activities that require them to miss normal class time or takes place outside regular school time.
- (2) The activity disclosure statements shall be disseminated to the students desiring involvement in the specific activity or to the students' parents or legal guardians or to both students and their parents.
- (3) An activity disclosure statement shall contain the following information:
 - (a) the specific name of the club, team, group, or activity;
 - (b) the maximum number of students involved;
 - (c) whether or not tryouts are used to select students, specifying date and time requirements for tryouts, if applicable;
 - (d) beginning and ending dates of the activity;
 - (e) a tentative schedule of the events, performances, games, or other activities with dates, times, and places specified if available;
 - (f) if applicable, designation of any non-season events or activities, including an indication of the status, required, expected, suggested, or optional, with the dates, times, and places specified;
 - (g) personal costs associated with the activity;
 - (h) the name of the school employee responsible for the activity; and
 - (i) any additional information considered important for the students and parents to know.

Georgia Senate Bill 149 session 2005-2006
School/Extracurricular Activities

To amend Chapter 2 of Title 20 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to elementary and secondary education, so as to provide for adoption of policies and procedures by local boards of education to provide information regarding school sponsored clubs and extracurricular activities to parents and legal guardians and to provide an opportunity to withhold permission to participate; to provide that local school systems shall comply with written notification from parents and legal guardians withholding permission for participation; to require written parental or legal guardian permission for membership in a specific club or activity; to require annual permission for club membership and participation in activities; to provide for related matters; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

(similar language mirrored in GA House Bill 661 School Clubs)

MODESTO CITY SCHOOLS
Administrative Regulation
AR 6145.5

INSTRUCTION

Associated Student Body Organizations and Equal Access, 7-12

Associated Student Body Organizations (Parent/Guardian Permission Required)

Associated Student Body organizations must be organized at the school, have a certificated advisor, be composed completely of current student body members and be approved by the Superintendent/designee in accordance with Governing Board policy. They shall hold the majority of their meetings at school and have a democratic plan for the selection of officers.

Organization activities shall not conflict with the authority and responsibilities of school officials.

The principal/designee shall direct any group of students seeking recognition as an Associated Student Body organization to submit a district-approved application form which includes the following information:

1. Name of the organization.
2. A statement of the organization's purposes, objectives, and activities. (Any affiliation of a student organization with any outside organization must be clearly described in writing, and a charter of the outside organization must be attached to the application.)
3. The title, powers, and duties of the officers and the manner of their election.
4. Name of certificated staff advisor and a description of the function of staff advisor in the promotion, supervision and leadership of the group. The principal shall have final authority in determining the assignment and role of the staff advisor.
5. A description of any qualifications for membership.

AR 6145.5 (a)

INSTRUCTION

Associated Student Body Organizations and Equal Access, 7-12

6. If a curriculum-related group, a statement of the relation of the club to the curriculum and/or instructional program.

In order to participate in Associated Student Body organizations, students shall:

- a. Parent/guardian written permission; and
- b. Meet all eligibility requirements defined in Board Policy 5132, Student Conduct Code, 7-1

These model policies all possess elements that should be part of your school's extracurricular parental notification policy. Enforcement of a parental notification policy requires that there be some penalty attached for non-compliance. A policy should include language such as:

Failure by the moderator or the officers of an extracurricular organization to completely abide by the requirements of _____ school district's extracurricular parental notification policy shall result in the immediate revocation of the organization's rights to meet on school property and use school resources for the remainder of the academic year. The organization shall be permitted to resubmit their application to be recognized as an extracurricular organization at the beginning of the next academic year.

2. Non-Referral Policies

Amazingly, many school districts do not have policies prohibiting employees, teachers, or volunteers from directing students to outside groups or agencies without their parent's permission or knowledge. Children have and are routinely referred to groups like Planned Parenthood to receive information and instruction of the most intimate nature and, in some cases, to undergo surgical procedures such as abortion without parental knowledge or consent. Children, whether through involvement with a GSA or by approaching a 'trusted' teacher, counselor or club advisor/moderator, can be referred to an outside group like GLSEN or a 'youth center' for gay, lesbian or questioning youth. There they are 'guided' and encouraged in their explorations of their sexuality. According to stories from young people who have frequented these centers, it is often a place of adult exploitation and introduction to many new ideas. One GSA which was denied official recognition by the Lubbock Texas Independent School District maintained as a stated goal of the club:

We are not in any way, "recruiting." Anyone who attends our functions does so of their own free will. We will use diplomatic tactics to provide guidance to youth. ***We will not be the ones making the decision about their sexuality and we will be working with other organizations, councilors [sic], etc. to provide the best help possible.*** (emphasis added).

School districts operating without a policy governing referrals of students to outside agencies are ignoring the responsibilities imposed upon them when the district assumes the position of *in locus parentis* with respect to its students. The failure by a district to adopt and promote such a policy endangers not only their students but exposes the district to a significant potential for liability. Parents should demand answers from their school board, school attorney and superintendent to the following questions to determine what policies are in place to protect their children and to make the

district aware of this potential for liability.

District Awareness of Issues Related to Negligent Referral and/or Negligent Entrustment

- 1) Are any administrative personnel, board members, employees, agents, volunteers or servants of our School District allowed to refer students to outside agencies or organizations concerning issues related to sexual identity disorders, practices or matters generally pertaining to sexual education or health?
- 2) What, if any, written directives, policies and/or guidelines are issued by our School District to administrative personnel, board members, employees, agents, volunteers or servants regarding the district's referral/non-referral policy?
- 3) If there exists written directives, policies and/or guidelines regarding referrals please provide a copy of the policy(ies).
- 4) Are administrative personnel, board members, employees, agents, volunteers or servants of our School District, who have contact with or access to students, required to "sign-off" that they have been made aware of the district's policy prohibiting referrals? Are they reminded about the district's policy prohibiting referrals during staff meetings or "in-service" training?
- 5) If it is school policy to permit referrals to outside agencies or organizations with respect to issues involving sexual identity disorders, practices or matters generally pertaining to sexual education or health, please provide a copy of the policy and list of the approved referral agencies.
- 6) Pursuant to the aforementioned policy permitting referrals, which administrative personnel, board members, employees, agents, volunteers or servants of our School District are allowed to give referrals? Are School District administrative personnel, board members, employees, agents, volunteers or servants who are approved to provide these referrals required to have special training which makes them qualified to do so?
- 7) Before approving an agency or organization for referrals, what kind of background investigation does our School District conduct regarding this organization's malpractice history and their record of compliance with applicable state laws? Is there a verification that personnel at these agencies are not listed on sexual offender registries or do not have a criminal record of such nature that could jeopardize the safety of a student?
- 8) Has any representative of the Gay Lesbian and Straight Education Network (or any similar organization) ever been allowed to give a presentation to (or provide information to) students within our School District regarding or pertaining to matters involving sex education, sexual practices or sexual orientation?

In today's world, the political or moral motivations of those who come in contact with your children could vary drastically with your own beliefs. And sadly, a teacher or counselor can have a drastic influence on the future of your child by referring him or her to groups that advocate, among other things, the acceptance and experimentation of dangerous lifestyles. A district adopting a policy similar to the one below will take a step forward to protect the welfare of students and secure parental rights to direct the moral, physical and educational upbringing of their children. A district adopting such a policy will also begin to take the necessary steps to address significant exposure to potential liability.

Policy: Non-referral

The _____ School District recognizes its responsibility to provide for the security and safety of all students. _____ School District intends that its approved curriculum for students represents and provides the framework in which employees, instructors, volunteers, students and servants may discuss matters pertaining to sexuality, birth control, family planning, sexual health, sexual orientation and gender identity.

No employee, instructor, volunteer, student or servant of this district shall be permitted or authorized to refer or otherwise provide information to a student or other person(s) under their care or supervision regarding agencies, organizations, clubs or individuals outside of _____ School District not expressly approved by the _____ School District with respect to or pertaining to matters of sexuality, birth control, family planning services, sexual health, sexual orientation or gender identity

It is the policy of the _____ School District that all employees, instructors, volunteers, students and servants of the district be fully informed with respect to their obligations pursuant to state law to report evidence of underage sexual activity to the proper authorities for investigation. Pursuant to state law, each employee, instructor, volunteer or servant is to be trained and to understand the reporting protocols established by this district in compliance with the obligations of state law with respect to those persons designated as mandatory reporters of possible child sexual abuse. Symptoms of sexual activity by a minor and therefore, potential abuse of a minor may include, but are not limited to:

1. Seeking to obtain birth control information or paraphernalia
2. Seeking treatment for a sexually transmitted disease
3. Seeking abortion or referral for abortion services

In accordance with this policy the _____ School District shall appoint a person(s) singularly responsible to insure district wide compliance with all state mandatory reporting laws. This person(s) shall serve as a liaison with local law enforcement and child protection authorities permitting an immediate response to the potential of child sexual abuse. The person(s) so appointed shall develop a Student Protection Program identifying and insuring against events exposing students to harm and the district to potential liability for that harm. The Student Protection Program shall address, examine and safeguard against instruction, activities or advice which:

- Encourages sexual activity by underage children or the promotion of sexual activity, either actively or passively, with adults.
- Encourages a failure to report, as required by state law, the reasonable suspicion of sexual abuse of an underage minor.
- Activities by a mandatory reporter which encourages an underage child to conceal sexual activity from authorities or other mandatory reporters or which coach a child in the manner and/or means to conceal such sexual activity or avoid an official investigation by state authorities.
- Encourages or assists an underage child in violating this district's or this state's statutes regarding parental involvement, the provision of advice, counsel or assistance to underage children to leave the jurisdiction of the courts encompassing our district or referral of an underage child to an individual, clinic, group or organization for the purposes of concealing sexual activity and/or introducing students to topics or subject matter already addressed by the district's comprehensive curriculum

Employees, instructors, volunteers, students and servants of the District violating this policy shall be subject to the provisions of the disciplinary procedures contained within the District Policy Manual up to, and including, immediate termination.

3. Character Education: Filling the Void

One of the most significant factors that have presented outside groups with their greatest opportunity to shape what children are taught has been the movement to drive God from public schools. This single event has created a 'moral vacuum' which groups like GLSEN seek to fill with their new 'morality' based on one-sided 'tolerance.' This 'new tolerance' demands the acceptance of all ideas and viewpoints without question and without consideration of whether the idea is contrary to truth, societal goals, or the moral beliefs of the overwhelming majority of Americans. To enforce this 'new tolerance' school districts have increasingly adopted speech codes which serve to limit any speech that reveals a 'heterosexist bias' that calls into question the homosexual lifestyle or which enshrines the heckler's veto by forbidding speech that insults or stigmatizes the individual.

School districts have found, however, that restrictive speech and codes of conduct policies invite costly litigation when students successfully defend their constitutionally guaranteed rights of conscience and free expression. True tolerance demands that everyone be treated with dignity, respect and civility. Tolerance of another's ideas or beliefs does not require acceptance of another's viewpoint nor does tolerance demand silence when another student asserts his opinion. School districts should avoid one-sided, unconstitutional attempts to secure the rights of a small number of activist students over another. Instead, schools should strive to teach our children the true meaning of character, building

in them qualities like honesty, integrity, and respect for others.

Character education answers the demands by homosexual activists for respect and tolerance by advancing behaviors that we expect toward everyone. Character education provides a clear path for our children and young adults to mold from a diverse people a shared ‘character culture’ without being forced to compromise their moral or religious beliefs. Instead of silencing discussion or discriminating against beliefs, a civil society depends upon the public school system to instill those values that a pluralistic society most depends upon to function and succeed, particularly with regard for the individual while holding an opposite opinion or viewpoint.

The Ohio Secretary of State, Kenneth Blackwell, has developed a project worth mentioning. The Ohio Center for Civic Character offers a booklet for educators and employers entitled *Uncommonsense*⁵ which defines nearly two dozen common characteristics for “high character people.” Programs like *Uncommonsense* look to encourage compassion and respect for others while directing participants to seek the truth and strive for excellence.

4. Abstinence Education

It goes without saying, but abstinence education presents the only 100% certain method for the prevention of pregnancy and the transmission of sexually transmitted diseases. Aside from these benefits, abstinence education also represents a tool by which a school district may wrest control of matters regarding sexuality away from activists who wish to advance their own agendas.

Why abstinence education? It’s called “Viewpoint Discrimination” and “Subject Matter Pre-Emption.”

a. Viewpoint

A school is a unique type of public forum, different from a public street corner where an individual has practically an unrestricted right to speak on whatever issue he or she might wish. In instances where a student’s speech may appear as school sanctioned such as a strongly worded editorial regarding abortion in a school newspaper, courts have held that a school may prevent the student from speaking. Where student speech may, “materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school,” a school may also prohibit student speech.

However, a school may not prohibit or censor a student’s viewpoint when the school has opened up discussion regarding a certain subject. For example, Pioneer High School in Ann Arbor, Michigan initiated a ‘Diversity Week’ during which the school decided to invite a panel discussion among clergy concerning homosexuality but insisted that only ‘gay accepting’ clergy compose the panel. Predictably, when a student wanted to invite her pastor to participate in order to present another viewpoint, the school district refused to permit the pastor to appear. Several years and one federal lawsuit later the judge ruled against the school in a strongly worded opinion noting:

This case presents the ironic, and unfortunate, paradox of a public high school celebrating ‘diversity’ by refusing to permit the presentation to students of an ‘unwelcomed’ viewpoint on the topic of homosexuality and religion, while actively promoting the competing view. This practice of ‘one-way diversity,’ unsettling in itself, was rendered still more troubling—both constitutionally and ethically by the fact that the approved viewpoint was, in one manifestation, presented to students as religious doctrine by six clerics (some in full garb) quoting from religious scripture. In its other manifestation, it resulted in the censorship by school administrators of a student’s speech about ‘what diversity means to me,’ removing that portion of the speech in which the student described the unapproved viewpoint.”

b. Curricular Control and Subject Matter Pre-emption

As previously noted, a school district may not act to limit a particular viewpoint when it has opened up a subject for dialogue. A school district is granted wide latitude when it decides to select a subject over which the district will exercise curricular control. So was the case in the recently decided Caudillo v. Lubbock Independent School District, 2004 US Dist Ct 3166 (2004). In Caudillo, the Lubbock Independent School District successfully refused to permit a group of students to form a GSA.

⁵ <http://www.sos.state.oh.us/sos/initiatives/OCCC.aspx?Section=107>

While the district persuaded the court that by preventing the formation of the GSA the district was securing the well-being of its students and maintaining order and discipline, a critical element in the case was the adoption of a policy of abstinence only sex education as a part of the formal curriculum. The judge determined that the Lubbock Independent School District, by adopting a policy of abstinence only sex education, had intended to ‘occupy’ matters related to sexuality and preclude all other discussions of sexual activity, in whatever context, whether it be from a heterosexual or homosexual viewpoint.

Effectively, the Caudillo court found that the proposed GSA would admittedly violate the school's policy by engaging in discussion of sexuality and matters pertaining to sexual activity such as sexually transmitted diseases or AIDS. The judge determined that the GSA was, at its core, based upon sexual activity. Furthermore the judge ruled the orientation of the club, that is whether the material was homosexual or heterosexual in nature, was irrelevant. The school district had conscientiously decided to control the subject matter of sexuality and the group’s planned agenda would interfere with the school’s educational mission.

Abstinence programs permit a school district to impart accurate information regarding matters of sexuality in a non-controversial, responsible manner and additionally frustrate the aims of any club which makes as its goal the irresponsible dissemination of sexual material and encouragement to experiment with dangerous sexual practices. As well, schools should insure that as part of any club activity, students will not be involved in sexual issues, behavior, or adult-level sexual media or material.

There are many good abstinence programs available today suitable for use in both public and religiously affiliated schools. The Lubbock Independent School District reportedly uses the abstinence program *Why kNOw?*, which can be found at www.WhykNOw.org. As well, the Kentucky Health Cabinet offers grants to promote abstinence education and offers a program, *Postponing Sexual Involvement*, through local health districts. Information regarding abstinence programs approved by the Kentucky Health Cabinet can be found at <http://chs.ky.gov/publichealth/teenpregnancy.htm>.

5. Teaching of Controversial Subjects and/or the Use of Controversial Materials

It is almost unavoidable that some subject matter addressed in the public school setting will be considered “controversial.” But in matters pertaining to sexuality and specifically homosexuality, the introduction of such subject matter to young children profoundly impacts the manner in which they view themselves and others. School districts seeking to introduce such themes should do so with caution, deliberation and the consent of parents.

A controversial issues policy should encourage parental involvement by facilitating a request for re-evaluation of materials. Normally this is accomplished by including in parent/student handbooks a form by which a parent can describe the material and the reason for concern. A controversial issues policy should also rely on a permanent committee constituted in such a manner as to require several parent members ensuring on-going parental scrutiny of proposed school curriculum. Such a policy should also require that all sides of a controversial topic be covered in order to present balance.

Policy: Controversial Material/Subject Matter

New material or presentations considered to create polarizing viewpoints may be considered controversial. Issues, for example, relating to sex, sexuality, birth control, abortion, homosexuality, sexual behavior, national defense, creationism and conflicts between science and religion shall be considered ‘controversial.’

Educators seeking to include or permit the presentation of controversial issues or material should submit the materials to the district Materials Review Committee. The Materials Review Committee shall be composed of a principal, school board president, one school board member and a parent representative from the elementary, middle and high school levels. The committee will review the materials or planned presentation and make its final recommendation permitting or prohibiting the materials or presentation to the district superintendent.

Individuals may challenge the presentation of controversial issues and the use of controversial subject matter by completing a Request for Re-evaluation of Material form and submitting the form to the Materials Review Committee.

Materials Review Committee and the Evaluation Procedure

New material or material considered ‘controversial’ should meet the following requirements:

1. The subject matter or issue is of definite educational value to the proposed audience
2. The proposed audience is at an age and/or educational level suited for the subject matter.
3. The presentation is the best and most appropriate treatment of the subject or issue permitting the exposition

- of opposing views on controversial issues.
4. The subject matter or presentation is consistent with the educational mission of the school district as expressed by existing policies and procedures.
 5. Materials donated or given as gifts by individuals or organizations to the school district shall meet the above criteria and be accepted or rejected in accordance with the established criteria.
 6. The material does not convey misleading information which could jeopardize a student's health.

The failure to submit material deemed 'controversial' as described by this policy to the Materials Review Committee for approval prior to its presentation to students shall be considered a violation of this policy. A person violating this policy shall be subject to the provisions of the disciplinary procedures contained within the District Policy Manual up to, and including, immediate termination.

Implementing the Plan-Where do you go from here?

There is no typical recommendation regarding which policy should be implemented first, just as much as there is no typical school district. There are many contending factors that will shape how concerned parents go about urging the adoption of new policies and changing their school environment. The make-up of the community and the school board as well as whether a GSA exists within the district are all important factors to consider.

It is generally thought that in a district without an existing GSA, the adoption of an abstinence only policy and a character education curriculum should be a priority. Again, with an abstinence only policy in place the school takes control of subject matter dealing with sexuality. A school that adopts a character curriculum, creates a framework in which all students are required to respect each other regardless of differences in religious or political belief or sexual orientation. Any allegations of 'harassment' by a special interest advocacy group can and should be dealt with as a general fault of character and not as a justification for sexual orientation or gender identity 'tolerance training'.

For a school district with an existing GSA, the immediate implementation of an abstinence based curriculum may be difficult. In such situations it may be best to begin to educate parents on the goals and activities of the GSA. A parents group may consider implementing a notification and consent policy for extracurricular activities which will increase parental awareness of the goals and activities of a GSA. A non-referral policy regarding outside agencies or groups will serve to protect children and instruct other parents and administrators regarding liability issues. The adoption of a controversial issues policy serves to restore some measure of control of the curriculum to parents.

Conclusion

In the culture war that has enveloped this country, our public school system has become a hotly contested battleground. Without question those proponents of the homosexual agenda seek to gain an advantage by eliminating the possibility of an unbiased education, thereby preventing school children from making critical and informed decisions regarding sexuality, morality and the societal good. If our children are entangled in the deceptive lies of 'tolerance' without discernment, it is not only that *they* are trapped, but future generations of children who are subsequently brought into this world. As parents and as taxpayers, we have the right and the obligation to ensure that our public school system offers the children of today the proper knowledge base and skills to make the decisions for tomorrow.

No "Equal Access" for Homosexual Clubs: How to Keep GSA's out of Your Child's School

http://www.defendthefamily.com/_docs/resources/6719613.pdf

By Linda Harvey

It starts with a handful of students. They want a club in their high school-or sometimes nowadays it's a middle school. They want to meet with others who have their same interests and concerns. They say they have a right to meet based on the federal Equal Access Act, which provided opportunities for school Bible groups to meet in high schools as non-curricular clubs. These students say there shouldn't be discrimination against their particular type of club, either.

But what responsible school would permit students to organize a tattoo club?

Surely no responsible school would allow such a dangerous, risky behavior to be legitimized by a school club. Yet, according to the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), as of the end of 2002, almost 1700 homosexual clubs now exist in schools in the U.S.¹ So why not a tattoo club? Or a Marlboro club? Or a pornography club? Or a diet pills club? Or a drag racing club? Or a nudists' club? All are unacceptable activities, and we are unaware of any such organizations in U.S. high schools. Yet clubs centered around a known high-risk behavior like homosexuality are allowed, sometimes even encouraged. Schools seem willing to believe the unsubstantiated claims of homosexual activists and their student allies that these clubs are a fair civil rights' gesture to a pre-existing minority, and that students will simply share philosophical views at their meetings. No high-risk sexual behavior will be discussed, organizers assert. (See companion article about what really goes on during "gay" club meetings.) Yet drag racing, potentially fatal diet schemes and other topics could similarly only be approached "ideologically"- yet parents in most communities would have a fit.

In the current youth culture, it's becoming more acceptable to be homosexual or bisexual. These identities and the behaviors associated are "in" and "cool" in many schools, after a decade of relentless promotion. However, clubs encouraging more acceptance of this behavior are completely inappropriate.

But homosexual clubs are needed, legal activists like the ACLU and Lambda Legal Defense Fund assert, because students with homosexual desires are victims of discrimination, harassment that goes unpunished, and suffer from a higher risk of suicide. Questionable statistics, seldom challenged, accompany these claims.² In those schools where bullying has been a problem, however, is the solution to force everyone to accept homosexuality? Why not simply document with facts any real problems, then enforce existing conduct codes for everyone?

The "Equal Access" argument has once again moved to center stage since the ACLU filed suit in January to force a "gay" club at a school in Ashland, KY, and in March, at a school in Klein, TX.³ Now, many schools are giving in to student activist demands on this issue. School officials in Klein have quickly caved in to ACLU pressure and allowed the club to go forward, despite the fact that sodomy is still illegal in that state.

Many believe there are ways to prevent impressionable students from this kind of harmful application of the Equal Access Act, but to do so will call upon the courage, good sense, and proactive planning of communities and schools.

The Distortion of Equal Access

How did this 1984 federal law come to be misused to allow sodomy and cross-dressing to become implicitly acceptable behaviors in so many U.S. schools?

The Equal Access Act (20 U.S.C.4071-74) was passed because many schools were barring school Bible or Christian clubs citing "separation of church and state" as a justification. This phrase appears nowhere in our Constitution but reflects judicial opinion based on a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to a Baptist group, assuring them there would be no official state religion. So in 1984, Congress had to pass an unnecessary law to re-assert what our Constitution allowed for all along-that a group of students should be able to organize a religious club based on their First Amendment rights and have it recognized within their school.

Now this law has been used in the last decade as justification for "gay" clubs to organize. Courts have said that "equal access" applies if the school has other non-curricular clubs because of First Amendment rights, i.e., freedom of speech. A curricular club would be like, e.g., a French Club. A non-curricular club would be something like the Chess Club or Future Business Leaders of America Club. The club must be open to all students and truly be student-organized with no adults or outside organizations backing the club. All of these provisions only apply to schools which accept federal funds in some way.

Yet schools still have the authority, courts have determined, to exclude clubs that would cause significant disruption or

would interfere with order. The school can still act to "protect the well-being of students and faculty."⁴ One would think this would be a sound reason to exclude any club advocating homosexuality. Amazingly, very few schools are taking this stand. Why?

Many times, administrators and school boards support the clubs after being convinced this constitutes "tolerance". They are also bombarded with pro-homosexual information supporting such equal access by the NEA and other sympathetic groups. They erroneously believe that homosexuality is an inborn trait that some students simply will at some point discover is a part of their make-up. There are schools that would prevent the formation of these clubs if they could, but when threatened by well-funded, mighty legal defense groups like the ACLU or Lambda Legal Defense Fund, they scramble to put together a strategy. Having failed to prepare adequately, they give up and give in.

Steps to Prevent "Gay" Clubs

We believe that schools can defend against this assault on high standards and healthy behavior. There are many reasons that are in the best interests of all students and the community to oppose "gay" clubs. If a school allows this, it sets the precedent for other harmful clubs for students as well as the future unlimited demands of "gay" activists. This greatly endangers the students who want the club as well as others.

Based on the provisions already allowed for under "Equal Access" and with additional thorough research, schools may be able to successfully defend themselves against homosexual clubs and all that follows. Here are some suggested steps:*

1. Take an official school position, with supporting research, that homosexuality, bisexuality and gender confusion are threats to student physical and mental well-being. In today's climate, this takes a lot of guts, but it is a winnable position, because not only is it the truth, it's the opinion of most parents. A recent Zogby poll clearly showed that, when given the facts, parents overwhelmingly object to having their kids taught to accept homosexuality as equal to heterosexuality.⁵

Health information will provide ample evidence of the potential for harm. It should include information on the high risk of AIDS in this country by males having sex with males (MSM) as well the much-higher risk of other STDs by practicing homosexuals. The higher rates of promiscuity, domestic violence and much-lower life span should be covered as well as the lack of any evidence for a gay "gene."

