

# THE CHALLENGE OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Bill Muehlenberg  
*Updated October 2005*

	Introduction
I	Strategies of the Homosexual Lobby
II	Homosexual Practices
III	The Politics of AIDS
IV	How Many Homosexuals Are There?
V	Once Gay, Always Gay?
VI	Gay Rights and Discrimination
VII	Judicial Activism and Homosexuality
VIII	The Homosexual Agenda
IX	Homosexual Marriage
X	Homosexual Adoption Rights
XI	Homosexuality And Children
XII	Homosexual Suicide
XIII	Conclusion and Recommendations

## INTRODUCTION

The issue of homosexuality and the threat it poses to the traditional family is a complex and difficult issue. A number of distinctions and qualifications need to be made to properly represent the position we hold.

The homosexual community, like the heterosexual community, is a diverse and multifaceted phenomenon. In talking about the homosexual community, one must not over-generalise, but be sensitive to distinctions and differences. Several distinctions can be made at the outset.

First, the militant, vocal homosexual lobby does not represent all homosexuals. Many homosexuals simply want to be left alone, to live their lives quietly and peacefully. The homosexual lobby, on the other hand, is militant, vocal and very public. It wants to promote the homosexual way of life as an equal alternative to heterosexual lifestyles. It is very aggressive, demanding that homosexual behaviour be embraced and accepted by the straight community. It publicly flaunts and promotes homosexuality, as in the Sydney Gay Mardi Gras. It is this militant lobby group that we are primarily concerned about when speaking about homosexuality. Most people do not mind the private, discreet activities of homosexuals or anybody else for that matter. But most Australians do worry about the militant homosexual lobby and its never ending agenda of demands (see section VIII), demands which will have a very real effect on family and society.

Second, male homosexual behaviour and female lesbian behaviour should be contrasted. In general, male homosexuals are much more promiscuous than lesbians. They are the really great risk group in the spread of HIV. Lesbians can be promiscuous, but tend to prefer monogamous relationships - although "serial monogamy" may best describe lesbian practice. The threat of catching HIV is much, much less in the lesbian community.

Third, to use religious jargon, one is to love the sinner while hating the sin. That is, all homosexuals deserve to be treated with respect, love and compassion, even though society has a legitimate right to dislike and censure homosexual behaviour and activity. Society, for example, can rightly disapprove of alcoholism, while seeking to help individual alcoholics. So too, society has a right to deem homosexual behaviour as unhealthy, a threat to the family, and not in the best interests of society, while ensuring that individual homosexuals are not vilified or roughly treated.

Fourth, one can distinguish between homosexual orientation and behaviour. This matter will be discussed more fully in section V.

Having made these distinctions, one must ask what the push for homosexual rights is all about, and how it will effect society and the family.

## I. STRATEGIES OF THE HOMOSEXUAL LOBBY

The rapid advance of the homosexual movement and its acceptance by mainstream society has not happened by accident. As with all groups engaged in social reform, an active strategy has been put in place, and definite goals have been laid out. Homosexual activists know what they want, and have come a long way in achieving their aims. And the bottom line of the homosexual agenda has always been complete acceptance and social recognition of homosexuality.

One major strategy used by the homosexual lobby to achieve this goal is to present a picture of homosexuality that will hide their real behaviour, aims and agenda. Through the use of a series of half-truths or distortions of fact, they hope to convince the public about a number of points. They want to convince us that homosexuals are a persecuted minority, whose civil rights are being violated. They argue that they simply want to be tolerated, to be left alone to practice their behaviour in private. They argue that homosexuals make up at least 10 per cent of the population. They argue that they are born gay, and therefore no moral censure should apply to them. They argue that everything would be fine if homophobic attitudes could be stamped out. They argue that homosexual relationships are just the same as any other relationships.

So successful has the homosexual lobby been in this campaign of deception that one only has to look at how public perception of homosexuality has changed over the past few decades. Consider the following statement: "Even in purely nonreligious terms, homosexuality represents a misuse of the sexual faculty and, in the words of one...educator, of 'human construction.' It is a pathetic little second-rate substitute for reality, a pitiable flight from life. As such it deserves fairness, compassion, understanding, and, when possible, treatment. But it deserves no encouragement, no glamorization, no rationalization, no fake status as a minority martyrdom..." And the author of this statement? Fred Nile? Jerry Falwell? No. It was uttered by *Time* magazine in January 21, 1966. Would *Time* magazine ever dare to utter such comments today? Of course not.

The moral and intellectual climate has changed dramatically in just a very short period of time. As Daniel Patrick Moynihan has put it, we are "defining deviancy downwards".<sup>1</sup> Deviancy has reached such huge proportions that in order to deal with the problem, we have changed the way we think about normality and abnormality. What used to be regarded as deviant behaviour is now reclassified as normal, and what we used to call normal behaviour we now call abnormal. Thus the only abnormality now is to be "homophobic". Indeed, the pressure by the gay lobby to redefine deviancy resulted in the 1973 decision of the American Psychiatric Association to remove homosexuality from the listing in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, Mental Disorders (DSM-1).<sup>2</sup>

The homosexual lobby has been very successful in reframing the issues. For example, an interesting article appeared in the gay press some years ago entitled "The Overhauling of America". The article outlined a strategy by which homosexuals could best implement their goals. It included the following elements: desensitisation; portraying gays as victims, not as aggressive challengers; giving the protectors a just cause; and making the victimisers look bad. Here are some quotes from the article: "In any campaign to win over the public, gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so the straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the role of protector. . . . Our campaign should not demand direct support for homosexual practices, but instead make anti-discrimination as its theme. . . . In the early stages of the campaign, the public should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the imagery of sex per se should be down-played, and the issue of gay rights reduced as far as possible, to an abstract social question."<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, the authors of the above article expanded their strategy into a full-length book, and amplified this theme: "Our ultimate objective is to expand straight tolerance so much that even gays who look unconventional can feel safe and accepted. . . . Thus our campaign should not demand explicit support for homosexual practices, but should instead take *antidiscrimination* as its theme. Fundamental freedoms, constitutional rights, due process and equal protection of laws, basic features of fairness and decency toward all of humanity – these should be the concerns brought to mind by our campaign."<sup>4</sup>

This strategy of the homosexual community to shift attention away from homosexual behaviour and instead to focus on vague notions of civil rights, discrimination, and the like has been an ingenious and successful ploy. As Australian homosexual and Reader in Politics at La Trobe University Dennis Altman put it, "The greatest single

victory of the gay movement over the past decade has been to shift the debate from behavior to identity, thus forcing opponents into a position where they can be seen as attacking the civil rights of homosexual citizens rather than attacking specific and (as they see it) antisocial behavior.”<sup>5</sup>

Thus civil rights, not behaviour, has taken the limelight. By taking attention off homosexual behaviour, a clever strategy has been successfully implemented by the gay community, namely, to convince the general public that homosexual relationships are just the same as heterosexual relationships, only a bit different. Indeed, the homosexual lobby argues that except for the fact that they are in a same sex partnership, their relationship is similar to that of any married or de facto relationship. But are homosexual relationships just the same as heterosexual ones? In a number of crucial areas, homosexual relationships are qualitatively different from heterosexual relationships

## II. HOMOSEXUAL PRACTICES

In general, homosexual relationships do not offer the same stability and permanence as do heterosexual relationships. A number of studies have been conducted over the past few decades to show that the average homosexual relationship is far from stable and monogamous. Indeed, it can instead be characterised as highly unstable and promiscuous. “Sexual promiscuity is one of the most striking, distinguishing features of gay life in America,” wrote homosexual authors Silverstein and White.<sup>6</sup> They say that homosexuals represent hedonism in its most extreme form, with one-night stands and brief flings offering constant excitement and variety.

An exhaustive 1978 Kinsey Institute study of homosexuality showed that 28 per cent of homosexual males had sexual encounters with 1,000 or more males. And 79 per cent said more than half of their sex partners were strangers. Only one per cent of sexually active men had fewer than five lifetime partners.<sup>7</sup>

The study concludes, “Little credence can be given to the supposition that homosexual men’s ‘promiscuity’ has been overestimated . . . Almost half of the white homosexual males said that they had at least 500 different sexual partners during the course of their homosexual careers.”<sup>8</sup>

A 1982 study of AIDS victims by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control found that eleven hundred sexual partners was about average, with some reporting as many as twenty thousand partners.<sup>9</sup> One homosexual reported, “I believe my estimate of 4,000 sex partners to be very accurate. I have been actively gay since I was 13 (thirty-one years ago). An average of two or three new partners per week is not excessive, especially when one considers that I will have ten to twelve partners during one night at the baths.”<sup>10</sup>

Bell and Weinberg found that 28 per cent of white homosexual males claimed 1,000 or more partners, while 84 per cent claimed 50 or more partners over the course of a lifetime. They found that the average homosexual had 550 different sexual partners.<sup>11</sup>

Thomas Schmidt has meticulously gone through all of the available evidence on this subject. At the time of writing (1995) he had some of the best and most recent data available about the health risks of homosexuality. The information he used was taken only from primary, not secondary, sources. And it all came from secular, scholarly sources, “virtually all of which is either neutral or affirming of homosexuality”.<sup>12</sup> This is how he summarises the issue: “Promiscuity among homosexual men is not a mere stereotype, and it is not merely the majority experience - it is virtually the *only* experience. . . . Tragically, lifelong faithfulness is almost nonexistent in the homosexual experience”.<sup>13</sup>

But it can be rightly asked, has not the AIDS epidemic slowed down homosexual promiscuity rates? Yes it has, but only marginally. An article in the March 1987 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association* reports that both heterosexuals and homosexuals reduced their sexual contact due to fear of AIDS, but that homosexuals continued to have significantly more partners on average than the heterosexuals did.<sup>14</sup>

Indeed, a recent study of the sexual profiles of 2,583 older homosexuals published in *Journal of Sex Research* found that only 2.7 percent claimed to have had sex with one partner only. It also found that homosexual men had a mean lifetime number of 251 partners.<sup>15</sup>

More revealing, however, is this quote from a Los Angeles-based psychologist who counsels gay men, as recorded in an April 1994 issue of a homosexual magazine: “Gay men are discovering new ways of being intimate

with another man without excluding the possibility of outside erotic experiences . . . They're relaxing a bit about what seems like a normal and healthy interest in sex outside relationships, after having been shamed in the early days of AIDS. With all the talk about legalising marriage for gays, there's an assumption in the minds of most people I talk to that only rarely does that legalization include monogamy."<sup>16</sup>

In the same issue of the magazine, a gay couple spoke about how having outside affairs was the key to their relationship. Said one of the partners: "Pretty early on we had the monogamy discussion. I felt I wanted to be with him, but the idea of having sex with only one person was a little daunting. I mean, I was a real slut, and I didn't want to give that up."<sup>17</sup>

It is quite common in the homosexual press in Australia to find similar remarks. For example, one writer says that to assume monogamy is "a part of every healthy relationship is just plain wrong". He continues, "Let's face it. Monogamy is a bizarre human invention. Sure, some animals practice it but usually when survival is tough, and teamwork is required to eat. In fact, it's a human invention designed (on a cynical level) for the possession of women."<sup>18</sup>

Or as Australian homosexual activist Dennis Altman puts it: "Large-scale luxurious pleasure palaces where everyone is potentially an immediate sexual partner are a common sexual fantasy; only for gay men they are a commonplace reality."<sup>19</sup> Elsewhere Altman writes, "monogamy is not a realistic choice for many of us . . . we don't find one partner sufficiently fulfilling. People who argue that there would be no problem if all gay men would just be monogamous are ignoring both medical and emotional realities; with an unknown number of people already exposed to 'the virus' and an unknown incubation period, such advice is just too restrictive."<sup>20</sup>

Altman goes even further, saying that "it does seem clear that among gay men a long-lasting *monogamous* relationship is almost unknown. Indeed both gay women and gay men tend to be involved in what might be called multiple relationships, though of somewhat different kinds."<sup>21</sup>

He continues by making the startling admission that "in practice most gay males accept that fidelity to a relationship is not to be measured in sexual terms. A large-scale study of gay male couples in San Diego concluded that every couple together more than five years had outside sexual contacts as a recognized part of the relationship."<sup>22</sup>

As Schmidt has put it, "Even if we set aside infidelity and allow a generous definition of 'long-term relationships' as those that last at least four years, under 8 per cent of either male or female homosexual relationships fit the definition. In short, there is practically no comparison possible to heterosexual marriage in terms of either fidelity or longevity."<sup>23</sup>

Thus long term homosexual relationships are rare, and for those male couples who do actually stay together for longer periods of time, the prevalence of monogamy is quite low. Studies continue to document this fact. In a study of 156 males in homosexual relationships, only seven couples claimed to have a totally exclusive sexual relationship. But these seven were in relationships lasting less than five years. The authors comment: "Stated another way, all couples with a relationship lasting more than five years have incorporated some provision for outside sexual activity in their relationships."<sup>24</sup> Thus the norm is having outside sexual activity

Also, a recent study of homosexual men in Amsterdam found that the "duration of steady partnerships" was 1.5 years.<sup>25</sup> If that is a steady partnership, one wonders what a non-steady one is like. Moreover, the study noted that homosexual men with a "steady partner" have 8 casual sexual partners a year.<sup>26</sup>

It should be pointed out that lesbians are much less promiscuous, but they still have a large number of partners. One study found that about 55 per cent of lesbians had between one and ten partners ever, while 35 per cent had between 10 and 100 partners.<sup>27</sup>

Australian findings are quite similar to the overseas research. One of the best sources of Australian information is the SMASH report (*Sydney Men and Sexual Health*), published in 5 volumes in 1995.<sup>28</sup> This is a very revealing look at the demographics, behaviours, practices, promiscuity rates and health of homosexual and bisexual men in the Sydney area. It is the result of a joint research project of the National Centre in HIV Social Research (Macquarie University), the National Centre in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research (University of New South Wales), and the AIDS Council of New South Wales (ACON).

The report found, for example, that 26 per cent of homosexual men had 21 to 100 partners in a lifetime; nearly 41 per cent had 101 to 1000 partners; and 17 per cent had over 1000 partners.<sup>29</sup>

The 1996 the *Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey* reported similar findings. It found that 43 per cent of male homosexuals had engaged in sex with 2 to 10 partners in the previous six months; 21 per cent had engaged in sex with 11 to 50 partners in the last six months; and 5 per cent had engaged in sex with more than 50 partners in the past six months.<sup>30</sup> A study of Melbourne homosexuals reveals slightly higher figures, with 24 per cent of respondents saying they had sex with 11 to 50 partners in the last six months, and 6.5 per cent having sex with more than 50 partners.<sup>31</sup>

The National Centre in HIV Social Research released a study in 1998. It found that in 1996, 17.5 per cent of homosexual men had 101 to 500 partners in a lifetime; 7.7 per cent had 501 to 1000 partners in a lifetime; and 7.8 per cent had more than 1000 partners in a lifetime.<sup>32</sup>

Or consider an even more recent study. *The Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey February 2000* found that in the previous six months 26.2 per cent of male homosexuals had 11-50 sexual partners, while 7.8 per cent had more than 50 partners.<sup>33</sup>

Despite education campaigns, “safe sex” initiatives, and hundreds of thousands of tax payers’ dollars going into HIV/AIDS clinics, the practices continue. One of the most recent SMASH reports, issued in January 2000, reports that things have not changed very much.<sup>34</sup> It found in a study of sexual relationships with men over four years that 77.2 per cent were never celibate.<sup>35</sup> Only 5.3 per cent of male homosexuals over four years never had casual partners.<sup>36</sup>

Queensland studies reveal similar findings. A 1999 study found that in the previous 6 months, 46 per cent of male homosexuals had 2 to 10 partners, 20 per cent had 11 to 50, and 5.6 per cent had 50 or more sexual partners.<sup>37</sup>

One of the most recent, and largest, national studies (involving 20,000 Australians) found that 35.3 per cent of homosexuals had 10 to 49 same-sex partners in a lifetime, while 38.2 per cent had 50 or more sexual partners in a lifetime.<sup>38</sup>

The academic studies are backed up by the popular gay press. A casual perusal of the homosexual press reveals a predilection for this kind of behaviour. Consider but one recent example. A Melbourne writer, speaking of a New Year’s Eve celebration, speaks of “the essential tragedy of the heterosexual condition”. He explains, “Heterosexuals, it seems, simply do not know how to pick up total strangers in the street and have uncomplicated animal sex with them. The world would undoubtedly be a happier place if they did. Certainly the den of depravity where I found myself at 3am was a considerably happier place. I had already had uncomplicated animal sex with two attractive men – at least they looked pretty attractive in the dark – and was hot on the trail of number three. I did not expect to marry them, fall in love with them or even find out their names. All around me groans and grunts indicated that a thoroughly happy new year was being had by all.”<sup>39</sup>

Even pro-homosexual marriage author Jonathan Rauch admits that “male-male couples put a somewhat lower value on sexual fidelity within a relationship than do male-female couples,” although he goes on to say that the “somewhat” may not be that much of a big deal.<sup>40</sup>

As the above makes clear, for homosexual couples to have long-term monogamous relationships seems pretty rare. But one might be asking, so what? If it is a matter of consenting adults, it’s up to them. That might be true, but given that gay marriage and adoption rights are on the homosexual agenda, then a third party enters the equation: children. (A recent survey found that 90.5 per cent of Australian gays and lesbians wanted legal changes to allow them to adopt children.)<sup>41</sup>

Most people recognise that children have a right to be raised in loving, stable, committed relationships. Homosexual relationships do not seem to provide that stability and permanence.

True, not all heterosexual marriages are loving or stable, but that is the exception, not the rule. And that is why the marriage contract is so important: it provides some assurance that society recognises the importance of permanence in male/female relationships when children are involved.

And social science evidence bears this out. Numerous studies have found that heterosexual spouses are much more faithful and monogamous compared to homosexual couples. Consider but three studies. The authors of the definitive *Sex in America* report that 90 per cent of wives and 75 per cent of husbands claim never to have had extramarital sex.<sup>42</sup> It also found that 83 per cent of heterosexual couples were monogamous, while less than 2 per cent of homosexual couples were.<sup>43</sup>

A nationally representative survey published in the *Journal of Sex Research* found that 77 per cent of married men and 88 per cent of married women had remained faithful to their marriage vows.<sup>44</sup> And another national survey found that 75 per cent of husbands and 85 per cent of wives never had sexual relations outside of marriage.<sup>45</sup>

Before moving on, it will be noted that much of the above information pertained to male homosexuals. Lesbians experience less health risks, but still face higher than average risks when compared to heterosexual women. As just one example, a recent University of California study found that lesbians are at greater risk of heart disease than heterosexual women. And Australian data has come up with similar findings.<sup>46</sup>

## UNHEALTHY PRACTICES

A second area which distinguishes homosexual relationships from heterosexual ones is in the kinds of activities each engage in. Undoubtedly, some heterosexual relationships involve unhealthy or dangerous practices. But they don't seem to be the norm, whereas in homosexual relationships, a number of unhealthy and dangerous practices seem to be widespread and fairly common.

A lot of medical evidence, as recorded in such journals as *The Lancet*, *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, and *The British Medical Journal*, has shown how unhealthy homosexual practices can be. According to Dr Klamecki, a proctologist of 30 years experience, the sexual practices of the average homosexual typically effect "the oral cavities, lungs, penis, prostate, bladder, anus, perianal areas outside of the rectum, rectum, colon, vagina, uterus, pelvic area, brain, skin, blood, immune system, and the other body systems."<sup>47</sup>

A number of practices, which cannot be described in detail here, entail serious health risks.<sup>48</sup> Such behaviours are not unknown among heterosexuals, but are far less frequently practiced. For example, a 1992 study found that "fisting" or "handballing" is practiced by some 42 per cent of the male homosexual community, but only by 2 per cent of the male heterosexual community. Twenty nine per cent of male homosexuals report being involved in "golden showers" while only 4 per cent of males heterosexuals have practiced it. Also, 37 per cent of male homosexuals indulge in sadomasochism, contrasted to 5 per cent of heterosexual males.<sup>49</sup>

The Australian SMASH report found that 70 per cent of homosexual men with regular male partners engaged in "rimming", 20 per cent engaged in sado-masochism, and 20 per cent engaged in group sex.<sup>50</sup> It found that in sexual behaviour with casual male partners, 47 per cent engaged in group sex.<sup>51</sup>

A more recent SMASH report found these trends continuing, and getting worse. Over a four year period over 21 per cent of male homosexuals had over fifty sexual partners.<sup>52</sup> Also over a four year period, 40 per cent of male homosexuals engaged in sado-masochism, and 25 per cent engaged in "watersports" with regular partners.<sup>53</sup> And with casual male partners, 45 per cent engaged in S&M and 20 percent engaged in "watersports".<sup>54</sup> Finally, over 82 per cent had engaged in group sex with casual partners over the last four years.<sup>55</sup>

*The Gay Report*, a book much praised in gay communities, contains testimonials without adverse comment of homosexual encounters with Labrador retrievers, cows and horses.<sup>56</sup> The 1992 report mentioned above found that 15 per cent of male homosexuals and 19 per cent of male bisexuals had sex with animals, compared with 3 per cent of male heterosexuals.<sup>57</sup>

And another classic homosexual volume, *The Joy of Gay Sex* became so popular that it was updated in 1992 to become *The New Joy of Gay Sex*. Written by a New York clinical psychologist, this volume was published by mainstream publisher HarperCollins. In this book the author says this: "Moralists condemn sex with animals as disgusting, immoral, and generally horrible. . . . Like other inexperienced city dwellers, we may not so readily fathom the mechanics of cow-, sheep- or horse-f\*\*\*ing, but see no reason to condemn it out of hand."<sup>58</sup>

Moreover, various studies show that gays account for the majority of new cases of sexually transmitted diseases.<sup>59</sup> For example, a male homosexual is 14 times more likely to have syphilis than a male heterosexual, and eight times more likely to have hepatitis.<sup>60</sup>

In Victoria, for example, there has been a huge rise in cases of syphilis in the homosexual community. Rates have “skyrocketed” according to one report in a homosexual newspaper. While there were zero cases in 1999 there were 60 cases in 2003 and 50 cases in the first half of 2004. A doctor who works in a St. Kilda clinic said that “it appears to be occurring predominantly, almost completely, inside the men who sleep with men community”. The doctor said that there has been a jump in gonorrhoea and chlamydia diagnoses as well.<sup>61</sup>

And a study released at the Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for HIV Medicine held in Canberra in 2004 found that syphilis outbreaks had increased among homosexual men in all Australian capital cities.<sup>62</sup>

The epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases is further intensified by recreational drug use. Homosexuals - both male and female - have significantly higher percentages of drug and alcohol problems. American research has found that 47 per cent of male homosexuals have a history of alcohol abuse (compared to 24 per cent of males generally), and 51 per cent have a history of drug abuse (compared to 7 per cent of males generally). Thirty per cent of homosexuals - both male and female - are problem drinkers, as compared to 10 per cent of the general population.<sup>63</sup>

The SMASH report found that 82 per cent of Australian homosexuals sometimes use recreational drugs.<sup>64</sup> An update of the SMASH report found that 21 per cent of those surveyed used amyl at least weekly; 33 per cent used marijuana at least weekly; 16 per cent used heroin, cocaine or speed at least monthly, and 12 per cent injected any drugs.<sup>65</sup>

A recent study conducted by the Alternative Lifestyle Organisation (ALSO) and the Australian Drug Foundation found that homosexuals have a much higher rate of drug usage than does the general population. For example, “65 per cent of gay, lesbian, bisexual and queer men aged 20 to 29 and 36 per cent of women in the same category have used ecstasy. This is compared to 19 per cent of men and 12 per cent of women in the same age group in the national survey”.<sup>66</sup>

Also, a study of 16,000 adolescents in America, as reported in the *Archives of Paediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, found that lesbian and bi-sexual teenagers are more likely to smoke and more vulnerable to cigarette marketing than their straight sisters. Almost 40 per cent of lesbians and bisexuals smoked, compared to just 6 per cent of heterosexual teenage girls. This finding is in keeping with previous studies on the subject.<sup>67</sup>

In addition, according to the *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, homosexual men are at a greater risk of developing eating disorders, such as anorexia and bulimia, than heterosexual men.<sup>68</sup>

As one writer has summarised the situation, “For the vast majority of homosexual men, and for a significant number of homosexual women - even apart from the deadly plague of AIDS - sexual behaviour is obsessive, psychopathological and destructive to the body.”<sup>69</sup>

## VIOLENCE

Mention can also be made of violence in the homosexual community. The media often reports cases of homosexuals attacked by heterosexuals. Of course such attacks are to be condemned, and no physical or verbal abuse of homosexuals is to be countenanced. However, the research makes it clear that much of the violence against homosexuals is perpetrated by other homosexuals.

