

## Controversy over Professor J. Michael Bailey and the Existence of Bisexuality

In a 2005 issue of Psychological Science, researchers reported on measurements of arousal of 33 bisexual men as they were shown erotic videos of two men together and two women together. The researchers also measured 30 straight and 38 gay men for comparison.

Arousal was measured two ways: by how exciting the men thought the pictures were, and by changes in erections. About a third of the men— 11 bisexual, 9 straight and 13 gay men—had low erection response and were excluded from the results. Although the bisexual men reported they were aroused by both sets of pictures, their erection responses tended to favor one set or the other.

The researchers concluded that they did not find evidence of a distinctly bisexual genital arousal pattern. But they did *not* conclude that a bisexual genital arousal pattern does not exist, or that no men are bisexual. In fact, a few men did show a somewhat bisexual arousal pattern; but they were not especially likely to identify as bisexual.

UPDATE (2012): with input from bisexuals, Professor Bailey's lab conducted additional research and has now found men with a distinct bisexual genital arousal pattern.

The highlights are:

Recruitment	Rather than recruiting bisexual men with ads in a gay publication and an "alternative" weekly newspaper, men were recruited on-line from ads for a man to join a male-female couple.
Inclusion	Participants were required to have had sex with at least two men and two women, and to have had relationships of at least three months with at least one man and one woman.
Stimuli	Stimuli were updated and of better resolution. They included two men having sex, two women having sex and "threesomes" of two men and one woman having sex.
Results	<b>Bisexual men in this study did indeed exhibit a bisexual physiological arousal pattern.</b>
	Bisexual men were uniquely aroused by "threesome" stimuli. Perhaps straight men experience a suppression or inhibition of arousal when more than one man is present in the stimulus.
	The results were peer-reviewed and published in the academic journal Biological Psychology in late 2011.
	The New York Times and other outlets wrote about the results ("No Surprise to Bisexual Men: They Exist"), and former skeptic and sex columnist Dan Savage penned an article entitled: "Case Closed: Bisexual Men Exist!"
	The bisexual group that funded the study is pleased at the validation, especially coming from a former skeptic about bisexual orientation in men. This group had engendered some criticism from the community for supporting Professor Bailey's research, which it decided to do anyway for the reasons set forth in the remainder of this document.

The results of Professor Bailey's *original* study were misreported and misinterpreted for at least three reasons:

SHORT VERSION	LONGER VERSION
<p>First, they played into an incorrect but common stereotype: that everyone is either straight or gay, and never something in between. Readers incorrectly assumed the study “confirmed” the stereotype, which many people still believe.</p> <p>This is a form of ignorance and sometimes bigotry.</p>	<p>Sexual orientation can be interpreted many ways. Identity, behavior, arousal pattern. How attractive you find men, how averse you are to men. How attractive you find women, how averse you are to women. Sexual fantasies. Emotional preference for relating to men or women. Preference for socializing with men or women. Gay or bi or straight lifestyle preference.</p> <p>After choosing what we mean by sexual orientation, we will find that some aspects of orientation will change over time, for some people. Some may become more bisexual later, some may become more gay and some more straight.</p> <p>This does not mean that bisexuals are confused or do not really exist. Saying that bisexuals are gay people in denial is as hurtful and unenlightened as saying that being gay is a lifestyle choice, and that gay people chose wrongly. If you would not say that being gay is a choice, you should accept that bisexuality exists too.</p>
<p>Second, the New York Times reported the study under a simplistic headline "Straight, Gay or Lying?" This headline was not only demeaning, but also extremely misleading as to the topic, substance and results of the study. In fact, the report states “In terms of behavior and identity, bisexual men clearly exist.”</p>	<p>Contrary to much popular report, the researchers did not say that bisexual men do not exist or are “lying.” The authors reported that they did not find men whose erection measurements were equal when viewing men and women, and that most men reacted more to men or to women.</p> <p>They also found that most everyone reacted more to sex than to neutral images. In other words, straight men reacted more to images of men than to images of nature; and gay men reacted less to images of nature than to women.</p> <p>This insulting headline probably found its way to notoriety due to a publicist using it in a press release promoting a book by Professor J. Michael Bailey, one of the researchers. What Bailey's book said is: "<i>They [gay men] have a saying: 'You're either gay, straight or lying.'</i> In contrast, many women are bisexual; perhaps most are, at least in their arousal patterns." [emphasis added]</p> <p>Bailey himself only stated that he had not found evidence of a 50-50 bisexual arousal pattern in men, yet, in that study. And absence of evidence (of bisexuality) is not evidence of absence (of bisexuality.)</p> <p>In addition, the article itself highlights that the real discovery is that for some people, what is going on in their minds is different from what is going on in their bodies. And that social and emotional attraction are very important elements in bisexual attraction.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(continued on next page...)</p>

<p>Third, opponents of one of the researchers sought to discredit him by misrepresenting his results to suggest he was attacking bisexuals, another minority group.</p>	<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>Specifically, a very small group of transsexual activists spread the distortion that the lead researcher, Professor Bailey, was attacking bisexuals. They had felt attacked themselves when Bailey publicized a theory of transsexualism that they rejected and found hurtful.</p> <p>A number of them campaigned to discredit Bailey using hostile and misleading tactics, according to convincing research by Professor Alice Dreger, who, prior to her research, had assumed based on material on the internet that Bailey must be guilty. But of all the accusations, only one stuck: that Bailey should have been more frank about the small chance a transsexual woman would be able to change Bailey’s mind about the theory.</p> <p>No clear evidence refutes the theory, which states that male-to-female transsexuals fall in two categories: gay men who are attracted to straight men, and men who are sexually aroused by the image or idea of themselves becoming or being a woman.</p> <p>These two types are disputed by many transsexuals, who instead perceive themselves as born in the wrong body; some of them find the theory demeaning and hurtful, although others are unsure and some agree the theory explains their own experiences. Some transsexuals who disagree with the theory have attacked transsexuals who agree with the theory. One who agrees with it has suggested that extreme reactions by the few attackers may result from co-existing mental problems that cause pain and distress to the sufferer, who lashes out to excess.</p> <p>Many bisexuals who read the “Straight, Gay or Lying” headline researched Bailey on the internet, found anti-Bailey webpages and assumed that Bailey was a biased and bad researcher whose research should be ignored or attacked.</p>
---	--

