

A MUST READ BOOK FOR EVERY PARENT, TEACHER AND COMMUNITY LEADER

WHY HOMOSEXUALITY IS PROHIBITED IN ISLĀM

Also includes:
The 'Born Gay' Hoax
And Lifting The Lid On The
Homosexual-Pedophilia Connection

Protecting Your Child From Premature Hyper-Sexualization and
Predatory Pedophiles Lurking Within Gay Activism,
Education, Entertainment and Politics

Abū Zaynab Abd al-Rahmān al-Qawīm



WHY HOMOSEXUALITY IS PROHIBITED IN ISLĀM

“Why Is Sodomy A Sin And Why Would I Be Punished If Allāh
Made Me Have Homosexual Feelings?”

Also includes:

The ‘Born Gay’ Hoax And Lifting The Lid On The Homosexual-Pedophilia Connection

Protecting Your Child From Premature Hyper-Sexualization and
Predatory Pedophiles Lurking Within Gay Activism,
Education, Entertainment and Politics

Abū Zaynab ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qawīm



A foundational *core value* of humanity from time
immemorial rooted in immutable
biological reality.

Title: Why Homosexuality is Prohibited in Islām
Author: Abū Zaynab ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qawīm



© Qawīm Publishing, London, UK.
1st edition (version 7 .0) - July 2015.

All rights reserved Worldwide. No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording without express written permission from the copyright holder.

Legal Disclaimer: It is illegal to incite violence against other citizens under UK, EU, US and other laws. There is nothing in this work which incites violence against any particular group or segment of society. It is an expression of the freedom of speech in which the practice of sodomy is critiqued on factual, scientific grounds and provides a rational explanation for the mainstream view amongst Muslims, Jews and Christians that homosexual practices centred around sodomy are detrimental to health. This in no way interferes with nor hinders the individual liberties of homosexuals to have sex with other men in their anuses. The right to criticize any idea, belief or practice is protected under freedom of speech laws so long as criminal conduct is not advocated. This work is therefore an expression of the *freedom of speech* within the *rule of law* and is protected by Articles 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as well as freedom of speech laws in individual nations. It is crucial to note that the various leaders, presidents, organizations and bodies of the “gay rights” movement do not speak for all or even the majority of homosexuals. When the “gay rights” movement is discussed in this book it refers only to the most vocal and loudest voices and not the average homosexual. **Disclaimer:** Due to the nature of this topic there may be certain phrases, use of language and details of a sexual nature that some may find unbecoming, repulsive or offensive. It is not possible to completely avoid such phrases, language or details. It is not our intention to be rude or vulgar but in keeping with the broad objective of this book, we have seen fit to use certain phrases, avoid censoring what may be distasteful and employ the use of certain language where it is necessary in the context.

CONTENTS

ON THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND THE RIGHT TO OFFEND..... 6

A NOTE ABOUT TERMINOLOGY 13

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK..... 20

LIFE IS A ONE-TIME TEST 23

SEXUAL ORIENTATION, CONDUCT AND IDENTITY 25

HISTORY OF THE MODERN ‘BORN GAY’ HOAX..... 39

WAR: DESENSITIZE, JAM AND CONVERT 48

HOMOSEXUAL ACADEMICS ON THE ‘BORN GAY’ HOAX 51

THE ‘GAY GENE’ HOAX 59

THE ‘HOMOSEXUALITY IN NATURE’ HOAX 67

THE “QUEER BY CHOICE” MOVEMENT 70

A FEW COMMON MYTHS..... 73

RECTUM ABUSE, ANAL CANCER AND DISEASE 77

FROM STONEWALL TO AIDS IN 12 YEARS 90

EVOLUTION AND HOMOSEXUALITY 96

WHY ARE THERE HOMOSEXUAL FEELINGS? 98

THE SEXUALIZATION OF CHILDREN 106

PEDOPHILIA IN WESTERN SECULAR LIBERAL NATIONS..... 112

IMPLEMENTING KINSEY’S SEX RESEARCH IN THE CLASSROOM 115

THE HOMOSEXUAL-PEDOPHILE CONNECTION 121

HOW TO LEGALIZE SODOMY WITH CHILDREN (AND ANIMALS)..... 176

‘I HAVE COME TO INDOCTRINATE YOUR CHILDREN’..... 180

HOMOSEXUALS ON MARRIAGE..... 183

WHAT HOMOSEXUALS WANT AND HOW THEY ACHIEVE IT 188

HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVISTS AND THE USE OF LANGUAGE 193

CONCLUSION 201

ON THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND THE RIGHT TO OFFEND

Following the Charlie Hebdo attacks in January 2015, numerous politicians and leaders around the world boldly asserted that their nations will “*never give up*” freedom of speech.¹ Likewise they affirmed “*the right to offend*” in a free society. David Cameron, the UK prime minister stated, “It is very important in our countries that we have a freedom of [expression], **you are allowed to offend people**. You might not agree with something, as often I see things I do not agree with. But I believe in the freedom of speech and the rule of law.”² These types of remarks were made by politicians in order to defend the right of French cartoonists to depict Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) - who is revered as a Prophet of God by 1.5 billion Muslims spread across the entire globe - through immoral, deliberately provocative and inciteful pornographic caricatures.

In his 9th January 2015 article titled “*We must always be free to criticise ideas like Islam*” in the Telegraph, Nick Clegg, as the then deputy prime minister wrote, “This is the bottom line: in a free society people have to be free to offend each other. **There is no such thing as a right not to be offended. You cannot have freedom unless people are free to offend each other.**” He also cited the actor Rowan Atkinson, “the freedom to criticise ideas, any ideas, even if they are sincerely held beliefs, is one of the fundamental freedoms of society.” Clegg went on to write, “**The freedom that allows someone to criticise an idea - even a religious idea - is the same freedom that allows others to promote it.** We are all free to agree or disagree, believe or disbelieve, support or oppose. That we in Britain can do so, usually in a spirit of tolerance, makes us a beacon for the world’s oppressed.” Towards the end of his article, Clegg writes something of special note, “The same laws that allow satirists to ridicule Islamists

¹ Refer to *Britain will ‘never give up’ freedom of speech, David Cameron says after Charlie Hebdo attack* by Ben Riley in the Daily Telegraph (7th January 2015).

² An ITN interview with David Cameron in January 2014 about the Paris march for freedom of speech after the Charlie Hebdo attacks. Refer to <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=77QRQaJ-PIU>.

allow Islamists (and other extremists) to promote their views. When extremists incite violence or promote terrorism, the criminal law is the right response. But when they peacefully express views which the majority of people find odious, we need to remember what is at stake. **Free speech cannot just be for people we agree with. If it is to mean anything, free speech has to be for everyone.**"

Radical extremists can express their odious views without inciting violence or promoting terrorism and they would not be engaging in criminal conduct but exercising a fundamental human right protected by law according to Mr Clegg. If that is the case, peaceful, non-extremist, non-radical Muslims have every right - to take the words straight out of Mr. Clegg's mouth - 'to promote the religious idea' - the mainstream religious idea in fact, that sodomy is immoral and harmful to health and society.³

³ The immorality and harmfulness of the practice of sodomy is a *mainstream religious idea* amongst **Muslims, Torah Jews** and **Christians** based upon a *mainstream reading* of scripture. For example over 230 Jewish rabbis, academics and mental health professionals signed a declaration titled, "**The Torah Approach To Homosexuality**" affirming the negative position of the Torah towards homosexuality. It states, "There has been a monumental shift in the secular world's attitude towards homosexuality over the past few decades. In particular over the past fifteen years there has been a major public campaign to gain acceptance for homosexuality. Legalizing same-sex marriage has become the end goal of the campaign to equate homosexuality with heterosexuality. A propaganda blitz has been sweeping the world using political tactics to persuade the public about the legitimacy of homosexuality. The media is rife with negative labels implying that one is 'hateful' or 'homophobic' if they do not accept the homosexual lifestyle as legitimate. This political coercion has silenced many into acquiescence. Unfortunately this attitude has seeped into the Torah community and many have become confused or have accepted the media's portrayal of this issue. The Torah makes a clear statement that homosexuality is not an acceptable lifestyle or a genuine identity by severely prohibiting its conduct." Refer to <http://torahdec.org>. One should also consider that intolerance of same-sex unions are widespread in nations such as **Belarus, Poland, Moldova, Bulgaria, Montenegro** and **Serbia**. In November 2013 **Croatia** voted in a referendum forced upon the Social-Democrat government by 740,000 petition signatures to define marriage in the constitution as "union of man

Thus in light of Mr. Cameron's and Mr Clegg's affirmations that the right to offend belongs to everyone, that no one has the right not to be offended, that promotion of a religious idea is equal to the right to criticize it so long as there is no incitement to violence and

and woman." Refer to *Croats set constitutional bar to same-sex marriage* published by Reuters, 25th November 2013. The BBC also reported, "Croatian voters have backed proposals to ban same-sex marriages in a referendum. Two-thirds of those who voted approved changes to Croatia's constitution to define marriage as a union between a man and a woman. A government spokesperson confirmed that the constitution would now have to be changed accordingly. A petition backing the referendum, drawn up by a Catholic group, received more than 700,000 signatures. The referendum asked whether the constitution should be amended to define marriage as 'the union between a man and a woman'. Almost 90% of Croatia's population of 4.4 million are Roman Catholics and the Church had strongly urged a 'Yes' vote. The vote also received support from 104 members of Croatia's 151-seat parliament. Prime Minister Zoran Milanovic had argued that the referendum threatened people's right to happiness and choice. His government has pledged to push forward in the coming days proposals to give greater rights to same-sex couples. But leaders of the opposition HDZ party supported the referendum. The plan for a referendum was allowed parliamentary scrutiny after a Catholic group called 'In the Name of the Family' gathered enough signatures to pass the required threshold of support. 'Marriage is the only union enabling procreation. This is the key difference between a marriage... and other unions,' said Croatia's Cardinal Josip Bozanic in a letter read out in churches." *Croatians back same-sex marriage ban in referendum* (2nd December 2013). The democratically elected Christian President of **Kenya**, Uhuru Kenyatta, in a public on-stage dialogue with US President, Barack Obama, responded to Obama's request for Kenya to address gay issues by saying, "We share so many values, our common love for democracy, entrepreneurship, value for families. But there are some things we must admit we don't share, our culture, our societies don't accept. It's very difficult to impose that on people that which they themselves do not accept. For Kenyans today the issue of gay rights is really a non-issue. We want to focus on other areas that are day-to-day living for people." *Obama clashess with Kenyan president over gay rights* in the Telegraph (25th July 2015). The democratically elected Christian President of **Uganda**, Yoweri Museveni signed an anti-sodomy bill in 2014 and told CNN reporter, Zain Verjee in an interview, "I'm acting on behalf of the society. It's not just the state, it is the society... Respect African societies and their values." *Obama must 'respect African societies and their values' - Museveni* Uganda News 24 (29th July 2015).

terrorism: This work provides an occasionally satirical, yet logical, rational, factual and scientific critique of a lifestyle centred around the practice of sodomy.⁴ It promotes a mainstream religious idea amongst Muslims, Jews and Christians without inciting violence or criminal conduct. It also exposes from the words of “gay” activists themselves the presence of an active agenda within segments of *homosexual subculture* to legalize pedophilia as a means of facilitating the practice of sodomy with young boys.

☞ Basic biology and scientific research informs us that anuses and rectums were not designed for repeat abuse and as a result will have a relatively short life-span. Once the **anal fissures** and **anal-warts** set in and the **sphincter muscle** goes *kaput* - broken and useless - leading to **fecal incontinence** and **parasitical infections**, they lose desirability and become a liability, a fertile ground for disease transmission. This in turn fuels promiscuity and the need for more and more sodomizable partners. Hence, **it is logical and rational** to anticipate a strong demand for **a ready and constant supply of fresh new anuses**. Within this context, it makes economic sense to sexualize children from an early age in the name of “child rights” and then simultaneously lobby for the abolition of all age of sexual consent laws so that *anal supply* can adequately meet *anal demand* inclusive of a large surplus to cater for the excessive promiscuity demanded by the practice of sodomy.⁵

⁴ **As no evidence exists and nor will any ever be found** that a homosexual lifestyle centred around the practice of sodomy is *determined genetically* in the same way as skin, hair and eye colour and as the sum of all scientific research and evidence points to homosexual conduct being a *lifestyle choice influenced and determined primarily by external cues, the environment and personal experience*, factual criticism of such a lifestyle cannot be equated with racism because such conduct is not an immutable quality determined by genes, unlike skin, eye and hair colour. **This argument will stand up in a court of law and can be defended using government-funded research reports and bioethics policy papers.**

⁵ Rates of promiscuity amongst male homosexuals are multiple times more pronounced than amongst heterosexuals. Michelangelo Signorile, a homosexual activist states, “The term ‘open relationship’ has for a great

This book also defends a *genuine core value* not just of British society but of all civilizations from time immemorial: The **biological family unit** made up of a *biological male* and *biological female* which [through the act of sexual intercourse involving the male and female sexual organs] produce biological offspring on the basis of which parent-child, inheritance and material rights are established, leading to a simple, sound basis for a just, responsible economic order.

In grasping the objectives of this book - [which are aimed at serving public safety, prevention of disorder and crime such as **predatory pedophilia**, protection of health, lowering financial burdens upon state health authorities⁶ and the protection of the reputation, rights

many gay men come to have one specific definition: A relationship in which the partners have sex on the outside often, put away their resentment and jealousy, and discuss their outside sex with each other, or share sex partners." *Life Outside* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997): 213. Typical gay city inhabitants spend most of their adult lives in "transactional" relationships, or short-term commitments of less than six months and few homosexual relationships last longer than two years. Many men report hundreds of lifetime partners - most often in open relationships. Refer to: Adrian Brune, "City Gays Skip Long-term Relationships: Study Says," *Washington Blade* (February 27, 04): 12. Maria Xiridou, et al, "The Contribution of Steady and Casual Partnerships to the Incidence of HIV Infection among Homosexual Men in Amsterdam," *AIDS* 17 (2003): 1031. M. Pollak, "Male Homosexuality," in *Western Sexuality: Practice and Precept in Past and Present Times*, ed. P. Aries and A. Bejin, translated by Anthony Forster (New York, NY: B. Blackwell, 1985): 40-61, cited by Joseph Nicolosi in *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality* (Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc., 1991): 124, 125.

⁶ The famous Mayo Clinic states on its website (MayoClinic.Org), "Men who have sex with men are at increased risk of contracting HIV, the virus that causes AIDS, as well as other sexually transmitted infections, including hepatitis, human papillomavirus (HPV), herpes simplex, gonorrhea, chlamydia and syphilis." *Health issues for gay men and men who have sex with men* (15th August 2014). Robert Winnet writes in the Telegraph, "The Health Protection Agency recently calculated that it costs more than £300,000 to treat every person who contracts the disease including those who go on to develop AIDS. The cost of treating sufferers in the last stages of their lives is particularly high." (27th February 2012). Refer to the chapter on *Rectum Abuse, Anal Cancer and Disease* later in this book for more details on this subject.

and freedom of conscience of those who respect traditional values] - one must distinguish between the following:

- a) **Homosexual feelings** which are considered in Islām as one of many types of temptations. On their own these feelings do not make a person sinful, nor a homosexual in fact. The contents of this book are aimed at helping such people to understand the origins of such feelings, the dangers of acting upon them and to show that they can be changed and repelled. These people should be treated with sympathy and offered help and counselling.

- b) **Homosexual behaviour and conduct** symbolized in the practice of sodomy and its firmly-established, proven dangers to personal and public health. To all reasonable and intelligent people, exposing the dangers and harms of homosexual *conduct* does not amount to hate-speech or incitement to violence, since these dangers and harms are established through undeniable, irrefutable scientific and statistical evidences.

Thus, any attempts to censor this book or any of its contents or to deny the right to convey such information in the interests of *public health and safety* is a violation of human rights, runs contrary to the affirmations by Mr. Cameron and Mr. Clegg of the freedom of speech and is an exercise in hypocrisy. If parts of this book offend you, be warned, Mr. Cameron, Mr. Clegg and world leaders who marched in Paris on 11th January 2015 will not be happy.

In fact, Mr. Clegg will swiftly demonstrate the non-existence of your right not to be offended by a few quick strokes of his pen, as he did in his January 2015 article in the Telegraph, titled “*We must always be free to criticise ideas like Islam*” by stating, “**There is no such thing as a right not to be offended. You cannot have freedom unless people are free to offend each other... The freedom that allows someone to criticise an idea - even a religious idea - is the same freedom that**

allows others to promote it... Free speech cannot just be for people we agree with. If it is to mean anything, free speech has to be for everyone." Highlighting the dangers of sodomy and the homosexual culture and lifestyle built around it with scientific facts, logic and reason is not more offensive than making mockery of the Prophets of God through pornographic caricatures. If the latter is protected by free speech and the right to offend, then so is the former. If the latter is not provocative **non-violent extremism** then neither is the former. As you read through this book, keep an open mind. It is a book of history, science, logic and reason. It separates actual science from *identity politics* and sound reasoning from *marketing propaganda*.

Western governments are struggling to reconcile the "core values" of **the freedom of speech** and **the right to offend others** which allow cartoonists to satirize the Prophets of God with sexually explicit, pornographic cartoons with the cleverly-devised concept of **non-violent extremism**. This concept is being used to criminalize free speech *which does not incite or even lead to violence*. It is being used to force beliefs and values upon people who do not agree with them, as if to say "*Obeying the law is not an excuse. We will target you and label you if you fail to hold the beliefs and values we want you to believe - even if you obey the law and do not break it.*"⁷ These appear to be mind-control and fear tactics you would expect to see in North Korea, not Western democracies shouting *freedom* and *liberty* and making "universal human rights" declarations such as "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."⁸

⁷ On 3rd August 2015, the Telegraph newspaper reported on Tory MP, Mark Spencer in an article titled, "MP: use anti-terror powers on Christian teachers who say gay marriage is 'wrong'." Spencer wants to effectively ban the teaching of traditionalist views on marriage and to consider it "hate-speech." There are large numbers of homosexuals who oppose gay marriage and say it is wrong as documented in a separate chapter.

⁸ Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

A NOTE ABOUT TERMINOLOGY

The word **sodomy**⁹ is primarily a reference to the act of penetrative anal sex. The very first pro-sodomy movement was put in motion by **Karl Heinrich Ulrichs** (d. 1895)¹⁰ who attempted to repeal German

⁹ Circa. 13th century, “*unnatural sexual relations*,” such as those imputed to the inhabitants of Biblical Sodom, especially between persons of the same sex but also with beasts, from Old French sodomie, from Late Latin peccatum Sodomiticum ““anal sex,” literally “the sin of Sodom,” from Latin Sodoma. In Middle English also synne Sodomyke (early 14th century). (Online Etymology Dictionary). The Arab term for sodomy is liwāṭ which means “the practice of the people of Lot.”

¹⁰ The famous lawyer, Lloyd Duhaime includes a biographical account in his “Law Hall of Fame” for **Karl Heinrich Ulrichs**: He was born in Northern Germany in 1825. As a lawyer, he seemed restless, often moonlighting as a freelance writer. But as a closet gay, he risked financial ruin in engaging in a relationship with a soldier, and several other men. But by 1852, he was appointed a judge. Homosexuality or pederasty as it was then mostly known, was condemned and criminalized under the law of most nations, including German law. In 1854, a colleague suspected Ulrichs of immoral behavior and threatened to reveal it all. Ulrichs was forced to resign his position quietly. This gave him pause and in it, the young lawyer found his lifelong cause of justice. In 1862, he began to write to his family members and tease them about his sexuality. He postulated that ‘*uranians*’ were a third gender. Later, he suggested that by an accident at birth, gay men had a female soul trapped in a man’s body. A year later, he defied the criminal law and published a series of brochures (pamphlets) promoting the decriminalization of the uranian lifestyle, but he wisely did so under the pen name of Numa Numantius. He wrote: ‘*The class Urnings is perhaps strong enough now to assert its right to equality and equal treatment... Fortified with the shield of the justice of their cause, they must bravely dare to come out of the previous reserve and isolation. Herewith, let the ice be broken.*’ The German authorities were outraged and quickly confiscated copies of the pamphlets. Now completely released from his duties as a lawyer, he published three new pamphlets as Numa Numantius. He proposed to be the liberator of the gay in Germany. He tried desperately to find support from the medical profession but mostly failed. In 1865, he formed a Urning union but he was not even able to convene a single meeting. He sent a copy of his writings to the Hungarian writer Karl Kurtzbeny [Károly Mária Benkert] who changed Ulrichs’ terminology to something which sounded scientific: and thus the words **homosexual** and **heterosexual** were coined. In 1867, Ulrichs was imprisoned. When he was released after five months, he moved to

anti-sodomy laws. In 1867, Ulrichs went before the Sixth Congress of German Jurists in Munich and argued that people who possess a sexual nature opposed to “common custom” were being persecuted for impulses that “nature had implanted in them” and that sodomy laws should be repealed. Since the **primary, central goal** and **starting point** of all homosexual movements has been and still remains the repealing of anti-sodomy laws in **every country**, the terms *sodomy*, *sodomite* or *sodomist* will be used in this work for the purposes of maintaining precision. The commonly used terms **homosexual** and **heterosexual** are fairly recent in origin.¹¹ **Károly Mária Benkert** (d. 1882) first coined the word *homosexual* in a letter he wrote to Ulrichs on 6th May 1868. Ulrichs and Benkert along with **Heinrich Hossli**, were the founders of the first pro-sodomy “human rights” movement in history.¹² They put forward many of the familiar

Würzburg and continued to write but now as Karl Ulrichs, his real name. He published **Memnon: The Sexual Nature of Men-Loving Urnings**, where he further developed his theories of homosexuality. In 1869, a prominent German was convicted of the rape of a 5-year old boy, and a copy of Memnon found in his belongings. It was a severe blow to Ulrichs’ cause. In 1870, he tried to make a go of a gay magazine but it failed miserably. He published another pamphlet, this one called **Araxes: a Call to Free the Nature of the Urning from Penal Law** in which he postulated: ‘*The Urning, too, is a person. He, too, therefore, has inalienable rights. His sexual orientation is a right established by nature. Legislators have no right to veto nature; no right to persecute nature in the course of its work; no right to torture living creatures who are subject to those drives nature gave them.*’ Refer to <http://duhaim.org> and “Karl Heinrich Ulrichs” in *Gay & Lesbian Biography* (London: St. James Press, 1997), pages 436-439.

¹¹ The terms *heterosexuality* and *homosexuality* are used throughout this book as they are unavoidable. They were invented by pro-sodomy activists as a means of creating classes and categories which could then be used to facilitate cultural, social and political goals by shaping public perceptions. Gay activists admit that the terms “gay”, “homosexual”, “heterosexual” are all recent social constructs.

¹² “Ulrich’s goal was to free people like himself from the legal, religious, and social condemnation of homosexual acts as unnatural. For this, he invented a new terminology that would refer to the nature of the individual, and not to the acts performed.” Kennedy in “*Karl Heinrichs Ulrichs: First Theorist of Homosexuality*,” p. 30 in *Science and Homosexualities*, (Routledge, 1997), editor

arguments which are heard today, including the claim that sexual attraction to the same sex is innate and inborn (which today equates with the *gay gene* hoax) and that it is a part of a person's identity, not a practice.¹³ Their movement was launched behind the banners of *sexual emancipation* and *human rights*. The movement headed by Ulrichs split into two after his death. The first was represented by **Magnus Hirschfield** and developed the view that homosexuals are more feminine in their nature. The second, represented by **Benedict Friedlaender** and **Adolf Brand** was developed along the lines of the Greek tradition, that sodomists are hyper-masculine.¹⁴ The word **gay**¹⁵ is even more recent and is of preferred usage amongst sodomites, forming an essential element of their identity politics.

It should be clearly understood that there is no such thing as a *homosexual* or *heterosexual* as a distinct person, but only people who **identify themselves as such**. These are modern *social constructs*

Vernon A. Rosario. "The study of homosexuality began in Germany, where it was intertwined with the struggle to eliminate state proscriptions against homosexual practices." Carolyn Dean in *Sexuality and Modern Western Culture*. (Twayne Publishers. New York, 1996) p. 22.

¹³ Francis Mondimore writes, "For several hundreds of years, the institutions of the majority considered homosexuality something a person did and called it sodomy, buggery, or a crime against nature. During the nineteenth century, a conceptual shift occurred, and a few individuals began to talk about homosexuality as something a person was. A new vocabulary was invented for these persons. Urning, invert-homosexual." *A Natural History of Homosexuality* (John Hopkins University Press, 1996) p. 248.

¹⁴ Brand was jailed for child pornography in 1903 for publishing pictures of nude boys in his magazine *Der Eigene* (the Special).

¹⁵ A late 14th century word that meant "full of joy, merry; light-hearted, carefree." The word *gay* by the 1890s had an overall tinge of promiscuity -- a *gay house* was a brothel. Its slang meaning to refer to a homosexual began to appear in the mid-20th century. The *Dictionary of American Slang* reports that *gay* (adj.) was used by homosexuals, among themselves, in this sense since at least 1920. Rawson [in "Wicked Words"] notes a male prostitute using *gay* in reference to male homosexuals (but also to female prostitutes) in London's notorious Cleveland Street Scandal of 1889. By 1971 in common usage, the word *gay* usually meant a homosexual. (Online Etymology Dictionary).

invented for social, cultural and political objectives. In the real, physical world, there are only men and women, males and females representing masculinity and femininity and they complement each other like lock and key. These two distinct persons then exhibit behaviours which are associated with them through a combination of biological design and culture.¹⁶ “Gay activism” should be correctly viewed as a group of people **self-identifying** themselves by their **behavior** and the **sexual acts** they commit seeking **legal recognition** of their behavior and sexual acts in a **political context**. Thus, “homosexual” and “gay” are only **political identities** used to achieve political objectives such as the repealing of anti-sodomy laws and are not representative of true distinct persons.

Charlotte Patterson writes in the *Developmental Psychology* journal, summarizing contemporary research in the field, much of which is done by homosexuals themselves “The contemporary notion of identity is itself historically created. The concept of a specifically homosexual identity seems to have emerged at the end of the nineteenth-century. Indeed, only in relatively recent years have large numbers of individuals identified themselves openly as gay or lesbian or bisexual. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual public identities, then, are a phenomenon of our current historical era.”¹⁷

John D’Emilio, a homosexual professor, writes, “Although same-sex attractions and sexual behavior have undoubtedly occurred throughout history, lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities are relatively new.”¹⁸ Gay activist **Jeffrey Weeks** writes, “We tend to think now that the word ‘homosexual’ has an unvarying meaning,

¹⁶ As for “sex-changes” they are not true sex-changes but attempts to fake the opposite sex through a combination of surgery and drugs which are used to mask biological sex. Gender-confusion exists because of social, cultural factors. Environment (endocrine-disrupting chemicals) may have some role play though the extent of it is difficult to determine.

¹⁷ In “*Sexual Orientation and Human Development: An Overview.*” *Developmental Psychology*. 1995, Vol. 31, No.1, 3-11. p.3

¹⁸ In *Making Trouble Essays on Gay History, Politics, and the University.* (Routledge. New York & London, 1992).

beyond time and history. In fact it is itself a product of history, a cultural artifact designed to express a particular concept.”¹⁹

Charlene Muehlenhard writes in the *Journal of Sex Research*, “What these examples illustrate is that homosexual and heterosexual are socially constructed categories. There are no objective definitions of these words; there is no “Golden Dictionary in the Sky” that contains the real definitions. These are word categories we made up.”²⁰

Lisa Duggan and **Nan Hunter** write, “Lesbian and gay historians have asked questions about the origins of gay liberation and lesbian feminism, and have come up with some surprising answers. Rather than finding a silent, oppressed, gay minority in all times and all places, historians have discovered that gay identity is a recent, Western, historical construction. Jeffrey Weeks, Jonathan Katz and Lillian Faderman, for example, have traced the emergence of lesbian and gay identity in the late nineteenth century. Similarly John D’Emilio, Allan Berube and the Buffalo Oral History Project have described how this identity laid the basis for organized political activity in the years following World War II. The work of lesbian and gay historians has also demonstrated that human sexuality is not a natural, timeless ‘given’, but is historically shaped and politically regulated.”²¹

Homosexual professor, **Gilbert Herdt**²² writes, “Only in the twentieth century, through mass media and political rhetoric, has the explicit

¹⁹ in *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain, from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*. Quartet Books. London, Melbourne, & New York, 1977) p. 3.

²⁰ “*Categories and Sexuality*.” *Journal of Sex Research*. May 2000, Vol. 37, No. 2, 101-107.

²¹ *Sex Wars: Sexual Dissent and Political Culture*. (Routledge, 1995) p.151-152.

²² Dr. Gilbert Herdt is a cultural anthropologist, Professor and Founder of the Department of Sexuality Studies at San Francisco State University, and Founder of the National Sexuality Resource Center (NSRC). He previously taught at Stanford University (1979-1985) and the University of Chicago (1985-1998), where he was Professor and Chair of the Committee on Human Development.

terminology of ‘homosexuality-heterosexuality’ been widely applied to people and acts and events, typically to contain and control all sexual behavior. Only as wide-scale sexual liberation movements gained steam in the 1960s did people who desire the same gender begin to call themselves ‘lesbian’ or ‘gay.’ Since that time these identity systems have been exported to other cultures, which has created controversies in developing countries that previously lacked these concepts, having neither the history nor the political traditions that bought them about.”²³

This in turn sheds light on the invention of the term **homophobia**.²⁴ Since “homosexual” and “gay” are identities assumed for cultural and political goals by those who engage in specific behaviours and are not truly distinct persons, then homophobia is also an artificial construct. It is “a convenient term designed to interpret cultural restrictions on homosexual behavior, but become a catchall political concept used to refer to any nonpositive attitude [to] gays. However, the descriptions of the concept and the research used to support the theories show neither irrational fear nor a specific reaction toward ‘homosexuals’.”²⁵ This term was coined and given currency by pro-sodomy activists to be used to imply that the attitudes and actions of those who oppose sodomy were irrational. William O’Donohue, and Christine Caselles write, “It appears that during the past two decades, the term homophobia has been generalized to denote any negative attitude, belief, or action toward homosexuals.”²⁶

In itself, the word homophobia is highly problematic and misused. A phobia refers to a persistent, irrational fear, a clinical condition

²³ Refer to *Same Sex, Different Cultures: Gays and Lesbians Across Cultures* (Perseus, 1998) p.7.

²⁴ This term first appears during the early to mid 1970s.

²⁵ Lon Nungesser in *Homosexual Acts, Actors, and Identities* (Praeger. New York, 1983) p.162.

²⁶ In “*Homophobia: Conceptual, Definitional, and Value Issues.*” p. 65- 83 within *Destructive Trends in Mental Health: The Well-Intentioned Path to Harm* Edited by Rogers H. Wright and Nicolas A. Cummings. (Routledge. New York and Hove, 2005).

which makes a person dysfunctional and is usually unpleasant for the person. Sometimes phobias can create panic reactions which may include sweating, increased heart beat, breathing difficulties, light-headedness, dryness in the mouth, nausea and increased bowel movements. Arachnophobia for example, is the fear of spiders. **Anti-sodomists do not suffer from a phobia.** Their revulsion towards the act of sodomy is rooted in science and in evaluating its harms to personal and public health. They do not fear the act of sodomy in the way an arachnophobe fears spiders. The one who suffers from an excessive or irrational fear of spiders needs psychological help to come to terms with this fear and eventually remove it. The anti-sodomist who is repulsed by the act of sodomy and the diseases associated with it such as AIDS and syphilis [which are found overwhelmingly amongst sodomites who comprise the primary and overwhelming majority transmitters of these diseases within Western populations] **does not** require psychological help and is a mentally sane, rational, thinking being.

In light of what has preceded, when encountering the terms *sodomy*, *sodomite*, *homosexual* and *gay* in this book, one should keep the very important distinctions between **orientation**, **behaviour** and **identity** in mind. This is crucial to grasping and dissecting the origins of the very first “*gay rights*” movement of the 1860s and the current movement which has gained increasing momentum since the 1970s. Its success lies in the effective use of *marketing* and *propaganda* techniques layered on top of fraudulent or discredited science. Gay activists such as **Marshall Kirk** and **Hunter Madsen** from whom citations are made in this work do not hide the fact that marketing propaganda is their “big gun” and chief weapon against the “straight” world.

“Why Is Sodomy A Sin And Why Would I Be Punished If Allāh Made Me Have Homosexual Feelings?”

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK

Bismillāh wal-ḥamdulilāh. Before answering these questions it is important to point out two different world views. In the way of Islām brought by the Messengers of Allāh such as Abraham, Moses, Jesus (عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام) and Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), life has inherent meaning, value, direction and purpose. Central to that meaning, direction and purpose is a moral order which facilitates the pursuit of that purpose by maximizing personal and societal benefit and minimizing personal and societal harm. This moral order is founded upon the realities of human nature, is built upon the natural, traditional, *biological* family unit and leads to cohesive societies, and internally unified nations which possess strong identities. This is because *fidelity* and *chastity* provide stability in relationships and the home. Bonding in the home determines the bonding in the society and nation as a whole. In secular atheistic societies there is no inherent meaning, purpose or direction in life as a matter of principle and each person has to invent his own meaning, purpose and subjective moral compass. This has an implication on the nature of moral values, whether absolute or subjective or whether constant (unchanging) or fluctuating. It also affects personal choices and lifestyles and determines the type of society that is eventually produced. In liberal societies the boundaries of what is moral or immoral are not fixed but change over time and are determined by the ever-changing political, economic and social landscapes. This is presented as advancement and progress and ‘core values’ of nations can be changed swiftly through political pressure, the aid of money power and use of the media, film, music and literature industries.²⁷

²⁷ Up until the 1970s in the United States, homosexuality was officially considered to be a mental disease needing psychological treatment. Due to intense lobbying and for political reasons, the American Psychiatric Association (APA) removed homosexuality from the official list of mental disorders in 1973. Homosexuals had lobbied the APA since 1971 by

The family institution - a core value of all civilizations and nations - is systematically being dismantled and destroyed in these countries through the promotion of artificial values which - though serving the personal interests of small minority groups - harm societies and nations in the long-term. In such nations, morality is personal, subjective, hazy, has hundreds of shades and fluctuates. This eventually leads to the disintegration of the society into lots of tiny clusters and minority groups, each of which is concerned primarily about its own cause. This produces an entirely different type of nation, a weak nation in which the general population is devoid of a strong, unifying identity.²⁸

The Muslim world - due to Islām's deeply-rooted foundations for morality and the inherent resilience of core Islāmic teachings to subversive ideological movements - is the target of revolutionary Internationalist Socialists who have transformed the minds and essential characters of the populations of most Western nations. There are exceptions such as Russia, Croatia and Serbia where a strong religious spirit remains amongst *the general population*. The easiest target amongst a population is their young (children and youth). Hence, Muslim children will be the target of social

disrupting their meetings, grabbing microphones and shouting down any psychiatrist who considered homosexuality to be a mental disorder. The tactics of 60s anti-war protesters worked, the APA caved in and homosexuals used this victory to proclaim that homosexual behavior (sodomy) is normal. Despite this partial victory, they were unsuccessful in trying to repeal anti-sodomy laws and in 1986, following a US Supreme Court ruling (*Bowers vs. Hardwick*) which maintained the rights of individual states to criminalize sodomy, they adopted a new tactic relying upon social marketing and propaganda. Over the next twenty years, with financial support in addition to substantial help from the media, they have been largely successful in their goals to first normalize and then impose homosexual lifestyles upon societies.

²⁸ The weakening of nations in this way is the goal of Weishauptian, Jacobinist, Marxist, Bolshevik, Communist, Collectivist, Internationalist Socialist movements which have successively penetrated and transformed the economies, cultures and moral values of most Western nations over the past two centuries years.

indoctrination to help eliminate those traditional values which stand in the way of hyper-sexualization and militant pro-sodomy activism. Later in this work we cite in full an allegedly “satirical” essay, “The Dream,” by homosexual activist, Michael Swift who wrote in a 1987 newsletter for gays, “We shall sodomize your sons, emblems of your 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, in your movie theater bathrooms, in your army bunkhouses, in your truck stops, in your all male clubs, in your houses of Congress, wherever men are with men together. All laws banning homosexual activity will be revoked. Instead, legislation shall be passed which engenders love between men. All homosexuals must stand together as brothers; we must be united artistically, philosophically, socially, politically and financially. We will triumph only when we present a common face to the vicious heterosexual enemy. If you dare to cry faggot, fairy, queer, at us, we will stab you in your cowardly hearts and defile your dead, puny bodies.”²⁹ As the saying goes, “*Many a true word said in jest.*” Anti-gay campaigners have made use of this essay as proof of the existence of a *gay agenda* and homosexuals have responded by saying the essay was merely satire and not serious. However, when one reads the entire essay and the objectives outlined in the “dream” one can see that the dream is gradually being fulfilled pretty much to the letter. The dream is being realised through cultural imperialism imposed upon nations that have retained traditional, cultural family values. In turn, this has led to reactionary pro-family activist movements across the US, Canada, UK and Europe whose protests and campaigns are **deliberately concealed** from the public eye.³⁰

²⁹ Refer to the chapter on the homosexuality-pedophilia connection for the full essay text.

³⁰ An example is the virtual non-reporting on mainstream television of the Croatian people winning a majority vote to define marriage in their constitution as *a union between a man and a woman* in November 2013 and the spate of protests organised by *La Manif Pour Tous*, one of a number of French pro-family organizations which managed to bring 30,000 protesters on to

LIFE IS A ONE-TIME TEST

In Islām, we believe that life is a one-time test and its purpose is to show exclusive devotion and gratitude to Allāh, the Creator of the Heavens and Earth, for all of the innumerable benefits enjoyed by humanity on a daily basis. Resurrection and accountability after death determine the outcome of that test and are the foundation of moral law and order. As part of this test, obstacles have been placed which if not overcome with adherence to guidance from Allāh, they will divert a person away from what benefits him (and society at large) in this life and the next. Every person has a different set of circumstances and is put to trial with one or more of these obstacles. Yet, no person is burdened with a trial greater than it can bear. **“Allāh does not burden a soul more than it can bear.”** (2:286).

From such trials include disease, illness or handicap. Likewise, poverty and hunger. Even affluence, property and wealth are trials which test a person’s gratitude, patience and restraint. Similarly, war and its effects and the most horrible of crimes such as murder are all ways in which people are put to trial. The degree and severity of these trials vary, but each person will be recompensed in full with the greatest of rewards for showing patience. It is belief in the hereafter and anticipation of reward that make the trials of life meaningful.³¹ Amongst these trials are sexual feelings of men and women and exercising them within bounds and limits. **The sexual conduct of individuals has a direct, lasting impact upon society as a whole and is inseparable from issues such as personal and public**

the streets of Versailles during late 2013 as well as protests in other major cities.

³¹ In contrast to individuals with atheistic beliefs, a Muslim lives for the hereafter and not this life. Because there is no afterlife to live for in an atheist, materialist world-view, maximization of personal benefit and pleasure tend to be the primary motivations, driving forces and economically exploitable factors in such societies. Morals, whilst they be held in such societies amongst groups and individuals, do not have any *logical* basis in such a world-view and do not make *logical* sense, not for the individual, nor the corporation, nor the state.

health, material and inheritance rights and child development and welfare. From these numerous considerations, Islām regulates the exercise of sexual desire to ensure it is exercised within the confines of its biologically intended design and only in ways that protect and preserve the physical, psychological and material interests of all parties whose entrance into this world is through that design.³² This leads us then to the question of sexual ‘orientation’ and conduct.

³² The New York Times ran an article titled, “*Experts Find Extramarital Affairs Have a Profound Impact on Children*” in which it is reported, “Children suffer when their parents engage in extramarital affairs, even when the parents succeed in keeping the affairs secret, therapists and sociologists are finding. While an affair is taking place children sense that the parent is expending emotional energy outside the family, the specialists say. As a result, the children may become anxious or frightened, or they may sense rejection and feel they must have done something wrong. Moreover, experts found that such children are prone to have affairs themselves when they marry. The common assumption has been that unless a marriage is in jeopardy, a discreet affair has little if any impact on a child. But increasing clinical evidence and a recent study suggest that the subtle changes in an adulterous parent’s behavior can unsettle children, regardless of whether the truth leaks out and even if the children are too young to understand what is happening. Dr. Pittman said small children in such situations ‘tend to exhibit anxiety symptoms, with clinging, bed-wetting, thumb-sucking, fire-setting, temper tantrums, night terrors - in fact, anything that seems an appropriate response to the fear that their family is about to be wiped out.’ Older children, who may feel angry or betrayed when they find out that a parent is having an affair, may respond by acting out... Parental affairs can also become the training ground for a child’s adult behavior. ‘Even though they may swear they will never do the same,’ Dr. Lawson noted, ‘it appears to become a patterned response learned in childhood.’ In instances where a father boasts about his relationships to a teen-age son - as many do, her sampling showed - she found philandering taking on the overtones of a family tradition. By contrast, the researchers reported, a girl who is aware of her father’s behavior seems to grow up angry at men and unsure of her relationships with them. When the mother is having an affair, the therapists said they detected a different reaction in children. Because the mother is still most often considered the focus of the family, a child who learns of an affair is in danger of losing confidence in the viability of marriage and family.” (9th March 1989).

SEXUAL ORIENTATION, CONDUCT AND IDENTITY

It is a self-evident, undeniable fact that the default biological, physiological design in humans is sexual conduct between males and females. This is **rooted in biology** and is tied to the continuation and survival of humanity. Sexual attraction and conduct between males and females is therefore the normal, natural, *default sexual behavior* by design. The two halves of the human body, male and female are designed to combine together in pairs in all levels: physical, emotional, psychological and sexual. This is a statement of fact just as saying “*a lock and key combine together to provide a single mechanism*” is to make a statement of fact. Allāh (ﷻ) said, “**And of His signs is that He created for you from yourselves mates that you may find tranquillity in them; and He placed between you affection and mercy. Indeed in that are signs for a people who give thought.**” (30:21) Through this order, Islām establishes and protects the safety and dignity of human life from birth to death by encouraging the practice of sexuality within marriage between a biological male and a biological female. This gives rise to a natural family of a *biological father* and a *biological mother* which provides the intended setting for raising children.