Indeed, so prominent is the problem that a number of books have been written devoted to this subject. As an example, consider the book, *Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them: Battered Gay Men and Domestic Violence*. In this volume authors David Island and Patrick Letellier report that “the incidence of domestic violence among gay men is nearly double that in the heterosexual population”.<sup>70</sup>

Numerous articles in the scholarly literature also bear this out. For example, a recent study reported in the *American Journal of Public Health* discovered higher rates of partner abuse among men who have sex with men (MSM). The study, conducted in 4 major American cities between 1996 and 1998, found that “rates of battering

victimization among urban MSM are substantially higher than among heterosexual men and possibly heterosexual women".<sup>71</sup>

It appears that lesbian relationships also contain a high level of abuse. For example, one study found that a third of lesbians surveyed reported physical abuse from their lesbian partners.<sup>72</sup> And a survey of over 1,000 lesbians found that "slightly more than half of the [lesbians] reported that they had been abused by a female lover/partner. The most frequently indicated forms of abuse were verbal/emotional/psychological abuse and combined physical-psychological abuse."<sup>73</sup>

And in a book discussing the problem of violence in female homosexual relationships, the author concludes with these words: "In short, friends and the community itself must recognize that battering is a problem among lesbian couples, and that its consequences are as serious as those of heterosexual battering – perhaps more serious."<sup>74</sup>

The gay press itself also highlights this problem. For example, the NSW Anti-Violence Project has warned gay people about "dangers of violence from members of their own community" It spoke of a "series of recent gay-on-gay attacks around Oxford Street" in Sydney. A spokesman for the group said that in addition to violence from without, "we should be prepared to respond to violence from within the community as well" and that these actions should be reported.<sup>75</sup>

Concerning those Oxford Street incidents, some tried to downplay the violence, with one gay venue owner saying this was just a "spat" between gay men. This prompted one homosexual writer to complain to a gay newspaper, "Does this mean that violence against gay men by straights is violence, but violence against gay men by other gay men is just 'a tiff'? Where does that leave gay domestic violence?"<sup>76</sup> Good questions indeed.

Another gay writer admits that "up until recently, violence by gay people against their partners was effectively a taboo topic in the community."<sup>77</sup> A counselling manager at the Victorian AIDS Council said she found a "lot of gay men coming to her had issues with violence. . . .It's been too difficult in the community to talk about it until now."<sup>78</sup> A gay men's health educator said, "The reality is it hasn't been accepted because of the view that 'gay men won't be violent'."<sup>79</sup>

In sum, this is not a safe lifestyle. And to list such unhealthy behaviour is not of course being homophobic. The more honest homosexual organisations make similar warnings. For example, just prior to the November 2002 Sydney Gay Games, there appeared an article in the gay press predicting a sharp rise in STD's as a result of the games. According to the article, the Victorian AIDS Council/Gay Men's Health Centre has warned that Australia's low syphilis levels could rise sharply at the gay games. And they warned that the rampant gonorrhoea epidemic could get much worse at the games. With an influx of thousands of gay men and HIV positive men to Australia, the STD's are sure to increase, they warned. And Health Promotion Team Manager Colin Batrouney said that STD's among Australian gay men were bound to rise. He said syphilis is unlikely to be prevented by condom use for anal sex and can infect different parts of the body including the throat.<sup>80</sup>

It has been a major victory of the homosexual movement to deflect attention away from homosexual behaviour and practice, and to refocus it on more neutral areas like "rights" an "discrimination". This is all according to plan. As one influential homosexual activist manual put it, "The public should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself".<sup>81</sup>

## PEDOPHILIA

Finally, and most disturbingly, one must examine the issue of pedophilia. While not every homosexual engages in, nor approves of, this practice, there is a significant percentage - of both individuals and organisations - that does seem to. Aside from the obvious cues, like banners at gay rallies with phrases like, "We're here, we're queer, and we want your children" and "Sex before eight, or else it's too late," there is more reliable information.

A survey done by two homosexual authors revealed that three-fourths of homosexuals had at some time had sex with boys sixteen to nineteen or younger.<sup>82</sup> A coalition of homosexual groups since as early as 1972 has sought the repeal of age of consent laws, arguing that children as young as 8 years have a right to decide whether they enter into a sexual relationship with an adult.<sup>83</sup>



Groups like the North American Man-Boy Love Association, which regularly march in Gay Pride parades, have gone on record as wanting pedophilia legalised. “NAMBLA takes the view that sex is good, that homosexuality is good not only for adults, but for young people as well. We support all consensual sexual relationships regardless of age. As long as the relationship is mutually pleasurable and no one’s rights are violated, sex should be no one else’s business.”<sup>84</sup>

The pedophile connection is not confined to North America. For example, a Dutch social psychologist and pro-pedophilia lecturer describes in an article, “Pedophilia and the Gay Movement” how influential pedophiles have been in the gay movement in the Netherlands.<sup>85</sup>

One Australian surveyed 30 issues of the *Gay Community News*, from 1980 to 1983. He found that 16 issues carried one or more articles or news stories on pedophilia.<sup>86</sup> Other Australian homosexual magazines also contain similar amounts of coverage on pedophilia. At a 1982 conference in Canberra for Lesbians and Homosexual Men, a workshop leader said, “Pedophiles will be free when kids are free and not before” and urged that the effort to undermine public resistance to pedophilia be continued.<sup>87</sup> Dennis Altman seems to endorse the behaviour, describing pederasty (male pedophilia) as among the “safest” of stigmatized forms of gay sexuality, one that “often amounts to no more than acts of mutual masturbation.”<sup>88</sup>

Indeed, early conferences on homosexuality regularly had sessions on pedophilia. However, public pressure resulted in such courses being phased out. For example, a planned workshop on pedophilia was canceled at an Annual Conference of Lesbians and Homosexual Men at the University of Queensland in September of 1984. However the then president of the university student union condemned the cancellation, saying it was an attack on freedom of speech!<sup>89</sup>

Moreover, homosexual behaviour seems to be closely associated with child abuse. A recent review of the child molestation literature as it appears in medical and psychological journals concluded that between 25 and 40 per cent of all recorded child molestation was homosexual.<sup>90</sup> Also, a Family Research Institute’s national (US) random survey of 4,340 adults found that about a third of those who reported having been molested were homosexually molested. Other polls have come out with similar findings.<sup>91</sup> Also, homosexual pedophiles victimise far more children than do heterosexual pedophiles (150 to 20).<sup>92</sup>

In addition to the research, anecdotal evidence can also be marshaled. Just one recent Melbourne case will suffice. The founder of an under 18 homosexual disco was charged with 11 counts of sexual assault involving a child under 16 years of age. He no longer holds a position on the board of the under-age dance party organisation, which caters especially for gays and lesbians.<sup>93</sup>

Australian expatriate Peter Tatchell, a leading British gay activist, has made his views clear on under-age sex: “The age of consent should be reduced to 14 for everyone – gay and straight – and consensual sex involving people under 14 should not be prosecuted providing there is no more than three years difference in the partners ages.”<sup>94</sup>

In fairness, however, it should be noted that not all homosexuals want to be associated with pedophiles, and some have sought to distance themselves from the pedophilia movement. For example, the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) has recently voted to expel NAMBLA from its membership.<sup>95</sup> It is a fair question to ask, however, why NAMBLA was granted membership in ILGA in the first place. Moreover, as jilted NAMBLA leaders were quick to point out, ILGA still contains dozens of member groups that support man/boy lovers or have pedophile or pederast subgroups.<sup>96</sup>

In sum, the purpose of mentioning all of these facts on unhealthy practices is not to judge individual homosexuals nor to infer that all homosexuals share some of the negative traits described above. But enough people both within and without the homosexual community have acknowledged that these unsafe practices are a common feature of the homosexual lifestyle, that such an expose seems necessary, especially since the mainstream media often will not delve into these sorts of issues. If for no other reason than the broad issue of public health and safety, these facts need to be accessible and need to be acted upon for the general good.

Given that the Federal Government is spending our tax dollars to try to convince us to be tolerant and understanding of various “alternative” lifestyles, one has to ask why it carries on a double standard. Why does it spend millions of dollars on campaigns to get Australians to give up unsafe practices like smoking or drink

driving, but when it comes to dangerous homosexual behaviour, not only does it not try to warn the community about such high risk behaviours, but it actually seems to be promoting it, by granting homosexuals legal recognition and, as a result, social endorsement.

Indeed, government are quite happy to show graphic images of what smoking does to people, or bloody images of road accidents. Yet it presents no such picture of the high risk homosexual lifestyle. Part of the reason for this of course is that it is exactly what the homosexual lobby has been actively involved in: keeping their harmful practices hidden from the public. As one leading homosexual activist manual states, "Gays must launch a large-scale campaign – we've called it the Waging Peace campaign – to reach straights through the mainstream media. We're talking about propaganda." And to do this, the media campaign should "portray only the most favorable side of gays".<sup>97</sup> They go on to speak of "the wide range of favorably *sanitized* images that might be shown in the media (*italics added*). This strategy is obviously paying off.

Such a double standard can only lead many to believe that the homosexual lobby has far greater influence with the media and the Federal Government than first imagined. It will also lead to some deadly consequences.

### III. THE POLITICS OF AIDS

Aside from all of the above mentioned problems, there still remains the tragic issue of HIV/AIDS. This has been a problem of plague proportions in the homosexual community and needs to be addressed.

Perhaps the ultimate indicator of unsafe and unhealthy activities practiced by homosexuals can be found in their average life expectancy. A study of 5,371 obituaries of homosexuals revealed that the average age of a homosexual with AIDS is 39 years, and the average age of one without AIDS is 42 years.<sup>98</sup>

Other studies vindicate such findings. For example, a study published in the *International Journal of Epidemiology* found that the life expectancy of homosexuals is eight to twenty years less than that of heterosexual men.<sup>99</sup>

Surely such tragic statistics show how homosexual behaviour has very unhealthy outcomes. As Australian government statistics have made quite plain, it is homosexual activity which accounts for the majority of HIV cases. More specifically, 94 per cent of people known to be HIV positive are men, and at least 85 per cent of cases of AIDS in Australia are attributed to male homosexual or bisexual contact.<sup>100</sup>

More recent reports show similar, if not worse, trends. As described in the gay press, according to recent reports, "there has been a 17% increase in HIV transmissions in 2002, a trend that has continued in 2003. Over 90% of reported transmissions were related to homosexual sex. There also has been a 24% increase since 1998 in the number of men in Sydney having unprotected sex with casual partners."<sup>101</sup>

Initially, the homosexual community and its supporters tried to convince the rest of society that AIDS could be caught by anyone. Even they no longer run this line. As one homosexual activist recently admitted, "Between 1983 and 2001 there was [sic] over 8,000 people with AIDS in Australia, of whom over 6,000 died. The great majority of these were gay men. More than 20,000 people, again mostly gay men, have been diagnosed with HIV infection."<sup>102</sup>

The truth is, in Australia in particular, and the West in general, AIDS is primarily a homosexual disease. Indeed, back in 1981 when it was first being recognised in America, it was called GRID: Gay Related Immunodeficiency Disease. It was only after protest from the homosexual community that the name was changed to AIDS (Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome).<sup>103</sup>

In the West, homosexual activity is the main way the disease is passed on, along with intravenous drug usage. Avoid the homosexual lifestyle, and intravenous drug use, and you have an almost zero chance of getting AIDS. As one author put it, "as rare as male breast cancer is, more native-born American males are diagnosed with the disease *each year* than the total number who have contracted AIDS through heterosexual intercourse since the AIDS epidemic began".<sup>104</sup>

Thus the early campaigns designed to convince heterosexuals that they were equally at risk of getting AIDS were exercises in propaganda and Political Correctness. When people like Madonna exclaimed that "AIDS Doesn't

Discriminate” she was being disingenuous at best. So too were those who put out the Grim Reaper ads in Australia in the early days of the epidemic. It was patent nonsense and misinformation then, and still is. As Michael Fumento writes, “The slogans have a nice ring to them, but quickly fall apart under scrutiny. Bullets and knives don’t discriminate either, but you’re far more likely to catch one walking through a dark South Bronx alley than strolling down a well-lit street on Manhattan’s Upper East Side.”<sup>105</sup>

A 1996/97 survey of gay men in Sydney found that although 97 per cent were aware of AIDS, nearly half said they had not changed their behaviour in response. Said the report: “The results of the . . . survey indicate a decreasing concern for HIV/AIDS and a state of global complacency. This . . . severely inhibits real progress in the fight against AIDS”.<sup>106</sup> The 2000 Smash report found that over a four year period only 18.9 per cent of male homosexuals never had anal intercourse without a condom with regular male partners.<sup>107</sup>

In fact, even simple precautions like condom use are ignored. Recent studies in the US have shown that nearly half of all young gay men have unprotected sex.<sup>108</sup> Studies conducted here show similar results. A SMASH spokesman said years of post-epidemic proactive education are inducing a level of “safe sex fatigue”.<sup>109</sup> In Victoria, medical authorities have warned of a new AIDS crisis, with a 67 per cent HIV increase among gay men.<sup>110</sup> And a Queensland study found that only 20.8 per cent of homosexuals always use a condom with regular partners.<sup>111</sup>

More recent reports indicate HIV/AIDS infection rates continue to rise in NSW and Victoria. Carelessness, belief that the virus has been cured, and the practice of “barebacking” have led to the increase. Barebacking (sex without condoms), coupled with safe-sex fatigue, has become a new concern among some homosexual commentators.<sup>112</sup>

Indeed, many gay websites feature gay men who proudly proclaim they are into barebacking. And a recent Health in Men study by the National Centre in HIV Social Research found that 55 per cent of gay men did not disclose their HIV status to casual partners at any stage during the six months prior to the survey.<sup>113</sup> And according to reports found in extreme homosexual literature, some healthy homosexual men have actively sought HIV-positive partners so they could become infected.<sup>114</sup>

It may not be politically correct to say so, but if we seriously discouraged homosexual activity, we would greatly reduce the number of deaths due to AIDS in the Western world. Says one authority, “AIDS is a preventable, behavior-related disease. And we know what works in preventing the spread of AIDS. The virus is primarily spread by having sexual contact with an infected person or by sharing hypodermic needles or syringes with an infected person. Avoiding such behavior greatly reduces – indeed it almost entirely removes – the chances of becoming infected. Given the awful consequences of contracting the AIDS virus, it should be clear enough that public officials as well as members of the public health community have a basic responsibility to speak up for the true and time-honored, for things like restraint and responsibility on matters of sexual behavior.”<sup>115</sup>

Instead of claiming victim status, shouting homophobia, and blaming the rest of society, homosexuals need to take responsibility for their own actions. The simple truth is, if we want to see a real reduction in the number of AIDS cases, homosexuals will need to stop their high risk sexual practices.

This is a truth which even some homosexuals have acknowledged. Consider this forthright comment by an American homosexual: “By continuing to engage in sexual practices that spread HIV, we are contributing to our own massacre. What is wrong with us? Are we so self-hating that we welcome death, that we would trade 10 minutes of pleasure for a lifetime of illness? . . . The gay men who are now contracting HIV through unsafe sex are not victims. They have consciously decided to disregard their own health and the welfare of their community.”<sup>116</sup>

## AIDS AND PUBLIC POLICY

Based on somewhat older figures, the average hospitalisation of an AIDS patient runs four months and costs \$80,000.<sup>117</sup> Homosexual acts, therefore, are not “victimless crimes,” and the consequences must be borne by the entire community. In the 1997/98 financial year, HIV and AIDS treatments cost taxpayers \$59 million, more than 2 per cent of the total cost of the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme.<sup>118</sup>

Obviously illnesses suffered by heterosexuals are also borne by the community, but as the above has made clear, it seems the homosexual minority absorbs an inordinate amount of public finances to deal with homosexual-related diseases and problems. The medical research just canvassed makes it clear that homosexual relationships are more than just private activities between consenting adults, but a public health problem of serious proportions.

But even though homosexual behaviour brings on so much sickness and death, it must be remembered that the number of AIDS cases is relatively low in Australia, compared to some other health problems. Yet governments seem to spend disproportionate amounts of taxpayer funds on AIDS. Indeed, health issues have become politicised in Australia, with some issues appearing to be more politically correct than others. This can be seen in the way Governments allocate funding for various health problems. For example, the Federal Government spends much more money on AIDS, which takes the lives of about 600 Australians each year, than it does on breast cancer, which takes the lives of about 2600 Australians each year. Consider the following facts from several years ago:

- Every year 6500 Australian women are told they have breast cancer - over 2600 a year die of it.<sup>119</sup>
- In 1992, 643 people died of AIDS-related causes.<sup>120</sup>
- The National Program for the Early Detection of Breast Cancer - Commonwealth outlays of \$25.6m in 1993-1994. AIDS Control: 54.3m in 94-95 budget.<sup>121</sup>
- Some 4000 women die each year of gynaecological cancer (cancers of the cervix, ovaries, uterus and the vulva) and breast cancer. About 2500 Australians total have died of AIDS since the early 80s. \$32 million has been set aside for three years to combat these cancers, but \$62 million a year for AIDS.<sup>122</sup>

A call to the Federal department of the Minister for Health reveals that these figures have changed very little in the past few years. (Actual figures have not been sent to me as promised.) Clearly such a discrepancy indicates a political agenda at work. Such is the clout of the homosexual lobby that they have managed to take issues of life and death and skew them in their favour, and away from others.

This problem is not confined to Australia. Many Western countries have similar biases in their health funding. In America, for example, in the early 1990s, Federal spending on AIDS per death was around \$50,000, while it was \$3,500 for cancer, \$2,300 for breast cancer, and \$900 for heart disease.<sup>123</sup>

Former President Bill Clinton admitted to such imbalance as he addressed a homosexual lobby group on November 8, 1997: "Since I became president, we're spending 10 times as much per fatality on people with AIDS as people with breast cancer or prostate cancer"<sup>124</sup> Its not just conservatives who are concerned about such mistaken priorities. Michael Johnston, a former homosexual who was dying of AIDS, said the president's remarks put him in a difficult position. "What do I say to the person who has breast cancer or prostate cancer when they find out that the president is pandering to homosexuals and is spending 10 times more on their disease - AIDS - when primarily it is the result of our foolish and immoral choices, as opposed to those who have breast cancer or prostate cancer through no fault of their own".<sup>125</sup>

And given that the normal procedures associated with infectious diseases have not been used on AIDS, for fear of homosexual protests, it is clear, as some have put it, that AIDS has become the nation's first politically protected disease. But AIDS should be treated as a medical issue, not a political one. AIDS is a health epidemic, requiring stringent measures. This should include all the normal means of prevention of transmission: Public Health Departments should be able to know who has the disease through case monitoring and contact tracing; routine testing must be undertaken; and notification of carriers should be mandatory. As one author says, "we must stop romanticizing AIDS".<sup>126</sup>

As a co-founder of the Children's AIDS Fund in America put it, "Never before in medical history have we made it the responsibility of the individual exposed to a contagious or infectious disease to end such an epidemic. With HIV/AIDS, the medical and public health communities during the first fifteen years of the epidemic largely removed themselves from the intervention through aggressive diagnosis and reporting consistent with their approach to similar diseases."<sup>127</sup>

It is because we have refused to treat HIV/AIDS as we have any other public health risk, that we now are paying a terrible price. One doctor puts the situation in striking terms: "If a foreign nation were to attack our shores and kill 10,000 Americans, it would be considered an act of war. Yet, millions of Americans have already been

unnecessarily infected in this epidemic and they will almost all die. The tragedy is that this epidemic should never have occurred.”<sup>128</sup>

At bottom, AIDS is not primarily a health issue but a behaviour issue. Stop the behaviour (homosexual activity, and needle-based drug use) and you pretty well stop the disease. These are not just the thoughts of bigoted right wingers. Here is how one practicing lesbian puts it:

“Let’s be honest. There is a way to stop the spread of AIDS – it’s called abstaining from sex. Unlike with Alzheimer’s disease, Parkinson’s disease, or diabetes, you can make a decision to not get AIDS (with a few unfortunate exceptions, like the child of an infected mother or the victim of a contaminated blood transfusion). Considering its preventability, there is no excuse for AIDS being the biggest health crises we as a people face.”<sup>129</sup>

Another homosexual, writing in a leading American homosexual magazine, *The Advocate*, says that young homosexual men “are ignorant to a disease that has been around over 20 years. And if they are gay and male, they doubly deserve it. We’ve seen firsthand what it can do but choose to ignore that in favor of our own carnal desires.”<sup>130</sup>

#### IV. HOW MANY HOMOSEXUALS ARE THERE?

A staff reporter with *The Australian* once began an article on homosexuality claiming there were 1 million of them in Australia. How did she get this figure? As it turns out, she took the word of a member of Significant Others Marketing Consultants, who is later quoted in the article as saying there “are more than 1 million gays and lesbians in Australia”.<sup>131</sup> A month later, again in *The Australian*, the same spokesman for Significant Others was quoted in an article saying that there are “1.4 million gay and lesbian adults in Australia”.<sup>132</sup> That was a jump of 400,000 in one month. At that rate there should have been 24 million gays in Australia in the year 2000!

Now do these numbers seem a bit high? They should. An issue of *Newsweek* admitted that the 10 per cent figure which Alfred Kinsey used was highly inflated: “Activists seized on the double digits to strengthen their political message. . . . Policymakers and the press adopted the estimate - despite protests from skeptical conservatives - citing it time and time again. But new evidence suggests that ideology, not sound science, has perpetuated a 1-in-ten myth.”<sup>133</sup>

Gay activists have confirmed this to be a case of deliberate deception: “Based on their personal experience, most straights probably would put the gay population at 1% or 2% of the general population. Yet . . . when straights are asked by pollsters for a formal estimate, the figure played back most often is the ‘10% gay’ statistic which our propagandists have been drilling into their heads for years.”<sup>134</sup>

What is the evidence? The 10 per cent figure is actually about eight to ten times too high. Let’s look at Kinsey’s findings, for example. A recent article in *The American Journal of Psychiatry* claims that Kinsey’s work suffered from “severe methodological limitations” and that his sample group - male prisoners and sex offenders included - was “far from representative”. The authors of the article says that the actual figure should be about 1.1 per cent.<sup>135</sup>

Furthermore, Kinsey never actually said that 10 per cent of the population is homosexual. He claimed that 4 per cent of white males were exclusively homosexual throughout their lives after adolescence, and that 10 per cent were “more or less” exclusively gay for parts of their lives.<sup>136</sup>

Finally, while most people seem to know about Kinsey’s original study, very few know about a more recent Kinsey Institute study conducted in 1970 and released in 1989. This study found the number of homosexual males to be only 1.4 per cent. It also found that lesbians are far fewer than male homosexuals.<sup>137</sup>

Some years ago the *Wall Street Journal* presented a summary of some of the recent studies on the extent of homosexuality.<sup>138</sup> All the findings present similar low figures. In the United States a 1989 University of Chicago study found that only 1.2 per cent of both male and female adults reported homosexual activity. And a 1993 survey found only 1.1 per cent of men who claimed to be exclusively homosexual. Furthermore:

- In France a 1992 government study of over 20,000 adults found that 1.4 per cent of men and 0.4 per cent of women had had homosexual intercourse in the five years preceding the survey.