***More Questions, Short Answers and Detailed Answers:***

<p>Didn't Professor Bailey deny that bisexual men exist?</p>	<p>Short answer: No.  (UPDATE: they exist, even by the same measurements.)</p>	<p>The 2005 paper by Gerulf Rieger of Professor Bailey's lab did not state that bisexual men do not exist. On the contrary, as stated above, the authors state: "In terms of behavior and identity, bisexual men clearly exist." That paper, summarized below sought to compare one measure of male arousal to scores on the Kinsey scale:</p> <p>"Finally, Rieger, Chivers and Bailey (2005) investigated genital and subjective sexual arousal to films of male-male versus female-female copulation in heterosexual, bisexual and homosexual men. Bisexual men, as a group, did not show a 'bisexual' genital sexual arousal pattern. Most bisexual men responded with significantly greater genital response to one gender category or the other, though they reported subjective sexual arousal to both male and female stimuli. Heterosexual and homosexual men showed category-specific self-reported and genital sexual responses. We interpreted these results to mean that male bisexuality is not associated with a distinct pattern of genital sexual arousal, and that male genital sexual arousal tends to be, on average, specific to male or to female [filmed same-sex copulation] sexual stimuli, but not to both."</p> <p>--From Chivers &amp; Bailey (2006) <i>The Sexual Psychophysiology of Sexual Orientation</i>, <i>The Psychophysiology of Sex</i>, The Kinsey Institute Series Vol. VIII</p> <p>The Chivers et al. (2006) article quoted above also gives an excellent summary of other previous scientific findings concerning both male and female arousal patterns (pp.460-467.) The measurements to date have led some scientists to question whether a male bisexual arousal pattern, particularly with equal arousal at the time of measurement, has been found. These measurements do not minimize or question the existence of bisexually identified and/or behaving men, nor demonstrate that arousal patterns are constant over time for all people. Bailey also summarized the research and his opinions about it in his 2003 book.</p> <p>Some of the debate and controversy derives from whether arousal pattern and sexual orientation are "the same thing," or if that notion would be a gross oversimplification of sexual orientation.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>Notably, the Rieger paper further states:</p> <p><i>"To be sure, most men [that is, even heterosexual and homosexual men] were more genitally aroused to stimuli depicting their less arousing sex than to neutral stimuli. This finding contradicts some prior research in which men's arousal to their less preferred sex was comparable to their response to a neutral stimulus... This suggests that most men may possess a certain capacity of bisexual arousal, although the magnitude of this arousal is quite modest." [Emphasis and bracketed language added]</i></p> <p>- Rieger, G., Chivers, M.L., &amp; Bailey, J.M. (2005) Sexual Arousal Patterns of Bisexual Men. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 16, 579-584.</p> <p>The Rieger paper also suggests that emerging technology identifying <u>brain activation patterns associated with sexual arousal could in principle have higher validity than self-reported arousal or their study's measurements</u>. This suggestion anticipated a study such as Safron et al. of gay and straight men, and potential future fMRI research that would not exclude bisexual men.</p>
<p>How could the NY Times article get it so wrong?</p>	<p>Short answer: it didn't. The insulting headline, probably not written by the author of the article, misrepresented the results and conclusions.</p>	<p>Many bisexual activists were upset by the article. The National Gay &amp; Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) issued a three page critique of the article and Bailey.</p> <p>However, a close read of the article reveals more balance. The article is available at <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/05/health/05sex.html">http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/05/health/05sex.html</a> and summarizes the study for a popular audience.</p> <p>It cites Fritz Klein, M.D., author of "The Bisexual Option" and founder of AIB, saying social and emotional attraction are very important elements in bisexual attraction. It quotes Dr. Gilbert Herdt saying this study doesn't mean bisexuality doesn't exist. Dr Lisa Diamond is quoted noting the discrepancy between what is going on in peoples' heads and what is measured in their bodies. The article notes the study was small and would need to be repeated with more men before drawing conclusions. Dr. Randall Sell said therapists should not tell patients they cannot be bisexual, and is quoted saying "We don't know nearly enough about sexual orientation and identity" to jump to these conclusions. Finally, the article included the perspective of a bisexual man who was skeptical of the findings.</p> <p>The article does quote Bailey bluntly stating "I'm not denying that bisexual behavior exists, but I am saying</p> <p><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>that in men [measured in the study] there's no hint that true bisexual arousal exists, and that for men arousal is orientation." More generally, Bailey has stated "We found no evidence of a bisexual arousal pattern," which is a more precise statement than the newspaper quote.</p> <p>Critics of the article raised methodological questions, including whether the stimuli were "bad porn."</p> <p>The NGLTF critique disputed whether "arousal equals orientation," a point mentioned above. It questions the validity of the measurement device (PPG,) without suggesting anything better. It insinuates that the NY Times should have mentioned the controversy concerning Bailey and opponents' questions about his opinions and methods, although these have nothing to do with the physiological measurements and reports thereof in the study. The critique says bisexual community leaders and activists were not consulted; but in fact the author consulted AIB, which put him in contact with Dr. Klein and the quoted bisexual man.</p> <p>The next week, the Times ran informative letters written in response to the article that may be viewed at: <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/12/science/12lett.html">http://www.nytimes.com/2005/07/12/science/12lett.html</a></p> <p>Lastly, William Burleson has written about the translation from science paper to newspaper article, suggesting a better title would have been "Sexual Attraction More Complex than Expected, Research Shows." His two part paper revisiting the article, and recycling a number of anti-Bailey accusations, may be found at <a href="http://www.bi101.org/essays/">http://www.bi101.org/essays/</a> . Burleson argues that the data might suggest that 12% of gay men are really bisexual, among other things.</p>
<p>What was the brain study showing different gay and straight male brain response, and what about bi males?</p>	<p>Safron et al. (2007) Neural Correlates of Sexual Arousal in Homosexual and Heterosexual Men, Behavioral Neurosciences Vol. 121, No. 2, 237-248. Bisexual males were not recruited for the Safron study, but it appears that bisexuality can and does exist in some men's brains.</p>	<p>"Activity assessed across these [brain regions] was a reliable predictor of self-reported sexual orientation, with greater responses to female stimuli for heterosexual men and greater responses to male stimuli for homosexual men in 15 out of 16 participants in this study (with 6 additional participants failing to exhibit significant differences between conditions)."</p> <p>Early and preliminary data from a bisexual man measured by the same fMRI protocol as the above study suggests that some bisexual men have strikingly different patterns of brain activation, in a way that is consistent with bisexual arousal. Professor Bailey and his team (which includes straight, gay and bi researchers) are conducting further experiments, and already fully accept the bisexuality of the man whose brain was measured.</p> <p><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>They found brain regions involved in motivation/reward, attention and emotional experience showed significantly greater activity for both female and male sexual stimuli compared with sports.</p> <p>As of late 2011, additional studies are underway. And Bailey's lab has now found and measured bisexual arousal patterns.</p>
<p>Wasn't Professor Bailey discredited?</p>	<p>Short Answer: No. He is among the most respected sexologists. But he was the victim of innuendo and character assassination on the internet, as well as trumped up complaints to his employer and medical authorities.</p>	<p>The controversy surrounding Professor Bailey's 2003 book has been convincingly researched and reported by Professor Alice Dreger, who found facts disproving all serious accusations against Professor Bailey. Dreger's illuminating report, available at <a href="http://alicedreger.com/articles.html">http://alicedreger.com/articles.html</a>, also describes tactics of his detractors, who among other acts reported him for practicing medicine without a license (which was not true.) The article is available online at the link above and should be studied in its entirety before any judgment about Bailey based on unsubstantiated material on the internet.</p> <p>For information on the accusations to Bailey's employer, see below.</p>
<p>Can all the bad word on the street about Bailey really be so misleading and wrong?</p>	<p>Short Answer: Yes. A small number of detractors set out to discredit him and ruin his reputation with untruths, misleading accounts and innuendo. They also attacked people who defended Bailey, or urged civil dialogue.</p>	<p>Many people looking into the controversy have assumed that as regards Bailey, "Where there's so much smoke, there must be fire." Put another way, with all the negative things on the internet about Bailey, some of them must be based on truth.</p> <p>To explain the lengths to which his detractors went as part of the campaign to discredit Bailey and to intimidate his allies and supporters, consider this list of what occurred:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. false formal accusations filed of sexual abuse of a child patient in one's clinic: one victim;</li> <li>2. false formal charges of falsification of key data: at least three victims, including Bailey;</li> <li>3. false formal charges of violation of the rights of human subjects: at least two victims, including Bailey and Dreger (who was formally accused of sleeping with her husband during "research") and Dreger's husband, who also had charges filed against him;</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. false formal accusations of sexual relations with a research subject: two victims;</li> <li>5. posting of pictures of a researcher's minor children with obscene captions: one victim (Bailey);</li> <li>6. creepy notes left at one's office and in one's email containing such expressions as "bad move, mommy": at least seven victims;</li> <li>7. explicit threats to ruin researchers' careers, sometimes made publicly in front of one's untenured junior colleagues: at least two victims;</li> <li>8. outing of (or threats to out) individuals whose outing may cause them to be fired, bashed, evicted, etc.: at least three victims;</li> <li>9. online falsification of personal histories of others in order to make them appear to be convicted sex offenders: at least two victims;</li> <li>10. online falsification of personal histories of others generally: many victims;</li> <li>11. development of webpages "exposing" one's lovers, family, and colleagues who had nothing to do with all this: many victims;</li> <li>12. google-bombing of #s 1-5, 8-11, to make sure anyone searching that individual finds the derogatory information first: many victims.</li> <li>13. orchestrating a misleading "action alert" distributed by FAIR, a journalism watchdog: one victim (Bailey);</li> <li>14. attempts to recruit one's colleagues to disclose unflattering information and to isolate one professionally: Bailey is the most prominent example, and I think others were cowed; and</li> <li>15. canvassing of the neighborhood establishment where one hangs out to find out personal dirt: at least one victim, with more instances of trying to "recruit" other familiars, like grad students, former students, etc.</li> </ol>
--	--	--