Homosexuality is treated as a deviation from this natural order in the revealed books of the Torah,³³ Gospel and the Qur’ān. For the non-believing atheist who does not affirm revealed books, a proof for this can be adduced from the theory of evolution, a foundational cornerstone for atheistic, secular societies. Sodomy cannot be reconciled with natural selection and is not equivalent to heterosexuality which is a *permanent design feature* ensuring the survival and continuity of humanity. Leaving a hundred gays or a hundred lesbians on a remote island will lead them to die out *within*

³³ Refer to <http://www.torahdec.org> where hundreds of Torah Jews have signed a short declaration regarding homosexuality and in which they write, “The Torah makes a clear statement that homosexuality is not an acceptable lifestyle or a genuine identity by severely prohibiting its conduct.”

just one generation showing that this practice conflicts with the idea of *natural selection* as the mechanism of evolution and the concept of ‘*the survival of the fittest.*’ Thus, promotion of homosexuality and belief in natural selection (*‘survival of the fittest’*) at the same time is illogical. An exclusively homosexual lifestyle amongst a population will lead to inevitable extinction in the shortest amount of time (one generation) and the complete disappearance of their gene-pool.³⁴ This is especially so when we come to realize that such a lifestyle is inseparable from practices which are of high-risk to health and longevity.

Gay rights activists and their movements understand this point well. This helps us to appreciate the organized attempts from within the homosexual movement to legalize pedophilia and reduce or eliminate all age-of-sexual-consent laws as a means of ensuring a

³⁴ A counter-argument is presented by homosexuals in which the practice of sodomy is claimed to be an in-built population control mechanism and is part of the natural selection process. **First**, there is no evidence, and never will be, that the practice of sodomy is *determined* by genes in the same way that skin, hair and eye colour are determined by genes. **Second**, with a bit of satire, perhaps this population control mechanism worked a little too well for the dinosaurs. T-Rex, Stegosaurus, Diplodocus and Triceratops fell victim to the “gay gene” and become extinct due to excessive indulgence in non-reproductive anal sex over and above reproductive sex. **Third**, how and where does *gene-awareness* arise that the population is getting too large such that the “gay gene” is triggered and expressed in societies around the world to ensure a larger population of gays emerges from heterosexuals so that the growth rate of heterosexuals can be slowed down? **Fourth**, if we accept this and assert that the global population of true homosexuals is say, 2% or even 5% or 10%, that will still not keep the population in check in the long term, since the remaining 98%, 95% or 90% will continue reproducing at the same rate and any control effects will be wiped out after a generation or two. **Fifth**, this argument is clearly illogical and works against those making use of it. Since male homosexuals cannot engage in reproductive sex but only anal intercourse, their ability to pass on their alleged “gay” genes is compromised. They will die out in one generation. Heterosexuals on the other hand will continue reproducing. Thus, rather than being a population control mechanism, the alleged “gay gene” should be more accurately characterized as an in-built self-extinction mechanism.

constant supply of ‘partners’ to engage in sodomy. The inseparable connection between homosexuality and pedophilia is proven through empirical evidence in a separate chapter.

Unravelling Identity Politics Centred Around the Practice of Sodomy

It is important to distinguish between all of the following in order to thoroughly understand the nature of pro-sodomy propaganda and identity politics:

- a) The **default biological design** of *complementary male and female reproductive organs* tied to the **default sexual orientation**, which is heterosexuality. Sexual development in the male and female is biologically and physiologically rooted and is fixed for reproduction indicating that male-female sexual orientation is natural and normal.
- b) Sexual **attraction** whose development is strongly influenced by environment. The term ‘orientation’ is often used here. Social conditions, upbringing and culture influence the development of sexual attraction.
- c) Sexual **conduct** which is voluntary, not determined or forced by genes. All conduct is voluntary, if genes *determined* behaviour, no person could be held accountable for his actions.
- d) Sexual **identification**, a person’s labelling of his self-image and its projection and conveyance to others.

In explanation of this, a very small number of people in a population may experience same-sex attraction or feelings but choose not to engage in same-sex conduct. This does not make them homosexuals. A very small number of people may engage in some same-sex conduct due to unique circumstances (such as what may happen in prisons). Despite this, they may not identify as homosexuals. Thus,

not everyone who engages in same-sex conduct necessarily identifies as a homosexual indicating that *conduct* and *identity* are two separate affairs just as *orientation* and *conduct* and two separate affairs.

There are many types of *sexual conduct* but there is only one in-built, biologically-intended orientation, and that is heterosexuality. Had it been otherwise every human would have been born with both male and female organs and would have had the ability to reproduce with any other human. Homosexual conduct is not a category which can be put alongside the categories of skin, hair and eye colour (race), biological sex,³⁵ or disability which are all inborn, involuntary and immutable and on the basis of which discrimination is certainly unethical. Homosexual behaviour is acquired and learned from external cues and is not biological in origin. There are huge efforts to engineer public attitudes and perceptions towards abnormal types of *sexual conduct* with a view to making them not just normal and acceptable, but desirable and fashionable. A large part of this is being achieved through deceptive definition of terms relying upon hidden assumptions.³⁶ By controlling definitions public attitudes are manipulated effectively. With this in mind, the following matters should be clearly understood:

³⁵ Meaning, *gender* as determined through male or female genital organs.

³⁶ For example, *sexual orientation, diversity, discrimination, homophobia* and *tolerance* to name a few. These terms are employed with hidden assumptions to conceal the underlying issue which is that certain types of *voluntary conduct* (anal intercourse) are harmful to individual and collective health. Mark Steyn, social commentator and critic writes, “Language has been an important weapon in the gay movement’s very swift advance. In the old days, there was ‘sodomy’: an act. In the late 19th century, the word ‘homosexuality’ was coined: a condition. A generation ago, the accepted term became ‘gay’: an identity. Each formulation raises the stakes: One can object to and even criminalize an act; one is obligated to be sympathetic toward a condition; but once it’s a fully fledged 24/7 identity, like being Hispanic or Inuit, anything less than wholehearted acceptance gets you marked down as a bigot.” *Mark Steyn: There’s no stopping them now* in Chicago Sun-Times (13th July 2003).

First, there is no evidence that sodomy is genetically determined and an immutable behaviour. The claim that “homosexuality” is inborn was made for **political reasons** in the 1980s to avoid falling foul of anti-sodomy laws.³⁷ When the right of states to criminalize sodomy was maintained in a 1986 US Supreme Court ruling, sodomists sought another route of legal protection by claiming to have a *minority status* which can be proven if immutable qualities determine that status. In other words, the claim that sodomists are just born that way in the same way that blacks are born blacks and the blue-eyed are born blue-eyed and the disabled are born disabled. This would have enabled another legal defence for consensual sodomy.

Thus, one should differentiate between legal and political strategies used to justify a sodomistic lifestyle³⁸ and actual scientific evidence. It is impossible to prove homosexuals are born the way they are simply because no child is born with the desire for same-sex sexual conduct and sodomy.³⁹ That is an acquired feature in which external cues (environment, experience) play significant roles.⁴⁰ As for

³⁷ See the next chapter for more details.

³⁸ Homosexuality should be correctly defined as *the desire for or participation in same-sex sexual conduct* and should be viewed as a culture and way of life centred around the practice of sodomy and should be evaluated on the benefits and harms of such conduct (and its promotion) upon the individual and society.

³⁹ Having said this, we must point that out whilst genes certainly do not *determine* homosexuality (in the same way that they determine skin and eye colour, disease or disability) genetic or hormonal abnormalities can determine behavioural traits which are not exclusive to homosexuals but may predispose some towards choosing a homosexual lifestyle if the right experiences and external cues come to them. Even this is not evidence that homosexuality is genetically *determined* through hard-wiring in the same way as biological gender, skin, hair and eye-colour and other immutable qualities.

⁴⁰ The sum of all evidence indicates that genes do not *determine* homosexuality at all in the way that skin, hair and eye colour are determined. However, genes (and hormonal abnormalities) may influence the development of traits which when combined with a person’s environment, experiences, social settings and cues (and conditioning and indoctrination) would lead him to identify as a homosexual.

heterosexuality, it is an **in-built biological design feature**, even if sexual attraction to the opposite sex does not develop until later.

The American Psychological Association (APA) affirms that there are no findings to validate the “born-gay” claim, “There is no consensus among scientists about the exact reasons that an individual develops a heterosexual, bisexual, gay, or lesbian orientation. Although much research has examined the possible genetic, hormonal, developmental, social, and cultural influences on sexual orientation, no findings have emerged that permit scientists to conclude that sexual orientation is determined by any particular factor or factors. Many think that nature and nurture both play complex roles...”⁴¹

Second, here is conclusive, irrefutable proof that homosexuality is not genetically *determined*. If one of two identical twins was homosexual, having been born that way due to genetic determination, the other must always be homosexual without fail. It should not be possible to find a pair of twins one of whom is homosexual and the other heterosexual. Either they are both “homosexual” or both “heterosexual” in a 100% of cases or very close thereto. Studies never show a concordance rate of 100% which would be needed to prove this thesis correct. The pairwise studies⁴² performed in this field show around a 10% concordance rate. Thus, if you take pairs of identical twins in which one twin is homosexual, the identical co-twin is usually not homosexual nine times out of ten. That means, given that identical twins are always genetically identical, homosexuality cannot be genetically dictated. **No-one is**

⁴¹ In a Q&A leaflet titled, “*Answers to Your Questions For A Better Understanding of Sexual Orientation and Homosexuality.*” <http://apa.org>.

⁴² This is the most correct and accurate way to measure the percentage of same-sex attraction (SSA) in identical twins. A register of identical (monozygotal) twins is used to find pairs in which one twin has SSA. It is then determined if the other twin has SSA or not. One should also note the continued attempts by pro-sodomists within academia to undermine the conclusive evidence provided by identical twin studies by performing their own twin studies and twisting the data to fit their claims.

born gay. The predominant things that create homosexuality in one identical twin and not in the other have to be post-birth factors.

This is **clear undeniable evidence** that external cues, environmental and social factors play the determining role in sexual lifestyle choices and behaviours. It is therefore conclusively fallacious and fraudulent to claim that there is a “gay gene” which determines homosexuality in the same way that skin, hair and eye colour are determined. Be alert for all forms of academic propaganda and scientific studies which are used to deceive the public in this matter.⁴³ At best, genes may play a small role in influencing certain behaviors or emotions in some people which when coupled with external cues, social circumstances and certain life experiences predispose them to being susceptible to same-sex attraction more so than others who also have the same feelings and behaviour but never go on to develop such a disposition. Even this does not amount to evidence that homosexuality is genetic or biologically *determined*, contrary to the exaggerated claims of homosexual activists.

Third, a clear difference should be made between **orientation** and **conduct**. For propaganda purposes, when the general public is addressed, sexual ‘orientations’ are cleverly restricted to only four: heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual and transsexual. However, **bestiality, pedophilia, incest, necrophilia** and many other practices can also be treated as ‘orientations’ and their practitioners can also argue ‘we were born that way.’ This then weakens attempts to confer upon homosexuality a status equal to heterosexuality because it means that bestiality, pedophilia,⁴⁴ incest and necrophilia and every other ‘orientation’ has the same status and their practitioners must

⁴³ Homosexuals are active in academia attempting to publish studies to falsify firmly established biological facts.

⁴⁴ One should note that calls to legalize pedophilia and man-boy “*intergenerational*” relationships are coming within from the homosexual movement itself. Gay activist organizations provide indirect tactical support to this cause by campaigning for the reduction or abolition of all age of sexual consent laws.

have equal rights and not be discriminated against. The significance behind this point is that whilst we can potentially present an unlimited amount of ‘orientations’ it is *actual conduct* and the *benefits* and *harms* thereof upon the individual and society which should form the basis of law in the minds of all reasonable and intelligent people.

The reason why focus is around ‘orientation’ instead of conduct is because this allows a basis for civil rights and anti-discrimination policies in relation to homosexuals. By extension, and by the very same arguments, those who engage in bestiality, pedophilia, incest and necrophilia should be afforded the same rights as they can equally argue that they have legitimate ‘orientations’ based upon *immutable* characteristics.

If the matter is viewed purely from the perspective of benefits and harms of various types of sexual conduct, it would undermine homosexual arguments because of the clearly identifiable and proven harms associated with a homosexual lifestyle. What we will learn later in the book is that the homosexual agenda is closely-knit with stealth attempts to legalize pedophilia. Both of these agendas are in turn directed towards the dismantling and destruction of the family institution.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ The traditional *family unit* is the enemy of Weishauptian, Jacobinist, Marxist, Bolshevist, Communist, Collectivist, Internationalist Socialism. This is why a very large number of prominent homosexual activists are Communists, Marxists, Socialists who detest the family institution and desire its destruction. This is because the biological family establishes material, inheritance and private property rights whereas the collectivist ideology desires abolition of private property rights. Thus, “gay activism” indirectly supports the goals of Internationalist Socialism. Some homosexual radicalists make it clear that the demands for “gay marriage” are not primarily to give equal rights to homosexuals but to actually undermine the very nature of the institution of marriage. This is because marriage is purely a heterosexual institution, not a homosexual one. There is little evidence that gays and lesbians truthfully desire to commit themselves to the kind of fidelity and chastity required by the institution of marriage. Thus, the ideas of “open marriage” and “gay marriage” are

Fourth, a huge body of evidence now exists which puts the ‘born gay’ hoax in the same category as scientific frauds such as Piltdown man.⁴⁶ This body of evidence includes:

One: The *fluidity* in sexual orientation, the fact that homosexuals become heterosexuals and vice versa, indicating post-birth and social, environmental factors are at play.⁴⁷ Anthropologists who

intended to undermine and destroy the very institution itself. This goal is openly revealed by many gay activists. Paula Ettelbrick, lesbian homosexual thinker and activist stated in the 1980s, “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.” Quoted by William B. Rubenstein, “*Since When Is Marriage a Path to Liberation? Lesbians, Gay Men, and the Law*,” (New York: The New Press, 1993):398, 400. Refer also to Alan Soble, Nicholas Power, “*The Philosophy of Sex: Contemporary Readings*” (Rowman & Littlefield 2007) p. 185.

⁴⁶ The Piltdown Man is a famous hoax in which pieces of a skull and jawbone found in 1912 were believed to be the fossilized remains of an early form of human being. The specimen was officially given a latin name (*Eoanthropus Dawsoni*) after its collector Charles Dawson. In 1953 it was exposed to be a fraud consisting of the jawbone of an orangutan and the skull of a fully developed adult man. The Piltdown hoax is probably the most famous hoax in history. It has become so well known for two reasons: the attention it brought to the issue of evolution, and the length of time (over 40 years) that it took for anyone to discover it was a fraud.

⁴⁷ In an interesting article titled “*The Sexual Blur*”, the author, homosexual activist, Ted Gideonse, writes as his subtitle, “With straights falling for gays, lesbians dating men, and gay men in love with women, is anybody anything anymore? Just how important is sexual identity?” He begins his article with an interesting occurrence on an Oprah Winfrey show. Gideonse writes, “When Anne Heche sat down next to her girlfriend, Ellen DeGeneres, on The Oprah Winfrey Show and said, ‘I was not gay before I met her,’ Oprah Winfrey’s audience—and Winfrey herself—were a bit bewildered. ‘That confuses me,’ Winfrey said. One woman in the audience asked Heche to explain what she meant, because ‘we’re led to believe that people who are gay tend to know from birth, and you kind of disputed that.’ The only thing Heche could say in response was, ‘I didn’t all of a sudden feel, I’m gay—I just all of a sudden felt, Oh, I love’.” Published in the gay magazine, *the Advocate*, on 24th June 1997. Homosexuals know full well that sexuality is fluid and can be changed by social, cultural and environmental factors. It is these

study the evidence provide a uniform view that behaviours such as homosexuality are not produced genetically, but by social conditions. The sexual fluidity found amongst homosexuals is clear evidence of this in that some of them choose to be bisexual after being homosexual. Others choose to be exclusively homosexual after being bisexual and yet others abandon homosexuality altogether to lead heterosexual lives with or without marriage.

Two: Twin studies conclusively disprove the claim that being orientated towards the practice of sodomy is genetically determined as has preceded. If the “genes made me this way” argument is used by homosexuals, it can also be used by serial child-rapists and murderers.

Three: No convincing relationship has been demonstrated between pre-natal hormone exposure and homosexuality and nor between brain structure and homosexuality.⁴⁸ Since a genetic cause has been conclusively disproven, homosexual academics embark upon other avenues to help establish any biologically-related cause to support their propaganda efforts.

Four: Humans have very strong basic instincts such as hunger, reproduction and self-preservation. They are deeply embedded and extremely strong. However, we are able to control and *adapt* these instincts. If it is argued that homosexuality is a deeply ingrained instinct, then it follows that it is changeable, adaptable, controllable and responsive to training and therapy. This scares homosexual activists who live under the illusion that one’s sexual attractions and

factors (not biological ones) on account of which homosexuals decide or “realise” suddenly that they are gay.

⁴⁸ The brain has a high degree of plasticity, meaning it is constantly changing due to personal experiences. Thus, even if we accept for argument’s sake that homosexual brains are noticeably different to heterosexual brains, that would be a result of years of conditioning with repeat thinking patterns and behaviour. This establishes an environmental cause for the difference, not a fundamentally biological one.

identity cannot be changed.⁴⁹ Fearful of this, they are now lobbying for laws that prevent mental health professionals from providing sexual reorientation therapy for those who wish to purify themselves from same-sex attractions.

Five: Population genetic studies demonstrate that in any two unrelated people of any ethnicity, an average of at least 99.5% of their genes are the same.⁵⁰ Humans share more or less identical genes. If this is the case, then patterns of sodomy should be the same in all societies, cultures and civilizations. However these identical genetic properties do not express outwardly into identical patterns in human behaviour. Anthropologists who study civilizations and cultures have found such huge variations in heterosexual and homosexual practice from culture to culture, and such sudden changes in sexual practice and orientation, even over one generation, that it demands the natural and logical conclusion that all *sexual behaviour* is learned.

Six: It is impossible for there to be a “gay gene” *because no gene can do anything by itself*. Thus, all attempts to argue for the existence of a single “gay gene” are scientifically invalid from the very beginning. It would be less nonsensical and closer to scientific reality to claim “clusters of genes” determine homosexuality, which is also an incorrect claim. Molecular biologists familiar with gene activation and expression and how genes function will understand this well. Sensational media headlines such as “Gay gene found” are no more than propaganda aimed at making fools of the uninformed public. Just as there is no specific gene or collection of genes that cause a person to smoke, play football or give charity, there is likewise no specific collection of genes which cause a man to find pleasure in sodomizing another (homosexuality), or cause a man to find

⁴⁹ They know full well this is false, but it is fear of the consequences - losing members of their homosexual community - that drives them to live under this illusion and pretend it is true.

⁵⁰ Refer to “*In the Genome Race, the Sequel Is Personal*” in the New York Times, (4th September 2007).

pleasure in sex with dead bodies (necrophilia), or cause a man to find pleasure in sex with animals (bestiality).

Seven: Different models of homosexuality have existed amongst societies and in each case they have a cultural origin, not a genetic, biological one. Had homosexuality been natural, it would have found uniform expression in all cultures and civilizations. However, to many cultures the very concept of homosexuality is unknown. As for the variations in homosexuality, there is the **Greek model** in which older, married men (who often also had mistresses) would act as mentors to young boys and train them to become men. Part of this process involved sodomizing them. At the appropriate age, the mentor would even find the young man a bride. Then the mentor would find another boy and start the process again. There is the **Melanesian model** in Papua New Guinea, found only amongst a minority of tribes. In this model men pass through three stages in their graduation to manhood. First, they undergo *exclusive passive homosexuality* where they are sodomized by older men. Then *exclusive active homosexuality* where they sodomize younger boys. Finally, they practice *exclusive heterosexuality* by getting married. These stages were considered to be part of a developmental process. All homosexual activity had to stop when the third level had been reached, it was considered abhorrent beyond this point. The **Western model** is different from the previous models in which homosexuality was institutionalized. In this model there is exclusive homosexuality between adults, mostly of equal status. There is also significant interest in young post-pubertal teenagers as far as it is legally allowed in Western countries. It is claimed in this model that this behaviour is intrinsic, innate and it is also highly politicized. This model is unique in the sense that it has appeared and spread too rapidly for it to have been produced genetically. It is clearly from these different models, homosexuality is culturally acquired.⁵¹

⁵¹ Refer to *My Genes Made Me Do it* by N.E. Whitehead (2015) pp. 116-120.

Behavioural Genetics is a highly-controversial field. Whilst many claims are made about the extent to which genes influence behaviour, scientists admit that the connection between genes and human behaviour is much more complex (and thus **indirect** and **loose**) than the connection between genes and disease, which even now still baffles scientists a great deal. Scientific researchers recognize that connecting behaviour to genes has huge moral implications. Arguing for a “gay gene” means that murder, rape, embezzlement, incest and pedophilia genes also exist. The following quote from a government funded bioethics policy paper will relegate all pseudo-scientific, factually incorrect gay propaganda to its proper place: the dustbin. The current status and reality of research into behavioural genetics is nicely summarized in a detailed 258 page 2002 report by the UK Nuffield Council on Bioethics⁵² titled, “*Genetics and Human Behaviour: The Human Context.*” They write, “So, while it might be correct to say that a particular genetic variant is part of the cause of a particular trait, or that it is one causal factor, it will seldom be the only cause, **nor is it likely to be either a necessary or sufficient condition for the trait to be manifested.** Furthermore, even if particular genes that contribute to a trait can be identified, this is only a small part of the story. There is still a need to understand **the very indirect pathway** between a gene, a particular protein and an individual scoring highly on an IQ test or having an aggressive personality. Our understanding of these causal pathways is at an even earlier stage than our understanding of which genes influence behavioural traits, which is itself extremely limited... Research which claims to show an association between particular genetic variants and particular traits tends to receive considerable attention in the scientific and lay media. The various methods of research in this field are not infallible, and the reviews of the evidence in Chapters 7–10 show that few findings have been replicated successfully to date. **Thus, reports of such things as ‘gay genes’ or ‘smart mice’ convey a highly inaccurate impression of the state of**

⁵² The Nuffield Council on Bioethics is funded jointly by the Medical Research Council, the Nuffield Foundation and the Wellcome Trust and consists of a board of professors and specialists in medicine and law.

the research.⁵³ The lack of reporting of negative or contradictory findings exacerbates this problem. These difficulties are not unique to research in behavioural genetics. However, it does seem that such research is, at present, particularly susceptible to reporting which, whether strictly accurate or not, is misleading in the impression it gives to the reader.”

The reader should keep this quote in mind when we analyze the *born gay* and *gay gene* scientific frauds in the chapters to follow. All “gay” activism and pro-sodomy propaganda is based around these and numerous other hoaxes.

⁵³ This is a milder, kinder and politically correct way of saying that such reports are based upon unethical academic practices not excluding fraud.

HISTORY OF THE MODERN 'BORN GAY' HOAX⁵⁴

Pro-sodomy activists employ the courts, legislation, public schools and other avenues to impose *non-factual beliefs* upon populations. The greatest non-factual belief upon which the entirety of contemporary gay activism rests is the fallacious claim that homosexual attraction is *genetically determined* and *immutable* like skin, eye and hair colour. This direction was taken as part of an approach to overcome anti-sodomy laws when the US Supreme Court judged in a 1986 court case (*Bowers v. Hardwick* 478 U.S. 186) that states maintain their right to criminalize sodomy and that “privacy rights” arguments are invalid.⁵⁵ Pushed into a corner, gay lawyers and activists sought a means through which to claim “minority status” and thus use the approach of *civil rights* arguments. A year earlier in 1985, the “born-gay” hoax had already been invented at the hands of two Harvard University graduates. **Marshall Kirk**, a psychologist and **Hunter Madsen**, a PhD in politics who

⁵⁴ Refer to Victor J. Adamsons, “*The ‘Born Gay’ Hoax Exposed*” (24th December 2014) and the Ryan Sorba’s excellent book, “*The ‘Born Gay’ Hoax.*”

⁵⁵ In 1986, the US Supreme Court upheld the right of states to criminalize sodomy despite arguments by homosexuals that it was a ‘privacy right.’ Refer to *Bowers v. Hardwick* 478 U.S. 186 (1986) in which it was judged that “Held: The Georgia statute is constitutional. Pp. 478 U. S. 190-196. (a) The Constitution does not confer a fundamental right upon homosexuals to engage in sodomy. None of the fundamental rights announced in this Court’s prior cases involving family relationships, marriage, or procreation bear any resemblance to the right asserted in this case. And any claim that those cases stand for the proposition that any kind of private sexual conduct between consenting adults is constitutionally insulated from state proscription is unworkable. Pp. 478 U. S. 190-191. (b) Against a background in which many States have criminalized sodomy and still do, to claim that a right to engage in such conduct is ‘deeply rooted in this Nation’s history and tradition’ or ‘implicit in the concept of ordered liberty’ is, at best, facetious. Pp. 478 U. S. 191-194.” End of quote. In short, a male homosexual was criminally charged for committing consensual sodomy with another male adult in the bedroom of his home and the court ruled that there is no constitutional right to engage in consensual homosexual sodomy. Since that time, due to intense lobbying efforts anti-sodomy laws have now been repealed.


became an expert in social marketing and public persuasion. They co-authored an article, “*The Gay Agenda*” in a pro-sodomy magazine called Christopher Street.⁵⁶ They outlined a strategy for shifting the focus away from a sodomy-centred debate to an identity-centred debate in order to deceive the public into equating between a lifestyle choice and an immutable biological trait such as skin colour. Anti-sodomists could then be pushed into a position whereby they were treated as attacking *civil rights* of “gay” citizens. “Gay rights” activism could then be equated with the black civil rights movement of the 1960s. In 1986 the pro-sodomy movement lost *Bowers v. Hardwick*, the United States Supreme Court case which upheld the rights of individual states to criminalize sodomy. The loss was devastating to homosexuals. Desperate and angry, pro-sodomy activists learned that if they could make a compelling case that they were “born gay” they could become eligible for “minority status” as a “suspect class” under the 1964 Civil Rights Act. If minority status were granted, it would force the courts to overturn *Bowers v. Hardwick*, thus legalizing sodomy. Shortly after in 1987, Kirk and Madsen⁵⁷ published a follow up to “*The Gay Agenda*” called, “*The Overhauling of Straight America*” in the pro-sodomy publication known as “*Guide*” in November of that year. This included a systematic, point by point strategy to convince “straight” America that gays are born gays. The strategies include talking about gays as loud and often as possible, portraying gays as victims and not aggressive challengers, developing a just cause for straight protectors of gays so they can be recruited as defenders, make gays look good and superior pillars of society, make the victimizers look nasty and to vilify them in the public eye, to solicit funds, and finally to get onto the media as widely as possible.

In the following year, 1988, a “War Conference” of 175 leading pro-sodomy activists, representing organizations from every part of the

⁵⁶ This is the name of the street where Stonewall Inn was located that triggered homosexual riots in 1969, leading to the development of a militant side to “gay activism.”

⁵⁷ Madsen wrote under the pseudonym of “Erastes Pill.”

United States convened in Warrenton, Virginia. The purpose of the conference according to Kirk and Madsen was to establish an official agenda for the newly conceived “gay” movement. At this “War Conference” pro-sodomy activists adopted the *identity politics strategy* outlined in “The Gay Agenda” and “The Overhauling of Straight America”. The “born gay” hoax was officially born. Subsequently, in 1989, Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen expanded their article “The Overhauling of Straight America” into a book entitled “**After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of the Gays in the 90s**”. In this deliberately deceitful agenda for America, Kirk and Madsen wrote that they intend to “get tough” on straights. They also wrote, “...it is time to learn from Madison Avenue⁵⁸



and to roll out the big guns... We are talking about propaganda.” Kirk and Madsen explained the central tenet of their strategy, “The public should be persuaded that gays are victims of circumstance, that they no more chose their sexual orientation than they did, say, their height, skin color, talents, or limitations.” They were not ashamed to state openly, “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.”⁵⁹ In other words, we know that the born-gay claim is fallacious, but “*for all practical purposes*” - meaning propaganda purposes - gays should be *considered to have been born gay*. This book reveals that the “gay rights” movement is not a genuine civil rights campaign like that of blacks in the 1960s, **but an orchestrated Machiavellian propaganda campaign founded upon lies and deceit.**

⁵⁸ Madison Avenue was a central hub for the world’s biggest advertising and marketing agencies.

⁵⁹ *After the Ball* (Doubleday, 1st edition, May 1989) p. 184.

The book is described as a **“stunningly systematic and controversial blueprint... of carefully calculated public relations propaganda.”** (back cover). The authors write in the introduction, **“The campaign we outline in this book, though complex, depends centrally upon a program of unabashed propaganda, firmly grounded in long-established principles of psychology and advertising.”** (p. xxvii). Later in the work they write, **“We have in mind a strategy as calculated and powerful as that which gays are accused of pursuing by their enemies - or, if you prefer, a plan as manipulative as that which our enemies themselves employ. It’s time to learn from Madison Avenue, to rollout the big guns. Gays must launch a large-scale campaign—we’ve called it the Waging Peace campaign to reach straights through the mainstream media. We are talking about propaganda.”** (p.161). **“The first order of business is desensitization of the American public concerning gays.”** (p. 7), **“Talk about gays and gayness as loudly and as often as possible... The principal behind this advice is simple: almost all behavior begins to look normal if you are exposed to enough of it at close quarters and among your acquaintances.”** (p. 7), **“Gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the role of protector.”** (p. 8), **“Make use of symbols which reduce the mainstream’s sense of threat, which lower its guard”** (p. 8), **“Constant talk builds the impression that public opinion is at least divided on the subject.”** (p. 8). On the use of media, film and television, they write, **“Where we talk is important. The visual media, film and television, are plainly the most powerful image-makers in Western civilization. The average American household watches over seven hours of TV daily. Those hours open up a gateway into the private world of straights, through which a Trojan horse might be passed. As far as desensitization is concerned, the medium is the message of normalcy. So far, gay Hollywood has provided our best covert weapon in the battle to desensitize the mainstream.”** (p. 8).

They also state, **“The campaign should paint gays as superior pillars of society. Yes, yes, we know – this trick is so old it creaks.”** (p. 9),

“Replace the mainstream’s self-righteous pride about its homophobia with shame and guilt.” (p. 10), “It will be time to get tough with remaining opponents. To be blunt, they must be vilified.” (p. 14), “We intend to make anti-gays look so nasty that average Americans will want to dissociate themselves from such types.” (p. 10), “Each sign will tap patriotic sentiment; each message will drill a seemingly agreeable position into mainstream heads.” (p. 11), “The public should be shown images of ranting homophobes whose secondary traits and beliefs disgust middle America... the Ku Klux Klan demanding that gays be burned alive or castrated; bigoted southern [sic] ministers drooling with hysterical hatred to a degree that looks both comical and deranged; menacing punks, thugs and convicts... Nazi concentration camps.” (p. 10).

The authors make clear how vocal opponents will be handled, “These images (of anyone opposed to homosexual behavior) should be combined with those of their gay victims by a method propagandists call the ‘bracket technique.’ For example, for a few seconds an unctuous beady-eyed Southern preacher is seen pounding the pulpit in rage about ‘those sick, abominable creatures.’ While his tirade continues over the soundtrack, the picture switches to pathetic photos of gays who look decent, harmless, and likable; and then we cut back to the poisonous face of the preacher, and so forth. The contrast speaks for itself. The effect is devastating.” (pp. 13-14). Of special note is how the two propagandists explain how to tackle religious authorities, “Would a desensitizing campaign of open and sustained talk about gay issues reach every rabid opponent of homosexuality? Of course not! While public opinion is one primary source of mainstream values, religious authority is the other. When conservative churches condemn gays, there are only two things we can do to confound the homophobia of true believers. First, we can use talk to muddy the moral waters. This means publicizing support for gays by more moderate churches, raising theological objections of our own about conservative interpretations of Biblical teachings, and exposing hatred and inconsistency. Second, we can undermine the moral authority of homophobic churches by

portraying them as antiquated backwaters, badly out of step with the times and with the latest findings of psychology. Against the mighty pull of institutional Religion one must set the mightier draw of Science and Public Opinion (the shield and sword of that accursed 'secular humanism'). Such an unholy alliance has worked well against churches before on such topics as divorce and abortion. With enough open talk about the prevalence and acceptability of homosexuality, that alliance can work again here." (p. 12). We can see this approach being implemented in relation to Islām with the appearance of Muslim "moderates" and financial, political support for thrusting Muslim "gay rights" groups upon Muslim communities and belittling religious authorities.

For the sake of completeness, we present the excerpts below so that the true nature of this extremely successful propaganda war that has been waged for 25 years can be grasped:

The homosexual agenda can succeed by conversion of the average Americans emotions, mind, and will, through, a planned psychological attack in the form of propaganda to the nation via media (p. 153). "Propaganda relies more upon emotional manipulation than upon logic, since its goal is to bring about public change" (p. 162). Propaganda can be unabashedly subjective and one-sided, there is nothing wrong with this (p. 163). Homosexual agenda can succeed by "desensitization" achieved by lowering the intensity of antigay emotional reactions to a level of sheer indifference (p. 153). Homosexual agenda can succeed by "jamming" and "confusing" adversaries" (p. 153). "Heterosexuals dislike homosexuals on fundamentally emotional, not intellectual grounds" (p. 166). Make victimizers look bad by linking to Nazi horror while helping straights to see gays as victims and feel protective towards them (p. 221). Show grisly victimization of gays and demand that readers identify themselves with either social tolerance or gruesome cruelty. The AIDS epidemic amongst homosexuals should be exploited "to increase attention and sympathy" as "victimized minority" (p. xxv). "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” (p. 184). Muddy the moral waters, that is, to undercut the rationalization that justify religious opposition... this entails publicizing support by moderate churches and raising serious theological objections (179). Portray opposing churches “as antiquated backwaters”, badly out of step with the time and with the latest findings of psychology (p. 179). Jam the self-righteous pride by linking to a disreputable hate group (p. 235). The main thing is to talk about gayness until the issue becomes thoroughly tiresome (p.178). All opposition to homosexual behavior is rooted in “Homophobia, Homohatred, and Prejudice” (p. 112). It is acceptable to call people “Homophobic” or “Homohaters” if they do not agree 100% with homosexual views, opinions, or behavior (p. xxiii). A media campaign should portray only the most favorable side of gays (p. 170). All sexual morality should be abolished (pp. 64 to 67). All speech that is opposing homosexual behavior should be banned under “clear and present danger to public order” (p. 101). All and any news or media coverage that is presents homosexual in negative form is prejudiced and invalid (p. 54). “Gay activists have tried to manipulate the American judicial system” (p. 171). “Employ images that desensitize, jam, and-or convert on an emotional level” (p. 173). “Gain access to the kinds of public media that would automatically confer legitimacy upon these messages and sponsors” (p.173). Associate gay cause with “talk about racism, sexism, militarism, poverty, and all the conditions that oppress the unempowered” (p. 181). Project gays as victims of circumstance and oppression, not as aggressive challengers (p. 183). “Mustachioed leather men, drag queens, and bull dykes” should not appear in gay commercials and other public presentations (until later after wide acceptance) (p. 183). Groups on the farthest margins of acceptability, such as NAMBLA (pedophile activists), must play no part at all in the media campaign (p. 184).⁶⁰ “In time we see no reason why more and

⁶⁰ Pay attention to that, homosexual pedophiles are considered to be within

more diversity should not be introduced into the projected image (i.e., drag queens, pedophiles, etc.)” (p. 186). Infer and speculate that famous historical figures were gay for two reasons: first, they are dead as a door nail, hence in no position to deny the truth and sue for libel (p. 188). In TV and print, images of victimizers can be combined with those of their gay victims by a method propagandists call the “bracket technique” (p. 190). The media campaign will reach straights on an emotional level, casting gays as society’s victims and inviting straights to be their protectors (p. 187). We like television because it’s the most graphic and intrusive medium for our message (p. 201). Over the long-term, “television and magazines” are probably the media of choice (p. 204). Ads must manage to get the word gay into the headline or tagline (p. 207). Each message should tap public sentiment, patriotic, or otherwise, and drill an unimpeachable agreeable proposition into the mainstreams head (p. 208). Several years down the road, our tactics will have carved out, slice by slice, a large portion of access to mainstream media (p. 213). Associate and link gays to good causes and non-controversial activities (p. 219). The more people who appear to practice homosexuality, and the more innate it is made to appear, the less abnormal and objectionable, and the more legitimate it will seem (p. 217). Stage candid interviews with gays who appear as solid citizens. Subjects in commercials should be interviewed alone, not with their lovers (for now) (p. 247). Most people derive their impressions of the world through the national media (p. 250). It will be a sheer delight to besmirch our tormentors, we cannot waste our resources on revenge alone (p. 189).

The above evidence establishes that pro-sodomy activists have not been afraid to speak candidly and boldly about the movement’s *practical objectives* for promoting what they know deep inside their souls to be a fraudulent idea. They often admit that public “born gay” rhetoric is fabricated propaganda, contrived and carried out for

the margins of acceptability. Tactically, they are not to be involved in any media campaigns for fear of discrediting the group cause.

a specific political objective which is to overturn the 1986 *Bowers v. Hardwick* ruling and the normalization of sodomy. From then till now, they have been successful through their incessant, organized campaigns to influence public opinion in all sectors. A 2003 case, *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, led to a decision by the United States Supreme Court to overturn its 1986 ruling by striking down anti-sodomy laws in Texas and, by extension, invalidated anti-sodomy laws in other states, making same-sex sexual activity legal in every US state and territory. The same campaigning and lobbying activities have been taking place in other Western nations with similar success.⁶¹

⁶¹ It was not until 1990 that the World Health Organisation declassified homosexuality as a mental disorder, following the trend taking place in Western nations. It is true that homosexuals are not homosexual because they are mentally ill. On the contrary, homosexuals have full control over their cognitive faculties. They know and understand what they are doing. The mental illness claim is incorrect. Evidence indicates that adopting a homosexual lifestyle makes a person more prone to mental illness. The pro-homosexual Gay and Lesbian Medical Association (GLMA) affirms that compared to the general population, there is a higher rate of substance abuse, depression and anxiety, alcohol abuse and dependence, tobacco use and eating disorders amongst gay men. Refer to Victor M. B. Silenzio, “*Top 10 Things Gay Men Should Discuss with their Healthcare Provider*” (San Francisco: Gay & Lesbian Medical Association). Thus, whilst homosexual behaviour makes a person more prone to mental illness it is an incorrect generalisation to say that mental illness causes homosexuality.

WAR: DESENSITIZE, JAM AND CONVERT⁶²

The two gay propagandists, Kirk and Madsen, write, “In February 1988, a ‘war conference’ of 175 leading gay activists, representing organizations from across the land, convened in Warrenton, Virginia, (near Washington, D.C.) to establish a four-point agenda for the gay movement.”⁶³ The discussed future war was to be declared not only against heterosexuals but against homosexuals who did not tow the line. They would be ridiculed and denounced as “gay homophobes.”⁶⁴

A three point strategy to “**desensitize**”, “**jam**” and “**convert**” is presented by Kirk and Madsen and involves the “goodthink” and “badthink” concepts in George Orwell’s book “1984.” They write, “To one extent or another, the separability and manipulability of the verbal label is the basis for all the abstract principles underlying our proposed campaign.”⁶⁵ This means that deceptive labels are the foundation for their entire campaign. These labels will be used to deceive not only the public but also government bodies and officials.

They describe **Desensitization** as overwhelming the public in a “continuous flood of gay-related advertising, presented in the least offensive fashion possible. If straights can’t shut off the shower, they may at least eventually get used to being wet.”⁶⁶ The propagandists did not mean advertising in the usual marketing context but, rather, quite a different approach, “The main thing is to talk about gayness until the issue becomes thoroughly tiresome.”⁶⁷ They add, “seek desensitization and nothing more... if you can get [straights] to think [homosexuality] is just another thing meriting no more than a shrug

⁶² Refer to Paul Rondeau’s “*Selling Homosexuality to America*” in the Regent University Law Review (14:442-485).

⁶³ *After the Ball* (Doubleday, 1st edition, May 1989) p. 163.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* p. 127. This shows that “gay rights” leaders and organizations do not represent all homosexuals, perhaps even not the majority.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* p. 129.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* p. 149.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* p. 178.

of the shoulders then your battle for legal and social rights is virtually won.”⁶⁸ Then they describe the second step, “**Jamming** makes use of the rules of Associative Conditioning... and Direct Emotional Modeling... The bigot need not actually be made to believe... that others will now despise him... rather, our effect is achieved without reference to facts, logic, or proof.... Whether he is conscious of the attack or not. Indeed, the more he is distracted by any incidental, even specious, surface arguments, the less conscious he’ll be of the true nature of the process which is all to the good.”⁶⁹ Effectively, Jamming is *psychological terrorism* meant to silence expression of or even support for dissenting opinion. As for **Conversion**, they explain, “We mean conversion of the average American’s emotions, mind, and will, through a planned psychological attack, in the form of propaganda fed to the nation through the media... we mimic the natural process of stereotype learning, with the following effect: We take the bigot’s good feeling about all-right guys, and attach to them the label ‘gay,’ ...replacing his bad feelings toward the label of the prior stereotype... Our effect is achieved without reference to facts, logic, or proof.”⁷⁰ With Conversion, the bigot is shown images of “his crowd actually associating with gays in good fellowship.”⁷¹ The alleged bigot “is repeatedly exposed to literal picture-label pairs... of gays... carefully selected to look either like the bigot and his friends, or like any one of his other stereotypes of all-right guys.”⁷² An additional tactic is outlined as presenting historical figures as being homosexual and to associate them with positive images. As they are “as dead as a doornail” and in “no position” to “sue for libel” these figures are “especially useful.” And its opposite, to present all detractors as

⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 177.

⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 152-153.

⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 153. A good example of Conversion is from the Philip Morris Company which made marketing history by taking one of the most positive American images of all time, the cowboy, and associated it with a negative, death-oriented product, cigarette. The “Marlboro Man” campaign launched 50 years ago was a very successful example of Conversion.

⁷¹ Ibid. p. 154.

⁷² Ibid. p. 188.

criminals and victimizers and associate them with Ku Klux Klan, Nazis and concentration camps and menacing punks through the use of pictures but not words. They write, “Famous historical figures are considered especially useful to us for two reasons: first, they are invariably dead as a doornail, hence in no position to deny the truth and sue for libel. Second, and more serious, the virtues and accomplishments that make these historic gay figures admirable cannot be gain said or dismissed by the public, since high school history textbooks have already set them in incontrovertible cement.”⁷³

In summary, “the consciousness of others is structured”⁷⁴ through desensitization by talking about an issue so much that it becomes “just another issue.” Making people think this way essentially wins the battle and it is all downhill from this stage. Jamming is to silence any expression or support of a dissenting opinion. Negative images are attached to opponents to discredit or silence them. Conversion is changing a person’s emotion and will through psychological attack using a variety of techniques. Attaching homosexuality to historical figures such as Socrates, Alexander the Great, Leonardo Da Vinci, Abraham Lincoln and others, all claims which cannot be verified, is one element of many in the conversion process.

⁷³ Ibid. p. 189.

⁷⁴ This is a modern marketing concept.

HOMOSEXUAL ACADEMICS ON THE ‘BORN GAY’ HOAX

Camille Paglia, a feminist lesbian, author and social critic wrote in her book *Vamps and Tramps*,⁷⁵ “Homosexuality is not ‘normal.’ On the contrary, it is a challenge to the norm; therein rests its eternally revolutionary character. Queer theorists - that wizened crew of flimflaming free-loaders - have tried to take the post structuralist tack of claiming that there is no norm, since everything is relative and contingent. This is the kind of silly bind that word-obsessed people get into when they are deaf, dumb, and blind to the outside world. Nature exists, whether academics like it or not. And in nature, procreation is the single, relentless rule. That is the norm. Our sexual bodies were designed for reproduction. [---];⁷⁶ no fancy linguistic game-playing can change that biologic fact.” She also wrote, “Given the intense hormonal surge of puberty, the total absence of adult heterosexual desire is neither normal nor natural.” Also, “Is gay identity so fragile that it cannot bear the thought that some people may not wish to be gay? The difficulties in changing sexual orientation do not spring from its genetic innateness. Sexuality is highly fluid, and reversals are theoretically possible. However, habit is refractory, once the sensory pathways have been blazed and deepened by repetition.” She also wrote, “Helping gays learn how to function heterosexually if they so wish, is a perfectly worthy aim..” Also, “I was the only openly gay person at the Yale Graduate School (1968-1972), a candor that was professionally costly. That anyone with my aggressive and scandalous history could be called ‘homophobic,’ as has repeatedly been done, shows just how insanely Stalinist gay activism has become.” She also noted, “The 10 percent figure,⁷⁷ servilely repeated by the media, was pure propaganda, and it made me, as a scholar, despise gay activists for their unscrupulous disregard for the truth. Their fibs and fabrications continue, now about the still-fragmentary evidence for

⁷⁵ *Vamps & Tramps: New Essays* (Vintage, New York, 1994).

⁷⁶ A crude expression has been removed here, the meaning of which is that the male reproductive organ fits the female reproductive organ by design.

⁷⁷ The false claim that homosexuals make up 10% of populations.

a genetic link to homosexuality and for homosexual behavior among animals.” She also stated, “Heterosexual love... is in sync with cosmic forces. Not everyone has the stomach for daily war with nature.” Also, “If a gay man wants to marry and sire children, why should he be harassed by gay activists accusing him of ‘self-hatred’? He is more mature than they are, for he knows that woman’s power cannot be ignored. If counseling can allow a gay man to respond sexually to women, it should be encouraged and applauded, not strafed by gay artillery fire of reverse moralism.”

Dr. Lillian Faderman - who has won an award from the gay activist group called Lambda Literary Foundation - writes, “And we continue to demand rights, ignoring the fact that human sexuality is fluid and flexible, acting as though we are all stuck in our category forever... The narrow categories of identity politics are obviously deceptive... I’m much less happy when I think of the possibility of huge numbers of homosexuals (two-thirds of women who identify as lesbian for example) running off to explore the heterosexual side of their bisexual potential and, as a result, decimating our political ranks... The concept of gay and lesbian identity may be nothing but a social construct, but it has been crucial, enabling us to become a political movement and demand the rights that are do to us as a minority. What becomes of our political movement if we openly acknowledge that sexuality is flexible and fluid, that gay and lesbian does not signify ‘a people’ but rather a ‘sometime behavior’.”⁷⁸ Faderman reveals something all homosexual activists fear. They know that their success lies in identity politics and propaganda, not science and truth. For this reason, ideological terrorism is employed to ensure homosexuals remain faithful believers. Dare to become a bisexual or a heterosexual (which many do) and you will be treated an apostate, a traitor, a “self-loathing faggot.”⁷⁹ Faderman reveals that *sexual fluidity* is fatal to the cause of gay activism in more ways than one.

⁷⁸ In the Gay publication, *The Advocate*, 9th May 1995, p.43.

⁷⁹ This is a term actually used by homosexual extremists against ex-gay apostates.

John D’Emilio is a homosexual professor of History and of Women’s and Gender studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago. He explained in an interview that whilst the “born gay” claim is of great practical benefit to homosexuals, there is scant scientific evidence for it, “What’s most amazing to me about the ‘born gay’ phenomenon is that the scientific evidence for it is thin as a reed, yet it doesn’t matter. It’s an idea with such social utility that one doesn’t need much evidence in order to make it attractive and credible.”⁸⁰

Dr. John DeCecco is a psychologist, Director of the Center for Research and Education in Sexuality at San Francisco State University, and Editor of *The Journal of Homosexuality*. Dr. DeCecco calls himself “gay” but insists that such attractions are **a changeable preference not an orientation**. He explains in his book entitled, “*If You Seduce A Straight Person You Can Make Them Gay*”, that the whole “born gay” and immutable characteristic idea is just “gay and lesbian politics” and is aimed at achieving “gay” rights.⁸¹

Jane Ward who says she is “voluntarily homosexual” published a post titled, “*No One is Born Gay (or Straight)*”⁸² giving five reasons why. She presents hard-hitting logic against homosexual propaganda. She writes, “**Just because an argument is politically strategic, does not make it true...** the fact that the ‘born this way’ hypothesis has resulted in greater political returns for gay and lesbian people doesn’t have anything to do with whether it is true. Maybe, as gay people, we want to get together and pretend it is true because it is politically strategic. That would be interesting. But still, it wouldn’t make the idea true.”

⁸⁰ *LGBT liberation: Build a broad movement* in the International Socialist Review (Interview 65).

⁸¹ *If You Seduce A Straight Person You Can Make Them Gay*, (1993) pp. 17-18.

⁸² Although this is technically correct (sexual inclination and conduct is learned via upbringing and environmental and social cues) one should not forget that the default biological orientation, by design, is heterosexuality as evidenced by complementary male and female reproductive organs.

She also writes, “**Just because you have had homosexual or heterosexual feelings for as long as you can remember, does not mean you were born a homosexual or heterosexual.**”⁸³ There are many things I have felt or done for as long as I can remember. I have always liked to argue. I have always loved drawing feet and shoes. I have always craved cheddar cheese. I have always felt a strong connection with happy, trashy pop music. These have been aspects of myself for as long as I can remember, and each represents a very strong impulse in me. But was I born with a desire to eat cheddar cheese or make drawings of feet? Are these desires that can be identified somewhere in my body, like on one of my genes? It would be hard to make these claims, because I could have been born and raised in China, let’s say, where cheddar cheese is basically non-existent and would not have been part of my life. And while I may have been born with some general artistic potential, surely our genetic material is not so specific as to determine that I would love to draw platform shoes. The point here is that what we desire in childhood is far more complex and multifaceted than the biological sciences can account for, and this goes for our sexual desires as well. Some basic raw material is in place (like a general potential for creativity), but the details—well, those are ours to discover.”

And a third point made by Ward, “**Secretly, you already know that people’s sexual desires are shaped by their social and cultural context.**” Lots of adults worry that if we allow little boys to wear princess dresses and paint their nails with polish, they might later be more inclined to be gay. Even some liberal parents (including gay and lesbian parents) worry that if they introduce their child to “too much” in the way of queer material, this could be a way of “pushing” homosexuality on them. Similarly, many people worry that if young women are introduced to feminism in college, and if they become too angry or independent, they may just decide to be lesbians. But if we all really believed that sexual orientation was congenital—or

⁸³ Again, this is an incorrect generalization. Nobody is born gay, that is a scientific fact. But each person is born with either male or female genital organs and are heterosexual through *biological design*.

present at birth—then no one would ever worry that social influences could have an effect on our sexual orientation. But I think that in reality, we all know that sexual desire is deeply subject to social, cultural, and historical forces.”

David Benkof⁸⁴ wrote an article, “*Nobody is ‘born that way,’ gay historians say*” in which he discusses the findings that LGBT anthropologists have “found no gay minorities in their studies of cultures around the world.” He writes, “According to the experts on homosexuality across centuries and continents, being gay is a relatively recent social construction. Few scholars with advanced degrees in anthropology or history who concentrate on homosexuality believe gays have existed in any cultures before or outside ours, much less in all cultures. These professors work closely with an ever-growing body of knowledge that directly contradicts ‘born that way’ ideology. Journalists trumpet every biological study that even hints that gayness and straightness might be hard-wired, but they show little interest in the abundant social-science research showing that sexual orientation cannot be innate... Historian Dr. Martin Duberman, founder of the Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies, said ‘no good scientific work establishes that people are born gay or straight.’ And cultural anthropologist Dr. Esther Newton (University of Michigan) called one study linking sexual orientation to biological traits ludicrous: “Any anthropologist who has looked cross-culturally (knows) it’s impossible that that’s true, because sexuality is structured in such different ways in different cultures.”⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Benkof is described as a Stanford-trained historian whose research has focused on modern Jewish history and the gay and lesbian past. He has written about gay and lesbian history for dozens of LGBT publications, and authored the book (as David Bianco) “*Gay Essentials: Facts for your Queer Brain*” (Alyson, 1999). He has also taught gay and lesbian history in various institutions.

⁸⁵ *Nobody is ‘born that way,’ gay historians say* in The Daily Caller (19th March 2014).

Trudy Ring, writer for the homosexual magazine *The Advocate* admits the flawed nature of the central “born gay” argument of homosexual activism, “For years, much of the case for LGBT rights has been based on the argument that sexual orientation is fixed and immutable... But an increasing body of social science research posits that a sizeable number of people experience some degree of fluidity in their sexual and romantic attractions: being drawn to the same gender at one point in their life, the opposite gender at another.”⁸⁶

In her article, “*Queer by Choice, Not by Chance: Against Being ‘Born This Way’*” **Lindsay Miller** writes, “In direct opposition to both the mainstream gay movement and Lady Gaga, I would like to state for the record that I was not born this way... The life I have now is not something I ended up with because I had no other options. Make no mistake -- it’s a life I chose.”⁸⁷

Female homosexuals **Lyne Harne** and **Elaine Miller** explain their feelings regarding the “born gay” hoax, “There’s nothing natural in lesbianism. Its a positive choice, and a political one.”⁸⁸ Another admission appeared in the homosexual magazine “*Girlfriends*”. It states, “No wonder lesbians are so nervous. What makes the lesbian movement strong is the formation of a collective identity, unified behind sexual orientation as a category. If bisexuality undoes that, it kicks the lesbian movement where it really hurts: in the heart and soul of identity politics.”⁸⁹ Some lesbians are fearful that if they or others amongst their ranks “taste” heterosexuality, they will become at least “bisexual” if not fully heterosexual. In the least of these two “evils”, becoming bisexual, the claim of immutability of sexual orientation in the form of the “born gay” myth becomes apparent.

⁸⁶ *Exploring the Umbrella: Bisexuality and Fluidity* in the *Advocate* 11th February 2014.

⁸⁷ Published in the *Atlantic* online (12th September 2011).

⁸⁸ “*Commenting on All the Rage: Reasserting Radical Lesbian Feminism*” *Lambda Book Report*, Oct. 1996, p.11.

⁸⁹ *Girlfriends*, May-June, 1996, p. 40

Nicholas Cummings, a former president of the American Psychiatric Association, writes about his past experiences in a *USA Today* column, “When I was chief psychologist for Kaiser Permanente from 1959 to 1979, San Francisco’s gay and lesbian population burgeoned. I personally saw more than 2,000 patients with same-sex attraction, and my staff saw thousands more. We worked hard to develop approaches to meeting the needs of these patients... Of the patients I oversaw who sought to change their orientation, hundreds were successful... Since then, the role of psychotherapy in sexual orientation change efforts has been politicized. Gay and lesbian rights activists appear to be convincing the public that homosexuality is one identical inherited characteristic. To my dismay, some in the organized mental health community seem to agree, including the American Psychological Association, though I don’t believe that view is supported by scientific evidence. Gays and lesbians have the right to be affirmed in their homosexuality. That’s why, as a member of the APA Council of Representatives in 1975, I sponsored the resolution by which the APA stated that homosexuality is not a mental disorder and, in 1976, the resolution, which passed the council unanimously, that gays and lesbians should not be discriminated against in the workplace. But contending that all same-sex attraction is immutable is a distortion of reality. Attempting to characterize all sexual reorientation therapy as ‘unethical’ violates patient choice and gives an outside party a veto over patients’ goals for their own treatment. A political agenda shouldn’t prevent gays and lesbians who desire to change from making their own decisions. Whatever the situation at an individual clinic, accusing professionals from across the country who provide treatment for fully informed persons seeking to change their sexual orientation of perpetrating a fraud serves only to stigmatize the professional and shame the patient.”⁹⁰

⁹⁰ *Southern Poverty Law Center wrongly fighting against patients’ right to choose* in USA Today 30th July 2013. Cummings wrote this article in light of the attempts of gay activists to legislate against sexual reorientation therapy in which homosexuals are counseled into heterosexuality out of their own choice.

Female homosexual writer **Jennie Ruby** admits, “I don’t think lesbians are born... I think they are made... The gay rights movement has (for many good, practical reasons) adopted largely an identity politics.”⁹¹

From the above statements it is clear that deep down, gay activists are fully aware that same-sex attraction is not biologically *determined*, that it can be changed, that environmental factors contribute to the development of same-sex attraction and that reorientation therapies have been proven to work. However, the overwhelming majority of gay activists will never reveal these truths because they have so much to lose. They realize that to continue with the huge success they have so far achieved with their identity politics and propaganda, they must continue acting as if the “born gay” hoax is actually true. This hoax is advanced by the claim that homosexuality is in the **genes**, the **brain** or **hormones**.

⁹¹ *Off Our Backs*, Oct. 1996, p.22.

THE 'GAY GENE' HOAX⁹²

One of the most common studies pro-sodomists cite when they make the claim that people are “born gay” was conducted in 1993 by **pro-gay activist** Dr. Dean Hamer and his team of geneticists at the National Cancer Institute. Hamer and his colleagues reported that a “gay gene” seemed to be maternally linked and could be found on the Xq28 stretch of the X chromosome. Hamer’s genetic study played a key role in a massive public-relations campaign designed by *Harvard-educated* and *Madison Avenue-trained* homosexual activists **Marshall Kirk** and **Hunter Madsen**. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, this hoax was designed to help homosexual activists legally obtain minority-class status. In the 1990s, pro-sodomy activists believed that if they could convince the courts that they were “born gay” they would acquire protected-class status and could then legally challenge anti-sodomy laws in the United States. Dean Hamer played an enormous role in this effort. In fact, on April 3, 1994, the *The Washington Times* reported that while Hamer was testifying against Colorado’s Amendment 2 – which sought to keep men who have sex with men from winning minority-class status – Sen. Robert C. Smith, R-N.H., knew of Hamer’s motives and accused the doctor of “actively pursuing a gay agenda.” Immediately after Hamer’s “gay gene” study was published in 1993, a media explosion ensued. Hamer’s results, however, were a fraud. The title of an article appearing on page 25 of the July 10, 1995, edition of the pro-gay magazine *New York Native* explains: “*Gay Gene*” *Research Doesn’t Hold Under Scrutiny, Chicago*

⁹² From the article, “*The Gay Gene Hoax*” by Ryan Sorba, (3rd June 2010) and *Study on ‘gay gene’ challenged* by John Crewdson in the *Chicago Tribune* (25th June 1995). For further reading on this topic refer to the following resources: *Doubt cast on ‘gay gene’* in *BBC News* (23rd April 1999). *Scientists cast doubt on ‘gay gene’ theory* in *The Independent* (23rd April 1999), this report states, “Dr Hamer, who is homosexual, said at the time: ‘Our research implies that being gay or straight relies to some extent on a genetic predisposition. We can only speculate on what the gene does. Once we have the gene, we’ll be able to understand it.’ However, several years of research aimed at isolating the gene proved fruitless. Now, a second team of scientists has cast doubt on the evidence published by Dr Hamer six years ago.”

Tribune's John Crewdson Uncovers Possible Scientific Misconduct by NCI Researcher. The article begins: "In addition to the political and social firestorm Hamer's research has ignited, he has also been criticized by numerous scientists for not performing what seems to be an obvious control experiment: examining the genes of heterosexual brothers." The omission of a control group in a scientific experiment is significant, because it essentially renders the experiment inconclusive. According to the article, another researcher who worked on the project claimed that although Hamer conducted the experiment correctly by including a control variable, the results he obtained did not lead to the conclusion he was hoping to find: that some men are "born gay." Hamer therefore did not release the information related to the control group and published pseudo-scientific results. All went well for Hamer until a junior researcher on his team exposed his scheme. The article then continues: "Even worse for Hamer, the National Institute of Health's Office of Research Integrity is now investigating his "gay gene" research, according to Crewdson. The inquiry concerns allegations that Hamer was selective about which data he chose to report (i.e., that he ignored data that didn't support his contention that homosexuality is genetically determined). The data manipulation was reported to NIH's integrity office by a junior researcher who performed research crucial to Hamer's claimed discovery, according to Crewdson."

Crewdson's revelations turned out to be true. A November 1995 edition of *Scientific American* confirmed that Hamer was "being charged with research improprieties and was under investigation by the National Institute of Health's Federal Office of Research Integrity." Although the NIH never released the results of the inquiry, Hamer was shortly thereafter transferred to another section. In addition to lying about his results, he had done his "gay gene" research under a grant to work on **Kaposi's sarcoma**, a skin cancer that inordinately afflicts men who have sex with men. Upon learning that Hamer's "gay gene" study was a hoax, one might assume that if other researchers were to attempt to replicate his experiment, including his control group, they would fail to obtain

the pseudo-scientific result that there is a “gay gene.” This is exactly the case. The New York Native article continues: “At least one lab that has tried hard to replicate his findings has been unsuccessful. Only one independent laboratory has reported attempting such a replication, and it has found no evidence to support Hamer,” Crewdson reported. “We can’t reproduce Hamer’s data,” said George Ebers, a neurogeneticist from the University of Western Ontario, who has searched unsuccessfully for a Hamer-style genetic link to homosexuality in more than 50 pairs of gay Canadian brothers. In fact, Ebers found the genetic markers cited by Hamer in “exactly half of his brother pairs” according to Crewdson – precisely what the laws of chance would predict, if the “markers had no significance.”

The fact that Hamer’s study cannot be replicated confirms reports that Hamer lied about his results. In 1998, another group of researchers (Sanders, et al.) tried to replicate Hamer’s study as well. They also failed to find a genetic connection to homosexuality. Then, in the Aug. 6, 1999, edition of Science, George Rice and George Ebers published a review of Hamer’s study to go along with their previous attempts to replicate his findings. The scientists stated that the results of Hamer’s study “did not support an X-linked gene underlying male homosexuality.” They found that the brothers observed by the Hamer group were no more likely to share the Xq28 markers than would be expected by mere chance. By this time, Hamer had already conceded that his pseudo-scientific study did not support a genetic cause for homosexuality, in the Jan. 30, 1998, edition of the Washington Blade. He also conceded that homosexuality is “*culturally transmitted, not inherited,*” and that “*there is not a single master gene that makes people gay ... I don’t think we will ever be able to predict who will be gay,*” he said.⁹³ The extremely shaky

⁹³ Hamer never gave up however and waited many years after the dust had settled on his earlier fraudulent work before embarking on convincing the public that “several areas” in the genome “appear” to influence sexual preference. In 2005, he was involved with research at the University of Illinois at Chicago which attempts to connect “male sexual orientation” with a group of genetic regions. One should remain cautious of all scientific

ground upon which the “gay gene” hoax is built is revealed in another of Hamer’s remarks. A 1994 New Scientist report titled, “*Gay gene test ‘inaccurate and immoral’*” cites Hamer, “Even if genes play some role in determining homosexuality, as seems more and more likely,⁹⁴ genetic testing for gayness is both doomed to inaccuracy and morally wrong, a leading researcher said at the AAAS last week. Such a test ‘would be wrong, unethical, and an abuse of the research’, said Dean Hamer, a senior researcher at the US National Cancer Institute in Bethesda, Maryland.”⁹⁵ He is also cited as saying, “There will never be a test that will say for certain whether a child will be gay. We know that for certain.”⁹⁶ Hamer and all gay activists realize the implications. If there is a “gay gene” as they allege it can be tested for and whether a fetus is gay or not would be verifiable. They immediately remonstrate that this would be unethical because a parent may choose not to have a gay child. Of course, these are unfounded fears because the claim itself is false, there is no ‘gay gene’ and the fanfare around this claim is largely a marketing and propaganda exercise to support identity politics.

Other flawed studies which have failed in their attempts to establish a biologically determined link include:

The hypothalamus study of Simon LeVay, a homosexual who lost his partner to AIDS. LeVay tried to convince the public that men develop sexual desire for other men because of the size of the hypothalamus in the brain. The study was discredited shortly after its publication and LeVay is on record as having said in 1993 (two years later), “It’s important to stress what I didn’t find. I did not prove that

research studies claiming to have identified a “gay” gene or group of genes. Such attempts should be viewed in light of the pro-sodomy marketing agenda outlined by Kirk and Madsen in their book, “*After the Ball.*”

⁹⁴ Since that time, numerous twin studies have categorically disproven this claim. There is no evidence that a single gene or collection of genes *determine* homosexuality.

⁹⁵ New Scientist, 5th March 1994.

⁹⁶ Holmes B. 1994. *Gay gene test ‘inaccurate and immoral’*. New Scientist 141 (5 March):9

homosexuality is genetic, or find a genetic cause for being gay. I didn't show that gay men are born that way, the most common mistake people make in interpreting my work. Nor did I locate a gay center in the brain."⁹⁷ The now firmly-established **neuroplasticity** of the brain - which is its ability to constantly undergo change instead of being "hard-wired" as previously thought⁹⁸ - strongly indicates that differences in brain structure are caused by environment and behaviour. Thus, evidence favours the position that homosexuals have different brains *because* of specific behaviours and not that having different brains caused them to be homosexual. Then there was the "**gay**" **twins study** by Michael Bailey and Richard Pillard, who is a same gender sex activist. They, like Hamer, tried to convince the public that they had demonstrated a genetic basis for being "gay." Important data was withheld from the published study that invalidated the incorrect conclusions made even from the published data and the study was widely criticized for its inherent bias. Bisexuals were included amongst "gays." Their sample subjects were acquired through advertisements in homosexual newspapers.⁹⁹ Reviewers of their study stated that their data provided strong evidence for environmental influence and invalidated any genetic hypothesis.¹⁰⁰ **Hormonal studies** have likewise failed to demonstrate any biological basis for being oriented towards sex with men in their anuses.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ David Nimmons, "Sex and the Brain", Discover Magazine, March 1994.

⁹⁸ Refer to Norman Doidge's excellent work, "The Brain That Changes Itself: Stories of Personal Triumph from the Frontiers of Brain Science" (Penguin, 2007).

⁹⁹ Bailey and Pillard did not study a *random* sample of homosexuals and thus their results were skewed with bias. They did not find a large sample of twins, identify homosexual subjects within that sample, then ask whether their twin brothers were also homosexuals. This would have been a more rigorous and honest study design.

¹⁰⁰ Refer to Billings, P. and J. Beckwith (1993), Technology Review, July, p. 60. Hubbard, Ruth and Elijah Wald (1997), *Exploding the Gene Myth* (Boston: Beacon Press) and Byne, William and Bruce Parsons (1993), *Human Sexual Orientation Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50:228-239.

¹⁰¹ It is interesting to note that because pro-sodomists have successfully managed to repeal all anti-sodomy laws, they have no need to continue with the "gay gene" and "born gay" hoaxes. These propaganda tools have

Twins Studies Conclusively Disprove the “Gay Gene” Claim¹⁰²

Major studies of identical twins in Australia, the US, and Scandinavia during the last two decades all arrive at the same conclusion: gays were not born that way. “At best genetics is a minor factor,” says Dr. Neil Whitehead, PhD. Whitehead worked for the New Zealand government as a scientific researcher for 24 years, then spent four years working for the United Nations and International Atomic Energy Agency. Most recently, he serves as a consultant to Japanese universities about the effects of radiation exposure. His PhD is in biochemistry and statistics. Identical twins have the same genes or DNA. They are nurtured in equal prenatal conditions. If homosexuality is caused by genetics or prenatal conditions and one twin is gay, the co-twin should also be gay. “Because they have identical DNA, it ought to be 100%,” Dr. Whitehead notes. But the studies reveal something else. “If an identical twin has same-sex attraction the chances the co-twin has it are only about 11% for men and 14% for women.”¹⁰³ Because identical twins are always

served their purpose. Brakes are slowly being applied to this propaganda and the vehicle swerved towards a new direction. This direction is in the form of “**Queer Theory**.” This new marketing propaganda aims to convince the public that gender does not exist, that there is no such thing as a fixed gender or a fixed sexual orientation. Thus, there are two opposing approaches, the older fixed “gay identity” approach and the newer dynamic, fluid “queer theory” approach in which there is no fixed identity. One can see how each of the two approaches can be used to ensure continuous growth of the pro-sodomy community. The fixed “gay identity” approach convinces male homosexuals they were born that way and can never change. This prevents the likelihood of homosexual “apostates” who renounce the “gay” religion and adopt heterosexuality. The “queer theory” undermines masculinity, femininity and heterosexual identity. This ideology makes recruitment of heterosexuals into homosexuality a lot easier because it challenges all ideas of fixed identity. In reality, it is simply another ideological challenge against heterosexuality (and masculinity and femininity), and aims to eliminate these concepts from the minds of humanity.

¹⁰² From an article by Mark Ellis published online.

¹⁰³ This should not be misunderstood to mean that 11% of twins are gays. It means that for every 9 set of monozygotal twins, if one is homosexual, the

genetically identical, homosexuality cannot be genetically dictated. “No-one is born gay,” he notes. “The predominant things that create homosexuality in one identical twin and not in the other have to be post-birth factors.” Dr. Whitehead believes same-sex attraction (SSA) is caused by “non-shared factors,” things happening to one twin but not the other, or a personal response to an event by one of the twins and not the other. For example, one twin might have exposure to pornography or sexual abuse, but not the other. One twin may interpret and respond to their family or classroom environment differently than the other. “These individual and idiosyncratic responses to random events and to common environmental factors predominate,” he says.

The first very large, reliable study of identical twins was conducted in Australia in 1991, followed by a large U.S. study about 1997. Then Australia and the U.S. conducted more twin studies in 2000, followed by several studies in Scandinavia, according to Dr. Whitehead. “Twin registers are the foundation of modern twin studies. They are now very large, and exist in many countries. A gigantic European twin register with a projected 600,000 members is being organized, but one of the largest in use is in Australia, with more than 25,000 twins on the books.” A significant twin study among adolescents shows an even weaker genetic correlation. In 2002 Bearman and Brueckner studied tens of thousands of adolescent students in the U.S.¹⁰⁴ The same-sex attraction concordance between identical twins was only 7.7% for males and 5.3% for females—lower than the 11% and 14% in the Australian study by Bailey et al conducted in 2000.¹⁰⁵ In the

other is also homosexual only *one time out of nine*. Thus, to get an occurrence of both twins being gay one needs a sample of around 81 twins. This makes the occurrence of homosexuals amongst twins to be just over 1%, which is not much different from the rest of the non-twin population. This conclusively proves that social and environmental factors are at work and genes do not *determine* homosexuality.

¹⁰⁴ Peter Bearman, Hannah Bruckner, *Opposite-Sex Twins and Adolescent Same-Sex Attraction* AJS Volume 107 Number 5 (March 2002): 1179–120.

¹⁰⁵ Refer to Bailey J, Dunne M, Martin N. 2000. *Genetic and Environmental influences on sexual orientation and its correlates in an Australian twin sample*.

identical twin studies, Dr. Whitehead has been struck by how fluid and changeable sexual identity can be. “Neutral academic surveys show there is substantial change. About half of the homosexual-bisexual population (in a non-therapeutic environment) moves towards heterosexuality over a lifetime. About 3% of the present heterosexual population once firmly believed themselves to be homosexual or bisexual.” “Sexual orientation is not set in concrete,” he notes. Most changes in sexual orientation are towards exclusive heterosexuality. Even more remarkable, most of the changes occur without counseling or therapy. “These changes are not therapeutically induced, but happen ‘naturally’ in life, some very quickly,” Dr. Whitehead observes. “Most changes in sexual orientation are towards exclusive heterosexuality.” Numbers of people who have changed towards exclusive heterosexuality are greater than current numbers of bisexuals and homosexuals combined. In other words, ex-gays outnumber actual gays. The fluidity is even more pronounced among adolescents, as Bearman and Brueckner’s study demonstrated. “They found that from 16 to 17-years-old, if a person had a romantic attraction to the same sex, almost all had switched one year later.” “The authors were pro-gay and they commented that the only stability was among the heterosexuals, who stayed the same year after year. Adolescents are a special case—generally changing their attractions from year to year.” Still, many misconceptions persist in the popular culture. Namely, that homosexuality is genetic – so hard-wired into one’s identity that it can’t be changed. “The academics who work in the field are not happy with the portrayals by the media on the subject,” Dr. Whitehead notes. “But they prefer to stick with their academic research and not get involved in the activist side.”¹⁰⁶

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 78:524-36 and also Kirk K, Bailey J, Dunne M, Martin NG. 2000. *Measurement models for sexual orientation in a community twin sample*. Behavior Genetics 30:345-56.

¹⁰⁶ Dr. Neil Whitehead is the author of the most complete and authoritative work on this subject, “*My Genes Made Me Do it*.” Though first published in the 1990s, it is currently in its third edition and has been continuously

THE 'HOMOSEXUALITY IN NATURE' HOAX

Homosexual academics and pro-sodomy activists go out of their way to claim homosexuality is rampant in the “natural” world. Compiling observed instances of alleged homosexual conduct amongst various species, they aim to convince the public that there is no fixed sexual conduct. Because such variation in sexual conduct occurs within nature, it must therefore be natural amongst humans as well, it is argued, and thus “homosexuality” is a natural phenomenon. There are some simple arguments to invalidate this hoax.

First, the estimated amount of species on Earth is said to be around 8.7 million,¹⁰⁷ however this may still be a significant under-estimation. If we use the 10 million figure, then homosexual behaviour [as perceived by *homosexual researchers* who are *obviously* impartial in this matter] in lets say 2,000 species, a generous figure, would only amount to a mere 0.02% occurrence of *perceived* homosexual behaviour across all species. Given that homosexuals are said to make up around 2% of Western populations, this would mean that homosexuality is 100 times rarer in the animal world than in the human world. That hardly makes it natural.

Second, *perceived homosexual behaviour* [from the point of view of the homosexual researcher] is not homosexual behaviour from the point of view of the animal. Dogs, for example, are often seen mounting objects such as tables or sofas or even humans of either sex when sexually excited. This indicates that animals may be more easily stimulated and that their sexuality is less sophisticated because they,

updated to keep track of all research and developments in this field. The book is co-authored by Neil's twin, Briar Whitehead.

¹⁰⁷ “*Species count put at 8.7 million*” BBC News (23rd August 2011). In an April 2014 Scientific American article, “*Are We Any Closer to Knowing How Many Species There Are on Earth?*” Geoffrey Miller writes, “*Guesses, estimates and calculations have been as low as half a million and as high as 100 million. But despite increasingly sophisticated models and a greater understanding of ecology, we're no closer to a number, or even a range, than we were several decades ago.*”

unlike humans, do not have the same capacity to reason and think and will not perceive their own actions as being “homosexual.” Thus, when animals exhibit seemingly homosexual behaviours [in the eye of the homosexual observer] it is not because they are same-sex attracted.

Third, Muslims do not model their behaviour nor justify it by looking to the animal kingdom for validation. Allāh created mankind in the best of stature and ennobled him by raising him above all other creatures. “**We have certainly created man in the best of stature.**” (95:4) and “**We have certainly ennobled the son of Ādam.**” (17:70).

Fourth, there are many sexual practices amongst animals which can equally be treated as “natural” and adopted by humans. The male porcupine drenches his potential female lover in urine at high velocity. If she is not interested, she’ll shake off the shower and be on her way. If she is interested she will expose herself and allow the male to mount. The praying mantis (insect) engages in *sexual cannibalism*. The unfortunate male who seduces her may make her very hungry after the act. She begins snacking straight away, starting with her lover’s head. Often this can be while the male is still copulating with her. Black widow spiders also devour their male lovers after copulation. Just because something happens in nature does not make it “natural” in the sense that it is moral, ethical and acceptable. The absurdity of this argument is exposed when we consider that rape, murder, pillage all take place in nature, after all humans are part of the “natural world.” Thus, everything they do is also “natural” if we were to use the “homosexuality in nature” argument. Because murder takes place in nature, it is natural and acceptable. Because rape takes place in nature, it is natural and acceptable. The underlying fallacious line of reasoning used in this argument, “*It happens in nature so it must be alright*”, is thereby readily apparent to the sane mind.

Fifth, turning the same argument on its head, men who sodomize men (MSM) do not reproduce. Since all known species reproduce,

then sodomy cannot be natural. If sodomy is natural, then it is also natural that sodomists are not meant to have children. It is therefore unnatural to allow homosexuals to adopt children because “nature” - in the theory of evolution paradigm - did not intend them to have children. If there truly is a gay gene, a gay brain or gay hormones then it is unnatural for sodomists to acquire children because they were not designed to have any. Their genes, brains or hormones led them to be oriented towards anal intercourse instead of reproductive intercourse.

The preceding chapters have demolished the “born gay”, “gay gene” and “homosexuality in nature” fallacies and have exposed the real foundation of mainstream pro-sodomy activism which went in motion around the same time as the *Bowers vs. Hardwick* case of 1986. It is organized propaganda with a view to shaping public opinion in the same way that chocolate and auto insurance are marketed to the general public. It is clear that by playing with terminology and making use of clever propaganda, the focus has been shifted away from **an act** (having sex with a man in his anus) whose harms can be empirically and scientifically evaluated. It was presented as **a condition** for which the label of homosexuality was invented in the late 19th century. And finally in the late 20th century, it was turned into **an identity** (being “gay”) and deceptively equated to race. Thus a voluntary action and lifestyle choice was put in the same league as skin colour with masterful deceit. A further and final exposition of these hoaxes lies in the “**Queer by Choice**” movement.

THE “QUEER BY CHOICE” MOVEMENT

Neatly concealed from the public eye and greatly resented by the mainstream “*immutable biological characteristic*”, “*born gay*”, “*gay gene*” promoters is a sub-movement known as “**Queer by Choice.**” They oppose the “gay agenda” movement rooted in Madison Avenue-type marketing which began in the 1980s through the efforts of **Marshall Kirk** and **Hunter Madsen** and reject the validity and absolutism of its underlying foundations. They claim to represent at least 8% of all homosexuals.¹⁰⁸ Many are not willing to openly admit their homosexuality was a lifestyle choice for fear of backlash from the militants who treat the “born gay” hoax as religious doctrine. They know with certainty that they chose to be “gay.” Many of them lived a life of heterosexuality and were married with children. Certain experiences led them to the conclusion that becoming “gay” would make them happier within their life circumstances. They know that this decision was made consciously, with deliberation and that “genes” did not “make them do it.” In response, they are accused of not being *genuine* queers but simply *faking it* since queerness means to be “born that way.” A website dedicated to “queer by choice” people has a section answering common myths.¹⁰⁹ The first myth is listed as, “*We must be homophobic and ashamed of being queer.*” The response is given, “Reality: Most of us are very happy about being queer—after all, we chose to be.” The third myth is listed as, “*You’ve never met anyone who felt their queerness was a choice.*” The response to this myth is, “Reality: Anyone who says ‘I’ve never met a queer by choice person before in my life’ is making just as ignorant a statement as those who say ‘I’ve never met a queer person before in my life.’ Of course you’ve met some of us—we comprise about 8% of the queer community, according to the 1997 Internet Survey of

¹⁰⁸ A 1997 online survey titled, “Internet Survey of Queer and Questioning Youth” reveals that 8% of 1,105 respondents to the question on how they came to be queer affirmed the statement, “I chose to be queer.” The figure may be a lot higher as many may feel inhibited to reveal it was voluntary rather than innate for fear of backlash from the “gay gene” and “born gay” militants.

¹⁰⁹ Refer to <http://www.queerbychoice.com>.

Queer and Questioning Youth conducted by OutProud and Oasis Magazine. We are everywhere around you - you just didn't recognize us as queer by choice. We usually do not wear stickers on our foreheads saying 'I chose to be queer.' Many of us are very active members of the queer community, but unless someone brings up the topic of choice in our presence or specifically asks us if we had a choice, most of our queer friends may never even find out that we consider ourselves queer by choice. In fact, most of us are well aware of the hostile reactions that some members of the queer community have toward any mention of choice, and as a result, many of us are downright uncomfortable talking about our choices with our queer friends until we know them well enough to be very sure that talking about our experience of choice won't cause them to attack us." Speaking about "gay gene" studies they write, "Dozens of studies have found substantial numbers of identical twins who have different sexual preferences, so the very most that any biologists are even hoping to prove is that biology is one of multiple factors that may influence sexual preference. However, the current evidence for even the slightest direct biological influence on sexual preference is extremely shaky at best, and has been ridiculously overhyped by the homo and hetero media alike."¹¹⁰

Julie Bindel, a lesbian feminist, wrote an article, "*If we wanted to be straight, we would be*" in the LGBT Rights column in the Guardian Newspaper.¹¹¹ After the subtitle, "Attempts to identify a genetic basis for homosexuality refuse to accept that sexual desire is a social

¹¹⁰ They also cite the following statements, "To date, no researcher has claimed that genes can determine sexual orientation... No human behavior, let alone sexual behavior, has been connected to genetic markers to date." From an organization called PFLAG (Parents, Families & Friends of Lesbians And Gays), "*Why Ask Why: Addressing the Research on Homosexuality*" 1995. And "The genetic theory of homosexuality has been generally discarded today. Despite the interest in possible hormone mechanisms in the origin of homosexuality, no serious scientist today suggests that a simple cause-effect relationship applies." William H. Masters, Virginia E. Johnson and Robert C. Kolodny, *Human Sexuality*, 1984.

¹¹¹ Dated 14th December 2004.

construct” she documents the various experiments which have been conducted to identify a biological basis for homosexuality. She then asks, “What exactly is the purpose of these costly experiments? So parents can decide whether to abort if discovering the foetus might turn out to be a hairy lesbian? Or is it because the majority of people cannot get to grips with the fact that we choose to be lesbian and gay.” She goes on to say, “Many lesbians and gays want to believe we were ‘born that way’ to provoke sympathy and understanding. In the mid-1980s, during the kerfuffle around Section 28, I dared to write in a gay publication that being lesbian or gay was a positive choice. I was inundated with letters telling me what trouble I had caused, because if heteros thought we were choosing to be deviant, that means we are responsible, not our genes.”

The “Queer by Choice” movement provides yet another line of hard, empirical evidence to invalidate the “born gay” hoax. There are also thousands of ex-gay and ex-lesbians with their own stories to tell. This adds an additional layer of evidence to establish that sexual orientation is fluid and socially determined. It is impacted by personal experience, environment and external cues.

Next, we take a look at a few common myths.

A FEW COMMON MYTHS

First: A homosexual 'orientation' is not changeable. Many homosexuals change and become heterosexual after being disillusioned with the homosexual lifestyle in which they may have been abused and harmed or just simply fed up.¹¹² Research by psychiatrist Dr. Robert Spitzer led to his argument that some homosexuals can overcome their homosexual desires following appropriate psychotherapy.¹¹³ He said, "It is often said that those who try to change their sexual orientation become very depressed as a result. That was not the case for the subjects of this study. There was in fact a marked decline in depression after their effort to change."¹¹⁴ However, to illustrate how powerful the gay lobby is, due to the outrage his research

¹¹² **Why I No Longer Want To Be Gay** by Luis Pabon (American artist, social worker). "I no longer want to be gay. I know that on the surface this statement reeks of the denial, self-loathing and internalized homophobia commonly associated with accepting and integrating ones gayness but truth is, I just don't want to be gay anymore. It has outlived its usefulness. I have experienced all aspects of the life and can safely say that it no longer speaks to the person that I am or want to become. I didn't always feel this way. Initially I came to this community searching for love, intimacy and brotherhood. In return, I got shade, infidelity, loneliness and disunity. The self-loathing in this community forces you to encounter a series of broken men who are self-destructive, hurtful, cruel and vindictive towards one another. I have struggled to adapt my moral code to fit the behaviors concomitant with the lifestyle but it seems that the lifestyle is forcing me too far away from everything I love and value. No matter how many times I try to purge my perception of its firmly held beliefs and skewed biases, the same classic stereotypes of gay men keep rearing their ugly heads. The indiscriminate sex, superficiality, unstable relationships, self-hatred, peter pan syndrome, closeted connections, ageism, shade, loneliness, preoccupation with sex, prejudice, aversion to intimacy all seem to come out of the ground I thought they were buried under. Gay men just seem to find it difficult to transcend the stereotypes and clichés attached to the life and it is becoming disheartening..." Published by Luis Pabon on ThoughtCatalog.Com.