- In Britain a 1991 nationwide survey of 19,000 adults found that 1.4 per cent of men aged 16 to 59 had homosexual contact in the past five years.
- In Canada a nationwide survey of 6,000 first-year college students found that 1 per cent were homosexual and 1 per cent were bisexual.
- In Norway a 1987 nationwide poll found that 0.9 per cent of males and 0.9 per cent of females had homosexual experiences within the past three years.
- Finally, a 1989 study in Denmark found less than 1 per cent of males aged 18-59 were exclusively homosexual.

More recent American studies have demonstrated similar figures. A 1993 study of the sexual behavior of men based on the National Survey of Men found that “2 percent of sexually active men aged twenty to thirty-nine . . . had had any same-gender sexual activity during the last ten years. Approximately 1 percent of the men (1.3 percent among whites and 0.2 percent among blacks) reported having had exclusively homosexual activity.”<sup>139</sup>

A year later the most scientifically rigorous study to date of American sexual practices was released. A condensed version of the study, *Sex in America*, reported that there were “few homosexuals “ in its survey, and the nationwide incidence of male homosexuality was only 2.8 per cent, while lesbianism was just 1.4 per cent.<sup>140</sup>

And a major study released in 2000 in *Demography* found more of the same. Based on three large sets of data (the General Social Survey, the National Health and Social Life Survey, and the U.S. Census), it found that the number of exclusive male homosexuals in the general population was just 2.5 percent, and the number of exclusive lesbians just 1.4 percent.<sup>141</sup>

Recent Canadian research has found similar sorts of figures. The 2003 Canadian Community Health Survey, a comprehensive study of 135,000 Canadians on a wide range of health issues, was released mid-June 2004 by Statistics Canada. It found that among Canadians between 18 and 59 years old, about 1.0 per cent consider themselves homosexual; another 0.7 per cent said they were bisexual.<sup>142</sup>

Unless Australians are significantly different from their Western counterparts, it seems clear that the claim that one million Australians are homosexual is overstated at least five-fold. But as all good propagandists know, throw a figure around long enough, and pretty soon the general public won't even question its validity.

If the homosexual lobby is willing to use faulty statistics to support its cause, just how reliable is it in other areas? As one homosexual warned: “If you say a number that you can't prove, there's always the chance that by disproving one part of your argument, your opponents weaken you overall. I think that's dangerous.”<sup>143</sup>

While it is understandable that a movement would want to overestimate its importance and influence, it is reprehensible that such large portions of the media parrot these figures, without doing their homework first.

But the truth is, those who have sought to do the figures in Australia have come out with quite low figures. A recent study by Monash University entitled “How Gay is Australia?” based on 2001 Census figures found very low numbers indeed. It found that only 37,774 persons are in same sex couples; persons in same sex couples are only 0.2 per cent of the total population; and persons in same sex couples are only 0.47 per cent of all persons in couples.<sup>144</sup>

A more recent study of sexuality in Australia has confirmed that the ten per cent figure is greatly overblown. In a study of nearly 20,000 Australians, La Trobe University researchers found that 97.4 per cent of Australians said their sexual identity was heterosexual. A mere 1.6 said it was homosexual, and a paltry 0.9 per cent said it was bisexual. So much for the 10 per cent myth.<sup>145</sup>

The same study found that those who had an exclusively same-sex sexual attraction amounted to 0.6 per cent for men and 0.2 per cent for women. And those who had sexual experience exclusively with the same-sex came to 0.6 per cent for men and 0.1 per cent for women.<sup>146</sup>

In a book-length retelling of the study, two of the authors involved in the original research go on to say, “When questions about homosexuality have been asked in rigorous scientific sexual behaviour surveys in the United Kingdom and the United States, results similar to those in Australia have been found”.<sup>147</sup>

Incredibly, however, in the face of all this hard evidence to demonstrate the very low percentage of homosexuals in society, the two authors put this rather unscientific spin on things: “It is too simple to say ‘10 per cent of the population is gay’, but it is true that at least 10 per cent of the population is a little bit gay-ish!”<sup>148</sup>

#### V. ONCE GAY, ALWAYS GAY?

Is homosexuality a genetic condition in which people have no choice? Are people born homosexual? Can a homosexual break free of homosexuality? Can one make a distinction between homosexual orientation and homosexual behaviour? These and related questions deserve careful attention. The answers to these questions will help determine the way the homosexual rights arguments are assessed. For example, if homosexuals are born that way, then it would be hard to argue for legislation that discriminates against something they have no choice over.

First, one must make a distinction between homosexual orientation and behaviour. It is clear that not everyone with a homosexual orientation acts out this orientation. That is, some may have feelings of sexual attraction to another member of the same sex without acting on those feelings. Just as some may have an orientation to other activities, one need not act them out. As one author put it, “The question about choice and homosexuality is often asked the wrong way. It is not so much that one chooses to engage in homosexual acts as it is that one can choose not to. We are all predisposed to some things, and frequently tempted. But we make choices every day not to engage in certain activities, for any number of reasons.”<sup>149</sup>

The cause of homosexual orientation is far from clearly known and would appear to be multifactorial. It is apparent that social, psychological and cultural factors are involved as well as the aggressive promotion of homosexuality. In this it is no different from the development of alcoholism. In the case of homosexuality, many studies have noted the influence of weak or absent father figures as an important factor in offspring becoming homosexuals. Also, studies indicate that gay men and lesbian women report a significantly higher rate of childhood molestation than do heterosexual men and women.<sup>150</sup>

These last two points especially seem to be a common theme in the histories of homosexuals. Consider the area of abuse. Far too many homosexuals seem to have unfortunately undergone this tragedy as children. As one lesbian puts it, “Almost without exception, the gay men I know (and that’s too many to count) have a story of some kind of sexual trauma or abuse in their childhood – molestation by a parent or an authority figure, or seduction as an adolescent at the hands of an adult.”<sup>151</sup>

This lesbian goes on to make this revealing point: “The gay community must face the truth and see sexual molestation of an adolescent for the abuse it is, instead of the ‘coming-of-age’ experience many regard it as being.”

Two psychologists who survey the latest scientific research on the question of possible causation conclude as follows: “Homosexual persons are not subhuman robots whose acts are predetermined. They are moral agents who inherit tendencies from biology and environment, and who share in shaping their character by the responses they make to their life situations. Like all persons, they must ask, ‘This is what I want to do, but is it what I should do?’ The existence of inclinations or predispositions does not erase the need for moral evaluations of those inclinations.”<sup>152</sup>

Whatever the factors associated with the development of homosexuality, in each individual case certain factors will need to be weighted so that treatment – if desired - can be tailor-made to the individual and his or her needs.

Nonetheless, what about the claim that gays are born, not made? The Victorian AIDS Council President, recently repeated the claim that homosexuals “did not choose their homosexuality”.<sup>153</sup> Facts, however, speak otherwise. In America, for example, there are around 200 centres which help gays to go straight, and there are thousands of former gays who now are straight, many of them happily married with children.

And it is not just “religious” organisations that are involved in helping gays go straight. The decidedly non-religious Masters and Johnson Clinic in St. Louis has treated hundreds of homosexuals and bisexuals. Masters reports that they have successfully “changed” more than half of their homosexual clients, and higher than 75 per cent of bisexuals.<sup>154</sup>

One New York University psychologist, Dr. Robert Kronemeyer, puts it this way: “With rare exceptions, homosexuality is neither inherited nor the result of some glandular disturbance or the scrambling of genes or chromosomes. Homosexuals are made, not born that way. From my twenty-five years’ experience as a clinical psychologist, I firmly believe that homosexuality is a learned response to early painful experiences and that it can be unlearned.”<sup>155</sup>

Jeffrey Satinover, a psychiatrist who has taught at Yale University and is a past president of the C. G. Jung Foundation, after examining the evidence, says this: “The desire to shift to a biologic basis for explaining homosexuality appeals primarily to those who seek to undercut the vast amount of clinical experience confirming that homosexuality is significantly changeable”.<sup>156</sup>

A two year study involving nearly 860 individuals and 200 therapists found that change is clearly possible. The study found that “before counseling or therapy, 68% of the respondents perceived themselves as exclusively or almost entirely homosexual, with another 22% stating they were more homosexual than heterosexual. After treatment, only 13% perceived themselves as exclusively or almost entirely homosexual, while 33% described themselves as either exclusively or almost entirely heterosexual”.<sup>157</sup>

One male respondent said: “Change is extremely difficult and requires total commitment. But I have broken the terrible power that homosexuality had over me for so long. I haven’t been this light and happy since I was a child. People can and do change and become free”.<sup>158</sup>

More recently, a study found that psychotherapy has helped a large percentage of American homosexuals to change. Of 200 homosexuals and lesbians given the treatment, 78 per cent of males and 95 per cent of females reported a change in their sexuality. The author concludes, “This study provides evidence that some gay men and lesbians are able to also change the core features of sexual orientation”.<sup>159</sup> It is worth noting that the man who led the study, Professor Robert Spitzer, was instrumental in having homosexuality removed from the American Psychiatric Association’s list of mental disorders in 1973.<sup>160</sup>

But it is an aggressive homosexual lobby, along with the pressures of Political Correctness, that has robbed many of a chance of going straight. As psychologist Joseph Nicolosi, author of *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality*, points out, “Psychology and psychiatry have abandoned a whole population of people who feel dissatisfied with homosexuality”.<sup>161</sup>

Indeed, Political Correctness and the homosexual lobby have had such an influence that in the mid-90s, delegates of the American Medical Association voted to scrap the Association’s 13-year-old policy of encouraging practitioners to alert homosexual patients to “the possibility of sex preference reversal in selected cases.”<sup>162</sup> The new policy calls instead for attitudinal adjustment for medical personnel, saying that health care is improved by a “nonjudgemental recognition of sexual orientation and behavior.”<sup>163</sup> Physicians involved in assisting homosexuals to change their sexual behavior criticised the new policy as a “political maneuver.”<sup>164</sup>

But homosexual activists continue to insist that homosexuality is genetically based, and nothing can be done about it. Science, again, begs to differ. One person who should know is Oxford’s Richard Dawkins, author of *The Selfish Gene*. Dawkins argues that “the body of genetic determinism needs to be laid to rest.” Says Dawkins, “Whether you hate homosexuals or whether you love them, whether you want to lock them up or ‘cure’ them, your reasons had better have nothing to do with genes. Rather admit to prejudiced emotion than speciously drag genes in where they do not belong.”<sup>165</sup>

Indeed, scientists involved in genetic research are becoming increasingly convinced that “genetic determinism” is a fallacy. One distinguished Harvard University professor, Dr. Ruth Hubbard, recently wrote a book denouncing genetic determinism.<sup>166</sup> One summary of the issue concluded by saying that scientists are coming to realize one truth at least: “DNA is not destiny.”<sup>167</sup> And the two men most responsible for the humane genome project, Francis Collins and Craig Venter, have both argued that their discoveries imply the end of genetic determinism. Their discoveries about the human genome have made any simplistic statements about one or two genes predisposing someone to complex behaviors such as gayness or schizophrenia appear untenable.<sup>168</sup>

In America a recent study has found that while various factors might contribute to a person’s homosexual orientation, biological factors alone cannot be substantiated. After an in-depth review of the literature, the study makes this observation: “Recent studies postulate biological factors as the primary basis for sexual orientation.



However, there is no evidence at present to substantiate a biological theory, just as there is no compelling evidence to support any singular psychosocial explanation.”<sup>169</sup>

A stronger statement comes from Dr. Charles Socarides, Professor of Psychiatry at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York. He says theories seeking to relate sexual orientation to brain structure and hormones are “completely erroneous. There’s no possibility of someone developing homosexuality from hereditary or organic causes. It’s just impossible . . . a cluster of the brain cannot determine sexual object choice. We know that for a fact.”<sup>170</sup>

Closer to home, gay activist and Latrobe University lecturer, Dennis Altman, wrote this uncomfortable fact in 1986: “To be Haitian or a hemophiliac is determined at birth, but being gay is an identity that is socially determined and involves personal choice. Even if, as many want to argue, one has no choice in experiencing homosexual desire, there is a wide choice of possible ways of acting out these feelings, from celibacy and denial . . . to self-affirmation and the adoption of a gay identity.”<sup>171</sup> “Being gay,” says Altman, “is a choice”.<sup>172</sup>

Another Australian homosexual activist has much more recently said similar things about homosexuality and genetics: “I think the idea that sexuality is genetic is crap. There is absolutely no evidence for it at the moment, and I think it is unhealthy that people want to embrace this idea. It does reflect a desire to say, ‘it’s not our fault’, as a way of deflecting our critics. We have achieved what we have achieved by defiance, not by concessions. I think we should be recruiting people to homosexuality. It’s a great lifestyle and something everybody should have the right to experience. If you believe it’s genetic, how are you going to make the effort?”<sup>173</sup> Or as he put it elsewhere: “On the question of recruiting to homosexuality – well, of course, I am in favor of this. I believe homosexuality to be a perfectly valid lifestyle choice. . . . I am naturally keen to encourage people to participate in [the gay lifestyle].”<sup>174</sup>

And a leading Australian feminist and lesbian has also made it clear that choice is a major component of the lifestyle. Melbourne University academic Sheila Jeffreys became a feminist in her twenties, when she was involved in “perfectly good” relationships with men. She then decided to become a lesbian: “At the time, “ she says, we “made the decision to become political lesbians, as we called it.”<sup>175</sup>

She says that “you can learn to be heterosexual and you can learn to be lesbian”. When challenged by an interviewer that sexuality is more innate than that, she continues, “I don’t think there’s anything natural about sexuality; you do learn it. And you can unlearn it, go in a different direction, change it.” She says that her own experience proves this, as does that of many other women who decided to switch to lesbianism in the ‘70s.<sup>176</sup>

Other homosexuals have admitted that choice plays at least a partial role in the overall equation.<sup>177</sup> Indeed, there is even an entire website devoted to those who say they have chosen the homosexual lifestyle. The site says it is “a radical gathering place for people who have chosen to be queer”.<sup>178</sup>

However, the tendency is to deny choice, to make it appear that homosexuals cannot help it, and to argue that any criticism of the gay lifestyle is as silly as criticism of being left-handed or red-haired.

And this has been a deliberate strategy by homosexual activists. They have done a very good job to convince a gullible public that homosexuals are born that way and cannot change. Consider this revealing quote from a homosexual activist manual: “the public should be persuaded that gays are *victims of circumstance*, that they no more chose their sexual orientation than they did, say, their height, skin color, talents, or limitations. (We argue that, for all practical purposes, gays should be considered to have been *born gay* – even though sexual orientation, for most humans, seems to be the product of a complex interaction between innate predispositions and environmental factors during childhood and early adolescence.)”<sup>179</sup>

As Thomas Schmidt has noted, “a large component of homosexual activists applaud biologic causation theories for their effect on public opinion, but are philosophically committed to *personal choice* as opposed to any deterministic theory, biologic or environmental.”<sup>180</sup>

Even if there is a genetic predisposition to homosexuality, one can overcome this just as one can overcome a predisposition to, say, overeating, anger, or even alcoholism. We are not animals, and can therefore, as Altman points out, make choices about how we live out the life that nature accords us.

Or as one science writer reminds us, “even if genetic determinism is shown to be very powerful, we are still left having to decide what we want to do with it. After all, genetics can give someone a predisposition to cancer, but we don’t applaud cancer.”<sup>181</sup> And as another commentator remarks, “the influence of nonvolitional forces on *any* human activity is no help in determining the ethical status of that action. . . . To the degree that these external or nonvolitional factors influence one’s actions, they moderate the degree of personal culpability (or personal credit in the case of good behavior) but they do not change the assessment of the behavior itself.”<sup>182</sup>

Social commentator William Bennett reminds us that “a decent, humane, self-governing society will reject the belief that most human beings – homosexual *or* heterosexual - are slaves to their passions, their desires, their genetic predispositions. Our identities are not defined by sex, nor is sex itself an irresistible force. To believe otherwise is to vitiate the concept of individual responsibility and free will. Although our struggles are not all the same, we all do struggle against every sort of human desire, against our biological impulses, against our emotional luggage. We do not abjure the struggle because it is difficult or because we seem to be battling against something deep within us – even if that something is as powerful as sexual desire; even if it seems fundamental to who we are.”<sup>183</sup>

## IN THE GENES?

A few scientific studies have been heralded by a sympathetic press recently as evidence that homosexuality is genetically based. Studies by National Cancer Institute researcher Dean Hamer and gay researcher Simon LeVay are two such studies. While both studies urged caution in the interpretation of the findings, the media featured headlines claiming a genetic basis for homosexuality. Both studies have been heavily criticised for methodological shortcomings and other problems.<sup>184 185</sup>

Indeed, later attempts to verify these studies have proven a failure. A study of 52 gay brothers by a team of clinical neurologists “found no evidence of linkage of sexual orientation to Xq28”, the so-called ‘gay gene’ identified by Hamer in 1993.<sup>186</sup> Another study of 54 pairs of gay brothers also failed to find the link.<sup>187</sup>

Jeffrey Satinover has dealt with this question extensively. He concludes that “hard science is far from providing an explanation of homosexuality, let alone one that reduces it to genetic determinism”.<sup>188</sup> And homosexuals themselves have criticised these “gay gene” studies. For example, Edward Stein PhD, a homosexual activist, has written a whole book on the subject.<sup>189</sup> In an interview with a homosexual magazine he says this: “There are serious problems with the science itself. . . . My training had taught me that a lot of what was being said was, well, highly unscientific. . . . Many gay people want to use this research to promote gay rights. If gay people are ‘born that way,’ then discrimination against them must be wrong. . . . A gay or lesbian person’s public identity, sexual behaviors, romantic relationships, or decisions to raise children are all choices. No theory suggests that these choices are genetic.”<sup>190</sup>

The Victorian AIDS Council President said that homosexuality is “just a fact of life. The concept of someone becoming a homosexual because of something they see or hear is something I find quite bizarre”. He rejected the idea that young people could be seduced into homosexuality by homosexual propaganda and recruitment.

But if this is so, why do we keep hearing statements like this coming from the homosexual movement?: “We shall sodomize your sons, emblems of feeble masculinity, of your shallow dreams and vulgar lies. We shall seduce them in your schools, in your dormitories, in your gymnasiums, in your locker rooms, in your sports arenas, in your seminaries, in your youth groups . . . Your sons shall become our minions and do our bidding. They will be recast in our image. They will come to crave and adore us.”<sup>191</sup>

If young people cannot be seduced, why this statement from a gay activist?: “I have found that even many of my most unbiased straight friends grow skiddish with my homosexual candour - say, kissing my mate - when their children are around. Underneath it all, they too understand that sexually free ideas are infectious and that, once introduced to the suggestion of same-sex love, their kids might just try it and like it.”<sup>192</sup>

There are very real dangers of homosexuals seeking to recruit impressionable youth. The promotion of homosexuality, in the schools for example, will result in a number of young people being enticed to experiment with anal intercourse and other practices endemic in the gay community. Public policy should seek to discourage this kind of promotion of the homosexual lifestyle. The health and well-being of our children is at stake. Indeed, a war is waging over the minds and hearts of our young people. As one commentator puts it:

“From history, sociology, and anthropology, what we learn is 1) that it’s not just Judeo-Christian Western culture that has scorned homosexual behavior; and 2) that in those (rare) cultures where homosexual behaviour has *not* been scorned, gayness didn’t stop at some hypothetical 10 per cent, but ended up being virtually an epidemic. Homosexual behavior throughout a society is not static, but fluid. It can change radically in either direction, depending upon societal attitudes toward it. Isn’t that what sexual taboos have always been about? Both society and the individual have a say in the matter. Society can ban it or bless it; and whatever society decides, it is likely that its individual citizens will choose to go as far as they are permitted to go.”<sup>193</sup>

To conclude this section, perhaps the best argument that can be made against the ‘once gay, always gay’ mentality is to hear from former homosexuals themselves. As I have noted, countless thousands of homosexuals have known the experience of liberation from the homosexual lifestyle. And hundreds of organisations around the world are helping homosexuals make that change. Many books have been written documenting these changed lives.<sup>194</sup>

One such book, *Coming out of Homosexuality*, tells the story of how the book’s co-authors went through the difficult but rewarding path of change. They also speak of many others who have taken this tough journey: “We have witnessed solid, substantial healing in so many men and women over the years that we can say without hesitation, ‘There is a way out of homosexuality’.”<sup>195</sup> They continue, “During the past fourteen years, we have become personally acquainted with hundreds of men and women who have left behind the gay and lesbian lifestyle. . . . Now some of these men and women have been free from homosexual involvement for ten or twenty years. They are not just suppressing their strong homosexual or lesbian longings. There has been a true resolution of this issue in their lives.”<sup>196</sup>

And it is not just the lifestyle, but the orientation as well, that can be changed, albeit slowly and painfully. Another former homosexual, Jeff Konrad, puts it this way: “Despite what we hear from the media and the world at large, your homosexual orientation can be changed. I want you to know there is hope. . . . And I’m not just talking about behaviour or surface stuff. I’m talking about deep-down change. I no longer have the feelings, desires, temptations, orientation, or identity of the past. I am convinced you can experience this also.”<sup>197</sup>

Or as one former British lesbian says, “It is possible for your sexual orientation to change. It is also possible for a former lesbian to marry and to be happily married. I am.”<sup>198</sup>

The thousands of individuals who have left the homosexuals lifestyle comprise the most important counterweight to the claims of the homosexual activists and their demands for preferential treatment. As Robert Knight puts it, “The greatest threat to the gay rights movement is the ex-gay movement, with its message of compassion, hope and healing.”<sup>199</sup> That is why militant homosexuals try so hard to shout down and deny the message of those who have left the ranks of homosexuality. Their transformed lives belie the claims of the homosexual lobby.

## VI. GAY RIGHTS AND DISCRIMINATION

The push for gay rights, as we have seen, is the main means by which the homosexual lobby seeks to further its agenda. By talking about discrimination, civil rights and minority status, the impression is created that homosexuals lack basic human rights that others enjoy, and that they are a persecuted minority.

There are several things wrong with regarding homosexuality as a civil right. For example, homosexuals enjoy the same protections under law of basic civil rights as does anyone else.

Moreover, one’s behaviour should not be the basis of civil rights legislation. Homosexuality is not a benign factor like race or gender, but is primarily a behaviour-based activity. We do not extend special rights to other behaviour-based groups, like smokers or stamp collectors.

Analogies between homosexuality and race have proven to be insupportable. Special protected status has historically been granted when three criteria are met. First, economic, educational and cultural opportunities are denied a group. While this has been true of various races in the past, it is not true of homosexuals. Homosexuals as a class have higher than average annual incomes, are more often college educated than non-homosexuals, and especially predominate in culture, as in the arts world.

As a recent example, a study of 20,000 Australians found “associations between homosexual identity and experience and higher socio-economic status as marked by profession and education.” The authors of this study says that such findings are “consistent with some previous national studies”.<sup>200</sup> For example, a 2001 American study of nearly 6,000 gays and lesbians found that they were “overwhelmingly high-income, highly-educated, professionally employed, urban-dwelling and property owning”.<sup>201</sup> The findings left an Australian homosexual to ask, “This is an oppressed minority?”<sup>202</sup>

Second, obvious, immutable traits must be identifiable in protected classes. Again, this is true of race, but not of the homosexual community. Blacks cannot help being black, but as we have seen, gays can help being gay. Moreover, some characteristics are immutable but not protected. Height, good looks and predispositions to obesity are also immutable, but do not warrant in themselves special protection. Homosexual behaviour is not innate or immutable, so again, they fail the test.

Third, protected classes should demonstrate political powerlessness. Just the opposite is the case in Australia. The amount of influence one to two per cent of the population has over the rest of the population is staggering.

Shouts of discrimination, so often heard from homosexuals, need to be examined more closely. Often we hear lesbians talking about a right to children, or homosexuals talking about being denied the right to marriage. But discrimination means the denial of a right that one really has. It makes no more sense for a same-sex couple to talk about the right to have children that it does for me to talk about the right to be 5 metres tall. If two people decide to place themselves outside of the conditions that make procreation possible, then it is silly to talk about discrimination and the denial of rights.

Gay rights laws, in summary, meet none of the traditional criteria for human rights protection.

