

Exposing Scientific Misconduct

For thousands of years, Jews and Christians regarded those who practiced homosexuality as severely deficient in character and morally tainted. While no one — including homosexuals — always does wrong, those of the Jewish-Christian philosophy regarded the so-called “sodomites” as fundamentally deficient — belonging to that class of people the Bible calls ‘the wicked.’ So deep was their sin that sodomites could not be trusted to be honest or reliable

in other areas of their lives.

No one, of course, always lies; still, the testimony of those who engaged in sodomy was regarded as inherently suspect. Likewise, while no one is always dishonest, their honesty was held in question. The same moral taint also applied to those who practiced other sexually deviant acts, such as sadomasochism or bestiality.

Until recently, societies heavily influenced by Judaism or Christianity adopted these

assumptions. Literary works by the Marquis de Sade and Walt Whitman were held under a cloud as a consequence of their deviant behaviors. On the scientific front, Havelock Ellis (1859-1939) — the pioneering English sexologist who popularized sexology (e.g., *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*) — at one point wrote an apology for homosexuality and other sexual deviations. But even though he was ostensibly a “scientist,”

continued on page 2

Lesbians Make Inferior Parents

Last month, psychologist Peggy Drexler of Stanford University’s Institute for Research on Women and Gender wrote a widely disseminated column extolling the ways boys can benefit from having lesbian parents. Originally published in the *Los Angeles Times*, it was reprinted throughout the U.S. press in late August and appeared in *Newsday* on August 23rd.

As is common of homosexual apologists, Drexler’s ‘facts’ are bogus. Drexler never reveals how many couples are in her study sample, but she does assert that: “in my sampling of the more than 1 million lesbian couples who are mothers to sons, I found these women working to honor and encourage their sons’ masculinity.”

Some ‘fact.’ In mid-2001, the U.S. Census reported just under 600,000 live-together homosexual couples in the US — about half of whom were female. The 1996 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse estimated that about 400,000 of the nation’s 1.7 million noninstitutionalized homosexual practitioners live with their minor children. Yet, over 60% of these

homosexual parents were married — not divorced, never married, or separated. Very few of these married individuals could actually be living as gay or lesbian couples.

Given these figures, the number of lesbian couples raising children probably cannot exceed a quarter of a million. And, given that many parents (perhaps 25%) have only one child and that about half of all children are girls, the number of lesbian couples who are raising boys must be even less. Indeed, not all lesbians are in couples, and most studies suggest that at best a third of lesbian couples are even raising children at all. So it would appear highly unlikely that there are even as many as 100,000 lesbian couples currently raising any sons.

Bottom line: on her one ‘fact’ about the homosexual population, Drexler looks to be at least 90% wrong.

There is no reason to trust Drexler’s other implied ‘facts,’ either — particularly her implied claims that lesbian couples spend “more time with their children overall than married heterosexual parents” and that boys reared by lesbians turn out as masculine as

those raised with a father.

The largest comparative sample of married couples, cohabiting heterosexual couples, and gay couples/lesbian couples who were all raising children was reported in Australia in 1996.¹ The 58 children from each kind of couple were matched by age, sex, year in school, and various parental characteristics. Although not enormous, this investigation was far and away the largest matched study of the children of homosexual couples ever assembled.

Outcome? The children’s teachers reported that the homosexuals’ children did the least well academically, the least well socially, were more apt to exhibit gender confusion, and received the lowest amount of parental attention. The Australian study suggests that Drexler was as wrong about the benign effects of being raised by lesbians as she was about the number of lesbian couples raising boys.

References:

1. Sarantakos, S. Children in three contexts: family, education, & social development. *Children Australia*, 1996, 21:23-31.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE...

- No Dad = Gay Son??
- Misleading AIDS Data
- The Homosexual “Age”



A tantalizing mix of recent headlines

] Boston: On July 19, the Boston area Boy Scout councils adopted a ‘don’t ask, don’t tell’ policy that will allow homosexuals to be scout leaders (*Omaha World Herald* 8/1/01). The Boy Scouts is collapsing. And all because its leadership refuses to confront the twin facts that homosexual scout leaders are much more apt to molest scouts and that homosexuals have poorer character than heterosexuals. Indeed, how can an organization — dedicated to teaching character — employ those of deficient character and expect to succeed?