¹¹³ Spitzer RL. *Can some gay men and lesbians change their sexual orientation? 200 participants reporting a change from homosexual to heterosexual orientation.* Archives of Sexual Behavior 2003;38(5):403-417.

¹¹⁴ Archives of Sexual Behavior 2003;38(5):403-417.

created, he retracted his conclusions short of ten years later. Blatantly, contradicting his findings, he said, “The study does not provide evidence that gays can change.”¹¹⁵ This is falsified by mountainous empirical evidence in the form of thousand of ex-gays who have overcome same-sex attractions and went on to get married and have their own biological children.¹¹⁶ In any case, psychologists and psychiatrists who are immune to gay lobbying pressure continue to convey factual reality and affirm that removing same-sex attractions through psychotherapy is proven to work.¹¹⁷ In addition, there are to be found “gay” activists who reject the “born gay” and “gay gene” hoaxes and declare that they are “queer by choice.” **Second:** *Homosexual conduct is not harmful to health.* The most obvious example of harmful consequences of such conduct is the AIDS epidemic amongst homosexuals.¹¹⁸ The epidemic in male child molestation occurring simultaneously with the rise of an aggressive homosexual subculture that campaigns for reducing age of sexual consent laws (thereby seeking to normalize pedophilia) is not coincidental. Molestation can be a death sentence if HIV-AIDS is contracted. The Journal of the American Medical Association reported¹¹⁹ that 50% of male AIDS victims reported having sex with an adult male by the age of 16, and 20% had sex with an adult male by the age of 10. The Centre for Disease Control (CDC) writes, “Gay,

¹¹⁵ In fact, they have been so successful at lobbying that the state of California passed a bill making it illegal for mental health professionals to engage in sexual orientation change therapy for minors and similar bills have been proposed in other states such as Illinois by gay activists.

¹¹⁶ Refer to the website <http://pfox.org> by way of example.

¹¹⁷ Another indication of the huge power of the LGBT lobby is that homosexuals within psychology associations, boards and centres are joining forces to prevent “conversion therapy.” Significant numbers of homosexuals treat their feelings as unwanted and desire to remove them through counselling and help. However, conversion therapists are being targeted for essentially facilitating “apostasy” from homosexuality.

¹¹⁸ Dyana Bagby, “Gay, bi men 50 times more likely to have HIV: CDC reports hard data at National HIV Prevention Conference,” Washington Blade, August 28, 2009.

¹¹⁹ Harry W. Haverkos et al. *Initiation of Male Homosexual Behavior*, 262 J. Am. Med. Assn. 501 (1989).

bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (MSM) represent approximately 2% of the United States population, yet are the population most severely affected by HIV. In 2010, young gay and bisexual men (aged 13-24 years) accounted for 72% of new HIV infections among all persons aged 13 to 24, and 30% of new infections among all gay and bisexual men.”¹²⁰ In its Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) of 9th May 2014, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) wrote, “Primary and secondary syphilis rates increased among men of all ages and races-ethnicities during 2005–2013, from 5.1 cases per 100,000 population in 2005 to 9.8 in 2013, when men accounted for 91.1% of all cases reported in the United States. Although rates remain highest among black men (28.1), recent increases were greatest among Hispanic and white men. Currently, syphilis is predominantly an MSM [men who have sex with men] epidemic.”¹²¹ **Third:** *Homosexuals suffer ill health and mental depression because of homophobia and discrimination.* It was claimed in the 1970s that homosexuals are no different mentally to heterosexuals and to claim so is discrimination. When the mental health of homosexuals was shown in studies to be inferior to that of heterosexuals, homophobia and discrimination were blamed as the causes. A homosexual lifestyle is connected to disease and ill health because of the risky behaviour that is part and parcel of it. This in turn impacts mental health. Further, in countries which are ‘gay-friendly’ such as the Netherlands, rates of mental illnesses do not significantly decrease. No country equals the Dutch population in its tolerance of homosexuality. They also allow euthanasia, prostitution, marijuana smoking, same-sex marriage and even tolerated pedophiles until a number of high profile cases in Europe changed public opinion.¹²² However, Dutch homosexuals and bisexuals suffer the same degree and frequency of mental health problems as

¹²⁰ Refer to <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/group/msm/index.html>.

¹²¹ *Primary and Secondary Syphilis – United States, 2005–2013* by Monica E. Patton et al. MMWR (9th May 2014).

¹²² Refer to the case of Marc Dutroux, a Belgian serial killer and child molester, convicted of having kidnapped, tortured and sexually abused six girls from 1995 to 1996, four of whom he murdered.

homosexual populations in other places such as America. Many studies exist now that establish a correlation between homosexuality, bisexuality and increased mental disorders and suicide risks. There is little evidence to suggest that discrimination and homophobia are exclusive causes. The body of evidence suggests a combination of factors are involved and that particular elements of homosexual lifestyles expose them to an increased risk for experiencing mental health problems.¹²³

Now that we have stripped all of the individual layers of propaganda and word play employed to advance the modern “*gay agenda*” - [the *born gay, gay gene, gay brain, gay hormones* and *gay nature* hoaxes] we ultimately return back to the behavioural practice at the centre of “gay” politics which is **sodomy**. Hence, it is appropriate to take a look at this practice and its impact upon the health of individuals and societies from a factual, scientific standpoint.

¹²³ In a major Dutch study known as NEMESIS, “It has been suggested that homosexuality is associated with psychiatric morbidity. This study examined differences between heterosexually and homosexually active subjects in 12-month and lifetime prevalence of DSM-III-R mood, anxiety, and substance use disorders in a representative sample of Dutch population (N=7076; aged 18-64 years). The findings support the assumption that people with same-sex sexual behavior are at greater risk for psychiatric disorders.” Sandfort TG et al. *Same-sex sexual behavior and psychiatric disorders: findings from the Netherlands Mental Health Survey and Incidence Study (NEMESIS)*. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2001 Jan;58(1):85-91. In another study, “Findings support recent evidence suggesting that gay, lesbian, and bisexual young people are at increased risk of mental health problems, with these associations being particularly evident for measures of suicidal behavior and multiple disorder.” David M. Fergusson et al. *Is Sexual Orientation Related to Mental Health Problems and Suicidality in Young People?* Arch Gen Psychiatry. 1999;56(10):876-880. In another study, “These data provide further evidence of an increased risk for suicide symptoms among homosexually experienced men. Results also hint at a small, increased risk of recurrent depression among gay men, with symptom onset occurring, on average, during early adolescence.” Cochran and Mays. *Lifetime prevalence of suicide symptoms and affective disorders among men reporting same-sex sexual partners*. Am J Public Health. 2000 April; 90(4): 573-578.

RECTUM ABUSE, ANAL CANCER AND DISEASE

Homosexuality is a cultural lifestyle centered around the practice of sodomy. In Islām it is strictly prohibited for a man to have anal sex with a woman and it is considered a minor form of sodomy with men and a doorway to it. Scientific evidence is plentiful that abuse of the rectum in this way is tied to anal cancer. ‘Most anal cancers seemed to be linked to infection with HPV.’¹²⁴ The risk is significantly increased when there are multiple partners, a commonly observed practice amongst homosexuals.¹²⁵ “HIV-positive men who have sex with men are up to 90 times more likely than the general population to develop anal cancer... Abnormal anal cytology in HIV-positive men who have sex with men is highly indicative of the presence of abnormal anal cells that may be precancerous and should prompt further investigation”¹²⁶ The increase in anal cancer incidence in the U.S. between 1980 and 2005 was greatly influenced by HIV infections in males, but not females, according to a study published October 5, 2012 in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute.¹²⁷

When the rectum is abused in this way, it becomes a repository for the sodomized recipient’s feces and the germs and infections of the sodomizer, Unlike heterosexual intercourse where sperm cannot penetrate the purpose-built multilayered wall inside the vagina and no feces is present, rectum abuse is an efficient way to spread hepatitis,¹²⁸ HIV, syphilis and numerous other diseases. This *conduct*

¹²⁴ Refer to Cancer.org.

¹²⁵ Long term sexual fidelity is extremely rare amongst gay males.

¹²⁶ University of California - Los Angeles. “*Study Shows That Anal Cytology Predicts Anal Precancer In HIV-positive Gay Men.*” ScienceDaily, 31 March 2007. The research by Ross D. Cranston et al appears in the February issue of the International Journal of STD & AIDS.

¹²⁷ Meredith S. Shiels, Ruth M. Pfeiffer, Anil K. Chaturvedi, Aimee R. Kreimer, and Eric A. Engels. Impact of the HIV Epidemic on the Incidence Rates of Anal Cancer in the United States. JNCI, October 5, 2012.

¹²⁸ “The annual incidence of hepatitis A in susceptible (seronegative) homosexual men was 22 per cent, whereas no heterosexual men acquired hepatitis A. Diaries concerning sexual behavior kept by homosexual men showed that the acquisition of hepatitis A virus infection contact. Hepatitis

is not an immutable, biologically based condition unlike heterosexual sex because the human body was not designed to accommodate rectum abuse without suffering from adverse effects. In contrast to the vagina, the anus is an 'exit-only passage' whose lining is not designed for repeated penetration.

Homosexuals suffer from anorectal problems after repeated rectum abuse. Since, the internal sphincter is damaged, the anal opening no longer seals completely leading to anal incontinence. S.E. Goldstone mentions a study in which 25% of homosexuals engaging in this practice suffer from rectal incontinence.¹²⁹ This problem is addressed through a range of products including plugs and a variety of pads to prevent the soiling of clothes with feces. The term, "**gay bowel syndrome**"¹³⁰ has been used in the medical literature since the 1980s to refer to a string of infections and diseases that infect the gut due to the disgusting practice of ingesting feces.¹³¹ Outbreaks of hepatitis A amongst homosexuals are usually traced to oral-anal contact and a practice known as 'rimming' which involves insertion of the tongue into the anus.¹³² A sex-advice publication by RFSL (Swedish gay

A should be considered one of the enteric infections that appear to be sexually transmitted among homosexual men." Corey L, Holmes KK. *Sexual transmission of hepatitis A in homosexual men: incidence and mechanism*. New England Journal of Medicine. 1980 Feb 21;302(8):435-8.

¹²⁹ *The Ins and Outs of Gay Sex: a medical handbook for men* (Dell Publishing, New York, NY, 1999).

¹³⁰ Gay activists dislike this term and have lobbied against it, claiming it is "homophobic."


¹³¹ Refer to "*The Gay Bowel*" published in *Gut* within the British Medical Journal (1985, 26, pp. 869-875) which ties the increase in sexual diseases to practices amongst homosexuals in the larger cities of North America and Europe. In a controlled study, 67.5% of 200 homosexual men and only 16% of 100 heterosexual men had parasitic intestinal infections indicating the detrimental effects of rectum abuse. Refer to Keystone JS, Keystone DL, Proctor EM. *Intestinal parasitic infections in homosexual men: prevalence, symptoms and factors in transmission*. Canadian Medical Association Journal 1980;123(6):512-4.

¹³² Refer to Christenson B. et al. *An epidemic outbreak of hepatitis A among homosexual men in Stockholm. Hepatitis A, a special hazard for the male*

activist organization) writes, “For the non-initiated participant, the meeting between the tongue and the asshole is a mystery, painful and even repulsive. However, for the experienced participant it’s heaven on earth.”

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) published this chart on their website showing all new HIV infections. Sodomists barely make up 2% of the population yet 66% of all new infections are amongst them. In other words, out of a 100,000 new infections in a population, 66,000 would be in male homosexuals despite the fact that their existence within the general population is only

Figure 2: Estimated New HIV Infections, 2010, by Transmission Category



2,000 per every 100,000 as a generous estimation. “Gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (MSM) of all races and ethnicities remain the population most profoundly affected by HIV... in 2010, MSM accounted for 78% of new HIV infections among males and 63% of all new infections”¹³³ The Centre for Disease Control (CDC) writes, “Gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (MSM) represent approximately 2% of the United States population, yet are the population most severely affected by HIV. In 2010, young gay and bisexual men (aged 13-24 years) accounted for 72% of new HIV

homosexual subpopulation in Sweden. Am J Epidemiol. 1982 Oct;116(4):599-607. And M. Heller writes in his paper on gay bowel syndrome, “Frequently and promiscuity of sexual intercourse is probably a major risk factor. Gay men in this country have both higher rates of intercourse and many more sexual partners than do either straight men or gay women.” *The gay bowel syndrome: a common problem of homosexual patients in the emergency department.* Ann Emerg Med. 1980 Sep;9(9):487-93.

¹³³ *HIV in the United States: At a Glance* published on <http://aids.gov>.

infections among all persons aged 13 to 24, and 30% of new infections among all gay and bisexual men... In 2013, in the United States, gay and bisexual men accounted for 81% (30,689) of the 37,887 estimated HIV diagnoses among all males aged 13 years and older.”¹³⁴ The risk of HIV transmission during anal intercourse may be around 18 times greater than during vaginal intercourse. Anal intercourse drives the HIV epidemic amongst gay and bisexual men.¹³⁵

The research literature indicates that homosexuals have higher rates of promiscuity,¹³⁶ increased susceptibility to sexually transmitted diseases, mental illnesses,¹³⁷ higher rates of substance abuse, higher rates of domestic abuse¹³⁸ and suicide.¹³⁹

¹³⁴ See <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/group/msm/index.html>.

¹³⁵ Refer to Baggaley RF et al. *HIV transmission risk through anal intercourse: systematic review, meta-analysis and implications for HIV prevention*. Int J Epidemiol. 2010 Aug;39(4):1048-63.

¹³⁶ Paul Van de Ven et al. *A Comparative Demographic and Sexual Profile of Older Homosexually Active Men*. Journal of Sex Research 34 (1997): 354.

¹³⁷ The famous Mayo Clinic writes on its website (MayoClinic.Org), “Gay men are more likely to experience body image problems and eating disorders, such as anorexia and bulimia nervosa, than are their straight counterparts. Gay men and men who have sex with men might be at higher risk of depression and anxiety. In addition, youth who identify themselves as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender might have a higher risk of depression and attempted suicide.” *Health issues for gay men and men who have sex with men* (15th August 2014).

¹³⁸ “The incidence of domestic violence among gay men is nearly double that in the heterosexual population.” D. Island and P. Letellier, *Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them: Battered Gay Men and Domestic Violence* (New York: Haworth Press, 1991), p. 14. The pro-homosexual Gay and Lesbian Medical Association (GLMA) affirms that compared to the general population, there is a higher rate of substance abuse, depression and anxiety, alcohol abuse and dependence, tobacco use and eating disorders amongst gay men. Refer to Victor M. B. Silenzio, “*Top 10 Things Gay Men Should Discuss with their Healthcare Provider*” (San Francisco: Gay & Lesbian Medical Association).

¹³⁹ Herrell R. et. al., *Sexual orientation and suicidality: a co-twin control study in adult men*. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 1999 Oct;56(10):867-74. “*Background: Several recent studies have found a higher lifetime prevalence of suicide attempts in homosexual males compared with heterosexual control subjects or population rates. This study used twins from the population-based Vietnam*

A study in the *Journal of Adolescent Health Care* summarizes that, “Four general groups of conditions may be encountered in homosexually active men: *classical sexually transmitted diseases* (gonorrhea, infections with *Chlamydia trachomatis*, syphilis, herpes simplex infections, genital warts, pubic lice, scabies); *enteric diseases* (infections with *Shigella* species, *Campylobacter jejuni*, *Entamoeba histolytica*, *Giardia lamblia*, hepatitis A, hepatitis B, hepatitis non-A, non-B, and cytomegalovirus); *trauma* (fecal incontinence, hemorrhoids, anal fissure, foreign bodies, rectosigmoid tears, allergic proctitis, penile edema, chemical sinusitis, inhaled nitrite burns, and sexual assault of the male patient); and *acquired immunodeficiency syndrome* (AIDS).¹⁴⁰

In their paper titled *Sexual transmission of hepatitis C in homosexual men*, the authors write, “Recently, the number of cases of acute HCV infection has been seen to increase in The Netherlands. This may be due primarily to an increase in unprotected sexual intercourse and fisting.¹⁴¹ This hypothesis is supported by a documented increased prevalence of sexually transmissible diseases among gay men in The

Era Twin Registry, Hines, Ill. *Methods*: An analytic sample of 103 middle-aged male-male twin pairs from the registry was identified in which one member of the pair reported male sex partners after age 18 years while the other did not. Four lifetime symptoms of suicidality as measured by the Diagnostic Interview Schedule were analyzed: thoughts about death, wanting to die, thoughts about committing suicide, and attempted suicide. A composite measure of reporting at least one suicidality symptom was also assessed. *Results*: Same-gender sexual orientation is significantly associated with each of the suicidality measures. After adjustment for substance abuse and depressive symptoms (other than suicidality), all of the suicidality measures remain significantly associated with same-gender sexual orientation except for wanting to die. *Conclusions*: The substantially increased lifetime risk of suicidal behaviors in homosexual men is unlikely to be due solely to substance abuse or other psychiatric comorbidity.”

¹⁴⁰ Owen WF, Jr. *Medical problems of the homosexual adolescent*. *Journal of Adolescent Health Care* 1985;6(4):278-85.

¹⁴¹ The practice of one homosexual inserting his clenched fist into the anus of another homosexual.

Netherlands.”¹⁴² During the period 1994-1999, in Denmark, the incidence of gonorrhoea among men who sodomize men was 30 times that among heterosexual men.¹⁴³

A 1990 report from a Ft. Lauderdale, Florida clinic noted that up to 55% of homosexual men with anorectal symptoms had gonorrhoea, 80% of the patients with syphilis were homosexual men, 15% of asymptomatic homosexual men had Chlamydia, and about 1 in 3 male homosexuals had active anorectal herpes simplex infection. Additionally, intestinal infections that normally result from eating food contaminated with human feces were rampant in the homosexual community, indicating that feces ingestion was somehow taking place amongst homosexuals.¹⁴⁴

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) states on their website, “Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs) have been increasing among gay and bisexual men, with recent increases in syphilis being documented across the country. In 2012, **men who have sex with men (MSM)** accounted for 75% of primary and secondary syphilis cases in the United States. MSM often are diagnosed with other STDs, including chlamydia and gonorrhoea infections. HPV (Human Papillomavirus), the most common STD in the United States, is also a concern for MSM. Some types of HPV can cause genital and anal warts and some can lead to the development of anal and oral cancer. Men who have sex with men are 17 times more likely to develop anal cancer than heterosexual men. Men who are HIV-positive are even more likely than those who are uninfected to develop anal cancer.”¹⁴⁵

¹⁴² *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk.* 2004 Nov 20;148(47):2309-12.

¹⁴³ Johansen JD, Smith E. *Gonorrhoea in Denmark: high incidence among HIV-infected men who have sex with men.* *Acta Derm Venereol* 2002;82(5):365-8.

¹⁴⁴ Refer to Wexner SD, Milsom JW, Dailey TH. *The demographics of anal cancers are changing. Identification of a high-risk population.* *Dis Colon Rectum* 1987;30(12):942-6.

¹⁴⁵ Refer to <http://www.cdc.gov/msmhealth/STD.htm>.

The incidence of anal cancer has rapidly increased amongst men due to the prevalence of homosexuality, rising from an 8% incident rate in the 1950s to 74% in the mid 1980s.¹⁴⁶ The transmission of human papilloma virus (HPV) explains the connection between anal intercourse and anal cancer.¹⁴⁷ In a study looking at 3,391 Danish men in registered homosexual partnerships who were followed for an average of 4.6 years, the incidence of anal cancer was 31-fold higher compared to Danish men in general and the incidence of **Kaposi's sarcoma** was 136-fold higher compared to Danish men in general.¹⁴⁸

Because rectum abuse is unnatural, drug use to enhance the experience, mask pain and increase pleasure is not uncommon amongst homosexuals. There is substantial evidence for increased substance use amongst homosexuals. The most popular drugs include nitrites (poppers), ecstasy, and methamphetamine.¹⁴⁹ The use of such substances facilitate the spread of disease even further, "One of the major factors facilitating the increased risk-taking behavior by MSM is the use of disinhibiting substances, including alcohol, crystal methamphetamine, and other recreational drugs."¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁶ Wexner SD, Milsom JW, Dailey TH. *The demographics of anal cancers are changing. Identification of a high-risk population.* Diseases of the Colon and Rectum 1987;30(12):942-6.

¹⁴⁷ Frisch M et al. *Sexually transmitted infection as a cause of anal cancer.* New England Journal of Medicine 1997;337(19):1350-8.

¹⁴⁸ Frisch M, Smith E, Grulich A, et al. *Cancer in a population-based cohort of men and women in registered homosexual partnerships.* American Journal of Epidemiology 2003;157(11):966-72.

¹⁴⁹ Refer to L Stall R, Wiley J. *A comparison of alcohol and drug use patterns of homosexual and heterosexual men: the San Francisco Men's Health Study.* Drug Alcohol Depend 1988;22(1-2):63-73. Lewis L, Ross M. *A select body: The gay dance party subculture and the HIV/AIDS pandemic.* New York: Cassell 1995. Stall R, Purcell DW. *Intertwining epidemics: a review of research on substance use among men who have sex with men and its connection to the AIDS epidemic.* AIDS Behav 2000;4(2):181-92.

¹⁵⁰ Kenneth H. Mayer. *Sexually Transmitted Diseases in Men Who Have Sex With Men.* Clin Infect Dis. (2011) 53 (suppl 3): S79-S83.

In his paper titled, “*Increasing rates of sexually transmitted diseases in homosexual men in Western Europe and the United States: why?*” author K. Fenton notes the almost simultaneous outbreak of diseases amongst homosexuals across the US and Europe. He states, “The consistency of findings from across industrialized countries confirms an increasing connectivity within the global MSM [men who have sex with men] community; a community that is decreasingly defined by geographic boundaries and, in the era of the Internet and easier foreign travel, increasingly linked by shared interests and social and sexual networks. This is powerfully demonstrated in the near-simultaneous syphilis and LGV outbreaks among MSM in Europe and the United States. In this regard, greater collaboration between researchers and providers working with MSM indifferent countries is now required. More specifically, consideration should be given to creating closer partnerships between sentinel cities, such as London, New York, San Francisco, Berlin, Paris, and Amsterdam, that have large MSM populations and are likely to be emerging, or rapid diffusion sites for new social and sexual trends that may impact on disease transmission.”¹⁵¹ In other words, these simultaneous outbreaks of disease occurring exclusively amongst homosexuals across major cities in the world due to increased connectivity between homosexual networks are in turn a substantial risk in disease transmission to the wider society. This is hazardous to public health and places a huge economic burden on a nation’s finances.

Some homosexuals insert foreign bodies into their rectum for pleasure. Occasionally, while moving an object back and forth, a homosexual or his partner may lose his grip on the object and the foreign body gets sucked into the colorectum. The medical literature documents details of homosexual visits to hospital emergency departments with ‘foreign bodies’ lodged in their rectums which have caused trauma and perforation. By way of example, in their paper, “*Social injuries of the rectum*” Sohn et. al. report “Eleven patients with injuries of the rectum and sigmoid colon secondary

¹⁵¹ *Infect Dis Clin North Am.* 2005 Jun;19(2):311-31.

to¹⁵² the insertion of the clenched fist are presented. Six patients sustained mucosal lacerations of the rectum and four patients had rectosigmoid perforations requiring laparotomy. One patient sustained a severe sphincter laceration producing complete anal incontinence.¹⁵³ The management of these conditions is discussed.”¹⁵⁴

In their paper, “*Management of foreign bodies and trauma of the rectum*” Baron et. al. report, “A series of 101 patients with trauma of the rectum, secondary to homosexual practices, presenting at this hospital and medical center is reviewed. Two patients were injured twice. Thirty-six patients had retained foreign bodies in the rectum, 55 had lacerations of the mucosa, two had disruptions of the anal sphincter and ten had perforations of the rectosigmoid... Patients with abdominal pain, fever, continued bleeding, large lacerations or tear of the sphincter should be admitted and observed or operated upon, or both, as needed. Serious injuries, secondary to homosexual acts, can and do occur, as evidenced by the mortality¹⁵⁵ reported in this series.”¹⁵⁶

Some such objects recovered in emergency departments from the colorectums of homosexuals include soft-drink and other bottles, jars, light bulbs, candles, fruits like bananas and apples; vegetables like cucumbers, onions, potatoes, carrots and turnips; dildos, vibrators, tumblers, a polythene waste trap from the U-bend of a sink, salami, sponge rubber balls, a steer’s horn, baseballs, tennis balls, hard-boiled eggs, sand-filled bicycle inner tubing, an aluminum tube (used by a prisoner to store money and other valuables), broomsticks, broom handles, various types of brushes, axe handles, whip handles, soldering irons, a wood-handled carborundum sharpening stone, glass tubes, frozen pig’s tail, and

¹⁵² The phrase “secondary to” in medical literature means “caused by.”

¹⁵³ This would require the patient to wear nappies on a permanent basis.

¹⁵⁴ *Am. Journal of Surgery*. 1977 Nov;134(5):611-2.

¹⁵⁵ Meaning, some homosexuals die from this practice.

¹⁵⁶ Refer to *Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics*. 1983 Apr;156(4):453-7.

kitchen items such as spatula, ice pick, and mortar pestle.¹⁵⁷ The typical patient that presents in the emergency department with colorectal foreign objects is a male homosexual.¹⁵⁸

Another practice amongst sodomites is known as “fisting” or “handballing.” This involves the insertion of a fist and part of the forearm into the rectum. Because inserting a fist into the rectum is not easy, sodomites use a combination of lubricants and drugs such as amyl nitrite, methaqualone, marijuana, LSD, mescaline, cocaine, wine, and other alcohols to get the job done. The drugs act as both muscle relaxants and aphrodisiacs. Having achieved fist insertion, the movement of the hand and arm within the rectum may continue for two or more hours. Rest breaks may occur, but the fist is usually left in the rectum while the partners chill-out and relax.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Refer to Abcarian H, Lowe R. *Colon and rectal trauma*. Surg Clin North Am 1978;58(3):519-37. Barone JE, Sohn N, Nealon TF, Jr. *Perforations and foreign bodies of the rectum: report of 28 cases*. Ann Surg 1976;184(5):601-4. Busch DB, Starling JR. *Rectal foreign bodies: case reports and a comprehensive review of the world's literature*. Surgery 1986;100(3):512-9. Crass RA, Tranbaugh RF, Kudsk KA, et al. *Colorectal foreign bodies and perforation*. Am J Surg 1981;142(1):85-8. Eftaiha M, Hambrick E, Abcarian H. *Principles of management of colorectal foreign bodies*. Arch Surg 1977;112(6):691-5. Lucas MA, Ryan JE. *Rectal foreign bodies*. Kentucky Med J 1947;42:702. Marino AW, Jr., Mancini HW. *Anal eroticism*. Surg Clin North Am 1978;58(3):513-8. Newlinds JS. *A long standing, much travelled rectal foreign body*. Med J Aust 1979;2(7):373-4. Hunter RC, Jr. *Foreign body (light bulb) in the rectosigmoid*. Armed Forces Med J 1954;5:1050. Benjamin HB, Klamecki B, Haft JS. *Removal of exotic foreign objects from the abdominal orifices*. Am J Proctol 1969;20(6):413-7. Daffner RH. *Contrast enema for rectal foreign body*. Am J Proctol 1976;27(5):39-41. Shah J, Majed A, Rosin D. *Rectal salami*. Int J Clin Pract 2002;56(7):558-9. Through the highly-informative website <http://www.homosexinfo.org>.

¹⁵⁸ Crass RA, Tranbaugh RF, Kudsk KA, et al. *Colorectal foreign bodies and perforation*. Am J Surg 1981;142(1):85-8.

¹⁵⁹ Refer to Shook LL, Whittle R, Rose EF. *Rectal fist insertion. An unusual form of sexual behavior*. Am J Forensic Med Pathol 1985;6(4):319-24. Navin H. *Medical and surgical risks in handballing: implications of an inadequate socialization process*. J Homosex 1981;6(3):67-76.

It is clear from what has preceded that a **logical, rational, health-based reason** exists for aversion to homosexual conduct and a cultural lifestyle centred around anal-fascination and the practice of sodomy. In turn, there are ethical and moral reasons to be concerned about the organized hyper-sexualization and indoctrination of children into acceptance of such a lifestyle and the clear harms associated with it.

In light of this, a person may appreciate why the culture of sodomy is objected to in the strongest of ways in revealed books. Allāh (ﷻ) mentions regarding the people of Lot, **“And [mention] Lot, when he said to his people, ‘Do you commit immorality while you are seeing? Do you indeed approach men with desire instead of women? Rather, you are a people behaving ignorantly.’ But the answer of his people was not except that they said, ‘Expel the family of Lot from your city. Indeed, they are people who keep themselves pure’.”** (27:54-56).

The Qur’ānic exegete, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī introduces the statements of the Companions in explanation of the saying of the homosexuals about Lot and his family, **“Indeed, they are a people who keep themselves pure,”** by first summarizing the intent behind this statement, “[Indeed, they are a people who keep themselves pure] from what we [homosexuals] do of having sex with men in their anuses.” Then he cites from Ibn ‘Abbās (رضي الله عنه), “[Indeed, they are a people who keep themselves pure] from having sex with men and women in their anuses.” Then the statement of Mujāhīd, the student of Ibn ‘Abbās, “[Indeed, they are a people who keep themselves pure] from having sex with men and women in their anuses, [intending] mockery of them [Lot and his family].” And then from Qatādah who said, “They [the sodomizers] criticized them baselessly, meaning [in reality], that they [Lot and his family] keep themselves pure from actions of evil.”¹⁶⁰ And Imām al-Baghawī, another famous Qur’ānic exegete, commented, “[Indeed, they are a people who keep

¹⁶⁰ Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī.

themselves pure] from the anuses of men.”¹⁶¹ Imām al-Sa’dī, a famous scholar of the 20th century, said, “Meaning, they [Lot and his family] keep themselves pure from sodomy and the anuses of men.”¹⁶² Ibn Kathīr explained, “They [Lot and his family] are repulsed from doing what you do and from affirming your action (as normal and acceptable), so expel them from amongst you because they are not fit for living near you in your city.”¹⁶³

The Prophet Muḥammad (صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) said, “Never does lewdness spread amongst a people until they make it open except that such diseases and plagues will inflict them that were not found amongst their ancestors.”¹⁶⁴ In its Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) of 9th May 2014, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) wrote, “Primary and secondary syphilis rates increased among men of all ages and races/ethnicities during 2005–2013, from 5.1 cases per 100,000 population in 2005 to 9.8 in 2013, when men accounted for 91.1% of all cases reported in the United States. Although rates remain highest among black men (28.1), recent increases were greatest among Hispanic and white men. **Currently, syphilis is predominantly an MSM [men who have sex with men] epidemic.**”¹⁶⁵ This is an addition to AIDS being a predominantly male homosexual epidemic in the West.

In contrast, the in-built, innate, natural heterosexual *orientation* exercised within marriage¹⁶⁶ is one of cleanliness, uprightness, purity

¹⁶¹ Refer to Tafsīr al-Baghawī.

¹⁶² Refer to Tafsīr al-Sa’dī.

¹⁶³ Refer to Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr.

¹⁶⁴ Related by *Ibn Mājah* in his Sunah through ‘Abdullāh bin ‘Umar.

¹⁶⁵ *Primary and Secondary Syphilis – United States, 2005–2013* by Monica E. Patton et al. MMWR (9th May 2014).

¹⁶⁶ **Marxism, Socialism, Homosexuality and the Family Unit.** It is important to grasp the significance of marriage through which material, property and inheritance rights are established for close blood relations such as parents, children and siblings. The economic orders of nations have been centered around the family unity. It is not surprising that many prominent homosexual activists are also Marxists, Communists and Internationalist

and remoteness from disease. Muslims are drawn innately and naturally to a lifestyle founded on these principles because “Purity is one-half of faith.”¹⁶⁷ Muslims are prohibited from anal-intercourse with women and likewise they are prohibited from intercourse when the woman is on her menstrual cycle. Muslims are proud and boast about such cleanliness and purity because they are “**a people who keep themselves pure.**” Allāh (ﷻ) stated, “**And they ask you about menstruation. Say: It is harm, so keep away from wives during menstruation. And do not approach them until they are pure. And when they have purified themselves, then come to them from where Allah has ordained for you. Indeed, Allah loves those who are constantly repentant and loves those who purify themselves.**” (2:222).

Finally, it should be pointed out that the “safe sex” approach does not work in the long term with risky sexual practices such as sodomy. Despite the tens of millions spent on promoting “safe sex” amongst sodomites, diseases have been steadily on the rise over the past few decades in their sub-populations. This coincides with the gradual normalization and acceptance of sodomy as a “sexual orientation.” Further, as age of sexual consent laws are being lowered due to the intense lobbying efforts of sodomists in the name of “child rights” sexually transmitted diseases are steadily increasing amongst lower age groups.¹⁶⁸

Socialists. The abolition of marriage and family facilitates the goals of their ideology, at the core of which is abolition of all private property rights.

¹⁶⁷ Reported in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* through the Companion, Abū Mālik al-Ash‘arī.

¹⁶⁸ The Centre for Disease Control (CDC) writes, “Gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (MSM) represent approximately 2% of the United States population, yet are the population most severely affected by HIV. In 2010, young gay and bisexual men (aged 13-24 years) accounted for 72% of new HIV infections among all persons aged 13 to 24, and 30% of new infections among all gay and bisexual men.” Refer to this report on the CDC website: <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/group/msm/index.html>. Lowering the age of sexual consent facilitates the exploitation of boys for male child prostitution even further.

FROM STONEWALL TO AIDS IN 12 YEARS

Camille Paglia is a lesbian social critic and commentator. She writes, “From Stonewall¹⁶⁹ to the first AIDS alert was only twelve short years. In the Eighties and early Nineties, displaced anxiety over the horrors of AIDS turned gay activists into rampaging nihilists and monomaniacs, who dishonestly blamed the disease on the government and trampled on the rights of the gay majority, and whose errors of judgment materially aided the rise and consolidation of the far right. AIDS did not appear out of nowhere. It was a direct result of the sexual revolution, which my generation unleashed with the best intentions, but whose worse effects were to be suffered primarily by gay men. In the West, despite much propaganda to the contrary, AIDS is a gay disease and will remain one for the foreseeable future.”¹⁷⁰

Gabriel Rotello, who is a homosexual musician and film-maker, writes, “Evidence convincingly argues that before the middle of the century gay sexual behavior was vastly different from what it was to become later, that from mid century onward there were fundamental changes not only in gay male self-perceptions and beliefs, but also in sexual habits, kinds and numbers of partners, even ways of making love. These revolutions reached a fever pitch just as at the moment HIV exploded like a series of time bombs across the archipelago of gay America. When gay experience is viewed collectively, it appears that the simultaneous introduction of new behaviors and a dramatic rise in the scale of old ones produced one of the greatest shifts in sexual ecology ever recorded. There is

¹⁶⁹ The Stonewall riots were a series of spontaneous, violent demonstrations by homosexuals against a police raid that took place in the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, at the Stonewall Inn, located in the Greenwich Village neighborhood of Manhattan, New York City. This event is of great historical importance to “gay activism” and signified the appearance of a militant approach to “gay politics” and “gay liberation.” Stonewall is also the name of a UK “gay activism” organization that promotes sexual liberation in schools and supports lowering the age of sexual consent.

¹⁷⁰ *Vamps & Tramps: New Essays* (Vintage, New York, 1994) p. 68.

convincing evidence that this shift had a decisive impact on the transmission of virtually every sexually transmitted disease, of which HIV was merely one, albeit the most deadly.”¹⁷¹

Rotello also writes, “‘It was an historic accident that HIV disease first manifested itself in the gay populations of the east and west coasts of the United States,’ wrote British sociologist Jeffrey Weeks in *AIDS and Contemporary History* in 1993. His opinion has been almost universal among gay and AIDS activists even to this day. Yet there is little ‘accidental’ about the sexual ecology described above. Multiple concurrent partners, versatile anal sex, core group behavior centered in commercial sex establishments, widespread recreational drug abuse, repeated waves of STDs and constant intake of antibiotics, sexual tourism and travel - these factors were not ‘accidents.’ Multipartner anal sex was encouraged, celebrated, considered a central component of liberation. Core group behavior in baths and sex clubs was deemed by many the quintessence of freedom. Versatility was declared a political imperative. Analingus was pronounced the champagne of gay sex, a palpable gesture of revolution. STDs were to be worn like badges of honor, antibiotics to be taken with pride. Far from being accidents, these things characterized the very foundation of what it supposedly meant to experience gay liberation, Taken together they formed a sexual ecology of almost incalculably catastrophic dimensions, a classic feedback loop in which virtually every factor served to amplify every other. From the virus’s point of view, the ecology of liberation was a royal road to adaptive triumph. From many gay men’s point of view, it proved a trapdoor to hell on earth.”¹⁷²

Rotello also writes, “The primary factor that led to increase HIV transmission was anal sex combined with multiple partners, particularly in concentrated core groups. By the seventies there is little doubt that for those in the most sexually active core groups,

¹⁷¹ In *Sexual Ecology: AIDS and the Destiny of Gay Men* (New York, 1997) p. 39.

¹⁷² *Ibid.* p. 89.

multipartner anal sex had become a main event. Michael Callen, both an avid practitioner and a careful observer of life in the gay fast lane, believed that this was a ‘historically unprecedented aspect’ of the gay sexual revolution.”¹⁷³ **Rotello** also states, “As the gay version of the sexual revolution took hold among certain groups of gay men in America’s largest cities, it precipitated a change in sexual behaviors. Perhaps the most significant change was the fact that some core groups of gay men began practicing anal intercourse with dozens or even hundreds of partners a year. Also significant was a growing emphasis on ‘versatile’ anal sex, in which partners alternately played both receptive and insertive roles, and on new behaviors such as anilingus, or rimming that facilitated the spread of otherwise difficult-to-transmit microbes. Important, too, was a shift in patterns of partnership, from diffuse systems in which a lot of gay sex was with non-gay identified partners who themselves had few contacts, to fairly closed systems in which most sexual activity was within a circle of other gay men. Also important was a general decline in ‘group immunity’ caused by repeated infections of various STDs, repeated inoculations of antibiotics and other drugs to combat them, as well as recreational substantive abuse, stress, and other behaviors that comprised immunity.”¹⁷⁴

Mirko D. Grmek wrote in his *History of Aids*, a book which won the George Sarton Medal from the History of Science Society, “In the 1970s an extraordinary proliferation of clubs, bars, discotheques, bathhouses, sex shops, travel agencies, and gay magazines allowed the community to ‘come out’ and adopt a whole new repertoire of erotic behavior, out of all measure to any similar past activities.”¹⁷⁵

Gay activist **Jeffrey Weeks** wrote, “The magical link was through a key term. ‘One word’, the gay writer Nathan Frain has written, ‘is

¹⁷³ Ibid. p. 75.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid. 57-58.

¹⁷⁵ *History of AIDS: Emergence and Origin of a Modern Pandemic* (Princeton University Press, 1993). p. 168-169. The book was described, “A masterpiece of historical analysis.” Elizabeth M. Whelan, Washington Times.

like a hand grenade in the whole affair: **promiscuity.**' Although promiscuity has long been seen as a characteristic of male homosexuals, there is little doubt that the 1970s saw a quantitative jump in its incidence as establishments such as gay bath-houses and back-room bars, existing specifically for the purposes of casual sex, spread in all major cities of the United States and elsewhere from Toronto to Paris, Amsterdam to Sydney (though London remained more or less aloof, largely due to the effects of the 1967 reform). Michel Foucault has written characteristically of the growth of 'laboratories of sexual experimentation' in cities such as San Francisco and New York, 'the counterpart of the medieval courts where strict rules of proprietary courtship were defined'. For the first time for most male homosexuals, sex became easily available. With it came the chance not only to have frequent partners but also to explore the varieties of sex. Where sex becomes too available, Foucault suggests, constant variations are necessary to enhance the pleasure of the act. For many gays coming out in the 1970s the gay world was a paradise of sexual opportunity and of sensual exploration."¹⁷⁶

Professor of Physiology, **Rober Root-Bernstein** writes, "These data demonstrate definitively that the gay liberation movement resulted in a great increase in promiscuity among gay men, along with significant changes in sexual practices that made rectal trauma, immunological contact with semen, use of recreational drugs, and the transmission of many viral, amoebal, fungal, and bacterial infections far more common than in the decades prior to 1970. The same data strongly suggest that recent changes in sexual and drug activity played a major role in vastly enlarging the homo and bisexual male population at risk for developing immunosuppression. Since promiscuity, engaging in receptive anal intercourse, and fisting are the three highest-risk factors associated with AIDS among gay men and since each of these risk factors is correlated with

¹⁷⁶ In his book, *Sexuality and Its Discontents Meanings, Myths and Modern Sexualities* (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1988) pp. 47-48.

known cases of immunosuppression, they represent significant factors in our understanding of why AIDS emerged as a major medical problem only in 1970.”¹⁷⁷

A press release from **Life Site News** reads, “In a public statement last Friday, Matt Foreman, outgoing Executive Director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, rattled the homosexual activist community by joining the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), pro-family organizations and a growing number of homosexual activists willing to admit that homosexual behavior is both extremely high-risk and primarily responsible for the spread of HIV-AIDS in the U.S. Addressing the topic of AIDS, Foreman drastically deviated from the ‘gay’ lobby’s party line by admitting, ‘Internally, when these numbers come out, the ‘established’ gay community seems to have a collective shrug as if this isn’t our problem. Folks, with 70 percent of the people in this country living with HIV being gay or bi, we cannot deny that HIV is a gay disease. We have to own that and face up to that.’ A little over a year ago, Lorri Jean, CEO of the Los Angeles-based Gay and Lesbian Center, similarly shocked the ‘gay’ community by stating that, “HIV is a Gay Disease. Own it. End it’.”¹⁷⁸ **Pink News**, a UK based homosexual news service ran an article titled, “*HIV is a gay disease. Own It. End It*” in which the author writes, “These are the words at the front of a new controversial advertisement campaign dividing opinion within the gay community. The L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center has launched an extensive campaign to provoke debate within the gay community. The controversial advert hopes to highlight what they see as a vast complacency within the gay community surrounding the issue of HIV-AIDS. The campaign includes huge billboards erected across the city as well as magazine ads and posters in West Hollywood. The groups statement is a complete transition from years of campaigning against the stereotypical view that homosexual men are promiscuous, unsafe and most likely to become infected... Despite

¹⁷⁷ *Rethinking AIDS: The Tragic Cost of Premature Consensus*. (The Free Press. New York, 1993) pp. 290-291.