Also, it needs to be stressed than whenever you grant special rights to homosexuals you have to take rights away from other people. If gays are granted special rights to force homeowners to rent to them, those homeowners will have lost certain rights - the right to conscientiously choose who one wishes to rent to, for example. If a homosexual is granted the right to teach sex education in schools, the parent of the child in that school loses the right to have a say in the moral calibre of the teacher.

Admittedly, morality and law is not based on numbers, but how is it fair that one and a half percent of the population should be granted special rights at the expense of the other 98.5 per cent? Why should Australia’s four and a half million families be forced to concede rights to Australia’s 300,000 or so homosexuals?

Let’s illustrate the situation this way. Mrs. Murphy is renting a room. A student applies. Mrs. Murphy asks him, “Do you like the music of J.S. Bach?” “Yes” he replies. “Then you will never rent from me” she retorts. Next come two men dressed in female clothing. Mrs. Murphy eyes them over and tells them to get lost. What are the rights of each? Roger Magnuson puts it this way: “Before the passage of a gay rights law, both the student and the homosexuals have the same rights: none.”<sup>203</sup> Mrs. Murphy may be opinionated, bigoted or confused, but she can reject both applicants. Neither party has the right to claim special protection of the law for its preference for Bach or homosexuality. However, after a gay rights law is passed, says Magnuson, “the homosexuals win a privilege for their unnatural sexual practices that the student does not have for his baroque musical tastes, or the average citizen for his normal preferences. The homosexuals can sue, and win.”<sup>204</sup>

The truth of the matter is this: almost all societies and cultures throughout history have recognized the importance that the institutions of marriage and family offer to society.<sup>205</sup> Especially in the raising, teaching and protection of children, families, preferably cemented by marriage, offer the most secure, stable and loving context for preparing the next generation for their role in society. Societies thus have a vested interest in promoting marriage and family. Indeed, societies have therefore granted special recognition to marriage and family. In this sense they have positively discriminated in favor of marriage and family. But such a discrimination is both desirable and healthy. In the same way that society “discriminates” against 8-year-olds by not granting them licenses to drive, so society “discriminates” against those who choose to remain outside of the institutions of marriage and the natural family. A homosexual relationship is just that, a relationship. It has never been, nor can it ever be, considered to be a family. Thus if a person wants the benefits and privileges of family life, then he or she needs to meet the criteria and responsibilities thereof.

But it is nonsense for a person to eschew male-female relationships in favor of same-sex ones, and then complain of discrimination. If I choose to lop off both my arms, and then demand that the Melbourne Tigers hire me as a basketballer, they have every reason to tell me to get lost. Even if I retain my arms, my shortness and my inability to throw a ball may disqualify me as well.

Society is like that. It is full of distinctions, of differentiations. I may complain bitterly that I am not able to breastfeed, but that is life. Nature itself discriminates. The word discriminate simply means to differentiate, to distinguish. When I chose my wife over millions of other women, I discriminated. When a professional basketball team chooses a two and a half meter athlete over me, it is discriminating. When societies pass laws saying 7-year-olds cannot get a driver's license, they are discriminating. When a nation says a 4-year-old does not have the right to vote, it is discriminating.

Thus it does no good for the homosexual lobby to forever complain about discrimination and inequality when such is the very fabric of living in a democracy. (Genuine unjust discrimination – e.g., racial discrimination - of course is another matter.)

Nor will it do for homosexual activists to argue that they are the objects of all kinds of economic and social discrimination based on their sexuality. A homosexual activist once made just this claim in a radio debate with me. He bewailed the fact that as a taxpayer he was denied access to all kinds of government benefits because he was gay. He challenged me to name just one area where I was being discriminated against.

Unfortunately I was not given the right of reply. I could have produced a very long list. There are all kinds of benefits that I as a taxpayer also do not get. I do not receive the youth allowance. I do not get a single-parent benefit. I do not get a widow's pension. I do not get maternal health benefits.

The point is, as a married heterosexual male, there are all sorts of benefits that I am not qualified for. Yet I am a tax payer like everyone else. I am just as much a victim of discrimination in this regard as is any one else. Yet I do not hear of male taxpayers saying they will withhold part of their tax because they do not directly get the benefits of breast cancer screening or gynaecological services.

The issue of rights is often one of whoever shouts the loudest, gets the most attention. Homosexual activists have made many noisy demands over the years and have done quite well, often at the expense of other groups who may in fact exhibit more genuine need. Anthony Butcher offers this example: "In 1992, with some 250,000 Australians suffering from major mental illness, approximately \$8.2 million was spent on psychiatric research. In the same year \$10.6 million was spent on AIDS research, even though by December 1994 the total number of AIDS cases diagnosed had reached only 5732".<sup>206</sup> For a "poor persecuted minority group", homosexuals have done quite well out of the public purse.

## PRO-HOMOSEXUAL DISCRIMINATION

Moreover, if there is discrimination against homosexuals taking place, it is not just the heterosexual community that is doing the discrimination. Homosexuals seem to have a pretty good track record of discriminating against each other. For example, organisers of a lesbian festival in Victoria sought to exclude not only male homosexuals, but transsexuals as well. The organisers wanted to ban everyone except female-born lesbians. They even managed to persuade the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal to grant the organisers exemption from state equal opportunity laws.<sup>207</sup>

While this blatant example of discrimination went largely unnoticed in the mainstream community, there was a huge uproar amongst the gay community.<sup>208</sup> Various sides took to the debate, in numerous heated and acrimonious exchanges, as recorded in the gay press. The infighting lasted for several weeks until VCAT reversed its decision, saying that such a ban was illegal after all.<sup>209</sup> In the end "Lesfest" was cancelled because organisers did not want to accept the VCAT decision.<sup>210</sup>

During this kerfuffle, one homosexual writer penned an interesting article in the gay press. He spoke of rampant discrimination within the gay community, and said that the "bickering and infighting that I have witnessed within the GLBTIQ community in the last 12 months is atrocious". He continued, "the gay and lesbian community continues to discriminate, ignore or even ostracise bisexual, transgender, transsexual or intersex people. . . . I can

cite many examples where the gay and lesbian community has done the above either accidentally or deliberately. It still does.”<sup>211</sup>

As another example of pro-gay discrimination, the same VCAT recently ordered that Melbourne gays could get special rights over the rest of the community. It allowed an exemption for a gay hotel to have men-only dance parties. They even ruled that similar men-only parties could be held throughout the state.<sup>212</sup>

Many other cases could be cited. For example, in Cairns there is a gay-only resort. Interestingly, however, it has been forced to allow straights to come in as well, because of low returns from the gay travel market.<sup>213</sup>

## VII. JUDICIAL ACTIVISM AND HOMOSEXUALITY

As the VCAT examples above make clear, various courts and judges have been aiding and abetting the homosexual agenda in many instances. Indeed, along with a complicit media, and pro-gay activities in our educational system, the judiciary is a leading body of pro-gay activism. Increasingly judges and courts of various kinds are using their judicial powers to promote and implement the homosexual agenda, often against the express wishes of the majority.

A number of examples could be mentioned. Let me begin with some major cases from overseas. In December of 1999 the Vermont Supreme Court ruled that same-sex couples must be granted the full rights and privileges of heterosexual unions. In June of 2003 the Ontario (Canada) Court of Appeals declared that same-sex couples had the right to legally marry. In the same month the US Supreme Court decided that the laws banning sodomy in Texas were unconstitutional. Somehow the US Constitution is now interpreted to mean that every American has the right to homosexual relations. And in November of 2003 the Massachusetts Supreme Court ruled that a state ban on same-sex marriage was unconstitutional.<sup>214</sup> (Some of these cases will be further discussed below.)

In Australia similar judicial activism continues apace. Having a practicing homosexual on our highest court of course helps to explain, in part, this activism. But it seems that many of our courts, both state and federal, are involved in this promotion of the homosexual agenda.

In July 2000 a landmark court case in effect struck down state laws on IVF access by saying they violated the federal Sex Discrimination Act (1984) by banning single women and lesbians.<sup>215</sup> In April 2002 a High Court ruling threw out an appeal to that ruling.<sup>216</sup> Thus our un-elected Federal judges struck down the lengthy and careful consultative processes that resulted in the legislation of reproductive technology in several states. And taxpayers will have to foot the bill for allowing lesbians access to expensive IVF treatment.

In October 2001 Justice Chisholm of the Family Court ruled that, in effect, two women could marry. A woman who decided to become a man, and renamed herself Kevin, had taken up a relationship with another woman, Jennifer, and began steps to marry in 1999. The judge ruled that “man” could mean a variety of things, and not just be related to the constraints of biology. Psychological and social considerations, in other words, could also be considered when we define (or redefine) ‘male’ and ‘female’.<sup>217</sup> The full bench of the Family Court later upheld that decision.<sup>218</sup>

Some recent cases took place in December of 2003. In that month the Family Court granted a Melbourne gay couple parental responsibility for a baby boy born to a surrogate mother in the US. Justice Sally Brown ruled that it was in the “best interests” of the child to be looked after by the homosexual couple!<sup>219</sup>

Also in December, The Australian High Court declared that homosexuals who might suffer persecution overseas were entitled to refugee status in this country. In a 4-3 ruling, the Court declared that a gay Bangladeshi couple could win the rights to be refugees. It was a world-first ruling, and will likely have ramifications in other similar cases.<sup>220</sup>

In April 2004 Chief Justice Alistair Nicholson of the Family Court declared that a 13 year old girl could undergo a sex change procedure because she felt that she was really a boy.<sup>221</sup> Also in April 2004, an Auckland Family Court ruled that a toddler could have three parents: the lesbian mum, her female partner, and the Sydney male sperm donor.<sup>222</sup>

A glowing example of government sponsored pro-gay activity is the conduct of the Equal Opportunity Commission. It regularly goes out of its way to the gay community, seeking to get homosexuals more active. Instead of being an impartial observer, it seems the EOC wants to stir up trouble. Diane Sisely of the EOC complains that only 77 out of nearly 3500 discrimination cases taken to the Commission in 2003 were about sexuality. She is unhappy with that, and wants to see more such cases. She said the 77 complaints were “only the tip of the iceberg”. But how does she know that? Never mind that maybe it is just not as huge a problem as the EOC hopes it is. Nonetheless, she has had the EOC set up booths at gay festivals, informing people there of their rights, and encouraging them to make complaints if need be.<sup>223</sup>

Numerous other examples could be cited. But it should be clear that various judges, courts, commissions and tribunals are attempting to align themselves with the homosexual agenda, regardless of whether such actions are in the best interests of the community, or in fact reflect the desires of the majority of its citizens.

## VIII. THE HOMOSEXUAL AGENDA

We have already examined gay strategies. However, a few more words must be devoted to what the homosexual lobby actually wants. What are their demands? What changes do they propose? How will the family be affected by such changes?

Since Australian groups like GLAD (Gay men and Lesbians Against Discrimination) quote freely from their American counterparts, let me mention some of the agenda items listed in the USA. The homosexual lobby’s list of demands, as presented at the 1993 March on Washington, includes the following:

- Recognition of same-sex “marriages” and “domestic partnerships”.
- Adoption of children by homosexual couples.
- The implementation of homosexual, bisexual, and transgendered curriculum at all levels of education.
- Repeal of all sodomy laws.
- Passage and implementation of graduated age-of-consent laws for sexual relations.<sup>224</sup>

Much of this is already happening in Australia. An earlier list of demands stated similar goals:

- Repeal of all laws prohibiting private sexual acts involving consenting persons.
- Repeal of all laws prohibiting prostitution, both male and female.
- Repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent.
- Repeal of all legislative provisions that restrict the sex or number of persons entering into a marriage unit; and the extension of legal benefits to all persons who cohabit, regardless of sex or numbers.
- Enactment of legislation that child custody, adoption, visitation rights, foster parenting and the like shall not be denied because of sexual orientation or marital status.
- Encouragement and support for sex-education courses, prepared and taught by gay women and men, presenting homosexuality as a valid, healthy preference and lifestyle as a viable alternative to heterosexuality.<sup>225</sup>

It should be noted that many of these proposals have been put forward in Australia, and many have already been adopted. Indeed, one way to see how the gay agenda is being implemented is to examine earlier proposals made by the gay community and see just how many of their demands have been met.

Consider several earlier documents which list some of the demands that the homosexual lobby have been making. One source of information is from comments made by the homosexual community during a two-day Senate hearing concerning the Sexual Conduct Bill held late in 1994. Homosexual representatives at the hearing were quite frank about what they wanted achieved in the near future. For example, Mr Michael Alexander of the Australian Federation of AIDS Organisations, mentioned three areas which needed changing. The first area, he said, is the issue of criminal law (overthrowing anti-sodomy laws, etc.); “anti-discrimination legislation or equality is the second thing, and I think the whole recognition of relationships is a third thing.”<sup>226</sup> He mentioned a number of laws that could be affected: “laws on intestacy, laws on family provisions, challenging wills - that sort of stuff. There is a whole range of laws.”<sup>227</sup>

Changes to the definition of marriage and family are part of the package. Former Archbishop D’Arcy pointed out that in a letter former Attorney General Michael Lavarch wrote to D’Arcy, Lavarch made this admission: “The

bill does not purport to endorse nor condemn any alternative to the dignity of marriage and the procreation of children, but it does appear to equate them.”<sup>228</sup> Exactly, and this is just the point homosexual activists will seize on in their next set of claims. Indeed, as one witness said, well-placed homosexuals had informed him that “this bill was just the beginning of a wide range of things that will come before Parliament.”<sup>229</sup>

In fact, in a number of submissions by the gay community, such demands were already being made. For example, Mr David Buchanan of the Lesbian and Gay Legal Rights Service stated at the committee hearing that his group had argued that “the age of consent is excessively conservative . . . [and] the age of consent should be reduced to 16.”<sup>230</sup>

Some of the most revealing comments came from Tasmanian homosexual activist Rodney Croome. Concerning homosexual relationships being as valid as marriage, he said, “I think it is a form of chauvinism to elevate heterosexual relationships, be they sanctioned with marriage or not, to a position that is superior in some way to relationships between members of the same sex.”<sup>231</sup>

Concerning hiring and education, he said, “If the Tasmanian government was to introduce legislation to protect us from discrimination in employment and housing, goods and services some time in the distant future, then we would ask that there be no exemption in that for people who have care or responsibility over children, for instance, teachers.”<sup>232</sup>

Most frightening was his answer to Senator Abetz who asked him if he would make an exemption for religious organisations and religious schools: “In principle, Senator, we would argue that if a religious school found it acceptable to employ people of a different denomination or different religion who may not share the convictions and may actually disagree with the convictions of the people who run the school, then we could see no difference between that and employing homosexual people if those people were good teachers, regardless of the convictions of the people who ran the school.”<sup>233</sup>

Another document that is quite revealing is a paper put out by the Australian Democrats in 1995 entitled “Prohibiting Discrimination on the Grounds of Sexuality: Issues Paper No. 1”. The paper was “designed to collect the views of individuals and groups in the gay community”<sup>234</sup> concerning a Private Member’s Bill to be introduced in federal Parliament.

The section dealing with the ambit of the Bill says this: “One option here would be to design a bill which aims at a modest advance only ie. one which included sufficient exemptions from the prohibition of discrimination to make it more palatable to a greater number of people and therefore more likely to pass. The preferred alternative was to develop a piece of legislation which comprehensively, decisively and as effectively as possible prohibits discrimination in all spheres of our communal life.”<sup>235</sup>

Concerning same sex couple relationships, the document says that “Legal equality with heterosexual de facto relationships is in my view achievable.”<sup>236</sup>

Of most interest is the section on exemptions. It reads: “Exempting controversial areas, eg. employment as teachers in religious institutions was generally rejected despite superficial attraction as a strategy to reduce opposition to the Bill. The crucial role of teachers in perpetuating (or removing) stereotypical prejudices was emphasised.”<sup>237</sup>

Many of these demands have now been met. Indeed, the extent to which the homosexual agenda is being implemented is nicely laid out in a recent book by Australian homosexual activist Graham Willett. In his book *Living Out Loud* he presents a history of homosexual activism in Australia. His book shows how successful the homosexual lobby has been in achieving its ends. Indeed, the author expresses amazement at how quickly and easily its ends have been attained.<sup>238</sup>

A few representative quotes set the tone. He begins his book by noting “how very different” attitudes are today compared to not so very long ago: “Anti-gay ideas still exist in society, of course, but a basic liberal tolerance is the dominant mood. . . . It is a startling indication of just how far we have come that the moral crusaders’ demands are widely regarded as silly and unfair.”<sup>239</sup>



His concluding chapter offers more of the same: “Never have homosexuality, the gay and lesbian community and their issues been more visible or more seriously dealt with by the mainstream, or more entrenched in social and political life. . . . One of the great changes of the past 40 years has been the growing visibility of lesbians and gay men in Australian society. . . . This visibility is reinforced by the role of the mainstream media.”<sup>240</sup>

“The triumph of liberal tolerance is now more or less complete.”<sup>241</sup> Indeed, so successful has the gay offensive been that Willett argues that the real problem for the homosexual community may be internal fragmentation due to its own diversity and acceptance.

After Willett made those comments new and more ominous developments have occurred. In June of 2003 the Ontario Supreme Court declared that exclusive heterosexual marriage laws violated the human rights of Canadian homosexuals and lesbians. In the same month the US Supreme Court decided that Texan laws against sodomy were unconstitutional. And also in June, English Anglicans and Australian Uniting Church members debated the ordination of gay clergy.<sup>242</sup>

All of this encouraged one homosexual commentator to express amazement at how rapidly and easily the homosexual agenda was being implemented. He said he had previously doubted whether same-sex marriage was a “worthwhile or attainable objective for gay and lesbian activism. How wrong I was. This is clearly now the last great frontier of the 40-year struggle for gay and lesbian equal rights.” He went on to say, “Progress in this area has been much faster, and has met much less resistance, than I or anyone else anticipated”.<sup>243</sup>

Elsewhere the same commentator makes these remarks: “It is astonishing how in recent years the dynamics of gay rights law reform have changed. In the old days (before about 1990), it took years of patient lobbying, petition writing, fundraising and occasional violent demo-going to bring about change. . . . But in recent years, no sooner does the gay and lesbian community think of some new reform, some new right, than gay-friendly politicians positively . . . rush to put it into law for us. We scarcely even have to ask.”<sup>244</sup>

Australian homosexual activist Dennis Altman concurs: “When I became a gay activist – a phrase I always disliked – in the 1970s, it was because the law and society declared me to be both criminal and inferior. Much of the major issues of discrimination we opposed have now been addressed, though there is a strong residue of dislike and fear of homosexuals, as the frequency of fag-bashing and anti-queer jokes in the media attest.”<sup>245</sup>

And an Australian lesbian activist writing in early 2004 also remarks on the major advances being made: “In the last five years, progress in lesbian and gay law reform in Australia has seemed unstoppable”.<sup>246</sup>

Thus while many homosexual warriors are still claiming that they are the victims of discrimination and inequality, more forthright homosexual leaders are saying that they have come a long way indeed.

## IX. HOMOSEXUAL MARRIAGE

Perhaps the most disconcerting item on the gay agenda is the desire to equate same-sex relationships with normal marriage and family life. In this the gay lobby has been quite successful. For example, during the International 1994 Year of the Family, the Government refused to even try to define what it meant by the term “family” for fear of offending the homosexual lobby. Indeed, a Labor Federal Cabinet decided to include homosexual couples in its definition of families for the purpose of future census taking by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Also, in New South Wales it has been decided that gay couples are to be recognised as “family”.<sup>247</sup>

And this has been a deliberate strategy of the homosexual activists: to radically alter the traditional understanding of marriage and family. One representative quote will suffice here. One Melbourne activist, discussing homosexual law reform, says that it “was not just about formal discrimination, although that was the language of the campaign. It was a battle to change the meaning of family”.<sup>248</sup>

If the institution of family is under sustained attack, the real object of this assault is the institution of marriage. Homosexual activists know that this is in many ways the jewel in the crown. Redefine marriage and you can easily redefine and destroy family. Thus the campaign to radically redefine the institution of marriage.

Of course the Orwellian attempt to equate same-sex relationships with traditional marriage is doomed from the outset. Homosexual marriage is simply an oxymoron. However, with de facto relationships now on a near par with

marriage relationships, the gay lobby feels it can make a strong case for equating same-sex relationships with heterosexual marriage. Indeed, we have managed to strip away the inherent uniqueness of marriage by redefining it and broadening it.

As social commentator Maggie Gallagher puts it, “Over the past thirty years, quietly, and largely unremarked outside a narrow group of specialists, American family law has been rewritten to dilute both the rights and the obligations of marriage, while at the same time placing other relationships, from adulterous liaisons to homosexual partnerships, on a legal par with marriage in some respects. To put it another way, by expanding the definition of *marriage* to the point of meaninglessness, courts are gradually redefining marriage out of existence.”<sup>249</sup>

The identification of gay relationships with heterosexual marriage is a chief example of this. However, it needs to be pointed out that there has been a long debate amongst homosexuals over the question of gay marriage. Some are in favour, some are opposed, and there are many options in between. As one example, David McCarthy of the Victorian Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby puts it this way: “Obviously while there is a lack of unanimity about gay marriage, our human rights must be the same as everyone else’s. If someone wants to get married or doesn’t want to get married, it’s their choice.”<sup>250</sup>

Indeed, one Australian homosexual lobby group has actually split over this issue. Two committee members have resigned from the New South Wales Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby, claiming it has not pushed hard enough for marriage rights. But the Lobby said that marriage reform was “not a priority”.<sup>251</sup>

Consider just two of many quotes on this issue. An Australian lesbian said this about the Prime Minister’s attempts to keep marriage as the union of a man and a woman for life: “When it comes to same-sex marriages, John Howard has got us pretty well summed up. We’re not cut out for it. . . . [Heterosexuals are] welcome to it. ‘For life’! It’d be like sitting through one of those interminable bloody Indian films but when you get to the end it starts all over again and you can’t leave. Let’s leave marriage and other drudgery to heterosexuals. They’ve had millenniums of practice. They’re good at child-rearing and taking out the rubbish. I never wanted to be like them, even when I *was* one of them. . . . Surely we can come up with something better: semi-marriage or quarter-marriage, which would narrow the field down to eight. Or a casual, part-time or temporary marriage. Or even a flexitime marriage.”<sup>252</sup>

And the same lesbian, when asked whether open relationships work, was quite candid in her response: “I don’t know, but I know closed ones don’t. How many good, loving lesbian relationships have floundered on the rock of sexual tedium? That’s what worries me about our demands for holy matrimony because we want to be ‘just like them’. If we go on demanding exclusive access to those we love, our relationships will end in anger and sadness – just like theirs.”<sup>253</sup>

But even those in favour of gay marriage do not necessarily think in terms of marriage as is commonly accepted. One homosexual writer for example, Andrew Sullivan, writes that if homosexual marriage contracts come into force, they would have to be “different”: that is, they would have to allow for “extra-marital outlets” and other major changes.<sup>254</sup> Of course that undermines the very essence of marriage, which is the covenant of life-long sexual faithfulness.

Indeed, I noted in the section on gay practices that monogamy is quite rare in homosexual relationships. Many homosexual commentators have made it clear that if and when they do achieve the right to “marry” they will demand to radically redefine what that term means. Several examples can be mentioned here.