<p>Why didn't anyone defend Bailey?</p>	<p>Fear of intimidation.</p>	<p>Other researchers and some transsexuals were sympathetic to Bailey, but unwilling to say so publicly because of the virulent attacks against anyone who spoke up in his defense.</p> <p>They were also afraid their research would not be funded if they became associated with Bailey. As a result, many distanced themselves from Bailey and his lab.</p> <p>In addition, there was questionable reporting in the Chronicle of Higher Education that tended to misrepresent Bailey and the controversy. Finally, Bailey's lawyer advised him to keep silent.</p>
<p>Wasn't Dreger's work on Bailey criticized?</p>	<p>Of course, like many other academic articles are commented upon and debated.</p>	<p>Dreger's article stood up to investigation and reporting by the New York Times. Another article at <a href="http://www.huffingtonpost.com/seth-roberts/can-professors-say-the-tr_b_60781.html">http://www.huffingtonpost.com/seth-roberts/can-professors-say-the-tr_b_60781.html</a> explains how the author read Dreger's "excellent" article and wondered why a Bailey opponent made no mention of him or the theory in her own book about being transsexual.</p> <p>As part of normal academic debate, many researchers and scientists wrote "comments" on Dreger's paper. A simplified summary of the comments is below.</p> <p>Also, anti-Bailey websites now attack Dreger too. Examples of anti-Dreger opinions include:</p> <p>[Dreger] deflects attention away from Bailey's book and the massive trans community protest, and caricatures the entire controversy as nothing more than a vicious effort by three rather witch-like women to "ruin the life" of a brilliant scientist. In doing so, she stoops to new lows as a dirty-trickster by misquoting sources, exploiting sleazy innuendos and fabricating entire story-episodes in order to defame the three women.</p> <p>and</p> <p>Dreger is a professional academic troll, someone who gets money and publicity for making deliberately controversial statements, like Ann Coulter or Michael Moore.</p> <p>However, these unsubstantiated attacks are not particularly convincing compared to Dreger's work itself.</p>