¹⁷⁸ Life Site News (14th February 2008).

the controversy, the group insist that their campaign is supported by fact. L.A public health officials note three out of four HIV cases are the result of gay sex. In Los Angeles, gay and bisexual men make up less than 7% of the population yet account for more than 75% of those living with HIV and AIDS. Chief Executive Officer of L.A. Gay Lesbian Centre Lorri L. Jean said on the group website that ‘we have so effectively de-coupled the epidemic from the word ‘gay’ that most of us don’t even know the degree to which we are impacted’.”¹⁷⁹

For the purposes of clarification, AIDS is not a “homosexual disease” since *homosexuality* is not an *attribute* of a disease as such. A disease is a disease. It is more correct to say that AIDS spreads rapidly amongst homosexuals due to high-risk behaviours common to their lifestyles which suppress the immune system. These behaviours are centred around the act of **sodomy** and include **recreational drug-taking** through the use of needles and **promiscuity**. It is in this sense, that the phrase “AIDS is a homosexual disease” should be understood. In a large 2011 study on HIV infections, Rosenberg et al. write, “In 2006, the majority of new HIV infections were in MSM [men who have sex with men]. We sought to describe numbers of casual sex partners among US MSM. Among 11,191 sexually active MSM, 76% reported a casual male partner. The median casual partner number was three. Lower number of casual partners was associated with black race, Hispanic ethnicity, and having a main sex partner in the previous year. Factors associated with a higher number included gay identity, exchange sex, both injection and non-injection drug use. Being HIV-positive was associated with more partners among non-blacks only. Age differences in partner number were seen only among chat room users. MSM who were black, Hispanic or had a main sex partner reported fewer casual sex partners. Our results suggest specific populations of MSM who may benefit most from interventions to reduce casual partner numbers.”¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁹ Pink News (2nd October 2006).

¹⁸⁰ Rosenberg, E. S., Sullivan, P. S., Dinunno, E. A., Salazar, L. F., & Sanchez, T. H. (2011). *Number of casual male sexual partners and associated factors among*

EVOLUTION AND HOMOSEXUALITY

The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS)¹⁸¹ which plays a large role in public education in the US published answers to frequently asked questions regarding evolution. In explaining *natural selection* they write, “In the process of natural selection, individuals in a population who are well-adapted to a particular set of environmental conditions have an advantage over those who are not so well adapted. The advantage comes in the form of *survival* and *reproductive success*. For example, those individuals who are better able to find and use a food resource will, on average, live longer and produce more offspring than those who are less successful at finding food. Inherited traits that increase individuals’ fitness are then passed to their offspring, thus giving the offspring the same advantages.” **Douglas Futuyma**¹⁸² explains, “Natural selection is the process by which species adapt to their environment. Natural selection leads to evolutionary change when individuals with certain characteristics have a *greater survival or reproductive rate* than other individuals in a population and pass on these inheritable genetic characteristics to their offspring. Simply put, natural selection is a consistent difference in *survival and reproduction* between different genotypes, or different genes, in what we could call reproductive success.” **The American Museum of Natural History** writes, “Natural selection is a mechanism by which populations adapt and evolve. In its essence, it is a simple statement about *rates of reproduction and*

men who have sex with men: results from the National HIV Behavioral Surveillance system. BMC Public Health, 11, 189

¹⁸¹ An American public broadcaster and television program distributor. It was founded in 1969, and its members are America’s public TV stations -- noncommercial, educational licensees that operate more than 350 PBS member stations and serve all 50 states, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam and American Samoa.

¹⁸² Douglas Joel Futuyma is an American evolutionary biologist. He is a Distinguished Professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at Stony Brook University in Stony Brook, New York and a Research Associate on staff at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City. His research focuses on speciation and population biology. Futuyma is the author of a widely used undergraduate textbook on evolution.

mortality: Those individual organisms who happen to be best suited to an environment *survive* and *reproduce* most successfully, producing many similarly well-adapted descendants. After numerous such breeding cycles, the better-adapted dominate. Nature has filtered out poorly suited individuals and the population has evolved.”¹⁸³ It is a statement of scientific fact that homosexuals do not reproduce by both definition and design and it is also a statement of scientific fact that homosexuals engage in extremely high-risk behaviours which make them more prone to disease and earlier death than the general population.¹⁸⁴ Thus, heterosexuality is “better adaptation” and homosexuality is a trait that is being “filtered out” by “nature” because of the way it is designed. In light of these two scientific facts homosexuality cannot be considered a positive evolutionary process for homosexuals. This is why evolutionary biologists have a huge problem in reconciling their scientific beliefs with support for homosexuality. Many clever yet baseless or fallacious explanations have been crafted to clarify what is described as an “*anomaly*”, “*enigma*” or “*puzzle*” in evolution. These explanations often rely upon the previously discussed hoaxes [the *born gay*, *gay gene* and *gay animal* hoaxes] to provide non-scientific answers that are easily pierced by elementary logic. Frequently, these answers are qualified by “*perhaps*”, “*maybe*”, “*possibly*” indicating their non-scientific, conjectural nature. Unfortunately, even prestigious journals are happy to peddle this pseudo-science. There is no scientifically-validated evidence to explain the role of **homosexuality** in **natural selection** because by the very definition of the two terms, it is impossible for there to be one. Thus, conjecture and make-believe is passed off as science to serve *identity politics*. Make sure you read very carefully and in between the lines of any reports you may come across no matter how compelling they are made to look through clever scientific journalism and you will quickly see their emptiness and wishful thinking in trying to explain this puzzle away.

¹⁸³ Refer to <http://www.amnh.org>.

¹⁸⁴ Refer to the abundant evidence in the chapter on *Rectum Abuse, Anal Cancer and Disease* which follows shortly.

WHY ARE THERE HOMOSEXUAL FEELINGS?

We can now address the question as to why there are homosexual feelings and attractions. **People may develop same-sex desires and impulses due to specific childhood experiences, experimentation, external cues in their environment, emotional problems, trauma or social conditioning. Poor bonding with the same-sex parent or with peers, or child sexual abuse have been identified as strong factors in sexual lifestyle choices.** Basically, a number of factors coincide at a particular point in a person's life that lead the person to develop such feelings and attractions. Most often, the core problem is not the homosexual feeling itself which may only be a symptom of deeper issues in a person's life such as the struggles of rejection, envy, abuse, identity, distrust, or fear. Circumstances and external cues may act upon those deeper issues and lead to homosexual experiences which lead a person to self-identify on the basis of such experiences. Imbalances in early social life can also influence the development of homosexual inclinations. The role of environmental factors, to one degree or another, cannot be discarded either.¹⁸⁵

This is what all credible, scientific, statistical, social research points to and is also revealed (unintendedly) through testimony in court cases by expert witnesses, many of whom are brought by homosexual plaintiffs and is readily admitted by homosexual academics who do not deceive themselves by confusing gay propaganda with science.

¹⁸⁵ There is a growing body of evidence showing endocrine disruptors in chemical pollution are affecting gender development in animals and could therefore be affecting humans. "Scientists are continuing to sound the alarm about some common chemicals, including the herbicide atrazine, and link them to changes in reproductive health and development. Endocrine disrupting toxic chemicals have been found to feminize male frogs and cause homosexual behavior." *Hormone Disruptors Linked To Genital Changes and Sexual Preference* published by Living on Earth at the School for the Environment at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, <http://loe.org>. Refer also to the informative and eye-opening article, *Atrazine: Syngenta's herbicide doesn't just poison frogs - it could give you cancer* in The Ecologist journal by F William Engdahl (2nd June 2014).

A Model for the Development of Sexual Attraction

The following broad model presented by research psychologists attempts to explain the route through which sex attraction develops in a person from a male perspective.¹⁸⁶ For females, the model is the same, with some additional parameters. The normal male model will be used first and used as a basis to explain the abnormal route through which same-sex attractions arise. It must be made clear that these are only broad models and real life experience will be more complex as many combined factors are at work. Also, whilst some may develop homosexual feelings and attractions through the model described below, for others it is purely circumstantial and can occur by way of sexual experimentation or some other specific event(s) unique to a particular social setting.

Attachment to the Mother: From birth, all babies consider themselves a single unit with their mother. At some point, the baby realises that he is not one with his mother, but is separate. Then between the ages of 1 and 2 boys are able to identify differences in gender. They start to recognize boys are boys and girls are girls, that he is a boy like his father and his mother is a girl.

Movement Towards the Father: Around of the age of 3, the boy starts to face a challenge where he must start separating from his attachment to his mother and attach himself to his father. It is in this process of attachment to his father that he begins to get a sense of gender identity and who he is as a male. The boy starts to look to his father to answer a number of questions that pass through his inquisitive mind. These questions are “*What are boys about?*”, “*How do they walk, talk and act?*”, “*Who am I as a boy?*”, “*Am I a boy, do I measure up to what it means to be a boy?*”, “*Is there value in me being a boy?*”, “*Will you accept me?*”, “*Do I fit in?*” These are not conscious thoughts, they are taking place at a subconscious level. The boy looks to the father to

¹⁸⁶ Based on work by Dr. Julie Hamilton, former Assistant Professor of Psychology at Palm Beach Atlantic University and “I” by Dr. Neil Whitehead (New Zealand, 2015) pp. 102-113, 211-223.

answer all of these questions, and the father's answers are not verbal but through interaction and behaviour with the child. The child interprets these actions appropriately and sees them as answers to his subconscious questions. The father spends time with his son and shows interest in whatever his son shows interest. The father also makes verbal affirmations to his son, "*I am proud of you*", "*What a great boy you are*", "*You are so special*", "*You are so brave*" and so on. Hugging, holding, kissing and other types of affectionate behaviour, or wrestling and similar activities reinforce the conveyance and cementing of a strong male identity as the boy transitions towards, identifies and unifies with his father.

Male Peers: At the age of 5 to 6 the boy now reaches another stage where he looks to male peers to answer the same questions answered by his dad. He looks to the other boys to discover who he is in relation to them. He needs to be accepted, included and affirmed and requires a good few years to bond with members of the same sex. During this part of his life, boys do not want anything to do with the opposite sex. Boys will stick with boys and girls will stick with girls. This makes sense as a boy's attraction to the opposite sex cannot take place until he understands his own gender. This also reveals to us the wisdom in the segregation of males and females after a certain age. This allows fully-formed, mature, complete masculine and feminine identities to develop in boys and girls to ensure appropriate attraction to the opposite sex develops at the onset of puberty. Hence, this steady and constant exposure to male-bonding from the age of 2 all the way to puberty gives the boy a strong sense as to who he is as a male. This gives him ten or so years to develop fully as a male with a strong male identity before he starts becoming interested in the opposite sex at the onset of puberty.

Interest in Girls and Puberty. At this stage, the boy now becomes interested in the other gender which is mysterious and intriguing to him. His interest is not sexual at this stage. He knows what it means to be a boy and wants to know what girls are about. He is interested in what girls do, what they talk about, what their interests are and

why they are different to the interests of boys. It is during this phase that puberty generally sets in and the interest then develops into a sexual one, leading to strong opposite-sex attraction.

Same-Sex Attraction

In the case of same-sex attraction there are elements missing or defective in this model. In real life, the model is more complex and generalisations cannot be made from these models to every specific instance. Thus, from the age of 2 to 3 onwards, any of the following factors can contribute to an abnormal development of sexual attraction from a male perspective:

- a) There may not be a father, due to death or separation with mother after birth of child, or a father figure.¹⁸⁷
- b) He may not have a father whom he *perceives*¹⁸⁸ to be safe and welcoming because of the father's temperament. If the boy is more sensitive, he will take things more personally than a boy who is not.
- c) The boy may be intuitive and notice lots of details in the statements and behaviour of the father (or male figures) and take them to heart.
- d) The boy's father may have loved him a lot but failed to convey it appropriately, leading to incomplete bonding. Or he may have been loud and explosive when he becomes angry, leading the infant or young child to perceive him as a grave threat. Or he may have belittled his son with jibes and insults which destroyed his confidence, led to lack of bonding and to an incomplete self-image and male identity.

¹⁸⁷ This does not mean that every boy who does not have a father or father-figure present will become gay. This is simply a discussion of factors - which along with other specific experiences and circumstances - may contribute to the development of same-sex attractions.

¹⁸⁸ It is crucial to understand that perception is everything. How a person perceives what is happening is not the same as what is happening.

Because of these and other factors, the boy will have had difficulty in detaching from the mother and attaching to the father, even though he has an instinctual desire to attach to the father. The boy will keep trying but eventually give up. At this point, the boy will detach from the father due to perceived rejection. He will also suffer a detachment from what the father was meant to represent, which is masculinity. However, deep inside the boy still craves attachment but because he cannot take the rejection, he detaches subconsciously and emotionally. The consequence of this is that instead of soaking masculinity from his father, he continues to soak up femininity from his mother. Usually, for boys who develop same-sex attraction, there are other females in his life such as a sister, aunt or grandmother. As a result he will gradually learn what it means to be a girl from the females around him, though he still craves to know what it means to be a boy.

As he grows up, he may have a difficult time connecting with boys and will find greater comfort and acceptance amongst girls. In some cases, he may fear rejection from boys as he experienced rejection from his father. In other cases he might have developed feminine qualities as a result of which he is rejected by boys. When he reaches the age of seven and beyond, goes to school and mixes with others, he still craves an attachment to boys but will typically find himself in the company of girls. He will remain looking at the boys from a distance, wishing he could be a part of them and learn more about them and hoping that they would notice him, accept him and affirm him. By the time he reaches puberty, he will have little interest in the opposite sex. This is because his need to connect with the same sex, his father and his male peers was never met and never went away.

This indicates that innate instincts and needs, when they are not met will not go away but either intensify or take on another form. So by this stage, the boy will start developing a sexualized hunger for male love, acceptance and affirmation and he will feel that this is natural and outside of his control. In reality, what has been lacking

in his life and what he needs is a healthy, deeply emotional, non-sexual relationship with other males. But having experienced this route of development he will feel the need for a romantic, sexual relationship.

Lesbianism

As for lesbianism, there are a number of models. The **first** is similar to the male model where a girl craves femininity and attachment to her mother or a mother figure, but which does not happen, leading to incomplete bonding. Her specific social environment may lead her to identify more with males and she will gradually learn, by the time she reaches puberty, what it means to be a boy. Her latent need for female-bonding becomes sexualized when she experiences puberty. The **second** model is where there is some interruption in her connection with the mother in her infant life. Her mother might have become ill, suffered depression or become hospitalized and that early emotional attachment will have been cut off for a period, leading to a break in the relationship. This will lead to an unresolved need, a void, which remains with her even as she grows up and continues to build a fine relationship with her mother. Certain experiences later in her life may steer that unresolved need in a particular direction, leading to same-sex attraction. The **third** model is when a girl has been abused and molested by boys. From her perspective, lesbianism is protection from the male. The **fourth** is strong emotional dependency and this can occur even with two heterosexual women. This is when a deep, intense, emotional need causes two women to depend on each other, eventually transforming to an unhealthy, harmful sexual relationship.

Thoughts, Feelings and Actions

In Islām, a person is not held accountable for merely having unlawful thoughts and desires and is not sinful unless such thoughts and impulses are acted upon. In Islām, commands and prohibitions are founded upon that which is of preponderant benefit for both the individual and the society at large. Since sodomy is a practice that is

not beneficial to the individual in the long term and certainly not to the society at large from numerous aspects, it is firmly prohibited, and condemned as a practice harmful to the individual and society at large.¹⁸⁹ It clashes with the established biological and physiological order. It ruins the institution of marriage and family and puts child development and safety at risk.¹⁹⁰ It facilitates the emergence and transmission of diseases.

Whilst the act of sodomy is condemned in Islām,¹⁹¹ homosexual feelings are considered a deviation and should be resisted because they may eventually culminate in the practice of sodomy. Note that having homosexual feelings does not make a person a homosexual, rather it is the conduct itself. While feelings may be difficult (though not impossible) to repel, conduct is a choice. **A person is able to set clear boundaries regarding his conduct.** A Muslim who finds that he or she is having feelings of attraction to the same sex should realise that this is simply a trial amongst the trials which can be repelled by restraint and patience. They should realise that Allāh wants us to behave as noble, upright people who value the natural order and the concrete foundations upon which family and society are built and remain stable and not to give in to personal, desires of the lust no matter how alluring. This trial is similar to when a person suffers from illness or grief and sadness. In order to overcome such obstacles, a firm mental resolve is required and by placing one's trust in Allāh and adopting the practical ways and means, a person will be successful by Allāh's will.

¹⁸⁹ In Islām, the most severe prohibitions are for actions which harm the society the most. Thus, usury (interest), gambling, intoxicants and adultery are considered to be nation-destroyers because they destroy wealth (usury and gambling) or facilitate its embezzlement for the benefit of a few to the detriment of many, destroy the mind (intoxicants) or erode the moral and social fabric of society (promiscuity and adultery).

¹⁹⁰ Refer to the chapter on the homosexual-pedophilia link.

¹⁹¹ Note that sodomy laws in the United States were only repealed by the Supreme Court in 2003. This act is still illegal and punishable in some non-Muslim countries to this day.

Since homosexuals cannot reproduce, *homosexual behaviour and activity* cannot be considered a *natural instinct* to perpetuate the species. If we accept any argument to call it a natural instinct, then it is no less malleable and controllable than other powerful instincts such as the desire for food or strong emotions such as revenge or feelings of anger, jealousy and what is similar to them, all of which humans experience and can be subject to human will and other environmental influences. Thus, there is no reason why, if you can manage and control such instincts of hunger or repel the feelings of anger, fear and jealousy, you cannot repel same-sex attractions. For those who exercise patient restraint and abide by Allāh’s commands there is unlimited reward, **“Indeed, the patient will be given their reward without account.”** (39:10). And also, **“Verily, this Qur’ān guides to that which is most upright (straight) and gives glad tidings to the believers who work righteous deeds that they will have a great reward.”** (17:9).

THE SEXUALIZATION OF CHILDREN

Muslims should realise that there is an openly-stated active gay agenda which was set in motion decades ago in Western nations. It is vigorously being pursued through print and digital media, education, entertainment, social work, psychiatry and legislation. The European Union spends public money on maintaining a full-time bureau that does nothing except promote homosexual religion across Europe and beyond. The Inter-LGBT¹⁹² group is part of the EU Human Rights apparatus and spends its time and public money pushing a pro-LGBT agenda in every country of the EU. It lobbies to redefine marriage, abolish the family, provide test-tube babies for same-sex couples on the NHS, carry out sex-change operations on the NHS and force an agenda of promiscuous bisexuality on children in schools.

A blueprint paper was published in November 1987 called “*The Overhauling of Straight America*” by **Marshall Kirk** and **Hunter Madsen** [who used the alias Erastes Pill] in which strategies are laid down to replace a marriage based society with a culture of sexual freedom. The strategies include talking about gays as loud and often as possible, portraying gays as victims and not aggressive challengers, developing a just cause for straight protectors of gays so they can be recruited as defenders, make gays look good and superior pillars of society, make the victimizers look nasty and to vilify them in the public eye, to solicit funds, and finally to get onto the media as widely as possible. In advising homosexuals to take caution in this approach, they write in another publication, “And when we say talk about homosexuality, we mean just that. In the early stages of any campaign to reach straight America, the masses should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the imagery of sex should be downplayed and gay rights should be reduced to an abstract social question as much as possible. First let the camel get his nose inside the tent -

¹⁹² This abbreviation stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender.

only later his unsightly derriere...¹⁹³ The average American household watches over seven hours of TV daily. Those hours open up a gateway into the private world of straights, through which a Trojan horse might be passed... So far, gay Hollywood has provided our best covert weapon in the battle to desensitize the mainstream. Bit by bit over the past ten years, gay characters and gay themes have been introduced into TV programs and films (though often this has been done to achieve comedic and ridiculous affects). On the whole the impact has been encouraging...¹⁹⁴

This reveals a huge social engineering enterprise that is filtering through to every strata of society. Muslim countries and societies are also being targeted in their lands.¹⁹⁵ Great focus is being placed upon children as they are much more malleable and open to indoctrination.¹⁹⁶ Children are being encouraged to become sexually active at an early age.¹⁹⁷ They are deliberately being confused about their gender and are being led, manipulated or in some cases “recruited” into having a homosexual identity. Media, entertainment and education are the vehicles through which this indoctrination is taking place. Homosexual activist groups around

¹⁹³ Meaning, first let us at least push our noses through the door and once we are in, our backsides will follow. The real meaning of this statement is that once the positively portrayed homosexual is in the tent, the pedophiles, sadomasochists and other subcultures will immediately follow suit behind them.

¹⁹⁴ Kirk and Madsen, *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of the Gay's in the 90s* (Doubleday, 1989), p.8.

¹⁹⁵ The sexual categories of ‘gay’ and ‘lesbian’ are not universal and are not recognized in Islāmic (and other) societies. These categories are being enforced in the name of ‘human rights’ which ironically involves a violation of the very human right of the target population whose right it is to live freely without being subject to cultural subversion and coercion into an alien and harmful lifestyle.

¹⁹⁶ All it takes is to “re-educate” *one generation* of children in order to bring about permanent changes in social attitudes in a society.

¹⁹⁷ The actual long-term goal behind all of this is to normalize and legalize pedophilia in the same way that homosexuality has been normalized and legalized.

the world are working to lower or abolish age of consent laws in order to “liberate” children from the constraints of a “patriarchal society.” Kate Millett, a radical feminist and Marxist theoretician, described this philosophy in an interview first published in “*Loving Boys*” in 1980. It was later reprinted in *The Age Taboo*, published by Alyson Publishers, a homosexual publishing house in Boston. Millett claims, “One of children’s essential rights is to express themselves sexually, probably primarily with each other but with adults as well. So the sexual freedom of children is an important part of a sexual revolution.” Millett says the sexual revolution begins with the emancipation of women and also includes ending homosexual oppression. She views the incest taboo as an instrument of oppression. “The incest taboo has always been one of the cornerstones of patriarchal thought,” says Millett. “We have to have an emancipation proclamation for children. What is really at issue is children’s rights and not, as it has been formulated up to now, merely the right of sexual access to children.” Millett believes sexual access to children is only one part of a larger goal of liberating children from all forms of parental oppression.¹⁹⁸



The policy of the LGBT movement is to recruit children from as young an age as possible and make them into active homosexuals.

¹⁹⁸ York and Knight’s *Homosexual Behaviour and Pedophilia*, p. 3

They thus become accessible to adults. Under the guise of **anti-bullying** and **child safety** campaigns, they have manipulated the education system in more and more countries into letting them send homosexual activists directly into schools or set up clubs and so-called community groups where they indoctrinate children with their lies and ideology. Children as young as five are told they could be “born gay” or “born in the wrong body” and are encouraged to experiment with promiscuous and homosexual behaviour in order to “find their identity.” Some take part in marches where they are trained to demand “*transsexual rights*” in the form of artificial hormone treatment to falsify their sex. There is growing evidence that these “community groups” are used by homosexual adults to target youngsters and they are essentially a pedophile’s paradise. In the USA these groups are largely under the backing and protection of GLSEN while in the UK they are under the direction of an organization called Stonewall.

Hollywood And Homosexual-Pedophiila. In 2014 former child actor Michael Egan brought a legal case prosecuting openly “gay” Bryan Singer, Hollywood director and producer of famous blockbuster movies, for molesting him while under-age. Egan also named veteran television executive Garth Ancier, former Disney executive David Neuman and producer Gary Goddard. He referred to them passing young boys around like pieces of meat at their homosexual parties. Singer is alleged to have used alcohol and threat, telling Egan that homosexuals were very powerful in Hollywood and he would never work again if he refused. Egan also alleges that Singer and the others homosexually assaulted him and other boys repeatedly at “infamous coke and twink¹⁹⁹ pool parties” back when Egan was 15 and Singer was 32. Singer was accused of imprisoning children, filling them with drugs and alcohol, and then together with other wealthy Hollywood elites, violently gang-raping them against their will. The suit contends that the American media industry, government and law enforcement community are well aware of the massive illegal

¹⁹⁹ A *twink* is gay slang for a highly sought-after underage boy for sodomy.

pedophile ring because they've been flaunting it in the open for decades. The mother of the victim insists all three industries are part of the nationwide cover-up.

Egan filed further lawsuits in which the most powerful media moguls were accused of being (homosexual) child rapists: **Bryan Singer** (writer, director, producer) *Valkyrie*, *X-Men*, *Superman Returns*, **Garth Ancier** (network executive) - Fox, WB, NBC. **David Neuman** (network executive, owner) - Disney, Digital Entertainment Network. **Gary Goddard** (writer, designer) - *Masters of the Universe*, *Soldiers of the Future*, *Captain Power*, *Skeleton Warriors*. **Marc Rector-Collins** (network executive) - Digital Entertainment Network. **Chad Shackley** (network executive, owner) - Digital Entertainment Network.

Cory Feldman, another famous child actor, went public about being abused by powerful homosexual pedophiles in Hollywood. He stated in a video interview with ABC's *Nightline* show, "I can tell you that the number one problem in Hollywood was and still is and always will be pedophilia. That's the biggest problem, for children in this industry. It's all done under the radar, pedophilia is the big secret. I was surrounded by them when I was 14 years old, surrounded, they were everywhere like vultures" and also "There was a circle of older men that surrounded themselves around this group of kids. They all had their own power or connections to great power in the entertainment industry" and also "I was surrounded by [pedophiles] when I was 14 years old... Didn't even know it. It wasn't until I was old enough to realize what they were and what they wanted." Feldman went on to assert that pedophilia contributed to the early death of his friend Corey Haim, pointing the finger at one person in Hollywood, but stopping short of naming him. "There's one person to blame in the death of Corey Haim. And that person happens to be a Hollywood mogul. And that person needs to be exposed, but, unfortunately, I can't be the one to do it," he said.²⁰⁰

²⁰⁰ Refer to *Corey Feldman: I'll reveal pedophiles' names* NBC News (11th January 2012), *Bombshell* documentary about Hollywood pedophile ring preying on

Given these revelations, it is not unnatural to assume that **Gay-Pedophile Hollywood** will be at the forefront of overt and covert homosexual indoctrination of the masses through its films and cartoons.²⁰¹ When we consider that the age group amongst which AIDS is rapidly increasing²⁰² is the one including teenagers (ages 13-24), it reveals the dire consequences of the *homosexualization agenda* being implemented upon innocent children in the various nations. The Centre for Disease Control (CDC) writes, “Gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men (MSM) represent approximately 2% of the United States population, yet are the population most severely affected by HIV. In 2010, young gay and bisexual men (aged 13-24 years) accounted for 72% of new HIV infections among all persons aged 13 to 24, and 30% of new infections among all gay and bisexual men.”²⁰³

child actors that’s been linked to X-Men director Bryan Singer premieres in New York in the Daily Mail (15th November 2014) and Corey Feldman’s new book details sexual abuse he and Corey Haim experienced in Hollywood in NY Daily News (20th October 2013).

²⁰¹ Much research has been done in this field and it is *an established fact* that a clear child sexualization, homosexualization and gender confusion agenda exists and is in motion within the film and music industries.

²⁰² One should note how the consequences of a homosexual lifestyle are largely concealed from the public and likewise when homosexuality is either normalized (or glorified even) and is being thrust upon children in covert ways.

²⁰³ Refer to <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/group/msm/index.html>.

PEDOPHILIA IN WESTERN SECULAR LIBERAL NATIONS

Pedophilia in Western secular, liberal nations should be viewed historically in light of the sexual revolution movements that went into motion due to the philosophies and activism of people like **Wilhelm Reich**, a student of Sigmund Freud, and **Rene Guyon**, a psychologist in the Freudian school after whom a society was established with its slogan as “sex by year eight or else its too late”²⁰⁴ and which promoted incest with young children. Likewise, the influential hedonistic lifestyles of philosophers such as **Jean-Paul Sartre** and **Albert Camus** and unscrupulous, fraudulent, immoral “sex-researchers” such as **Alfred Kinsey**. “Kinsey’s ‘scientific research’ purported to prove that children were sexual beings, even from infancy, and that they could, and should, have pleasurable and beneficial sexual interaction with adult ‘partners’ who could lead them into the proper techniques of fulfilling sexual activity.”²⁰⁵

This pedophilia in the secular, liberal, sexual revolution has no connection to the standard practice of consensual marriage involving full rights and responsibilities found in many nations and civilizations between adults of any age, where adulthood is determined by the onset of puberty which by and large, unlike the modern era, coincided with full mental maturity or even came after it. Thus, it is incorrect to compare the predatory activities of pedophiles such as Jimmy Saville and those who rode on the wave of the sexual revolution sweeping Western nations in the 1970s with the historical, cultural, traditional practice of marriage by consent with anyone who has reached puberty and mental maturity.

Edward J. Wood writes, “Fathers who possessed rank and wealth affianced their children at a very early age, and compelled them to marry on arriving at puberty...” and a page later, “Thomas, Lord Berkeley, was contracted to Margaret, daughter of Gerald Warren,

²⁰⁴ As mentioned in *The Sexual Abuse of Children: Volume I: Theory and Research*. Edited by William T. O’Donohue, James H. Geer

²⁰⁵ See Dr. J. Reisman, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, 1990, p. 3.

Lord Lisle, in the forty-first year of Edward III and by reason of her tender age - she was then only about seven years old - it was arranged that she should remain with her father for four years; but sickness happening in the family, they were married in the November following.”²⁰⁶

Professor of History, **Margaret Wade Labarge** writes, “It must be remembered that many medieval widows were not old. Important heiresses were often married between the ages of 5 and 10 and might find themselves widowed while still in their teens.”²⁰⁷

Arthur Siccan writes, “Traditionally, across the globe, the age of consent for sexual union was a matter for the family to decide, or a tribal custom. In most cases, this coincided with signs of puberty, menstruation for a woman and pubic hair for a man. Sir Edward Coke in 17th century England ‘made it clear that the marriage of girls under 12 was normal, and the age at which a girl who was a wife was eligible for a dower from her husband’s estate was 9. The American colonies followed the English tradition, and the law was more of a guide. For example Mary Hathaway of Virginia, was only 9 when she was married to William Williams... I believe that a lot of our current mores come from reluctance to let our children mature mentally as quickly as our bodies do. Keep in mind that not all societies share Western mores. And to my surprise, until the latter part of the 19th Century, Children in the Western nations were engaged and married at a much earlier age. The trend to give children more time to mature is relatively new. In his book, *The Emphatic civilization*, (Penguin, NY, 200) Jeremy Rifkin points out that the concept of adolescence only emerged during the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first three decades of the twentieth century. Society started to think of childhood as extending beyond puberty, into the later teenage years. Before that,

²⁰⁶ *The Wedding Day: In All Ages and Countries* (1869, Harper & Brothers), p. 209.

²⁰⁷ *A Medieval Miscellany* (1997), p.52.


children were considered to graduate into adulthood with the onset of puberty.”²⁰⁸

The difference is that these unions were rooted in the tradition of marriage built upon principles of fidelity and chastity, were overseen by parents or legal guardians and the aims behind them were to produce families and live in comfort and serenity by maintaining fidelity and chastity. In contrast, “pedophiles” have a sexual interest driven by materialist, atheistic, liberal philosophies of sexual freedom and the pursuit of unbridled lust. This makes them naturally predatory and exploitative. This goes a long way in explaining why it is overwhelmingly “gay” activist groups who are waging a war to lower or abolish all age of sexual consent laws across the Western world. It is not surprising then, to see homosexual-pedophile activists citing the historically lower age of consent for conjugal relations and marriage as an argument for the removal of contemporary age of consent laws. However, nothing can be taken out of its social and cultural context. The tradition of marriage involving mentally mature 7-12 year olds with the knowledge and oversight of their legal guardians upon principles of fidelity and chastity which was acceptable in many societies cannot be put in the same category as the predatory lust of post 1960s sexual revolution philosophies which spawned the likes of Jimmy Saville, Cyril Smith MP, Gary Glitter, Jeffrey Epstein and a host of other criminal predatory pedophiles who had other things on their minds.

²⁰⁸ In *What’s Wrong in America: A Look at Troublesome Issues in Our Country* (2012, Kindle edition).

IMPLEMENTING KINSEY'S SEX RESEARCH IN THE CLASSROOM²⁰⁹

Alfred Kinsey was a criminal sex-researcher who, from a distance,²¹⁰ oversaw the sexual abuse and molestation of babies and infants as part of his research to promote sexual freedom and the exercise of lust between all ages without restraint. His ideas form the foundations of all modern sex education in schools which can be summarized as follows: The pretense of providing safe-sex instructions to children while in reality advancing Kinsey's agenda of sexualizing children and leading them to indulge in high-risk lifestyles and behaviors in the name of "child rights" and "child health."



In April of 2004, after five years of study, the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), a group of 2,400 lawmakers from 50 states, concluded that the work of Kinsey was a fraud and contained "manufactured statistics."²¹¹ The report outlined the influence these

²⁰⁹ Yorkshire Television produced a documentary called "*Kinsey's Paedophiles*" which can be viewed online and was aired 10th August 1998 on Channel 4.

²¹⁰ Evidence of Kinsey's movements does not discount that he may have had direct participation in some of these activities.

²¹¹ Kinsey's research was based on a sexually explicit and offensive questionnaire consisting of 350 questions. As most typical Americans would not answer these types of questions, Kinsey relied on "volunteers" which included a variety of deviants such as imprisoned criminals, prostitutes, streetwalkers and others. Relying on these categories showed a high percentage of immoral behaviour, skewing the data. This allowed Kinsey to present a picture of sexual life in America that was inaccurate and led to a sexual revolution by normalizing deviant and harmful behaviour. Kinsey labelled 1400 criminals and sex-offenders as "normal" claiming that the only difference between them and others was that they got caught. Thus,

bogus numbers had on the weakening of 52 sex laws that once protected women, children and marriage.²¹² Alfred Kinsey was a pornography-addicted, bi-homosexual, pedophile propagandist who often boasted of his large collection of homosexual pornography to his friends. All data regarding Kinsey is not “alleged” but in plain black and white in his own writing and communications. Dr. Judith Reisman’s book, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, is an excellent reference work for detailed evidence and her website is an excellent resource for learning more about the child sexualization agenda that is sweeping Western nations, spearheaded by gay activists under the banner of *human rights*.²¹³ Following the exposition of Kinsey multiple efforts are in motion to whitewash Kinsey from the factual allegations and to portray him as a hero.

As part of his data gathering he was in touch with serial pedophiles and was aiding them in their activities. One of them was **Dr. Fritz von Balluseck** a Nazi from Germany who would mail his on-going child abuse to Kinsey.²¹⁴ Kinsey flew to Frankfurt, Germany to collect documents from Balluseck. The infamous “**Table 34**” included in Kinsey’s research data reveals the systematic molestation of over 300 children ranging from 5 months of age into their early teens. Below is Kinsey’s Table 34:²¹⁵

all forms of sexual predators and criminals could be treated as the “typical American male.”

²¹² *ALEC Exposes Kinsey’s Role in Sabotaging American Law*, Dr. Judith Reisman (6th August 2004).

²¹³ Refer to <http://drjudithreisman.com>.

²¹⁴ In the mid 1950s Interpol contacted the Kinsey team for help in locating a child sex killer the team had interviewed. The Kinsey Institute protected their WWII Gestapo agent just as they have always protected all their pedophiles and pederasts. They refused to give his name to Interpol under cover of shielding a possible child murderer from investigation based on “scientific” ethics.

²¹⁵ Kinsey’s use of pedophiles in compiling this table of timed so-called orgasms for children of different ages with the use of stopwatches amounts to torture.

| AGE | NO. OF ORGASMS | TIME INVOLVED | AGE | NO. OF ORGASMS | TIME INVOLVED |
|---------|----------------|---------------|--------|----------------|---------------|
| 5 mon. | 3 | ? | 11 yr. | 11 | 1 hr. |
| 11 mon. | 10 | 1 hr. | 11 yr. | 19 | 1 hr. |
| 11 mon. | 14 | 38 min. | 12 yr. | 7 | 3 hr. |
| 2 yr. | { 7 | 9 min. | 12 yr. | { 3 | 3 min. |
| 2½ yr. | { 11 | 65 min. | 12 yr. | { 9 | 2 hr. |
| 4 yr. | 4 | 2 min. | 12 yr. | 12 | 2 hr. |
| 4 yr. | 6 | 5 min. | 12 yr. | 15 | 1 hr. |
| 4 yr. | 17 | 10 hr. | 13 yr. | 7 | 24 min. |
| 4 yr. | 26 | 24 hr. | 13 yr. | 8 | 2½ hr. |
| 7 yr. | 7 | 3 hr. | 13 yr. | 9 | 8 hr. |
| 8 yr. | 8 | 2 hr. | 13 yr. | { 3 | 70 sec. |
| 9 yr. | 7 | 68 min. | 13 yr. | { 11 | 8 hr. |
| 10 yr. | 9 | 52 min. | 14 yr. | { 26 | 24 hr. |
| 10 yr. | 14 | 24 hr. | 14 yr. | 11 | 4 hr. |

Table 34. Examples of multiple orgasm in pre-adolescent males
Some instances of higher frequencies.

This data was obtained from an unidentified serial pedophile who was shielded by Kinsey from the authorities. On the basis of this data, Kinsey claimed that children are “sexual from birth.” He concluded, based upon these experiments he directed and documented in his infamous Table 34, that adult-child sex is harmless, even beneficial, and described child “orgasm” as “culminating in extreme trembling, collapse, loss of color, and sometimes fainting.” Many children suffered “excruciating pain,” he observed, “and [would] scream if movement [was] continued.” Some “[would] fight away from the [adult] partner and may make violent attempts to avoid climax, although they derived definite pleasure from the situation.”

Dr. Reisman writes, “Kinsey solicited and encouraged pedophiles, at home and abroad, to sexually violate from 317 to 2,035 infants and children for his alleged data on normal ‘child sexuality.’ Many of the crimes against children (oral and anal sodomy, genital intercourse and manual abuse) committed for Kinsey’s research are quantified in his own graphs and charts. For example, ‘Table 34’ on page 180 of

Kinsey's *'Sexual Behavior in the Human Male'* claims to be a 'scientific' record of 'multiple orgasm in pre-adolescent males.' Here, infants as young as five months were timed with a stopwatch for 'orgasm' by Kinsey's 'technically trained' aides, with one four-year-old tested 24 consecutive hours for an alleged 26 'orgasms.' Sex educators, pedophiles and their advocates commonly quote these child 'data' to prove children's need for homosexual, heterosexual and bisexual satisfaction via 'safe-sex' education. These data are also regularly used to 'prove' children are sexual from birth'.²¹⁶

Dr. Judith A. Reisman reveals how modern sex educators rely upon 11 key "findings" by Kinsey to create curricula for child sex education:²¹⁷ **One:** All orgasms are "outlets" and equal between husband and wife, boy and dog, man and boy, girl, or baby, for there is no abnormality and no normality. **Two:** As the aim of coitus is orgasm, the more orgasms from any "outlet," at the earliest age, the healthier the person. **Three:** Early masturbation is critical for sexual, physical and emotional health. It can never be excessive or pathological.²¹⁸ **Four:** Sexual taboos and sex laws are routinely broken, thus all such taboos and sex laws should be eliminated, including that of rape and child rape, unless serious "force" is used and serious harm is proven. **Five:** Since sex is, can, and should be commonly shared with anyone and anything, jealousy is pass. **Six:** All sexual experimentation before marriage will increase the likelihood of a successful long-term marriage, and venereal disease and other socio-sexual maladies will be reduced dramatically.²¹⁹ **Seven:** Human beings are naturally bisexual. Religious bigotry and prejudice force people into chastity, heterosexuality and monogamy. **Eight:** Children

²¹⁶ In an excerpt from her book, "*Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences.*" (1998).

²¹⁷ See *Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences*, (pp. 170-171) through Sarah Markwood, *Kinsey-Based Sex Education: Putting Children at Risk* (24th August 2004).

²¹⁸ Despite all contrary claims, habitual masturbation is harmful to physical and psychological health and over time leads to dysfunction in actual sexual performance.