Lesbian activist Paula Ettelbrick put it this way: “Being queer is more than setting up house, sleeping with a person of the same gender, and seeking state approval for doing so. . . . Being queer means pushing the parameters of sex, sexuality, and family, and in the process, transforming the very fabric of society. . . . As a lesbian, I am fundamentally different from non-lesbian women. . . . In arguing for the right to legal marriage, lesbians and gay men would be forced to claim that we are just like heterosexual couples, have the same goals and purposes, and vow to structure our lives similarly. . . . We must keep our eyes on the goals of providing true alternatives to marriage and of radically reordering society’s views of reality.”<sup>255</sup>

American homosexual activist Michelangelo Signorile makes similar remarks, urging activists to “fight for same-sex marriage and its benefits and then, once granted, redefine the institution of marriage completely, to demand

the right to marry not as a way of adhering to society's moral codes but rather to debunk a myth and radically alter an archaic institution that as it now stands keeps us down. The most subversive action lesbians and gay men can undertake – and one that would perhaps benefit society – is to transform the notion of 'family' entirely.<sup>256</sup>

And the percentage of homosexuals who actually want marriage rights is very small indeed. In Australia, studies have found that only about one-fifth of homosexuals and lesbians have showed an interest in same-sex marriage.<sup>257</sup> A major article on the subject in the homosexual press found that there are deep divisions over the issue, and same-marriage was far from a high priority for most.<sup>258</sup>

But with at least three nations now going the way of homosexual marriage (The Netherlands, Belgium, and Canada), and one US state (Massachusetts), the issue has taken on new significance. Indeed, with the Ontario Supreme Court declaring that it is a violation of homosexuals' rights to restrict marriage to heterosexuals, a new emphasis has been made by some in the homosexual community to push for homosexual marriage in Australia.

For example, Victorian Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby Co-convenor David McCarthy said that gay marriage should be tested here, now that the Ontario ruling has been made. He argues that if an Australia gay couple went to Ontario and got married, or a Canadian married couple moved here, the Australian legal system would be forced to decide on whether that marriage was valid here. (Ontario has no residence requirement for marriages celebrated in the province, unlike Holland and Belgium).<sup>259</sup>

And this has now happened. A Melbourne couple went to Toronto, were "married," and have now demanded recognition by Australian lawmakers. While the outcome is pending, it is now only a matter of time before the issue is brought to a head.<sup>260</sup>

Bear in mind that the Australian Greens and Democrats have already moved to allow amendments to the Marriage Act 1961 going in their direction. Moreover, in June of 2002 a news item reported that the Marriage Act could easily be reinterpreted by the courts. A top jurist gave confidential legal advice to the then Attorney-General Daryl Williams saying that the Act was so wide open that courts could easily interpret gay and lesbian unions as legally valid marriages.<sup>261</sup>

Thus it is quite possible that the Australian Parliament could be by-passed altogether with a Court decision instead clearing the way for gay marriage. Indeed, the courts are already softening things up in this regard. On October 11, 2001, the Family Court of Australia decided that a transsexual could marry.<sup>262</sup> That is, a woman who underwent a sex change operation, was declared to be legally able to marry another woman, according to the Honourable Justice Chisholm. And in February 2003 the full court of the Family Court again decided that the 1999 marriage was valid.<sup>263</sup> In doing so the justices effectively undermined the words of the Marriage Act which state that marriage is the "voluntary union of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others".<sup>264</sup>

Fortunately in August of 2004, Federal Parliament voted to amend the Marriage Act 1961 to ensure that marriage can only be between one man and one woman. However, the battle continues, and homosexual activists have clearly not given up the fight.

If homosexual marriage were to be legalised here, it would be one of the final nails in the coffin of heterosexual marriage and family. The truth is, all cultures have recognised marriage, but only of the heterosexual variety. And marriage has always been associated with procreation.<sup>265</sup> To strip marriage of its traditional moorings is to effectively destroy it.

Indeed, one must bear in mind the normative and educative function of the law. Whenever something is legalised, it sends out a social signal, saying that this must be an acceptable and even preferable activity. In legalising same-sex marriage, we will be making a major social statement, and taking a major step forward in social engineering. Even Judge Richard Posner, who in general favors the direction of the sexual revolution, is concerned about homosexual marriage. He writes, "To permit persons of the same sex to marry is to declare, or more precisely, to be understood by many people to be declaring, that homosexual marriage is a desirable, even a noble, condition in which to live."<sup>266</sup>

And anthropologists who have studied the historical record have observed previous experiments in redefining sexual norms. They do not always like what they see. For example, a Boston University anthropologist remarks that anthropology "guards a treasure house of examples of what happens when a society institutionalizes *other*

arrangements.” He argues that if a society normalises male homosexuality through gay marriage, the general results “are predictable on the basis of the ethnography: heterosexual marriage will be weakened; the birth rate will decline; that status of women as mothers will further erode; and young boys will be a much greater target of erotic attention by older males.”<sup>267</sup>

As one Canadian University professor put it, legal attempts to redefine marriage will eradicate a tried and tested good in favor of a risky social experiment. But the new hybrid will not be marriage at all: “Marriage is not merely a union of two person. It is a gendered union with specific social goods attached. The state – which did not invent marriage and has no authority to re-invent it – rightly takes an interest in marriage on account of these goods: stability of community and property, of human reproduction and the care of children, of cross-gender and cross-generational bonding, etc.”

To include same-sex couples in the institution of marriage is simply to substitute “for a gendered phrase (‘one man and one woman’) its genderless one.”<sup>268</sup>

As William Bennett has written, “Marriage is not an arbitrary construct; it is an ‘honorable estate’ based on the different, complementary nature of men and women – and how they refine, support, encourage and complete one another. To insist that we maintain this traditional understanding of marriage is not an attempt to put others down. It is simply an acknowledgement and celebration of our most precious and important social act. Nor is this view arbitrary or idiosyncratic. It mirrors the accumulated wisdom of millennia and the teaching of every major religion.”<sup>269</sup>

Moreover, the same arguments used for legalising gay marriage could be used to argue for legalising incest, polygamy, and any number of other sexual combinations. If a man wanted to have a long-term sexual relationship with his daughter, or if three women wanted to do the same, how could any society argue against it, if it has already overturned the traditional understanding of marriage?

If marriage is no longer one man, one woman for life, then any number of alternatives seem to be possible. If homosexuals can argue that a loving committed relationship should qualify anyone for the institution of marriage, then other equally binding and loving unions should be recognised. What about a bisexual who really does love both a man and a woman? Cannot this threesome qualify?

Indeed, polyamory (group marriage) has become a new cause, championed by both grassroots groups and academic supporters. A quick search of the Web will reveal just how popular the idea of polyamory is becoming. Family law reformers for example are increasingly promoting this new sexual cause.

The truth is, all boundaries are smashed when we redefine marriage. There are even groups arguing for the right to marry one’s pet! Called petosexuality, this new sexuality insists that a person’s love for his or her pet, including sexual relations, should be made official. Thus one Dutch web site encourages people to marry their pets.<sup>270</sup>

Such proposals are not just being made by the lunatic fringe. Consider a recent article in the *Futurist*, produced by the World Futurist Society based in America. A cultural historian wrote an article entitled “The Transformation of Marriage”. Stephen Bertman, professor emeritus of languages, literatures, and cultures at Canada’s University of Windsor, argued that marriage may be “a semantic artefact of a lost world”.<sup>271</sup> He argued that it is not just the transience of marriage that is at issue now. “It is the very definition of the term that futurists must now address. A radical redefinition of marriage is now under way that promises to transform its meaning for all future time.”<sup>272</sup>

He gave as his first example same-sex marriage. He did not stop there however. He then went on to speak of other types of marriage. Seemingly with a straight face, he first raised the prospect of “interspecies marriage”. This is the “potential for the sexual union of human beings and aliens”.<sup>273</sup> From there he mentioned the option of marriages to pets. Why couldn’t an “individual choose to affirm the emotional attachment he or she feels for a pet with the formality of a documented ceremony in which the human partner promises to love and honor the animal companion?”<sup>274</sup>

And finally, presumably still with the utmost seriousness, he speaks of the “theoretical possibility” of “the marriage of human beings to inanimate objects”. He speaks of how many men love their cars, or how many people have formed an intimate relationship with their computer. “Why should not this bond of tactile intimacy be validated by more than an owner’s manual?” he asks, seemingly in complete sincerity.<sup>275</sup>

As Bennett writes elsewhere, “once marriage has been detached from the natural, complementary teleology of the sexes, it becomes nothing more than what each of us makes of it.”<sup>276</sup>

Or as another commentator says, “What we are doing by creating this institution to be called ‘gay marriage’ is smashing marriage and replacing it with a whole new set of arrangements that apply to everybody, not just homosexuals, everybody, in which marriage is a unique contract between any two or more adults who want to enter into it and set by any rules. It makes marriage impermanent, and it turns children into commodities.”<sup>277</sup>

And that last point is of utmost importance. It is a crucial question that is usually omitted in this whole debate: What about the children? If we allow homosexual marriage and adoption rights, what will be the effect on children?

I will deal with the issue of children in a moment, but let first me mention a few words about the complaint often made by gays that they are discriminated against under current marriage laws. As an example, Australian comedian and television personality Julie McCrossin gave an address to the Sydney Institute in July of 1999. Entitled, “Always a Bridesmaid, Never a Bride: Recognising Same Sex Relationships,” she spoke of how she and her lesbian partner were denied marriage rights in Australia.

She complained that she was being discriminated against, and made this impassioned statement: “Until we’re able to get married, gay and lesbian couples don’t have equality before the law.”<sup>278</sup> Such an argument is common of course amongst gay rights activists.

However, these arguments are as fallacious as they are common. The truth is, no one has the kind of “equality before law” that the homosexual activists are clamoring for. In this case, for example, homosexuals are no more (and no less) being discriminated against than are all kinds of other people.

Yes it is true, a homosexual cannot now legally marry. But neither can a whole lot of other folk. A five-year old boy cannot marry. Three people cannot get married to each other. And even if an attractive young woman were to fall in love with me and want to marry me (a highly unlikely scenario I might add), she cannot, because I am already married.

Moreover, a girl cannot marry her pet goldfish, no matter how much she might love it. A father cannot marry his daughter, regardless of his affection for her. A football team cannot enact group marriage, no matter how close, committed and bonded they are. The list is endless.

However, under the law, almost all of us can marry, given certain conditions. If I should decide to reciprocate the affections of this young woman, I could divorce my current wife and marry her (also an unlikely scenario I must emphasise). The five-year-old could wait for around a dozen years, and then he will be free to marry. The threesome can decide to give one the boot, and then get married (provided they are an opposite sex pair).

And a homosexual too can marry. There is no law saying a homosexual cannot marry, if he decides to find a woman and settle down (or if a lesbian finds a man and seeks marriage). But it is nonsense for a person to eschew male-female relationships in favor of same-sex ones, and then complain of discrimination.

In the same way, it is disingenuous to complain about rights being taken away, when they never existed in the first place. Homosexual activist Rodney Croome for example displayed a case of sour grapes after the passage of the Marriage Amendment Act on August 19, 2004, which reaffirms in law what has always been the case: that marriage is only to be between a man and a woman, and no other combination. He wrote an op-ed piece a few days later, which opened with these words: “For the first time since federation, an Australian Parliament has voted to deprive gay and lesbian people of their rights.”<sup>279</sup> Sorry Rodney, but there never was such a right in the first place, so the government did no such thing. You cannot take something away if it was not there to begin with. But playing fast and loose with rights talk is a common characteristic of the homosexual activists in their attempt to cloud the issue and mislead public opinion.

Indeed, another way they seek to deceive the public is to use faulty analogies. For example, many advocates of same-sex marriage use the faulty analogy of racial segregation and policies which prevented people of different

racism from marrying. They claim that just as we now have renounced such discriminatory laws regarding marriage between the races, so too we should stop the restriction on same-sex marriage.

For example, when Prime Minister John Howard said he wanted to block legal recognition of same-sex marriages, high-profile lesbian couple Kerryn Phelps and Jackie Stricker said this was a “form of apartheid”.<sup>280</sup> But this is simply fallacious. There is no comparison between apartheid and defending heterosexual marriage. Even black activists like Jesse Jackson have rejected such a disingenuous analogy.

Apartheid is about keeping races apart. Marriage is about bringing the sexes together. Heterosexual marriage has been around for millennia. Talk of same-sex marriage has been around for a few short decades. Marriage was thus not created to discriminate against anyone, as apartheid was.

Finally, when marriage is declared to be about the best interests of children, homosexuals will still object. They argue that if you deny marriage for homosexuals because they cannot reproduce, what about all the heterosexual couples who do not have children? Marriage isn't just about having children, is it, they ask.

This sounds like a good argument, but it isn't really. Marriage is certainly open to the possibility of children, even though for various reasons not all marriages will result in children. One commentator offers this insight on the relationship of marriage to reproduction: just turn the question around. That is, instead of asking “whether actual reproduction is essential to marriage, ask this: If marriage *never* had *anything* to do with reproduction, would there be any reason for the government to be involved in regulating or rewarding it?”<sup>281</sup> Governments do not determine who your best friend should be. But when the possibility of children arise, then governments and societies are greatly concerned.

Before dealing with the issue of children, one final matter should be addressed. Just why is it that some homosexuals are so insistent on marriage rights? Why the very strong push by at least some in the homosexual community to be able to marry?

As many homosexuals themselves admit, a major reason why they want marriage is not so much to be like heterosexuals, or because they want to abandon their more free and promiscuous lifestyle, but because of its symbolic value. It will give them public recognition, approval and acceptance. This has long been the overriding goal of the homosexual lobby: complete social and public endorsement and approval. Thus by getting marriage rights, and, in turn, the last hurdle for gays, full adoption rights, homosexuals will have achieved their longstanding goal: legitimizing the gay lifestyle.

A leading American homosexual who has championed the cause of gay marriage, Jonathan Rauch, admits that this will be an important effect of same sex marriage: “it will ennoble and dignify gay love and sex as it has done straight love and sex”.<sup>282</sup> Exactly, but as I have shown above, such a dangerous threat to public health and safety should not be ennobled or dignified, certainly not by governments who have the duty and responsibility to promote the health and wellbeing of all its citizens.

Australian homosexual activists have also acknowledged that their attempt to join heterosexuals in marriage is about legitimacy and acceptance. Consider the words of Rodney Croome: “this isn't about sex, it's about symbolism. Despite, or perhaps because of, an increase in de facto relationships and divorce, many Australians value marriage highly. For better or worse, it bestows on a relationship society's ultimate seal of approval. This is why social conservatives deeply loathe marriage equality and why, as the inheritors of centuries of stigma, many same-sex couples yearn for it.”<sup>283</sup> That is what Mr Croome and so many others want, social approval. That is why there is such a concentrated effort to redefine marriage by the homosexual lobby.

## X. HOMOSEXUAL ADOPTION RIGHTS

A major part of the gay agenda has been that of gay adoption rights. And slowly they are getting what they want. On February 10, 2004 the ACT Government's controversial parenting Bill was passed which allows gay and lesbian couples to adopt children.<sup>284</sup> Other States are expected to follow suit. But is the right direction to be taking?

Now the desire for people, especially women, to have children is of course normal, but one has to ask if homosexual or lesbian parenting is desirable. Homosexuals may claim that there is no reason why they should not

raise children, that sexual preference has nothing to do with the issue of good parenting. But does the evidence bear this out? Initial research is beginning to show that children do suffer from being raised by same sex parents. Before turning to this evidence, let me say that obviously many traditional families have poor parenting skills. But exceptions do not make the rule. The point is, in most cases, a child will do better with a mother and father, and in most cases, a child will suffer as a result of being raised by same-sex parents.

One person who has spent a lot of time looking into this question is psychologist Dr Joe Nicolosi. He argues that kids raised by homosexuals are traumatised, emotionally and socially.

Children, he argues, are profoundly affected by parental behaviour. For example, children of smokers often become smokers. "Homosexuality," says Nicolosi, "is primarily an identity problem, not a sexual problem, and it begins in childhood. The process begins when a child realizes that the world is divided between male and female and that he is not equipped to be identified as male. His father fails to sufficiently encourage male-gender identity. Because he is not fully male-gender-identified, he is not psychologically prepared to feel heterosexual attractions. In order to be attracted to women, a male must feel sufficiently masculine. Faced with this predicament, he goes into a world of fantasy and denies the imperative of being either male or female."<sup>285</sup>

The lack of a strong father figure seems to be a major factor in those who become homosexuals. Another researcher, Dr Paul Cameron, says the admittedly scant data on the subject confirms Nicolosi's findings. These studies show that between 8% and 33% of adult respondents raised by homosexuals said they considered themselves homosexual or bisexual, far above the national (US) norm of 2% of the adult population.<sup>286</sup>

The absence of role models presents other problems. How will a man raised by two men know how to relate to a woman? Or how will a man raised by two women know how to relate to men? Thus the Beatles were wrong: love is *not* all you need, at least when it comes to parenting. As two family experts point out: "The two most loving mothers in the world can't be a father to a little boy. Love can't equip mothers to teach a little boy how to be a man. Likewise, the two most loving men can't be a mother to a child."<sup>287</sup>

They continue, "Love does little to help a man teach a little girl how to be a woman. Can you imagine two men guiding a young girl through her first menstrual cycle or helping her through the awkwardness of picking out her first bra? Such a situation might make for a funny television sitcom but not a very good real-life situation for a young girl."<sup>288</sup>

One woman who was raised by lesbians now runs a support and recovery program for those coming out of the homosexual lifestyle and their families. She put it this way: "I realise that homosexuals feel they can give a child love and support that even many straight families can't provide, but I've been there. I know the finger-pointing and the shame one carries. For years, you struggle with the thought that you might be a homosexual. People say 'like mother, like daughter.' Most of us become promiscuous to prove we're straight."<sup>289</sup>

Another woman says this of her upbringing by two homosexuals: "From 40 years of experience, I can tell you that, even though my father loved me, his homosexual orientation handicapped my ability to learn to relate to life in a healthy way. My homosexual home stunted my growth as a person and as a woman, not to mention the damaging effect of 16 years of drugs and alcohol abuse on my early childhood development. I spent the first 20 years of my life in a family that nearly destroyed me and the last 20 years analyzing and being analyzed in order to make sense of it. The bottom line is: I was dearly loved by my father. His love alone was not enough to give me the foundation that I needed to grow into a secure young woman.... My father and I have looked back through the past and discussed the issue of homosexual parenting. With great remorse, he agrees the homosexual lifestyle, no matter how conservative, is not healthy for children. My father and I agree: homosexuality and raising healthy children exclude each other."<sup>290</sup>

Or consider the tragic case of a twelve-year-old Melbourne boy who has run away from home five times. The reason? He refuses to live with his mother and her lesbian partner. The boy's father has repeatedly been denied access to the child, and the boy has threatened to kill himself as a result.<sup>291</sup>

And finally, someone who can speak from experience in this area. A lesbian mother has publicly expressed her regret at bearing three children through artificial insemination. The New Zealand woman, who says she is "now in the process of becoming a heterosexual," had a stormy relationship with her lesbian lover, which eventually broke down. Her comments are worth noting: "I realise now that I deprived my kids of their right to a father, and I see

the hurt in their faces every day. . . . I believe children should have the best opportunities in life. The best way they can have a balanced view of what is normal is with heterosexual parents.<sup>292</sup>

Children need to see how men and women interact together. A homosexual or lesbian union cannot provide that role model. Children deserve better. But the interests of the child is the last thing being considered in this debate. Indeed, today everyone is demanding rights to do this and that, but very few seem to realise that rights must be balanced by responsibilities. The right to have a child must be balanced by the rights of the child. Children should be given the first priority, and not be allowed to be used as a political football by the homosexual lobby in their efforts to seek legitimacy for their lifestyle. If the data is still not all in yet, then for the sake of children, we should not rush headlong into gay adoption and marriage.

However, some will argue that the data is coming in. In the last few years studies have appeared which claim that children raised in same-sex households suffer no ill-effects, and may even do better than children raised in heterosexual families. How are we to assess such studies?

Several points can be made. First, there are many studies that have arrived at the opposite conclusion. For example, a study of Australian primary school children from three family types (married heterosexual couples, cohabiting heterosexual couples and homosexual couples) found that in every area of educational endeavour (language; mathematics; social studies; sport; class work, sociability and popularity; and attitudes to learning), children from married heterosexual couples performed the best, while children from homosexual couples performed the worst. The study concludes with these words: “[M]arried couples seem to offer the best environment for a child’s social and educational development”.<sup>293</sup>

And a major American study arrived at these conclusions: “children of homosexuals will 1) be more frequently subjected to parental instability (of residence and sexual partners) and 2) have poorer peer and adult relationships. Also, as is held to be true of their parents, homosexuals’ children will be more apt to 3) become homosexual, 4) be unstable (have emotional problems and difficulty forming lasting bonds) with reduced interest in natality, and 5) be sexually precocious and promiscuous”.<sup>294</sup>

Second, most of these studies purporting to show that children raised in same-sex households do as well as other children have been roundly criticised for methodological shortcomings. One meta-analysis of 49 such studies found a number of methodological flaws. These include, the lack of any proper hypothesis statement, the problem of affirming the null hypothesis, the lack of proper comparison groups, the problem of measurement error and probability, neglect of extraneous variables, and so on.<sup>295</sup> On a less technical level, these studies suffer from small sample sizes, lack of a proper control group, inadequacy of self-reporting, and lack of proper timeframe (longitudinal analysis).

Consider self-reporting. Most of these studies simply ask the children how they enjoy their same-sex parents. Not surprisingly, they don’t find any problems. But what child is going to bag his or her own parents? Indeed, if that is all they have known, it is even more difficult to criticise it. Thus scientific objective is sorely lacking in these types of studies. And since gay parenting is relatively recent, most children in same-sex households are relatively young. So asking 10-year-olds about their social, mental and psychological well-being may not result in very reliable data.

But many of the children in same-sex households originally came from heterosexual families, making measurement more difficult. How much of their well-being or lack of it is attributable to heterosexual upbringing, and how much is attributable to homosexual upbringing?

A further problem with many of these studies is the political agenda being promoted. That is, most of these studies are conducted by those who are homosexual or support the homosexual agenda. To confirm this point, one study examined all the major studies on same-sex marriage and gay parenting published in law review publications in the 1990s. “Only one of the seventy-two pieces published in the nineties unequivocally supports the rule of exclusive heterosexual marriage, while sixty-seven pieces advocate or support same-sex marriage. . . . Likewise, virtually all of the law review literature addressing homosexual parenting advocates the politically progressive position favoring legalization or expansion of legal status, benefits, and privileges for homosexual parenting.”<sup>296</sup>

Interestingly, two American sociologists who are openly supportive of the homosexual agenda have recently admitted that bias is a real factor in these studies. They declare that “heterosexism” has “hampered the intellectual



progress in the field” and show that in these studies the researchers “frequently downplay findings indicating difference regarding children’s gender and sexual preferences and behavior that could stimulate important theoretical questions”. After examining the findings of 21 psychological studies published between 1981 and 1998, they “identified conceptual, methodological, and theoretical limitations in the psychological research on the effects of parental sexual orientation and ... challenged the predominant claim that the sexual orientation of parents does not matter at all”. Indeed, they “recognise the political dangers” of pointing out the truth that “children with lesbian parents are themselves apt to engage in homosexual activity”.<sup>297</sup>

Thus, the so-called evidence that gay parenting is just as beneficial as heterosexual parenting has been examined and found wanting. The remarks of one group of researchers who reviewed 14 of these gay parenting studies is worth noting. Their “most impressive finding” was that “all of the studies lacked external validity. The conclusion that there are no significant differences in children raised by lesbian mothers versus heterosexual mothers is not supported by the published data base”.<sup>298</sup>

Finally, one must recall why adoption laws have been established in the first place. Because young children are so vulnerable, the aim of adoption has been to provide the child in question with a secure, permanent, legal family. The paramount concern in adoption has been the best interests of the child. Thus only the best families have been allowed to adopt, not just “good enough” families. The issue of homosexual fostering is really all about homosexual rights, not the interests and needs of children.

Can a homosexual couple love and nurture a child? Undoubtedly many can. But that is not the issue. As the former vice president of the National Council for Adoption in the US has put it, “providing a nurturing environment is not enough. A homosexual parent cannot provide the parental experience of a parent of the opposite sex, and this is as critical to the child as anything else. When discussing a child’s needs, it is not just a discussion of what a particular parent can provide – it is just as important to consider what a parent cannot provide and, in this case, it is half of a child’s needed parenting experience.”<sup>299</sup>

The simple truth is, there exists a mountain of social science research which demonstrates that children do best when raised in a biological, two-parent household, cemented by marriage. The evidence is so overwhelming that the reader is advised to look at recent summaries of the data.<sup>300</sup> However, several recent academic studies can be mentioned here, which demonstrate the importance of children growing up with their married biological mother and father.