One critical part of any school district's defense should be to provide evidence, by researching "gay" advocacy material, of the overwhelming promotion to youth of just the opposite of a fixed, stable sexual identity. The real goal is for all people, including youth, to be able to practice sexual fluidity and experimentation (which would include homosexual behavior), even by those who call themselves "heterosexuals." There is no question that this broad strategy of fluid sexualization of youth is having an impact and adversely affecting our kids. This bottom line of the "gay" agenda is its soft underbelly that, when exposed and fully explained, will alarm parents as they should be, and discourage support for pro-homosexual activities in schools. [On our web site at www.missionamerica.com, we have amassed evidence from the material recommended to youth by the two major pro-"gay" youth organizations, GLSEN and PFLAG. These can be great resources for support for opposing "gay" clubs.]

A very good resource outlining health risks, with solid citations from medical research, is found at www.corporateresourcecouncil.org/white_papers.html. It's a paper called "The Health Risks of Gay Sex." Originally developed to aid companies, this material nonetheless contains an enormous amount of helpful material in one place.

Another solid argument, as an extension of the health risks, is the issue of school liability. What will be the future pay-outs for the district when the fifteen-year-old who is seduced into homosexual behavior through attendance at "gay" club meetings contracts AIDS, and in six years when he is 21, sues your district?

The fact is that homosexual desire can change. Many times, it is the troubled youth who is drawn to these attractions and behavior. Sometimes the influence of older teens, or a homosexual teacher or coach, is a factor, and these will be the people involved in your school's "gay-straight alliance," the name often given to these clubs. Responsible counseling should be advising youth to turn away from homosexual desire and avoid these deadly consequences. There will be no defense before a jury of Mom and Pop Americans who cannot believe that your school supported a "gay" club, implying that the behavior was innocuous and acceptable. And always greedy liability lawyers will be seeking out such cases just like medical malpractice, once one proves successful.

Then there is the molestation issue. Openly homosexual adults will come into contact with your "gay" club members, especially after it gets rolling and is well-established. They may be invited as guest speakers, or a homosexual may be a teacher advisor. Homosexuals much more inclined to seduce young teens than heterosexuals, in part because close access is allowed to same sex youth in a way not available between adults and youth of the opposite sex. Corruption of a minor is still illegal everywhere in the U.S.

Also, as can be easily verified, homosexual teens are told by advocates that sex between adults and minors is part of their "empowerment" to make their own sexual decisions early. As Mission America has documented, this activity is a frequent refrain of pro-homosexual groups and material, which your "gay" club members will use as their resources and guidelines.⁶ The 30-year-old "Pride Day" speaker with undisclosed HIV infection who meets and then seduces the 15-year-old president of your "gay" club after a school-sponsored event will provide disastrous great headlines for your school. Think of the current predicament of the Catholic Church, and act accordingly to protect your district's financial status and your students. And if you doubt that adult sex with minors is much more likely among homosexuals as evident in their own material, please review Mission:America's research papers cited above.

A school club will imply that homosexual behavior is acceptable and non-threatening, and if a school district wants to maintain otherwise, then why NOT a smoking club, or a Ku Klux Klan club? The reason is, of course, to avoid any implication of school endorsement of certain behaviors or philosophies, as well as for liability reasons. The same argument should apply to homosexual clubs. If your school has a non-discrimination code citing "sexual orientation," it will be harder to fight a homosexual club. A very valuable step would be to revoke that code, but if it must remain, it can be argued that this code was only meant to increase politeness and civility, not to endorse these behaviors. You need to establish your own definition of the squishy term "discrimination" before they do.

2. Reaffirm the known, clear risks of homosexuality as opposed to abstinence by students, which should be the standard. If abstinence until marriage is not the standard in your school, it should be. There are many benefits and no detriments to delaying sexual activity until marriage. This can be remedied by passing a district policy along these lines.

3. Show how this club will disrupt order and civility. The club's objective is to discuss the need to reduce harassment and "homophobia," which they will, if pressed, reveal is their shorthand for what is usually open hostility toward traditional values, parental and school authority, and the views of many traditional religions. This will create divisiveness in the school in new, and not constructive, ways. It will increase intolerance, bias and stereotypes, because homosexual activist students are being taught by all the major advocacy organizations to fear and fight parents who try to restrict their sexual freedom; schools that don't jump to their every demand; and religions like traditional Christianity, conservative Judaism, conservative Hindu faith and conservative Islam.

Their harassment claims can be dealt with simply, by ensuring that the current school conduct code is being enforced fairly, but after that, don't give in to the endless demands for "non-harassment" policies based on sexual orientation. Any student kids who is assaulted or whose property is vandalized needs to be protected, and the harassers punished but not based on pre-set objectionable thought. It should be based on the severity of the incident. Insults will need to be dealt with on a case by case basis, and falls into a subjective realm. Don't paint the district into the unnecessary corner of endorsing homosexuality simply to protect some students from excessive insults. Punish all those who are excessive verbal harassers, whatever the content.

4. Demonstrate that a homosexual club does, in fact, communicate endorsement to students of homosexual behavior by any student who wishes to engage in it. It is not simply, as will be claimed, justice for a small, fixed minority group. The club will be open to anyone. There will usually be a demand that the club to be open to students without parental knowledge. They will discuss homosexuality, bisexuality, and cross-gender identity, dress and the benefits of sex change surgery and /or hormones. They will talk about homosexual liaisons, provide information about web sites that contain graphic homosexual pornography, community social outlets where homosexual activity will be facilitated, and provide opportunities for students to participate. This is a critical point and key to your public relations and media communications on this issue. A "gay" club is not for a pre-existing minority, even though only a small group at present will be interested in it, and this is how it will be portrayed by its organizers (and they probably truly believe this). No such minority exists, but those students wishing to engage in homosexual activity or cross-dressing are a flexible and changeable sub-section of the whole student body.

More students are likely to be drawn into homosexual activity as a result of the existence of this club This usually manifests as an increase in expressed "bisexuality" by more students. Homosexual-friendly books tell students this is okay. The books endorsed by GLSEN and PFLAG which we've researched reveal that sexual fluidity and experimentation by any student who wishes to engage in it is the goal-not "rights" for only a few. ALL district parents therefore will need to be notified in these terms. Make this a condition if your school is forced into accepting a "gay" club-that all the district's parents will need to be advised and that you must do this for liability reasons.

5. Student activist members of "gay" clubs and their adult allies will insist your school support radical pro-homosexual district-wide activities. Once your school allows a "gay" club, student activists will demand-or else go to the media and complain-that your school hold Pride Days, Transgender Awareness Days, "Coming Out" days, etc. Your school can also expect to have teachers who are openly homosexual apply for positions, or "come out" if they already hold them. If the school objects, you will be sued, and they will win based on "discrimination." Then you may have teachers or students who are cross-dressers or have had a sex change do the same thing. This again opens up a whole new range of possible

dangers for students and liability risks for the district.

Another result of a high school "gay" club is that it virtually guarantees to eventually generate middle school and elementary school clubs as well as pro-homosexual activities. There are increasing numbers of "gay" middle school groups. In Stony Brook, NY, the Murphy Junior High School homosexual club started in spring 2002 as a result of "outreach" by the high school to the younger students. GLSEN, the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, has stated that their goal for their GSA Network (the "gay-straight alliances, their term for these clubs) is to establish them in as many schools, K-12, as possible.

6. Homosexual clubs can imply school support for or endorsement of illegal sex acts. Sex between adults and minors-illegal everywhere-is implicitly endorsed by the "gay" rights movement in a vast array of web sites, books, magazines, novels, movies, TV shows, etc. Illegal activity should not be a part of any official or semi-official school club.

If sodomy is still illegal in your state, this may be a worthy defense. It was employed as one aspect of defense in Utah in a much-publicized case, and was unsuccessful, but much has happened since that case to document what actually goes on in "gay" clubs. The claim is that these clubs don't discuss actual homosexual activity. This is a disingenuous defense, and now that so many clubs exist and their activities are well-publicized, it can be demonstrated that existing clubs most assuredly do discuss homosexual sex, male and female, and provide resources where students can become homosexually active, on a regular basis. States where sodomy is still illegal are Idaho, Utah, Michigan, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri and the territory of Puerto Rico. All other states have repealed laws prohibiting sodomy through litigation or legislation.⁷

* These suggestions are not meant to provide legal advice. We are not attorneys but have simply researched and found the above material, and believe it may be helpful. Any questions should be directed to your legal counsel.

Notes:

1. www.glsen.org-- "Local Chapters"
2. For example, the frequently cited statistic that 30 % of all teen suicide or suicide attempts are by "gay and lesbian" teens has been shown to have been derived from flawed calculations of activists and outright misrepresentation. See www.traditionalvalues.org/urban/five.php for a great overview of the facts about this "urban legend," which has been repeated so many times, it is now believed to be fact. And the basic question remains that a teen's tragic reaction doesn't dictate changing reality. The solution to every young person's discomfort is not to affirm every desire so he/she won't be self-destructive. Children disagree with parents and teachers all the time. Do we change reality or do we continue to provide our best guidance and communicate our highest ideals?
3. <http://headlines.agapepress.org/archive/1/292003c.asp> and <http://www.washblade.com/national/030131suits.php3>
4. Derived from information at www.lambdalegal.org/cgi-bin/iowa/record?record=251
5. Abstinence survey-----
http://www.whatparentsthink.com/pdfs/coalition_press_release.pdf
6. See our expose of the pro-homosexual groups working most closely with youth in this country, GLSEN and PFLAG at www.missionamerica.com/stoppflag1.htm
7. www.sodomylaws.org

Kennesaw Mountain High School Gay-Straight Alliance

<http://www.meowzers.net/etcetera/PrideGSA/news.html>

Kennesaw Mountain High School, 1898 Kennesaw Due-West Rd., Kennesaw, GA 30152

Home/Welcome

Welcome to the KMHS Gay-Straight Alliance website. Here, we hope you will find all the information you seek. You can navigate the site using the links to the left. If you have any questions or comments, please email the president at thisissarabrynn@hotmail.com or the secretary/webmistress at spazkitty@gmail.com.

The last meeting of the semester will be Wednesday, May 11th at 3:30PM. We'll be presenting the new officers as well as voting on key issues for the club this upcoming semester. Refreshments will be provided, and snack donations are accepted. Please attend!

The KMHS Gay-Straight Alliance Mission Statement

To promote tolerance of all lifestyles, open-mindedness, and respect among students.

Visit the GSA Network for additional information about Gay-Straight Alliances.

Minutes

The next meeting will be Wednesday, May 11th at 3:30PM in room 622.

3.21.05 - It is very important that all members make an attempt to show up at the next meeting, the Monday after Spring Break. Emails have been sent out regarding it as a further reminder. This meeting is important as it is when we will be discussing the Day of Silence, which takes place Wednesday, April 13th, as well as giving out notecards for the event. Please make an effort to drop by for the meeting and participate in Day of Silence, or if you absolutely can't make it, meet up with Sarabrynn or Brooke to get your notecard.

2.14.05 - 11 people attended the meeting, where we asked the question: "Why are you here today?" The results varied from wanting to take a stand to being in it for the controversy and everything inbetween. We also discussed the three purposes of GSA: promoting tolerance (actively showing our support in school w/flyers), political news regarding gay rights (marriage amendment/hate crime laws), and a social area for everyone to have fun and feel safe (movie night/etc). We also talked about the possibility of a gay rights debate with a committee from the Young Republicans (perhaps alongside some members of Young Democrats) - more details concerning this will be discussed at the next meeting after Sarabrynn and Brooke have brought it up with YRA.

1.10.05/1.28.05 - At the meeting, the Vice President and Secretary set up a date for Movie Night. The following week, the officers met with Coach Thompson to discuss future activities and topics for debate for the club, as well as laying out further groundrules.

11.29.04 - About 15 students showed up at the Pride meeting, where we discussed the ACLU, anti-gay lyrics being banned in the UK, the definition of hate crimes being expanded to include homosexuality, and wrote letters to Georgia's senate about gay rights. We also decided to decorate a Christmas tree along with many other clubs at our school - it will be Disney-themed, as chosen by the members. If you can, please stay after school on Tuesday to help us decorate, and please bring any decorations (preferably Disney-themed) you can to put on the tree. The bowling details are settled (Dec. 10 @ 7PM), but check the activities page for more information.

11.15.04 - The last meeting had 21 students present, where we gave out the website address, picked a date and a place for bowling (Dec. 10 @ Marietta Lanes), talked about writing the Georgia Senate in response to the Gay Marriage Amendment (see Activities page), and made more posters to advertise the club around school.

11.1.04 - 27 people attended our second meeting, where we discussed the Gay Marriage Amendment. With the upcoming elections and the measure on several state ballots (including Georgia), everyone knew what a big effect it was having on politics and society. The group discussed what the Amendment meant (no civil unions, etc.), and it made for a good group

talk.

10.22.04 - Our first meeting was a great success! We had over 30 students in attendance, and we thank everyone who showed up for their interest. Sarabrynn set out several expectations for future meetings and events, including our mission statement and what we can and cannot do in GSA. Dues will not be taken up, though if shirts are purchased, members will pay for them if they want a shirt of their own. Donations for snacks are accepted as well.

Upcoming Activities

Wednesday, April 13 - Day of Silence

If you would like to write the Georgia Senate in regards to the Gay Marriage Amendment, here is the address. Remember, be polite, yet firm.

Senator John Isakson
United States House of Representatives
132 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Information

The KMHS Gay-Straight Alliance was formed in October 2004 by Sarabrynn Hudgins. We always welcome new members and guests, and if you have any questions, feel free to ask one of the officers.

Officers

Co-Presidents: Daniel Brettschneider and Laura Chance

Vice President: Spencer Montalvo

Secretary: Tiffany Lowe

Frequently Asked Questions

Q: Is this group only for heterosexuals/homosexuals/bisexuals/etc.?

A: No. GSA is an organization meant to promote tolerance of all lifestyles, not just one. We do not ask personal questions so as to prevent any possible discrimination based on alternate lifestyles.

Q: I heard that you can't have a club like this.

A: Under the Equal Access Act, any club may be formed so long as it "does not materially and substantially interfere with the orderly conduct of educational activities within the school". Click here to find out more about the EAA.

Q: So what all can we talk about in the club?

A: Our teacher sponsor has given us permission to discuss any relevant issues during club meetings, including, but not limited to, gay rights, religion in relation to homosexuality, etc. However, please do NOT discuss personal sexuality in meetings. Individual orientations and preferences are not an appropriate topic in a school-sponsored meeting, but may be freely discussed outside of the classroom among trustworthy friends.

Q: Sounds like fun! How can I help out?

A: We're glad you're interested. Feel free to approach any of the officers before or after school or during lunch, drop by one of the meetings listed under News and Activities, or email us expressing your interest. Some mornings, a few members of GSA meet up in the mornings (around 7:15) to post new flyers, so any help there would be welcome as well.

Gay-Straight Alliance club at Wilton High School

<http://www.wilton.k12.ct.us/whs/stu/clu/gsa/minutes.html>

Wilton High School, 395 Danbury Road, Wilton, CT 06897

Minutes

October 18

- * reviewed the responses to the survey given at the last meeting
- * discussed a flyer outlining the purpose of the GSA
- * discussed an article in Time magazine
- * other important topics: the Stonewall Speakers, a plaque for the Dr. J memorial tree, donating money to a scholarship or organization, the True Colors conference

October 11

- * discussed the goals of the GSA
- * took a survey on expectations for the GSA
- * movement exercises- rating your opinions and feelings concerning different topics (safety at WHS, gay marriage, sexuality) on a scale of 1 to 10

Home/News

Upcoming Events

- * Next meeting: Tuesday 10/25, 3:00 pm in Rm 302B
- * Next board meeting: Tuesday 11/1, 3:00 pm in Rm 302B
- * Human rights rally (with Amnesty International): Sunday 11/13
- * True Colors XIII Conference: Friday 3/24/06 and Saturday 3/25/06
- * Day of Silence: Wednesday 4/26/06

About

Mission Statement: The Gay-Straight Alliance is a community of students dedicated to the promotion of tolerance in Wilton High School. Our mission is to inform members and the student body of issues and events affecting the lives of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and straight ally youth. Throughout the year, we hope to work in coalition with the administration and other WHS clubs to create a safer, more accepting environment in our school.

Meeting Times: every other Tuesday after school, 3:00-4:00

Meeting Place: oom 302B

Joining: All are welcome! YOU DO NOT NEED TO BE GAY TO JOIN. You only need an open mind. Furthermore, it is neither required nor expected of you to disclose your sexual orientation; this is a personal issue and frankly, it doesn't make any difference to us. That's kind of the point.

2005-2006 Plans and Goals:

- * organizing a field trip into New York City for a walking tour of Greenwich Village
- * bringing in speakers to address LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender) issues
- * attending the True Colors Conference in March at Central Connecticut State University
- * honoring the Day of Silence, a national student-run demonstration that protests the silence created by homophobia in our society
- * continuing to educate ourselves and our peers about LGBT issues in our community and the world at large

Board:

Faculty Advisor: Eric Fischman

President: Caroline Morgan

Vice-President: Brynn Shepherd

Secretary: Jihan Chao

Treasurer: Jilyn Chao

Publicity Officer: Peter Kempson

Activities Coordinator/Recruitment: Tana Brown

Links

Outproud.org: website for the national coalition for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered youth with a wide range of resources available for teens and educators
Pflag.org: website for the Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG) organization; offers updated resources for support and education
Angelfire.com/ns/gyl: collection of gay youth-related websites that cover a wide range of interests and issues
Grd.org: excellent site and resources directory for almost anything pertaining to homosexuality
Gsanetwork.org: national GSA website and directory

GLSEN

Out Front Amnesty International
GLAAD Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation
Lesbian and Gay Rights Issues American Civil Liberties Union
ACLU's Lesbian and Gay Rights Project
National Institute for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Education
International Lesbian and Gay Association
Gay and Lesbian Activists Alliance
GLAD Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders
PFLAG Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays

Connecticut Colleges and Universities with Lesbian and Gay Studies Programs and Support Centers
OutSpoken
Connecticut GLBT Organizations

Sexual Identity and Gender Identity Glossary Feminism and Women's Studies
Valuing a Gay or Lesbian Self Identity Kansas State University
The Self Discovery of Being Queer University of New Hampshire
Narratives of women's sexual identity development 1997 AERC Proceedings
Valuing a Gay or Lesbian Self-Identity Kansas State University Counseling
Gender and Sexuality
Sexual Identity University of Cincinnati Psychological Services Center
Sexual Identity / Orientation Creighton University
Sexual Identity University of Missouri-Kansas City

For and About the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgendered Community SUNY Buffalo
What Are Your Beliefs about Gays and Lesbians? SUNY Buffalo
Where do you go from here? SUNY Buffalo

Coming Out University of Illinois
Coming Out Iowa State
Coming Out UCLA LGBT
Coming Out University of Wyoming LGBT
Coming Out Florida State
The in's and out's of coming out University of Missouri-Kansas City
Coming of Age and Coming Out Representations of Gays and Lesbians in Young Adult Literature U Texas
Getting There University of Toronto
Need Help With Coming Out Issues? University of Indiana
Coming Out Resources University of Colorado
Coming Out Resources University of Wisconsin-Stout
Coming Out and Being Out: What You May Need to Think About U North Texas Counseling
Coming Out in College: The Struggle for a Queer Identity University of Southern California Press
Coming Out: Resources and Readings University of Michigan School of Information
What Can You Tell Me about Coming Out? SUNY Albany Counseling
Coming Out SUNY Potsdam
Coming Out Can Reduce Sexual Prejudice UC Davis

Gay/Lesbian Politics and Law: WWW and Internet Resources Indiana University
Homosexuality And Tasmania's Criminal Law
Youth Suicide Problems: Gay/Bisexual Male Focus Pierre Tremblay
Suicide and Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth University of New Hampshire
Discrimination based on sexual orientation -case Lisa Grant vs South West Trains Department of Social Policy and Social Work -

University of Tampere - Finland
Gay & Lesbian National Hotline
Lesbian and Gay Parenting American Psychological Association

Gay and Lesbian Adolescents American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry
Adding Sexual Orientation & Gender Identity to Discrimination & Harassment Policies in School ACLU/GLSEN
Gay and Lesbian Youth Fare Well Psychologically Despite Chronic Stress Connecticut Kidslink

Harvard Gay and Lesbian Caucus
Emory University's Office of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Life
Tasmanian Gay & Lesbian Rights Group
Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Center University of Pennsylvania
inQueery University of Michigan
The Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies City University of New York
Wright State University's Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgendered, Queer, Questioning, and Allied Student Organization

Information Resources for Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Studies UC-Santa Barbara
National and International Gay and Lesbian Organizations and Publications University of Washington Libraries
Women's Studies Section: Lesbian Links Association of College and Research Libraries
Gay and Lesbian Studies: A Research Guide New York Public Library
American Library Association Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered Round Table
Studies on Gay & Lesbian Language: A Partial Bibliography Michigan State University
The Lesbian Legacy Collection USC
James C. Hormel Gay and Lesbian Center San Francisco Public Library
Resources for Parents of GLBT Youth Scott Bidstrup

Lesbian and Gay Historical Society of San Diego
Gay & Lesbian History in the US San Diego State University
People with a History: An Online Guide to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Trans* History Fordham University
1970s Lesbian Feminism Ohio State University
Lesbian History Project USC
Overcoming Heterosexism & Homophobia: International Perspectives One Institute
Queer Theory Explained Warren Hedges, Southern Oregon U English Dept.
The Society for Lesbian and Gay Philosophy University of Illinois-Chicago
Gendys Network

International Gay & Lesbian Review University of Southern California
The Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide

Gay Lesbian Health MedLine, U.S. National Library of Medicine
Gay and Lesbian Aging School of Social Work, University of Minnesota
Gay and Lesbian Aging Webster University

Jesus Metropolitan Community Church Christian
Affirmation United Methodists for LGBT Concerns
A Zen Buddhist Perspective on Same-Gender Marriage Robert Aitken's Written Testimony To the Commission on Sexual Orientation
Presbyterian Church Groups Dealing with Homosexuality Religious Tolerance.org
LGBT Muslims
LGBT Catholics Dignity USA
Everything Jewish and Gay / Lesbian / Bisexual / Transgender USC

Source: <http://www.chemistrycoach.com/lbe6.htm>

Unsafe Schools

Monday, April 18, 2005 - www.pfox.org

Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays

Teenagers' same sex attractions do not automatically mean that they are homosexual. Many teens go through temporary episodes of idealization of same sex peers and should not be urged to prematurely label themselves as gay. Most parents hope to maximize the likelihood of their child growing up to be heterosexual and comfortable in claiming his or her own masculine or feminine nature. Teens themselves have the right to be presented with all options. But instead of presenting all of the facts on sexual orientation in a fair and balanced manner, GLSEN (Gay and Lesbian Student Education Network), GSA (Gay Straight Alliance), PFLAG (Parents, Families and Friends of Gays & Lesbians), and other anti-ex-gay groups encourage confused and impressionable youth to immediately identify as "gay" and thus ensure a future homosexual outcome that may be unnecessary. Indeed, they would deny a student's right to receive information on counseling for unwanted same sex attractions. Is this what our children deserve?

Why PFLAG, GLSEN and GSA do not provide "Safe Schools"

They discriminate against struggling teens by denying a student's right to receive information on treatment for unwanted same sex attractions. Consider this: no effort has been spared to warn teens about the dangers of smoking, which reduces life expectancy by up to 7.3 years – yet the health risk to young men entering homosexuality is greater. Therefore, withholding ex-gay information from at-risk youth does not constitute "safe schools."

They call for censorship of ex-gay materials and discussion in our nation's schools. Instead of presenting all of the facts on sexual orientation in a fair and balanced manner, confused and impressionable youth are encouraged to prematurely label themselves as gay and thus ensure a future homosexual outcome that may be unnecessary.

They recommend books on homosexuality for youth that teach "do what feels right to you" and that self-restraint on sexual choices is foolish. How can this philosophy of "anything goes" and enthusiastic promotion of sexual alternatives then condemn ex-gay alternatives as an option for at-risk youth?

They lack tolerance and inclusion towards the ex-gay community with respect to school events and presentations on sexual orientation. Their opposition to sharing school access with ex-gay representatives and allowing ex-gay resources to be made available to schools demonstrates their own disregard for diversity.

GLSEN's phobia of non-homosexual students and curriculum under the guise of heterosexism.

Source: GLSEN Heterosexism Alert (See below.)

> **Subject: GLSEN SPECIAL HETEROSEXISM ALERT**

> *****

> **Calling all students and school staff! Help GLSEN with a new resource on heterosexism by sharing your thoughts and experiences:**

> **a.. Is using the school bathroom a daily anxiety because neither "boys" nor "girls" match your gender**

identity/expression?

> a.. Do the curriculum guidelines, textbooks and other instructional materials in your school erase your gay identity and history?

> Most people equate anti-LGBT bias with individual acts of harassment or discrimination. Equally as damaging, however, are heterosexist school policies and practices that are not the fault of any one individual or group, but that give privileges and access to certain people.

>

> Rules and rituals that reinforce heterosexuality and a narrow view of what it means to be male or female exist for many reasons-- certainly due to overt prejudice, but also because these systems have long existed and are unseen or taken for granted by many.

>

> The first step toward undoing "institutionalized heterosexism" in schools is naming it and then offering alternatives to traditional practices with which schools have grown too comfortable.

> Toward that end, GLSEN is developing a resource that will explore examples of heterosexism in school practices, and offer concrete strategies for moving toward greater equality.

> Please write to us and share your thoughts on one or more of the following questions:

> 1) What are the forms of "institutionalized heterosexism" that bother you most in your school?

> (This may include prom rituals, athletic traditions, gender-specific bathrooms, school curriculum, celebrations of Valentine's Day or Mothers/Fathers Days, dress codes, course offerings, library holdings, school forms, or anything else that reinforces heterosexuality as the norm).

> 2) What personal experiences or observations have you had with regard to institutionalized heterosexism in your school?

Describe specific rules, practices or incidents that you know of and which illustrate heterosexism.

> 3) What have you or others done to change institutionalized heterosexism?