<p>Wasn't Bailey censured by HBIGDA?</p>	<p>Not really.</p>	<p>The Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association (HBIGDA)(now WPATH,) in response to complaints by Bailey detractors, wrote back that the allegations were serious but they would await the results of the investigation at Bailey's university.</p> <p>It also stated that some HBIGDA members found the book "poorly referenced" (not enough footnotes and citations to academic journal articles) and that it "does not reflect the social and scientific literature that exists on transsexual people and could damage that essential trust." Finally, the letter urged <i>everyone</i> concerned "to exercise professionalism and treat the relationship between researchers, practitioners, and the community with great care" and encouraged "trust and mutual respect between the scientific and the transgender communities."</p> <p>A fair reading of the letter suggests concern that cold scientific truth might result in harm to mental health, or to discrimination and stigmatization. Put slightly differently, it might imply that scientists should consider treatment outcomes and potential counterproductive reactions and effects when writing for a popular audience.</p> <p>However, research and truth could also lead to acceptance and understanding, instead of shame and isolation. The theory need not be a "disease model," any more than other orientations are diseases. Some commentators, including transsexuals, have proposed that whatever the cause of transsexualism, it should be removed from the list of mental disorders, just as homosexuality has been.</p>
<p>Don't some sexologists disagree with Bailey?</p>	<p>Of course. It's normal for people to have different opinions and to debate.</p>	<p>Some of the disagreement with Bailey in the sexologist community can be summed up: "It may be true, but it will be hurtful to people to publicize it or to tell them. The best course in therapy is to affirm their feelings and sense of self-essence, not to disclose or explain physiological measurements that suggest a different explanation for their condition."</p> <p>Bailey, as a researcher, takes a different and also valid approach. He is skeptical of self-report but trusts physiological measurements. There is room for both approaches in the marketplace of ideas, and neither merits suppression.</p>