One American study of 19,000 young people conducted by the Bowling Green State University (Ohio) found that teens fare best when living with two married biological parents: “Adolescents in married, two-biological-parent families generally fare better than children in any of the family types examined here, including single-mother, cohabiting stepfather, and married stepfather families. The advantage of marriage appears to exist primarily when the child is the biological offspring of both parents. Our findings are consistent with previous work, which demonstrates children in cohabiting stepparent families fare worse than children living with two married, biological parents.”<sup>301</sup>

Another large-scale American study found that there are “overall disadvantages” in not living with both biological parents.<sup>302</sup> The author concludes, “My analyses have clearly demonstrated some overall disadvantages of living with neither parent. Among adolescents from all six family types, those in non-biological-parent appear to rank the lowest in academic performance, educational aspiration, and locus of control. Further, they appear to fare less well in the remaining outcome areas (self-esteem, behavior problems, and cigarette smoking).”<sup>303</sup>

The evidence then is quite plain. Children deserve a biological mother and father, preferably cemented by marriage. The emotional appeals of homosexuals and their own selfish adult demands must be balanced by the interests of the child, and the right of every child to be raised by a mother and a father.

Yet critics might argue that in many other situations children are already being raised without a mother or a father. True, by there is a big difference in dealing with an existing crisis and the creation of a new crisis. That is, when one parent dies or is deserted by his or her spouse, society does all it can to help the children get through such difficult periods. But it is another matter altogether to deliberately create those sorts of situations.

As two family experts and child psychologists put it: “While a compassionate and caring society *always* comes to the aid of motherless and fatherless families, a wise and loving society *never* intentionally creates fatherless or

motherless families. But that is exactly what every same-sex family does and for no other reason than adults desire such families. No child-development theory says children *need* parents of the same gender – as loving as they might be – but rather that children *need* their mother and father.”<sup>304</sup>

But too often the well-being of children is not at the forefront of homosexual concerns. For many homosexuals, the demand for adoption rights, like the demand for marriage rights, is really about seeking legitimacy and acceptance. That is, these are symbolic demands as much as anything. They are part of the attempt to seek the complete public acceptance and normalization of their lifestyle, something which many societies are rightly hesitant about. “For the homosexual rights movement the right to adopt is a symbol – a goal which must be achieved in order to achieve broader victory. . . . Clearly, adoption as a political statement does not take into account a child’s needs at all. And an individual parent, whether heterosexual or homosexual, who is seeking to adopt principally to meet narcissistic needs is also not concerned about the best interest of the child,”<sup>305</sup>

And the desire for children may even spring from more sinister motives. Consider this revealing quote from someone who should know. Tammy Bruce is the former president of the LA chapter of the National Organisation of Woman,. She is also a pro-abortion feminist and a lesbian. But she is greatly alarmed by homosexual activism. This is what she says about the issue of children and the homosexual agenda: “Today’s gay activists have carried the campaign a step further, invading children’s lives by wrapping themselves in the banner of tolerance. It is literally the equivalent of the wolf coming to your door dressed as your grandmother.”<sup>306</sup>

She continues, “The radicals in control of the gay establishment want children in their world of moral decay, lack of self-restraint, and moral relativism. Why? How better to truly belong to the majority (when you’re really on the fringe) than by taking possession of the next generation? By targeting children, you can start indoctrinating the next generation with the false construct that gay people deserve special treatment and special laws. How else can the gay establishment actually get society to believe, borrowing from George Orwell, that gay people are indeed more equal than others? Of course, the only way to get that idea accepted is to condition people into accepting nihilism that forbids morality and judgment.”<sup>307</sup>

Finally, it needs to be stressed that homosexuals themselves are quite divided on the issue of same-sex parenting. While it appears that lesbians want to have children more than homosexual men, it seems that in general most homosexuals do not even want to have children. As two homosexual “parents” admitted, “We have to be careful sometimes that we don’t give the appearance of crusaders trying to convert gay men into breeders. And we do totally understand that probably most gay men don’t aspire to parenthood.”<sup>308</sup>

And a recent major article in the homosexual press admitted that there were deep divisions in the homosexual community over both marriage and parenting issues. As one long-time homosexual activist admitted: “There is little point in chasing access to IVF, ART and getting parenting reforms if the vast majority of us are never going to have children. These issues are important but they are not the whole game.”<sup>309</sup>

But the media is quite happy to pick up the cause of a very small percentage of homosexuals, who make up a very small percentage of all adults, who do want children, and turn it into a major campaign.

## MORE ON HOMOSEXUAL PARENTING

Because this issue has been getting considerable media treatment as of late, it is worth devoting more attention to the topic. Indeed, the media has made much of several new studies that purport to show no adverse effects to children raised in same-sex households. One of the newest and most extensive critiques of such studies is that by British sociologist Patricia Morgan. In her 160-page book she does a thorough job of documenting the evidence for the two-parent family, and revealing how studies purporting to show the benefits of being raised in a same-sex family are deeply flawed.<sup>310</sup>

She begins her analysis by noting a common tactic used by those who support same-sex parenting: the observation that there are so many dysfunctional heterosexual families. But, “no amount of decrying or demonstrating the disadvantages of one situation is, in itself, proof of the advantages of another. Deficiencies or condemnations of heterosexual parenting are not, in themselves, valid evidence for the superiority of homosexual parenting.”<sup>311</sup> Moreover, as she points out, most children who go into government care because of abuse or other problems, come from homes other than where a mum and dad are present, committed by marriage.<sup>312</sup>

And as politically incorrect as it may be, “the evidence is that around a third of all molestations of children are homosexual molestations, and the same applies to the proportion of paedophiles who are homosexual.”<sup>313</sup>

The bulk of her book is a review of 144 academic papers on gay parenting. She demonstrates that the overwhelming majority of these studies are quite worthless. They are so poorly done that the “results” prove nothing. The methodological shortcomings include: failure to design the study properly; failure to properly measure the relevant variables; failure to control for extraneous variables; and failure to use proper statistical tests. These and other shortcomings mean that most of the studies and reports are invalid.

Many of the studies, for example, are little more than anecdotal. People offer gushing praise for their lifestyle choice, and report that everything is just fine in the family. Says Morgan, “While anecdotes may illustrate conclusions drawn from well-conducted research, in themselves they prove nothing.”<sup>314</sup> Using self-congratulatory testimonials is hardly objective science: “It is astonishing how collections of anecdotes are reverentially accepted by public bodies, academics and research institutes, who would immediately laugh away the use of similar material as ‘evidence’ elsewhere.”<sup>315</sup>

Plenty of other problems are found in the so-called studies. Small sample groups are a frequent drawback. Often just several dozen are featured in a study, making any reliable and informative statistical conclusions almost impossible to achieve.

Another problem is where the samples come from. The truth is, in most cases the study is advertised in a homosexual newspaper, and people with a vested interest (those who want to promote the homosexual agenda) are thereby recruited. Self-selected volunteers with vested interests are hardly scientific sample groups. Proper studies of child development based on randomly selected, representative sample groups seem not to exist.

And that leads to a further problem. Self-reporting is not a basis for an objective, neutral study. What homosexual is going to say he or she is a lousy parent, and what young child raised in a same-sex household is going to badmouth his or her parents? Self-reporting leads to no useful objective evidence.

The volunteers involved in such ‘research’ “know the purpose of the research and have an interest in the outcome. So have the researchers, who are overwhelmingly sympathetic to the homosexual movement”.<sup>316</sup>

Another point that can be raised is what the studies actually say. Often the media gives them a spin that is not so accurate. Some of the better studies, for example, are much more qualified and nuanced than the popular press would have us believe. That is, some of the studies really offer a mixed message, and call for further research in the area. And some of the studies actually make admissions that the pro-homosexual side does not want too widely publicised. For example, “many studies actually indicate significant differences between homosexual and heterosexual parenting outcomes for children, particularly the likelihood that children of homosexuals may become involved in homosexual behaviour themselves.”<sup>317</sup>

Also, we know that family behaviour tends to be intergenerational. Thus children of divorce or single motherhood are proportionally far more likely to repeat cycles of divorce and non-marriage than those born to married couples who stay in intact families. Says Morgan, all this “seems even more likely to be the case with homosexual parents and their children”.<sup>318</sup>

Moreover, surveys of post-adolescent offspring of same-sex parents show large proportions with a homosexual lifestyle. The figures range from 8 to 24 per cent, which is four or five times higher than the general population (of British males). Morgan offers the interesting insight that if “it were true that there was any genetic or biological basis or predisposition for homosexuality, a greater frequency among the children of homosexuals would be expected”.<sup>319</sup>

Speaking of the so-called genetic basis of homosexuality, Morgan points out some other arguments against the thesis. Studies on identical twins show that often one is and one is not homosexual, which belies any genetic basis, since identical (monozygotic) twins have the same genes. Also, we know that homosexuality is not distributed in the population either randomly or uniformly like left-handedness or intelligence.<sup>320</sup>

Furthermore, research on outcomes for sexually abused young males, found that early homosexual contact with an adult was highly related to homosexual outcomes.<sup>321</sup> All of which suggests that social and cultural factors are as, or more, important than biological factors.

If it is true that children of same-sex couples are more likely to become homosexuals themselves, some might reply, So what? The answer is, the welfare of children, not the preferences of adults, should be our major concern. And we know that the homosexual lifestyle is a dangerous, high-risk lifestyle. Homosexuals “suffer disproportionately from a range of morbid conditions compared to heterosexuals, particularly sexually transmitted diseases, like gonorrhoea, syphilis, hepatitis A and B, anorectal warts and AIDS,” with 70 per cent of the cases of HIV in Britain due to homosexual intercourse.<sup>322</sup> (The figure is around 85 per cent in Australia.) And the average lifespan of a homosexual is much shorter than that of a heterosexual.

Also we know that homosexual relationships (especially among men) are less stable and more transient than heterosexual relationships. Homosexuals also tend to be much more promiscuous. “The most ‘stable’ of ‘gay partnerships’ are ones where there is an arrangement between the two to have sex with third parties on the side, while maintaining a permanent living arrangement.”<sup>323</sup>

“This all suggests that children living with homosexuals – particularly male homosexuals – are more likely to face high prospects of repeated family disruption, or multiple family transitions and exposure to high stranger levels in the home, compared to those living with heterosexuals.”<sup>324</sup>

In the light of all this, Morgan asks this pointed question. If we tend to not allow children to be adopted into situations where there is obesity, smoking, old age and other factors that may result in shorter life spans, thus leaving vulnerable children at risk of being prematurely orphaned, why do we not also consider homosexuality a similar risk factor?<sup>325</sup>

Concludes Morgan, “from the perspective of the ‘best interests of the child’, if homosexual activity – like intravenous drug use – is life shortening, and morbidity attracting, then children should be placed with parents who, at very least, will not steer them towards this.”<sup>326</sup>

If the evidence presented above is correct, we should not be talking so cavalierly about gay adoption rights. We should not be treating children as trophies. Indeed, we should not be treating children as guinea pigs in a radical social experiment. The rights of children, not the desires of adults, should be our primary concern.

## XI. HOMOSEXUALITY AND CHILDREN

Mention has already been made of the issue of pedophilia. However, the issue of children needs to be examined more closely. It is of course obvious that homosexuals cannot multiply by reproduction.<sup>327</sup> Therefore recruitment is the only way to increase their numbers. An unfortunate aspect of this is the tendency to recruit among young people.

Many homosexuals speak of being introduced to the gay lifestyle by someone older, while they were still in their teens. Consider this representative quote: “Nobody is fooled when we proclaim that the gay movement has nothing to do with kids and their sexuality. . . . Many of us – both women and men – had our first homosexual experience with partners who were older than ourselves.”<sup>328</sup> Indeed, one study found that 75 per cent of homosexual men report their first homosexual experience before the age of sixteen. This compares to 22 per cent of heterosexual men reporting their first heterosexual experience.<sup>329</sup>

A well known saying states that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. Homosexual activists know this all too well. As one lesbian put it, “Whoever captures the kids owns the future.”<sup>330</sup> Thus the constant attempts by homosexual activists to influence children.

There have been many attempts lately to get access to young people. For example, in the United States the New Jersey Supreme Court has ordered the Boy Scouts to admit homosexuals.<sup>331</sup> The Girl Scouts have also caved into Political Correctness. Indeed, according to some Scout staffers, one in three of the Girl Scouts’ paid professional staff is lesbian.<sup>332</sup> And in the United Kingdom, the English Scout Association recently lifted the ban on homosexuals becoming troop leaders.<sup>333</sup>

In Australia a number of homosexual activities have made many conclude that children are indeed being targeted by older homosexuals. Several years ago a large outcry arose over the discovery of gay swap cards. The cards, which featured sexually explicit photos, pictures and cartoons, were part of a safe-sex campaign.<sup>334</sup>

Also, in a recent edition of a Melbourne homosexual newspaper, there was a large article entitled “Comics come out”.<sup>335</sup> The article described how mainstream as well as underground comic book makers are increasingly using gay characters and themes in their comics. Gay superheroes have been featured, along with graphic homosexual scenes and dialogue. Indeed, one comic, *The Authority*, features two main characters who are gay superheroes.<sup>336</sup>

Another article in the homosexual press on the same issue reported that there “probably around a hundred gay characters out there” in comics right now.<sup>337</sup> Given that children are usually the main readers of comics, one has to ask if recruitment is not part of the strategy.

And we also have gay cartoon characters in both TV series and in the movies. Consider *Utena*, *Revolutionary Girl*, an anime character who is a lesbian. Anime, or Japanese animation, is of course hugely popular with children - *Pokemon* being but one example). Advertisements for *Utena* the movie feature in homosexual newspapers.<sup>338</sup>

Along the same lines, what is one to make of the world’s first talking gay dolls? The dolls, which have been sold in the US and Europe, were made available in shops for Christmas 2003 in Australia. Openly gay Elton the Biker (complete with nipple rings), and his plastic counterpart Marshall, evidently have sold well overseas.<sup>339</sup> Given that dolls are usually the kind of thing that children, not adults, play with, one has to ask if this is another recruiting attempt.

In the US pro-homosexual books such as *Heather Has Two Mommies* are found in many schools and libraries.<sup>340</sup> And in Australia, similar books can be found, for example in Sydney school libraries. Another example is *Daddy’s Roommate*.<sup>341</sup> One book entitled *My House* has this as part of its story line: “I’ve got a cat and two dogs. I’ve got two mums.”<sup>342</sup>

In similar fashion, the producers of the much-loved Australian children’s program *Playschool* decided to push the boundaries of political correctness by featuring a segment where a young girl goes to the park with her “two mummies”.<sup>343</sup> Such indoctrination of two and three-year olds is reprehensible. And their lame explanation that they were just trying to reflect life in the real world simply does not stand up. Do they also feature segments on crack cocaine use, prostitution, child pornography and rape? These are all parts of the real world as well, after all.

Interestingly, the same lesbian who appeared on the *Playschool* episode has produced two children’s books. Entitled *The Rainbow Cubby House* and *Koalas on Parade*, the books about homosexual families are funded by the NSW government and available in public schools and libraries.<sup>344</sup> This is another example of promoting the homosexual lifestyle to primary school students at tax-payers’ expense.

Moreover, homosexual porn sights have been featuring pictures of school boys, taken without their knowledge or permission. A number of Melbourne private schools discovered that hundreds of their male students aged 12 to 18 had their photos taken while at sports events. The semi-clad boys appeared in hardcore gay sites.<sup>345</sup> Such exploitation of young people was nowhere denounced or disowned by the homosexual community, as far as I am aware of.

In a similar vein, a homosexual magazine managed to take sexually suggestive photos of male models posing as school boys at an elite Melbourne high school and publish them. They include pictures of boys pulling down the pants of other boys, and pictures of nude boys in locker and shower room scenes. The photographers told the high school that they were doing a photo shoot for a fashion magazine.<sup>346</sup> The homosexual magazine, *DNA*,<sup>347</sup> ran the photos without comment, but told journalists that it was harmless “fun”. However, it was not just conservatives or religious types who were outraged; even other homosexuals failed to see the humour. One rightly asked, “What were *DNA Magazine* doing at Melbourne High School anyway? If they were intending to end up with a photo spread that looks like it was catering to paedophiles, they’ve succeeded.”<sup>348</sup>

Many other attempts to reach young people can be mentioned. Many of our State and Federal anti-discrimination and equal opportunity boards have pro-homosexual activities and programs aimed at young people. For example, the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) is a Commonwealth (tax-payer

funded) body which has a very active homosexual component. One such program is called Outlink. It is described in these terms: “Towards a national rural lesbian, gay and bisexual youth network. The Commission, with funding from the Australian Youth Foundation, has engaged prominent Tasmanian gay activist Rodney Croome to begin the network building process.” One of its publications is *Not Round Here: Affirming Diversity, Challenging Homophobia*. The HREOC web site says this is “a training manual produced under the auspices of Outlink, a project of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission and the Australian Youth Foundation.”<sup>349</sup>

In addition, there is the long standing push to make pro-homosexual classes compulsory in Australian schools. As a recent example, Rodney Croome claims that to stamp out “homophobia” we must have mandatory pro-homosexual kits in classrooms.<sup>350</sup> And in a related matter, former High Court Judge, Justice Michael Kirby, who is homosexual, has been speaking at schools telling young people that homosexuality is normal.<sup>351</sup>

Of course a whole book could be mentioned on how popular culture is doing its best to normalise homosexuality, seeking to make it look cool. Just one of many examples will here suffice. One of Australia longest running and most popular television soap operas as recently added a homosexual character. A 19-year-old actress is playing a lesbian to spice things up on *Neighbors*.<sup>352</sup> The problem is, this is a G-rated program, show every week night at 6:30pm, and has a large audience of children and young people. We do not need the force-feeding of homosexuality on programs not aimed at adults and not aired at adult time slots.

Yet this is not an isolated incident. On any night of the week Australian TV offers a whole host of homosexual characters, programs and themes. Even the homosexual press has run a number of stories lately discussing the proliferation of homosexuality on prime time television. One can only suspect that indoctrination is as much at work here as is entertainment.

And this constant barrage of pro-homosexual imagery, especially in film and on television, is beginning to pay off. A recent study conducted by the University of Minnesota in the US found that those exposed to homosexual programs on television were more likely to accept homosexuality. A homosexual activist commented, “The study reinforces that visibility leads to understanding, and understanding leads to acceptance.”<sup>353</sup>

## PRO-HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVITIES IN SCHOOLS

The issue of homosexuality and children is worth looking at in more detail. A major way in which the homosexual lobby can reach children is of course through school curricula, especially in sex education programs. There are many such programs around the country, taught in many schools, all designed to instil in young children the idea that homosexuality is natural, normal and to be accepted and embraced.

Such programs, and/or proposals for them, have been around for years. These programs have often been justified as part of AIDS education, or more recently, as a means of dealing with bullying. As an example, back in 1987 the Australian Teacher’s Federation called on teachers to educate students on male and female homosexuality as part of basic sex education.<sup>354</sup>

In 1992 an AIDS study commissioned by the University of Queensland recommended that explicit sex education courses be taught in the first three years of primary school. The study said that students should become experts in contraception techniques and STDs before they enter secondary school.<sup>355</sup>

In January of 1995 the Australia Education Union (AEU) called for mandatory AIDS and sex education for all students, beginning in primary school. The course should include “positive information about gays and lesbians,” the AEU said.<sup>356</sup> The AEU argued that not only should these classes be mandatory for even primary school children, but parents who ban their children from attending such courses for religious and cultural reasons should be prosecuted by the law!<sup>357</sup>

At an October 1995 conference on Schooling and Sexualities at Deakin University yet more such proposals were made. Speakers told the delegates that homosexuality should be taught as acceptable to primary and secondary students, and gay relationships should be recognised through school projects.<sup>358</sup>

And pro-homosexual indoctrination is not limited to sex education classes. In 1995 the Victorian Association for the Teachers of English said that AIDS and homosexuality studies should be incorporated into mainstream

English studies. It said that the study of English must embrace “the burgeoning field of lesbian and gay studies,” and that teachers need to “promote awareness of homosexual issues”.<sup>359</sup>

And the AEU called for pro-homosexual education to be integrated into all parts of the curriculum. It spoke of the “rights of all teachers to influence curricula in ways that will enhance understanding and acceptance of lesbians, bisexuals and gay men”.<sup>360</sup>

In mid-2002 a pro-homosexual booklet was distributed to every secondary school in Victoria. The 72-page booklet, *Alsorts*, was jointly published by the Alternative Lifestyle Organisation (ALSO Foundation) and Deakin University.<sup>361</sup> The book, filled with a number of statements that many would consider inaccurate and misleading, is just one of many attempts by the homosexual lobby to convince young people that homosexuality is an acceptable and positive lifestyle.

Also, in New South Wales a recommended reading list of fiction and non-fiction books providing positive images of homosexuals and lesbians has been distributed to NSW schools. The lists have been distributed by the Department of School Education as a response to perceived anti-homosexual attitudes.<sup>362</sup>

The push continues today. Consider several recent examples. In a newspaper article entitled, “Sex survey shocks,” there was a story about a Wodonga (Victoria) High School course for 14-year-olds.<sup>363</sup> Year 9 students were forced to answer a blatantly pro-homosexual questionnaire. The mandatory questionnaire, which students had to sign their names to, was part of a compulsory health class. The survey asked these sorts of questions:

“If you have never slept with a person of the same sex, is it possible that all you need is a lesbian/gay lover?”

“How can you become a whole person if you limit yourself to compulsive and exclusive heterosexual behaviour?”

“Is it possible that your heterosexuality stems from a neurotic fear of others of the same sex?”

The students then had to discuss these questions in class. It is designed to show that homosexuality is just the same as heterosexuality, that the two are interchangeable. But they are not of course. This appears to be nothing but propaganda: forcing students to feel guilty about being heterosexual. This is just a blatant attempt to force the homosexual agenda upon impressionable young people.

Most 14-year-olds are too young to be questioned about explicit details in sexuality. Indeed, some 14-year-olds can’t even handle questions about what they want for breakfast! Thus our public schools, with our tax dollars, are pushing the homosexual agenda on our children.

The following day there was a follow-up article about the questionnaire.<sup>364</sup> It seems that as a result of a loud public outcry, the State Government had to go into damage control. The article said that the Premier had ordered an inquiry to find out what was happening. It also said that the survey has been scrapped from the class. The school authorities claimed that the adult-only survey was actually meant for teachers, not for students.

However, in an article in another newspaper, a much different slant was put on the affair.<sup>365</sup> According to that report the principal of Wodonga High School was standing by the decision of the teacher to hand out the survey. He said the survey had been handed out at a professional development course run by the federally-funded Family Planning Victoria. A spokesperson for FPV in turn said the questionnaire was designed by the Australian Research Centre in Sexual Health and Society at La Trobe University to develop teachers’ sex education skills, and was “not a classroom tool”.

Whatever the actual facts and explanations are, many questions still remain: Why are our tax dollars being used to indoctrinate teachers with pro-homosexual propaganda, who then in turn are expected to indoctrinate their children?

Simply swap the word tobacco for homosexuality and see how this plays out. Every class has some smoking students. We need to respect this diversity. We do not want them to feel stigmatised. We need to embrace them in their lifestyle choices. We should let all students know that smoking is as normal as non-smoking. The important thing is for all students to be tolerant and non-judgmental. We do not want the smoking students to feel alienated or vilified for his behaviour. No one lifestyle choice is better than another.

Does anyone really believe such an approach would get very far in our school systems? Homosexuality is a very dangerous and high risk lifestyle, just as smoking is. Why do we have such double standards in these areas? Why do we protect our children against tobacco while forcing them to embrace homosexuality?

This questionnaire is part of a Commonwealth-funded national teacher development package that has been adopted by more than 250 Victorian schools, and presumably schools across the nation. I have seen several versions of this kit, and it is one big exercise in pushing the homosexual agenda onto our nation's children, via their teachers.