²¹⁹ This is outright false and the reality is the opposite.

are sexual and potentially orgasmic from birth (womb to tomb), are unharmed by incest, adult-child sex, and often benefit thereby. **Nine:** There is no medical or other reason for adult-child sex or incest to be forbidden. **Ten:** All forms of sodomy are natural and healthy.²²⁰ **Eleven:** Homosexuals represent 10 to 37 percent of the population or more.²²¹

Reisman and others have refuted these findings which were based on fraudulent data but they remain the basis for manipulating children into harmful, exploitable lifestyles through modern Socialist education systems across the US, Canada, UK, Europe, Australia and beyond. Kinsey's research set in motion the modern pornography industry, the homosexual revolution, the pedophile "*intergenerational intimacy*" activism organizations, the normalization of promiscuity, the gradual dismantling of biologically-rooted, natural parent-child rights and destruction of the institution of the family.

To very reluctantly give you a sample of the type of indoctrination being imposed through the education system and which may very well be taking place in your child's school, consider the books promoted by homosexual pressure groups. The Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network (GLSEN)²²² is the leading homosexual pressure group working incessantly to insert homosexual propaganda into public education.²²³ Stonewall is a similar organization in the UK. GLSEN promotes pro-pedophile books which

²²⁰ A significant percentage of those indulging in repeat anal abuse go on to develop permanent fecal incontinence requiring the wearing of tampon-like pads and nappies. That is neither natural nor healthy.

²²¹ Another outright falsehood. On the basis of this and other lies Kinsey's disciples are working to eliminate all "*heterosexual bias*" such as laws reserving marriage for one man and one woman and deliberately confusing children about gender, masculinity and femininity.

²²² Its founder, Kevin Jennings, was appointed by Barack Obama to be the Assistant Deputy Secretary for the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools at the U.S. Department of Education between 2009 and 2011.

²²³ Refer to Steven Baldwin's article, "*Obama appoints Homosexual Propagandist to Education*" on <http://westernjournalism.com>.

contain at least half a dozen stories involving sex between children and adults. Statements from these books include, “When I was 15, he must have been 29-39... I seduced him... it was a wild night... we did everything.” Another book has a story about a minor who boasts about how he met his 25 year old boyfriend. Another book has a story about a 13 year old teenage girl having sexual relations with a 25 year old female. Another book discusses how a man had sex in a public rest-room²²⁴ with a young boy who then comments, “the whole world of rest-room sex had opened up to me.” GLSEN is a promoter of books by Alyson Publications, a leading publisher of pro-pedophile books. These books promoted by GLSEN represent fantasies of pedophiles who believe children actually want them sexually. This is the sexual revolution of Kinsey taking place in your child’s classroom and it is being forced on your child courtesy of gay activism organizations operating under the deceptive labels of “*child rights*”, “*child safety*” and “*celebrating diversity*.”

☞ The “**gay rights**” movement was only a stepping stone for the greater objective of legalizing pedophilia. As the “**gay rights**” movement has been largely successful in its initial goal of making homosexuality acceptable and legal, it is putting all efforts into the original core objective. As it stands, homosexual organizations are working extremely hard to a) lower age of sexual consent laws, b) to soften stances towards pedophilia, c) to have pedophilia redefined within psychiatry and to eventually have it removed from the list of psychiatric conditions just as they did with homosexuality in 1973, d) to force “**sexual liberation**” on children within schools, e) to use literature and film to promote pedophilic themes as a means of destigmatizing and normalizing pedophilia and f) shield all of their activities by using the slogans of “**child rights**” and “**human rights**.” By stating publicly that they “**do not support adult-child sexual relationships**” they camouflage their actions. The empirical evidence for all of this is detailed in the next chapter.

²²⁴ Meaning, public toilet facilities.

“Scratch the average homosexual and you will find a pedophile”
Kevin Bishop, gay activist, Marxist and self-admitted pedophile.²²⁵

☞ **The ultimate goal of the ‘gay rights’ movement was and is to attack all age of sexual consent laws and destroy the allegedly “repressive” institutions of family and marriage.**

THE HOMOSEXUAL-PEDOPHILE CONNECTION²²⁶

The connection between homosexuality and pedophilia - or to put it another way, the strong gravitation towards younger men and boys - is undeniable. This will be established through *revealed text* and *actual reality*.

The Qur’ān has demonstrated this strong gravitation towards the youthful beauty of boys amongst homosexuals and their predatory lust for them. Allāh (عَزَّوَجَلَّ) said, **“And when Our messengers, [the angels], came to Lot, he was anguished for them and felt for them great discomfort and said, ‘This is a trying day.’ And his people came hastening to him, and before [this] they had been doing evil deeds. He said, ‘O my people, these are my daughters; they are purer for you. So fear Allah and do not disgrace me concerning my guests. Is there not among you a man of reason?’ They said, ‘You have already**

²²⁵ In an interview in the *Electronic Mail and Guardian* (30th June 1997), South Africa. Kevin Bishop was promoting the work of the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) in South Africa. Bishop agrees with NAMBLA that the next social movement in Western politics will be an attack on “sexual ageism,” which prohibits sexual contact based on age differences. The movement is already well under way in Europe and Canada.

²²⁶ Refer to Frank York’s and Robert Knight’s excellent paper, *Homosexual Behaviour and Pedophilia* on how homosexual activists work to normalize sex with boys. Another excellent resource is Steven Baldwin’s paper titled “*Child Molestation and the Homosexual Movement*” published in the *Regent University Law Review*, Vol. 14 (2001-2002), pp.267-282. Also, *Homosexuality and Paedophilia: A Reference Guide*, a dossier of evidence by Tony Aster, is an excellent, comprehensive compilation establishing the concrete link and from which most of the entries in this section have been taken.

known that we have not concerning your daughters any claim, and indeed, you know what we want’.” (11:77-79).

Ibn Kathīr, the Qur’ānic commentator explains, “The [angels] came to Lot in the most beautiful appearance there can be, in the form of two youths with handsome faces, [this being] a trial and test from Allāh, and within it is a wisdom and far-reaching proof. So they came to him which grieved him and his soul became constrained because of them. He feared that unless he hosts them, someone else from his people will host them and will exercise their evil upon them.”²²⁷

Imām al-Baghawī said, “When those angels came to Lot in the form of handsome [alluring] youth with beautiful faces, Lot became grieved by their arrival... this is because when Lot (عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام) saw the beauty of their faces and their good fragrance, he pitied them with respect to his people lest they desire them for lustful deeds and he knew that he would be in need of protecting them. **‘And his people came hastening to him’**, Ibn ‘Abbās said, ‘Rushing towards him’ and Mujāhid said, ‘Running towards him.’ And prior to them coming to Lot, **‘they had been doing evil deeds’** meaning having sex with men in their anuses.”²²⁸ **Imām al-Sa’dī** said, “When those angels who had [visited] Ibrāhīm came to Lot, **‘he felt for them great discomfort’** meaning their arrival was hard upon him... because he knew that his people would not leave them alone as they were in the form of youthful boys, beardless, extremely beautiful and complete (in appearance). So **‘his people came hastening to him’** meaning, running, all of a sudden, desiring to exercise their lust on his guests, [meaning] that which they were accustomed to doing [of anal intercourse].”²²⁹ So Lot offered his daughters to his people, saying that they are **“purer”**²³⁰ for them and remonstrated against them that they should not dishonour his guests. However, they insisted

²²⁷ Refer to Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-Aẓīm of Ibn Kathīr.

²²⁸ Refer to Tafsīr al-Baghawī.

²²⁹ Refer to Tafsīr al-Sa’dī.

²³⁰ Vaginal sex with a woman is **cleaner, purer** and **healthier** than anal sex (whether with a man or a woman) and is the intended biologically designed and route of sexual satisfaction.

that they were not interested in his daughters and had a desire for his youthful [boyish-looking] guests. This passage of the Qur’ān should be reflected over in light of the factual evidence presented in the rest of this chapter. The statement of Allāh “**And his people came hastening to him**” meaning, to Lot so as to solicit anal intercourse with his youthful guests brings to mind the practice of homosexuals today who hasten to places like Thailand, Sri Lanka, the Phillipines and major city centres across Europe (where underground male child-prostitution is on the increase) in order to seek fresh young boys for the fulfilment of sodomistic fantasies and pleasures.

For many decades, many prominent gay activists and the organizations set up by them have been working around the world to gradually lower the age of sexual consent to facilitate greater access to boys and to expand the numbers in their homosexual community. This is being done in the name of “child rights” and “human rights.” Just as there was a move to normalize homosexuality in the 1970s, a similar move is in motion to gradually normalize and eventually legalize pedophilia. Upon consideration of all the evidence presented below, this appears to be the long term and actual intended goal of the gay rights movement.

Before we proceed to outline the evidence, a note about terminology. Strictly-speaking, ‘pedophilia’ refers to sexual attraction of an adult male to an underage girl or an adult female to an underage boy, but is now used more broadly to include homosexual attraction to boys. The official term for homosexual-pedophilia is **pederasty** and one who engages in it is a **pederast**. The following is just a very small selection of evidence establishing the foundational link between homosexuality and pedophilia (or pederasty more specifically).²³¹ To make it clear, a strong link

²³¹ It will become apparent through this evidence that after having successfully normalized and legalized homosexuality, they are marching towards their goal of normalizing and legalizing “consensual” sodomy with boys. “The Holy Grail of the pedophile movement is the lowering or elimination of all age of consent laws. The main warriors in this political

between homosexuality and pedophilia does not mean every homosexual is necessarily a pederast.

01. Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (d. 1895). Sodomite, pederast and founding father of the “gay rights” movement in 1860s Germany, precursor to 20th century “gay rights” movements. After being forced to resign from his occupation due to sodomistic practices he began a campaign to overturn anti-sodomy laws and appeared before the Sixth Congress of German Jurists in Munich in 1867 to argue that people who possess a sexual nature opposed to “common custom” were being persecuted for impulses that “nature had implanted in them.” Ulrichs coined the terms “Uranian” and “Urning” to represent people with a homosexual identity and wrote many works

and legal battle are ‘mainstream’ homosexual groups. Robert Knight and Frank York of the Family Research Council have thoroughly documented this in a report. ‘As far back as 1972, the National Coalition of Gay Organizations adopted a ‘gay rights platform’ that included a demand to ‘repeal all laws governing the age of sexual consent.’ It is homosexual activists within the United Nations who are lobbying to give sexual rights to underage children. In England, the campaign is being led by **Outrage!** and **Stonewall**, both homosexual organizations. The Dutch homosexual group, **Association for the Integration of Homosexuality**, has succeeded in lowering the age of legal sex to twelve in Holland. Assisting them was another homosexual group, the **COC**, which stated: ‘The liberation of pedophilia must be viewed as a gay issue... [and that] ages of consent should therefore be abolished... by acknowledging the affinity between homosexuality and pedophilia, the COC has quite possibly made it easier for homosexual adults to become more sensitive to the erotic desires of younger members of their sex, thereby broadening gay identity.’ In Canada, the effort is led by homosexual activist and **NAMBLA** defender Gerald Hannon. In America, aside from NAMBLA, the effort is supported by most of the major homosexual organizations such as the **National Gay Task Force**. Indeed, the annual homosexual ‘March on Washington’ invariably releases a ‘statement of demands’ which includes abolishing age of consent laws. Homosexuals in Hawaii have already successfully lowered the age of consent there to fourteen. To be frank, it is difficult to find an advocate of lowering the age of consent laws in the United States or elsewhere who is not a homosexual activist.” *Child Molestation and the Homosexual Movement* by S. Baldwin, published in the Regent University Law Review, Vol. 14 (2001-2002), pp.277-278.

to argue for their rights. He published a pamphlet called **Araxes: a Call to Free the Nature of the Urning from Penal Law** in which he postulated, “The Urning, too, is a person. He, too, therefore, has inalienable rights. His sexual orientation is a right established by nature. Legislators have no right to veto nature; no right to persecute nature in the course of its work; no right to torture living creatures who are subject to those drives nature gave them.”²³² A detailed biographical account of Ulrichs has been written by Hubert Kennedy in “Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: Pioneer of the Modern Gay Movement.”²³³ The arguments advanced by Ulrichs and his followers are the same arguments employed today by pro-sodomy campaigners.

Ulrichs’ followers and advocates of his views include: **Károly Mária Benkert** (d. 1882) who was the first person to coin the classifications of *homosexual* and *heterosexual* and also advanced the views that homosexuality is inborn and unchangeable and that sodomy should not be criminalized due to privacy rights. Jewish physicist, **Benedict Friedlaender** (d. 1908) who founded *Gemeinschaft der Eigenen* (GdE), translated as *Community of the Special* which presented homosexuality as hyper-masculinity. The GdE was a type of scouting movement that echoed the warrior creed of Sparta and the ideals of pederasty in Ancient Greece. Jewish physician **Magnus Hirschfield** (d. 1935) who founded the *Scientific Humanitarian Committee* to defend sodomites and remove German anti-sodomy laws. He presented homosexuality as being of an *intermediate sex* with more of a feminine identity and also invented the term “transvestite.”

02. Henry “Harry” Hay. Founding father and aggressive advocate of the “gay rights” movement in America. He was a pro-pedophilic activist and a Marxist, Communist. Concerns were raised about his connection to Communism, so he overtly severed ties with the party in 1951 and set up the Mattachine Society in the same year, a name

²³² Refer to <http://duhaine.org> and “Karl Heinrich Ulrichs” in *Gay & Lesbian Biography* (London: St. James Press, 1997), pages 436-439.

²³³ Alyson Publications (1988).

taken from a medieval French secret society called Societe Mattachine. This militant gay organization advocated the legalization of homosexuality and pedophilia.²³⁴ In 1969, he set up the Gay Liberation Front. He was a supporter of North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA), an organization seeking to normalize and legalize pederasty.

Photo from the **NAMBLA** website of the late “gay” icon Harry Hay (far right, wearing hat) speaking at a 1984 meeting of the North American Man-Boy Love Association in San Francisco. Hay said “gay” boys ages 12-15 benefit from sexual relationships with adult homosexual men.



03. Franklin Kameny (1925-2011). American sodomite, pro-pedophile. Known as the “father of the gay rights movement” and founder of the Gay and Lesbian Alliance of Washington. Kameny has been given iconic status by having all his papers put into a museum after his death, together with placard saying “Gay is Good”, which he used to carry in early pro-sodomy marches. A Harvard graduate, Kameny was a co-founder of **the Mattachine Society**, whose agenda included abolition of the age of consent. In 1963, Kameny and Mattachine launched a campaign to overturn sodomy laws in Columbia. He openly supported NAMBLA, is mentioned in its bulletins and he was their public speaker at a meeting in 1981. He never had any adult partner and this, combined with his support for Mattachine and NAMBLA, invites the speculation that he was a closet

²³⁴ Their aim was to legalize homosexuality, pedophilia and pederasty. They campaigned for 20 years for these aims and their demands were incorporated into the first official Gay Rights Agenda of 1972 along with the demands to legalize prostitution and make “marriage” between any number of people of either gender. One of their leaders and founders was Jack Nichols, who wrote *The Tomcat Chronicles: Erotic Adventures of a Gay Liberation Pioneer* (Haworth Series in GLBT Community and Youth Studies) and edited GAY (the first homosexual weekly newspaper).

pederast. While Kameny is highly celebrated within “gay activism”, his support for pedophilia is discreetly kept under the rug.

04. Alfred Kinsey (1894–1956). American sex researcher, bisexual sodomite. One of the most influential voices in the permissive, sexual revolution era of the 1960s. Kinsey wrote two volumes on human sexuality in the late 1940s and early 1950s. He said that sexual promiscuity was normal, children are sexual from birth and can experience multiple orgasms in infancy and that rape is one of the most “forgettable” crimes against women. Dr. Judith Reisman has written an excellent expose of Kinsey in her work *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The Indoctrination of a People*.²³⁵

05. Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen. Authors of *After the Ball*, the definitive handbook of the LGBT movement that reveals its aims and its propaganda tactics. Kirk and Madsen admit that there is a “gay agenda” to market homosexuality and homosexuals to the public. Trained in psychology, they advised LGBT activists and journalists how to go about manipulating the public of the Western world, using Chinese mind control tactics, brainwashing techniques, advertising ploys, lies, deception and propaganda. “The homosexual agenda can succeed by conversion of the average American’s emotions, mind, and will, through, a planned psychological attack in the form of propaganda to the nation via media.” (page 153). They advised activists to vilify all opposition, demonizing those who sought to escape LGBT mind control, and to ceaselessly portray homosexuals as “victims in need of protection.” The pedophile part of the LGBT agenda was to be concealed until later, because it tended to spoil the image of homosexuals as always the victims of an unjust society. “It almost goes without saying that groups on the farthest margin of acceptability such as NAMBLA, must play no part at all in such a campaign: suspected child-molesters will never look like victims.” But this is a Trojan Horse strategy. When the public is malleable enough, pedophilia was to be sneaked back onto the agenda by

²³⁵ Available on her website drjudithreisman.com.

calling it “diversity”. They write, “In time we see no reason why more and more diversity should not be introduced into the projected image, i.e., drag queens, pedophiles, etc.” (page 186).

06. Pedophile Activist Organizations. Almost every single pro-pedophile activist organization that is listed by Wikipedia²³⁶ (and many more not listed there) are set up and run by male homosexuals. Likewise, on its page regarding pedophile activism, all but one of the individuals listed are homosexual males.²³⁷ They include *International Pedophile and Child Emancipation*, *Australian Man-Boy Love Association (AMBLA)*, *Quebec Pedophile Coalition* (Canada), *Centre For Information and Research on Infants and Sexuality* (France), *Danish Pedophile Association*, *AG-Pado* (Germany), *Jon*, founded by the *Dutch Society for Sexual Reform*. In the Netherlands, an LGBT organization called *Cultuur en Ontspanningscentrum* (Center for Culture and Leisure) publicly states that “the liberation of pedophilia must be viewed as a gay issue... and ages of consent should be abolished... by acknowledging the affinity between homosexuality and pedophilia, the COC has quite possibly made it easier for homosexual adults to become more sensitive to the erotic desires of younger members of their sex, thereby broadening gay identity.”²³⁸ This organization succeeded in getting the age of consent lowered to twelve in the Netherlands in 1991 and also lobbied to have laws which prevented adults from having sex with minors removed.

07. Gay Rights Manifesto. This document originally issued by the National Coalition of Gay Organizations Convention held in Chicago in 1972 has been repeatedly re-issued and endorsed by all the most prominent LGBT activists of the western world and beyond. It was re-issued online with endorsements by Elizabeth Wilson and Peter Tatchell in 2010. It was re-published and distributed by Pride London (the group that runs the Gay Pride Parade with public funding) in 2011. It confirms that the LGBT agenda includes pedophilia,

²³⁶ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_pedophile_activist_organizations.

²³⁷ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Pedophile_activism.

²³⁸ Cited in *Homosexuality and Paedophilia: A Reference Guide*.

pornography, prostitution, promiscuity and the abolition of the family. Manifesto Demands at Federal level included Clause 1, *“Amend all federal Civil Rights Acts, other legislation and government controls to prohibit discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations and public services.”* This means allowing homosexuals to become boy scout leaders or school teachers. Manifesto Demands at State Level included Clause 7, *“Repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent.”* This is a charter for pedophiles, many of whom campaign under the broader umbrella of “gay rights” for legalizing their activities.

08. North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA). A gay subgroup lobbying for the normalization and acceptance of sodomy of boys. NAMBLA representatives march in “gay-pride” parades as a key element of the “gay-rights” movement. NAMBLA publishes its own Bulletin. The issue for Jan-Feb 1993 includes on page 30 “Letter to a Young Boy-Lover” advising pederasts to go abroad to Thailand and other far-eastern countries where young boys can be easily obtained for money. Numerous members have been convicted of child-rape, and one was found to be running a “foster-home” in Thailand which was a front for a boy-brothel. The leaders claimed they were unaware of this. NAMBLA was set up by “gay” rights founder-leaders Harry Hay, Allen Ginsberg, and David Thorstad, and supported by Franklin Kameny as well as prominent homosexual writers such as Gore Vidal. It started after an incident in Boston in December 1977, when police raided a house in the Boston suburb of Revere. Twenty-four men were arrested and indicted on over 100 felony counts, including child pornography and statutory rape of boys aged eight to fifteen. Suffolk County District Attorney Garrett Byrne alleged that the men used drugs and video games to lure the boys into a house, where they photographed them as they engaged in homosexual activity. Byrne accused the men of being members of a “sex ring”, and said that the arrest was only “the tip of the iceberg.” The arrests sparked intense media coverage, and local newspapers published the photographs and personal information of the accused men. This incident led to the pedophiles organizing into

a Boston-Boise Committee which eventually became NAMBLA in 1978. On its website, this organization states, “NAMBLA is strongly opposed to age-of-consent laws and all other restrictions which deny men and boys the full enjoyment of their bodies and control over their own lives... NAMBLA’s goal is to end the extreme oppression of men and boys in mutually consensual relationships by: building understanding and support for such relationships; educating the general public on the benevolent nature of man/boy love; cooperating with lesbian, gay, feminist, and other liberation movements; supporting the liberation of persons of all ages from sexual prejudice and oppression.” NAMBLA participates in gay pride parades with the stated goal of removing the barriers to man-boy sex. They employ the phrases, “oppression towards pedophilia” and “liberation of pedophilia” and argue that it is a “civil right,” which deserves the same legal protections given to other minorities. One wonders how much of this is simply a pretext for sexual predators to be given free reign in exploiting vulnerable children.

09. The Pedophile Information Exchange (PIE). An organization set up in England in 1971 to legalize and normalize pedophilia. The movement was founded, led and dominated by male homosexuals who always outnumbered heterosexual members. Many of its members (Tom O’ Carroll, Barry Cutler, Ian Campbell Dunn, Charles Napier, Peter Thornton, Steven Adrian Smith, John Stamford by way of example) have been convicted of criminal pedophile activities.²³⁹ The group was disbanded in 1984 but regrouped and reformed under another name, “*The International Pedophile Child Emancipation Group.*” Homosexuals seeking to sodomize boys take the approach of campaigning for child rights and emancipation. Their slogans include “*children’s sex rights*” and “*lowering the age of consent.*” A 1972 PIE leaflet reads, “Homosexuals are now widely regarded as

²³⁹ By way of example, Peter Bremner, (alias Roger Nash) PhD from Clapton, East London. Homosexual was an executive member of PIE. Bremner wrote an article for the magazine *Contact* arguing that children were not physically harmed by pedophiles. In 1978 Bremner was convicted for indecently assaulting 3 boys, two aged 8 and one aged just 5.

ordinary, healthy people — a minority, but no more ‘ill’ than the minority who are left-handed. There is no reason why paedophilia should not win similar acceptance.” The organization had a magazine called *Magpie* and another called *Understanding Paedophilia and Childhood Rights*.

10. International Paedophile and Child Emancipation group (IPCE). The successor to PIE. Founded and run by Tom O’Carroll and other male homosexuals around the world, many of them ex-PIE members. IPCE holds a conference every year attended by male homosexuals. It uses the argument that age of consent laws oppress children who have “sex rights” and their views are gaining in influence in the political parties, education and in the EU.

11. National Gay Task Force. Homosexual group in USA, receives public funding and organizes an annual pro-sodomy “March on Washington” where it always releases a “statement of demands” which includes abolishing age of sexual consent laws.

12. Stonewall.²⁴⁰ Pro-sodomy organization founded in UK in 1989 by Ian McKellen, Ben Summerskill and Angela Mason. Its first aim was to abolish Section 28, a clause in the Local Government Act which prohibited the promotion of homosexuality in schools. This law, which Stonewall always referred to “infamous”, was a major impediment to their pedophile agenda. Legalizing pedophilia was always the central aim of Stonewall, even though they work for it in a Fabian way²⁴¹ by demanding successive reductions of the age of

²⁴⁰ The Stonewall Inn was a working class gay and lesbian bar situated in New York’s Greenwich Village and was frequented by cross-dressers of both sexes. On the night of 29th June 1969, police attempted to raid the bar as usual, but the regulars were fed up and three days of rioting ensued. This event signalled the development of a militant side to “gay” activism.

²⁴¹ Fabianism is a movement that aims to install International Socialism in small, incremental gradual (and unperceivable) steps as opposed to the radical revolutionary methods of the likes of Marx and Lenin. The objectives are exactly the same, the tactics are different. Violent revolution is too obvious, as is forcing an ideology on people. A long, drawn-out,

consent. The way it chose to celebrate its tenth anniversary was a frank admission of its pedophile agenda.²⁴² Many Stonewall members have been exposed and convicted as practicing pedophiles such as James Rennie²⁴³ and Neil Campbell.²⁴⁴ The media hushed up their homosexual identity and their connection with Stonewall. Stonewall

gradual approach is much more subtle and hardly raises any suspicion, especially amongst an ill-informed, uneducated public.


²⁴² In December 1999, **Elton John** starred in an entertainment show at the Albert Hall to celebrate the tenth birthday of Stonewall. He and the group “Pet Shop Boys” put on a dance in which they dressed as Cub Scouts and then proceeded to strip on stage. The cub scout uniform is designed to be worn by boys aged 8-12. **George Michael** (thrill-seeking homosexual public toilet stalker) also performed at the concert. John Fogg, a spokesman for the Scout Association, said: “We think it is pretty deplorable and in bad taste in terms of denigrating our uniform and what it stands for. We are disappointed that someone of Sir Elton’s standing should involve himself in something of such poor taste. It linked homosexuality with paedophilia. If Stonewall are completely for the rights of homosexual people, they have not done themselves any favours.” Refer to *Gay group apologises for Sir Elton’s camp act with ‘cub scout’ strippers* in the Independent (1st December 1999) and *Apology over Elton’s ‘boy scout’ show* on BBC News (30th November 1999).

²⁴³ **James Rennie**. Homosexual, chief executive of LGBT Youth Scotland, established in November 1989 as the Stonewall Youth Project by members of the LGBT community in Edinburgh. Under the Socialist government of Tony Blair these organizations got public funding and access to the state education system where they imposed their ideology on all teachers during training. In 2007 Rennie 38, from Edinburgh, and his partner **Neil Strachan** were convicted of running one of the biggest child abuse and child-pornography rackets in legal history.

²⁴⁴ **Neil Campbell**: One of the Stonewall Scottish pederast ring convicted in 2009. Cake firm manager Campbell was found guilty of five charges. The 46-year-old church elder had 928 indecent images of children at his home in Bearsden, near Glasgow. He was traced by computer experts to his home on 29th March 2008 after sharing images with James Rennie. Officers searched his home and seized a computer before Campbell, who was married, was arrested at the address two days later. He was convicted of possessing, taking, distributing, and possessing with intent to distribute indecent photos of children. The judge said the crimes were of the most serious nature. “These offences involved real children. Many of the photos involved children being sexually abused, often in the most appalling ways.” Refer to *Scotland’s largest paedophile web* by BBC News (11th June 2009).

has acquired influence by making donations to political parties and, incredibly, it is still classified as a charity.²⁴⁵

13. The Pedophile Press. Pro-pedophile publishing in the form of journals and newsletters is totally dominated by male homosexuals campaigning for pederasty and only a tiny, tiny glimpse can be given of the huge amount of published literature. For example, in the US there is *Boy Art Magazine*, *Chicken*,²⁴⁶ *Lollitots* to name a few. In the Netherlands, there is *Paidika: The Journal of Pedophila*, *Pan: A Magazine About Boy-Love*, *Lolita Magazine* and others. France had plenty of photographic magazines during the 1980s. The Pedophile Information Exchange published a newsletter called “*Childhood Rights*” in 1977 and newsletters with the same theme can be found across major European countries, the US and Australia from the 1970s to the present. All are dominated and run by male homosexuals. A 1981 publication, *The Age Taboo, Gay Male Sexuality, Power and Consent* (Alyson Publications) is described as “a collection of writings about intergenerational relationships.” The various essays making up this publication indicate that the pedophile movement is a central part of the homosexual movement and that “gay rights” were only the first step, “child sex rights” are the true final goal. The essays include: “*Loving Boys*” by Tom Reeves, “*Children and Sex*” by Youth Liberation, “*Sexual Revolution and the Liberation of Children*” by Mark Blasius and Kate Millet, “*The Case for Abolishing Age of Consent Laws*” by the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA), “*Confronting Ageism*” by Michael Alhonte. A 1986 publication titled, “*The Betrayal of Youth: Radical Perspectives on Childhood Sexuality, Intergenerational Sex, and the Social Oppression of Children and Young People*” (CL Publications), edited by Warren Middleton, alias John



²⁴⁵ Refer to *Homosexuality and Paedophilia: A Reference Guide*.

²⁴⁶ The word *chicken* is gay slang for a boy sought for sodomy.


Parrot, founder of the Pedophile Information Exchange (PIE) and convicted child-molester. Its thirteen chapters and two appendices are written by members of PIE, convicted pedophiles and are virtually all homosexuals. The book calls for making pedophilia acceptable, in fact Chapter 10 is titled, “*Ends and Means: How to Make Paedophilia Acceptable*” by Roger Moody – an intellectual pedophile who is described as “One of the most outspoken advocates of children’s rights.” Peter Tatchell, prominent UK gay activist who masquerades as a ‘human rights campaigner’ whilst working to erode age of consent laws also wrote a chapter ‘*Questioning Ages of Majority and Ages of Consent.*’ His chapter preceded Moody’s. ***Ganymede*** is a homosexual-pederast magazine founded in the USA in 2008. A review of the magazine drooled “Ganymede is not like other literary journals. It aims at a gay mens’ audience, which means it can’t be earnest, dull, or without pictures, as many literary journals are. Its mission statement explains, ‘our features reflect the mixture of high and low tastes actually pursued by literate gay men.’ A look at the first issue bears this out-strikingly. The front cover shows a half-naked boy in golden light, and each text article is followed by a striking visual portfolio...”²⁴⁷ ***Gay News*** was a homosexual magazine started in the 1970s and frequently showed support for the pedophilia agenda. Gay News used to run adverts for PIE and contact advertisements for pedophiles, leading to it being banned by the WH Smith chain of bookshops. All over the UK, dozens of LGBT groups then protested, picketed and harassed WH Smith in a variety of ways. Gay News later discontinued advertising PIE, but only under pressure. ***Gay Men’s Press*** is a publishing company set up in England in the 1970s, which has brought out various pro-pedophile titles including “*Dares to Speak*” and “*The Age Taboo*,” a collection of essays edited by Daniel Tsang (1981). In one of them, homosexual Tom Reeves writes, “Sex between men and boys, on the other hand, is widely practised to the joys and benefits of those involved. It has become a centre of attention in the straight media where it is associated with molestation, abuse, runaways and hustling. It is all of

²⁴⁷ Review published on humanities360.com.

these things at times, but it is more often quiet, enduring, reciprocal and certainly voluntary. Such sex is a central feature of gay life.” (p.25). *Journal Of Homosexuality* is an American periodical, supposedly academic. In 1990, the Journal of Homosexuality produced a special double issue devoted to adult-child sex, which was entitled “*Male Intergenerational Intimacy: Historical, Socio-Psychological, and Legal Perspectives,*” Vol. 20, Nos. 1&2, 1990. One article said many pedophiles believe they are “born that way and cannot change” (p. 133). Another writer said a man who counseled troubled teenage boys could achieve “miracles... not by preaching to them, but by sleeping with them” which translates to “sodomizing them achieves miracles.”

14. “Colonialism and Homosexuality”

and pedophile tourism. This is the title of a Routledge publication (2008) by Robert Aldrich and is a full-length study of how European middle and upper-class men in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries used to visit the colonies specifically for the purpose of practising homosexuality, usually in the form of pederasty. In this period homosexuality was illegal in most European countries but in many colonies the poverty of the locals and the wealth of the Europeans



made many boys available for hire, or even for outright purchase. Pederasty was thus an extension of imperialism, and this exploitative relationship was the forerunner of modern-day homosexual pedophile sex tourism to places like Bangkok in Thailand, the Phillipines and Sri Lanka.²⁴⁸ There are hundreds of

²⁴⁸ The government of Sri Lanka announced that more than 10,000 boy prostitutes work its beaches as a result of the high demand created by affluent Western homosexuals. But the dirty little secret of the American homosexual community is the thousands of boy prostitutes who service

available reports and the following are just a few samples: ***Thai police arrest man for procuring boys for suspected American pedophile.*** “Thai police working with the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation have arrested a man for procuring more than 100 boys over the past three years for an alleged American pedophile in northern Thailand, police said on Friday. Ayo Ahcho, a 23-year-old from the Akha hill tribe, was arrested on Tuesday in a border village in the Mae Fah Luang district of Chiang Rai province and charged with human trafficking, said Lt. Col. Apichart Hattasin of Thailand’s northern region police. Police said Ayo had been supplying boys to be sexually abused by 61-year-old Thomas Gary, who had been coming and going from Thailand for 20 years and was arrested on Sept. 13 and charged with the sexual abuse of minors.”²⁴⁹

42 years for UK paedophile. “A British man has been jailed for 42 years after a Thai court convicted him of sexually molesting at least eight street boys in Bangkok and distributing photographs of them on the internet, Thai media reported yesterday. Robert Errol Wood, 24, was found guilty on Monday of luring the boys, reportedly aged seven to 14, into a rented room in the Thai capital, where he sexually abused them, sometimes with others, between August 2002 and January 2003. He was also convicted of photographing the naked boys and distributing the images to paedophiles in Britain. When an interpreter read out the verdict and sentence - one of the longest given to a foreigner for paedophilia - Wood, who reportedly lives in

them within our borders. A book exposing the boy prostitution world, *For Money or Love, Boy Prostitution in America*, reveals that boys are selling themselves not only in the cities of New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Chicago, Baltimore, and New Orleans, but also in smaller towns across the country. In street jargon, the boys are known as “chickens” and their customers are known as “chickenhawks.” *Child Molestation and the Homosexual Movement* by S. Baldwin, published in the Regent University Law Review, Vol. 14 (2001-2002), pp.274-275.

²⁴⁹ *Thai police arrest man for procuring boys for suspected American pedophile* published by Reuters.Com (9th January 2015).

Dewsbury, West Yorkshire, banged the table and shouted abuse at the judge.”²⁵⁰

Agency ‘front for pedophiles.’ “Thai police have accused former Australian diplomat Robert Scoble of running a secret child-sex recruitment network behind the facade of one of South-East Asia’s biggest gay tourism agencies. Senior police officers told The Age that they had found more than 100 albums containing explicit photographs of boys - some believed to be as young as 10 - during a raid on the luxury Bangkok apartment of the former deputy ambassador to Vietnam and senior Telstra executive. ‘They were like catalogues and we believe he was sending these pictures to people overseas,’ said Major Choowong Uthaisang of the Royal Thai Police immigration department, who lead the raid. Major Choowong said they had also seized computer picture files of a man they believed to be Scoble engaged in sexual acts with several prepubescent boys. The department’s Lieutenant-Colonel Pichit Itthipalacahai said Scoble, 56, and American business partner John Charles Goss were believed to have used their Bangkok travel agency, Spice Trade Travel, as a front to introduce foreign pedophiles to Thai children. The two men were arrested on Friday after a month-long surveillance operation, which followed information supplied by the Australian embassy in Bangkok and complaints to the Tourism Authority of Thailand. ‘There is evidence that they were supplying boys to tourists coming to Thailand, and we are looking at further charges,’ Colonel Pichit said. Scoble and Goss were charged on Saturday with distributing pornography and employing an unregistered foreign worker in their travel agency, which operates from an office suite in the Tarntawan Place Hotel - a boutique hotel popular with homosexual travellers on the fringes of Bangkok’s infamous Patpong nightclub district.”²⁵¹

²⁵⁰ *42 years for UK paedophile* published by the Guardian (26th November 2002).

²⁵¹ *Agency ‘front for pedophiles’* by Mark Curtis, published in the Age, Australian newspaper (25th March 2004).

15. Campaign For Homosexual Equality (CHE). London based homosexual activist group that includes many pedophiles and openly campaigns for legalizing sodomy with boys. CHE started as the North Western Homosexual Law Reform Committee (NWHLRC) founded in Manchester in 1964 by Allan Horsfall and Colin Harvey. In 1969 it became the Committee for Homosexual Equality, then the Campaign for Homosexual Equality. Its HQ is now in Caledonian Road, London. CHE had close links with PIE, allowing it to lobby at its conferences until 1983, and there are many common members. Leo Adamson was on the executive committees of both. The pedophile magazine *Minor Problems* was run jointly by CHE and PIE. In 1980, CHE adopted as its official policy the abolition of all age of consent laws.



15. B4U-ACT. Pro-pedophile organization in America which holds academic conferences attended by large numbers of male homosexuals. It was founded by two homosexuals, **Mike Melsheimer** and **Richard Kramer**. In a 2011 conference in Baltimore, Maryland, they discussed how to manipulate the public into accepting their agenda [to decriminalize and normalize pedophilia] as it has accepted homosexuality.²⁵² Dr. Judith Reisman, who was awarded an \$800,000 grant in the 1980s to provide a report for the Justice Department on child sexual abuse, attended this conference and provided a summary of some of the proceedings: World renowned “sexologist,” Dr. Fred Berlin of Johns Hopkins University gave the keynote address, saying: “I want to completely support the goal of B4U-ACT.” Pedophiles are “unfairly stigmatized and demonized” by

²⁵² As mentioned in *Homosexuality and Paedophilia: A Reference Guide*.

society. There was concern about “vice-laden diagnostic criteria” and “cultural baggage of wrongfulness.” “We are not required to interfere with or inhibit our child’s sexuality.” “Children are not inherently unable to consent” to sex with an adult. “In Western culture sex is taken too seriously.” “Anglo-American standard on age of consent is new [and ‘puritanical’]. In Europe it was always set at 10 or 12. Ages of consent beyond that are relatively new and very strange, especially for boys. They’ve always been able to have sex at any age.” An adult’s desire to have sex with a child is “normative.” Our society should “maximize individual liberty... We have a highly moralistic society that is not consistent with liberty.” “Assuming children are unable to consent lends itself to criminalization and stigmatization.” “These things are not black and white; there are various shades of gray.” A consensus belief by both speakers and pedophiles in attendance was that pedophilia should be removed as a mental disorder from the American Psychiatric Association’s (APA) Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM), in much the same way homosexuality was removed in 1973. Dr. Fred Berlin acknowledged that it was political activism, similar to that witnessed at the conference, rather than scientific conclusions that successfully led to the declassification of homosexuality as a mental disorder: The reason “homosexuality was taken out of DSM is that people didn’t want the government in the bedroom,” he said. The DSM ignores that pedophiles “have feelings of love and romance for children” in the same way adult heterosexual and same-sex couples have romantic feelings for one another. “The majority of pedophiles are gentle and rational.” The DSM should “focus on the needs” of the pedophile, and should have “a minimal focus on social control” and the “need to protect children.” Speaker Jacob Breslow (self-identified homosexual and gay activist who graduated from the London School of Economics) said children can be “the object of our attraction,” referred to a child as “it,” compared the child to a shoe, and used graphic, slang language to approvingly describe the act of climaxing “on or with” the child. No one in attendance objected to this explicit description of child sexual assault. End of Dr. Judith

Reisman's summary. A separate entry for Richard Kramer is found further below.

16. Gay Rights Activists and Pederasty (Homosexual Pedophilia)

Allan Ginsberg. Beat poet and exhibitionist homosexual, he made no secret of his sodomistic lust for boys. Ginsberg was an active pederast. He was a founding member of the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA). In June 1977, during the Boston-Boise pedastery scandal, in which he supported the defendants, Ginsberg said on TV, "I had sex when I was 8 with a man in the back of my grandfather's candy store in Revere, and I turned out okay". By "turning out okay" he meant a lifetime of taking LSD, cannabis, mescaline, and other psychedelic drugs, even laughing gas, and spending eight months in a mental institution in Columbia. In the 1950s and 60s he lived in Paris and Morocco with William Burroughs and other homosexuals, indulging in the drugs and the local boys. Ginsberg wrote a lot of poems about homosexual activity with boys. He even wrote a poem called "Sweet Boy Give Me Your Ass." His poetry is crude and monotonous, and with unspeakable vulgarity he misuses the f-word to mean anal intercourse. On the subject of NAMBLA, Ginsberg wrote: "Attacks on NAMBLA stink of politics, witch hunting for profit, humorlessness, vanity, anger and ignorance... I'm a member of NAMBLA because I love boys too - everybody does, who has a little humanity."

Paul Goodman, (1911-1972), American homosexual, left-wing writer, and pedophile campaigner. His book *Growing Up Absurd* advocates what he calls "children's sexual freedom." **Leo Adamson,** a gay rights activist and pederast who helped set up the Pedophile Information Exchange. In 2011, police searched his flat and eventually hacked into his computer, finding 3000 images of child abuse. He was jailed for a year.

Ad van den Berg. Dutch sodomist, who founded a political party to legalize pedophilia. Member of Association Martijn.²⁵³ In 1987 he was convicted of raping a boy aged 11. He insisted that the boy had consented. He was fined and given a suspended prison sentence. The Dutch television show ‘Netwerk’ monitored Van den Berg for three months. They discovered that he still has an under-age male partner. Soon afterwards, Berg formed a political party in Holland whose agenda included lowering the age of consent to 12. It calls itself the Party for Neighbourly Love, Freedom, and Diversity (PNVD). Berg is only one of a number of Dutch homosexuals involved in this sort of campaigning, which is perceived by some as being ‘left-wing’ or ‘progressive.’

Larry Brinkin. Sodomist, “gay rights” activist and director of San Francisco’s Human Right’s Commission²⁵⁴ where he earned \$135,000 per year. He is considered a “gay rights pioneer,” and a champion for “equal rights” for the Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual and Transgender “community.” In 2014 Brinkin, 67, was convicted on two charges of possessing child pornography. Human Rights did not extend to children that he had a chance to exploit. Brinkin was the lawyer who started the whole “gay marriage” campaign and brought the first cases for “discrimination” that led to legalizing same-sex “marriage.” On his computer he had literally thousands of images of small children that he was getting and sending to other pedophiles. They added comments of their own to indicate excitement and from them is Brinkin’s remark on a particular picture, “I loved especially the nigger 2 year old getting nailed.” One should note that sodomist pedophiles, especially when they are gay-rights activists, are largely shielded by the media and receive little negative press. Refer to the

²⁵³ A Dutch Homosexual’s Pedophile Group in Holland. Founded by Frits Bernard and advocated the acceptance of pedophilia and legalization of sexual relationships between adults and children. From 1986 till 2006 the group published *OK Magazine*, featuring essays, letters, interviews and photographs of scantily clad or naked children, mostly boys.