> Has any particular individual, group or the school leadership taken specific action to change heterosexist practices?

> Please write to GLSEN's Education Director, Scott Hirschfeld with your thoughts and/or questions, and stay tuned for the final resource.

Join us for GLSEN's Sixth Annual TEACHING RESPECT FOR ALL Conference. > How can you make a difference?

> Take action immediately by logging onto the Safe Schools Action Network.

Example of PFLAG "Safe Schools" Initiative

Listed as #4 on "25 Ways PFLAG Makes Schools Safer Every Day" is "Donating books on sexual orientation and gender identity to school libraries." These are a few of the types of books they encourage teens to read:

Young, Gay and Proud!, by Don Romesburg:

In the chapter, "Getting Started":

“There are all sorts of stupid rules, like that. . . guys shouldn’t wear dresses. Girls aren’t supposed to shave their heads. People might say that certain kinds of sex are dirty. . . we all know about all these ‘rules’. . . Many of them are more than just foolish – they can be destructive. . . No one has the right to make anyone else feel bad about their sexuality or their sexual choices. . .”

From the chapter for teenage boys, “Doing It: Gay Men”:

“Learning how to give and receive love through sex is an important part of loving ourselves and becoming more comfortable with our sexuality. It also shows the straight world that we’re not going to live according to their narrow-minded myths about men, women, and sex.. Most of all, just have a good time. Sex should be fun. . .”

Bi Any Other Name: Bisexual People Speak Out, by L. Hutchins and L. Kaahumanu:

From the chapter, “My life as a Lesbian-Identified Bisexual Fag Hag”:

“I got some measure of vicarious, voyeuristic thrills in watching the guys cruise. . . But come 2 a.m. they went off in two’s, or whatever, and I went home. Somehow I was once again not being allowed to play. So I turned dyke. . . In the privacy of my own heart I knew that what I really wanted was to be wild and free, happily nonmonogamous, or even kinky (if I felt like it), like the faggots seemed to do with such ease. . . I was delighted to find that. . . a greater tolerance seems to exist (in the bisexual community) for things like open relationships, multi-person relationships, cross-dressing, group sex, kinkiness, and even for a mixed-up, lesbian-identified fag hag who was finding that she was not mixed up at all, but the people who were laying trips on her were. . .”

From the chapter, “Beyond Bisexual”:

“I started out monogamous. I ended up with two lovers. At present I have many lovers. There are four main ones. One is a woman I have deeply adored for three years. Another is a female-to-male transsexual/hermaphrodite – the perfect playmate for bi-sex! Number three is a gay man . . . I [have] had sex with thousands of people of all races, religions, colors, sexual persuasions, tried most every kink and fetish imaginable, worked in pornography and prostitution . . . do not judge yourself or others. . .”

The PFLAG booklet “Beyond the Bible: Parents, Families and Friends Talk about Religion and Homosexuality,” recommends that religious seekers read *Gay Soul: Finding the Heart of Gay Spirit and Nature*. In it, first-person stories are told of gay men delightfully flouting their vow of celibacy in seminaries; and of sadomasochistic torture being enjoyed by a psychotherapist as a mystical experience.

Throughout these recommended books for teens, the same themes are repeated -- do not judge others for their sexual decisions, sexual alternatives are sacred, and sexual choices are a birthright of everyone, no matter how young. With their enthusiastic promotion of sexual options, why do these same groups actively discourage “gay” youth from considering ex-gay as an alternative?

Court rules Texas school can forbid gay student club from meeting on campus

Federal judge upholds school's policy restricting discussions of sexual activity

http://www.pfox.org/Education_news.asp

© 2004 Student Press Law Center

March 8, 2004

TEXAS — A federal court has ruled that Lubbock Independent School District can restrict students' promotion of sex and sexuality in school-sponsored activities without violating their First Amendment right to free speech.

U.S. District Judge Sam R. Cummings ruled March 3 that the district's "abstinence-only" policy "restricting any discussion of sexual activity and birth control other than abstinence does not violate the First Amendment."

Two Lubbock High School students sued the school district after school officials denied their requests to promote the Lubbock Gay-Straight Alliance in school and to hold meetings on campus. The students sought permission from the school in September 2002 to advertise their organization's off-campus meetings by posting fliers and using the school's public announcement system, as did other student groups, according to court documents. The group's members then asked the school principal and assistant superintendent for permission to meet on campus in December 2002. Both requests were denied.

The court found that the school's actions did not constitute an attempt to silence a particular viewpoint, which the First Amendment would have prohibited. Rather, the court said the school's restrictions were reasonable efforts to enforce its abstinence-only sex discussion policy.

The court was concerned about the organization's Web site — mentioned on its fliers — which included links to Web sites that discussed sex and sexuality.

"This case has nothing to do with a denial of rights to students because of their sexual viewpoint," Cummings wrote in his decision. "It is an assertion of a school's right not to surrender control of the public school system to students and erode a community's standard of what subject matter is considered obscene and inappropriate."

The court cited the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Hazelwood v. Kuhlmeier*, which allows high school administrators to censor some school-sponsored student publications by showing they have a legitimate educational reason for doing so. In his ruling, Cummings quoted *Hazelwood*, saying that "a school need not tolerate student speech that is inconsistent with its basic educational mission, even though the government could not censor similar speech outside of school."

Cummings' ruling suggests administrators at the school could also prohibit school-sponsored newspapers from publishing articles that conflict with the school's abstinence-only policy.

"If kids aren't allowed to discuss the benefits of fact-based sexual education, then the school has censored the people who are in best position to criticize school policy," Brian Chase, the students' lawyer, said of student journalists.

Chase, an attorney from Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, a national gay civil-rights organization, argued that the school district cannot deny the Gay-Straight Alliance the right to meet on campus simply because of the district's abstinence-only policy.

"The judge seemed convinced this club was all about discussing sex, which isn't true," Chase said. "The kids listed many goals, [including discussing] discrimination and bullying, and the judge didn't mention any of those." (This is the lie GSA organizers always tell, that they're just talking about discrimination, etc., when homosex is about SEX.)

Ann Manning, the school district's lawyer, said the district was pleased by the ruling because the court upheld the school's abstinence-only policy. She said the abstinence-only policy does not discriminate against gay students because it applies to all students.

Manning would not discuss how the district's abstinence-only policy affects student journalists.

The students have not decided whether they will appeal the ruling, Chase said.

For More Information: Caudillo v. Lubbock Indep. School District, 5:03-CV-165-C (Northern Dist. Texas, March 3, 2004)

Caudillo v. Lubbock Independent School District, No. 03-165 (N.D.Tex. March 3, 2004)

A federal district court in Texas has ruled that a school district did not violate the First Amendment or the federal Equal Access Act (EAA) when it denied a gay student club's request for access to school fora. Students at Lubbock High School formed a club that became known as the Lubbock Gay Straight Alliance (LGSA).

They requested permission from Lubbock Independent School District (LISD) to pass out club flyers, use the public address system, and meet on campus. Their request stated LGSA's goals, which included educating youth about safe sex. The proposed flyer contained the address for LGSA's Web site, which in turn linked to two other Web sites that provide detailed information on sexual matters. When officials denied the request, the students sued. Addressing their free speech claim first, the district court found that LISD had not engaged in impermissible viewpoint discrimination for two reasons. First, LISD policy forbids discussion of sexual matters and applies to both heterosexual and homosexual viewpoints. Based on *Bethel School District No. 403 v. Fraser*, 478 U.S. 675 (1986), LISD has the authority to exclude sexually explicit, indecent, or lewd speech.

The court concluded that both the discussion of safe sex and the websites linked to LGSA's site are speech of an indecent nature contemplated in *Fraser* and, therefore, that LISD engaged in permissible, viewpoint-neutral exclusion of sexual subject matter. An important factor was that children as young as 12 attend the school.

Second, under *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier*, 484 U.S. 260 (1988), LISD has the authority to ban speech that is "inconsistent with its basic educational mission." LISD exercised that authority when it rejected the LGSA's request, because the group's goal of discussing safe sex is inconsistent with LISD's "abstinence only" policy. Turning to the EAA claim, the court found out that LISD had created a "limited open forum" under EEA, which requires LISD to give LGSA the same access it provides any other noncurricular student club unless one of EEA's exceptions applies. The court concluded that EEA's "maintain order and discipline" exception applied, the court ruled, because LGSA was proposing to discuss illegal activity, i.e., sex by minors. The "well being of the students" exception also applied, because the online material and the group's goals are at odds with the district's compelling interest in protecting students from the harms associated with sexual activity by minors and their exposure to sexual matters.

The Reality of Gay Straight Alliance Clubs

by Elise Graham, Senior, Lone Peak High School, 10/28/2005

What do you think of when you see a rainbow? Pretty Colors? Hope? Your little sister's crayon drawing? This is the symbol adopted by the activist gay movement. This movement is anything but what it is pretending to be: harmless.

Provo High has a new GSA club. These clubs are laid out and encouraged by a part of the gay activist movement called GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, www.glsen.org). Although on the surface this may sound like a step toward inclusiveness and tolerance, it is actually a dangerous and irresponsible move based on political correctness and ignorance. No one seems to be considering that a gay club is saying to every student in the district that homosexual, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender lifestyles are acceptable, healthy, normal, and ought to be supported and encouraged.

People who want to start a gay club in their high school say it will be all about coming together because of a common interest to talk about diversity and political issues. But the teachers, administrators, and parents need to know that GSA is a youth recruitment strategy carefully laid out by gay activist groups who carefully avoid addressing the health issues involved. Parents, teachers, and students need to know about the dangers. There is no excuse for ignorance. The mainstream media won't report it, but the Internet is packed with the truth about the radical gay political agenda and lifestyle. In order to get what they want, they are targeting kids.

Putting aside politics, traditional moral values and religious beliefs, we must address the health dangers in encouraging this lifestyle. Has everyone forgotten about HIV and AIDS? These are fatal diseases spread primarily by the gay community and there are also many chronic health problems associated exclusively with homosexual behavior.

(www.corporatecouncil.org/white_papers.html, "The Health Risks of Gay Sex")

People cite the federal Equal Access Act as the reason a gay club must be allowed. According to Linda Harvey (www.missionamerica.com/agenda.php?articlenum=7) there are many good arguments for keeping them out apart from the EAA. Utah state law states that schools are not allowed to endorse and promote homosexuality. Utah Code also says schools can deny clubs that pose any danger to students in order "to protect the physical, emotional, psychological, or moral well being of students and faculty (Utah code 53A-3-419 Limitations Regarding Access for Student Clubs and Organizations.)" I think it's interesting that a few years ago, my sister who was a model student, tried to start a badminton club, which was rejected because it was "too dangerous." So, administrators are worried about students being nicked by flimsy rackets and birdies and not worried about promoting high risk sexual behavior, or for that matter, any kind of sexual behavior for minors (also against state law)? Why not create a pro-anorexia club? Or a tattoo club? Or a make-out club? They all have a common interest, and feel misunderstood by the general public as well.

Teenagers are impressionable at this state in life. They are sponges, soaking in everything, whether it is implied or blatant. School clubs can have an effect on a student's whole life. Another of my sisters started the Culinary Club at LPHS, and is now a certified pastry chef working at a fancy bakery in Maryland. The mere existence of a gay club says to all students that deviant sexual lifestyles are healthy and acceptable and protected by authority.

One of the arguments for starting a GSA is to deal with and stop discrimination. The fact is many different groups of people experience bullying in school. Why not just teach everyone to treat each other with respect? Even gay scientists admit that science has not proven people are naturally gay. In school, people shouldn't be allowed to label themselves or other people according to a self-determined "sexuality." If kids have problems with abnormal sexual feelings, counselors should refer them to their parents and specialized psychotherapists if only on the basis that the gay lifestyle is harmful. Many people are able to overcome homosexual feelings if they want to. I personally know someone who did. He says that if there had been a gay club back when he was in high school it would have made a huge negative impact on him even if he didn't join it.

I think allowing a gay club in high schools is potentially harmful to everyone in the school. My grandpa who is a lawyer calls it child endangerment and contributing to the delinquency of minors, both of which are illegal. I have heard that school districts are worried about being sued by the ACLU if they don't allow a gay club. But maybe the schools should be more worried about being sued by students who come back to haunt them with responsibility for their addictions, health problems, and deadly diseases. For a huge amount of scientific information about homosexuality and its dangers, visit www.narth.com.

Rainbows are harmless. Homosexuality is not.

Testimony in opposition to HB 345, "An Act concerning Education -Prevention of Harassment and Intimidation in Public Schools."

<http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=TS03C1>

Family Research Council: Defending Family, Faith and Freedom, November 5, 2005

by: Peter Sprigg, Testimony given on February 19, 2003.

I (Peter Sprigg) am here to speak in opposition to HB 345, "An Act concerning Education--Prevention of Harassment and Intimidation in Public Schools."

Pro-homosexual activists contend that our schools have large numbers of students who are (or are perceived by their peers to be) gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered, (often referred to as "GLBT" or "LGBT" for short) and that such students are frequent victims of verbal or physical harassment or even acts of violence. The Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), for example, reports that 83% of the "GLBT" youth they surveyed reported at least verbal harassment because of their sexual orientation. They also point to reports that gay youths are more likely to commit suicide than their straight peers, and claim that this is a result of harassment and discrimination as well. They argue, therefore, that victims of harassment or violence targeted for their real or perceived "sexual orientation" should be singled out for specific protection under school disciplinary codes.

Yet there is evidence that harassment of gay teens may neither be as frequent, as severe, nor as disproportionate, as some pro-homosexual rhetoric would suggest. GLSEN fails to note, for example, that a survey by the American Association of University Women (AAUW) showed that 83% of all girls and 79% of all boys report experiencing physical intimidation or sexual harassment at school.[i] Of the "gay" teens surveyed by GLSEN, less than half--40% of the total--said that "verbal harassment" occurs "frequently" or "often." [ii] But the majority of gay teens (58%), according to the GLSEN survey, reported no incidents of "physical harassment" in the past year (only 15% claimed to have experienced this "frequently" or "often") [iii], and nearly four-fifths (79%) had not experienced a single incident of "physical assault" (less than 7% "frequently" or "often"). [iv]

Reports of gay teen suicides also appear to have been exaggerated. A recent study by a pro-gay researcher found, "Gay and lesbian teenagers are only slightly more likely than heterosexual kids to attempt suicide," according to USA Today. [v] And the author of *Suicide in America*, Dr. Herbert Hendin, reportedly "found no evidence that social discrimination was a major factor behind the suicide attempts of the homosexual students he studied." [vi]

Pro-family groups such as the Family Research Council agree wholeheartedly that no student should ever be the victim of unprovoked violence--for their sexual orientation, or for any other reason. We also agree that no student should be subjected to taunting or the use of vulgar epithets--again, whether for their sexual orientation or for any other reason. We believe that such behavior--regardless of its motivation--should be prohibited by school disciplinary codes, and that those codes should be strictly enforced.

However, singling out "sexual orientation" for special protection cannot be justified on logical grounds, and it could have consequences not clear at first glance. Lumping "sexual orientation" together with "race, color, national origin, sex, and disability" for special protection is illogical because the latter qualities are inborn (except for some disabilities), involuntary, immutable, and innocuous--none of which is true of homosexuality, despite the claims of its advocates. Evidence that homosexuality is inborn (that is, unalterably determined by genetics or biology) is ephemeral at best; [vii] while same-sex attractions may come unbidden, homosexual behavior and adoption of a "gay" identity are clearly voluntary; [viii] the existence of numerous "former homosexuals" proves that homosexuality is changeable; and the numerous pathologies associated with homosexuality demonstrate how harmful it is. [ix]

If all forms of harassment are wrong, then all forms of harassment--without distinction--should be banned. In fact, singling out "sexual orientation," and including it with traditional categories like race and sex, serves not a "safety" function but a political one. When harassment based on sexual orientation is explicitly banned, schools staff and students are inevitably trained that the reason that such harassment is wrong is not because all harassment is wrong or because all people should be treated with respect, but because "there is nothing wrong with being gay or lesbian." Such an assertion is not only offensive to the moral standards of most Americans and to the historical teachings of most major religions, but it flies in the face of hard scientific data showing the high rates of promiscuity, physical disease, mental illness, substance abuse, child sexual abuse, and domestic violence that result from homosexual behavior.

As for the specifics of HB 345, I am particularly concerned about the broad definitions used in the bill. The bill defines "harassment and intimidation" as any "gesture or a written, verbal, or physical act . . . motivated by an actual or perceived characteristic." Yet the Concise Oxford Dictionary is far more detailed in specifying the intention of the act, defining "harass" as "trouble and annoy continually or repeatedly" or "make repeated attacks on (an enemy or opponent)," and defining "intimidate" as "frighten or overawe, especially to subdue or influence." Without such specific qualifications that the behavior must be repeated or intended to frighten, the possibility arises that a student who peacefully and respectfully expresses to a classmate his or her personal religious conviction that homosexual behavior is immoral could be considered guilty of harassment or intimidation. Lest you think this is an extreme example, I would direct your attention to our neighbors to the north in Canada, where just two months ago a court fined a newspaper for publishing an ad that quoted Bible verses regarding homosexuality.

I urge you to oppose HB 345.

END NOTES

[i] Hostile Hallways: Bullying, Teasing, and Sexual Harassment in School (Washington:American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, 2001); see online at <http://www.aauw.org/2000/hostile.html>

[ii] Kosciw and Cullen, The GLSEN 2001 National School Climate Survey, op. cit., p. 13, Figure 25.

[iii] Ibid., Figure 26, p. 14.

[iv] Ibid., Figure 27, p. 15

[v] Marilyn Elias, "Gay teens less suicidal than thought, report says," USA Today, November 26, 2001.

[vi] Cited in: National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality, Homosexual Advocacy Groups and Your School (Encino, CA:NARTH, January 2002), p. 3.

[vii]Yvette C. Schneider, "The Gay Gene: Going, Going . . . Gone," Insight (Washington, DC:Family Research Council), April 20, 2000.

[viii]Failing to distinguish the distinct elements of attraction, which is a psychological factor; sex acts, which are a behavioral factor; and a gay identity, which is a cultural factor; constitutes one of the major problems with the term "sexual orientation" itself.

[ix] Timothy J. Dailey, "The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality," Insight (Washington, DC:Family Research Council), 6 March 2001.

What "Gay" Clubs Will Bring to Your School - and Sample Letter for Schools to send to Parents

By Linda P. Harvey

<http://www.missionamerica.com/agenda.php?articlenum=6>

Clubs dealing with homosexuality are being considered in high schools, middle schools and soon (if "gay" activists have achieve their goals) in elementary schools in the U.S. Their advocates claim that these clubs are about "tolerance" and creating an accepting climate for students who are otherwise outcasts. And-this claim is made over and over- sex is NOT discussed at meetings. All the students want is acceptance and a "safe" place to go.

Is this claim true? And even if it is, would discussion of homosexual tolerance alone be a good thing? To be fair, some of the club meetings we've read about do seem to conduct business in a relatively mild tone. The students talk about teen concerns, have social "ice-breaker" games, and incorporate the perennial teen favorite---food. However, one still has to remember the bottom line reason these students are meeting-to defend their right to have homosexual sex, and to reinforce misinformation and bias against heterosexuality, traditional marriage and certain religions.

And sometimes the activities of the club are not so harmless. Here are some of the documented activities of these clubs, often called "gay/straight alliances" (GSA's), that should be of grave concern to parents and school officials.

1. A "gay" club will demand that the school hold pro-homosexual events. Many clubs have been the sponsors of "Coming Out" day in October, when students (and teachers) are celebrated for the "courage" to openly declare their homosexuality. Clubs have also been the catalyst for diversity events dwelling mostly on homosexuality and the massive April "Day of Silence" event. One Massachusetts "gay" club was given a rainbow flag symbolizing homosexual rights at a youth rally, and then persuaded the principal to fly it at their school just below the U.S. flag. Many complaints were received from both parents and veterans.¹

2. Hostility and discrimination against those who don't endorse homosexuality will be heightened. A "gay" club in North Andover, Massachusetts sponsored a school forum on "homophobia". They also sent around a school survey which 154 students filled out. One of the questions asked how the person would react if asked out on a date by a person of the same sex. The goal of these students was to change any negative perception of such a social interaction. 2 Other clubs have spoken at teacher "diversity training" meetings, and many "gay" club members have appeared before school board meetings to present their requests. The GSA Network in California recently urged through its newsletter that "gay" club members attend a conference called "Expression, Not Suppression" in Fresno. One of the workshop titles for the day was "The Bible: Weapon of Love or Weapon of Hate?"³

3. Misinformation will be disseminated by the "gay" club to all students. One club in Florida-in a middle school-handed out flyers throughout the school promoting "gay" history month. The idea was that of their adviser, an eighth grade teacher, and was brought to a halt by the administration.⁴ This strategy is the invention of several activist organizations, and would teach children that major historical figures like Abraham Lincoln, George Frederic Handel (composer of The Messiah) and even the Apostle Paul were probably homosexuals.⁵

4. Sexual themes will be a substantial focus of the club and will encourage dangerous experimentation by students. A controversial one-day event held at Tufts University in March 2000 described in detail high-risk homosexual practices like "fisting" to students as young as 14. The attendance was drawn substantially from members of gay-straight alliances in the surrounding communities. GLSEN was a co-sponsor of this event.⁶ Despite widespread publicity and negative reaction, Tufts again hosted the event in 2001, 1002 and 2003.

In 2002, members of a middle school "gay" club at Murphy Junior High in Stony Brook, NY attended a special presentation by the author of a novel called Rainbow Boys. This book describes teen boys engaged in high-risk heterosexual and homosexual sex. In one episode, a 17 year old has anal sex with a 29 year old man he meets on the Internet. Concerns of parents in the community who objected to this middle school club have been brushed aside. 7

The GSA Network reports on activities and announcements of "gay" clubs all over California. Movie nights are a frequent activity. One recent issue reported a movie night organized by a community "gay" group (to which school club members were invited) and the movie for this particular night was comedienne Margaret Cho's "I'm the One I Want, " described by one reviewer as containing, among other raunchy material, a gross discussion of female genitalia and douching and how to perform oral sex on males. 8

Another popular movie, "Jeffrey," was one of the features of "Q[for Queer] Movie Night" of the Hellgate High School gay straight alliance in Missoula, Montana last year. "Jeffrey" is a sexually explicit homosexual film featuring the exploits of a promiscuous "gay" man.9

A recent young women's event held at the Bay area community homosexual organization, LYRIC, was publicized by the GSA Network for its "gay" club members. It was "Make Your Own Sex Toy Night" held on March 27, 2003. These are the kinds of positive opportunities that students involved in GSA's can benefit from. "Let your imagination go wild and create a sex toy you can be proud of!" girls were told.10

5. "Gay" club members and networks have outside allies with their own agendas, including filing lawsuits against the school district. Students are trained as activists by their liaisons with the "gay" community and activist groups outside the school, and they go to the media, the school board, and their legal allies if they don't get their way. At Escambia High School in Pensacola, FL, a student trying to form a gay club defied his prospective club advisor and went to the media after being told not to do so.11 In Westerly, RI, a student reporter contacted the media on his own after the principal decided to pull a story from the student paper highlighting homosexual students. The decision was made to protect the privacy rights of underage students. As a result, the principal and superintendent had to defend its decision in the newspapers.12

Outside speakers from adult "gay" organizations like PFLAG and GLSEN frequently appear in schools to talk with club members. Students are frequently told that, if they need legal help, it is available to them

The GSA Network in California sued one school district on behalf of a student who claimed to have been harassed without proper school intervention. As a result of the suit between George Loomis and Visalia Unified School District, the school paid a six-figure settlement and now must hold mandatory diversity sessions, some run by the "gay" club members themselves. One newspaper interviewed the executive director of the GSA Network, Carolyn Laub, and described the situation as follows:

"Many districts in the Bay Area have long had anti-harassment policies and tolerance training. The Visalia training is different, Laub said, in that it includes annual updates by professional consultants peer-to-peer sessions led by GSA Network students. "13

Notes:

1. Mahar Regional High School in Orange Massachusetts. From the P.E.R.S.O.N.P.R.O.J.E.C.T. updates, from Mary Detloff to person@youth.org , from June 10, 1996, www.youth.org/PERSONPROJECT/
2. Boston Globe, May 18, 1997
3. GSA Network News and Announcements, February 26, 2003
4. 365gay.com Newscenter in Miami, October 15, 2001.
5. See www.gayheroes.com
6. Affidavit sent by Scott Whiteman to Martha Coakley, Middlesex District Attorney's Office in Cambridge,

MA dated April 18, 2000, describing the material covered in the March 25, 2000 GLSEN workshop which he attended.

7. From interview by author with mother of a student at Murphy Junior High.

8. GSA Network News and Announcements, November 16, 2001. www.gsanetwork.org.

9. www.gsaglobal.net/hellgate/index.1.html and www.imusic.artistsdirect.com/soundtracks/Jeffrey.html

10. GSA Network News and Announcements, February 26, 2003.

11. Pensacola News Journal, December 15, 2001.

12. Westerly Sun, March 14, 2003.

13. San Francisco Chronicle, August 14, 2002.

Sample letter to parents in your school district--for schools that don't choose to fight a potential lawsuit over a GSA:

Dear (School district name) parent:

It is our responsibility as a school district to do whatever we can to provide a valuable and safe learning environment for our students. In doing so, the schools do not knowingly endorse or provide a forum for behavior that could pose a high risk for students.

Nevertheless, a group of students has approached the administration and requested that an after-school club be formed where homosexuality, bisexuality and alternative gender identities be the subject matter.

We believe that this club may pose a risk for students, and we want to advise you accordingly. Since such a club would be open to all students in the school, and would essentially advocate behaviors that most parents would not approve of, we felt that you might want to know. The students maintain that they will only be discussing ideas and philosophies, not behaviors. Our research into similar clubs in other districts does not support the claim that the activities would be thus restricted. If you would like more information outlining the risks we feel are posed by such a club, we'd be happy to send you a paper outlining health risks for students. Please call _____ at _____ for a copy.