In another example of pro-homosexual activities in our schools, the Tasmanian Committee for Human Rights Education gave three Tasmanian schools prizes for their "anti-homophobia" programs. In December of 2003, the schools were given the awards after they trialed the six-week Pride and Prejudice courses. The schools are now planning to make the courses compulsory, and the Education Department plans to run the program state-wide. Gay activist Rodney Croome praised the program, saying that challenging homophobia must be "put in a human rights context".<sup>366</sup>

The constant push by gay activists to get access to all school children, from the earliest of ages, is a part of the larger attempt to coerce mainstream society to not only accept but welcome homosexuality. The progress they have made has been quite alarming, and all parents should be aware of the pro-homosexual agenda being pushed in our schools.

And as mentioned earlier, increasingly the concept of bullying is being used to push the homosexual agenda. Bullying of course should not be tolerated, and one can counter bullying without pushing the gay agenda. But gay activists are linking the two together. Recently the Victorian Education Services Minister told a gay interviewer that more needs to be done in this area, and she spoke of a recent conference on the issue, and that the department is "ensuring all schools have a code of conduct" on the issue. In the same interview she took a swipe at the Catholic Church, saying their abstinence approach was misguided: "The zero tolerance approach to young people and sexuality is not the best".<sup>367</sup> Thus she is lining herself up with gay activists, and against parents who might have religious concerns about homosexuality and condom use.

## XII. HOMOSEXUAL SUICIDE

It is often claimed by homosexual activists and their sympathizers in the media that pro-homosexual education and legislation is needed because of high levels of gay suicide. It is claimed that "homophobia" in society is driving many homosexuals to suicide. But are these claims true?

One general observation is in order. Yes, there are more suicides amongst gays than in the heterosexual community, just as there are greater occurrences of depression, mental illness, substance abuse, and so on. But the common line that this is due to homophobia just does not stand up. A simple way to test this is to look at places where homosexuality is very much accepted, such as in nations like Holland or cities like San Francisco. One would expect less suicide and other mental health problems amongst gays in these places. But that is not the case. There is as much if not more suicide and related problems in these localities. So homophobia cannot be to blame.

More specifically, the claim is often made that gay and lesbian teens are two to three times more likely to attempt suicide. Another version of this oft quoted "statistic" is that 30 per cent of teen suicides are committed by gay youth. Often it is claimed that this is a "government statistic". In point of fact, however, this is just not true. It is neither a correct figure nor is it a government figure. So where does this figure come from?

The myth of gay teen suicide mainly derives from a study by a San Francisco social worker named Paul Gibson. His study, "Gay Male and Lesbian Youth Suicide" was incorporated into a 1989 report published by the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). This study has been criticized for methodological weaknesses. Dr David Shaffer, a psychiatrist at Columbia University said that Gibson's study "was never subjected to the rigorous peer review that is required for publication in a scientific journal".<sup>368</sup> For example, he did not properly distinguish between suicide attempts and actual suicides. Also, he began by taking statistics from homosexual sources, then applied them to the general population by using the discredited Kinsey figures. Sexologist Alfred Kinsey had claimed that 10 per cent of the population was gay - a figure now widely rejected. These and other shortcomings prompted the then-HHS Secretary Louis Sullivan to distance himself from Gibson's study: "...the



views expressed in the paper entitled ‘Gay Male and Lesbian Youth Suicide’ do not in any way represent my personal beliefs or the beliefs of this department”.<sup>369</sup>

Other authorities have also condemned the study. Peter Muehrer of the National Institute of Mental Health said, “There is no scientific evidence to support this figure”<sup>370</sup>. A 1994 panel - convened by such groups as the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the American Psychological Association, and the American Association of Suicidology - made this finding: “There is no population-based evidence that sexual orientation and suicidality are linked in some direct or indirect manner”<sup>371</sup>. One study published in *Pediatrics* in 1991 entitled “Risk factors for attempted suicide in gay and bisexual youth,” examined 137 youths who deemed themselves ‘gay’. Says the study, “In this sample, bisexuality or homosexuality per se was not associated with self-destructive acts”<sup>372</sup>. This study found that less than one in 10 gay youths attempted suicide because of their homosexuality. Bear in mind again that attempts are always much more common than completed suicides.

The claims of high gay suicide rates are unfounded therefore. But these myths keep being repeated because they serve in the overall cause of the militant homosexual lobby: to get mainstream acceptance of homosexuality. Indeed, by using skewed statistics, homosexual activists are seeking to win over societal acceptance. This strategy is outlined in the influential homosexual publication, *After the Ball* by Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen. In this book the authors urge homosexuals to cast themselves as victims and “invite straights to be their protectors”<sup>373</sup>. Such a strategy is obviously working.

Indeed, it has resulted in many schools inviting homosexuals into the classroom to tell students that homosexuality is normal, and that students need to overcome their “homophobia”. Polished videos have been produced by the gay lobby to convince teachers to invite in gays to help change children’s perceptions of homosexuality. A number of elementary schools in America have done just that, and there is pressure on for Australian schools to do the same.

It is important therefore that the myths of gay teen suicide be exposed. As one pro-family leader has commented: “Teen suicide is always a tragedy. But tragedies should never be manipulated in order to advance an agenda - especially one that lures youth into an immoral, disease-ridden lifestyle”<sup>374</sup>.

### XIII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is clear that the homosexual lobby is on a roll. It has made tremendous advances in a very short period of time, and looks to make more gains in the near future. The effect this is having, and will have, on families is of great concern. For centuries the family has been the bedrock and safeguard of society. As the homosexual juggernaut continues, the influence and viability of the family will be lessened. At stake is nothing less than the survival of the family unit. All concerned citizens need to become informed on these issues and take a stand on behalf of the family.

The institution of the family has survived many assaults. But the homosexual assault on the family may be the most severe and the most important thus far. With these considerations in mind, we offer the following recommendations concerning the issue of homosexuality and public policy.

#### Negatively,

- Homosexual relationships should not be viewed as equal to or of the same natural order as heterosexual marriage.
- Homosexual couples should not be allowed access to artificial insemination or to IVF procedures.
- Homosexual marriage and adoption should not be allowed.
- Public schools should not be used as a channel for the promotion of the homosexual lifestyle.
- Public monies should not be used to promote the gay lifestyle (be it the Gay Mardi Gras, school sex education programs, and the like).

#### Positively,

- Traditional marriage and family life should be promoted by government and society as both the norm and the ideal. Other relationships are just that, types of relationships, which share no moral or social reciprocity with heterosexual marriage and family arrangements.

- Conscious social policy should affirm and support marriage and family. Legal, taxation and other policy should prioritise marriage and family life.
- Australia should legislate in favour of a Defence of Marriage Act which insures that marriage remains exclusively limited to heterosexual couples only.
- Family benefits should be restricted to actual families, not to alternative lifestyles. Family benefits should be seen for what they are, not as penalties to homosexuals, but as incentives for the glue that holds society together.

<sup>1</sup> Daniel Patrick Moynihan, "Defining Deviancy Down," *The American Scholar*, Winter 1993, pp. 17-30.

<sup>2</sup> Roger Magnuson, *Are Gay Rights Right?* Portland, Oregon: Multnomah Press, 1990, p 23.

<sup>3</sup> Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill, "The Overhauling of America," *The Guide*, November 1987.

<sup>4</sup> Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen (the real name of Erastes Pill), *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Hatred and Fear of Homosexuals in the 90s*. New York: Plume, 1990, pp. 186-187.

<sup>5</sup> Dennis Altman, *The Homosexualization of America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982, p 9.

<sup>6</sup> Charles Silverstein and Edmund White, *Joy of Gay Sex*, New York: Crown Pub., 1977, cited in Cal Thomas, "Behavior Does Not Deserve Special Protection," *The Los Angeles Times*, Feb 4, 1993.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> Cited in Roger Magnuson, *Are Gay Rights Right?*, p 43.

<sup>10</sup> Karla Jay and Allen Young, *The Gay Report*. New York: Summit, 1979, p 250.

<sup>11</sup> Alan Bell and Martin Weinberg, *Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978, pp 85, 86, 308, 312.

<sup>12</sup> Thomas Schmidt, *Straight & Narrow: Compassion & Clarity in the Homosexuality Debate*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1995, p. 101.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>14</sup> San Francisco Men's Health Study, *Journal of the American Medical Association*, vol. 3 no. 257, Jan 16, 1987, p 323.

<sup>15</sup> Paul Van de Ven, et. al., "A comparative demographic and sexual profile of older homosexually active men," *Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 1997, p. 354.

<sup>16</sup> Cited in *Lambda Report*, July 1994, p 11.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Ross Jacobs, "Is monogamy the death knell of relationships?," *MCV*, 9 January 2004, p. 6.

<sup>19</sup> Dennis Altman, *The Homosexualization of America*, p 17.

<sup>20</sup> Dennis Altman, *AIDS in the Mind of America*. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1986, p 159.

<sup>21</sup> *The Homosexualization of America*, p. 187.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 188.

<sup>23</sup> Schmidt, *ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>24</sup> David McWhirter and Andrew Mattison, *The Male Couple: How Relationships Develop*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1984, pp. 252-253.

<sup>25</sup> Maria Xiridou, et. al., "The contribution of steady and casual partnerships to the incidence of HIV infection among homosexual men in Amsterdam," *AIDS*, vol. 17, no. 7, May 2003, pp. 1029-1038, p. 1031.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> Bell and Weinberg, p.308.

<sup>28</sup> Garrett Prestage, et. al., *Sydney Men and Sexual Health*. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications, 1995.

<sup>29</sup> Prestage, *ibid.*, Report C.2, "Sexual identity and sexual behaviour with both men and women in a sample of homosexuality-active men in Sydney, Australia," p. 34.

<sup>30</sup> Garrett Prestage, et. al., *Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey*. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications, 1996, p. 16.

<sup>31</sup> Paul Van de Ven, et. al., *Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey: February 1998*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, 1998, p. 14.

<sup>32</sup> June Crawford, et. al., *Male Call 96: National Telephone Survey of Men Who Have Sex With Men*. Sydney: The National Centre in HIV Social Research, 1998, p. 40.

<sup>33</sup> Clive Aspin, et. al., *The Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey February 2000*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, 2000, p. 19.

<sup>34</sup> Garrett Prestage, et. al., *Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey*. Sydney: Report Series C.4.: "Changes in Behaviour over Time". Sydney: National Centre in HIV Epidemiological and Clinical Research and National Centre in HIV Social Research, January 2000.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>37</sup> Paul Van de Ven, et. al., *Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 1999*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, 1999, p. 18.

- <sup>38</sup> Andrew Grulich, et.al., "Homosexual experience and recent homosexual encounters," *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2003, pp. 155-163, p. 158.
- <sup>39</sup> Lance Spurr, "Sexless in the city," *B.News*, 3 January 2002, p. 8.
- <sup>40</sup> Jonathan Rauch, *Gay Marriage: Why it is Good for Gays, Good for Straights, and Good for America*. New York: Times Books, 2004, pp. 146-147.
- <sup>41</sup> Georgina Windsor, "Gays, Lesbians Show Support for Labor," *The Australian*, July 29, 1994.
- <sup>42</sup> Robert Michael, et. al., *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*. Boston: Brown, Little & Company, 1994, pp 101-107.
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>44</sup> Michael Wiederman, "Extramarital sex: Prevalence and correlates in a national survey," *Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 1997, p. 170.
- <sup>45</sup> E.O. Laumann, et. al., *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994, p. 217.
- <sup>46</sup> "Lesbians at greater risk, says report," *MCV*, 26 September 2003, p. 4.
- <sup>47</sup> Bernard Klamecki, "Medical Perspective of the Homosexual Issue," in J. Isamu Yamamoto, ed., *The Crisis of Homosexuality*. Wheaton, IL.: Victor Books, 1990, p. 107.
- <sup>48</sup> These practices especially involve the use of urine and faeces.
- <sup>49</sup> Kirk Cameron and Kay Proctor, "Effect of Homosexuality upon Public Health and Social Order," *Psychological Reports* 64 (1989), pp. 1167-1174.
- <sup>50</sup> Garrett Prestage, et. al., *Sydney Men and Sexual Health*. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications, 1995., Report C.2, *ibid.*, p. 38.
- <sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.
- <sup>52</sup> Garrett Prestage, et. al., *Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey*. Sydney: Report Series C.4.: "Changes in Behaviour over Time". Sydney: National Centre in HIV Epidemiological and Clinical Research and National Centre in HIV Social Research, January 2000., p. 9.
- <sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- <sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- <sup>56</sup> Jay and Young, p. 567.
- <sup>57</sup> Cameron and Proctor, *loc. cit.*
- <sup>58</sup> Charles Silverstein and Felice Picano, *The New Joy of Gay Sex*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1992, p. 171.
- <sup>59</sup> Edward Artnak and James Cerda, "The Gay Bowel Syndrome," *Current Concepts in Gastroenterology*, July/Aug 1983, p 6.
- <sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>61</sup> Jeffrey Carlisle, "Syphilis surge," *B.News*, 9 September 2004, p. 3.
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>63</sup> Schmidt, *ibid.*, p. 113.
- <sup>64</sup> Prestage, *ibid.*, Report C.2, *ibid.*, p. 45.
- <sup>65</sup> Juliet Ritchers, et. al., *Sydney Gay Community Surveillance Report: Update to December 1997, Report No. 6*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, Macquarie University, June 1998, p. 15.
- <sup>66</sup> James McKenzie, "Study finds higher drug use within the community," *Brother Sister*, 6 July 2000, p. 3.
- <sup>67</sup> As reported in "Up in smoke," *MCV*, 23 April 2004, p. 11.
- <sup>68</sup> "Gay men face eating disorders," *B.News*, 25 April 2002, p. 14.
- <sup>69</sup> Schmidt, *ibid.*, p. 130.
- <sup>70</sup> David Island and Patrick Letellier, *Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them: Battered Gay Men and Domestic Violence*. New York: Haworth Press, 1991, p. 14.
- <sup>71</sup> Gregory Greenwood, et. al., "Battering victimization among a probability-based sample of men who have sex with men," *American Journal of Public Health*, December 2002, Vol. 92, no. 12, pp. 1964-1969, p. 1964.
- <sup>72</sup> Lettie Lockhart, et. al., "Letting out the secret: Violence in lesbian relationships," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 9, December 1994, pp. 469-492.
- <sup>73</sup> Gwat Yong Lie and Sabrina Gentlewarrior, "Intimate Violence in Lesbian Relationships: Discussion of Survey Findings and Practice Implications," *Journal of Social Service Research* 15, 1991, pp. 41-59.
- <sup>74</sup> Claire Renzetti, *Violent Betrayal: Partner Abuse in Lesbian Relationships*. New York: Sage Publications, 1992, p. 130.
- <sup>75</sup> "Gays threaten gays, AVP says," *MCV*, 24 October 2003, p. 5.
- <sup>76</sup> Letter to the editor, *MCV*, 31 October 2003, p. 7.
- <sup>77</sup> Andrew Milnes, "Hurting the one you love," *MCV*, 7 November 2003, p. 7.
- <sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>80</sup> Sherele Moody, "Games gonorrhoea, syphilis fears," *The Melbourne Star*, Oct 17 2002, p, 1
- <sup>81</sup> Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Hatred and Fear of Homosexuals in the 90s*. New York: Plume, 1990, pp. 177-178.
- <sup>82</sup> Cited in Magnuson, p 46.
- <sup>83</sup> Reported in George Grant and Mark Horne, *Legislating Immorality: The Homosexual Movement Comes Out of the Closet*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1993, pp 40, 42.

- <sup>84</sup> Cited in Magnuson, p 14.
- <sup>85</sup> Reported in Judith Reisman and Edward Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, Lafayette, Louisiana: Huntington House Books, 1990, P 213.
- <sup>86</sup> Andrew Lansdown, *Blatant and Proud: Homosexuals on the Offensive*. Cloverdale, Western Australia: Perceptive Publications, 1984, p 100.
- <sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, p 105.
- <sup>88</sup> Dennis Altman, *AIDS in the Mind of America*, p 144.
- <sup>89</sup> Sharon Sargent, "Gays cancel paedophilia workshop," *The Weekend Australian*, 1,2 September 1984.
- <sup>90</sup> Reported in Paul Cameron, *Exposing the AIDS Scandal*. Lafayette, Louisiana: Huntington House Publishers, 1988, p 39.
- <sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>92</sup> K. Freund and R.I. Watson, "The proportions of heterosexual and homosexual pedophiles among sex offenders against children: an exploratory study," *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, vol. 18, Spring 1992, pp. 34-43.
- <sup>93</sup> Sherele Moody, "Minus 18 founder on teen sex charges," *The Melbourne Star*, 20 February 2003, p. 1.
- <sup>94</sup> Peter Tatchell, "Equality is not enough," *The Melbourne Star*, 7 February 2002, p. 18.
- <sup>95</sup> *Lambda Report*, Aug 1994, p 12.
- <sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>97</sup> Kirk and Madsen, *ibid.*, pp.161, 170.
- <sup>98</sup> Cited in John Ankerberg and John Weldon, *The Myth of Safe Sex*, Chicago: Moody Press, 1993, pp 148, 149.
- <sup>99</sup> Robert Hogg, et. al., "Modeling the impact of HIV disease on mortality in gay and bisexual men," *International Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 26, 1997, p. 657.
- <sup>100</sup> National Centre in HIV Epidemiology and Clinical Research, *Australian HIV Surveillance Update*, Vol. 10, no. 2, April 1994.
- <sup>101</sup> "More unsafe sex reported," *MCV*, 31 October 2003, p. 5.
- <sup>102</sup> Adam Carr, AIDS 2001: from gay male cancer to global epidemic," *B.News*, 3 January 2002, p. 28.
- <sup>103</sup> Lawrence McNamee and Brian McNamee, *AIDS: The Nation's First Politically Protected Disease*. La Habra, Ca.: National Medical Legal Publishing House, 1988, p. 5.
- <sup>104</sup> Michael Fumento, *The Myth of Heterosexual AIDS*. New York: Basic Books, 1990, p. 151.
- <sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.
- <sup>106</sup> Cited in Mary-Anne Toy, "Putting a rein on HIV," *The Age*, 29 November 1997.
- <sup>107</sup> Garrett Prestage, et. al., *Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey*. Sydney: Report Series C.4.: "Changes in Behaviour over Time". Sydney: National Centre in HIV Epidemiological and Clinical Research and National Centre in HIV Social Research, January 2000., p. 28.
- <sup>108</sup> Robert Lusetch, "AIDS fears as gays spurn rubber," *The Australian*, 8 September 1999, p. 11.
- <sup>109</sup> Quoted in Georgina Safe, "Gay abandon," *The Australian*, 21 September 1999, p. 13.
- <sup>110</sup> Glenn Mitchell, "HIV jump as risks ignored," *The Herald Sun*, 5 January 2001, p. 12.
- <sup>111</sup> Clive Aspin, et. al., *Queensland Gay Community Periodic Survey: June 2000*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, 2000, p. 22.
- <sup>112</sup> Steve Dow, "New HIV campaign needed," *B.News*, 17 July 2003, p. 4.
- <sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>114</sup> Jen Kelly, "HIV partners sought," *The Herald Sun*, 27 December 2000, p. 20.
- <sup>115</sup> William Bennett, "For our children's sake" in Jo Ann Gasper, ed., *What You Need to Know About AIDS*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Servant Books, 1989, p. 143.
- <sup>116</sup> Jennifer Vanasco, "It's our fault AIDS is still spreading," *Washington Blade*, February 1, 2002.
- <sup>117</sup> Cited in Magnuson, p. 132.
- <sup>118</sup> Julie Robotham, "Drugs for HIV cost up to \$59m," *The Age*, 23 November, 1998, p. 8.
- <sup>119</sup> Sue Williams, "Beyond the Ordeal," *The Australian Magazine*, 13-14 May, 1995, p. 12.
- <sup>120</sup> Julian Cribb, "Cancer the biggest killer for second year," *The Australian*, 24 September 1993.
- <sup>121</sup> 1994-95 Budget Statements.
- <sup>122</sup> Jane Fraser, "Lady Killers," *The Australian*, 5 July 1993, p. 9.
- <sup>123</sup> Gene Antonio, *AIDS: Rage and Reality*. Dallas: Anchor Books, 1993, p. 2.
- <sup>124</sup> Cited in Carl Ramsey, "Clinton's homosexual bias shortchanges cancer victims," *Focus on the Family Citizen*, January 1998, p. 5.
- <sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>126</sup> Lorraine Day, *AIDS: What the Government Isn't Telling You*. Palm Desert, Ca.: Rockford Press, 1991, p. 266.
- <sup>127</sup> Shepherd Smith, "Translating science into policy: A sound approach to AIDS and HIV," in Christopher Wolfe, ed., *Same-Sex Matters*. Dallas: Spence Publishing, 2000, pp. 128-149, p. 129.
- <sup>128</sup> Stanley Monteith, *AIDS: The Unnecessary Epidemic*. Sevierville, TN: Covenant House Books, 1991, p. 21.
- <sup>129</sup> Tammy Bruce, *The Death of Right and Wrong*. Roseville, Ca.: Prima Publishing, 2003, pp. 99-100.
- <sup>130</sup> [http://www.advocate.com/html/stories/869\\_70/869\\_70\\_bouley2.asp](http://www.advocate.com/html/stories/869_70/869_70_bouley2.asp)
- <sup>131</sup> Georgina Windsor, "Gays, lesbians show support for Labor," *The Australian*, July 29, 1994.
- <sup>132</sup> Elisabeth Tuckey, "Gays 'have strong buyer instincts'," *The Australian*, September 1, 1994
- <sup>133</sup> Patrick Rogers, "How Many Gays Are There?," *Newsweek*, Feb. 15, 1993, p. 46.
- <sup>134</sup> Kirk and Madsen, *ibid.*, p. 46.