<p>Isn't Professor Dreger biased and on the same faculty as Bailey?</p>	<p>No. Dreger found facts, which are not biased, and works in a different school and department.</p>	<p>Dreger is a Professor of Clinical Medical Humanities and Bioethics in the Medical Humanities and Bioethics Program at the Feinberg School of Medicine of Northwestern University in Chicago. Bailey is Professor in the Psychology Department in Evanston. Dreger was initially suspicious of Bailey, in fact, but concluded a small group had set out to ruin him.</p> <p>Dreger tried to interview several Bailey detractors for their side, but they refused. Her article describes attempting to interview them for their side. One even accused Dreger of "stalking" her by telephoning her at home.</p>
<p>Did Bailey claim his book was science, when others disagree?</p>	<p>No. Bailey wrote a book for a popular audience about science and research by him and others. He did not claim his book was itself science.</p>	<p>At a conference, another scientist stated that Bailey's book was "not science," but now says he would not have said that if he knew how his words would be misinterpreted and misused. Strangely, someone at the conference quickly alerted an anti-Bailey activist, who promptly put word out on the internet suggesting incorrectly that Bailey's book had been denounced.</p> <p>More specifically, researcher John Bancroft did not denounce Bailey's book as "not science." He used those words intending to distinguish popularized science writing from peer-reviewed academic papers that don't contain illustrative personal narratives. Bancroft later said if he had known his words would be leaked outside the profession and used out of context by Bailey's detractors, he would not have made the statement; i.e., the words are being misused. He later wrote "I was naïve to think that I could make a remark about this book at an International Academy of Sex Research meeting which would stay within the academic community; a lesson for all of us."</p>
<p>Isn't the Blanchard-Bailey-Lawrence theory of male-to-female transsexualism debunked?</p>	<p>No scientific study has contradicted it; some lend support. Many MTF transsexuals don't believe the theories apply in their cases, though some do.</p>	<p>Perhaps MTFs who disagree could present themselves as counterexamples for research.</p> <p>No one questions the sincerity of MTF transsexuals who do not feel the theory fits them, nor does the theory mean they should suffer discrimination or mistreatment. Some who don't agree with the theory concede that not feeling it explains them may be consistent with the theory itself.</p> <p>One MTF who believes the theory has suggested that growing up with no modeling or theory to understand one's own sexual orientation may lead to rage and lashing out as part of a personality disorder. She further</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>suggests that some activist’s anger at Bailey may result from narcissistic rage. (The term narcissistic is used in the sense of a painful problem for the sufferer, not in the common sense of excess concern about physical appearance.)</p> <p>Many transsexuals understand their condition as being trapped in the wrong body, so disagree with the theory. One MTF researcher who disagrees with the theory feels she was not comfortable being viewed as a man (gender dysphoria) rather than being happy or aroused as a woman (gender euphoria); this is yet a different theory.</p>
<p>Wasn’t Bailey’s study based on only a few transsexual women?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Bailey’s book describes a few women to illustrate findings; but the research studies whose results Bailey described were done by others, with numerous subjects.</p> <p>It is not true that the people mentioned in Bailey’s book, under pseudonyms, were “research subjects”; although Bailey’s attackers frequently make that claim and say the “subjects” did not give informed consent to the research. In truth, these people were acquaintances who variously spoke to his classes and even initially helped promote his book before they were recruited to turn against him. They were not part of a scientific study, just Bailey acquaintances written about under different names to protect their anonymity. In addition, there is written evidence that the two (of six) women Bailey wrote about knew Bailey was including them in his book and actually gave permission.</p>
<p>What do Bailey’s detractors have to say about all this?</p>	<p>Plenty. A number of websites maintained by a small number of Bailey’s opponents are devoted to attacking any defender of Bailey, and even intimidating anyone, even transsexuals, who call for civil discourse.</p> <p>However, the activists declined to be interviewed by Professor Dreger when she studied what they had done.</p>	<p>For a sense of the attacks and innuendo, see many of the webpages devoted to convincing everyone what a monster and bad scientist Bailey is. They fool many people, and intimidate others. They lie about what Bailey has said and his standing as a researcher.</p> <p>In addition, for years Bailey’s opponents have edited the entry about him on wikipedia.org to present him in a highly unflattering light. Although anyone can edit most Wikipedia entries, they are supposed to present a neutral point of view — and tend to be corrected over time, except when “vandalized” repeatedly by someone with an agenda. Brief perusal of earlier versions reveals anti-Bailey sentences added to the entries about him:</p> <p>“However, his previous ‘research,’ heavily discredited and all but debunked within the scientific community, is now considered to be passé at best and a disgrace to the field of sexology at worst.”</p> <p><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>That biased and false statement appeared in the 13:57 12 July 2007 entry for Bailey after a number of edits by “Truthbetold17,” who never edited any Wikipedia entry except the one about Bailey.</p> <p>Another Wikipedia internet attack took this form:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">He has also made numerous claims that transsexual women are truly “men,” discounting the personal experiences of countless transsexual women. Shockingly, during the course of the investigation at Northwestern University, a former male-to-female transsexual research subject came forward and disclosed to university officials that Bailey had sex with her during the course of his studies. The incident was widely publicized in The Chronicle of Higher Education. This represents only one of the inherent flaws in the logical formulation of his theories, as well as his own personal hypocrisy and ethical violations as a researcher. In vernacular, he has come to be known as a “tranny chaser.” As with nearly all allegations against him, Bailey has refused to respond publicly to this issue. [From Bailey Wikipedia entry at and around 10 July 2007.]</p> <p>Alice Dreger’s paper convincingly explains that this was part of a pattern of intimidation and character assassination, threatening academic freedom in the age of the internet.</p>
<p>Didn’t the Chronicle of Higher Education investigate and report on Bailey?</p>	<p>Yes, with bad reporting.</p>	<p>Many press outlets reported charge after charge of misconduct by Bailey, but carried little in the way of independent investigation or follow-up. These reports of mere accusations, not proven wrongdoing, made Bailey look bad.</p> <p>Robin Wilson, a reporter for the Chronicle of Higher Education, had written in 2003 about a friendly night out with Bailey and a transsexual woman who disagreed with his theories. These women, mentioned in the book, were then speaking on the record to help Bailey promote his book. But two months later, reporting on accusations against Bailey by <i>two of the same women</i>, Wilson failed to mention that she had recently met and written about them: she reported only the serious accusation of sex with a research subject. Wilson reported the lurid charge without questioning why the accuser felt so differently just two months after promoting the book. Wilson refused to explain to Dreger on the record why she failed to use her own</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>knowledge of and about the accusers. Dreger concludes the reporting by Wilson was “strangely shallow—even critically incomplete....”</p> <p>The Chronicle’s reporting was further distorted by people involved in creating an “action alert” about Bailey for Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting (FAIR,) a left-of-center media watchdog group. The “action alert,” available at <a href="http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=2573">http://www.fair.org/index.php?page=2573</a> states</p> <p>“In suggesting that men who claim a bisexual sexual orientation are liars, the Times relies heavily on a single study whose senior researcher has a career marked by ethics controversies and eugenics proposals--facts that were not presented to readers. ...</p> <p>“The fact that a researcher has promoted the eugenic elimination of homosexuality would seem to be relevant background for gauging the credibility of his studies of bisexuality.... Bailey more recently came under fire for his 2003 book, <i>The Man Who Would Be Queen: The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism</i>, which defended the discredited theory that transsexual women are not female-gendered people born with male bodies, but <u>“are extremely feminine gay men or are sexual fetishists who are ‘erotically obsessed with the image of themselves as women.’”</u> [emphasis added] (Chronicle of Higher Education, 12/10/04)....The book shares remarkable similarities to Bailey’s new study on bisexuality: In both, the researcher denies people’s own evaluation of their identities, suggesting that bisexuals and transgender people are lying about who they are.”</p> <p>The above excerpt misrepresents: Bailey on bisexuality, the controversy over his book, the discrediting of the theory of autogynephilia, ethical controversies concerning Bailey, and his stand on eugenics. Also, it quotes the Chronicle in a way that suggests Bailey himself called MTF transsexuals “either extremely feminine gay men or sexual fetishists,” when the original article used those words not quoting Bailey:</p> <p>Rather, Mr. Bailey writes, they either are extremely feminine gay men or are sexual fetishists who are <u>“erotically obsessed with the image of themselves as women.”</u> [emphasis added]</p> <p>It appears that FAIR was manipulated to denounce Bailey. In our experience, journalists writing about Bailey have been misled by the FAIR action alert.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Isn't Bailey anti-gay?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>He is very gay-affirming, has many gay friends and colleagues and believes in civil and marriage rights. He is straight, and the innuendo about being a "tranny chaser" is untrue (not that there would be anything wrong with that.) He is comfortable around gay friends, students and colleagues.</p> <p>In a 1993 article, he wrote (with a co-author)"  "... consideration of the issues has led us to the conclusion that homosexual conduct harms only those who take offense at it, and that offense is taken on irrational and often inhumane grounds. We therefore believe that homosexuality is entitled to a strong presumption of moral and legal acceptability, a presumption not overcome by any argument or evidence of which we are aware."</p>
<p>Didn't Bailey have sex with a research subject?</p>	<p>No. One person he wrote about who was <u>not</u> a research subject claimed they had sex, but there was no proof.</p>	<p>In fact, there is e-mail evidence that Bailey was taking care of his children at home on the night the accuser stated they had sex. The accuser's story shifted when this alibi came to light.</p> <p>In any case, the accuser was not part of any scientific study or survey. She was an acquaintance, not a research subject. The allegations of sex arose only after Bailey's opponents somehow convinced the woman to file a complaint. As noted above, the woman and Bailey had been friendly for years; she spoke at his classes, and initially even helped promote his book.</p>
<p>Doesn't Bailey only try to confirm preconceptions and demeaning stereotypes?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Bailey is a research scientist who welcomes argument and contrary evidence and is interested in finding truths. He does think that <i>on average</i> gay men are different and more feminine, but calls for society and even LGBTQQ people to better embrace, accept and even celebrate such differences.</p>
<p>Doesn't Bailey support aborting babies who will be gay? Won't his research be used for Nazi-like persecution?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Bailey wrote a paper that was pro-choice and pro-research into biological causes of being gay. Around the time of the paper, there was talk of restricting research into gay genes because it might lead to selective abortion. Bailey wrote that it is fine to be gay, and parents should be educated and enlightened not to discriminate against or abort gay babies, but that as an ethical matter parents should have the right to choose not to have a child that would suffer discrimination.</p> <p>Some detractors have said it's better not to research sexual orientation if the results might be used to discriminate. But the problem there is not the research,</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>it's the discrimination— which Bailey is against. In fact, his groundbreaking work on sexual orientation of twins led to wider acceptance that being gay is partly genetic rather than a choice or environmental or psychological.</p> <p>Bailey spoke to LGBT students about the so-called “eugenics” paper, reportedly saying he was not anti-gay but pro-parental rights, and that he didn't see how selecting for straightness would harm a child. Someone from the audience alerted the Chicago Free Press, which decided to refuse to run ads for Bailey's studies and ran an anti-Bailey editorial. However, veteran journalist Jim D'Entremont investigate the matter and wrote in <i>The Guide</i>: “Bailey's critics follow the familiar patterns of ideologues seeking to discredit scientists whose findings they deem politically wrong.”</p>
<p>Didn't the Southern Poverty Law Center take Bailey to task?</p>	<p>Yes, but they were probably duped.</p>	<p>A number of anti-Bailey activists point to a 2003 Intelligence Report issued by the Southern Policy Law Center (SPLC.) However, the SPLC report was suggested and sourced by one of very same anti-Bailey activists who cite it (and who, along with another, is quoted,) rather than being independently researched and reported. It says that Bailey wrote about research subjects and people he was counseling without their consent, a claim Dreger shows is false. It likens gender stereotypes to racial stereotypes, and quotes a former friend of Bailey whom activists convinced to file charges against him saying “At the beginning of the last century, blacks were expendable human beings to be experimented on without their knowledge.... For Bailey and his allies, we transsexuals are just their guinea pigs.” Simply put, the report is biased and inaccurate, and certainly not independently investigated. It is not a reliable account, but an embarrassment to SPLC.</p>
<p>Will Bailey's research lead to discrimination and preventing trans people from getting sex reassignment surgery they desperately want?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>Bailey has written letters in support of individuals getting sex reassignment surgery. He has stated that even if the Blanchard-Bailey-Lawrence theory explains all MTF transsexualism, that does not mean that MTFs will be better off without surgery, and in many cases they will be better off transitioning.</p> <p>What has infuriated some people is the idea that counseling MTF people is a good idea before surgery, and for some maybe surgery may not be necessary. In theory, a gay man attracted to straight men might learn to be attracted to other gay men, and not need surgery. And a man aroused by the idea or image of himself becoming or being a woman might learn to celebrate</p> <p><i>(continued on next page...)</i></p>