] Louisville, KY: The chief policy making body of the mainline 2.6 million member Protestant Presbyterian Church USA recommended lifting a ban on ordaining clergy who engage in homosexuality (*Omaha World Herald* 6/16/01). A number of Presbyterian USA churches have reacted by joining a “Confessing Church Movement” that may split from the main body. Over 500 congregations have joined (*Omaha World Herald* 6/30/01). Unfortunately, a May phone poll by Barna reported that 48% of adults said that homosexual relations between adults should be legal, while 42% said they should not. 66% of ‘born again’ Christians, 64% of non-mainline Protestants, 44% of mainline Protestants, 38% of Catholics, 27% of non-Christians, and 20% of atheists considered homosexuality to be an unacceptable lifestyle. (*Christian News* 7/30/01)

Misconduct from page 1

Ellis' writings were still considered suspect. Why? Because Ellis married a lesbian, probably did not consummate his marriage, and may not have had conventional sexual relationships with anyone at any time. He was also given to a number of rather bizarre sexual practices — his biggest sexual thrill was watching women urinate, for instance. Indeed, a British judge barred publication of his first sexological book, Ellis' "scientific" apology for homosexuality, because it was, he said, "a pretense, adopted for the purpose of selling a filthy publication."

Alfred Kinsey (1894-1956) was well aware of this attitude. Since he also engaged in homosexuality, he made sure that that fact was not known either before or after the publication of his two books on sexuality in 1948 and 1953 or before his death. Indeed, only in the past few years has it become widely known that Kinsey was a homosexual practitioner. Had it been known at the outset, it is likely that the Kinsey reports would have garnered much, much less popular attention. They would also have been held in even lower regard by the academic community than they were at the time they were published. As it was, although they attracted attention, few scholars initially credited Kinsey's books with much scientific merit.

Times have changed. Today, many scientists who engage in homosexuality are quite open about it. In the field of sexology, a large fraction of the professionals are homosexuals. Not all of these professionals are "out" about their personal sexual activities, but you can often detect 'where they are coming from' by closely studying their writings. In any case, part of the spillover of the sexual revolution into science is that homosexual professionals are now associated with

much less suspicion and distrust.

In the field of study of homosexual parenting, probably most of the professionals who have published are themselves homosexual. Indeed, a substantial part of the literature is housed in the *Journal of Homosexuality*. And the 'condition' of being a transsexual (e.g., a man 'trapped' in the body of a woman) is dominated by professionals who participate in homosexuality. And even if these professionals don't, they are dyed-in-the-wool sexual liberals or libertines.

Which brings us to Richard Green and his colleagues. Dr. Green currently shepherds people through their sex change operations at Charring Cross Hospital in London, England. Apparently, they are doing about two a month right now. Green, with a post at Cambridge University, has been a dogged supporter of gay rights, and is responsible for one of the most oft-cited studies about how children turn out when one of their parents is homosexual. This study by Green has been used by just about all the liberal organizations to 'prove' that the homosexuality of parents is irrelevant. So argues the American Psychological Association (APA), so argues the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), etc., etc. In turn, the major legal associations — leaning on the expertise of the APA and NASW — have cited the Green, et al. study as 'proving' that homosexual parenting is essentially no different from heterosexual parenting.

In 1997, FRI scientists documented several problems with both the Green study and how it has been interpreted (see, for instance, our article "Did the APA misrepresent the scientific literature to counts in support of homosexual custody?" *Journal of Psychology*, 131:313-332). But now FRI has gone further. It

turns out that Green's much heralded and cited study was published not only in its 'final form' in 1986, but was also partially published three other times in the early 1980s.

FRI scientists carefully examined these reports. And we found something very interesting — the 'facts' described in these reports were different! That is, in instance after instance, the material reported in one publication could not be reconciled with the same material reported in another publication, even though all the information was supposedly gotten from the same sample!

We, of course, don't know what motivated Green's research team. Perhaps they 'made up' the data, or perhaps they made up part of the data. Maybe they kept absolutely miserable records. Since Green was the editor of the journal in which the article appeared,

But whatever these investigators did, since a federal grant was involved, they did it at U.S. taxpayer expense

maybe he and they thought they could 'game' the system. Indeed, by calling the unmatched homosexual and heterosexual samples "matched", it would seem that they were playing a joke on the gullible scientific public. But whatever these investigators did, since a federal grant was involved, they did it at U.S. taxpayer expense.