- <sup>135</sup> Stuart H. Seidman and Ronald O. Rieder, "A Review of Sexual Behavior in the United States," *The American Journal of Psychiatry* 151 [1994]: pp.330-339.
- <sup>136</sup> Kinsey, A.C., W.B. Pomeroy and C.E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1948, pp. 650, 651.
- <sup>137</sup> John Gagnon, et. al., *Science* 243 [1989]: 338-348.
- <sup>138</sup> Dr J. Gordon Muir, "Homosexuals and the 10% Fallacy," *The Wall Street Journal*, March 31, 1993.
- <sup>139</sup> John O. G. Billy, et al., "The Sexual Behavior of Men in the United States," *Family Planning Perspectives* 25, March/April 1993, p. 58.
- <sup>140</sup> R.T. Michael, et. al., *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1994, p. 35.
- <sup>141</sup> Dan Black, et al., "Demographics of the Gay and Lesbian Population in the United States: Evidence from Available Systematic Data Sources," *Demography* 37, May 2000, p. 141.
- <sup>142</sup> <http://www.canada.com/health/story.html?id=911E67EC-B544-4A97-A364-42F6652266C9> Accessed 17 June 2004.
- <sup>143</sup> Quoted in *Newsweek*, *ibid*.
- <sup>144</sup> Bob Birrell and Virginia Rapson, "How gay is Australia?" *People and Place*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2002, pp. 59-67.
- <sup>145</sup> Suzanne Carbone, "Concern on sex findings," *The Age*, 9 April 2003, p. 7.
- <sup>146</sup> Anthony Smith, et. al., "Sexual identity, sexual attraction and sexual experience among a representative sample of adults," *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2003, pp. 138-145, at p. 141.
- <sup>147</sup> Juliet Richters and Christ Rissel, *Doing It Down Under*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 2005, p. 56.
- <sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- <sup>149</sup> Cal Thomas, *The Things That Matter Most*. New York: Harper Collins/Zondervan, 1993, pp. 34, 35.
- <sup>150</sup> Marie Tomeo, et. al., "Comparative data of childhood and adolescence molestation in heterosexual and homosexual persons," *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, October 2001, vol. 30, issue 15, p. 535.
- <sup>151</sup> Tammy Bruce, *Ibid.* p. 99.
- <sup>152</sup> Stanton Jones and Mark Yarhouse, *Homosexuality: The Use of Scientific Research in the Church's Moral Debate*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2000, p. 90.
- <sup>153</sup> Victoria Gurvich, "Heterosexual advertising plan angers Aids group," *The Age*, March 21, 1995.
- <sup>154</sup> Cited in F. LaGard Smith, *Sodom's Second Coming*. Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Pub., 1993, p. 82.
- <sup>155</sup> Robert Kronemeyer, *Overcoming Homosexuality*. New York: Macmillan, 1980, p. 7.
- <sup>156</sup> Jeffrey Satinover, *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996, p. 114.
- <sup>157</sup> National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality, "New survey says change is possible," *NARTH Bulletin*, vol. 5, no. 2, August 1997, p. 1.
- <sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>159</sup> Spitzer, Robert, "Can some gay men and lesbians change their sexual orientation? 200 participants reporting a change from homosexual to heterosexual orientation," *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, vol. 32, is. 5, October 2003, pp. 403-417.
- <sup>160</sup> Robin Yapp, "Gay cure claims to reignite sex debate," *The Courier-Mail*, 8 October 2003.
- <sup>161</sup> Cited in LaGard Smith, *Ibid.*, p. 84.
- <sup>162</sup> Cited in *Washington Watch* by the Family Research Council, February 21, 1995, p. 2.
- <sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>165</sup> Richard Dawkins, "It's Not All in the Genes," *The Daily Telegraph*, July 17, 1993, p. 14.
- <sup>166</sup> Ruth Hubbard, *Exploding the Gene Myth*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993.
- <sup>167</sup> Sharon Begley, "When DNA Isn't Destiny," *Newsweek*, December 6, 1993, pp. 53-55.
- <sup>168</sup> As reported by Robyn Williams, "How Darwin's birthday present will change our lives," *The Age*, May 28, 2001, p. 1.
- <sup>169</sup> William Byne and Bruce Parsons, "Human Sexual Orientation: The Biologic Theories Reappraised," *Archives of General Psychiatry*, March 1993, vol. 50, p. 228.
- <sup>170</sup> Cited in Larry Burtoft, *The Social Significance of Homosexuality: Questions and Answers*. Denver: Focus on the Family, 1994, p. 16.
- <sup>171</sup> Dennis Altman, *AIDS and the New Puritanism*, New York: Pluto Press, 1986, p. 98.
- <sup>172</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 188.
- <sup>173</sup> Graham Willett in an interview with *Capital Q Weekly*, 3 November 2000, p 17.
- <sup>174</sup> Graham Willett, letter to the *Herald Sun*, 1 December 2000, p. 17.
- <sup>175</sup> Catherine Keenan, "The bare-faced radical," *The Sydney Morning Herald, Spectrum*, September 24-25, 2005, pp. 4-5, p. 5.
- <sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>177</sup> For example, lesbian author Vera Whisman, in *Queer By Choice* (New York: Routledge, 1996), argues that choice is certainly a factor for many homosexuals and lesbians.
- <sup>178</sup> See their site at: <http://www.queerbychoice.com/>
- <sup>179</sup> Kirk and Madsen, *ibid.*, p. 184.
- <sup>180</sup> Schmidt, *ibid.*, p. 141.
- <sup>181</sup> Pete Moore, *Babel's Shadow: Genetic Technologies in a Fracturing Society*. Oxford: Lion Publishing, 2000, p. 169.
- <sup>182</sup> William Webb, *Slaves, Women and Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2001, pp. 233-234.
- <sup>183</sup> William Bennett, *The Broken Hearth*. New York: Doubleday, 2001, pp. 124-125.
- <sup>184</sup> Burtoft, *ibid.*, pp. 13-18.

- <sup>185</sup> William Byne, "The biological evidence is challenged," *Scientific American*, May 1994, Vol. 270, No. 5, pp 20-25.
- <sup>186</sup> George Rice, et. al., "Male homosexuality: absence of linkage to microsatellite markers at Xq28," *Science*, 23 April 1999, vol. 284, pp. 665-667.
- <sup>187</sup> As recorded in Ziauddin Sardar, "Scientific fundamentalists preach to the converted," *The Australian Financial Review*, 4 June 1999, Review, p. 7.
- <sup>188</sup> Satinover, p. 117.
- <sup>189</sup> Edward Stein, *The Mismeasure of Desire: The Science, Theory, and Ethics of Sexual Orientation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- <sup>190</sup> Michael Bronski, "Blinded by Science," *The Advocate*, 1 February 2000, p. 64.
- <sup>191</sup> Michael Swift, "For the Homoerotic Order," *Gay Community News*, Feb. 15-21, 1987.
- <sup>192</sup> Darrell Yates Rist, "Are Homosexuals Born That Way?," *The Nation*, October 19, 1992, Vol. 255, No. 12, p. 424.
- <sup>193</sup> F. LaGard Smith, *ibid.*, pp. 97, 98.
- <sup>194</sup> For a collection of stories about Australian homosexuals and lesbians who left the lifestyle behind, see Christopher Keane, ed., *What Some of you Were*. Sydney: Matthias Media, 2001.
- <sup>195</sup> Bob Davies and Lori Rentzel, *Coming out of Homosexuality*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1993, p. 16.
- <sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.
- <sup>197</sup> Jeff Konrad, *You Don't Have to be Gay*. Tunbridge Wells, Kent, UK: Monarch Publications, 1993, pp. 9, 11.
- <sup>198</sup> Jeannette Howard, *Out of Egypt: One Woman's Journey Out of Lesbianism*. London: Monarch Books, 1991, p. 241.
- <sup>199</sup> Robert Knight, "opposing homosexual advocacy," in Christopher Wolfe, ed., *Same-Sex Matters*. Dallas: Spence Publishing, 2000, pp. 169-179, p. 178.
- <sup>200</sup> Grulich, et. al, *ibid.*, p. 162.
- <sup>201</sup> Adam Carr, "Looking for gay liberation: finding wealth and marriage," *The Melbourne Star*, 29 November 2001, pp. 20-21.
- <sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- <sup>203</sup> Roger Magnuson, *Informed Answers to Gay Rights Questions*. Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Books, 1994, p. 107.
- <sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 107, 108.
- <sup>205</sup> For full documentation of this claim, see the author's paper, *The Historicity And Universality of the Natural Family*.
- <sup>206</sup> Anthony Butcher, "Human Rights and the Vulnerable in our Midst," *Quadrant*, January-February 2001, p. 26.
- <sup>207</sup> Richard Baker, "Lesbians only need apply," *The Age*, 12 September 2003, p. 3.
- <sup>208</sup> For example, Andrew Milnes, "Queer spaces?" *MCV*, 19 September 2003, pp. 1-4.
- <sup>209</sup> "Lesfest bans overturned," *MCV*, 3 October 2003, p. 3. See also, Andrew Bolt, "Bully laws that discriminate," *The Herald Sun*, 6 October 2003, p. 19.
- <sup>210</sup> Adam Carr, "Lesfest cancelled," *B.News*, 23 October 2003, p. 7.
- <sup>211</sup> Collin Mullane, "Hatching an idea for change," *B.News*, 11 September 2003, p. 4.
- <sup>212</sup> Kate Jones, "Men stage dance win," *The Herald Sun*, 20 December 2003, p. 2.
- <sup>213</sup> "Going straight," *MCV*, 9 January 2004, p. 3.
- <sup>214</sup> Phillip Coorey, "Gay marriage victory," *The Herald Sun*, 20 November 2003, p. 34.
- <sup>215</sup> Darrin Farrant, "Joy, anger in IVF victory," *The Age*, 29 July 2000, p. 1.
- <sup>216</sup> Michelle Pountney, "Baby battle," *The Herald Sun*, 19 April 2002, p. 1.
- <sup>217</sup> Cindy Wockner, "Transsexual marriage is valid," *The Daily Telegraph*, 15 October 2001.
- <sup>218</sup> Ian Munro, "Family court ruling tests the meaning of marriage," *The Age*, 22 February 2003, p. 3.
- <sup>219</sup> Fergus Shiel, "Gay couple 'parents', court finds," *The Age*, 13 December 2003, p. 3.
- <sup>220</sup> Misha Schubert, "Gays win rights as refugees," *The Australian*, 10 December 2003, p. 1.
- <sup>221</sup> Deborah Gough, "Court allows girl's bid to become boy," *The Age*, 14 April 2004, p. 1.
- <sup>222</sup> "Boy gets three parents," *The Herald Sun*, 19 April 2004, p. 14.
- <sup>223</sup> "Find out your rights," *MCV*, 9 January 2004, p. 4.
- <sup>224</sup> "Platform of the 1993 March on Washington for Lesbian, Gay, and Bi Equal Rights and Liberation" as cited in Burtoft, *ibid.*, pp. 57-68.
- <sup>225</sup> National Coalition of Gay Organizations, 1972 Gay Rights Platform, as cited in Enrique Rueda, *The Homosexual Network*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Devin-Adair Publishers, 1982, pp. 202, 203.
- <sup>226</sup> Senate Hansard, Legal and Constitutional Committee; Reference: *Human Rights (Sexual Conduct) Bill*. Wednesday November 30 and Thursday December 1, 1994, p. 349.
- <sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 396.
- <sup>229</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 389.
- <sup>230</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 341.
- <sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 365.
- <sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>234</sup> Sid Spindler, *Prohibiting Discrimination on the Grounds of Sexuality: Issues Paper No. 1*, p. 1.
- <sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- <sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- <sup>237</sup> *Ibid.*

- <sup>238</sup> Graham Willett, *Living Out Loud: A History of Gay and Lesbian Activism in Australia*. Allen & Unwin, 2000
- <sup>239</sup> *Ibid.*, p. x.
- <sup>240</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 238-239.
- <sup>241</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 240.
- <sup>242</sup> In a vote on July 17, 2003 the Australian Uniting Church did decide to go down the path of gay ordination.
- <sup>243</sup> Lance Spurr, "Who wants to get married?," *B.News*, 3 July 2003, p. 8.
- <sup>244</sup> Lance Spurr, "The rise of same-sex marriage," *Melbourne Star*, 5 February 2004, p. 5.
- <sup>245</sup> Dennis Altman, "Responsible gay citizenship," *The Sydney Star Observer*, 26 August 2004.
- <sup>246</sup> Miranda Stewart, "It's a queer thing," *The Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 29, no. 2, April 2004, pp. 75-80, p. 75.
- <sup>247</sup> "NSW gives new meaning to the concept of family," *The Age*, April 18, 1995, p. 7.
- <sup>248</sup> Stewart, *ibid.*, p. 78.
- <sup>249</sup> Maggie Gallagher, *The Abolition of Marriage*. Washington: Regnery Publishing, 1996, p. 131.
- <sup>250</sup> Cited in Andrew Milnes, "Always a bridesmaid," *MCV*, 7 November 2003, p. 1.
- <sup>251</sup> "Marriage splits NSW lobby," *MCV*, 11 June 2004, p. 3.
- <sup>252</sup> Amy Lowell, "Do lesbians need marriage?," *MCV*, 4 June 2004, p. 6.
- <sup>253</sup> Amy Lowell, "Do open relationships work?," *MCV*, 27 August 2004, p. 6.
- <sup>254</sup> Andrew Sullivan, *Virtually Normal: An Argument About Homosexuality*. London: Picador, 1996, p. 202.
- <sup>255</sup> Paula Ettelbrick, "Since when is marriage a path to liberation?," *Out/Look*, Fall 1989, p. 8.
- <sup>256</sup> Michelangelo Signorile, "Bridal wave," *Out*, December-January 1994, p. 161.
- <sup>257</sup> Sotirios Sarantakos, "Same-sex marriage: Which way to go?," *Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 24, no. 2, April 1999, pp. 79-84, p. 82.
- <sup>258</sup> Cath Pope, "Marriage, right?," *MCV*, 27 May 2005, p. 1.
- <sup>259</sup> Adam Carr, "Test gay marriage says lobby," *B.News*, 3 July 2003, p. 3.
- <sup>260</sup> Farah Farouque, "Gay 'husbands' to test their marriage in court," *The Age*, 4 February 2004, p. 3.
- <sup>261</sup> Gerard McManus and Simon Kearney, "Same-sex laws probe," *Sunday Herald Sun*, 30 June 2002, p. 8.
- <sup>262</sup> Richard Egan, "Family court redefines man," *Family Update*, vol. 17, no. 6, November-December 2001, p. 1.
- <sup>263</sup> Ian Munro, "Family court ruling tests the meaning of marriage," *The Age*, 22 February 2003, p. 3.
- <sup>264</sup> Commonwealth Government, *Marriage Act 1961*, sect. 46 (1).
- <sup>265</sup> The case for this is argued in my research paper, *The Historicity and Universality of the Natural Family*.
- <sup>266</sup> Richard Posner, *Sex and Reason*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1992, p. 312.
- <sup>267</sup> Peter Wood, "Sex and consequences," *The American Conservative*, 28 July 2003, pp. 8-12, p. 10.
- <sup>268</sup> Douglas Farrow, "Culture wars are killing marriage," *National Post* (Canada), 7 May 2003.
- <sup>269</sup> William Bennett, "Gay marriage: Not a very good idea," *The Washington Times*, 21 May 1996.
- <sup>270</sup> "Marriage for petrosexuals," *B.News*, 23 October 2003, p. 4.
- <sup>271</sup> Stephen Bertman, "The transformation of marriage," *The Futurist*, March-April 2004, pp. 44-47, at p. 47.
- <sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- <sup>273</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.
- <sup>274</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- <sup>275</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- <sup>276</sup> Bennett, *Broken Hearth.*, p. 115.
- <sup>277</sup> David Frum, "Modern Marriage, Modern Trouble," in Katherine Anderson, Don Browning and Brian Boyer, eds., *Marriage: Just a Piece of Paper?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, p. 364.
- <sup>278</sup> Julie McCrossin, "Always a bridesmaid, never a bride: Recognising same sex relationships," *The Sydney Papers*, Winter 1999, pp. 145-151, p. 145.
- <sup>279</sup> Rodney Croome, "Fundamental flaws and dangers in moves against same-sex marriage," *The Canberra Times*, 16 August 2004, p. 13.
- <sup>280</sup> Emma-Kate Symons, "Block on gay marriage is just like apartheid," *The Australian*, 27 April 2004, p. 1.
- <sup>281</sup> Peter Sprigg, "Questions and answers: What's wrong with letting same-sex couples legally 'marry'," Family Research Council, Issue no. 256, 17 October 2003.
- <sup>282</sup> Rauch, p. 71.
- <sup>283</sup> Rodney Croome, "Let no wedge tear gay unions asunder," *The Australian*, 29 April 2004, p. 11.
- <sup>284</sup> Catherine Naylor, "ACT same-sex couples can now adopt," *The Canberra Times*, 11 February 2004, p. 2.
- <sup>285</sup> Michael Ebert, "Joseph Nicolosi, PhD, is the Fugitive," *Focus on the Family Citizen*, June 20, 1994, pp. 10-12.
- <sup>286</sup> Cited in Don Feder, "Dangers of Gay Parenting are Underrated," *The Boston Globe*, September 27, 1993.
- <sup>287</sup> Glenn Stanton and Bill Maier, *Marriage on Trial*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004, p. 71.
- <sup>288</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>289</sup> Cited in Feder, *ibid.*
- <sup>290</sup> Testimony of Suzanne Cook before the Oregon State Senate, April 3, 1997.
- <sup>291</sup> Kylie Smith, "I prefer suicide to lesbian mum," *The Herald Sun*, 24 November 2002, p. 6.
- <sup>292</sup> Patrick Smellie, "Mum no more," *The Australian*, 24 January 1995.
- <sup>293</sup> Sotirios Sarantakos, "Children in Three Contexts," *Children Australia*, vol. 21, no. 3, 1996, pp. 23-31.
- <sup>294</sup> Paul Cameron, "Homosexual parents testing 'common sense' – A literature review emphasizing the Golombok and Tasker longitudinal study of lesbians' children," *Psychological Reports*, 85, 1999, p. 282.

- <sup>295</sup> Robert Lerner and Althea Nagai, *Out of Nothing Comes Nothing: Homosexual and Heterosexual Marriage Not Shown to be Equivalent for Raising Children*. Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 2000.
- <sup>296</sup> Lynn Wardle, "The potential impact of homosexual parenting on children," *University of Illinois Law Review*, 833, 1997.
- <sup>297</sup> Judith Stacey and Timothy Biblarz, "(How) does the sexual orientation of parents matter?," *American Sociological Review*, 66, 2001, pp. 159-183.
- <sup>298</sup> P.A. Belcastro, et. al., "A review of data based studies addressing the affects of homosexual parenting on children's sexual and social functioning," *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 20, 1993, pp. 105-106.
- <sup>299</sup> Mary Beth Style, "Homosexuality and adoption," in Christopher Wolfe, ed., *Same-Sex Matters*. Dallas: Spence Publishing, 2000, pp. 107-127, p. 116.
- <sup>300</sup> See for example my two research papers, "The Benefits of Marriage" (Melbourne, 2004), and "The Case for the Two-Parent Family" (Melbourne 2004).
- <sup>301</sup> Wendy Manning and Kathleen Lamb, "Adolescent well-being in cohabiting, married, and single-parent families," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 65, no. 4, November 2003, pp. 876-893, at p. 890.
- <sup>302</sup> Yongmin Sun, "The well-being of adolescents in households with no biological parents," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, vol. 65, no. 4, November 2003, pp. 894-909, at p. 894.
- <sup>303</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 905.
- <sup>304</sup> Stanton and Maier, *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.
- <sup>305</sup> Style, *Ibid.*, p. 114.
- <sup>306</sup> Tammy Bruce, *Ibid.*, p. 88.
- <sup>307</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>308</sup> Tony Wood and Lee Matthews, "Men making babies," *The Melbourne Star*, 14 April 2005, p. 4.
- <sup>309</sup> Cath Pope, *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- <sup>310</sup> Patricia Morgan, *Children as Trophies?* Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: The Christian Institute, 2002.
- <sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.
- <sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35.
- <sup>313</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45.
- <sup>314</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.
- <sup>315</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.
- <sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.
- <sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.
- <sup>318</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 89.
- <sup>319</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.
- <sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 81-82.
- <sup>321</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83.
- <sup>322</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87.
- <sup>323</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 111.
- <sup>324</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 112.
- <sup>325</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 130.
- <sup>326</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 132.
- <sup>327</sup> Although the new reproductive technologies are beginning to make this possible.
- <sup>328</sup> Pat Califia and Daniel Tsang, eds., *The Age Taboo*. Alyson Publications and Gay Men's Press, 1981, p. 144.
- <sup>329</sup> As cited in Schmidt, *ibid.*, p. 148.
- <sup>330</sup> Patricia Neil Warren, "Future shock," *The Advocate*, 3 October 1995, p. 80.
- <sup>331</sup> Cal Thomas, "Good and bad get ugly," *World*, 21 August 1999, p. 19.
- <sup>332</sup> As reported in Kathryn Jean Lopez, "The cookie crumbles," *Citizen*, January 2001, p. 17.
- <sup>333</sup> Bruce Loudon, "Scout's gay move anger," *The Herald Sun*, 24 March 1997, p. 23.
- <sup>334</sup> Scott Emerson, "Sexually explicit gay cards banned," *The Australian*, 9 March 1995, p. 3.
- <sup>335</sup> Zoe Velonis, "Comics come out," *Brother/Sister*, 29 April 2000, pp. 12-13.
- <sup>336</sup> Stephen McGinty, "Camped crusaders up, up and a-gay," *The Australian*, 28 February 2000, p. 11.
- <sup>337</sup> Troy Gurr, "Super Queer!," *MCV*, 15 April 2005, p. 8.
- <sup>338</sup> For example, *MCV*, 5 March 2004, p. 24.
- <sup>339</sup> Nikki Voss and Catherine Lambert, "Gay dolls are outed," *The Herald Sun*, 2 November 2003, p. 13.
- <sup>340</sup> Leslie Newman, *Heather Has Two Mommies*. Los Angeles: Alyson Publications, 1989.
- <sup>341</sup> Michael Willhoite, *Daddy's Roommate*. Los Angeles: Alyson Publications, 1990.
- <sup>342</sup> Alexandra Carlton, "Her own write," *Who*, 24 March 2003, p. 36.
- <sup>343</sup> Liam Houlihan, "'Gay school' for tots row," *The Herald Sun*, 3 June 2004, p. 2.
- <sup>344</sup> Kelly Burke, "See Jed's dads rile the minister," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 February 2005.
- <sup>345</sup> Larissa Dubecki, "Schools unable to stop photos on gay website," *The Age*, 22 February 2002, p. 3.
- <sup>346</sup> Chris Tinkler, "Gay photos storm," *Sunday Herald Sun*, 1 August 2004, p. 5.
- <sup>347</sup> "Back to school," *DNA*, July 2004, pp. 40-51.
- <sup>348</sup> John from Footscray, "High school hijinx?," *MCV*, 6 August 2004, p. 5.
- <sup>349</sup> <[http://www.hreoc.gov.au/human\\_rights/gay\\_lesbian/](http://www.hreoc.gov.au/human_rights/gay_lesbian/)> (Accessed 2 December 2003.)
- <sup>350</sup> Greg Callaghan, "Worst days of their lives," *The Australian*, 10 April 2000, p. 11.



- 
- <sup>351</sup> Malcolm Brown, "It's OK to be gay, said the judge to the schoolboys," *The Age*, 25 February 2000, p. 3.
- <sup>352</sup> Darren Devlyn, "Gay neighbour moving in," *The Herald Sun*, 20 August 2004, p. 3.
- <sup>353</sup> "TV reduces homophobia," *MCV*, 22 April 2005, p. 5.
- <sup>354</sup> David Hirst, "Teachers urged to educate students on homosexuality," *The Australian*, 9 January 1987.
- <sup>355</sup> Jamie Walker, "Under-10s 'should be taught about sex'," *The Australian*, 13 March 1992.
- <sup>356</sup> Joanne Painter, "Teachers consider classes on sex and gays," *The Age*, 19 January 1995.
- <sup>357</sup> Carolyn Jones and Justine Ferrari, "Teachers propose mandatory HIV classes," *The Australian*, 18 January 1995.
- <sup>358</sup> Cheryl Critchley, "Call to give lessons on gays," *The Herald Sun*, 2 October 1995.
- <sup>359</sup> Kevin Donnelly, "Teacher unions make classrooms the new battleground," *News Weekly*, 22 April 1995, p. 7.
- <sup>360</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>361</sup> Daryl Higgins, ed., *Alsorts: A Sexuality Awareness Guide*. Melbourne: The ALSO Foundation/Deakin University, 2002.
- <sup>362</sup> Julie Lewis, "Books may counter anti-gay attitudes," *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 7 March 1995.
- <sup>363</sup> Jeremy Calvert, "Sex survey shocks," *The Herald Sun*, 28 October 2003, p. 7.
- <sup>364</sup> Jeremy Calvert, "Sex survey probe," *The Herald Sun*, 29 October 2003, p. 15.
- <sup>365</sup> Daniel Hoare, "Gay sex questions 'in the curriculum'," *The Australian*, 29 October 2003, p. 3.
- <sup>366</sup> "School's out for award winners," *MCV*, 12 December 2003, p. 3.
- <sup>367</sup> "Taking aim at bullying," *MCV*, 16 January 2004, p. 4.
- <sup>368</sup> Cited in Trudy Hutchens, "Gay teen suicide: Myths and misconceptions," *Family Voice*, August 1996, p. 15.
- <sup>369</sup> Cited in Hutchens, *ibid.*, p. 13.
- <sup>370</sup> Cited in Delia Rios, "A bogus statistic that won't go away," *Citizen*, 18 August 1997, pp. 2-3.
- <sup>371</sup> Cited in Rios, *ibid.*, p. 3.
- <sup>372</sup> Gary Remafedi, James Farrow and Robert Deisher, "Risk factors for attempted suicide in gay and bisexual youth," *Pediatrics*, vol. 87, no. 6, June 1991, p. 873.
- <sup>373</sup> Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, *After the Ball*. New York: Plume, 1990.
- <sup>374</sup> Beverley LaHaye, cited in Hutchens, *ibid.*, p. 16.