		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>that orientation through fantasy and dress instead of surgery. Society might become more aware and accepting of it too. These might be reasons for some MTFs not to have surgery, even if they start out thinking that transitioning is the only way to be happy.</p> <p>However, some transsexuals think any rationale for delaying or depriving them of sex reassignment surgery is a form of oppression and discrimination, and desperately want surgery to be who they really are. Researchers like Ray Blanchard have written thoughtfully about this, although some detractors maintain a completely hostile view of his work. See Blanchard arguing for sex reassignment surgery in <a href="http://www.autogynephilia.org/psychiatry_rounds.pdf">http:// www.autogynephilia.org/psychiatry_rounds.pdf</a></p>
<p>How can Bailey, who is not transsexual himself, write about transsexuals?</p>	<p>Come on.</p>	<p>People write about things they study but are not all the time. Men write about women, and women write about men. Researchers write about subjects who are different, and about animals and rocks and atomic particles. Healthy doctors write about patients with diseases. The sick may write about the well.</p> <p>The narratives and identities of MTF transsexuals are valid and important. So is reducing any stigma if the other theories are correct.</p> <p>Why do so many transsexual people reject the theory? Blanchard found that rejecting being [autogynephilic] was correlated with desire to exaggerate their own moral excellence and to present a socially desirable facade on the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale.</p>
<p>Wasn't Bailey investigated and demoted?</p>	<p>Yes and No.</p>	<p>A small group of transsexual activists found people who had been friendly to Bailey and convinced them to file formal complaints against him at his university. As mentioned earlier, one of the accusers had actually helped promote Bailey's book before she was recruited to complain about being portrayed in it (under a different name.) The results of the investigation are confidential. No public action was taken.</p> <p>Bailey had been chair of the Psychology Department, but left that position before the investigation was finished. There is no evidence that stepping down was related to the complaints, which are exhaustively researched and debunked in Alice Dreger's peer-reviewed published research.</p> <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p>

		<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>Bailey’s peer-reviewed description of the episode is:</p> <p>“Beyond denying the role of autogynephilia in MtF transsexualism, some transsexual activists have mounted attacks on those who publicly disagree with them. In 2003, [Bailey] published a book, ‘The Man Who Would Be Queen,’ about male femininity, including MtF transsexualism. The section on transsexualism included summaries of Blanchard’s theory illustrated by transsexual women of both types whom he had met, and who agreed to let their stories be included. Upon publication, there was a firestorm of controversy among some MtF transsexuals. Most notably, the transsexual activists [‘C’] (2006) and [‘J’] (2006) led an internet ‘investigation’ into the publication of the book. [C] (2004) likened the book to ‘Nazi propaganda’ and said that it was ‘transsexual women’s worst nightmare.’</p> <p>“As a result of [C’s] and [J’s] efforts, a number of very public academic, personal, and professional accusations were made against [Bailey]. None of these accusations was true (Bailey 2005). (For an historical investigation into the controversy surrounding <i>The Man Who Would Be Queen</i>, including a description of the substance and the merits of the accusations, see Dreger 2007.) The attacks on <i>The Man Who Would Be Queen</i> were precisely an attempt to punish the author for writing approvingly about Blanchard’s ideas, and to intimidate others from doing so.</p> <p>“The second author was also attacked by some of the same transsexuals after she helped create the Website <i>transkids.us</i>. This website was created by a group of homosexual transsexuals, or ‘transkids,’ their nonclinical name for themselves, to educate the clinical and research communities in the wake of the controversy regarding <i>The Man Who Would Be Queen</i>. The writings on the site both endorsed Blanchard’s distinction between homosexual and autogynephilic MtF transsexuals and criticized the standard feminine essence narrative as being both false and harmful to homosexual MtF transsexuals. Subsequently, [J] (2007) conducted highly personal attacks on individual transkids (including the second author), urging that these transkids be exposed and asserting that they were ‘fakes’ because they would not reveal their identities publicly.</p>
--	--	---