As a district, our funds are limited, particularly our funds for legal defense. It has come to our attention that the ACLU and another group, Lambda Legal Defense Fund, have used their considerable legal clout and financial resources to sue school districts in several parts of the country to force such clubs to be formed. They say that such clubs are necessary to support students who they believe will inevitably be homosexual or bisexual. We don't believe these claims are supported entirely by facts. But at this time, we do not have the resources or staff to fight this. It is our hope that you will understand.

(Optional paragraph for districts that have a non-discrimination policy based on sexual orientation) Our district does include a non-discrimination clause that includes the category 'sexual orientation'. However, we have been advised that health risks and discrimination are totally separate issues.

This communication should not be construed as anything but the result of an unfortunate set of circumstances. We believe the students in question are gravely mistaken at such a young age, and it is our hope that time and sense will prevail in their lives, and we have communicated this to them and to their parents. We wish them nothing but the best, and we will do everything in our district's power to support them as students now and in the future. Any deviation from that position by any staff or student will be punished in accordance with our existing student conduct code, (insert citation of school code).

Our advice is that you convey the tone of this letter to your child, and that you advise them of the time-honored expected standard of civility to all, regardless of whether we agree with their views or not.

Yours sincerely,

(school official's name)

[Note: The above suggested letter is not intended as a substitute for the legal advice of your own counsel.]

Homosexual Clubs: The Rest of the Story

By Linda P. Harvey

<http://www.missionamerica.com/agenda.php?articlenum=35>

Let's say you're a high school principal in Anytown, USA, and some students have come to you asking to form a "gay" club. Since roughly 3,000 such clubs have been formed in the past decade in American high schools (and a few middle schools), it's certainly not revolutionary, they tell you. You start to think, yes, this might be a workable idea. After all, these are students who are more prone to being discriminated against, and this would raise their self-esteem.

But wait. This administrator needs to slow way down, and think. We are talking here about homosexuality---not the debate team. Most or all the students who want to form this group have homosexual desires and are willing to participate in the behaviors involved in homosexuality, behaviors commonly associated with serious diseases like AIDS. In fact, in the weirdest of ironies, there is a high probability that currently at Anytown High, there is money being spent to fund a health education program warning about the dangers of HIV, and its associated high-risk behaviors. And now the school may sponsor a club that will imply those behaviors acceptable?

Those at highest risk of HIV are males who participate in, well, anal sex, to be blunt. It's a practice engaged in by roughly three-fourths of homosexual males.

So how in the world can any high school justify a club that considers homosexual behavior a respectable option? That brings homosexually-inclined teens together, as well as older advisors, for social activities? That allows teens to reinforce one another in their inclinations---inclinations that may result in early death? And imply to all the other school's students that it's an acceptable option? Why aren't more school administrators seeing the hypocrisy-no, lunacy --of indulging these groups?

A smoking club or maybe and anorexia would make more sense.

But the issue goes way beyond health. In today's climate, a school not only encourages risky, unhealthy behavior by allowing a homosexuality club, but also fosters a climate of tension and division. This is because of what homosexual clubs-or "gay/straight alliances," as they are often called-will spend their time exploring. Here's what goes on in such groups, and some of the ramifications:

* Misinformation about homosexuality will be learned. Uniformly supportive, it will reinforce the homosexual desires of vulnerable teens, without any authentic exploration of what has prompted these desires. Genetic origins will be firmly claimed without a scintilla of supporting scientific evidence (since there is none). This dangerous brainwashing of at-risk teens-some of whom are there simply as "questioners"-- is to have the aegis of school support. Liability issues are just lurking to be discovered.

* Their "rights" to "be who they are"---i.e., to participate in homosexual behavior-will be constantly reinforced. These "rights" will increasingly be defined as they want, until adults put on the brakes. Short of that, what happens in the school environment to the rights to others to practice freedom of religion and freedom of speech (not including, of course, genuine harassment or threats)? What about privacy rights-like, the right of straight students not to be openly ogled in the shower after gym class?

* The group will dwell on what they believe constitutes harassment or discrimination by other students or teachers. Yes, there is unkind name-calling and even worse in high schools, but schools already have policies to deal with real problems. What these students will do through a club is to seek ways to manipulate the problem of unkindness, into a solution that affirms homosexuality. So, having sealed their decisions to "be who they are," and being immature adolescents anyway, this group's interpretation of harassment can range from extreme

sensitivity about natural and commonplace disapproval of homosexuality by other teens, to rage when a "straight" teen swiftly and angrily rejects homosexual advances. And, depending on the limits set by the school, what this groups feels is harassment may be the standard adopted.

* Activist training will have a fertile field. Regional conferences will be attended by the club members and adult advisors. A slight can become a potential lawsuit, because these teens, and often their sympathetic parents, will know about the resources at their disposal through ACLU, Lambda Legal Defense Fund, GLSEN, and other national, well-funded groups. Suspicion and a victim mentality are developed in already emotionally-challenged teens, and an explosive and costly situation will be in the making.

* Traditional religions that disapprove of homosexuality will be regularly and soundly trashed. The intolerance coming out of the adult pro-homosexual lobby is implanted here, and a mindset of animosity is created. "Gay" clubs, by perpetuating myths, help to fuel division, not eliminate it. These kids are told that "homophobia" must be "eliminated." Eliminated? These kids will be taught that, way beyond actual violence, they have the moral right to silence ordinary disapproval and to become incensed at anyone's distaste for the lifestyle. Think of the many people who have well-founded objections to homosexuality. Is such a club's attack-dog hostility something anyone wants unleashed in their school?

* Homosexual clubs will embrace the idea that cross-dressing or even sex change surgery are defensible activities for teens. Transgendered rights are going to include--get ready, school boards--the right to define one's own gender; to use whichever bathroom or shower one wants; or attend whichever gym class or be on whatever sports team one wishes. To not see reality as these individuals see it will be, again, "discrimination."

ready, school boards-the right to define one's own gender; to use whichever bathroom or shower one wants; or attend whichever gym class or be on whatever sports team one wishes. To not see reality as these individuals see it will be, again, "discrimination."

* Social activities will be planned for homosexual teens--and their adult advisors. So their defense will be that the prom is a dating activity for heterosexuals--why not something for homosexuals? But homosexuality is high risk. Vastly higher percentages of kids die early from the practices associated with it. Fifty percent of all newly-reported HIV infections are found in people under 25.¹ If the school or your state has an abstinence education policy, all the more ammunition. How can a school sanction both simultaneously? Take a look at just a few of the recommended reading selections by pro-homosexual groups P-FLAG or GLSEN -often filled with graphic sex between teens-- and it will be easy to prove how abstinence is hardly being encouraged or promoted.

But This is "Who We Are!"

Throughout the debate will rage a continual cry---that this is an identity issue, not a sexual practices issue. When that claim is raised, tell them you will seriously consider their claim if they can bring you even one article that shows conclusive evidence for a biological origin for homosexuality. Ask for the location of the nearest genetic testing site for homosexuality. We are not being flip-- just trying to show the quicksand of a pro-homosexual defense. If you stand your ground, you will find that they will not be able to produce such evidence. If an honest debate can be the result, some eyes and minds may be opened in the process.

Without that underlying claim, "discrimination" on the basis of "sexual orientation" falls apart as public policy, at the national, state and school board level. It really comes down to just allowing certain sexual practices, or not. Like sodomy laws. This is why they were in place to begin with, because historic evidence has shown that homosexuals are not different humans. They are heterosexually constructed like everyone else. Societies had decided to discourage homosexual behavior, and we need to do so again, while at the same time trying to help those struggling.

Homosexual desire violates something foundational in humans, and the truth about its origins is something that these kids really need and deserve to hear.

Common Rationale for "Gay" Clubs

When students present a club proposal, they usually have support and advice from an adult organization. Check out the Lambda Legal Defense Fund's web site at www.lambdalegal.org and you'll find all their best arguments for "gay" clubs. These arguments are, however, founded on myths, misinformation and/or the desire for political clout.

We aren't going to address all of the misleading claims here, but here are a few points to consider.

Some of the most frequently-cited reasons given for forming a "gay" club are that homosexual teens are at higher risk of suicide; have higher levels of depression; have more trouble in school, greater problems with drug and alcohol, and so on. These are generally troubled kids. But even though our hearts are saddened by the plight of such students, we must look with skepticism if the proposed solution is that these kids receive more social support for their homosexual behavior. It may be claimed that it is society's homophobia that causes all their problems.

This is where we need to object. Homosexuals have some behavior patterns that show every indication of emotional problems. The more vulnerable students with chaotic backgrounds are those most likely to be attracted to the behavior, sadly.

The presumption of homophobia as the underlying issue needs to be challenged, because it takes one down a road that has no end to demands. It's also demonstrably untrue and prevents kids from getting real help to understand their self-destructive feelings. When teens have homosexual desire, it is a symptom, not an identity. The desire stems from emotional issues, and these same factors may also be responsible for these students' frequent history of school problems, the substance abuse, depression, and so on. If these issues remain unresolved and the teen enters the lifestyle, the pattern of high risk behavior continues. Only this explanation accounts for:

- * The anonymous sexual encounters characteristic of homosexuals, the high-risk sex practices, the numerous partners, and the substances needed to cope with it all;
- * The suicidal tendencies that don't diminish in communities of acceptance, nor with age and "well-adjustment" within the homosexual community;
- * The millions of dollars spent on pointless education about condoms and safe sex don't seem to change the behaviors of most homosexuals;
- * High rates of domestic violence characteristic of homosexual live-in relationships.

Drawing kids into a homosexual club, for all these reasons, is the last thing these teens need. They need family and individual counseling, and they need to be told in no uncertain terms the course they are on if they don't reject the idea that they are "gay". No one is born homosexual. These desires are created---not inborn.

There is hope, because many people have overcome homosexual desire. For much more information on this, as well as the stories of young people who are ex-homosexuals, see the Exodus Youth web site at www.exodusyouth.net.

Standing Firm

The wise high school principal is one who will know that a "gay" club involves health decisions, as well as decisions about competing rights. Ultimately, it is a moral decision. A stand will have to be taken. A "gay" club is not a position of neutrality, but a slap in the face to health, to morality and really, to the kids.

Affirming homosexuality, in a club or elsewhere, will result in the rapid demoralization of the school, and a possible increase in experimental homosexual behavior by students. The most educationally-supportive parents will flee with their families. Few responsible parents want their kids to be subjected to increasingly empowered "gay" students in the classroom, the gym, or in a dark hallway. Remaining will be left-wing ideologues willing to subject their children to social experiments, and parents who are indifferent, to school levies as well as other involvement. Neither makes for a stable yet growing school system.

Notes:

1. HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report, Centers for Disease Control, June 1998, 10 (1).

Resources on Homosexuality

Causes / "Gene" Question

Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth, Jeffrey Satinover, MD, Baker Books, 1996.

My Genes Made Me Do It, Neil & Briar Whitehead, Huntington House, 1999.

Web sites: www.narth.com

www.leaderu.com

Lifestyle/Medical Risks

Straight & Narrow? Compassion & Clarity in the Homosexuality Debate, Thomas E. Schmidt, InterVarsity Press, 1995.

Legislating Morality: The Homosexual Movement Comes Out of the Closet, George Grant, Mark A. Horne, Moody Press/Legacy Communications, 1993.

Web sites: www.cwfa.org

www.frc.org

Change

Web Sites: www.exodus.to

www.stonewallrevisited.com

www.leaderu.com

www.narth.com

Schools / Public Policy

Web sites: www.missionamerica.com

www.cwfa.org

www.frc.org

www.afa.net

Truth At School--Dealing with Gay issues at our schools

<http://www.missionamerica.com/>

Are You Worried about Your Children or Grandchildren?

You aren't alone. Most adults today are concerned, even alarmed about the moral depravity of the youth culture. It's becoming more and more difficult to raise children to become adults who have character, when the world all around them beckons toward a dark abyss of self-indulgence and addiction.

And what role do the schools play? This web site is for people who want to do something about the nonsense. First of all, we need to get it out of our own lives.

We all need to make choices that are wise and that are based on timeless truths. We need to make a choice for truth in our own lives.

You can do something. You can:

1. Talk to your family, friends and neighbors with facts
2. Talk to the school board, the superintendent, the principal, the teachers
3. Consult with your pastor and youth group leaders about their programs for teenagers
4. Write letters to the editors of your papers
5. Exercise your right to vote and choose candidates who support life, morality and families.

How We Got Here

Revolutions don't happen overnight. Homosexuality is being widely accepted in schools now by administrators, school boards and some parents and students because of diligent, aggressive people who believe it's okay. Some work for large, well-financed national "gay" activist groups; others are local volunteers. Some are practicing homosexuals who are educators; others are their relatives or sympathizers.

Regardless, this process has happened because traditional-minded parents and communities weren't watching closely enough, and many thought supporting homosexuality was part of being kind, compassionate and tolerant. Most people never thought it would get this far.

But it has gotten very far. When the facts are laid before average Americans, most are incredulous. It's gone way beyond being civil and nice to people who are "different," as the activists claim. It's at the point where school lessons portraying typical married parents with children are considered discriminatory in some communities. It's at the point of defending the "rights" of students and teachers to be transvestites (cross-dressers). Entire school days or weeks are devoted in some schools to "celebrating" homosexuality-and all students must participate.

It's at the point where traditional-minded parents and students can seldom voice objections. Why are people being silenced?

All of this has happened, astonishingly, in the absence of credible research that shows homosexuality is inherited or biologically-determined. Amazingly, the "born that way" idea is now a widely held belief of many Americans. And while there have been some well-publicized studies, the scientific community has not accepted them as demonstrating a "gene." The emptiness of this claim has gotten little publicity. (See Resources for more details.) Yet, the belief that "sexual orientation" is an identity or a basic right rests on this claim.

Non-discrimination policies and laws are built on this erroneous assumption!

A little known fact is that most homosexual activist organizations in their own materials do not say that homosexuals are born that way. For an example, go to the PFLAG web site, www.pflag.org, and look at their Q & A section.

The roots of same sex attraction have been under study for decades. Emotional disorders, previous sexual abuse and reckless experimentation are in play here, not genetics. Young people struggling with this desire or who are experimenting with homosexuality deserve to know that change is possible.

Should communities support high-risk practices for our children, especially when they are unnecessary? The behaviors involved are dangerous. Accepting these attractions is not kind nor ‘safe,’ but just the opposite.

Do You Know About The Hidden Agenda?

Behind the incessant discussions about homosexuality at school is a purpose that reaches beyond tolerance. The real goal is forced enthusiastic acceptance of homosexual acts and frankly, of the elimination of all distinctions between the genders. This includes acceptance of cross-dressing and cross-gender identification among students and teachers (“transgender” people).

Material from the influential school activist group, GLSEN (the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network) defines “hate,” “homophobia” and “discrimination” as including even simple statements expressing personal disapproval of homosexuality for moral or religious reasons. As schools pass non-discrimination policies covering “sexual orientation,” these policies are being used to silence the voices of people who believe homosexuality is wrong. Unjust stereotyping and references linking traditional views with “hatred” and even with violent acts are now a normal part of public school teaching in multi-culturalism and “anti-bias” lessons. In such an environment, children quickly learn to self-censor to remain silent if they have been taught something different at home. Over time, this silence will change to acceptance, and the enemy will become the parents, grandparents and churches that don’t support the brainwashing and propaganda. There will remain no obstacle to young teenagers’ total acceptance of, and in some cases, experimentation with morally and physically dangerous practices.

What is aiding this agenda to take firm root in the schools and in the minds of our children? The silence of adults. We can bring a halt to this nonsense and reverse the trend, or we can remain silent and the values of our children--and of society itself--will be deeply and tragically altered.

Parents...Are You Getting Involved?

The atmosphere of hostility toward traditional values can be intimidating, but we must speak out! It’s not enough to grumble about these crazy ideas with our neighbors who agree with us. We must be willing to put ourselves publicly on the line in this battle. That means making phone calls to the school board president, to the superintendent, to the principal, to teachers and to the editors of the paper. Even better, put it in writing! The more people who do this, the more the agenda will slow down or eventually stop. Why? Because most people believe as you do, and are just looking for others to support them in taking a stand for morality. Do not be intimidated into what the activists want you to believe--that you are “hateful” if you oppose these plans. In reality, we are hateful if we do not, because of the vulnerable children and teens who are being put at risk.

Red Flags to Watch For: Tactics Being Used to Promote Homosexuality at School ...and Silence Objections

Ready to do a little research? Here's how to find out how much groundwork has been laid in your school system to facilitate acceptance of homosexuality-and, more frighteningly, to silence students, teachers, parents or voters who object.

Find out how many of the following activities and policies are being implemented in your school system:

1. A non-discrimination policy on "sexual orientation" for teachers and students.

It's usually part of a bigger policy saying, "We do not discriminate based on race, religion, etc." This policy will be used to label anything the activists don't like-including too much emphasis on traditional families and heterosexuality-as "discrimination."

2. An "anti-harassment" or "safe schools" program specifically on "sexual orientation."

Claims to protect students from violence, but why dwell just on homosexuality? Conduct codes already exist.

The real goal is to associate all objections with "hate" and "violence," thus intimidating those who disagree into silence.

3. A homosexual club for students.

Students are trained to be activists who will talk to school boards, the media, etc. Meetings focus on rejection of traditional values, particularly religious beliefs that don't accept homosexuality. "Straight" supporters may also attend and are encouraged to explore alternate sexuality. Students with same sex attractions will be supported if they begin this behavior.

4. Diversity or tolerance lessons to stop "homophobia."

Such lessons equate acceptance of homosexuality with religious/racial tolerance. Many such programs are now in elementary schools. In reality, they portray traditional values (and thus, parents and communities holding them) as "hateful." Note: federal money supports these lessons! Through the "Safe and Drug Free Schools" section of federal education law, organizations can receive funds for developing and distributing so-called "tolerance" lessons These materials classify objections to homosexuality as "bigotry" just like racial prejudice. Many of these programs are blatantly anti-Christian, and oppose traditional values. (See Resources for more details.)

5. Pro-homosexual literature in libraries, & language and social studies classes.

The number of novels and storybooks has exploded in response to the demand created in schools; it would be impossible to list all the books being used. Most are "coming out" stories, or tales about children with homosexual parents. Middle and high school books are often very sexually explicit.

6. Special events: days of "diversity," "pride" days, days of silence.

Organized by a handful of students and teachers, the whole school will be intimidated into going along. This tactic will soon move down into the elementary schools.

7. Diversity and "sensitivity" training for teachers.

This is done behind the scenes to make teachers support the agenda. Usually, no exceptions are available for teachers who have personal beliefs that differ.

8. AIDS speakers, "safe sex" education classes.

This was the first avenue into the schools. Validity of alternate "families" and sexual practices is often a basic assumption..

9. Hiring a staff “support” person for homosexual students

- who then becomes an internal monitor for the homosexual cause, and may even keep track of “hate speech” incidents.

10. Openly homosexual teachers and staff.

These are then role models, in-house activists, and possible confidants for students who want to start homosexual behavior. Student molestation becomes a real risk.

11. Liaison with community homosexual youth groups.

Ostensibly to “support” youth with same sex attractions, these groups welcome even 12 or 13 year olds, and parental notification is not required. Students socialize with older practicing homosexuals. Many schools refer students to these groups!

12. “Safe” zones throughout the school.

Usually symbolized by an inverted pink triangle, these are classes or counselors’ offices “safe” to discuss homosexuality, where no disapproval will be given. Sadly it’s those who facilitate this unsafe lifestyle, not those who disapprove, who present a safety risk.

13. Pro-homosexual counseling.

Counselors refer students to community groups without parental knowledge. The ACLU and other groups warn schools not to advocate heterosexuality as the norm in counseling students with same sex desires, nor to discuss the fact that many people have overcome homosexual feelings! Schools who tell students the whole truth are may face suits by these radical organizations! Can you believe that we actually have schools that won’t tell children heterosexuality is healthier than homosexuality? Yet how much money is going into these same schools for AIDS education? Is there something nonsensical about this picture?

Tips for Solving the Problem: Working Within Your School and Community

How can you keep the insidious and deceptive homosexual agenda out of your school-or remove it once it arrives? Here are some tips on working effectively within your school and community:

1. Do the homework needed.

Get the facts. Is it a new curriculum that’s been introduced on “bias” and “intolerance”? Get a copy of it. If it’s a graphic homosexual novel, purchase one and read it. If it’s a non-discrimination policy, get a copy of the regulation. Verify any rumors yourself. Then, learn all you can about how such material has been opposed successfully in other schools. See Resources, p.11, for legal and other options.

2. Be persistent with the school.

They do not, in most cases, want to give you detailed information. They know this stuff is controversial. They may ignore your requests for copies, they will tell you it’s “in the mail” or “in a committee.” Politely but firmly offer to come to the school to pick up the material. Make appointments with those who are the gatekeepers of information, or simply haunt their offices until they give you the material you’ve asked for - all of it (the whole curriculum, not just part). Taxpayers have the legal right to copies of everything they are teaching students and every school policy.

3. Publicize what you find out.

When parents find out, most are appalled. Make copies, do mailings, write letters to the editor, circulate a petition, or hold home meetings. It’s usually advisable to meet with school officials or teachers first, but don’t let the school persuade you not to be “divisive.” Remember - their actions are the problem!

4. Get a group together for support.

It's much better to work with others-the school can't dismiss your concerns as easily. You may want to form a loose alliance and call yourselves something like, "Parents (or Citizens) for Responsible Education." Respect any confidentiality some group members may need to retain, including teachers. Legal and health professionals are good additions to such a group. So are grandparents!

5. Hold meetings to educate others in the community.

These are best held at someone's home. Public meetings pose the risk of being sabotaged by "gay" activist groups who specialize in heckling and disruptive behavior. Private meetings of ten to twenty-five people at a time work well, educating on your side of the issue. Have hand-outs available.

6. Set realistic goals.

You may want to sue the school or get a state law passed, but be realistic about what would be involved. If someone can organize this, great! Steady persistent educational efforts are probably more doable. You may only be able to bring a halt to one program or offer parents "opting out" options for their children, but these are still significant accomplishments.

7. Identify good media sources, and learn to work with them.

The media can be your enemy or your ally. Educating the community - exposing what's happening - is the key to stopping the "gay" agenda. One of the best outlets may be smaller newspapers, the ones that feature pictures of school clubs and high school sports. Send them letters and announcements. The Internet and e-mail are great vehicles to use. You may want to set up a web site just on local school issues. Local TV and radio can be good, if someone in your group speaks well in 30-second sound bites using simple concepts. The talk radio stations or religious stations may treat your positions more fairly. If a paper or station misquotes you, meet with the reporter and get assurances they will be fair in the future. Meetings with editors and reporters can develop valuable contacts and facilitate understanding. Paid ads are usually a waste of time and money. They are one-shot efforts and sometimes, after all the trouble and expense to prepare an ad, papers find this subject too controversial and won't print it.

8. Put everything in writing.

If you make a request to the school, put it in writing. If you have a meeting where a school official made promises, confirm these agreements in a follow-up letter. If you've gotten information about a program that supports homosexuality, write a letter to the school board. Send it to every member as well as the superintendent.

9. Make phone calls.

Talk with the principal, superintendent and school board members on the phone and then send a follow-up letter. There have been situations where just a few phone calls gave a school board member the incentive to oppose some of these crazy ideas.

10. Inform community groups and churches.

Contact the Kiwanis, Rotary, churches and other groups and ask to speak or distribute flyers. Church bulletins may print a paragraph. Set up a response mechanism, like e-mail or a phone number for more information.

11. Use opportunities like school board elections and levies to inform people about the school's policies and educational direction.

Keep track and then write letters to the editor and even do mailings to some or all voters in your school district. Call a press conference of your citizens' group while the levy or election issue is still news, and announce your position. Be careful in opposing levies. It may be wiser to offer conditional support if the school district changes direction, or doesn't allow a homosexual club, etc. The public responds better to solutions than just problems,

but taxpayers also respond well to wise use of money-and funding “gay pride week” or a special staff position to encourage homosexuality sounds wasteful to most people.

12. Keep your cool-don’t threaten or shout.

It’s often difficult not to lose one’s temper with bureaucrats who give you the runaround or teachers who support this nonsense, but it will only harm the situation. Rehearse carefully any school board testimony, preparing mentally for possibly being treated coldly. In some communities, there has even been heckling from an audience packed with local activists and students. This task needs a thick skin.

13. Avoid exchanges with student activists.

Homosexual clubs produce teen activists, and “gay” groups know that this tends to paralyze school boards and administrations. They want to look inclusive of student opinions and needs, and not touch off issues with volatile parents of these teens, who may be encouraging their activism. You can only lose by debating with teenagers. Go around them to the adults who are supposedly in charge. Get regulations changed. Take your issues to a friendly media source, run by adults.

14. Be courageous and hopeful!

You may get some heat, but people forget quickly. Other people will be encouraged by your example. You will have more silent supporters than you’ll ever know!

Talking Points for Overcoming Prejudice in Favor of Homosexuality

Many people are now biased toward homosexuality, thinking it’s the kind and tolerant attitude. It’s exactly the opposite. The kindest approach is to understand how damaging this behavior is, how children can be drawn into it, and the risks it presents.

Here are some points to cover with school officials, students (including your own children) teachers, and parents.

Homosexuality is not genetic. No research supports this claim. Many thousands of people have overcome this desire as well as leaving the lifestyle. (See Resources for details)

Homosexuality is associated with destructive outcomes: AIDS, a much higher risk of STDs, roughly three times the rate of alcoholism and drug abuse, much more promiscuity and domestic abuse, and a shortened life span. The staggering health consequences observed for decades among homosexuals are referenced in much more detail in our Resources. Male homosexuality involves frequent anal sexual contact; lesbianism involves phallic substitutes. This is graphic, but we must always remember the reality of the risks we are talking about.

Revealing these risks is not cruel or “hateful.” In fact, the truth is the light at the end of the tunnel for many kids. Remember, the problem here is the behavior, not the person. And knowledge helps all of us identify and change our self-damaging behaviors.