²⁵⁴ Note how “human rights” is the cover for homosexual-pedophiles in their agenda to enforce their lifestyle upon societies and nations.

article, “*Pedophiles Are Not National News - When They’re Gay Rights Pioneers*” by Tim Graham.²⁵⁵

Bernad Alapetite, French homosexual who published the pederast magazine *Beach Boys* in the 1980s. He was convicted in 2000 for running a pedophile ring. He was also involved with TORO BRAVO and ADO71, which were international pedophile-porn networks.

Dr William Ayres, former head of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, a believer in “child liberation” and follower of Wilhelm Reich (student of Sigmund Freud and campaigner for child sexuality). He was convicted in 2012 for molesting more than 50 boy patients.²⁵⁶

William S. Burroughs (1914-1997). American sodomist, author of *The Naked Lunch*, regarded as a “gay icon” and founding father of the LGBT movement. Burroughs was a pederast, drug-addict and an all-round degenerate. He came from a rich family who sent him to private school where he started sodomistic activity at the age of 13. When he grew up, his parents paid him an allowance so he did not have to work. He spent the money on heroin, to which he soon became addicted, and on travelling to Berlin and Vienna, where he picked up boys in Turkish baths. A similar motive led him to travel through Mexico, and Colombia, where he found it easy to purchase the services of young rent-boys with his powerful dollar. “The Mexican boys cost Burroughs three pesos apiece.”²⁵⁷

Edward Brongersma. Sodomist Dutch politician and doctor of law. For a number of years he was a member of the Dutch Senate for the Labour Party, and chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He was primarily known as a defender of the “rights” of pedophiles and

²⁵⁵ Published on <http://newsbusters.org>.

²⁵⁶ Refer to *Peninsula child psychiatrist William Ayres sentenced to eight years for molesting patients* in the San Jose Mercury News (27th August 2013).

²⁵⁷ *Naked Lunch @ 50: Anniversary Essays*, edited by Oliver C. G. Harris, Ian MacFadyen, SIU Press, 2009 p.94.

an advocate of more lax legislation on public morality. Once jailed for having relations with a 17-year-old male, Brongersma went on to write a book entitled “Loving Boys” advocating abolition of all age of consent laws. In 1979 he donated his library and personal papers to a foundation bearing his name, the object of which as stated in its articles of association was promoting scientific study and publications in the field of sexual relations between adults and young people.” In 1992 the objective was broadened to “promoting research of the sexual-emotional health of children and young people.”²⁵⁸ After resigning from the Dutch Senate in 1977, Brongersma devoted himself completely to the objectives of his foundation. He was sponsored by PIE in a lecture tour of England.

Pat Califia. American LGBT activist and pornographic writer. Born a woman in 1952 she became a lesbian, then a “transsexual” and now calls herself “Patrick.” She wrote a long-running column in the homosexual magazine *The Advocate*, giving advice on relationship and family matters, from the perspective of somebody who advocates pedophilia and sado-masochism. In a 2-part article in *The Advocate* in 1980, she attacked age of consent laws and demanded to “liberate children and adolescents.” In a later article “Feminism, Pedophilia and Children’s Rights”, written in 1991 for *Paidika* (Dutch journal), she upheld these views and insisted that there was something called “the sexual rights of young people.” In her eyes, any attempt to interfere with a life of promiscuity from the cradle to the grave is a crime.

Warren Middleton. His alias is John Parratt. Sodomist and vice-chairman of the Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE), was given a 12 month sentence in England in July 2011 after being convicted of having indecent images of children. Middleton, aged 63, the partner

²⁵⁸ Note how homosexuals use the fields of psychology, psychiatry and the legal profession to pursue their agenda in normalizing and promoting and their sexual conduct upon society.

of John Morrison²⁵⁹ was involved in a child-pornography distribution business led by PIE founder Steven Freeman. Middleton was the editor of *Betrayal of Youth, Radical Perspectives on Childhood Sexuality, Intergenerational Sex, and the Social Oppression of Children and Young People* (CL Publications, 1986), a pedophile campaigning manual to which Peter Tatchell contributed a chapter on “Questioning Ages of Majority and Ages of Consent.”

Peter Tatchell. Prominent UK “gay rights” activist. He is the founder of campaign group *Outrage!* and had multiple, close links to the Paedophile Information Exchange. He was also a member of the Gay Liberation Front. In 1986 he contributed a chapter to a book



entitled *Betrayal of Youth* produced by several official members of PIE. The editor was Warren Middleton, a founder member of PIE. The book argued for the complete abolition of any ages of consent and asserted that children seek and enjoy sex with adults. Tatchell wrote “What purpose does it (the age of consent) serve other than reinforcing a set of increasingly quaint, minority moral values left over from the Victorian era?” On June 26, 1997, Peter Tatchell wrote a letter to the *Guardian* newspaper (pictured below) defending a book *Dares to Speak* published by the Gay Men’s Press, that advocated pedophilia. He wrote that the book was ‘courageous’. It documented ‘examples of societies where consenting inter-generational sex is considered normal’. He claimed that in a New Guinea tribe ‘all young boys have sex with older warriors as part of their initiation into

²⁵⁹ John Morrison, homosexual PIE member, partner of Warren Middleton alias Parratt. Jailed in 2011 along with Middleton and other PIE members Steven Freeman, Barry Cutler, and Leo Adamson, for possession of a vast store of child pornography. More than 5,000 images were found on three discs at the Putney home shared by Middleton/Parratt and Morrison after a police raid in July 2008. Morrison, 44, was jailed for 24 months for possessing indecent images and failure to disclose a computer password.

manhood’ and allegedly grow up to be ‘happy, well-adjusted husbands and fathers.’ Tatchell’s letter asserted that sex or sodomy between adults and children as young as nine was normal and did no harm. “The positive nature of some child-adult relations is not confined to non-Western cultures. Several of my friends – gay and straight, male and female – had sex with adults from the ages of 9 to 13. None feel they were abused. All say it was their conscious choice and gave them great joy. While it may be impossible to condone paedophilia, it is time society acknowledged the truth that not all sex involving children is unwanted, abusive and harmful,” said Tatchell, contradicting himself in one and the same sentence.²⁶⁰ In order to deflect criticism from himself these days, Tatchell goes out of his way to tell the blatant lie, “I’ve always opposed adults having sex with kids”²⁶¹ despite the fact that his Guardian comment in 1997 indicates otherwise. The book Tatchell was attempting to defend was edited by Joseph Geraci who was also the editor of *Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia*, and the book itself was a collection of articles from that journal. The Wikipedia entry for *Paidika* in English (which appears to have been removed) stated, “*Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia* (1987–1995) was a journal published by the Stichting *Paidika* Foundation whose purpose was to promote the normalization of pedophilia. Its editor was Joseph Geraci and the editorial board included articles by writers Frits Bernard, Edward Brongersma, Vern L. Bullough, and D. H. (Donald) Mader, some of whom campaigned as



²⁶⁰ Tatchell now claims his original letter was edited by the Guardian, but for some reason he didn’t complain about this in his second letter (1st July 1997) to the Guardian which he wrote in response to a reader’s response to his first letter.

²⁶¹ In his tweet dated 24th June 2014.

pro-pedophile activists.” Peter Hitchens, writer for the Daily Mail also exposed Tatchell’s hypocrisy in a September 2010 article titled, “Question: Who said: ‘Not all sex involving children is unwanted and abusive’? Answer: The Pope’s biggest British critic.”²⁶² Tatchell wrote a chapter titled “Questioning Ages of Majority and Ages of Consent” in the book “*The Betrayal of Youth: Radical Perspectives on Childhood Sexuality, Intergenerational Sex, and the Social Oppression of Children and Young People*” (CL Publications), edited by Warren Middleton, alias John Parrot, founder of the Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE) and

²⁶² Hitchens wrote, “For on June 26, 1997, Mr Tatchell wrote a start-ling letter to the Guardian newspaper. In it, he defended an academic book about ‘Boy-Love’ against what he saw as calls for it to be censored. When I contacted him on Friday, he emphasised that he is ‘against sex between adults and children’ and that his main purpose in writing the letter had been to defend free speech. He told me: ‘I was opposing calls for censorship generated by this book. I was not in any way condoning paedophilia.’ Personally, I think he went a bit further than that. He wrote that the book’s arguments were not shocking, but ‘courageous’. He said the book documented ‘examples of societies where consenting inter-generational sex is considered normal’. He gave an example of a New Guinea tribe where ‘all young boys have sex with older warriors as part of their initiation into manhood’ and allegedly grow up to be ‘happy, well-adjusted husbands and fathers’. And he concluded: ‘The positive nature of some child-adult sexual relationships is not confined to non-Western cultures. Several of my friends – gay and straight, male and female – had sex with adults from the ages of nine to 13. None feel they were abused. All say it was their conscious choice and gave them great joy. ‘While it may be impossible to condone paedophilia, it is time society acknowledged the truth that not all sex involving children is unwanted, abusive and harmful.’ Well, it’s a free country. And I’m rather grateful that Mr Tatchell, unlike most of his allies, is honest enough to discuss openly where the sexual revolution may really be headed. What he said in 1997 remains deeply shocking to almost all of us. But shock fades into numb acceptance, as it has over and over again. Much of what is normal now would have been deeply shocking to British people 50 years ago. We got used to it. How will we know where to stop? Or will we just carry on for ever? As the condom-wavers and value-free sex-educators advance into our primary schools, and the pornography seeps like slurry from millions of teenage bedroom computers, it seems clear to me that shock, by itself, is no defence against this endless, sordid dismantling of moral barriers till there is nothing left at all.”

convicted child-molester. At the very end of this chapter, Tatchell writes, “In a fully democratic and egalitarian society, there can be no question of adults usurping the rights of young people by keeping them in a state of ignorance, fear and guilt or by resort to arbitrary and autocratic laws which deny them responsibility for decisions affecting their lives, especially about their bodies and emotions” (p. 118). Considering the objectives of the book within which Tatchell wrote these words at the time, his real position appeared to be: *“The protection that parents provide to their biological children from predatory pedophiles like the ones who have contributed to the other chapters in this book needs to be removed. This can be achieved by accusing parents of child abuse because they are hindering the sexualization of their children. In turn, predatory pedophiles - like the ones who wrote the other chapters in this book whose cause I am indirectly advocating by working to lower or abolish age of sexual consent laws - can eventually have access to these children to play out their man-boy sodomistic love fantasies. But until the time arrives wherein we have managed to legalize adult-child relationships through Fabian-type tactics, we will openly state that we oppose all adult-child sex relationships.”* The reader should be very wise to how these “gay rights” activists have learned how to shield themselves and their activities by masquerading under the broad label of “human rights” and using “stop-gap” viewpoints to achieve their ultimate goals. Homosexual-pedophile activists operate under the broader “gay rights” banner so as not to give their game away. Their mainstream friends, aiders and supporters operate under the broader “human rights” label. In order to deflect criticism from themselves, these mainstream activists will distance themselves from homosexuals or their organizations which are frank and open about their agenda of legalizing pedophilia. So the end result is that both groups are really working towards the same agenda.²⁶³ This agenda is to abolish (not

²⁶³ Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, authors of *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of the Gays in the 90s*, the definitive handbook of the LGBT movement that reveals its aims and its propaganda tactics, write, “In time we see no reason why more and more diversity should not be introduced into the projected image, i.e., drag queens, **pedophiles**, etc.” (page 186). Mainstream gay activists know that after homosexuality has

just lower) all age of sexual consent laws so that they can eventually have greater access to children and are able to inflate the numbers of their community. Its simple and the writing is on the wall: **Anal Economics 101** - *anal supply* has to equal *anal demand* given the elevated levels of infidelity and promiscuity amongst homosexual males. Children are much easier to recruit into a homosexual lifestyle and they are of course, younger, fresher and disease free. No need for flights to Bangkok in Thailand. When the age of sexual consent was lowered to 16 (allowing gays to engage in sodomy), Tatchells homosexual group took to the streets with banners reading “16 is just a start.” Tatchell had already begun campaigning to lower the age of consent to 14 years earlier.²⁶⁴

Peter Tatchell: The UK should look at lowering the age of consent to 14

If they are successful in reducing the age of consent to 14, rest assured, pro-sodomy activists will begin campaigning to have the age lowered even further to the age of 12. At the same time, activists like Tatchell obfuscate and conceal the long term agenda of the pedophile subculture amongst homosexuals by making remarks such as “I oppose adult sex with children.” Homosexual activists are very scared of being linked to pedophilia because public opinion remains very strong against it and has not yet been softened enough. Further, they cannot openly defend or promote the consensual sodomization of young boys (“*intergenerational intimacy*”) because it is illegal. Nevertheless, they work diligently in a Fabian-like manner (small, gradual, imperceptible steps) to make it legal in the future. This objective is alluded to in Kirk and Madsen’s definitive handbook of homosexual propaganda, “*After the Ball*,” wherein normalizing pedophilia through *positive image-projection* is mentioned as a goal of the broader “gay rights” movement.

been normalized and legalized, work will commence on legalizing pedophilia in the name of *child rights* and fighting against “*sexual ageism*.”

²⁶⁴ Refer to “*Don’t criminalise young sex*” by Peter Tatchell in the Guardian (24th September 2009), “*Peter Tatchell Calls For Age Of Consent To Be 14*” in the Huffington Post (21st November 2013).

Peter Frank Ashman. A homosexual lawyer and member of *Gay Liberation Front* and *Campaign for Homosexual Equality*, both of which have the abolition of all age of sexual consent laws as part of their agenda. He played a role in setting up the *International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA)*²⁶⁵ which receives huge funding from the European Union. Ashman was one of the lawyers who set up the *European Human Rights Foundation*, under the auspices of the European Union. In 1992 he became its director, earning a colossal salary and persuading the EU to allocate tens of millions of euros to

promoting the LGBT agenda even in countries whose own national parliaments opposed it, regarding it as against their religious belief and culture. Member states from Ireland to Croatia have been bribed or pressurized to adopt LGBT legislation, if they want to remain in the EU. The EHRF and its gay rights office even funds the lobbying of foreign nations not in the EU. It gives large subsidies to LGBT groups working all over the world. In 1976, he wrote an angry letter to the *Guardian* newspaper in which there was criticism of the *Campaign for Homosexual Equality* organization which had endorsed the *Pedophile Information Exchange*. Ashman demanded to see evidence that sex or deviant relations between adults and children had ever done any harm to anybody, and denounced those who disapproved of

Sir,—Here is a note from a non-sponsor, non paedophile, homosexual member of CHE concerning Peter Hain's emotive nonsense which John Torode endorses. What evidence do you have as to the effect on children of sexual relations with adults? Where are your examples? What is your proof? What precisely is Hain's or Torode's knowledge of the matter? How much of their attitude is based on the proven experience of those qualified to assess it about paedophilia at home and abroad? How much of it is based on prejudice, ignorance and bigotry? Before Torode suffocates his inferior reader with his übermensch morality, would he kindly give us the facts?—Yours truly,

Peter Ashman.

Leigh on Sea,
Essex.

²⁶⁵ ILGA passed a resolution in 1985 which stated that “young people have the right to sexual and social self-determination and that age of consent laws often operate to oppress and not to protect” cited by J.R. Rodriguez in her book, *Sexual Futures, Queer Gestures, and Other Latina Longings* (NYU Press, 2014) p. 63. This is a clear indication that ILGA - a worldwide network of homosexual groups campaigning for “human rights” - supports the agenda of pedophiles in attempting to lower or remove age of sexual consent laws.

pedophilia for “prejudice, ignorance and bigotry.” Ashman was very keen on taking holidays in Thailand. At the age of 57, Ashman took a civil partner, Poramate Jitsopas, who naturally enough, comes from Bangkok in Thailand, and is about forty years younger than him. Ashman was also involved in an organization called **Stonewall**, the group that campaigned to lower the age of consent for male sodomy from 21 to 16 and to legalize the active promotion of homosexuality in schools.

Peter Walter Campbell, Professor of Politics at Reading University, member of the Conservative Party, Campaign for Homosexual Equality (CHE) and the Albany Society. Sodomist, pedophile activist and known client of **Elm Guesthouse** while it was a boy brothel. Campbell founded LGBTory in 1975. The minutes from the founding meeting clearly show that, despite being labelled as an organisation that promotes “gay” equality, it was, from inception, a pro-pedophile organisation. In 1981 it had 62 members, and by late 1983 it had 171. Campbell remained its chairman or vice-president through almost all the Thatcher years. The group lobbied at Conservative party conferences and in 1991 changed its name to TORCH (*Tory Campaign for Homosexual Equality*). It is also sometimes known as CGHE (*Conservative Group for Homosexual Equality*). Campbell advertised Elm Guesthouse in TORCH’s newsletter, to which he appointed Glencross as editor. If you google his name you are now warned, “Some results may have been removed under data protection law in Europe.” The international pedophile network looks after its own. Campbell later became a paid researcher for Conservative leaders including David Cameron. Campbell was quoted in his obituary in 2005 using the familiar but fallacious analogy between homosexuality and being left-handed, a comparison which is false.

Roger Moody. Sodomist, pederast, member of PIE and self-proclaimed “pedophile activist”. Moody wrote articles for *Gay Left* and *Gay News*. In 1977, Moody was charged with child molestation and attempted buggery of a boy aged 10. In March 1979, he was

acquitted. The diary he kept during this period is the basis for his book *Indecent Assault* (1980) a defence of pedophilia. He contributed a chapter to the book "*Betrayal of Youth*," Chapter 10: "*Ends and Means: How to Make Paedophilia Acceptable?*" by Roger Moody of Peace News: "One of the most outspoken advocates of children's rights in Britain." Well-documented as a ubiquitous pedophile intellectual. In 1986, when Geoffrey Dickens MP first exposed the existence of child prostitution on the Elthorne Estate in Islington, Moody wrote to the Islington Gazette attacking him derisively. His letter called Dickens a rabble-rouser and accused him of seeking cheap publicity by claiming that such things went on. He also ridiculed Dickens' allegations about VIP sex-abuse rings. Since then, Dickens has been proved abundantly right on both matters.

Dudley Scott Cave (1921-1999). Sodomist and LGBT activist, member of Peter Tatchell's Outrage group for the lowering the age of consent for sodomy, Cave revealed his support for pedophilia by writing an angry letter to *Social Work Today* in 1992 protesting against the prosecution of Peter Righton on child-porn charges. Righton, one of the co-founders of PIE, had run a child-abuse network in schools and care-homes all over the UK for twenty years and is now known to have raped countless boys. Cave exploded with rage, called Righton a "responsible adult" and wrote "the trial itself is obscene". He asserted that child pornography was "a crime without a victim". He added that he was a septuagarian but if he wanted to be stimulated by erotic pictures or videos he would defy the law and go ahead. Another article in *Social Work Today* around this time referred to Righton being prosecuted for photographs of "young men" not boys. For some reason the Independent newspaper thought Cave deserved an obituary in 1999, and it was duly written by Peter Tatchell, who lauded Cave as a "gay rights champion." Cave is held up as a hero in LGBT History Month.

Ashley Tellis. Sodomist and pederast. Professor Tellis of Department of Liberal Arts at the Indian Institute at Hyderabad wrote an article in 2010 entitled "*Man-Boy Love Can Be a Beautiful Thing*." He argues

that far from wanting to deny any connection with pedophilia, “homosexuality may sometimes have a lot to do with paedophilia, and, further, that if it is based on mutual consent, it is no big deal.” Prof. Tellis, a prominent gay activist and left-wing agitator, was sacked by the institute because of the outcry over his article in 2010.²⁶⁶

Michle Foucault. French academic and obsessive sodomist. In 1977 he and a group of others (mainly sodomists) presented a petition to the French Parliament for the abolition of all age of consent laws. Known for his sado-masochistic homosexual lifestyle and drug taking, he died of AIDS in 1984. He is said to have passed the illness on to about 100 other people. In 1979 he signed two open letters to the French press repeating his demand for the age of consent to be abolished altogether. In a dialogue with other fashionable left-wingers, Foucault expressed his disapproval of laws against adult-child sex: “And to assume that a child is incapable of explaining what happened and was incapable of giving his consent are two abuses that are intolerable, quite unacceptable.”²⁶⁷ From the signatories of Foucaults 1977 petition include: a) **Michel Cressole**, (1948 -1995), French journalist, essayist and militant sodomist. Member of *Front Homosexuel d’Action Révolutionnaire*. He died of AIDS. b) **Roland Barthes** (1915-1980), French literary critic and theorist. Sodomist and pederast. His published diaries *Soirées de Paris* and an earlier diary he kept give details of his encounters with boys he paid for deviant sex in Paris and Morocco. The details he provides are coarse, sordid and utterly disgusting. c) **Jean-Louis Bory** (1919-1979), French writer and film-maker, sodomist and activist. His autobiographical works include *The Skin of Zebras* (1969) *All Born of Woman* (1976), and *My Half of Orange* (1973). He appeared in the gay association Arcadia, giving his first public lecture. He joined *Front Homosexuel d’Action Révolutionnaire* and co-authored a book with its leader Guy Hocquenghem. d) **Guy Hocquenghem** (1946–1988), sodomist French

²⁶⁶ Refer to *IIT-H sacks gay activist Ashley Tellis* in the Times of India (11th June 2010).

²⁶⁷ Refer to his entry in *Homosexuality and Paedophilia: A Reference Guide*.

writer and queer theorist. Hocquenghem was the first male member of the *Front Homosexuel d'Action Révolutionnaire* (FHAR). With filmmaker Lionel Soukaz (b.1953), Hocquenghem wrote and produced a documentary film about homosexual history, *Race d'Ep!* (1979) In his novel *L'Amour en relief* (1982) about a blind Tunisian boy in France, Hocquenghem presents homosexual desire as a resistance to white supremacy and racism. In 1977, Hocquenghem together with Gabriel Matzneff and René Scherer formed a group to campaign against the pederasty laws. They were supported by Foucault. Hocquenghem died of AIDS on 28 August 1988, age 41. e) **Georges Lapassade** (1924-2008), French philosopher and sociologist, sodomist. f) **Christian Hennion** (1949-1999) French journalist and sodomy activist. *Member of Front homosexuel d'action révolutionnaire* (FHAR). In 1995 he and his partner left Paris to travel in Sénégal, Morocco and Cambodia. He spent some time in prison in Cambodia before returning destitute to France to die of lung cancer. g) **Gabriel Matzneff**. Sodomist, French author of novels, poems, essays and travelogues, pro-pedophile advocate. h) **René Scherer**, French philosopher, writer, sodomist and author of homosexual-pedophile fiction. Advocating pedophilia has been central to his writing career. In 1977, Scherer, his lover Guy Hocquenghem and the writer Gabriel Matzneff, formed a group to campaign against the age of consent, which is 15 in France. They were supported by Michel Foucault. In 1982 Scherer was mixed up in the Coral affair²⁶⁸ and charged with inciting minors to commit indecency.

Stephen Freeman. Otherwise known as Stephen Adrian Smith. Freeman, a sodomist, was among the founders of PIE. He edited and printed the PIE publications and contact lists. Freeman was at one time a Home Office security guard, so that the members' hotline for PIE rang inside the British Home Office. The phone would be picked up by "Steven Smith", who would tell callers where to go for the next meeting. In 2009 Freeman was convicted of running a large-

²⁶⁸ The "Affaire Coral" in France was a child-abuse scandal in a care-home at Aimargues near Nîmes in the 1980s.

scale child pornography network in London, along with John Morrison, Barry Cutler, Leo Adamson and John Parratt, all PIE members.²⁶⁹

Caleb Laiesky. LGBT activist in the USA, charged in Nov. 2013 with molesting an under-age boy and collusion in molestation. Laieski, an openly sodomist teenager, was an LBGT adviser to Phoenix Mayor Greg Stanton and honored by President Obama at a White House “gay pride” dinner.

Frank Lombard. Prominent sodomy activist. He was an Associate Director of Duke University’s Center for Health Policy in the USA, where he sat on the university’s LGBT Rights committee. His partner, Ken Shipp, was a pharmacist and also worked for Duke. After getting a civil partnership Lombard and Shipp adopted two small boys and were found to have sexually abused one of them and made pornographic videos and photographs which they were circulating on the internet. When investigated by an undercover FBI agent, posing as a fellow-pederast, Lombard offered him his adopted 5-year-old boy for sodomy and abuse. He boasted that he sodomized the boy all the time and drugged him with Benadryl to make him more malleable. Lombard, of Durham, North Carolina, was sentenced to 27 years and 3 months in prison in March 2010. Both Lombard and Shipp were involved with the BoyLovers internet network. Shipp, who claimed to be unaware of what was going on, escaped prosecution and still works for Duke University.²⁷⁰

Robert Mikelsons. Dutch homosexual activist, member of Association Martijn,²⁷¹ was found to have carried out sexual abuse with 87 children at nurseries in Amsterdam between 2007 and 2010.

²⁶⁹ *Paedophiles jailed after 3,000 child abuse drawings found* in the Guardian (15th July 2011).

²⁷⁰ *Pedophile, Frank Lombard sentenced to 27 years* published by Hicktown Press (30th March 2010)

²⁷¹ A Dutch homosexual pedophile group in Holland. Founded by Frits Bernard and advocated the acceptance of pedophilia and legalization of

David Thorstad. American communist, LGBT activist and pederast. An open sodomite and founding member of the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) as well as former president of New York's Gay Activists Alliance. He was also active in Trotskyite politics for some years. For more than six years, Thorstad was a member of the Upper West Side branch of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), and a staff writer for its newspaper, *The Militant*. In the early 1970s Thorstad was president of the Gay Activists Alliance in New York. Thorstad was one of a group of NAMBLA members who were sued in 2000 for the wrongful death of a ten-year-old boy in a long-running court case *Curley v. NAMBLA* in Boston.

Richard Kramer. American lawyer, who advocated and carried out some of the earliest same-sex “marriages” in the USA, is a pro-sodomy activist. He is a co-founders of the pedophile advocacy group B4U-Act. Kramer spoke at a pro-pedophile conference in Baltimore, Maryland in August 2011 and asserted that pedophiles were harmless and misunderstood. Moreover, he has previously admitted that he himself identifies as a pedophile. He wrote “We need to confront the stigmatization, demonization, and stereotyping that exists due simply to our attraction to children or adolescents, regardless of our behavior. To do this, we need to be honest about our sexuality.”²⁷² In 2005 he ruled to strike down Proposition 22, a California ballot initiative defining marriage as only valid when between a man and a woman. Kramer is also the founder of the MHAMIC website, the “Male Homosexual Attraction to Minors Information Center,” which he established in 2003.

Beat Meier. Swiss bisexual pedophile with international connections. Meier has convictions for sexually abusing children in the US, Australia, UK, Switzerland, and possibly Belgium and Holland. Meier

sexual relationships between adults and children. From 1986 till 2006 the group published *OK Magazine*, featuring essays, letters, interviews and photographs of scantily clad or naked children, mostly boys.

²⁷² In a 2009 letter in the “*Uncommon Sense*” online newsletter, published by the pedophile-oriented site Newgon.com

founded and ran a pedophile magazine named LIBIDO. He was connected to a British PIE member called Roger Lawrence, and the two were caught by UK customs in 1987 trafficking a 3-year-old boy on the Ostend–Dover ferry. Meier was a member of the Swiss Pedophile Association, a prominent member of CRIES, involved in the Marc Dutroux pedophile ring in Belgium, and was a member of Spartacus. Meier is now serving a long sentence in a Zurich prison, having been convicted of using boys to make snuff videos.

Luiz Mott. Sodomist, pedophile. In Brazil in 2007, Mott, the leader of Brazil’s homosexual movement, was prosecuted for pedophilia. Mott ran a blog advocating and defending man-boy sex, which was spotted and denounced by journalist Julio Severo. Gay activists then ran a malicious campaign against Severo, claiming that he was “*homophobic*” and was threatening violence against gays. The eminent Brazilian philosopher Olavo de Carvalho blasted the campaign against Severo in his regular column for the newspaper *Jornal do Brasil*. It was revealed as a slanderous attack to retaliate against Mott being outed as a pedophile.

Charles Napier. Homosexual, “gay” activist, member and treasurer of the Paedophile Information Network, In 1972 Napier, a teacher, was convicted for molesting a boy. He was allowed to work again only because he got a report from his friend **Peter Righton**, then head of education in England, saying that Napier was no longer a risk to children. Righton has since been exposed as the founder of PIE and an arch-pedophile. In 1978, Napier went to teach in Sweden in 1978, where he corresponded with Righton about the availability of boys there. Righton visited him there so they could hunt boys together. Napier then became an English teacher in Cairo, where the laws on abusing boys were less strictly enforced. He travelled in Turkey and boasted of sending child porn videos to England in diplomatic bags. By 1995, Napier had returned to England and was teaching at a school in Somerset. There he invited a boy aged 14 to his home where he indecently assaulted him, leading to a criminal conviction. Police searching his home found a huge collection of his

correspondence with other pederasts such as Righton. The correspondence revealed that Righton and Napier, together with their PIE friends, planned a network of pederast schools, national and international, where their activities could go on undetected and for many years they were successful. Napier was sentenced to 15 months in prison for a rape committed in the 1980s. A 1994 documentary explored Righton's links with Napier and showed film of the two with young boys in Sweden. The Metropolitan police investigation into their network was called Operation Fairbank.

Peter Righton. Also known as Paul Pelham. Founder member of Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE) who became a top government adviser on child protection.²⁷³ Righton was Director of Education at the National Institute for Social Work. Righton also founded a school for emotionally disturbed children, which he undoubtedly used to get access to boys. If they complained, they could be easily branded liars as they were already classified as "troubled". In Operation Fairbank, police questioned a man who was one of Righton's victims. He was taken out of Righton's school, and molested systematically. "The victim, now in his 40s, told how Righton and members of his infamous Paedophile Information Exchange groomed him and sexually abused him in London from the age of 11 in 1977 until he was 16." Righton boasted to him that he had friends and contacts high up in the Establishment and the government. The victim says he once saw Righton in the company of **Cyril Smith, MP**. In 1992, police raided Righton's home and found child porn videos, many hard-core, shot in Amsterdam, and correspondence with pedophiles around the world, proving that had exploited, raped and prostituted children. He got off with just a £900 fine. He then went to live in a cottage on the estate of his friend

²⁷³ Take special note of this: When gay activists campaign against "discrimination" in employment, one wonders whether their real goal is to acquire positions which involve access to children whom they can recruit into homosexuality. The fact that so many prominent gay activists are either self-confession pedophiles or are ferocious campaigners against age of sexual consent laws should be ringing alarm bells.

Lord Henniker, in Thornham Magna, North Suffolk. He kept up his connections with social services, and arranged special “holidays” on the estate for vulnerable children from Islington (now notorious for the organized abuse of children in care-homes there). In May 2014, a victim came forward and recalled how he was repeatedly raped and molested by Righton and others while in the care of a foster-parent in Suffolk. He witnessed this happening to other boys. The Chief Constable of Suffolk visited Henniker personally to warn him that Righton was a career pedophile, but he ignored this advice, and Righton was able to continue hosting children on the estate until his death in 2008. He was never prosecuted for abusing boys in his care - though he openly admitted doing so. Righton’s homosexual partner, Richard Alston, was head teacher of New Barns School, where pupils later made allegations about abuse of children aged less than 12. Allegations that Righton sadistically assaulted and killed one boy while living in Suffolk are now in February 2015 being investigated by police in Suffolk. The accuser says that Righton not only repeatedly raped him but also made him and another boy dig six holes the size and shape of graves.

Cyril Smith (1928-2010), British MP for Rochdale, Lancashire. Revealed to be a sodomizing pederast by Private Eye, the satirical magazine, in May 1979 (Eye 454). Smith could have taken libel action and so could the Liberal Party he belonged to, but neither of them did so. In December 2012, David Steele, former leader of the Liberal Party, admitted that he had been aware of rumours concerning Smith but had taken no action. Smith is now revealed to have been a regular client of the Elm Guesthouse. Smith, a bachelor weighing in at around 29 stone, was in the habit of visiting teenage boys in a childrens’ home in Rochdale where they were made available often with the connivance of the staff.²⁷⁴ An investigation was led by his successor, Simon Danczuk, Labour MP for Rochdale. Danczuk said they had been “young boys who were humiliated, terrified and

²⁷⁴ *Cyril Smith: the predatory paedophile protected by establishment* in The Telegraph (18th April 2014) and *Sir Cyril Smith ‘sexually abused boys’, MP tells Commons* in the Telegraph (13th November 2012).

reduced to quivering wrecks by a 29-stone bully imposing himself on them.”

Gore Vidal, (1925-2012) American sodomist and novelist who is regarded as a radical hero by the left. Boorish, thick-skinned, arrogant and a lifelong sexual boaster, Vidal explained his worldview to an interviewer, “The difference between Italian boys and American boys, is the Italian boys have dirty feet and clean assholes, while American boys have clean feet and dirty assholes.” Vidal was a founder and financial donor to the joint Boston and Boise group that later became NAMBLA. He appeared at NAMBLA fundraising events and he appeared as a defence witness for various NAMBLA members who were prosecuted for pederasty in the 1970s. Later, Vidal moved to a villa in Ravello in Italy, where the ages of consent for homosexuality and prostitution are among the lowest in Europe, and took annual holidays in Thailand, a notorious pederast’s haven. His half-sister Nina Straight, told his biographer Tim Teeman that Vidal was a pedophile who preyed on underage boys and that this was the reason he took yearly holidays in Bangkok. This is confirmed by his nephew, the actor and director Burr Steers, who was very close to Vidal and says the writer was afraid that secrets about his pedophile activities would come out. Steers said Vidal was “terrified that conservative columnist William F. Buckley had evidence that Mr. Vidal had sex with underage boys” — or as Straight put it, “Jerry Sandusky acts.”²⁷⁵

Jerry Sandusky, American football coach, serial sodomizer, convicted in 2012 of molesting 45 underage boys. Sandusky was a celebrity who had won charity awards for his work with deprived children. A popular football coach at Pennsylvania State University, he had founded The Second Mile, a charity providing sports opportunities for boys from poor backgrounds. Then it emerged that he had used

²⁷⁵ Refer to *A literary giant, he was feted by the rich and powerful. But did Gore Vidal hide a monstrous secret?* Daily Mail (12th November 2014), *From Hollywood Stars to Hustlers in Rome: Gore Vidal’s Very Busy Sex Life* in Psychology Today, (May 2014), *Vidal’s Ravello Redoubt* in Vanity Fair (3rd August 2012).

The Second Mile as a means for getting hold of vulnerable kids and abusing them. Sandusky would choose boys aged 10-13 from fatherless homes, knowing that they would be more vulnerable, and offer gifts, money and treats to lure them in. Then he would subject them to a range of sexual abuse, carrying out some of it right there on the premises. He was once caught penetrating a 10-year-old boy in the showers of the football club. Witnesses testified that he had been molesting boys all his life, for forty or fifty years, and there had been a series of cover-ups. Sandusky was married but had no natural children. He and his wife adopted six children and fostered many others. During his trial, one of his adopted sons, Matt, revealed that he too had been molested by Sandusky. Sandusky was a homosexual who was solely and exclusively interested in boys. That is probably the reason he and his wife never had any children. The press in the USA was reluctant to call Sandusky a homosexual because of the “gay” lobby controlling the media and the Democrat Party.


Milton Orkoplous. Australian MP honoured for being one of the first “openly gay” in their national parliament. In 2007 he was arrested on child pornography charges and was eventually convicted on 54 charges of molesting underage boys and drug-related activity. The victims included boys aged from ten to 18. Orkopoulos, 49, was found guilty of 12 counts of supplying a prohibited drug, which include eight counts relating to cannabis and four to heroin, six counts of homosexual intercourse (sodomy) with a child aged between 10 and 18 and three counts of indecent assault. When criminals like Orkoplous are outed, convicted and imprisoned, the media (complicit in advancing the pro-sodomy agenda) tends to make references only to “child sex” and never reveals the homosexual-pedophilia connection or fails to reveal that the children were actually all boys.

Jack Nichols. Sodomist, activist and co-founder of the Mattachine Society whose agenda was to legalize homosexual relations between men and boys and to abolish the age of consent. Nichols edited “Gay” the first magazine for homosexuals. Author of *Men’s Liberation* (1975

onwards) and *The Gay Agenda: Talking Back to the Fundamentalists* (October 1996).

Mark J. Newton and Peter Truong.

Two LGBT activists. They adopted a boy from Russia in 2005 and paid his mother \$8,000 for him. They then sexually abused him from the age of two



weeks, and used the child to make pornographic videos, taking him to three countries to be molested by eight other homosexual pederasts. They were convicted in LA in June 2013 but mainly ignored by the mainstream media.²⁷⁶ The crime was accidentally revealed when police in the USA found a video, in the possession of another pedophile, of the child being abused by Newton and Truong. Until this exposure, Newton and Truong were featured in several TV programmes and magazine articles about their loving perfect “gay” family. Newton and Truong’s crime is an example of ultra-vile, premeditated and intensive child abuse, heinous even beyond the standards of most pedophilia. It is not an isolated incident but reveals the existence of a global homosexual pederast network with thousands of active members.

Tom O’ Carroll. Also known as Thomas Victor. Sodomist and “gay” rights activist prosecuted for pedophile activities. In 1979, he was secretary of the Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE). When it was officially disbanded he carried on as a prominent member of its successor, IPCE, the *International Paedophile and Child Emancipation* group.

²⁷⁶ Because the mainstream media is complicit in implementing the gay agenda, efforts are made to keep the connection between homosexuals and pedophilia from the public eye.

Joe Orton (1933-1967). Sodomist and playwright honoured by the Socialist Left. Died young in horrible circumstances in London murdered by his male partner Kenneth Halliwell. His writings are sickening, full of macabre violence and often feature man-boy sex. Orton's diaries record his marked pederastic tastes. Orton was battered to death aged 34 by Halliwell in their bedsitter in Islington, North London, on 9 August, 1967. Halliwell used a hammer to smash Orton's brains right out of his skull, then he committed suicide by taking a massive overdose of Nembutal. Although Orton and Halliwell lived together, Orton was wildly promiscuous and Halliwell was jealous. He was also envious of the success of Orton's plays that were making him a celebrity. "Often clad from head to foot in black leather, Joe revelled in lowlife sleaze, constantly cruising the red-light districts of London in search of anonymous roughtrade sex, returning home to fill his diaries with shocking details of 'frenzied homosexual saturnalia' in public lavatories. He would proposition any attractive male who took his fancy, myself included, regardless of their persuasion," writes Michael Thornton, a theatre critic who met him. Halliwell's jealousy led him to make repeated threats of suicide (he came from a traumatic family background). "As Orton's promiscuity increased, Halliwell raged, 'I'm disgusted by all this immorality. Homosexuals disgust me!' And on a drink and drug-fuelled holiday in Tangiers in June 1967, where both had sex with underage boys, Halliwell hit Orton about the head with his fists, told him that his plays were 'ultimately worthless', and that they were 'finished'."²⁷⁷ Orton and Halliwell were prosecuted and jailed in 1962 for borrowing books from the public library and defacing them with obscene pictures and writing. They cut pages or parts of pages out of certain books and replaced them with vile pederastic pornography. Some of these books were taken from the children's section and their additions were intended to be seen by children using the library. The day before he died, Orton told a friend that he was getting treatment for a venereal disease, and also that Halliwell was

²⁷⁷ *Why I blame myself for the murder of Sixties playwright Joe Orton* by Michael Thornton (4th April 2009).

taking “valium, librium, speed, Nembutal and every other pill he can lay hands on.”

Christopher Skeaping. Sodomist and member of Gay Liberation Front and PAL, the Paedophile Action for Liberation. Active in 1970s campaigning for pedophilia to be legalized. He was first jailed for pedophile offences in the 1990s. In 2009 he was jailed again for 5 years for offences against a 12-year-old boy in the 1980s. Skeaping had befriended the boy and often invited him into his house to drink alcohol and watch pornography. He told him there was nothing wrong with being a “boysexual” and proceeded to carry out acts of sodomy. In later life, after consulting a counsellor, the boy complained to the police. Skeaping’s appeal against the sentence was refused.

John D. Stamford. Sodomist, “gay” activist and member of the Paedophile Information Exchange. Stamford founded and ran the Spartacus²⁷⁸ Gay-pedophile network in London in the 1970s. In 1972 he was convicted of sending pornographic material through the post. This was extremely hardcore and involved children as young as eighteen months old. But before he could be jailed, he escaped to the Netherlands where he teamed up with a Francis Shelden. The Sunday People newspaper ran an exposure article about him on February 6th 1983. He was pictured petting a boy. Another article appeared in the Sunday Times in August 1986, revealing him to be

²⁷⁸ **Spartacus Club**, pederast network reported to have 25,000 members. Run in the early 1980s from Amsterdam by John Stamford, a “gay” activist and member of PIE.²⁷⁸ Spartacus was exposed by The Sunday Times in 1986 as a front for a world-wide pedophile holiday business. Interviewed by an undercover reporter, Stamford said: “If you are discreet, I can guarantee you will get as many boys as you want in the Philippines. Our chaps there will fix it up, and all it will cost you is a meal for the guides, and just the equivalent of a pound or so for the kid per night.” The reporters were offered two boys in Manila, aged 8 and 14. Because Stamford was living in Germany, Holland or Belgium, he was not arrested until 1995. The British manager of Spartacus, Peter Glencross, was also running Gay Yellow Pages from his London address, BCM, Box 6782, London WC1N 6XX.

arranging pedophile holidays all over the world. He had arrangement with compliant hoteliers in Madeira, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the Philippines, and Indonesia. Stamford boasted of having relations with boys as young as 8, claiming to have done so in countries where it was legal. Between 1979 and 1985, Stamford also published PAN, or Paedo Alert News, which described itself as a “magazine about boy-love.” He and Shelden founded Coltsfoot Press, a publishing house for pederastic books and porn. Stamford continued to run his pedophile holidays and in 1995 was busted by police in Belgium. They found his list of pederasts, worldwide, who paid for his Holiday Help Portfolios. This was Stamford’s euphemism for fixing up ‘facilities’ (i.e. children) for pedophiles in hotels. Stamford’s notes recorded credit card payments, plus descriptions of the age and type of children requested, together with the sexual services they would be required to perform. Just before he was due to stand trial Stamford died in prison of a sudden heart attack aged 56. Stamford is now regarded as a “gay” hero.