<p>What were the specific comments on and critiques of Dreger's article about the Bailey controversy?</p>	<p>To grossly oversimplify: some people explain things by data and science, some by narrative, and these groups may violently disagree what's true (Jonathan M. Adler); sensitivity is needed not to disturb, stigmatize or offend—in order that scientific messages can be heard; scientists should clearly separate belief from data; and there is much we don't understand (John Bancroft); not felt balanced or factual, not respectful, transphobic hate speech and other anti-Bailey points mentioned here (Ben A. Barres)(writing as a transperson); Dreger is wrong, the book is transphobic, it stereotypes, and transsexualism is about life much more than sex (Talia May Bettcher); there is no single “femine essence theory” (Ray Blanchard); it's more complicated than both Bailey and his opponents write about it; Dreger left out the historical context; and Dreger should have said how Bailey's opponents hurt the trans community (Antonia Caretto); Dreger should have criticized Bailey's book instead of the tactics of his opponents (Nicholas L. Clarkson)(writing as a transperson); people on both sides will “spin” what's written about the controversy for their own purposes, and truth in science is often unstable especially in a cutting edge field like sex and gender (John H. Gagnon); attacks on Bailey reduce academic freedom and research and reduce study of minorities (Brian A. Gladue); attacks indirectly compared to McCarthyism (Richard Green); Dreger “ignores the social circumstances of science, politics, and identity that enable understanding of the deep anger that [the book] provoked” (Riki Lane); much of the MtF transsexual campaign against Bailey can be understood as a manifestation of narcissistic rage (Anne A. Lawrence)(writing as a transperson); book was a failure, didn't describe the trans experience and “We certainly do not need any more ‘science’ or ‘research’ in this area like that published by Bailey...” And the research “blam[es] a vulnerable, oppressed, and stigmatized sexual minority group.” (Robin M. Mathy)(writing as a transperson); being trans is a free human choice, not a sexual pathology; autogynephiles are classified with pedophiles and animal lovers; I didn't work to ruin Bailey; Bailey's theories will result in “more dead queers”; I did answer Dreger's questions (Deirdre McCloskey)(writing as a transperson); Dreger “seems open-minded and fair”; Bailey underestimates the importance of identity; Bailey could have mentioned other theories; transsexuals are suspicious of medical and scientific establishment (Marta Meana); Dreger should have said how the sides should get along; Bailey is not anti-trans; it is understandable that the theory angers transsexuals even if it is right, which the author does not believe (Charles Moser); Dreger “ignores the history of queer activism and its relationship to psychiatry” and ignores the work of many who disagree with Bailey (Margaret Nichols); Bailey's opponents used the liberal media in their attacks; it was political not scientific controversy; sex researchers are vulnerable (Bruce Rind); they did try to ruin Bailey with trumped up charges, and they are trying to discredit and suppress the theory without scientific evidence to the contrary (Seth Roberts); Bailey's book was good about many things besides the theory (Amir Rosenmann and Marilyn P. Safir); Dreger did not provide an “adequate examination of transsexual women's realities and perspectives on the issue” and insensitive to the ways transsexuals have been “historically and institutionally marginalized in society and within psychology” (Julia Serano)(writing as a transperson); Dreger was a bit biased, and “psycho- medical oppression has sparked fear and distrust among transsexuals”; Bailey should have included the narratives of the people who disagree with the theory (Elori J. Windsor); Dreger too readily accepts the theory without discussing alternate ideas; transsexuals are branded unwell for “who they are” unlike any other minority; transsexuals need to “stop seeing any psychological research as inherently attempts to control and undermine personal experiences; clinicians need to remove transsexualism from the list of disorders (Madeline H. Wyndzen)(writing as a transperson); and finally Dreger responded to these comments, notably mentioning that no one had or could prove her facts were wrong, sympathizing with the problems transsexuals face and reiterating that it was only a few who campaigned virulently against Bailey so she hoped that Lawrence's suggestion of narcissistic rage would not further pathologize the majority of transsexuals (Alice Dreger).</p>
---	--

Do you really believe the autogynephilia theory? Isn't it dangerous?

We have not reviewed the scientific literature, so we express no opinion. Even if it is true, we do not think there's anything stigmatic about an orientation where one is aroused by the idea of being a woman. Many women are probably aroused by (feel sexy from) the attractiveness of their womanhood, and many men are probably aroused by (feel sexy from) the attractiveness of their manhood. Based on that, it seems plausible that a man could be aroused by women and also the idea of his own attractiveness as a woman, or being a woman. This explanation seems simpler than being born in a body of the wrong sex (sometimes referred to as the "feminine essence narrative.")

In addition, many people have found the theory helpful and liberating—as if they finally have an understanding of what makes them tick, and that they are not alone. (Some of these have been intimidated into silence, however.) For a sense of experiences of men who identify as autogynephilic, see <http://autogynephiliac.blogspot.com> and <http://www.annelawrence.com/twr/28narratives.html>.

(Research on whether transsexuals' brains are physically different from non-transsexuals' brains is probably inconclusive. Some transsexuals have seized on work by Zhou et al. and Kruijver et al. on a part of the brain called BSTc as proof transsexuals' brains are different, but others question whether the effects are random and/or stem from hormone therapy. See [http://www.annelawrence.com/twr/brain-sex\\_critique.html](http://www.annelawrence.com/twr/brain-sex_critique.html).) (Notably, many people who doubt bisexuality in men also seized on the Rieger et al., paper; but Professor Bailey—sometimes alleged to believe bisexual men are "liars"—was not at all hesitant to declare a finding of bisexuality when *very* preliminary fMRI evidence was collected. This suggests that as soon as Bailey and other researchers see non-subjective data suggesting that (a) all MTF transsexuals have similar brains that are different from other brains, or that (b) MTF transsexuals' brains exhibit characteristics typically found in female brains, that they may be pleasantly surprised to accept that their old beliefs need updating.)

(Interestingly, new research by Carillo et al. (2010) published in *Psychoneuroendocrinology* found that brain scans of MTF transsexuals who were always attracted to men showed lower activation in the superior parietal lobe than did straight men control participants when performing three-dimensional mental rotation tasks. Compared to straight female control participants, these MTF transsexuals also showed higher activation in orbital and right dorsolateral prefrontal regions and lower activation in the left gyrus during these tasks. This suggests a different brain "wiring" for spatial processing in MTF transsexuals who were always attracted to men ("homosexual transsexuals" in Blanchard's terminology.)

(In addition, very recent research published by Gómez-Gil et al. (2010) indicates that MTF transsexuals who were always attracted to men had significantly more older brothers than other FTM transsexuals. This echoes Blanchard's finding that gay men tend to have more older brothers, i.e. later order of birth for males is correlated with more likelihood of being gay. Blanchard has suggested this birth order effect may be a result of maternal immune response(s) to male antigens that gets stronger the more sons a mother bears, and that the immune response somehow affects the later sons, leading to higher rates of being gay. Gomez-Gil did not find a birth order effect in the non-homosexual MTF transsexuals, suggesting that they are indeed somehow different. Blanchard recently commented on the study: "Gómez-Gil et al. (in press) confirmed previous findings that, within the heterogeneous population of male-to-female transsexuals, it is that subgroup who is exclusively attracted sexually to other males who has the greater average number of older brothers. This suggests that homosexual orientations in males have the same origins, whether the individual thinks of himself as a gay man or as a 'heterosexual woman' who happens to be 'trapped in a man's body.'")