This is not a “religious” issue. This is a social and health issue. Major religions affirm male-female marriage because it fits the reality of human life and has always been a foundation of civilization. However, the problems with homosexuality will be apparent to an atheist who’s open-minded and wants to know the facts.

You don’t have to apologize for this position. Just because there are a few radicals who actually might want to harm people involved in homosexuality, doesn’t mean we all fit that mold - quite the opposite. This factual position is based on genuine, not artificial, compassion.

Frequent Claims of Homosexuality's School Supporters and How to Respond

“Schools need to respect all students and teachers!”

We are objecting to dangerous, changeable behavior, not people. Telling the whole truth shows genuine respect. Remember, this desire is not genetic, and those involved are not some separate breed of humans!

“This intolerance is causing teens to attempt suicide!”

Youth involved in homosexual behavior may have a higher risk of suicide attempts. But these are often students who have other troubles as well-- substance abuse, school problems, unstable homes, etc. Usually, the situation shows a kid in distress. These other factors are likely to be the causative issues, rather than intolerance about homosexuality. Besides, even if the tragedy of a suicide attempt is the student's response to disapproval of homosexuality, does that indicate the disapproval was unjustified? A student could have a tragic response to parents who disapprove of him/her shooting up heroin. Would this mean legalization of drugs is the only solution for that student's welfare? This kind of thinking is a recipe for societal chaos! Reaching out while still supporting the highest standards remains the best approach.

Suicide attempts arise from hopelessness. Our kids aren't always being given answers that make sense. For instance, while activists claim homosexuality is a right and kids need to be “freed” and out of the closet, why is youth suicide worse now than in the supposedly more “repressive” past? Indications are that being “out” may be a factor in youth suicide, not the opposite.

“This ‘homophobia’ must be stopped!” So, in other words, no disagreement with full expression of homosexuality is to be allowed? That sure sounds intolerant and repressive. Why do you want to force your beliefs on others? And, what exactly will “support” involve?

“You want to censor us!”

But there's already censorship! That's what a school does - choose some things to teach and not others. Why can't parents have a say? And why can't facts be part of my child's education?

Resources

Consult these resources for more background about the issues discussed on this website.

The “gay gene” question

www.narth.com/docs/innate.html

“The Innate-Immutable Argument Finds No Basis in Science.”

www.cprmd.org/Myth_Fact_008.htm

Contains 14 pages of quotes and citations debunking the “gay gene” claim.

See also:

www.afa.net/homosexual_agenda/articles.asp

Health Risks of Homosexuality

“The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality”

10 pages of material--at

www.frc.org/papers/insight/index.cfm

Straight & Narrow? Compassion and Clarity in the Homosexuality Debate, Thomas E. Schmidt, Intervarsity Press, 1995, chapter 6, "The Price of Love." Much detail on studies about STDs, substance abuse, etc. among homosexuals.

Lifespan for "gay" men lowered by up to 20 years:

"Modelling the impact of HIV disease on mortality in gay and bisexual men," International Journal of Epidemiology, Vol. 26, 657-661, 1997.

Domestic Violence: homosexuals are at much higher risk: Men Who Beat The Men Who Love Them, Island and Letellier., Haworth Press, 1991; Violence in Gay and Lesbian Domestic Partnerships, Claire Renzetti, Ed., Haworth Press, 1996.

Coming Out of Homosexuality

See web sites:

www.exodusintl.org

www.narth.com

www.portlandfellowship.com

www.pfox.org

www.stonewallrevisited.com

Legal issues in Education

Call American Family Association Law Center,
1-800-326-4543

For a manual on parents' legal rights. and opt-out forms, Call AFA-California, (916)676-1057

Also contact: Liberty Counsel, 1-800-671-1776
liberty@lc.org or Alliance Defense Fund,
(480)444-0031

Safe and Drug Free Schools federal program
(and how this funds "anti-bias" education):
www.traditionalvalues.org/hc_curriculum.html

General Resources

For Confronting the Homosexual Agenda in Our Schools

Web Sites from a Pro-Family Perspective

www.cultureandfamily.org

www.abidingtruth.com

www.afa.net

www.afamichigan.org

www.family.org

www.missionamerica.com
www.parentsrightscoalition.org
www.cprmd.org
www.portlandfellowship.com
www.cwfa.org
www.exodusintl.org
www.Choice4Truth.com
www.massnews.com
www.frc.org
www.reclaimamerica.org
www.americansfortruth.com
www.savecalifornia.com
www.traditionalvalues.org
www.oregoncitizensalliance.org
www.narth.com
www.pfox.org
www.recallcrooks.com
www.youthworkers.net
(complete list of all schools in the country)
www.lovewonout.com
www.KerussoMin.org

Web Sites of Homosexual Activism to Monitor

www.glsen.org
www.pflag.org
www.lambdalegal.org
www.smyal.org
www.youth.org/loco/PERSONProject/
www.aclu.org
www.safeschools-wa.org
www.ccme.org
www.hrw.org
www.kurfew.com
www.prideagenda.org
www.ligaly.org
www.younggayamerica.com

Brochures

“Teaching Captivity? How the Pro-Gay Agenda is Affecting Our Schools”

Focus on the Family, 1-800-A-Family

Also from Focus:

“Straight Answers”

“Amy and Jason: Two True Stories”

“What You Can Do to Stop the Promotion of Homosexuality
in Our Schools”

Available from Truth in Schools Task Force

P.O. Box 21836

Columbus, OH 43221
missiona@ee.net

Newsletters

“Choice 4 Truth”-covers the latest events in the battle over homosexuality in the schools Mission:America,
614-442-7998; missiona@ee.net

AFA Journal
American Family Association
1-800-326-4543

“Citizen” magazine
Focus on the Family-1-800-A-Family

“Family Voice”
Concerned Women for America
202-488-7000

National Monitor of Education
(925) 945-6745

Manuals

“Taking Back the Schools”
Available from AFA-California
(916) 676-1057

“A Parent’s Manual to the Homosexual Agenda in Public Education,”
from Family First, 303-471-8067

For teachers:
“A Manual to the Homosexual Agenda in Public Education,”
Family First, 303-471-8067

Tapes/Videos/CDs

“Love Won Out” conference tape series
www.lovewonout.com
1-800-A-Family

CD-- "Let Me Show You Jesus" by Stephen Bennett at www.sbministries.org . Songs and his testimony about exiting homosexuality.

“Suffer the Children” AFA Video
1-800-326-4543

“It’s Not Gay” AFA video
1-800-326-4543

The Map-interactive CD for youth
From Portland Fellowship
www.portlandfellowship.com
(503) 235-6364

Specific Papers & Articles

“Homosexual Activists Solidify Hold On Schools”
AFA Journal
www.afa.net/journal/december/coverstory.asp

“Top 10 Strategies Used by Homosexual Activists in Schools”
by Peter J. LaBarbera
on web site www.frc.org

“How to Protect Your Child From Pro-Homosexual Propaganda” by Peter J. LaBarbera on web site
www.frc.org

“The Facts About ‘Just The Facts’”
by Timothy J. Dailey, Ph.D.
on web site www.frc.org

“The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality”
by Timothy J. Dailey, Ph.D.
on web site www.frc.org

“Homosexual Clubs: The Rest of the Story”
at www.missionamerica.com/agenda2.htm

“The Dirty Dozen: A Checklist to Assess Your School’s Risk
for Encouraging Homosexuality”
at www.missionamerica.com/agenda1.htm

“Eradicating Homophobia Means Silencing Families:
Translating GLSEN’s Deceptive Language About Homosexuality”
at www.missionamerica.com/agenda4.htm

“How GLSEN Encourages Student Experimentation”
at www.missionamerica.com/agenda3.htm

“How and Why to Defeat the ‘Gay’ Movement”
by Scott Lively, Esq.
www.abidingtruth.com/pfrc/whyandhow.html

“Gay High School Clubs Put Students in Spotlight”
on NARTH web site, www.narth.com/docs/hsclubs.html

“‘Making Schools Safe’ Means ‘Refashioning Values’ in Massachusetts”
On web site www.narth.com/docs/makingsafe.html

“NARTH’s Response to ‘Just the Facts about Sexual Orientation and Youth’”
on web site www.narth.com/docs/narthresponse.html

“Recommended Reading for Teenagers? A Closer Look at P-FLAG”
on web site www.narth.com/docs/pflag1.html

“First AIDS Education, then Safe Schools, then Gay Advocacy”
on web site www.narth.com/docs/firstaids.html

Books

Seven Steps to Recruit-Proof Your Child
By Scott Lively
See web site www.abidingtruth.com

Why Isn't Homosexuality Considered A Disorder On The Basis Of Its Medical Consequences?

By Kathleen Melonakos, M.A., R.N., Delaware Family Foundation
<http://www.narth.com/docs/consequences.html>

The writer of this article, health professional and medical reporter Kathleen Melonakos, describes the impact of male-with-male sex upon physical health.

I worked as an RN for several years during the eighties and nineties at Stanford University Medical Center, where I saw some of the damage homosexuals do to their bodies with some of their sexual practices. As a result of that eye-opening experience, I much admire the work of NARTH in the research and treatment of homosexuality.

I have long been concerned about the serious medical consequences which result from the gay-affirming attitudes that predominate in the San Francisco Bay Area. For example, I knew personally a prominent dermatologist, a dentist, an engineer, and a hairdresser that died in their mid-forties of infectious diseases related to their homosexual behavior patterns. I know of many others that have died young as a result of living a gay lifestyle.

The co-author of my own medical reference book, Saunders Pocket Reference for Nurses,[i] was the head of the surgery department at Stanford. She related case histories of homosexuals needing emergency surgery due to "fisting," "playing with toys," (inserting objects into the rectum) and other bizarre acts. I am certain--in light of my clinical experience, and since doing considerable amount of studying about it since that time--that homosexuality is neither normal nor benign; rather, it is a lethal behavioral addiction as Dr. Jeffrey Satinover outlines in his book, Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth.[ii]

As far as I know, there is no other group of people in the United States that dies of infectious diseases in their mid-forties except practicing homosexuals. This, to me, is tragic, when we know that homosexuality can be prevented, in many cases, or substantially healed in adulthood when there is sufficient motivation and help.

I now live in Delaware and work in conjunction with the Delaware Family Foundation to inform the public about homosexual issues. We are debating gay activists who want to add "sexual discrimination" to our anti-discrimination code. In trying to make the case that homosexuality is not healthy and should not be encouraged, we come up against the fact that neither the American Psychiatric Association, nor the American Psychological Association recognize it as a disorder. Our opponents say we are using "scare tactics."

Dr. Satinover brilliantly laid out in his book, Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth the solid, irrefutable evidence that there are lethal consequences of engaging in the defining features of male homosexuality--that is, promiscuity and anal intercourse.

It doesn't take someone trained in medicine to recognize that, as Brian Camenker of the Parent Right's Coalition said on national TV, "A lifetime of anal sex does not do great things for the body." Brian also said, "As troubling as that statement sounds, there is no logical argument against it." Thus, even lay people recognize what should be obvious, especially to those trained in medicine, and who know the basic facts about homosexuality. It seems to me that medical professionals should be more aware and concerned about the consequences of habitually engaging in promiscuous anal intercourse, and other oral-anal practices of active homosexuals.[iii]

The risk of anal cancer soars for those engaging in anal intercourse. According to one report, it rises by an astounding 4000%, and doubles again for those who are HIV positive.[iiib]

Can anyone refute that anal intercourse tears the rectal lining of the receptive partner, regardless of whether a condom is worn, and the subsequent contact with fecal matter leads to a host of diseases?

Diseases to which active homosexuals are vulnerable can be classified as follows:

Classical sexually transmitted diseases (gonorrhea, infections with Chlamydia trachomatis, syphilis, herpes simplex infections, genital warts, pubic lice, scabies); enteric diseases (infections with Shigella species, Campylobacter jejuni, Entamoeba histolytica, Giardia lamblia, ["gay bowel disease"], Hepatitis A, B, C, D, and cytomegalovirus); trauma (related to and/or resulting in fecal incontinence, hemorrhoids, anal fissure, foreign bodies lodged in the rectum, rectosigmoid tears, allergic proctitis, penile edema, chemical sinusitis, inhaled nitrite burns, and sexual assault of the male patient); and the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS).[iv]

Can anyone refute that increased morbidity and mortality is an unavoidable result of male-with-male sex--not to mention

the increased rates of alcoholism, drug abuse, depression, suicide and other maladies that so often accompany a homosexual lifestyle?[v] People with this whole cluster of behavior patterns are somehow "normal"?

My primary question is: why isn't homosexuality considered a disorder on the basis of its medical consequences alone? Dr. Satinover and others have made a solid case for why homosexuality parallels alcoholism as an unhealthy addiction. It should have a parallel diagnosis.

There is a lot of literature, including on the NARTH website, discussing the 1973 removal of homosexuality as a diagnosis. The arguments against the change in diagnosis seem to center around "societal standards," moral relativism, "subjective distress" of the client, and whether or not there is any objective standard for "psychological" normalcy (for instance, the debate between Joseph Nicolosi and Dr. Michael Wertheimer in *A Clash In Worldviews: An Interview with Dr. Michael Wertheimer*).

While these considerations are important, it seems like we can set aside, for the moment, the debate on whether homosexuality should be classified as a developmental disorder. Very simply, it seems, an objective person just looking at homosexuality's lifestyle consequences would have to classify it as some kind of pathology. Does it or does it not lead to a dramatically shortened lifespan? Studies say it does, some by as much as 40%; the Cameron study being only one of many other studies that suggest this.[vi]

Taken together, these studies establish that homosexuality is more deadly than smoking, alcoholism, or drug addiction. However, it appears that far too few physicians or other professionals are making arguments in favor of homosexuality as a diagnosis based on its adverse health consequences.

While doing research into the history of the 1973 decision to remove homosexuality from the diagnostic manual of disorders, I have been shocked to find out the specious reasoning upon which the decision was based, and that qualified physicians have allowed the decision to stand.

On Feb. 5, 2002, I corresponded by e-mail with Dr. Robert Spitzer of the APA and asked him to send me references for the position papers and studies upon which his committee based its decision to remove the diagnosis. He told me to read Ron Bayer's book,[vii] the "closest thing to a position paper" (*American Journal of Psychiatry*, 130:11, 1207-1216), and he said, "There was no specific list of references, but what was influential too was the Evelyn Hooker Rorschach study and the Eli Robins community study." [viii]

I have read many of the criticisms of the Hooker study--how respondents were specifically selected rather than at random, and other methodological limitations.[ix] Dr. Charles Socarides informs us also that Spitzer was influenced by the Kinsey Report, which was recognized as early as 1976 by "social progressives" like Prof. Paul Robinson of Stanford as "a pathetic manifestation of Kinsey's philosophical naivete.. a mechanical contrivance, which...bore little relation to reality," [x] and since has been discredited by the work of Judith Reisman and others.

It is clear that Dr. Socarides was right when he said that the decision to remove homosexuality as a diagnosis "involved the out-of-hand and peremptory disregard and dismissal not only of hundreds of psychiatric and psychoanalytic research papers and reports, but other serious studies by groups of psychiatrists, psychologists and educators over the past seventy years..." [xi]

It appears even more obvious that the Task Force on Nomenclature cavalierly ignored (and the APA's continue to ignore!) the substantial and unambiguous evidence that homosexuality involves a life-threatening behavior with an addictive component which has serious health implications.[xii]

That the APA's have escaped accountability for their lack of scientific and professional integrity is especially incredible since the advent of the AIDS epidemic. There are currently an estimated 900,000 people in the United States that are infected with the HIV virus, or 1 in 300 Americans. Though there has been a decrease in AIDS deaths per year due to drug therapy, (which costs an average of \$12,000 per patient per year) the rate of new infections per year has remained the same, at 40,000, despite the twenty year "safe-sex" campaign.[xiii]

These facts demonstrate the failure of current policies in containing the AIDS epidemic. While drug therapy will briefly extend the life of these patients, AIDS remains the fifth leading cause of death among those aged 25-44, and 60% of new cases are contracted by men who have sex with men.[xiv] According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), homosexual men are a thousand times more likely to contract AIDS than the general heterosexual population[xv]

Dr. Satinover has said in an interview with NARTH:

"A recent article in a psychiatric publication informed us that 30% of all 20-year-old homosexual men will be HIV positive or dead by the age of thirty. You would think that the objective, ethical approach would be: let's use anything that works to

try to take these people out of their posture of risk. If it means getting them to wear condoms fine. If it means getting them to give up anal intercourse, fine. If it means getting them to give up homosexuality, fine. But that last intervention is the one intervention that it absolutely taboo.

"There is no doubt that a cold, statistical analysis of this epidemic would lead you to believe that this attitude of political correctness is killing a substantial proportion of these people. I think there is an element of denial, in the psychological sense, of what gay-related illnesses really mean."[xvi]

It seems to me that the APA's should be aggressively pressed to recognize the facts about the morbidity and mortality directly attributed to homosexuality, or be exposed for the recklessly irresponsible "guardians of the public health" they have become, at least on this issue.

When will doctors and other health care workers demand that officers in the American Psychiatric Association respond to the clear evidence in the following: Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth: the mortality rates listed in their own "APA's Practical Guidelines for Treating Patients with HIV/AIDS";[xvii] and other important reports, such as the Monograph put out by the Institute of Sexual Health, Health Implications of Homosexuality?[xviii]

Lest we think that APA officers justify their neglect of medical consequences of homosexuality on the basis that sexual orientation cannot be changed, we note that Robert Spitzer acknowledged in his original 1973 position paper on Nomenclature that "modern methods of treatment enable a significant proportion of homosexuals who wish to change their sexual orientation to do so."[xix]

He has now confirmed the fact that sexual orientation can be changed with his recent study.[xx] We know that changing sexual orientation only became "impossible" in the nineties, as part of a political strategy by gay activists.[xxi]

Spitzer and his allies' rationale for removing homosexuality as a diagnosis in 1973 was that to be considered a psychiatric disorder,

"it must either regularly cause subjective distress, or regularly be associated with some generalized impairment in social effectiveness or functioning....Clearly homosexuality per se does not meet the requirements for a psychiatric disorder, since, as noted above, many are quite satisfied with their sexual orientation and demonstrate no generalized impairment in social effectiveness or functioning." (Spitzer, et.al, p. 1215).

The Task Force's reasoning fails for several reasons. First, even if we grant the validity of their stated criteria (which is questionable), the fact that many homosexuals "are satisfied with their sexual orientation," fails to take into account the large number of homosexuals who are not satisfied with their sexual orientation and who do experience "subjective distress and generalized impairment in social functioning." The removal of the diagnosis is not just unfair, but cruel to those who would seek treatment for their condition.

Secondly, there are unambiguous reasons to think that homosexuality per se does cause "generalized impairment in social effectiveness or functioning." If in fact it is a lethal addiction, and the many studies documenting the behavior patterns of homosexuals are correct (that show compulsive patterns of promiscuity, anonymous sex, sex for money, sex in public places, sex with minors, concomitant drug and alcohol abuse, depression, suicide), for the APA to argue that these features do not constitute an "impairment of social effectiveness or functioning," stretches the boundaries of plausibility. To argue that early death does not constitute an "impairment of social effectiveness or functioning" is absurd.

The APA claims its mission is "to promote a bio-psycho-social approach to understanding and caring for patients, in all aspects of health care, including illness prevention" (APA's Strategic Goals Statement). Thus the APA violates its own goals then when it ignores evidence that homosexuality can in many cases be prevented, and denies reorientation therapy to those who want it.

A careful reading of the articles opposing reorientation therapy reveals their authors' rationale that they find such therapy to be "oppressive" to those who do not want therapy.[xxii]

What if this logic was applied to any other lethal illness? What if doctors said, "We refuse to treat cancer (or, say, alcoholism) because we only achieve a 50% cure rate--and many people who don't want to be cured find it oppressive that we do cure the others?" Why wouldn't the lawsuits for malpractice be filed?

We know that Ronald Gold of the Gay Activist's Alliance, an openly gay man, was a member of the committee to remove homosexuality as a diagnosis in 1973. We know that gay activists were disrupting meetings, threatening doctors, and using other strong-arm tactics to get their way at that time.[xxiii]

We also know that homosexual activists like Dr. Richard Isay in the APA have pressed for resolutions to punish therapists

for practicing reorientation therapy, and that threats of lawsuits appear to be the main reason the APA has not implemented his proposals.[xxiv]

We know homosexual advocates in the APA continue to suppress debate about Spitzer's new study documenting that sexual orientation can be changed (and to suppress debate about other supporting studies).[xxv] We also know that active homosexuals such as Clinton Anderson at the American Psychological Association refuse to permit NARTH to engage in open debate or announce NARTH meetings in APA publications simply because he disagrees with the premises upon which reorientation therapy is based.[xxvi]

For these reasons, I do not think it is far-fetched to use the analogy that the "drunks are running the rehab center," in reference to the APA's--at least as far as homosexuality is concerned. Active homosexuals can hardly be objective about an addictive behavior they engage in themselves. In light of the medical evidence, it seems that the Galenic dictum, "physician heal thyself," should apply, as it did in the past, as Dr. Satinover suggests.[xxvii]

It seems to me the situation in this country will only get worse until the APA is held directly responsible for what is arguably their criminal negligence. In failing to reckon with serious medical consequences of the homosexual behavior pattern, they are harming our whole society, and especially the upcoming generation.

The recent decision by the American Academy of Pediatrics to endorse gay adoptions is yet another disturbing example of how the decision to "normalize" homosexuality by the APA has had a broad ripple effect. Health professionals especially, should heed Dean Byrd's outcry on the NARTH web site that it is time that the American people "insist on truth, not politics, from all of our professional organizations."

What will it take to insist on truth? Lawsuits? Protests? In my opinion, doctors and other health professionals must exert pressure, or share culpability.

What if every person reading this article sent a copy of it to the president of the American Psychiatric Association and asked for a response? Reasoned debate is the least that psychiatrists owe our society--especially those whose lives and loved ones are at risk.

The following is relevant contact information. If interested in contacting these organizations, remember that our aim is to open up a principled, civil debate:

American Psychiatric Association
President, Richard Harding, M.D., Rharding@Richmed.medpark.sc.edu
President-Elect, Paul Appelbaum, M.D., appelbap@umhmc.org
Or: American Psychiatric Association, 1400 K Street N.W., Washington, DC 20005
(888) 357-7924 -- FAX 202-682-6850 -- apa@psych.org

[i] Melonakos, Kathleen, Saunders Pocket Reference for Nurses
, Philadelphia: Saunders, 1990, (2nd ed)., with Sheryl Michelson, , 1995.

[ii] Satinover, Jeffrey, Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth, Hamewith/Baker Books, 1996.

[iiia] For an eye-opening survey of the medical studies and journal reports describing the unhygienic and disease-producing practices of homosexuals, see <http://www.cprmd.org>, "Homosexual Myths--Male Homosexuals are Healthy and Have Normal Sex Lives."

[iiib] Fenger, C. "Anal Neoplasia and Its Precursors: Facts and Controversies," Seminars in Diagnostic Pathology 8, no. 3, August 1991, pp.190-201; Daling, J.R. et al., "Sexual Practices, Sexually Transmitted Diseases, and the Incidence of Anal Cancer," New England Journal of Medicine 317, no.16, 15 October 1987, pp. 973-77; Holly, E.A. et al., "Anal Cancer Incidence: Genital Warts, Anal Fissure or Fistula, Hemorrhoids, and Smoking," Journal of the National Cancer Institute 81, no. 22, November 1989, pp. 1726-31; Daling, J.R. et.al, "Correlates of Homosexual Behavior and the Incidence of Anal Cancer," Journal of the American Medical Association 247, no.14, 9 April 1982, pp. 1988-90; Cooper, H.S., Patchefsky, A.S. and Marks, G., "Cloacogenic Carcinoma of the Anorectum in Homosexual Men: An Observation of Four Cases"; Diseases of the Colon and Rectum 22, no. 8, 1979, pp. 557-58. Also see Between the Lines, Michigan's statewide gay newspaper, reporting on the risk of anal cancer for men who have sex with men, http://www.afa.net/homosexual_agenda/ha031901.asp

[iv] W.E. Owen Jr., "Medical Problems of the Homosexual Adolescent," Journal of Adolescent Health Care6, No.4, July 1985, pp. 278-85.

[v] See O'Leary, Dale, "Recent Studies on Homosexuality and Mental Health," <http://www.narth.com/docs/recent.html>. O'Leary gives a summary of health findings and references for specific studies.

[vi] Mr. Trey Kern, President of the Citizen's for Parent Rights, in Pasadena, Maryland has collected an impressive amount data on studies documenting the diminished lifespan of active homosexuals. See www.cprmd.org, "Homosexual Myths: Homosexuals Live Long Lives, Fact Sheet. Studies include: (G. Tardieu, 1858; M. Hirschfield, 1914, Kinsey, 1930's, 1940's; Mattachine Society, 1950's; Berger, 1960's, Kinsey Institute, 1969; Spada Report 1978; M. Mendola, 1979; Cameron, Playfair, Wellum, 1994; Hogg, R.S., et. al, International Journal of Epidemiology, 1997; Cameron, P, Cameron, K, Playfair, WL., Psychological Reports, 1998.

[vii] Bayer, R. Homosexuality and American Psychiatry, Princeton University Press, 1987. Mr. Bayer chronicled the story of how homosexuality was

removed as a diagnosis. It confirms that the APA did not officially investigate or study the issue thoroughly before it gave formal approval of the deletion of homosexuality from the DSM-III.

[viii] Personal e-mail correspondence with Dr. Spitzer, Feb. 5, 2002.

[ix] Socarides, Charles, W., "Sexual Politics and Scientific Logic: The Issue of Homosexuality," *The Journal of Psychohistory*, 10:3, 1992, p. 309 Dr. Socarides explains that a task force within the APA itself concluded in 1973 that Hooker's study was full of methodological errors, and did not warrant her conclusions. See also, Joseph Nicolosi, "Clash of Worldviews: Interview with Michael Wertheimer", www.narth.com.