By any standard, the Green, et al. effort was one of the most contradictory and confusing 'famous' scientific studies ever performed. Clearly some degree of scientific sloppiness and/or misconduct was involved. Because the study itself is so important and its utility to the gay rights side has been so great, pointing out these problems raises a number of questions anew. To wit, should the reports of homosexual scientists automatically be trusted? After all, a number of the authors of

the Green study were homosexual. Further, should those who are staunchly pro-gay be automatically regarded as reliable?

Green himself figures to be in some trouble. At the very least he mismanaged a study paid for by the government. Green is also one of the most influential sexologists in the world. Might he join John Money in some degree of disgrace? Money was, after all, recently embarrassed by the revelation that he was not entirely candid about what he claimed was a good outcome after surgically turning a boy into a girl. And different editors of British journals have indicated to FRI that they will 'put the heat on Green' as soon as the facts of the misconduct are published.

The facts FRI has uncovered are going to be published in a refereed scientific journal within just a few weeks! So the fat is finally going to 'hit the fire.'

Time will tell if Green — and those who worked with him on this bit of flotsam — will have to 'stand trial' before the court of scientific opinion. If so, they will have to answer a number of highly embarrassing questions. Kinsey died and was rotting for 40 years before his 'homosexual secret' came out. We don't know whether Green is just ultra liberal or something else. But unless he dies right quickly, he may have to defend himself — and so will his co-authors.

If, as is possible, the Green team did their study, but then 'added and subtracted data' as suited their purposes, some sorting out will be in order. FRI intends to launch a complaint to the inspector general of the National Institutes of Health. That will happen as soon as the article sees print. And maybe, just maybe, there might be some newspapers, magazines, and/or TV producers interested in reporting on this 'different kind of sex scandal.' FRI will keep you posted.

No Dad = Homosexual Son??

Psychiatry, particularly that wing influenced by Freudian thinking, has strenuously argued that the relationship with parents — particularly the same sex parent — strongly determines whether or not a child becomes homosexual. If the son has an absent or distant father in his early childhood — or a father who is rejecting — the son is at risk of developing homosexual tendencies. So claim the Freudians and so claim many ministries to gays, be they religious (e.g., Exodus) or secular.

Interestingly, new findings from a U.S. government sex survey provide a kind of test of this Freudian-based theory. In the 1996 National Study of Household Drug Abuse (NSHDA) — which FRI researchers have re-analyzed — over 3,000 blacks were compared with more than 9,000 whites on a series of questions, including two bearing on the issue of what ‘causes’ homosexuality. First, respondents were asked if they had ever been married and had children. Then they were asked if they had engaged in homosexuality in the past year.

The NSHDA investigation demonstrated what every study has shown — the black family is in shambles. Around 70% of all black children in the U.S. are born out of wedlock. And although blacks have at least as much sex as whites, much less of that sex is within marriage. Overall, 55% of black adults 18 to 59 years of age v. 23% of white adults have never been married. Since blacks and whites have about the same number of children per capita, many, many more black children neither know who their father is nor live with him as compared to white children. In other words, for black children, an absent father is the norm.

So what would Freudians predict regarding homosexuality among blacks and whites? Since the father is absent or gone for so very many black children and for so much of their children’s lives, blacks should have a much higher rate of

homosexuality. But do they?

For blacks in general, 1.3% reported having engaged in homosexuality in the past 12 months versus 1.1% of whites who made the same claim. This difference is not statistically significant. That is, it is not a ‘real difference’ from a sampling standpoint. For black men, 1.4% reported having engaged in homosexuality compared to 1.1% of white men. Again, the difference is not statistically significant. And for black women, 1.2% reported having engaged in homosexuality in the past year versus 1.1% of white women. The difference is again — not statistically significant.

So for participation in homosexuality, there appear to be no statistically reliable differences between blacks and whites. And this from the largest randomly drawn sample of individuals ever asked these questions. While no one study “proves” anything beyond any doubt, and while black participation in homosexuality was slightly higher than that for whites, it is rather unlikely that the true difference is any greater than that: very slight.

What does this say about that theory of Freudian psychiatry which posits that a child’s relationship with his same-sex parent is determinative? According to theory, boys of black mothers ought to be especially susceptible to homosexuality. Yet the difference between blacks and whites is almost nonexistent.