*(continued on next page)*

	<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>(Research just published by Nuttbrock et al. (2010) seems to confirm Blanchard’s 1985 finding of a difference between the levels of transvestic fetishism (“TF”)—nothing wrong with that, by the way—between MTF transsexuals who were always attracted to men and others. As pointed out by Lawrence (2010), Nuttbrock’s data indicate homosexual transsexuals’ lifetime TF prevalence is under 25%, while the TF of non-homosexual MTF transsexuals is much higher, ranging from about 60-90%, depending on whether they are straight, bi or asexual. This suggests there are at least two groups of MTF transsexuals, and that being gay is a feature that makes one group different.)</p> <p>Interestingly, in at least one country where being gay is forbidden—Iran—sex reassignment surgery is viewed as a solution to avoid being gay: one is attracted to the same sex as before, but now is himself or herself of the opposite sex.</p> <p>Finally, whether there is only one type or only two types of MtF transsexuals may be questioned: perhaps there are three or more kinds, which further research may show. Perhaps further research will definitively detect similarities between MtF transsexuals’ brains and women’s brains (and see the description of the Carillo et al. (2010) article above, which suggests there are processing differences.) Maybe something else if going on, entirely. If the theory is overly simplistic, let’s conduct more research and discover more nuance. We need more research.</p> <p>The point is, we probably shouldn’t be afraid of research, truth, theory or disagreement. Some gay men are more masculine than most straight men, and some are more feminine. Some lesbians are more masculine than the average woman, and some are more feminine. Some people have unusual but harmless sexual interests, and some suffer distress because of unusual sexual interests. We do not know enough, and probably never will. But there’s a good argument for embracing diversity, advancing knowledge and fighting conditions that discriminate or drive people to hide, sometimes even from themselves, who they truly are.</p> <p>A number of transsexuals opposed to Bailey have suffered terrible discrimination or even violence in the past. Some believe that Bailey’s theories may further marginalize them, leading to more discrimination and violence. Some transsexuals believe that the theory itself is a part of the intolerance they face. Some transsexuals have argued that support for the “two types” theory will lead to “more dead queers.” It is not clear how a scientific theory can have this result or influence people to commit more bad acts, or that a theory about being born in the wrong body is less stigmatizing than Blanchard’s autogynephilia theory. The problem to work on is the stigma, not the theory.</p> <p>To paraphrase the bard, “There is more in heaven and earth than is dreamt of in your philosophy.”</p>
<p>Why did you prepare this long-winded document? Why are you defending someone whom some transsexuals abhor?</p>	<p>Some of us who disagreed with the results of the 2005 study about bisexual men were initially fooled by the large volume of anti-Bailey information on the internet. Some of us now resent being fooled.</p> <p>Some of us have since met Bailey; and although we don’t agree with him about everything, we have a sense about what Bailey stands for—and it is not what his detractors assert. He has not publicly defended himself, but he deserves fairness.</p> <p>A charity group that some of us work with funded one of Bailey’s current studies. Specifically, Bailey is investigating fMRI responses of bisexual, straight and gay men. Bailey’s detractors, and people who have read what they wrote, encouraged the group to use someone else—anyone but Bailey. However, based on knowing what Bailey really</p> <p><i>(continued on next page)</i></p>

	<p><i>(continued from previous page)</i></p> <p>stands for, and more importantly the fact that his lab’s previous research was at the forefront for understanding neural correlates of sexual orientation, the group decided to support Bailey’s research into bisexuality. Already, that research has convinced Bailey—thought to be the enemy of the bisexual community—that measurable bisexuality, independent of self-report, exists in men.</p> <p>However, people still criticize Bailey and the funding group for working with him. Some members of the funding group have tired of explaining repeatedly that (a) Bailey is not discredited or a bad researcher, (b) we have considered all the arguments against him and understand them better than his critics do and (c) we know what we are talking about. This required writing in great detail, so much so that no one would read all of it.</p> <p>That is why we offered this document in a format mostly of Question, Short Answer that people will read, and longer Detailed Answers in case people don’t believe the short version.</p> <p>Bailey’s opponents have labeled Dreger’s research an “apologia,” “sloppy, vindictive nonsense,” “a frenzied tome of rationalized justifications,” “a propaganda tool in defense of editorial board members,” “contain[ing] over-the-top attacks on Bailey’s critics,” a “hit-piece,” a “revisionist history,” and “a one-sided hatchet job.” (Ironically, one of them at the same time cites it, misleadingly, for the oft-repeated assertion that Bailey’s book is “not science,” without saying that Dreger says the book is <i>about</i> science and written for a popular audience, not itself a report of new scientific research.)</p> <p>We are hoping that Bailey’s opponents will be civil to us. We accept that some of them experience themselves as women trapped in men’s bodies. We will consider adding additional facts to this document, see below. We have not previously spoken publicly about our independent conclusions about Bailey. Now that the bi male brain video from the Safron et al. protocol is at <a href="http://www.bibrain.org">http://www.bibrain.org</a>, we anticipate many more waves questions along the lines of “Why the hell are you working with Bailey?” and “Don’t you know the truth about him?” We release this document in order to demonstrate (a), (b) and (c) above: (a) Bailey is not discredited or a bad researcher, (b) we have considered all the arguments against him and understand them better than his critics do and (c) we know what we are talking about.</p>
<p>You got something wrong, will you fix it?</p>	<p>We will gladly consider submissions for improvement to this piece. By submitting, you agree that we own the right to use, adapt, edit, modify, reproduce, distribute, perform and sublicense what you submit, in whole or part, for any purposes whatsoever, throughout the world in and on videotape, film, photographs, quotations, broadcast, cablecast, internet, CD-ROM, print and any other medium or method now known or later developed.</p> <p>We will give special consideration to factual corrections and clarifications, as opposed to opinion and rant. You also agree to send only material you have the right to send, e.g. your original material. You may e-mail suggestions to <a href="mailto:aib@bisexual.org">aib@bisexual.org</a>. Thank you for reading all the way to the end.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Copyright © 2012 AIB and its licensor(s). All rights reserved. Version 2.0 (2012-02-16)</p>