[x] Socarides, p. 324.

[xi].Socarides, p. 315

[xii] Spitzer, R.L, et. al, in "Symposium: Should Homosexuality Be in the APA Nomenclature?" *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 130:11, 1973 make no mention whatsoever of any health implications of homosexuality. Also, I asked Dr. Spitzer in an e-mail correspondence April 4, 2001, whether there was any chance the APA might change its policy in light of evidence that sexual orientation can be changed and the negative impact of homosexual practices upon lifespan. He acknowledged nothing about shortened lifespan, but gave a one-sentence reply that said there was no possibility that APA would change its policy on homosexuality at that time.

[xiii] "APA's Practical Guidelines for the Treatment of Patients with HIV/AIDS," *Epidemiology, Clinical Features Influencing Treatment*, sections, www.psych.org/aids/

[xiv] Ibid, Anti-Viral Treatment section.

[xv] The HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Infectious Diseases, Division of HIV/AIDS, January, 1992, p. 9.

[xvi] Satinover, Jeffrey, "Reflections: Interview with NARTH," Feb. 5, 2001, <http://www.narth.com/docs/satinovr.html>

[xvii] See American Psychiatric Association website, www.psych.org/aids/, or obtain bound copy of report available from American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc., 1-800-368-5777, or www.appi.org.

[xviii] Monograph is available from The Institute of Sexual Health, P.O.Box 162306, Austin, TX 78716, ph (512) 328-6268, fax (ph) 538-6269.

[xix] Spitzer, R.L, et. al, "Symposium: Should Homosexuality Be in the APA Nomenclature?" p.1215.

[xx] Spitzer, R.L, "Two Hundred Subjects Who Claim to Have Changed Their Sexual Orientation from Homosexual to Heterosexual," presentation made at the American Psychiatric Association, May 9th, 2001, in New Orleans, available from NYS Psychiatric Institute, New York, NY, 10032, phone (212) 543-5524.

[xxi] Rev. Dr. Earle Fox, former president of the chapter of Exodus Intl. whose members picketed the 2000 APA convention to protest the denial of therapy to those who want it (which resulted in Dr. Robert Spitzer's 2001 study on reorientation therapy), tells in "Homosexuality Wrongly a Civil Right," *Delaware State News*, January 13, 2002, how no one was disputing that sexual orientation could be changed until gay activists, Kirk and Madsen, in *After the Ball: How America will Conquer It's Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90's*, Doubleday, 1989, outlined their plan to convince America gays were "born that way," and "beyond the realm of moral choice," p. 189.

[xxii] For an extensive survey of the articles promoting the view opposing reorientation therapy, see Diamond, Eugene, et.al, *Homosexuality and Hope*, the results of a two-year study, published by the Catholic Medical Association, p. 14, obtainable at P.O. Box 757, Pewaukee, WI, 53072 or <http://www.cathmed.org>. Some of the articles quoted are Davison, G., 1982; Gittings, 1973; Begelman, 1975, 1977; Murphy 1992; Sleek 1997; Silverstein, 1972; Smith, 1988. See also, "Psychiatrists Reject Therapy to Alter Gays: Efforts aimed at Turning Homosexuals into Heterosexuals are Harmful, Professional Board Declares, Even for Those Not Being Treated," *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 12, 1998.

[xxiii] Socarides, p. 310. See also, Satinover, p. 31-40.

[xxiv] See Satinover, p. 36,180-182, and Stern, Mark, E, "The Battle Against the A.P.A. Resolution", www.narth.com, Interviews/Testimonies.

[xxv] Rev. Dr. Earle Fox, *Delaware State News*, Jan. 13, 2002.

[xxvi] NARTH Bulletin, Vol. 10, No. 3, Dec. 2001, Letter from Clinton W. Anderson to Drs. Nicolosi and Byrd, p. 16.

[xxvii] Satinover, p. 47.

Updated: 19 September 2004

Testimony in opposition to HB 345, "An Act concerning Education -Prevention of Harassment and Intimidation in Public Schools."

<http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=TS03C1>

Family Research Council: Defending Family, Faith and Freedom, November 5, 2005

by: Peter Sprigg, Testimony given on February 19, 2003.

I (Peter Sprigg) am here to speak in opposition to HB 345, "An Act concerning Education--Prevention of Harassment and Intimidation in Public Schools."

Pro-homosexual activists contend that our schools have large numbers of students who are (or are perceived by their peers to be) gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered, (often referred to as "GLBT" or "LGBT" for short) and that such students are frequent victims of verbal or physical harassment or even acts of violence. The Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), for example, reports that 83% of the "GLBT" youth they surveyed reported at least verbal harassment because of their sexual orientation. They also point to reports that gay youths are more likely to commit suicide than their straight peers, and claim that this is a result of harassment and discrimination as well. They argue, therefore, that victims of harassment or violence targeted for their real or perceived "sexual orientation" should be singled out for specific protection under school disciplinary codes.

Yet there is evidence that harassment of gay teens may neither be as frequent, as severe, nor as disproportionate, as some pro-homosexual rhetoric would suggest. GLSEN fails to note, for example, that a survey by the American Association of University Women (AAUW) showed that 83% of all girls and 79% of all boys report experiencing physical intimidation or sexual harassment at school.[i] Of the "gay" teens surveyed by GLSEN, less than half--40% of the total--said that "verbal harassment" occurs "frequently" or "often." [ii] But the majority of gay teens (58%), according to the GLSEN survey, reported no incidents of "physical harassment" in the past year (only 15% claimed to have experienced this "frequently" or "often") [iii], and nearly four-fifths (79%) had not experienced a single incident of "physical assault" (less than 7% "frequently" or "often"). [iv]

Reports of gay teen suicides also appear to have been exaggerated. A recent study by a pro-gay researcher found, "Gay and lesbian teenagers are only slightly more likely than heterosexual kids to attempt suicide," according to USA Today. [v] And the author of *Suicide in America*, Dr. Herbert Hendin, reportedly "found no evidence that social discrimination was a major factor behind the suicide attempts of the homosexual students he studied." [vi]

Pro-family groups such as the Family Research Council agree wholeheartedly that no student should ever be the victim of unprovoked violence--for their sexual orientation, or for any other reason. We also agree that no student should be subjected to taunting or the use of vulgar epithets--again, whether for their sexual orientation or for any other reason. We believe that such behavior--regardless of its motivation--should be prohibited by school disciplinary codes, and that those codes should be strictly enforced.

However, singling out "sexual orientation" for special protection cannot be justified on logical grounds, and it could have consequences not clear at first glance. Lumping "sexual orientation" together with "race, color, national origin, sex, and disability" for special protection is illogical because the latter qualities are inborn (except for some disabilities), involuntary, immutable, and innocuous--none of which is true of homosexuality, despite the claims of its advocates. Evidence that homosexuality is inborn (that is, unalterably determined by genetics or biology) is ephemeral at best; [vii] while same-sex attractions may come unbidden, homosexual behavior and adoption of a "gay" identity are clearly voluntary; [viii] the existence of numerous "former homosexuals" proves that homosexuality is changeable; and the numerous pathologies associated with homosexuality demonstrate how harmful it is. [ix]

If all forms of harassment are wrong, then all forms of harassment--without distinction--should be banned. In fact, singling out "sexual orientation," and including it with traditional categories like race and sex, serves not a "safety" function but a political one. When harassment based on sexual orientation is explicitly banned, schools staff and students are inevitably trained that the reason that such harassment is wrong is not because all harassment is wrong or because all people should be treated with respect, but because "there is nothing wrong with being gay or lesbian." Such an assertion is not only offensive to the moral standards of most Americans and to the historical teachings of most major religions, but it flies in the face of hard scientific data showing the high rates of promiscuity, physical disease, mental illness, substance abuse, child sexual abuse, and domestic violence that result from homosexual behavior.

As for the specifics of HB 345, I am particularly concerned about the broad definitions used in the bill. The bill defines "harassment and intimidation" as any "gesture or a written, verbal, or physical act . . . motivated by an actual or perceived characteristic." Yet the Concise Oxford Dictionary is far more detailed in specifying the intention of the act, defining "harass" as "trouble and annoy continually or repeatedly" or "make repeated attacks on (an enemy or opponent)," and defining "intimidate" as "frighten or overawe, especially to subdue or influence." Without such specific qualifications that the behavior must be repeated or intended to frighten, the possibility arises that a student who peacefully and respectfully expresses to a classmate his or her personal religious conviction that homosexual behavior is immoral could be considered guilty of harassment or intimidation. Lest you think this is an extreme example, I would direct your attention to our neighbors to the north in Canada, where just two months ago a court fined a newspaper for publishing an ad that quoted Bible verses regarding homosexuality.

I urge you to oppose HB 345.

END NOTES

[i] Hostile Hallways: Bullying, Teasing, and Sexual Harassment in School (Washington:American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, 2001); see online at <http://www.aauw.org/2000/hostile.html>

[ii] Kosciw and Cullen, The GLSEN 2001 National School Climate Survey, op. cit., p. 13, Figure 25.

[iii] Ibid., Figure 26, p. 14.

[iv] Ibid., Figure 27, p. 15

[v] Marilyn Elias, "Gay teens less suicidal than thought, report says," USA Today, November 26, 2001.

[vi] Cited in: National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality, Homosexual Advocacy Groups and Your School (Encino, CA:NARTH, January 2002), p. 3.

[vii] Yvette C. Schneider, "The Gay Gene: Going, Going . . . Gone," Insight (Washington, DC:Family Research Council), April 20, 2000.

[viii] Failing to distinguish the distinct elements of attraction, which is a psychological factor; sex acts, which are a behavioral factor; and a gay identity, which is a cultural factor; constitutes one of the major problems with the term "sexual orientation" itself.

[ix] Timothy J. Dailey, "The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality," Insight (Washington, DC:Family Research Council), 6 March 2001.

From Tolerance to Affirmation: One School's Experience with a Gay-Affirmative Program

NARTH, from Gay Activism in the Schools, <http://www.narth.com/docs/fromtoler.html>

A concerned teacher, who wishes to remain anonymous, describes the quiet beginnings of his school's Project 10 program

Background:

The high school where I teach is an upper-middle-class suburban school near a major metropolitan area, with parents who are deeply involved in the education of their children. The school hires top-notch teachers, and has been recognized many times for excellence in education.

Although the majority faith among the families is Christian, many other faiths are represented, and the children are trained to appreciate religious differences.

Previously, the school had never been known for gay and lesbian activity, and most teachers seemed to be either indifferent to, or hostile to, a gay agenda.

The Beginning: School Safety

Gay agitation began during the 1992-93 school year. A group of teachers, led by a dedicated gay and lesbian promoter, banded together to discuss a problem. The teachers were told that gay students were being discriminated against--harassed, beaten up, and called names within the confines of the school. Although these incidents, whether real or created, would normally be handled by the dean's office, it was resolved that because the target of these incidents was gay students, more intense efforts needed to be made.

The group was officially formed, taking a generic name that would not display its function--even though it resolved specifically to work to fight gay harassment and discrimination.

Note the following pattern:

1. The existence of a dedicated activist on school grounds. The leader of the group was gay, and extremely dedicated to bringing the gay agenda to the school.
2. The group charter was created to be as non-threatening as and general possible. No students would be involved. Teachers were simply to be informed about it, and not coerced into joining.
3. The goals of the charter were to focus on "safety" and "sexual harassment" issues, not the affirmation of homosexuality. After all, no teacher, administrator, or parent can argue with the idea that schools should be as safe as possible for all children.
4. No record of the group's initial activities was made available, because the group was not officially recognized.

Early Development:

The group's scope soon began to expand. Sexually confused students were quietly made aware of the group's presence. More teachers were urged to join, and soon over 50 had officially become members. Meeting agendas were usually set by a core group of 10 to 15 teachers. The goals of the group--which had originally focused on "making schools safe for all children," soon shifted to "tolerance." Teachers were made aware that tolerance was

an important quality to model; one did not have to agree with gay-activist philosophy, just tolerate the existence of gay persons.

Opposition to this group was not organized; rather, individual teachers who made their concerns known were reassured that the group's goals were very limited. The group became more and more public; mailings were sent out to the teachers--and teachers who were not receptive to gay issues were informed that students felt "threatened" by their behavior.

Next, a "home page" was created for the group. Some teachers actively taught "tolerance" from the pulpit of the classroom, and began to incorporate gay and lesbian themes into their lessons. Rainbow signs--the symbol of diversity--appeared in classrooms to let students know that those classrooms were "safe" places to be.

In summary:

1. Once the gay and lesbian agenda establishes itself in a district, that agenda starts to expand. It is typically first introduced under the philosophy of "making schools safe."
2. Gay and lesbian activists choose words and phrases which make their agenda sound innocuous. Teachers are taught to respect diversity, but this respect is used by the activists to further a larger agenda. Teachers who oppose the group are labeled intolerant and warned of the fear and bigotry they are spreading among their students.
3. There is covert spreading of rainbow symbols throughout the school. The symbols are said to stand for the broader issue of respect for diversity.
4. Information about the group is quietly passed to students; soon the whole school is aware that a "pro-gay" group exists among the teachers.
5. Since the group is not recognized by the school, it is impossible for parents to influence it, or ask for its closure.
6. Although not official, the group gains credibility through each successive mailing, meeting, and forum.

Soon, students confused about their sexual identity begin to come out publicly, becoming activists themselves. Gay pride symbols appear on the student TV station. One boy enters the school talent show dressed in drag as Madonna; two young boys, and two girls, make public the fact that they are going to the prom "as a foursome." The idea soon grows that it is "cool," "different," and "chic" to be gay. Because the students are perceived as the initiators of these actions, there is no administrative censure.

Activist teachers become more public in their attempts to pass on the tenets of gay activism. Students are by now required to read books that have explicit gay and lesbian stories, and they are humiliated in class if they express any reservations about homosexuality.

The administration, sensing that this has become an issue, now decides to include the gay group among the school's official organizations--listing it along with other support groups for issues of divorce, alcoholism and pregnancy. A gay-activist teacher is made the head, aided by a sympathetic social worker from Project 10. Parents are not contacted if their child enters the Project 10 group.

The group's social worker now states that he believes that sexual identity is not an issue that has anything to do with values.

At a meeting of a student's discussion club, the leader of the gay activist group makes several announcements:

* The rainbow signs that had appeared throughout the school were not just "respect diversity" signs; they were actually gay pride signs. (Every counselor, by that time, already had one in his office.)

* "Tolerance" was not the goal, after all, because "tolerance" implies that there is something wrong with being gay, and of course there is not.

* Gay rights are said to be in the same category as civil rights for ethnic minorities; therefore in the future, the school will offer gay-affirmative curricula.

* The name of the support group is now "Project 10," referring to the "fact" that 10% of the population is gay.

As of this writing, there still is no organized opposition to Project 10 among staff members, and no group has formed among parents to oppose this agenda. From its quiet beginnings as a non-sanctioned gathering concerned with "safety," the group has now become a fully sanctioned, gay-pride organization.

Gay is now officially okay, according to the administration. These same activists are now moving on to other area schools, working to initiate similar programs.

Sexual Politics And Scientific Logic: The Issue Of Homosexuality

Charles W. Socarides, The Journal of Psychohistory, 19(3), Winter 1992

<http://www.geocities.com/kidhistory/homopolo.htm>

A significant portion of society today is of the belief that homosexuality is a normal form of sexual behavior different from but equal to that of heterosexuality. Many religious leaders, public officials, educators, social and mental health agencies, including those at the highest level of government, departments of psychiatry, psychology, and mental health clinics, have been taken in by a widespread sexual egalitarianism, by accusations of being "undemocratic" or "prejudiced" if they do not accept certain scientific assertions thrust upon them, as if deprived of all intellectual capacity to judge and reason. It is my contention in this paper that this threat of revolutionary change in our sexual mores and customs has been ushered in by a singular act of considerable consequence: the removal of homosexuality from the category of aberrancy by the American Psychiatric Association (December 1973). It is furthermore a fateful consequence of our disregard for psychoanalytic knowledge of human sexual behavior.

In what follows, I shall present a detailed account of social and political forces both within and without our organization responsible for this act and critically examine the spurious and pseudoscientific reasons put forth for the removal of a diagnosis from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual.

This act was naively perceived by many psychiatrists as the "simple" elimination of a scientific diagnosis in order to correct injustices. In reality, it created injustices for the homosexual as it belied the truth that prevented the homosexual from seeking and receiving psychoanalytic help. At the social, group, and community level, it proved to be the opening phase of a two-phase sexual radicalization; the second phase being the raising of homosexuality to the level of an alternate life style, an acceptable psycho-social institution alongside heterosexuality as the prevailing norm of behavior.

POLITICAL FACTORS LEADING TO DIAGNOSTIC CHANGE

In 1963, growing concern in the press and the medical profession prompted the New York Academy of Medicine to entrust its Committee on Public Health to study the subject of homosexuality. While the Committee in its report (1964) concluded that "homosexuality is indeed an illness, the homosexual is an emotionally disturbed individual who has not acquired the normal capacity to develop satisfying heterosexual relations," it sounded an alarm: it warned that "some homosexuals have gone beyond the plane of defensiveness and now argue that deviancy is a 'desirable, noble, preferable way of life.'" Spokesmen for homosexual groups argued that homosexuality was not an aberration; those so oriented were merely a different kind of people living an acceptable way of life, and, for one thing, they claimed it was the perfect answer to the problem of a population explosion (!). Clearly a disturbing trend was developing, with homosexuals banding together, not to demand help from psychiatry and the medical profession and public recognition of their condition (alongside those individuals with any form of neurosis or emotional disorder) or simply to protest against legal injustices, but to proclaim their "normality" and attack all opposition to this view. Those who took this view in the past constituted a vocal but very small minority of homosexuals compared to the large number of homosexuals who desired more help, not less, or who remained silent. To my mind just as alcoholism and drug addiction has become recognized as illness over the past several decades, so was sexual deviation increasingly to be understood as an emotional disorder and, similar to other mental disorders, not to be penalized when practiced among consenting adults. Freedom from persecutory laws as well as the granting of full civil rights constituted an integral part of this approach to homosexual individuals.

As a young analyst encouraged by the therapeutic response of my homosexual patients to the freedom they found in being relieved of the yoke of their homosexuality, I decided that the moment had come to act directly on the behalf of the homosexual and anyone else suffering from a sexual disorder, with the idea of making help available on request to many. I wrote to Stanley F. Yolles, M.D., then Director of the National Institutes of Mental Health, asking to meet with him to discuss some suggestions for a national program for the prevention and treatment of homosexuality and other sexual disorders. I wrote, "Of the whole range of sexual disorders, homosexuality is the most misunderstood. Homosexuality not only causes suffering for the individual but is inimical to the preservation of the family unit. The psychological conflicts which lead to the development of homosexuality, the anguish of the homosexual himself and the damage to his family and close associates produces tragic consequences. It should be the task of psychoanalytically informed psychiatry and modern medicine to dispel the mystery that surrounds homosexuality and dissolve the fear which attends any attempt at free discussion. Homosexuality, I predicted, could well be alleviated in many instances by fresh approaches to therapy. Hope could then be offered to many who had often surrendered in despair, the very real hope that a favorable prognosis was quite possible in most cases when homosexuals

voluntarily sought help, Yolles' encouraging reply was that I meet with members of his staff with the possibility of implementing such a program, but representatives of our nation's central mental service (NIMH) dismissed it out of hand at a meeting in Washington, D.C. (February 3, 1965). I went on, however, writing and publishing my findings (1968, 1978) and was invited by my colleagues to address the Adult Psychiatry branch of the NIMH on the problem and treatment of homosexuality in 1967. Shortly thereafter, NIMH appointed a Task Force on homosexuality. In October 1969, this Task Force submitted its final report in which it acknowledged at least in part the validity of my earlier proposal by recommending "the coordination of NIMH activities in the broad area of sexual behavior for the establishment of a center for the study of sexual behavior."

This task force did not by any means represent the forefront of knowledge on the issue of homosexuality. Only three psychiatrists were participants. One of them, Dr. Judd Marmor, had for years espoused the view that homosexuality was "normal." The Chairperson was psychologist Evelyn Hooker, Ph.D.,⁽¹⁾ who was of the same long time conviction. The Kinsey-Hopkins faction was represented by Dr. Paul Gebhardt, Ph.D., Director of the Institute for Sex at Indiana University, and John Money, Ph.D., from Johns Hopkins, an early proponent of transsexual surgery and the acceptance of homosexuality as normal. The law was represented by the Honorable David M. Bazelon, who at one point during the Task Force deliberations resigned. Psychoanalytic clinicians such as Bieber, Hadden, Bychowski, Rado, Lorand myself and others who had worked for many years in depth therapy with homosexual patients were pointedly left off the committee. On a subsequent occasion I was told by Gebhardt that this action was taken as Bieber, I and others were considered "professionally biased" because of our "Freudian approach." The NIMH report concluded: "Some of the primary goals of the NIMH service study of sexual behavior should be to develop knowledge, generate and disseminate information, mollify taboo and myths, provide rational basis for intervention, and provide data to policy makers for use in their efforts to frame social policy." The report asked for society's toleration and understanding of the homosexual condition and the gradual removal of persecutory laws against such activities between consulting adults. These positions were good and well taken, but where the report failed abysmally was that it never concluded that exclusive homosexuality was a form of emotional illness, arrested psychosexual development, or a pathological condition of any kind, thereby lending tacit approval to emerging concepts of deviancy.

Meanwhile, militant political homosexual groups continued to disrupt a number of scientific programs both at the national and local level in which findings as to the psychopathology of homosexuality, its origins, symptomatology, course, and treatment, were going to be discussed, e.g., national meetings of the American Psychiatric Association; Association for Psychoanalytic Medicine (Columbia University); Panel on Homosexuality: "A Current Controversy," New York Academy of Medicine (November 27, 1973). Psychiatrists who dared to speak of their clinical findings were "discredited" even in the pages of the official newspaper of our own organization, e.g., "Psychiatrists Blast Colleagues' 'Prejudice' Against Homosexuals" *Psychiatric News*, June 7, 1972.⁽²⁾ Some of these public attacks were augmented by hate-filled letters, threatening attacks over the telephone, and even threats of terrorist action against those who continued to speak of their scientific findings. Marmor, utilizing the nationwide distributing capacity of the newsletter distributed by SIECUS⁽³⁾ (Scientific Information and Education Council of the U.S.), a private non-governmental organization heavily in favor of "new liberal concepts of sexuality" including homosexuality, denounced a *Journal of the American Medical Association* article entitled "Homosexuality and Medicine (1970)" by this author as "an unfortunate potpourri of prejudice and misinformation [which] stems ... from obvious personal prejudices."

As a counter to such tactics, which tended to silence all scientific debate, I proposed to the New York County District Branch of the American Psychiatric Association that it should establish a task force as an official committee of that organization in order to shed light on the nature, meaning, and content of homosexuality to psychiatry and an increasingly bewildered public. Thus the first all-psychiatric task force on homosexuality was born. It was and has been the only such medically oriented body in the country. After two years of deliberations and sixteen meetings the task force, composed of a dozen experts affiliated with the major medical centers of New York City, attempted to submit its report on homosexuality to the Executive Council of the New York City District Branch, a report which unanimously documented the fact that exclusive homosexuality was a disorder of psychosexual development and simultaneously asked for civil rights for those suffering from the disorder. The report was "not acceptable" to the new members⁽⁴⁾ (and some old) of the Executive Committee. Other business took its place in the Executive Committee meeting and although general statements were accepted as to its content it was not accepted into the minutes of the meeting. The message was coming through loud and clear: the only report acceptable would have been one which was not only in favor of civil rights but one which declared homosexuality not a psychosexual disorder. The committee was then dissolved. Its members, determined that the report see the light of day, eventually published it as a "study group" report in the late Spring of 1974 (New York City District Branch APA Task Force Report).

In mid-1973, Vice President Judd Marmor of the APA and John Spiegel, President, APA, and other psychiatrists met with the Gay Activist Alliance, the Mattachine Society and its female ancillary, the Daughters of Bilitis, and the Nomenclature Committee of the American Psychiatric Association at Columbia University, New York City, to discuss the deletion of "homosexuality" from the diagnostic nomenclature (*New York Times*, Spring 1973).

In November 1973, I was asked by a Newsweek reporter if I would care to comment on the upcoming celebration/cocktail party to take place at the APA headquarters in Washington, D.C. in December commemorating the "greatest of gay victories"-the "purging" of homosexuality from the realm of psychiatry. Dr. Robert L. Spitzer, a psychiatrist at the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, and Secretary of the APA Committee on Nomenclature and Statistics, had been made chairman of the Nomenclature Task Force on Homosexuality, apparently setting it apart from the Nomenclature and Statistics Committee itself. Dr. Henry Brill, a respected and dignified psychiatrist embodying the best traditions of the state hospital system, had been removed from a position of authority in respect to the issue. Spitzer, who to my knowledge had never previously published a single article on homosexuality or the sexual deviations, had composed a position paper on the meaning and content of homosexuality. It was upon his rationale that the Nomenclature Committee (or the task force part of it) had proceeded. His new definition was sent to the Council on Research and Development. The head of the group, in a telephone call I made to him soon thereafter, stated: "After all, homosexuals must be protected and this might be the best way to do it." I argued that we were all for protecting the homosexual against persecution, but this was a different matter.

Should we dismiss our scientific findings for social/political reasons? Joseph Stalin's insistence on substituting Lamarckian concepts in place of those of Mendelian inheritance for political purposes and the serious consequences to the science of genetics immediately came to my mind. We psychoanalytic clinicians had long been and continue to be in the vanguard of protecting our homosexual patients against assertions of degeneracy and unfair laws. After all, it was Freud who first admitted homosexuals and others were sexually deviant into the consultation room as respected and worthy patients on a par with till those suffering from emotional disorders of any kind. Psychoanalysis had begun to understand homosexual condition: was the homosexual to be "buried" by stating that this was a "non-condition?" Such an action would constitute a repudiation of all we have learned about sexual deviation. I said that homosexuals were individuals who out of inner necessity must engage in homosexual practices or otherwise experience anxiety. This was clearly a psychiatric disorder. We got nowhere.