The ‘truth’ that psychiatrists claim to have ‘discovered’ about homosexuality is — at best — a very marginal truth. To accept it as the cause of homosexuality in general just doesn’t make sense.

Clinical psychologists and psychiatrists see as patients only a small subset of those who practice homosexuality. Further, these clinicians know only what their clients tell them. If you assemble such clinical information and try to make sense of it, perhaps you might arrive at the Freudian theory of homosexuality. But as the NSHDA survey’s outcomes

More Misleading AIDS Data

On August 14, according to the Wall Street Journal, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) made another announcement about the AIDS epidemic. According to the CDC, the number of new patients with AIDS has fairly stabilized at about 40,000 new cases per year. Despite this, Dr. Helene Gayle, who heads the CDC’s prevention program for AIDS, was quoted as saying that “the chances of [future trends] going in the wrong direction are higher than for going in the right direction.” All this because a six-city study suggested that young adult gays are infecting each other at a rate of about 4.4% per year. The Journal also reported that “42% of new AIDS cases occur among gay or bisexual men; 33% are reported by heterosexuals and 25% by injectable-drug users.”

Because the newest HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report hit the streets on August 11, we can compare what the Journal reported with the data actually

released by the CDC. In 2000, almost 42,000 new cases of AIDS were reported. So the first figure is OK.

But the rest are off the mark.

Were 42% of new AIDS cases among gays? Not really. First consider what we actually know. Of the 31,561 new AIDS cases among men, the ‘cause’ was unknown in 7,683. So a cause was only known for 23,878 of the male cases. Of these, 59% were among gays. In addition, 25% were among IV drug users and 6% were among gays who shoot drugs. So 65% of all new, known cases among men were among gays.

Of the 6,731 new cases among women where a ‘cause’ was reported, 59% were due to sex with men — usually men who also had sex with other men or who shot drugs. So for the 30,609 new cases whose cause is established, 44% were among gays and an additional 5% among gays who shoot drugs. Thus gays contributed

continued on page 4

suggest, if the Freudians are on to ‘something,’ it is a very small something. The information available from ‘the psychiatrist’s couch’ is simply too limited to adequately explain the origins of homosexuality.

So on this count, Freudian psychiatric theory ‘bombed out.’ And make no mistake about it: this is the largest random sample of blacks and whites that has ever been asked about homosexuality. This study provides the ‘best answer to date.’ And the answer? The best bet is that there is no difference in homosexual participation between blacks and whites. And another good bet is that there is very little validity, if any, to the Freudian notion about what causes homosexuality. This is yet another powerful bit of evidence that it is highly risky to generalize from ‘clients on the couch’ to people in general. It is also a powerful set of evidence that the psychiatric notion about what

causes homosexuality has little empirical support.

FAMILY RESEARCH REPORT

Family Research Report critically examines empirical data on families, sexual social policy, AIDS, drug addiction, and homosexuality, digging behind the ‘headlines’ and breaking new scientific ground.

FRR is published 8 times/year by the Family Research Institute.

Dr. Paul Cameron, Publisher
Dr. Kirk Cameron, Editor
Subscriptions: \$25/yr (\$40 foreign)

©2001 Family Research Institute
P.O. Box 62640
Colorado Springs, CO 80962-2640
(303) 681-3113

www.familyresearchinst.org

Cameron's Corner

The "Age" of Homosexuality

The August 14 edition of the Advocate — one of the largest magazines catering to gays and lesbians — underscores a great truth.

The major article of this issue? "Innovation through the ages." And just what is an 'age' for homosexuals? A clue is provided by the span of events. The first event is listed as occurring in 1896 — celebrating a book by Edward Carpenter "which suggests that homosexuals are potentially superior to other people." 1896. It rather looks as though Carpenter is given the credit for starting the whole movement off. And this way back in history — all of 105 years ago! What better evidence that "being a homosexual" or "having a homosexual identity" is only about a hundred years old?

The next event the Advocate listed happened in 1897, when Magnus Hirschfeld founded the "Scientific-Humanitarian Committee" to end the legal "persecution of homosexuals." The sixth event is in 1924 when "Henry Gerber forms the Society for Human Rights, the first homosexual advocacy group in the United States, in Chicago." Notice the emotional appeals of these groups. Albert Einstein signed up in support of Hirschfeld's group, and "human rights" has rather a nice ring to it. Who would ever guess that all that these earnest people wanted was to sodomize one another... and of course, to get taxpayers to foot their bills via government funding and support.