From the Council on Research and Development the proposed change in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual went to the Assembly, thence to the APA Reference Committee. "Minor changes" were made in these committees, it was later announced. These "minor changes" were hardly minor, e.g. "heterosexual orientation disturbance" was to be included along with homosexuality as a "sexual orientation disturbance" to signify those people who were "disturbed" at the knowledge that they were heterosexual(!) (Minutes, APA Council, 11/3/73). It was decided a few weeks later that this was unwise, and therefore "heterosexuality as a disorder" was deleted. The new position favoring deletion of homosexuality was obviously clinically untenable and scientifically fallacious, even to a first-year resident in psychiatry. There was no scientific explanation for this deletion except the statement that the homosexual did not experience "suffering"; those who disliked being homosexual and "suffered over it" or "complained" were to be considered to have a "disorder." We persisted that respect for the tradition of open scientific debate as well as professional ethics and morality required that we be given a hearing on this matter.

Our group of dissidents consisting of three members of the APA out of a committee of twelve received a hearing immediately preceding the Board of Trustees vote on December 14, 1973. I reviewed before the Board the serious consequences(5) of this change during an allotted five-minute presentation by stating that as a result of this position: [1] An alteration of theoretical concepts of healthy versus abnormal sexual development would have to "logically" take place; [2] Sex education in our schools would in all likelihood include homosexual sex education (this has already come to pass); [3] Despair would be created within the individual homosexual who wished help. The homosexual would forfeit his mammalian heritage, the chance to engage in the male-female design; [4] Homosexuals would not enter therapy or be dissuaded for long periods in doing so: tremendous resistances to therapy would result, injuring the patient's progress; [5] Suicides among those with gender identity disorder might well increase.(6) Where would individuals get help if they could not turn to psychiatry? The individual homosexual who wished to be helped, to rid himself of his condition, would be doomed by pronouncements of the Board of Trustees, family and friends would despair. [6] would confuse other medical disciplines such as pediatrics, to whom families and youngsters turned for advice, to say nothing of the rest of the medical profession; [7] Homosexuals were already giving lectures on the value of homosexuality as an alternative life style to some of our public schools and in our colleges; [8] Psychiatric residents would be reluctant to enter an area of psychiatric research where they would only receive attack, belittlement, and demeanment. Thus there would be a decrease in both our knowledge and psychiatric research in this condition. We strongly urged postponement of voting by the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees voted practically unanimously against us, with two abstentions. It is interesting to note that only two thirds of the members of the Board of Trustees were present, barely enough to constitute a quorum for this important decision. Were some members simply avoiding a confrontation with the majority view already determined and adamant in their conviction? Otherwise, how could one explain their absence on such a critical issue?

A few weeks later, the "rationale" for the deletion of homosexuality as a psychiatric disorder was presented to the medical

community. The "rationale" for this change was to be found in two items: The first was an official position paper presented by Robert F. Spitzer, Chairman, Nomenclature Task Force on Homosexuality, before the Board prior to its decision (Spitzer, R.L. [1974], "The Homosexual Decision-A Background Paper," *Psychiatric News*, pp 11-12). According to *Psychiatric News*, it was "essentially upon the rationale of Dr. Spitzer's presentation that the Board made its decision" (p. 11). This paper in essence repeated Kinsey's earlier assertion that exclusive homosexuality was a normal part of the human condition at one end of the Kinsey "homosexual - heterosexual scale."⁽⁷⁾ It did not meet the requirements of a psychiatric disorder since it "does not either regularly cause subjective distress or [is] regularly associated with some generalized impairment in social effectiveness or functioning" (Spitzer). The second item consisted of conclusions supplied by Drs. Marcel T. Saghir and Eli Robins in their book *Male and Female Homosexuality* (1973). Saghir and Robins' "scientific" evidence did not employ any psychoanalytic methodology, but was a descriptive survey from which the conclusion that homosexuality was a normal condition was derived from one structured lengthy interview with homosexuals (recruited through homophile organizations) and "unmarried heterosexual controls" (solicited by mail and paid for the interview) and coincided with the position paper above.

The term "sexual orientation disturbance (homosexuality)" was now to be substituted for homosexuality. It was defined as follows:

This is for individuals whose sexual interests are directed primarily toward people of the same sex and who are neither disturbed by, in conflict with, or wish to change their sexual orientation. This diagnostic category is distinguished from homosexuality, which by itself does not constitute a psychiatric disorder. Homosexuality per se is one form of sexual behavior, and with other forms of sexual behavior which are not by themselves psychiatric disorders, are not listed in this nomenclature" (*Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*) July 1974).

This diagnostic category underwent several metamorphoses in several editions of the DSM III, including establishing a separate category of "ego-dystonic homosexuality" (for those who were "unhappy" that they were homosexual) to the ultimate elimination of the word "homosexual" from the DSM III Revised 1987 as a scientific category (APA Diagnostic Criteria DSM II; American Psychiatric Association, Washington, D.C.)

A reversal of the decision by the Board of Trustees would require two hundred members requesting a referendum. It was for this purpose that a referendum was asked for. Fortunately, the American Psychoanalytic Association was holding its midwinter meeting in New York City at the time and two hundred and forty-three signatures from psychoanalytic practitioners (members and fellows of the APA who were familiar with the clinical problems of the homosexual) petitioned for a reversal of the Board of Trustees vote. It was a credit to psychiatrists in general that in the voting of the general membership (April, 1974) that was to follow on this issue (voting marred by hidden lobbying by homosexual activists)⁽⁸⁾ held months later, forty percent of the psychiatrists who voted (10,000) took issue with the Board of Trustees' action, asserting that there were no legitimate scientific reasons for the APA's change in fundamental psychiatric theory. It is fallacious to conclude from this vote that the majority of psychiatrists in the United States were in favor of the action, for only 25% of those eligible to vote out of more than 25,000 psychiatrists sent in their ballots. Despite this fact, the decision stood.⁽⁹⁾

By declaring a condition a "non-condition," a group of practitioners had removed it from our list of serious psychosexual disorders. The action was all the more remarkable when one considers that it involved the out-of-hand and peremptory disregard and dismissal not only of hundreds of psychiatric and psychoanalytic research papers and reports⁽¹⁰⁾ but also of a number of other serious studies by groups of psychiatrists, psychologists, and educators over the past seventy years, for example, the Report of the Committee of Cooperation with Governmental (Federal) Agencies of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (1955); the New York Academy of Medicine Report (1964); the Task Force Report of the New York County District Branch of the APA done in 1970-72 (Socarides, et. al., 1973).

To the psychoanalyst, this was psychiatric folly. Psychoanalysts comprehend the meaning of a particular act of human behavior by delving in-to the motivational state from which it issues. Obviously these decision makers had not viewed individuals in this manner. When individuals with similar behavior are analytically investigated, we then arrive at objective conclusions as to the meaning and significance of a particular phenomenon under examination. Thus is insight achieved. To form conclusions as to the specific individual meaning of an event simply because of its frequency of occurrence (the number of homosexuals was often alluded to as indicating that it was normal)⁽¹¹⁾ is to the psychoanalyst scientific idiocy only in the consultation room, using the technique of introspective reporting and free association, protected by all the laws of medicine, psychology, and psychiatry, will an individual reveal the hidden (even from himself) meaning and reasons behind his act. The meaning of a particular act of piece of behavior can only be decided on the basis of the motivational context from which it arises.

The concept of "disadvantage" was introduced as a reason for declaring homosexuality a "non-disorder" by the Nomenclature

Committee two years after the deletion (1976). The view that the homosexual of the obligatory type is at "no social disadvantage" is a denial of the realities that surround us when one considers that a society governs the behavior of its members from birth to death through its laws, mores, and other institutions. A human being is born with responses that constitute his mammalian heritage (a product of evolution). He is then introduced into a web of social institutions, a product of cumulative tradition which con-stitutes his cultural heritage. The two, mammalian and cultural heritages, lead man to his sexual pattern-heterosexuality. Heterosexuality has a biological and social usefulness. It creates the family unit and allows men and women to live together under conditions where there is likely to be the least amount of fear, rage, and hate. It furthermore regulates this relationship through a series of laws, penalties, and rewards.

Additional proof of the politicization of American psychiatry was to be provided later from an unexpected source: a book by Ronald Bayer, a fellow of the Hastings Institute of New York. He stated that Spitzer was "sympathetic to the viewpoint of the gay liberation group" (pp.130-131) and Brill was suffering from "indecision and discomfort with Spitzer's aggressive assumption of leadership on this issue." Even more important was the revelation (never previously acknowledged) that the Council on Research and Development of the APA did not officially investigate or study the issue thoroughly before it gave formal approval to the deletion of homosexuality from the DSM II.

It was to Monroe's council, comprised of five senior psychiatrists who were responsible for providing the APA with advice on matters of policy and with information on current issues in psychiatric research, that Spitzer's proposal [for deletion] was first under consideration. Though officially coming from the Committee on Nomenclature, in fact it had never been formally approved by its members and thus presented Spitzer's own effort to resolve what many APA leaders considered "a hot potato" (Bayer, pp.130-131, emphasis added).

Bayer laid bare developments that took place in December 1973. He states that the Board of Trustees "satisfied the formal requirements of providing a fair hearing [and proceeded] to render its verdict," but he omitted the fact that the requests for such a hearing had to be aggressively pursued (there was no invitation" to appear and permission to address the Board of Trustees was granted most reluctantly by its chairman, Dr. John Spiegel). Furthermore, this "fair hearing" consisted of a five-minute allowance for each person testifying, including Drs. Irving Bieber (Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, New York Medical College), John McDevitt (Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, University of Cincinnati), Armand Nicholi of the Harvard Medical School Student Health Service-and myself. The time limit was strictly adhered to and no time was allowed from discussion. The suggestion by the Ad Hoc Committee Against the Deletion of Homosexuality (the "psychiatric dissidents"), headed by myself, that a pro-civil rights statement be made but that the question of scientific merits of the diagnosis(12) be left for further study and reflection, was peremptorily dismissed. Our proposal was unacceptable. For the next 18 years, the APA decision was to serve as a Trojan horse, opening the gates to widespread psychological and social change in sexual customs and mores. The decision was to be used on numerous occasions for numerous purposes with the goal of normalizing homosexuality and elevating it to an esteemed status.

To some American psychiatrists this action remains a chilling reminder that if scientific principles are not fought for they can be lost - a disillusioning warning that unless we make no exceptions to science, we are subject to the snares of political factionalism and the propagation of untruths to an unsuspecting and uninformed public, to the rest of the medical profession, and to the behavioral sciences.

Beyond the disservice to homosexual patients and their families, the confusion in the mind of the public, and the pushing back of the front-tiers of our knowledge, what is the fate of society in all this? Abram Kardiner, psychoanalyst, former Professor of Psychiatry at Columbia University, recipient of the Humanities Prize of The New York Times in 1966, warns:

There is an epidemic form of homosexuality, which is more than the usual incidence, which generally occurs in social crises or in declining cultures when license and boundless permissiveness dulls the pain of ceaseless anxiety, universal hostility and divisiveness. Thus in the Betsileo of Madagascar the incidence of homosexuality was visibly increased at a time when the society was under a state of col-lapse. Supporting the claims of the homosexuals and regar-ding homosexuality as a normal variant of sexual activity is to deny the social significance of homosexuality. To do this is to give support to the divisive elements in the community. Above all it militates against the family and destroys the function of the latter as the last place in our society where affectivity can still be cultivated.

Homosexuals cannot make a society, nor keep ours going for very long. Homosexuality operates against the cohesive elements in society in the name of fictitious freedom. It drives the opposite sex into a similar direction. And no society can long endure when either the child is neglected or when the sexes war upon each other (Kardiner, personal communication to the author, 1973).

THE PSYCHOANALYTIC POSITION

The psychoanalyst's compassion and concern as regards the external conflicts faced by the homosexual due to societal disapproval should not blind us, however, to the internal conflicts, conflicts which occur between various conscious and unconscious tendencies within the individual which are causative of this disorder. The homosexual, no matter what his or her level of adaptation and function in other areas of life, is severely handicapped in the most vital area-interpersonal relations.

A typical family constellation is that in which there is a psychologically crushing mother (in extreme cases) and an absent or abdicating father who does not assume his appropriate masculine role in relation to his son that allows the son to identify with him. In the female homosexual there is a corresponding inability to identify with what is viewed by the girl as a malevolent, malicious mother and a father who does not respect the femininity of his daughter. The female homosexual seeks femininity in the body and personality of her female partner.

Pathology, organically and psychologically, may be defined as a failure to function, with concomitant pain and/or suffering. It is this failure, its significance and manifold consequences that are so obvious in obligatory homosexuality—a failure in functioning which, if carried to its extreme, would mean the death of the species. Beneath this obvious failure of function and the secondary external conflicts it may provoke, lie the agony, sorrow, tragedy, fear and guilt of a both conscious and un-conscious nature which pervades the homosexual's life. Psychiatrists who treat such individuals in depth know this very well. Those who do not practice depth psychotherapy or psychoanalysis often do not observe or may tend to minimize the degree of suffering the homosexual endures—suffering induced by internal conflicts—inasmuch as the homosexuality also provides temporary relief from severe anxiety. Furthermore, obligatory homosexuality (in contrast to episodic, situational, or variational homosexual behavior, which is not considered a pathological condition per se) may cause such disruption in the equilibrium of the individual that all meaningful relations in life are damaged from the outset and are peculiarly susceptible to breakdown. Attitudes toward the opposite sex are often filled with distrust and fear as to render them incapable of any relationship at all, except on the most superficial and brittle basis. The obligatory homosexual is unable to function in the most meaningful relationship in life: the male-female sexual union and the affective state of love, tenderness and joy with a partner of the opposite sex.

The homosexual engages in a compromise adaptation, "choosing" a same-sex partner for sexual gratification in order to save the self from anxiety. The ability of the homosexual to neutralize anxiety motivates the homosexual to use this as a face-saving rationalization—that is, that he or she is not suffering from an emotional disorder at all, especially if one is convinced that there is no help for changing their condition. Despite the appearance at any given time of an adequate life performance, internal conflict threatens to disrupt this fragile adjustment.

Major breakthroughs have been made in psychoanalytic knowledge leading to the conclusion that oedipal-phase conflict in certain homosexual patients is always superimposed on deeper, basic preoedipal nuclear conflicts. In certain cases of homosexuality, it is apparent that object relations pathology contributes more to the development of homosexuality than the vicissitudes of the drives—in other words, that the central conflict of the homosexual is an object relations one rather than a structural one. These views apply to relatively pronounced cases in which the perverse development is clear and definite.

The combination of infant observational studies and developmental theories in the psychoanalytic material derived from the study of adult homosexuals helps to explain that the fixation of the homosexual lies in all probability in the later phases of the separation-individuation process, producing a disturbance in self identity as well as in gender identity, persistence of a primary feminine identification with the mother (in the case of the female homosexual, an identification with the mother perceived as malevolent and hateful), separation anxiety, fears of engulfment (restoring the mother-child unity), and disturbance in object relations and associated ego functions.

The homosexual has no choice as regards his or her sexual object. The condition is unconsciously determined, is differentiated from the behavior of a person who deliberately engages in same-sex sexual contact due to situational factors or a desire for variational experiences. As noted above, these constitute non-clinical forms of homosexual behavior. The nuclear core of true homosexuality is never a conscious choice, an act of will; but rather it is determined from the earliest period of childhood, in terms of origin, of course, not in practice. The homosexogenic family environment has been noted above. The presence of external conflicts which complicate the lives of homosexuals should not be allowed to obfuscate the valid clinical data secured through in-depth psychoanalytic studies, for this misinforms psychiatrists, the general reader, and, unfortunately, a vulnerable public.

Lastly, it should be stated that it is obvious to some psychoanalysts that the requirements for definitions of a condition or disorder on the basis of conscious anxiety and suffering ran counter to everything we knew dynamically about the mechanisms

involved in this serious disturbance. For example, the enactment of any sexual deviation helps to keep the individual in equilibrium and neutralize anxiety. It has been unconsciously specifically fashioned for this purpose. Therefore, the presence or absence of anxiety cannot be an adequate criterion to use when determining whether the condition is a disorder or not. Some of the most severely disturbed homosexuals have no anxiety because of their constant enactment of the homosexual act. Furthermore, Spitzer's proposal, as noted above, disregarded the following: [1] the presence of a specific need, desire, compulsion, or other symptom formation may so circumscribe pathology that a patient may appear to be functioning well in every other aspect of his life; [2] fully developed neurotic symptoms can mask illness as well as express it; and [3] the mechanism of sexual deviation results in the production of an ego-syntonic symptom, namely, one that allays and neutralizes anxiety.

The official position of the American Psychoanalytic Association is indicated by its definitions of homosexuality which appear in *A Glossary of Psychoanalytic Terms and Concepts*, edited by B.E. Moore, M.D. and B.D. Fine, M.D. This glossary, first published in 1968, underwent its third printing in 1983. It states:

In the male homosexual there is, as a rule, an overly strong attachment to the mother up to and including the oedipal phase, which is not resolved by identification with the father but rather by partial identification with the mother. Object choice is narcissistic in type, i.e., the loved person must be like the self, and sexual excitation is experienced in regard to men instead of women. Due to strong castration fears, the homosexual man cannot tolerate a sexual partner without the tremendously valued male organ. Another common motive for homosexual object choice is the avoidance of rivalry with fathers and brothers.

In female homosexuality (lesbianism), the woman retains a strong original preoedipal attachment to the mother, which is displaced onto the homosexual partner. As a result of an unsatisfactory outcome of oedipal conflicts, her identification with the mother is incomplete and she holds onto mother as an object of love [p.48].

EPILOGUE

In the material cited above, I have described a movement within the American Psychiatric Association which through social/political activism has accomplished the first phase of a two-phase radicalization of a main pillar of psychosexual life: the erosion of heterosexuality as the single acceptable sexual pattern in our culture. The motive force for this movement was the wish to protect the homosexual against injustices and persecution which could to all intents and purposes have been removed by the demand for equal rights for the homosexual, a demand that could well have been fulfilled through humanitarian motivations so deeply embedded in our humanistic science. Instead, the false step of removing homosexuality from our Diagnostic and Statistical Manual was substituted. This amounted to a full approval of homosexuality and an encouragement to aberrancy by those who should have known better, both in the scientific sense and in the sense of the social consequences of such removal. (The relationships between social approval and homosexuality as a developmental disorder will be dealt with in a subsequent paper.) The devastating clinical fallout from this decision was to follow. Those who would wish to retain homosexuality as a valid diagnosis have been practically silenced by lectures, meetings, and publications, both originating within our association and from other sources. Political parties and religious leaders have been utilized to reinforce this silence. The press has been influenced as well as the media;(14) television and movies promote homosexuality as an alternative life style as well as censor movies which might show homosexuality as a disorder. Homosexual sex education has entered our schools and colleges-and pro-Gay activists, homosexual or otherwise, portray their way of life as "normal as apple pie" and intimidate others with different views. In essence, this movement within the American Psychiatric Association has accomplished what every other society, with rare exceptions, would have trembled to tamper with, a revision of a basic code and concept of life and biology: that men and women normally mate with the opposite sex and not with each other.

Forces adamantly insisting that homosexuality is an alternative life style have not been stopped by appeals to tradition, enlightened self-interest or even the findings of psychoanalysis.(15) Threats about what would happen to society do not have much effect: nobody considers himself society's guardian. The average citizen says he doesn't quite know what these social interests are and, after all, aren't personal decisions about sex a private matter? The answer to that question, contrary to popular opinion, is NO.

Psychoanalysis reveals that sexual behavior is not an arbitrary set of rules set down by no one knows who for purposes which no one understands. Our sexual patterns are a product of our biological past, a result of man's collective experience and his long biological and social evolutionary march. They make possible the cooperative coexistence of human beings with one another. At the individual level, they create a balance between the demands of sexual instinct and the external realities surrounding each of us. Not all cultures survive; the majority have not, and anthropologists tell us that serious flaws in sexual codes and institutions have undoubtedly played a significant role in many a culture's demise (Kardiner, A., 1939). When masses of people

think similarly about previous sexual customs, their collective behavior will, in the last analysis, have a profound impact on the whole of society.

Scientists, psychologists, psychiatrists, political leaders, public officials and others with vested interests today ransack literature for bits of fact and theory which can be pieced together into a pro-homosexual or bisexual concept of nature, man and society. Some of the individuals say that homosexuals are healthy, society is sick and that science should cure society. Others raise false or outdated scientific issues in their war with traditional values. Many of our values could use change, but polemical pseudoscience is not the way. No society has accepted adult preferential homosexuality. Nowhere is homosexuality or so-called bisexuality a desired end in itself. Nowhere do parents say: "It's all the same to me if my child is heterosexual or homosexual." Nowhere are homosexuals more than a small minority at the present time. Nowhere does homosexuality per se place one in an enviable position (Karlen, A., 1971).

Some pro-homosexual proponents within the behavioral sciences state that mental illness is simply a product of social definition and that sexual behavior considered normal in one society may be deviant in another. Examination of the facts shows that this is not true of all illness and all behaviors. Some behaviors are universally deviant, and every society thinks them disruptive. Incest, rape, psychopathic (apparently unmotivated) violence are considered taboo in all societies. So is predominant or exclusive homosexuality or even bisexuality.

The counter to such forces is the knowledge that heterosexuality has self-evident adaptive values: decades and even centuries of cultural change are not likely to undo thousands of years of evolutionary selection and programming. Man is not only a sexual animal but a care-bonding, group-bonding, and child-rearing animal. The male-female design is taught to the child from birth and culturally ingrained through the marital order. This design is anatomically determined, as it derives from cells which in the evolutionary scale underwent changes into organ systems and finally into individuals reciprocally adapted to each other. The male-female design is thus perpetually maintained and only over-whelming fear or man's false pride and misdirected individual enterprise can disturb or divert it.

APPENDIX A

Spitzer's rationale for removing homosexuality relied heavily on the work of Alfred Kinsey and his belief in the normality of homosexuality. For that reason, it shall be commented on in some detail.

The Kinsey Report of 1948 has been likened in importance by some to man's radically altered view of himself initiated by Darwin's discoveries. His conclusions are accepted even among some well-intentioned and educated people. The Kinsey Report has had in several ways a severe and damaging delayed impact on our sexual mores, especially as they pertain to homosexuality. Alfred Kinsey, a Ph.D. in zoology, made a valuable statistical survey between 1939 and 1948 of the sexual behavior of twelve thousand American males. His figures are still widely cited as there are no others of comparable scope to contradict them. In general, there is no reason to dispute his data as to incidence. The value of the exhaustive and informative survey was that it enumerated the manifold forms taken by a force so powerful it cannot be denied expression. The enormous public curiosity about Kinsey's figures blinded most people to some of the erroneous interpretations to which some of the figures gave rise, especially in the area of homosexuality. The Kinsey conclusions and interpretations have become a banner under which the gay liberationists and similar pleaders have rallied, citing them as sexual gospel. Kinsey, however, erred in attempting to interpret his statistics, a fault which was perpetuated by his followers. Kinsey concluded that homosexuality is present in ten percent of all males in a persistent (obligatory) form and in thirty-five percent of all males in the transitory form. He believed this was due to the fact that homosexuality is a biological variant. Kinsey invented a scale based on the incidence revealed in his own studies of homosexuality-heterosexuality, representing a continuum between homosexual and heterosexual behavior. To him this connoted that exclusive homosexuality was a normal part of the human condition, of normal sexuality, and simply existed at one end of the "homosexual-heterosexual scale." Exclusive heterosexuality was purportedly at the other end for apparently the same reason, because it was a "biological given." Conscious and unconscious motivations in the causation and/or expression of homosexuality, whether of the exclusive (obligatory) type or not, were completely disregarded.

The statistical studies of the type Kinsey offered ignored the concepts of repression, unconscious mind, and motivation. While they supply incidence rates of certain phenomena, they do so as if behavior has no connection with motivation. Since neither conscious nor unconscious motivation is even acknowledged, these studies arrive at a disastrous conclusion that the resultant composite of sexual behavior is the norm of sexual behavior. The next step was to demand that the public, the law, medicine, religion, and other social institutions unquestioningly accept this proposition. Even intelligent laymen, gulled by the false interpretation of these statistics, were taken in and continue to be so.

In contrast to the psychoanalytic method of investigating behavior (motivational analysis), the only differentiation Kinsey and his followers admitted to is a quantitative one. For example, among the various forms of homosexuality, Kinsey was opposed to considering a man homosexual in whom the "heterosexual-homosexual balance" was only slightly or temporarily shifted to the homosexual side. Psychiatrically, this is incorrect, for the quantitative approach cannot replace the psychogenetic one.

Edmund Bergler, a psychoanalytic pioneer into understanding homosexuality, was fond of comparing this quantitative approach to the situation that would exist if someone invented the idea of subdividing headaches entirely according to quantitative principles, rating them from one to six according to severity.

Medically speaking, a headache is only a symptom indicating a variety of possibilities: from brain tumor to sinus infection, from migraine attack to uremia, from neurosis to high blood pressure, from epilepsy to suppressed fury. Instead of the causal (what causes the headache) viewpoint, we would have in this new order only quantitatively varying degrees of big, middle-sized, and small headaches (1969).

The Kinsey yardstick omits differentiation of the underlying conditions. Moreover, as Bergler notes, "in the previously mentioned rating of headaches, at a specific moment a headache produced by a sinus attack could be more severe than one produced in certain stages of a brain tumor." The homosexual "outlet" covers a multitude of completely different genetic problems. Hence a causal yardstick is necessary for the differentiation and therapy of the confusion and many-faceted types of human relationships.

From the beginning, when Kinsey's figures were made known, few individuals—except for Lionel Trilling in the literary arts and some eminent psychoanalysts, especially Bergler, Kubie, and Kardiner—cared to criticize Kinsey's findings. Still fewer treated them lightly, although H.L. Mencken in his volume *Christomathy* quipped: "All this humorless document really proves is: (a) that all men lie when they are asked about their adventures in amour and (b) that pedagogues are singularly naive and credulous creatures."

According to social historian Paul Robinson (1976), Kinsey's heterosexual-homosexual rating scale was a "pathetic manifestation of Kinsey's philosophical naivete . . . a hopelessly mechanical contrivance, which sought to promote a system of classification that bore little relation to reality" (pp.73-74). It was a gargantuan scientific hoax promoted by Kinsey for reasons of his own. In psychoanalytic terms, it was a massive form of denial as defense. With remarkable prescience, Lionel Trilling, social and literary critic, predicted the dire consequences of this idea for the scientific community as early as 1948. He stated that in the future

Those who most explicitly assert and wish to practice the democratic virtues [will have taken] as their assumption that all social facts—with the exception of exclusion and economic hardship—must be accepted not merely in the scientific sense but also in the social sense, in the sense, that is, that no judgment must be passed on them, that any conclusion drawn from them which perceives values and consequences will turn out to be "undemocratic" (Trilling, 1948).

And so it is today. Charges of being "undemocratic," "cruel and in-human" (Marmor, 1973), "irresponsible, homophobic and prejudiced" (Isay, 1986) are leveled at those who would question the normality of homosexuality. These accusations are then reinforced by the media, motion pictures, and the press, and render the ordinary citizen who disapproves of such practices, as well as faint-hearted members of the psychiatric profession, mute before their onslaught.

APPENDIX B

The ability to engage in variational sexual experiences and substitute them for the standard coital pattern (male-female sexual coital pairs) (Rado, 1949) is a consequence of man's evolutionary development. Evolutionary development is used by proponents of normality of homosexuality for purposes of their own: they turn to Ford and Beach, prominent ethologists, and ransack their studies on primates to support the concept that "a biological tendency for inversion of sexual behavior [homosexuality] is inherent in most if not all mammals including the human species" (Isay, 1983, p.238). Ford, however, says nothing of the sort. He states that same-sex mounting behavior is not an evidence of in-born homosexual patterns which can be generalized to humans. Beach corrected this erroneous interpretation in 1971: "I don't know any authentic instance of male or female in the animal world preferring a homosexual partner—if by homosexual you mean complete sexual relations, including climax. It's questionable that mounting in itself can properly be called sexual" (p.399).

Ford has made stunning discoveries—discoveries which prove the opposite. They noted that above the level of the chimpanzee,

only three automatic mechanisms for orgasmic release remain: erection, pelvic thrust, and orgasmic release itself. Everything else is learned behavior. Man builds up his sexual pattern by virtue of his cerebral cortex in combination with early childhood experiences. In man, due to the tremendous development of the cerebral cortex, motivation, both conscious and unconscious, plays the crucial role in the selection of individuals and/or objects that will produce sexual arousal and orgasmic release. Furthermore, not only is man's cortex responsible for the development of heterosexual patterns and the associated social and cultural which support them, but it is the unique action of the cerebral cortex allows man to develop all the sexual deviations as partial attempted solutions to inner conflict as well as facilitating roundabout methods of sexual release in the face of insurmountable fears. Sexual deviations are beyond the mental and motivational capacities of lower animals. Evolution has relieved us of pheromones, sexual and olfactory responses to sexual stimuli as a major factor in sexual arousal, but it has left in its wake the possibility of deviant practices as well as other complex neurotic behavior. These deviant practices then may become the bane of one's existence when they become stereotyped and inflexible.

Charles W. Socarides, M.D. is Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, Albert Einstein College of Medicine/Montefiore Medical Center, New York City. Author of *The Overt Homosexual* (1968), *Beyond Sexual Freedom* (1975), *Homosexuality* (1978), and *The Preoedipal Origin and Psychoanalytic Therapy of Sexual Perversions* (1988). Life Fellow, American Psychiatric Association; Member, American Psychoanalytic Association, International Psychoanalytic Association.

NOTES

1. Evelyn Hooker's widely quoted studies of homosexual men (1957, 1958) had been widely used by pro-normalization proponents to buttress the argument that homosexuals differ from heterosexuals only in that they are homosexuals. They are not other-wise pathological and the adjustment of many is in the normal range, perhaps even superior to that of heterosexuals. Hooker's reports consisted of a detailed examination by clinical interviews and psychological tests of thirty male homosexuals and thirty heterosexual controls. They were not psychoanalytic interviews nor in-depth psychoanalytic studies. A careful review of her work by the Task Force on Homosexuality, New York County District Branch, American Psychiatric Association (1973) concluded that:

With regard to her major thesis, that there is no evidence to show that homosexuals are maladjusted ... her study shows nothing of the kind. It is too full of methodological errors (particularly the spurious "controls" and confused think-ing) to warrant any such conclusion ... With regard to the "adjustment" of the homosexual, the study shows nothing, one way or the other. It was not adequately designed to do so (13 p. 471475; evaluation prepared by Ruben Fine, Ph.D., Clinical Professor of Psychology at Adelphi University, Supervisor of Psychology, Elmhurst Hospital; Vice President of the National Psychological Association for Psychoanalysis.)

2. Homosexual groups began lobbying the APA and its meetings in earnest in 1970, according to F. Charles Hite, reporter for the *Psychiatric News* (1/2/74, Vol.9, No.1.) Homosexual militants severely disrupted programs at the annual meeting in San Francisco in 1975.

3. The SIECUS propaganda of the normalcy of homosexuality and the advocacy of homosexual sex education is a philosophy prevailing in several university centers and medical schools and dominates several societies for the study of sex, e.g., The Scientific Study of Sex, Eastern Region, University of Pennsylvania. It has dominated the Master's Degree Program, Department of Health Education, New York University, Human Sexuality Program to the point where heterosexual students were asked to engage in "homosexual experimentation" and students are "indoctrinated with theories of sexual orientation that are propaganda and not science" (personal communication, E.W. Eichel, M.A.; Sexual Education, letter to the Dean of New York University, Health Education Program, 1986, quoted with permission).

4. Dr. B. Diamond, President, New York District Branch 1970-1971, who had formally authorized the task force, died in mid-1971. This was a great loss to all of us nation-wide.

5. Similar arguments with different emphases were made by Drs. I. Lieber and J. McDevitt.

6. Over one-third of Harvard-Radcliffe student suicide attempts (25 out of 65, or 375) between 1965 and 1967 were made by individuals severely disturbed by homosexual conflicts (reported in a survey by the National Institutes of Mental Health, 1974) (Bunney, Melitta, Roach). More recently, The New York Times reports that "young American men from 15-24 years old are killing themselves at a rate 50% higher than at the beginning or the previous decade according to a new Federal study" (New York Times, 2/22/87). While the increasing use of drugs may play a role, disturbances in gender defined self identity, in my clinical opinion, are of crucial importance.

7. See Appendix A for a critical evaluation of Kinsey's material and conclusions.
8. The details of this lobbying effort are to be found in my paper "The Sexual Unreason" (1974, pp.180-183).
9. In late 1977, ten thousand psychiatrists, members of the American Medical Association were polled on this issue. Of twenty five hundred replies received, approximately sixty eight percent answered the question "Is homosexuality usually a pathological adaptation (as opposed to a normal variation)?" in the affirmative. This strongly suggested to the interpreter, Dr. Harold I. Lief, Professor of Psychiatry at the University of Pennsylvania, an authority on sexual problems and leading sex educator, that the "previous APA vote was influenced by political and social considerations [emphasis added] and that the vote was [misperceived as a step toward the denial of rights to homosexuals]" (Lief, 1977, p. 110).
10. An exhaustive bibliography of these contributions can be found in my book, *Homosexuality* (1978).
11. The significant incidence of homosexuality (8-10% of the population) may well be due to the necessity for all human beings to undergo the separation-individuation phase of early childhood (Mahler, 1967), which is decisive for gender identification. A substantial proportion of children fail to successfully complete this developmental process and, therefore, are unable to form a healthy sexual identity in accordance with their anatomical and biological capacities. This is the core of the disorder.
12. Dr. Nicholi could not appear due to illness in his family.
13. An alternative argument to homosexuality simply being an alternative life style was that it was simply a "biological variant." This argument is discussed in Appendix B.
14. The destructive effects of the mass media in this regard requires special study beyond the purpose of this paper. Such a study, however, begins with understanding the mechanism through which mass media exerts its effort. The mass media satisfy a pressing need for expression, keeps people from feeling painfully alone, and distracts individuals from their own problems. Its content arises from the prevailing social currents and its aim is to relieve tension. Needs are constantly stimulated and wishes encouraged in every way. Although we do not do something sexual or aggressive, we get a kick out of watching others do the forbidden. The knowledge that life and emotion may be thereby devalued makes no difference. There is an implied permission to do the same thing.
15. At the present time (1986-1987) pro-gay activists groups, even within the American Psychoanalytic Association, are asserting that Freudian analysts who treat homosexuals for their disorder are "homophobic" and have been "prejudiced" by our culture.

REFERENCES

- The American Psychoanalytic Association (1968). *A Glossary of Psychoanalytic Terms and Concepts*, revised 1983. New York, p.48.
- Beach, F.A. (1942). Central nervous mechanisms involved in the reproductive behavior of vertebrates. *Psychological Bulletin*, 39:200.
- (1947). A review of physiological and psychological studies of sexual behavior in mammals. *Physiological Review*, 27:240.
- (1971). As quoted in *Sexuality and Homosexuality* by A. Karlin. New York: W.W. Norton, 1971, p.399.
- Bergler, E. (1969). *Selected Papers of Edmund Bergler*. New York: Grune & Stratton. Committee on Cooperation with Governmental (Federal) Agencies of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (1955). Report on homosexuality with particular emphasis on the problem in governmental agencies. Report No.30, Jan.1955. Topeka, Kan.
- Eichel, E.W. (1986). Personal correspondence to the author. Views cited found in a letter to Dean of New York University, Health Education Dept.
- Freud, S. (1905). Three essays on the theory of sexuality. *St. Ed.*, 7:125-244. London: Hogarth Press, 1958
- (1911). Formulations on the two principles of mental functioning. *St. Ed.*, 12:213-226. London: Hogarth Press, 1958.
- Hooker, E. (1957). The adjustment of male homosexuals. *Journal of Project Techniques*, 21:17-31.

..... (1958). Male homosexuality in the Rorschach. *Journal of Project Techniques*, 22:33-54.

Kardiner, A. (1939). *The Individual and his Society. The psychodynamics of Primitive Social Organization*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Karlen, A. (1971). *Sentality and Homosexuality*. New York: Norton.

Kinsey, A. et al. (1948). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.

Lief, H.I. (1977). Sexual survey #4: Current thinking on homosexuality. *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality*, 11:110.

Mahler, M.S. (1967). On human symbiosis and the vicissitudes of individuation. *Journal American Psychoanalytic Association*, 15:740-763.

New York Academy of Medicine Report of the Committee on Public Health (1964). *The Problem of Homosexuality*. N.Y. Acad. Med. Bulletin, 40:57&580.

New York City District Branch APA Task Force Report on Homosexuality (1972). (C.W. Socarides [Chairman], Bieber, I., Byschowski, G., Gershman, H., Jacobs, T.J., Myers, W., Nackenson, B.L., Prescott, K.F., Rifkin, A.H., Stein, S., & Terry, J.) Published as: *Homosexuality in the male: A report of a psychiatric study group*. *Int. J. Psychiatry*, 2, (4):460-479 (1973).

Panel Report (1983). Toward a further understanding of homosexual men. *J. Amer. Psychoanalytic Association*, 34:193-206. R.C. Friedman, reporter.

Rado, S. (1949). An adaptational view of sexual behavior. In: *Psychosexual Developments in Health and Disease*, eds. P.H. Hoch & J. Zubin. New York: Grune & Stratton, pp. 186-213. Also in: *Psychoanalysis of Behavior: The Collected Papers of S. Rado*. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1956; pp. 186-213.

Robinson, P. (1976). *The Modernization of Sex*. New York: Harper & Row, pp. 73-74.

Saghir, M.T. & Robins, E. (1973). *Male and Female Homosexuality* Baltimore: William & Wilkins Company.
Digital Archive of PSYCHOHISTORY

The Innate-Immutable Argument Finds No Basis in Science

In Their Own Words: Gay Activists Speak About Science, Morality, Philosophy

A. Dean Byrd, Ph.D., MBA, MPH, Shirley E. Cox, DSW, Jeffrey W. Robinson, Ph.D.

<http://narth.com/docs/innate.html>

The following article was published in the Salt Lake City Tribune, in a slightly abbreviated form, on May 27th, 2001.

The Salt Lake City Tribune has published several articles in recent months regarding homosexuality. While many of the articles are well-written, they do not reflect the scientific literature. In fact, the social advocacy of many of the articles seems to suggest a greater reliance on politics than on science.

Leaving aside the politics of the issue, perhaps it is time to examine the innate-immutable argument about homosexual attraction. First of all-although the issue is enormously complex and simply cannot be reduced to a matter of nature vs. nature-the answer to that debate is probably "yes" - it is likely that homosexual attraction, like many other strong attractions, includes both biological and environmental influences.

What is clear, however, is that the scientific attempts to demonstrate that homosexual attraction is biologically determined have failed. The major researchers now prominent in the scientific arena-themselves gay activists-have in fact arrived at such conclusions.

Researcher Dean Hamer (1993), for example, attempted to link male homosexuality to a stretch of DNA located at the tip of the X chromosome, the chromosome that some men inherit from their mothers. Referring to that research, Hamer offered some conclusions regarding genetics and homosexuality.

"We knew that genes were only part of the answer. We assumed the environment also played a role in sexual orientation, as it does in most, if not all behaviors..."(Hamer and Copeland, 1994, p. 82).

"Homosexuality is not purely genetic...environmental factors play a role. There is not a single master gene that makes people gay...I don't think we will ever predict who will be gay" (Mitchell, 1995).

Citing the failure of their research, Hamer & Copeland further write,

"The pedigree failed to produce what we originally hoped to find: simple Mendelian inheritance. In fact, we never found a single family in which homosexuality was distributed in the obvious pattern that Mendel observed in his pea plants" (1994, p. 104).

What's more interesting is that when Hamer's study was duplicated by Rice et al with research that was more robust, the genetic markers were found to be nonsignificant. Rice et al concluded:

"It is unclear why our results are so discrepant from Hamer's original study. Because our study was larger than that of Hamer et al, we certainly had adequate power to detect a genetic effect as large as reported in that study. Nonetheless, our data do not support the presence of a gene of large effect influencing sexual orientation at position XQ 28" (Rice et al, 1999, p.667).

Simon LeVay, in his study of the hypothalamic differences between the brains of homosexual and heterosexual men, offered the following criticisms of his own research:

"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 work. Nor did I locate a gay center in the brain.

"The INAH 3 is less likely to be the sole gay nucleus of the brain than a part of a chain of nuclei engaged in men and women's sexual behavior....Since I looked at adult brains, we don't know if the differences I found were there at birth, or if they appeared later." (Nimmons, 1994, p. 64).

Indeed, in commenting on the brain and sexual behavior, Dr. Mark Breedlove, a researcher at the University of California at Berkeley, demonstrated that sexual behavior can actually change brain structure. Referring to his research, Breedlove states:

"These findings give us proof for what we theoretically know to be the case-that sexual experience can alter the structure of the brain, just as genes can alter it. [I]t is possible that differences in sexual behavior cause (rather than are caused) by differences in the brain" (Breedlove, 1997, p. 801).

Our Perception of Science Alters Politics

LeVay made an interesting observation about the emphasis on the biology of homosexuality. He noted, "...people who think that gays and lesbians are born that way are also more likely to support gay rights" (1996, p. 282)

The third study, which was conducted by Bailey and Pillard, focused on twins. They found a concordance (both twins homosexual) rate of 52% among identical twins, 22% among non-identical twins and a 9.2 % among non-twins. This study actually provides support for environmental factors. If homosexuality were in the genetic code, all of the identical twins would have been homosexual (1991).

Prominent research teams Byne and Parsons, and also Friedman and Downey, each concluded that there was no evidence to support a biologic theory, but rather that homosexuality could be best explained by an alternative model where "temperamental and personality traits interact with the familial and social milieu as the individual's sexuality emerges" (Byne and Parsons, 1993; Friedman and Downey, 1993).

Are homosexual attractions innate? There is no support in the scientific research for the conclusion that homosexuality is biologically determined.

Is Change Possible?

Is homosexuality immutable? Is it fixed, or is it amenable to change? The 1973 decision to delete homosexuality from the diagnostic manual of the American Psychiatric Association had a chilling effect on research. The APA decision was not made based on new scientific evidence-in fact, as gay activist researcher Simon LeVay admitted, "Gay activism was clearly the force that propelled the APA to declassify homosexuality" (1996, p. 224).

In reviewing the research, Satinover reported a 52% success rate in the treatment of unwanted homosexual attraction. (Satinover, 1996, p. 186). Masters and Johnson, the famed sex researchers, reported 65% success rate after a five-year follow-up (Schwartz and Masters, 1984, pp. 173-184). Other professionals report success rates ranging from 30% to 70%.

An article in the Monitor on Psychology reviewed the research of Dr. Lisa Diamond, a professor at the University of Utah and concluded that "Sexual identity is far from fixed in women who aren't exclusively heterosexual"(Murray, 2000, p. 15; Diamond, 2000).

What is more intriguing is the research of Dr. Robert L. Spitzer, the prominent psychiatrist and researcher at Columbia University. Dr. Spitzer was the architect of the 1973 decision to remove homosexuality from the diagnostic manual, a gay affirmative psychiatrist, and a long time supporter of gay rights. His current study focused on whether or not individuals can change. His preliminary conclusions are:

"I am convinced from the people I have interviewed, that for many of them, they have made substantial changes toward becoming heterosexual...I think that's news...I came to this study skeptical. I now claim that these changes can be sustained"(NARTH, 2001).

What was most interesting was Dr. Spitzer's response to a journalist who inquired what he would do if his adolescent son revealed his homosexual attraction. Dr. Spitzer said that he hoped that his son would be interesting in changing and would get some help. It is interesting to note that Dr. Spitzer has received considerable "hate mail" and complaints from his colleagues because of his research.

Is homosexuality immutable? Hardly. There is ample evidence that homosexual attraction can be diminished and that changes can be made.

Comparative Levels of Mental Health: The Data

What is particularly disturbing is the lack of attention paid by the media to the research evidence reported in the Archives of

General Psychiatry which concluded that gay, lesbian and bisexual people were at higher risk for mental illness, specifically suicidality, major depression and anxiety disorder (Ferguson et al, 1999; Herrell et al).

While one might suggest that society's oppression of homosexual people may be the cause of such mental illness, this may not be the case. In fact, this study corroborated the findings of a well-conducted Dutch study, and Dutch society is a very gay-affirming and gay friendly society (Sandfort et al, 2001).

Bailey (of the twin study) offered other possible reasons for significantly more mental illness in homosexual individuals: "homosexuality represents a deviation from normal development and is associated with other such deviations that may lead to mental illness," or another possibility is "that increased psychopathology among homosexual people is a consequence of lifestyle differences associated with sexual orientation." An additional possibility offered by Bailey: "behavioral risk factors associated with male homosexuality such as receptive anal sex and promiscuity." He noted that it would be a shame if "sociopolitical concerns prevented researchers from conscientious consideration of any reasonable hypothesis" (Bailey, 1999, p. 883-884).

Regarding change and the right to treatment, lesbian activist Camille Paglia offered the following observations:

"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...."

"Is the gay identity so fragile that it cannot bear the thought that some people may not wish to be gay? Sexuality is highly fluid, and reversals are theoretically possible. However, habit is refractory, once the sensory pathways have been blazed and deepened by repetition-a phenomenon obvious in the struggle with obesity, smoking, alcoholism or drug addiction....helping gays to learn to function heterosexually, if they wish, is a perfectly worthy aim.

"We should be honest enough to consider whether homosexuality may not indeed be a pause at the prepubescent stage where children anxiously band together by gender....current gay cant insists that homosexuality is 'not a choice,' that no one would choose to be gay in a homophobic society. But there is an element of choice in all behavior, sexual or otherwise. It takes an effort to deal with the opposite sex; it is safer with your own kind. The issue is one of challenge versus comfort." (Paglia, 1994, pp. 70, 72, 76, 77, 78, 91).

Gay activist Doug Haldeman, at a recent meeting of the American Psychological Association, focused on the right of individuals who were unhappy with their homosexual attraction to pursue treatment and change. He stated,

"A corollary issue for many is a sense of religious or spiritual identity that is sometimes as deeply felt as is sexual orientation. For some it is easier, and less emotionally disruptive, to contemplate changing sexual orientation, than to disengage from a religious way of life that is seen as completely central to the individual's sense of self and purpose...."

"However we may view this choice or the psychological underpinnings thereof, do we have the right to deny such an individual treatment that may help him to adapt in the way he has decided is right for him? I would say that we do not" (Haldeman, 2000, p. 3).

Finally, lesbian activist and biologist Dr. Anne Fausto-Sterling of Brown University offers some interesting insight. Referring to the "born-that-way" argument, she states,

"It provides a legal argument that is, at the moment actually having some sway in court. For me, it's a very shaky place. It's bad science and bad politics. It seems to me that the way we consider homosexuality in our culture is an ethical and a moral question" (Dreifus, 2001).

When asked about how much of her thinking about change in sexuality comes from her own life, Fausto-Sterling responded,

"My interest in gender issues preceded my own life changes. When I first got involved in feminism, I was married. The gender issues did to me what they did to lots of women in the 1970's: they infuriated me. My poor husband, who was a very decent guy, tried as hard as he could to be sympathetic. But he was shut out of what I was doing. The women's movement opened up the feminine in a way that was new to me, and so my involvement made possible my becoming a lesbian.

"My ex and I are still friends. It is true. I call myself a lesbian now because that is the life I am living, and I think it is something you should own up to. At the moment, I am in a happy relationship and I don't ever imagine changing it. Still, I don't think loving a man is unimaginable." (Dreifus, 2001).

A Moral-Philosophical Issue, or a Scientific Issue?

LeVay concludes: "First, science itself cannot render judgments about human worth or about what constitutes normality or disease. These are value judgments that individuals must make for themselves, while possibly taking scientific findings into account. Second, I believe that we should as far as possible, respect people's personal autonomy, even if it includes what I would call misguided desires such as the desire to change one's sexual orientation" (LeVay, 2000, p. 12).

Gay-activist researcher Dean Hamer makes a revealing statement about science and morality. He states,

"...biology is amoral; it offers no help in distinguishing between right and wrong. Only people, guided by their values and beliefs, can decide what is moral and what is not" (Hamer and Copeland, 1994, p. 214).

Homosexuality is an issue of ethics and morality. Individuals who experience unwanted homosexual attractions have a right to treatment aimed at reducing those attractions.

Whether or not others agree with that choice is not as important as respecting their right to make the choice. In fact, tolerance and diversity demand that they do so.

References

- Bailey, J. M. (1999). Homosexuality and mental illness. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 56, pp. 883-884.
- Bailey, J. M. & Pillard, R. C. (1991). A genetic study of male sexual orientation. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 48, pp. 1089-1096.
- Breedlove, M.S. (1997). Sex on the brain. *Nature*, 389, p. 801.
- Byne, W. & Parsons, B. (1993). Human sexual orientation: the biological theories reappraised. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50, pp. 228-239.
- Diamond, L.M. (2000). Sexual identity, attractions, and behavior among young sexual minority women over a 2 year period. *Developmental Psychology*, 36 (2), pp. 241-250.
- Dreifus, C. (2001). Exploring what makes us male or female. *New York Times, Science Section*, January 2.
- Ferguson, D. M, Horwood, L.J. & Beautrais, A.L. (1999). Is sexual orientation related to mental health problems and suicidality in young people? *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 56, pp. 876-880.
- Friedman, R. C. & Downey, J. (1993). Neurobiology and sexual orientation: current relationships. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry*, 5(2), pp. 131-153.
- Haldeman, D. (2000). Gay rights, patients' rights: the implementation of sexual orientation conversion therapy (Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association), Washington, D. C., August.
- Hamer, D.(1993). A linkage between DNA markers on the X chromosome and male sexual orientation. *Science*, 261, p. 321.
- Hamer, D & Copeland, P. (1994). *The science of desire*. New York: Simon and Schuster
- Herrell, R., Goldberg, J., True, W.R., Ramakrishnan, V., Lyons, M., Eisen, S. & Tsuang, M. T. (1999). Sexual orientation and suicidality. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 56, pp. 657-661.
- LeVay, S. (1996). *Queer Science*. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- LeVay, S. (2001). Sexual orientation: the science and social impact. 12. Retrieved April 3, 2001 from: http://members.aol.com/_ht_a/slevay/page12.htm.
- Mitchell, N. (1995). Genetics, sexuality linked, study says. *Standard Examiner*, April 30.
- Murray, B. (2000). Sexual identity is far from fixed in women who aren't exclusively heterosexual. *Monitor on Psychology*, 31 (3), p. 15.
- National Association For Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (2001). Press Release. Prominent psychiatrist announces new study results-some gays can change. May 9.
- Nimmons, D. (1994). Sexual brain. *Discover*, 5, 3, pp. 64-67.
- Paglia, C. (1994). *Vamps and tramps*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Rice, R., Anderson, C., Risch, N., & Ebers, G. (1999). Male homosexuality: absence of linkage to microsatellite markers at Xq28. *Science*, 284, pp. 665-667.
- Sandfort, T. G., de Graaf, R., Bijl, R. V. & Schnabel, P. (2001). Same-sex behavior and psychiatric disorders. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 58, pp. 85-91.
- Satinover, J. (1996). *Homosexuality and the politics of truth*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Schwartz, M. F. & Masters, W. H. (1984). The Masters and Johnson treatment program for dissatisfied homosexual men. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 141, pp. 173-181.