The 12th event in "Innovation through the ages" is the publication of Alfred Kinsey's first book in 1948. The 13th, the founding of the Mattachine Society, by communist Harry Hay, "dedicated to service and welfare for lesbians and gay men" in 1950. The 17th event is the U.S. Supreme Courts' decision in 1953 that homosexual pictorial magazines were not "obscene."

In 1981, we reach the 61st event, when "Keith Haring begins sketching his artwork on unused ad boards in New York City subway stations. Within a few years he is heralded as one of the leading young artists of his time." In other words, he created graffiti. As his 'reward,' Haring died of AIDS in 1990.

Four pages and many events later we get to the last listed event: "2000: The state of Vermont passes a civil unions law — the first of its kind in the nation — which legally recognizes gay and lesbian relationships and grants them every state-sanctioned privilege that married couples enjoy, except a marriage certificate."

Where is this all leading? To freedom, of course. What kind of freedom? In another section of the Advocate "Patrick Califia-Rice,... the best known lesbian, feminist, S/M activist, and erotica author" to transition from female to male "is learning about being a father" since 19 months ago, "his partner, Matt (who is also a female-to-male transsexual), gave birth to their son, Blake."

Pity the child. His "mother" is also one of his "fathers" — and neither one was born male! Can't you see it all now — appearances on various TV shock shows and calls to 'educate all children' about the 'wonderful world of diversity.' And who knows, one or both of the 'fathers' may want to 'go back' to being a woman. The child could wind up having a most interesting history: born with a 'mother and father,' then living with two 'fathers,' and (who knows) finally ending up with two 'mothers.' Why in the name of 'sexual freedom' is this little boy's life being sacrificed on the altar of 'weirdness' and depravity?

At one end, men who have sex with men accounted for 53% of new HIV infections in 2000. Toward the other end, men who have sex with men accounted for 49% of all new AIDS cases in the same year. This 'educational success,' if repeated throughout the classrooms of America, would reduce the populace to abysmal ignorance.

But perhaps AIDS education is 'saving young people.' Really?

- In 2000, there were 342 AIDS cases diagnosed among those 13-19 years of age. Of these 342, the cause was known for 178. 32% of these were among boys who had sex with men and 8% were among girls who had sex with men.
- Of the 55 new HIV infection cases in 2000 among those aged 13-19, the cause was known in 31. Of these, 39% were among boys who had sex with men and 45% were among girls who had sex with men.
- By comparison, in 1995, there were 405 newly diagnosed AIDS cases among those aged 13-19. Of these, the cause was known for 305. And of this set, 30% were among boys who had sex with men, while 27% were among girls who had sex with men.
- Also for 1995, there were 555 new HIV infection cases among 13-19 year olds, of which 269 had a known cause. Of these, 49% were among boys who had sex with men and 43% were among girls who had sex with men.

Clearly, the AIDS epidemic seems to be 'winding down' in general among teens, except perhaps for young gay males. This is seen in the declining total numbers of new adolescent cases between 1995 and 2000. Interestingly though, the relative proportions of such cases attributable to homosexual activity have not changed that much. And overall, men who have sex with men seem to be as they were at the beginning of the epidemic — doing their best to keep it going.

AIDS from page 3

49% of all new AIDS cases. Drug shooters accounted for 28%. Heterosexuals, unless they had sex with drug shooters or gays, had very little chance of being infected. So the "33% are reported by heterosexuals" is quite misleading.

Over the entire epidemic, from 1980 through 2000, 763,873 AIDS cases where a cause was known have been reported. Of these, 404,389 (53%) were among gays. So last year homosexuals contributed

49% of new AIDS cases. For the epidemic as a whole — all 20 years of it — they have accounted for 53% of all AIDS cases.

So what impact has all the billions of dollars of AIDS education had on gays? Not much, if success is measured by how well they avoid getting AIDS. Remember, most AIDS education has been heavily targeted toward homosexual practitioners. And gays are supposedly the ones that have most responded to these educational

efforts. Yet their relative proportion of new AIDS cases is not much different than their historical average.

How about new infections with HIV (not AIDS, the disease)? Not all states participate in HIV testing, but for those which do, there were 12,982 new HIV infections among adults in 2000 where the mode of infection was known. Of these, gays accounted for 53%. Where is the evidence that 'AIDS education' is working?