Olaf Stüben. German sodomist and pedophile campaigner, convicted child-molester. Stüben was a teacher at a school for boys, Odenwaldschule, in Heppenheim, where he was found to have carried out systematic abuse of a large number of pupils over many years. Despite being convicted he carried on blatantly boasting about his proclivities and campaigning to legalize pederasty. He is a prominent member of the group Homosexual Action Hamburg. He writes for the socialist newspaper, Die Tageszeitung, as well as for pro-pedophile magazines such as the “*Allgemeine homosexuelle Arbeitsgemeinschaft*” and he has connections with pro-pedophile campaigners in England and Holland. In 1980 he wrote an autobiography “*Ich Liebe Jungs*” (I Love Children) in which he used the familiar homosexual arguments that pedophiles were oppressed and the age of consent ought to be abolished. He was influential in getting the age of consent in Germany reduced to 14, which has attracted many homosexual-pedophiles to that country. When data-protection laws were extended to cover Google, Stüben and many other pedophiles world-wide were quick to take advantage of it and

a search on his name now tells the reader “Some results may have been removed under data protection law in Europe.”

Michael Swift. Sodomist from the US who published a disgusting, hysterical rant called “A Dream.” It is alleged to be a satirical, humorous piece of writing and not intended seriously. Gay activists have decried attempts to use this piece to prove the existence of a “gay agenda.” Here is the text of the essay in full:²⁷⁹

This essay is an outré, madness, a tragic, cruel fantasy, an eruption of inner rage, on how the oppressed desperately dream of being the oppressor. We shall sodomize your sons, emblems of your 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, in your movie theater bathrooms, in your army bunkhouses, in your truck stops, in your all male clubs, in your houses of Congress, wherever men are with men together. 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. Women, you cry for freedom. You say you are no longer satisfied with men; they make you unhappy. We, connoisseurs of the masculine face, the masculine physique, shall take your men from you then. We will amuse them; we will instruct them; we will embrace them when they weep. Women, you say you wish to live with each other instead of with men. Then go and be with each other. We shall give your men pleasures they have never known because we are foremost men too, and only one man knows how to truly please another man; only one man can understand the depth and feeling, the mind and body of another man.

All laws banning homosexual activity will be revoked. Instead, legislation shall be passed which engenders love between men. All homosexuals must stand together as brothers; we must be united artistically, philosophically, socially, politically and financially. We will triumph only when we present a common face to the vicious heterosexual enemy. If you dare to cry faggot, fairy, queer, at us, we

²⁷⁹ Published in *Gay Community News*, Feb. 15-21 1987. The full text of this “vision” is here <http://legacy.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/swift1.asp>

will stab you in your cowardly hearts and defile your dead, puny bodies. We shall write poems of the love between men; we shall stage plays in which man openly caresses man; we shall make films about the love between heroic men which will replace the cheap, superficial, sentimental, insipid, juvenile, heterosexual infatuations presently dominating your cinema screens. We shall sculpt statues of beautiful young men, of bold athletes which will be placed in your parks, your squares, your plazas. The museums of the world will be filled only with paintings of graceful, naked lads. Our writers and artists will make love between men fashionable and de rigueur, and we will succeed because we are adept at setting styles. We will eliminate heterosexual liaisons through usage of the devices of wit and ridicule, devices which we are skilled in employing. We will unmask the powerful homosexuals who masquerade as heterosexuals.

You will be shocked and frightened when you find that your presidents and their sons, your industrialists, your senators, your mayors, your generals, your athletes, your film stars, your television personalities, your civic leaders, your priests are not the safe, familiar, bourgeois, heterosexual figures you assumed them to be. We are everywhere; we have infiltrated your ranks. Be careful when you speak of homosexuals because we are always among you; we may be sitting across the desk from you; we may be sleeping in the same bed with you. There will be no compromises. We are not middle-class weaklings. Highly intelligent, we are the natural aristocrats of the human race, and steely-minded aristocrats never settle for less. Those who oppose us will be exiled. We shall raise vast private armies, as Mishima did, to defeat you. We shall conquer the world because warriors inspired by and banded together by homosexual love and honor are invincible as were the ancient Greek soldiers.

The family unit-spawning ground of lies, betrayals, mediocrity, hypocrisy and violence--will be abolished. The family unit, which only dampens imagination and curbs free will, must be eliminated. Perfect boys will be conceived and grown in the genetic laboratory. They will be bonded together in communal setting, under the control and instruction of homosexual savants. All churches who condemn us will be closed. Our only gods are handsome young men. We adhere to a cult of beauty, moral and esthetic. All that is ugly and vulgar and banal will be annihilated. Since we are alienated from middle-class

heterosexual conventions, we are free to live our lives according to the dictates of the pure imagination. For us too much is not enough. The exquisite society to emerge will be governed by an elite comprised of gay poets. One of the major requirements for a position of power in the new society of homoeroticism will be indulgence in the Greek passion. Any man contaminated with heterosexual lust will be automatically barred from a position of influence. All males who insist on remaining stupidly heterosexual will be tried in homosexual courts of justice and will become invisible men.

We shall rewrite history, history filled and debased with your heterosexual lies and distortions. We shall portray the homosexuality of the great leaders and thinkers who have shaped the world. We will demonstrate that homosexuality and intelligence and imagination are inextricably linked, and that homosexuality is a requirement for true nobility, true beauty in a man. We shall be victorious because we are fueled with the ferocious bitterness of the oppressed who have been forced to play seemingly bit parts in your dumb, heterosexual shows throughout the ages. We too are capable of firing guns and manning the barricades of the ultimate revolution.

All of this is said to be satirical and a true vision of the future. Such hatred and revulsion against anti-sodomists appears to be a more vengeful and vindictive response than that of the people of Lot as documented in the Qur'ān, **“And [mention] Lot, when he said to his people, ‘Do you commit immorality while you are seeing? Do you indeed approach men with desire instead of women? Rather, you are a people behaving ignorantly.’ But the answer of his people was not except that they said, ‘Expel the family of Lot from your city. Indeed, they are people who keep themselves pure’.”** (27:54-56). The Qur'ānic exegete, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī explains the saying of the homosexuals about Lot and his family, **“Indeed, they are a people who keep themselves pure,”** by saying, “[Indeed, they are a people who keep themselves pure] from what we [homosexuals] do of having sex with men in their anuses.” Then he quotes from Qatādah who said, “They [the sodomizers] criticized them baselessly [by saying] that they [Lot and his family] keep themselves pure from

actions of evil.”²⁸⁰ And Imām al-Baghawī, another famous Qur’ānic exegete, commented, “[Indeed, they are a people who keep themselves pure] from the anuses of men.”²⁸¹ Imām al-Sa’dī, a famous scholar of the 20th century, said, “Meaning, they [Lot and his family] keep themselves pure from sodomy and the anuses of men.”²⁸² Ibn Kathīr explained, “They [Lot and his family] are repulsed from doing what you do and from affirming your action (as normal and acceptable), so expel them from amongst you because they are not fit for living near you in your city.”²⁸³ The people of Lot wanted to expel Lot and his family, but in Swift’s satirical dream, he wants to defile the “dead, puny bodies” of anti-sodomists.

Walter Lee Williams. Professor of Gender Studies at the University of Southern California, and described as an eminent member of the Californian LGBT community, was arrested by the Mexican police in June 2013 and charged with pedophile offences. He was in a locality south of Cancun, where he was engaged in illegal sodomistic activities with under-age boys. Williams is the author of several books promoting homosexuality, including *Overcoming Heterosexism and Homophobia*, and *Gay and Lesbian Rights in the United States*. His personal website hints how he has travelled to many parts of the world, including Thailand and the Philippines, in search of boys to molest and sodomize. He has been for some time under investigation by the FBI in relation to more than ten charges of this kind. The charges include molesting at least ten boys in the Philippines, making and distributing child pornography, and sexually harassing his students and others he met for the purpose of conducting his “gender studies research.” “Because of his status, he has the means and access to children, and that’s what makes him dangerous, he preys on the most vulnerable children.”²⁸⁴ This again raises the question about homosexuals using the cover of “gender studies,”

²⁸⁰ Refer to Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī.

²⁸¹ Refer to Tafsīr al-Baghawī.

²⁸² Refer to Tafsīr al-Sa’dī.

²⁸³ Refer to Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr.

²⁸⁴ In a report by Alyssa Newcomb for ABC News (9th June 2013).

“*child abuse*” claims (in other words, children being hindered from exploring homosexuality is child abuse), “*human rights*,” “*mental health*” and “*employment discrimination*” as a means of engineering easy access to boys for the purposes of sodomistic pleasure.

Terry Bean. Sodomist, activist, founder of aggressive LGBT organization and power play in the gay rights movement. “Terry Bean, a Portland power player in national Democratic politics and the gay rights movement, was arrested today on charges of sex abuse in a case involving a 15-year-old boy. Police arrested Bean, 66, and booked him at the Multnomah County Detention Center this morning. Law enforcement sources familiar with the case say Bean will be charged with two counts of sodomy in the third degree, a felony, and sex abuse in the third degree, a misdemeanor. He will be arraigned later in Lane County, where the crimes allegedly occurred in 2013. The arrest comes after a five-month investigation that began with WW’s reporting about allegations of secret video recordings of men having sex in Bean’s bedroom. As WW reported in June, Bean went to the police soon after WW began asking questions, telling them that he was a victim of an extortion plot by a former lover, Kiah Lawson. WW’s story revealed, among other things, that months before, Bean sought to keep the allegations about the video recordings quiet and tried to reach a \$40,000 settlement with Lawson. Lawson told WW that early this year he had discovered a hidden camera in a smoke detector above Bean’s bed. Lawson claimed he was in more than one video that was made without his knowledge, and that video recording also captured at least a half dozen men ‘in a state of nudity engaged in intimate acts with [Bean]’... Bean made millions as a real estate developer and used his wealth to promote political causes, primarily gay rights. **He is a founder of the Human Rights Campaign, the nation’s leading gay-rights organization and has given more than \$1 million to the group.**”²⁸⁵

²⁸⁵ Terry Bean Arrested on Charges of Sex Abuse of a Minor in the Williamette Week newspaper (19th November 2014)

17. Centre De Recherche et d'Information sur l'Enfance et la Sexualité (CRIES). Previously named Groupe d'Étude sur la Pédophilie. Founded in Brussels in 1982 by Philippe Carpentier, a homosexual and other members of *Gay Infor Homosexualité*. The group published the magazine *L'Espoir* and got funding from UNICEF, the UN children's charity. In 1986, CRIES was exposed as a front for pedophile activity. The basement of the UNICEF building was being used for making child pornography, children were hired out for sex, and Joseph Verbeeck, the head of UNICEF Belgium was found to be a member. He was one of only four people to be convicted after an investigation which many still regard as a cover-up operation meant to protect other high-up figures.

18. Guest Houses, Charity Organizations and Educational Institutions as a Cover for Homosexual Pedophilia.

The Azimuth Trust. In 1988 Dr Morris Fraser and Michael Johnson set up a sailing charity for disadvantaged boys called the Azimuth Trust based in Cornwall. They were allowed to do this despite the fact that Dr Fraser, a child psychiatrist had a criminal record for taking indecent photographs of children and assault in 1972 and that Michael Johnson had only the year before in 1987 received a written warning from his employer, Cornwall County Council, after a council disciplinary hearing cleared him of sexual allegations against a boy. In the 3 years that the Azimuth Trust existed over 100 children took part in sailing trips many of those selected by Dr Morris Fraser had learning difficulties. The Azimuth Trust published it's own magazine which included photographs of naked boys. Many known pedophiles subscribed to the magazine. **Caldicott School**, Buckinghamshire, England. The Times described the boys's prep school as a "child-abuse factory for more than two decades. Under headmaster Peter Wright, who was there 1968-1993, the school became a hotbed of abuse of boys. They were routinely molested in baths, in their beds, in teacher's bedrooms and on school trips. One victim, Ian McFadyen, who spoke out in 2008, described how when he was a small boy at the school in the 1970s, he was "passed from teacher to teacher and sodomized on a regular basis." Hugh Henry, a teaching

contemporary of Wright's at the school, tried to commit suicide by taking an overdose after being caught in a boy's bed in the 1960s. A third teacher at the same school, named John Addrison, has also been convicted of molesting boys. Yet although Wright was prosecuted in 2003 and personally convicted of 12 offences against five boys, he never got any penalty. A judge decided that it was better to just pass over the whole matter. Wright told the parent of one boy who had been raped at the age of 12 that no harm would come of it and it might even be good for him. One teacher, Martin Carson, got a two-year sentence.²⁸⁶ **The Elm Guesthouse.** Homosexual brothel in south-West London, used to run a pederast racket, with boys supplied from local care homes. Clients included MPs, a judge, a bishop and a long list of VIPs. Police re-opened an investigation into it after the revelations about Jimmy Savile brought renewed complaints about sexual abuse and the grooming of children by British politicians at parties for men at the former Elm Guest House at 27, Rocks Lane, Barnes Common SE13 in South West London during the late 1970s and 1980s. **North Wales Child Abuse Scandal.** First investigated in 1996, then suppressed, this story re-emerged in 2012. An official enquiry, the Waterhouse Report said that there was a long-standing pedophile ring in the Wrexham and Chester area of North Wales, with links to the Campaign for Homosexual Equality. Boy inmates of as many as forty children's homes such as Bryn Estyn and Bryn Alyn Hall, both near Wrexham, had been regularly accessed by powerful men and politicians over a period of decades, from 1963-1992.

19. Homosexual-Pedophiles in Political Circles.²⁸⁷ Numerous scandals have erupted or resurfaced in the past few years involving high-level

²⁸⁶ *Ex-prep school headteacher convicted of child sex offences* in the Guardian (18th December 2013).

²⁸⁷ Refer to the Australian 60 Minutes special program "Spies, Lords and Predators" which aired in July 2015 and can be viewed on Youtube. "It's shaping up to be the biggest political scandal in Britain's history. There is new evidence that some of the country's most respected men were in fact depraved paedophiles. Leaders that were preying on children as young as

government officials including MPs, lords, diplomats, cabinet ministers and secret service officers. They include Labour MP **Greville Janner**, **Cyril Smith MP**, **Peter Righton** (a former government advisor on child protection), ex-British Prime Minister **Edward Heath** and former Home Secretary **Leon Brittan** amongst others. Former Deputy Head of MI6 **Peter Telford Hayman** was caught with diaries containing details of sadistic fantasies involving child abuse, yet he was allowed to walk free. He was a member of the Paedophile Information Exchange. The serial child abuser **Jimmy Saville** had high level connections which allowed him, along with his fame, easy access to children and to become a major player in pedophile rings. These revelations indicate the presence of organized homosexual-pedophile rings operating with a degree of protection because of the positions held by those involved. In much of the reporting in the mainstream media the term “child abuse” is used which conceals the fact that it was mostly boys who were sodomized and exploited for sexual activity.²⁸⁸

20. Summary

What has been presented above is only a tiny fraction of the evidence.²⁸⁹ It is sufficiently clear that predatory homosexuals who are open about seeking boys for sodomistic pleasure use the cover of “*child rights*” to facilitate their access to children. Meanwhile their

eight and nine. Many of the kids were trafficked from state-run homes and other institutions to be abused by MPs, Lords, and spies. They were protected from on high by a secret code, and have never been held to account for their horrific crimes. 60 Minutes investigates the scandal and the cover up, speaks to the victims and the witnesses, and confronts a member of the notorious paedophile information exchange. Reporter Ross Coulthart also reveals how children were killed in order to protect this network of predators.”

²⁸⁸ Refer to *How the Establishment hid the monster in their midst* in the Daily Mail (5th July 2014), *At least 40 UK politicians complicit in alleged Westminster ‘pedophile ring’ - report* in Russia Today (5th July 2014), *UK Police Investigating Five Alleged Pedophile Rings Involving ‘Highly Influential’ Politicians* in Vice News (22nd December 2014) and many other reports.

²⁸⁹ For more entries refer to *Homosexuality and Paedophilia: A Reference Guide*.

friends, supporters and defenders who operate gay activist organizations do their bidding [whilst overtly distancing themselves] by fighting to lower or abolish age of consent laws, claiming they violate *child rights*. This raises the question as to why gay activists campaign for lowering or abolishing age of sexual consent laws. It is because they are either concealed pedophiles operating under the broader more subtle umbrella of “gay rights” or “human rights” or they seek to indirectly aid the cause of homosexual pedophiles with the knowledge that lowering the age of sexual consent is of direct benefit to the pedophile subculture amongst their ranks.²⁹⁰

As sodomists generally make up around 2% or less (in Western societies), they should show up with the same percentage (2%) amongst child abusers, but the statistics indicate that they have a 20% to 40% representation in cases of child molestation which means that sexual abuse (of boys, naturally) is ten to twenty times more pronounced amongst them. In a study published in the *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, the researchers note, “the high prevalence of homosexuality in pedophiles (25% in this study)” and also state “Thus, the rate of homosexual attraction is 6 to 20 times higher among pedophiles.”²⁹¹ Freund et. al. wrote in their study “the resulting proportion of true pedophiles among persons with a homosexual erotic development is greater than that in persons who develop heterosexually.”²⁹² Reviewing 19 separate studies on the ratio of heterosexual-to-homosexual molestations of children, P.

²⁹⁰ Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, authors of *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of the Gays in the 90s*, the definitive handbook of the LGBT movement that reveals its aims and its propaganda tactics, write, “In time we see no reason why more and more diversity should not be introduced into the projected image, i.e., drag queens, pedophiles, etc.” (page 186). This is proof that mainstream gay activists have in mind the goals of homosexual subculture movements such as pedophilia.

²⁹¹ *Fraternal birth order and sexual orientation in pedophiles*. *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 2000 Oct 29(5): 463-78.

²⁹² Freund K, Watson RJ. *The proportions of heterosexual and homosexual pedophiles among sex offenders against children: an exploratory study*. *J Sex Marital Ther.* 1992 Spring;18(1):34-43.

Cameron writes, “Using random-probability studies reported by three different sets of investigators, an estimate that about 4 percent of the general population is bisexual-to-homosexual was employed to generate relative degrees of ‘dangerousness’ of the various sexual orientations. It appears that at least a third of all the reported child molestations involve homosexual acts, while girls account for about two-thirds of children victimized. Those who practice homosexual acts are at least 12 times more apt to molest a child sexually, and with suitable corrections for bisexuals (who molest both genders), probably at least 16 times more apt to molest a child. A review of recorded cases of teacher-pupil sexual interaction indicated that of the 30 instances detailed in the literature, 24 (80 percent) involved homosexual acts. It appears that teachers who practice homosexual acts are between 90 to 100 times more apt to involve themselves sexually with pupils than teachers who confine themselves to heterosexual acts.”²⁹³ This same study reveals that the average homosexual pedophile molested an average of 150 boys whilst the heterosexual pedophile molested an average of 20 girls, which is a ratio of 7.5 to one.

Despite this, a link between homosexuality and pedophilia is rejected by many research groups and homosexual interest groups actively work to discredit all research which establishes a clear link between homosexuals and pedophilia. One of the deceptive instruments used to deny a link is to put homosexuality and pedophilia into separate categories. It is then argued that a pedophile who molests and abuses boys is not in the homosexual category. This is false because homosexuality and pedophilia with boys are intersecting categories. Steve Baldwin writes in his paper in the Regent University Law Review, “Using twisted logic, pro-gay academics argue in various social science journals that the molestation of boys is not a gay lifestyle issue and that such men are not really homosexuals. It is simply amazing that gay propagandists and sexology ‘experts’ are

²⁹³ P Cameron. *Homosexual Molestation of Children/Sexual Interaction of Teacher and Pupil*. Psychological Reports Volume:57 Issue:3 (1985) pp. 1227-1236.

successfully bamboozling the public and the media into believing that a man's exclusive focus on young males should not be defined as homosexuality! But if an exclusive attraction of a male to other males of any age is not homosexuality, what is? On one hand, homosexuals publicly claim that the molestation of boys is not part of the homosexual lifestyle. On the other, they are quietly establishing the legal parameters exempting the molestation of boys from prosecution on anti-discrimination grounds."²⁹⁴ In addition, mainstream gay fictional literature is not free of pedophile themes. Prominent homosexuals, like Allen Ginsburg supported the calls of gay organizations such as NAMBLA for legalization of pedophilia which they reclassify as "*intergenerational sex*." We also find that prominent gay activists and organizations to be behind calls for reducing the age of consent."²⁹⁵

What further indicates an active gay interest in pedophilia is the presence of gay slang terms whose meanings are known only within that community. "*Chicken*" means a young homosexual boy, "*chicken dinner*" means sex with an underage boy and "*chicken hawk*" means a homosexual who seeks underage boys for sex. Another word, "*twink*" also refers to a highly-sought underage boy used for sodomy by adult homosexual men. This is only part of the sum of evidence which establishes that male homosexuality is *an elevated risk factor* for (male) child sexual abuse. So as not to be misunderstood, this does not mean *every single* homosexual is a child abuser, though some gay activists openly state, "Scratch the average homosexual and you will find a pedophile."²⁹⁶

²⁹⁴ *Child Molestation and the Homosexual Movement* published in the Regent University Law Review, Vol. 14 (2001-2002), p.270.

²⁹⁵ Examples include David Thorstad, former member of New York's Gay Activist Alliance and also founding member of NAMBLA.

²⁹⁶ Kevin Bishop, gay activist, Marxist and self-admitted pedophile, in an interview in the *Electronic Mail and Guardian* (30th June 1997), South Africa.

HOW TO LEGALIZE SODOMY WITH CHILDREN (AND ANIMALS)

It is now clear that prominent homosexual activists have been behind a clearly-defined agenda to facilitate greater and easier access to children to help elements within homosexual subcultures to fulfil their sodomistic fantasies. This appears to be the ultimate goal behind whole the “gay rights” movement which was founded by pedophiles such as **Karl Heinrich Ulrichs** in 19th century Germany or champions of the rights of pedophiles to sodomize boys such as **Harry Hay** in 20th century America. All of this is advanced, covertly behind the deceptive, fraudulent slogan of “child rights” and preventing “child abuse.” Prominent, famous “gay right” activists have now been shown as either self-confessed pedophiles or pedophile sympathizers working to lower and eventually abolish all age of consent laws. Headlines are already appearing which suggest that attitudes towards pedophilia are being manipulated using the same processes that were used to make sodomy acceptable.

This plan is being implemented in the same way that homosexuality was **destigmatized**, **normalized** and **legalized** over a couple of decades. The first step is to turn the sodomy of boys from an abomination to a mental issue and treat it as an ‘orientation’ for which men require psychiatric advice and support, to help them come to terms with it. It is claimed that ‘they were born like that.’ For a period, this ‘orientation’ is treated as a psychology issue. Then, the American Psychiatric Association (APA) redefines the condition within their Diagnostic and Statistic Manual (DSM)²⁹⁷ and eventually

²⁹⁷ The APA have already redefined pedophilia. In the fifth edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM V), the American Psychiatric Association (APA) drew a very distinct line between *pedophilia* and *pedophilic disorder*. Pedophilia refers to a sexual orientation or profession of sexual preference devoid of consummation, whereas pedophilic disorder is defined as a compulsion and is used in reference to individuals who act on their sexuality. This essentially labels pedophilia as a sexual orientation and is a huge step in legitimizing and legalizing it in the same way homosexuality was legalized. S. Baldwin writes, “This type of behavior (rape of boys), however, is considered normal in psychiatric

withdraws it from the list of conditions.²⁹⁸ Through this step, destigmatization is achieved.

Next, is the normalization process which works within a backdrop of other broader activities including the sexualization of children through entertainment and education, human rights activism employing the slogans of “child rights” and “sexual freedom for

circles due to the influence of homosexual psychiatrists within the American Psychiatric Association. It is the homosexual caucus within that body that pushed to rewrite the diagnostic criteria for pedophilia. The new definition defines sex with children as a psychological disorder only if it causes ‘clinically significant distress’ for the molester! Under that definition, most molesters are perfectly normal people!” *Child Molestation and the Homosexual Movement* by S. Baldwin, published in the Regent University Law Review, Vol. 14 (2001-2002), p. 280. In other words, pedophilia is only pedophilia if the child molester experienced distress that was clinically significant. If he did not experience any distress, guilt, anxiety and the likes, he is a normal person like everybody else. Effectively, pedophilia has been defined out of being a condition.

²⁹⁸ “BALTIMORE, MD, August 16, 2011 – Researchers from several prominent U.S. universities will participate tomorrow in a Baltimore conference reportedly aiming to normalize pedophilia. According to the sponsoring organization’s website, the event will examine ways in which “minor-attracted persons” can be involved in a revision of the American Psychological Association (APA) classification of pedophilia. B4U-ACT, a group of pro-pedophile activists and mental health professionals, is behind the August 17 conference, which will include panelists from Harvard University, the Johns Hopkins University, the University of Louisville, and the University of Illinois. In an interview with LifeSiteNews (LSN), Liberty University Visiting Professor of Law Judith Reisman, an expert on sexual ethics and pornography, criticized the Baltimore conference, saying, “This has been on the agenda for decades.” “I first met up with what I had come to call ‘The Academic Pedophile Lobby’ in 1977 at The British Psychological Society Conference on Love and Attraction, Swansea, Wales,” she said. “I delivered a research paper on [the presence of] child pornography in Playboy 1954-1977.” “Other conference academicians, some hired by pornographers, presented ‘scientific’ papers advocating the legalization of child pornography, prostitution and an end to age of consent,” she said. “They promoted their ‘scientific’ claims for early childhood sexuality to lawmakers and fellow academicians via both legitimate and pornographic media.” Published on LifeSiteNews.com.

children.”²⁹⁹ Older men’s lust for boys is presented as a right of the child “if the child is the one who incline towards it and ask for it.” **It helps of course that such children are first given a helping hand into adopting a homosexual lifestyle.** Once normalization is achieved, legalization follows not long after. As it stands, the first two steps of destigmatization and normalization are in motion but far from being complete. Homosexuals face considerable resistance with respect to pedophilia and their organizations across the world are working collectively to make it more acceptable with concerted efforts in the fields of education, legislation, psychiatry, entertainment, research and literary fiction.

The Future Animal Rights Movement

Since zoophilia, otherwise known as *bestiality*, is considered an ‘orientation’ just like sodomy and pedophilia, then zoophiles are equally justified in engaging in political activism for their cause using identical pro-sodomy logic. They will campaign under the banners of “animal rights”, “animal safety” and “anti-bullying” and claim that animals are sexual beings who are being repressed and it is their right to explore and be explored. That “discrimination” amongst mammals is a crime and should be outlawed under threat of fines and imprisonment and “minority rights” should be enshrined in legislation. Zoophile activists will create organizations such as the *Mammalian Liberation Movement* (MLM), the *Mammalian Diversity Association* (IMDA), *Animal Outrage!* and the *Mammalian Information Exchange* (MIE) for the organization of national and international activism. Zoophile psychologists will get to work on softening public perceptions towards zoophilia. Zoophile academics will write papers

²⁹⁹ In a letter to the editor of a gay newspaper, Andy Humm, a key leader of one of America’s largest gay youth groups, Advocates for Youth, said, “No one should be denied basic civil rights because of his or her orientation, whether the person be homosexual, heterosexual, transsexual, transvestite, **pedophile**, sadist, masochist, asexual, whatever one can imagine . . . They are in themselves natural variations.” As cited in *Child Molestation and the Homosexual Movement* by S. Baldwin, published in the Regent University Law Review, Vol. 14 (2001-2002), pp.274-275.

and establish that there is a biological, genetic origin for zoophilia and that some are just born that way, hence “minority rights” can be argued for legally. Films and cartoons overseen by zoophiles in Hollywood will be produced to help normalize the practice of sex with animals. “Mammalian rights” organizations will send zoophile speakers and representatives to schools to teach children about sexual diversity, lust with animals and animal-sex safety. Zoophile authors of fiction will write stories involving love between humans and their animals, children with their pets, and they will be made recommended reading in schools (and to the animals in zoos). Within a decade or two zoophilia will have been legalized. Shortly after, animal marriage will be sought as a “mammalian right.” And not long after that, “adoption rights” will be demanded. Infant goats, sheep, foals and other young animals can be confiscated from their biological parents on grounds of “child abuse” and “sexual repression” and given to a zoophile and his animal civil-partner. Hence, the proponents of every conceivable sexual ‘orientation’ including incest, necrophilia, pedophilia, bestiality can campaign with the very same tactics of the pro-sodomy movement.³⁰⁰

³⁰⁰ A specific methodology is employed to coerce other societies into adopting “gay culture” and its identity politics. These societies and their democratically elected leaders are averse to such a culture. It starts with calls for **tolerance** and respect for other people’s beliefs and practices. Once tolerance has been attained, **acceptance** is demanded. Then, **celebration** is requested whereby it must be promoted as a good thing. This leads to **forced participation** in gay culture. Finally, the scene is set to **punish** those who refuse to participate because they have their own values which they desire to keep. The **seed** which is thrown into nations to allow the five-step process to commence is the seed of “**anti-discrimination.**” In other words, for the sake of anti-discrimination: We want you to tolerate men having sex with other men in their anuses (in the same way you tolerate skin color or religious belief and practice). Thereafter you must accept and affirm this practice as a human right. Then you must celebrate a culture centred around this practice. And if you don’t do so, we will cease to provide help to your nation in which people are in dire need of medical aid, clean water, infrastructure and other affairs affecting day to day life. Currently, this is taking place with gay rights. Next it will be pedophile rights. And it is not so outrageous to suggest that in 20-40 years it will be animal rights.

'I HAVE COME TO INDOCTRINATE YOUR CHILDREN'

Such is part of the title of an article in the Huffington Post dated 7th March 2015. The author, S. Bear. Bergman describes himself in his twitter profile as “*Writer, educator, storyteller, loudmouth*” and writes columns for the Jewish Daily Forward. Bergman is a homosexual transgender activist, is married to his husband “J” and also has a son. The complete title of Bergman’s article reads, “**I Have Come to Indoctrinate Your Children Into My LGBTQ Agenda (And I’m Not a Bit Sorry).**” Bergman writes, “I am here to tell you: All that time I said I wasn’t indoctrinating anyone with my beliefs about gay and lesbian and bi and trans and queer people? That was a lie. All 25 years of my career as an LGBTQ activist, since the very first time as a 16-year-old I went and stood shaking and breathless in front of eleven people to talk about My Story, I have been on a consistent campaign of trying to change people’s minds about us. I want to make them like us. That is absolutely my goal. I want to make your children like people like me and my family, even if that goes against the way you have interpreted the teachings of your religion. I want to be present in their emotional landscapes as a perfectly nice dad and writer who is married to another guy. Who used to be a girl (kind of). Who is friendly and cheerful and not scary at all, no matter what anyone says.” Bergman continues a little later, “At the moment, I am helping to put the finishing touches on a series of children’s books that all feature lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer kids or families. There are six books, and they are racially and ethnically diverse, filled with girls and women doing cool things, page upon page of kids enacting their own identities in joyous and peaceful ways. There’s no bullying or shaming in these books, and no Very Special Episode identity politics - it’s just happy kids being well, solving problems, having adventures, loving and being loved. They have lesbian mums and gay dads and big extended queer chosen families; some are gender-independent. But what they all are is present. They are all in the books, on the page, on the landscape.” It is clear that Bergman and others like him, such as the self-described “*queergender*” co-author of his book *Gender Outlaws: The Next Generation*, Kate Bornstein, are trying to take mankind out of *binary-*

gender thinking (male, female) to *no-gender* thinking. A survey of Bergman’s books and writings reveals that he is pushing the idea that gendering children into “boys” and “girls” amounts to child abuse. In a hilarious piece that was intended as a philosophical anti-gender rant, Bergman writes, “This is a legitimate concern. Once we know a kid’s sex, we think we understand what they should wear, how they should behave, what they should like to play with, and so on. In short, we think we know how their gender should look. If you are someone who is worried about the forces of gender working on young people generally—pushing them toward some activities and away from others based on gender expectations, reinforcing a heterosexual future, narrowing their choices of clothing or hairstyle, and so on—then having an actual child of your own kicks this concern into overdrive. The very first thing anyone asks you when you say you’re having a baby, or just had one, is: boy or girl? Everywhere you go, everywhere you look, things are gendered and the boy or girl reductionist question just keeps coming.”³⁰¹

It is clear that gender (male, female) and masculinity and femininity are under attack by activists like Bergman and in the context of these cultural developments, it is not surprising that the Moscow City Court confirmed for the second time its ruling banning all “gay pride” events in the Russian capital for **the next century**³⁰² and the majority Croation population voted to have it enshrined in the constitution that marriage is correctly defined as between a man and a woman³⁰³ and why the French pro-family group, *La Manif Pour Tous*, one of a number of French pro-family organizations, managed to

³⁰¹ “Two Trans Guys Have a Son. Are They Raising Him Gender-Neutral?” published in the Outward section of Slate.Com (22nd October 2013).

³⁰² See *Moscow court upholds 100-year ban on gay pride events* in Russia Today (17th August 2012) and *Gay parades banned in Moscow for 100 years* in BBC News (17th August 2012).

³⁰³ In November 2013 Croats voted in a referendum forced upon the Social-Democrat government by 740,000 petition signatures to define marriage in the constitution as “union of man and woman.” Refer to *Croats set constitutional bar to same-sex marriage* published by Reuters, 25th November 2013.

bring 30,000 protesters on to the streets of Versailles during late 2013 to protest against laws which effectively undermine the institution of marriage and family and why the populations of Belarus, Poland, Moldova, Bulgaria, Montenegro, Serbia, Kenya, Uganda and others have asserted values they wish to preserve. Unfortunately, these events do not make mainstream television to reach tens of millions of people who would very quickly learn that other nations have a right to assert and defend their own core values. Unlike Bergman, most homosexual activists cowardly deny that they target children for seduction into the homosexual lifestyle. That this is a lie is proven by empirical evidence. Homosexual organizations are making increased efforts to target public school children, to abolish age of consent laws and to publish “studies” that purportedly show that adult-child sex is not harmful. Homosexual publishing companies are churning out dozens of books targeted to kindergarteners, pre-teens, and teenagers to normalize homosexual behavior and to push for homosexual marriage and adoption.³⁰⁴ Many of these books are designed to stigmatize opponents of homosexual behavior as bigoted and hateful and inaccurately portray “happy” homosexual families consisting of two men or two women and their children. All children in homosexual families come from broken homes or were conceived by artificial insemination. A homosexual household is by definition, abnormal, and - from evidence presented in this book - children are at greater risk for molestation and abuse in these homes than in homes with a mother and father who have innate love and care for their own biological children.

³⁰⁴ One of the most popular books distributed by homosexual activists to preteen and teenagers is *Two Teenagers In Twenty*, (formerly called *One In Ten*, and published by Alyson Publishers, Boston). It describes the sexual experiences of teenagers who engage in homosexual behaviors. One chapter of the book details the seduction of a teenage girl by her dance instructor on a field trip out of town. Alyson Publishers is also the publisher of the out-of-print book, *The Age Taboo—Gay Male Power, Sexuality, Power, and Consent*, which includes essays on having sex with children and teenagers. One essay is written by North American Man-Boy Love Association founder David Thorstad.

HOMOSEXUALS ON MARRIAGE

The statement to the right was posted by homosexuals opposed to same-sex marriage. Homosexual activists and “gay rights” campaigners are divided about same-sex marriage³⁰⁵ and have considerable debate amongst themselves about the meaning, purpose, significance and symbolism of “gay marriage.” From a survey of their discussions, it is clear that whilst they differ on whether there are actual benefits to homosexuals in legalizing gay marriage or not and whether it is purely a symbolic ritual of no further significance to the daily lives of homosexuals, they all realize that its legalization serves as a powerful tool to destroy the traditional institution of marriage.

Marriage is the proverbial burning building. Instead of pounding on the door (to be let in) queers should be stoking the flames.



Michelangelo Signorile, gay activist, wrote in 1994 presenting a proposition, “A middle ground might be to fight for same-sex marriage and its benefits and then, once granted, redefine the

³⁰⁵ For example a homosexual organization called “Against Equality” has as its slogan, “Queer challenges to the politics of inclusion” and introduces itself as “an online archive, publishing, and arts collective focused on critiquing mainstream gay and lesbian politics. As queer thinkers, writers and artists, we are committed to dislodging the centrality of equality rhetoric and challenging the demand for inclusion in the institution of marriage, the US military, and the prison industrial complex via hate crimes legislation.” These homosexuals see marriage as a purely heterosexual institution, see homosexuality as a lifestyle to which the concept of marriage is alien, and oppose the demands of inclusion by gays into heterosexual concepts and institutions. However, whilst they differ on this matter, they all understand that legalizing “gay marriage” helps to destroy the institution of marriage and aids in undermining the heterosexual family structure. All of this facilitates avenues for recruiting children into homosexual lifestyles.

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... [Legalizing 'same-sex marriage'] is also a chance to wholly transform the definition of family in American culture."³⁰⁶ He also said, "Rather than being transformed by the institution of marriage, gay men — some of whom have raised the concept of the 'open relationship' to an art form — could simply transform the institution itself, making it more sexually open, even influencing their heterosexual counterparts."³⁰⁷ In an interview about same-sex marriage, **Ryan Conrad**, a gay activist who actually opposes same-sex marriage, is cited by Xtra Magazine as saying, "And after all, we are advocating the destruction of the centrality of marriage and the nuclear family unit..."³⁰⁸ **The Gay Liberation Front** stated in its 1971 Manifesto, "We must aim at the abolition of the family, so that the sexist, male supremacist system can no longer be nurtured there."³⁰⁹

Paula Ettelbrick, lesbian thinker and activist stated in the 1980s, "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."³¹⁰

Nan Hunter, professor of Law at Georgetown Law Center and same-sex marriage advocate states that the purpose of legalizing gay marriage is to "destabilize marriage's gendered definition, thus

³⁰⁶ Michelangelo Signorile (Gay Voices Editor), *How We Got to the Supreme Court*, Huffington Post (25th March 2013).

³⁰⁷ Michelangelo Signorile, "I Do, I Do, I Do, I Do, I Do" *OUT* magazine, May 1996, p. 30.

³⁰⁸ *Not the marrying kind* in Capital Xtra (12th Jan 2012).

³⁰⁹ Refer to <http://legacy.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/glf-london.asp>.

³¹⁰ Quoted by William B. Rubenstein, "Since When Is Marriage a Path to Liberation? Lesbians, Gay Men, and the Law," (New York: The New Press, 1993):398, 400. Refer also to Alan Soble, Nicholas Power, "The Philosophy of Sex: Contemporary Readings" (Rowman & Littlefield 2007) p. 185.

disrupting the link between gender and marriage, thereby subverting its power differential.”³¹¹

Masha Gessen is a Jewish lesbian “gay rights” activist. In a panel discussion at the Sydney Writers Festival in June 2012 stated about same-sex marriage, “It’s a no-brainer that we should have the right to marry, but I also think equally that it’s a no-brainer that the institution of marriage should not exist [cheers from the audience]. That causes my brain some trouble. And part of why it causes me trouble is because fighting for gay marriage generally involves lying about what we are going to do with marriage when we get there—because we lie that the institution of marriage is not going to change, and that is a lie. The institution of marriage is going to change, and it should change. And again, I don’t think it should exist. And I don’t like taking part in creating fictions about my life.³¹² That’s sort of not what I had in mind when I came out thirty years ago. I have three kids who have five parents, more or less, and I don’t see why they shouldn’t have five parents legally... [After my divorce,] I met my new partner, and she had just had a baby, and that baby’s biological father is my brother, and my daughter’s biological father is a man who lives in Russia, and my adopted son also considers him his father. So the five parents break down into two groups of three... And really, I would like to live in a legal system that is capable of reflecting that reality. And I don’t think that’s compatible with the institution of marriage..”³¹³

³¹¹ See Barbara Cox, *A (Personal) Essay on Same-Sex Marriage* in the National Journal of Sexual Orientation Law, Vol. 1, Issue 1. Refer to Nicola Barker, *Not The Marrying Kind: A Feminist Critique of Same-Sex Marriage* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012) and Stephen Macedo, *Just Married: Same-Sex Couples, Monogamy, and the Future of Marriage* (Princeton University Press 2015) p. 126.

³¹² This highlights the nature of the debate amongst homosexuals, many see gay marriage as mimicry of a useless heterosexual institution and as nothing more than a symbolic ritual with no further meaning or significance to the lives of homosexuals.

³¹³ *Why get married when you could be happy?* MP3 audio of panel discussion available on <http://www.abc.net.au>.

Amy Lowell, an Australian lesbian, states, “When it comes to same-sex marriages, John Howard has got us pretty well summed up. We’re not cut out for it... 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 [Heterosexuals are] welcome to it.”³¹⁴ In other words, the concept of “marriage” is alien to a homosexual lifestyle and runs counter to it. Rather than homosexuals mimicking heterosexuals in the issue of marriage, gays should force their concept of multiple promiscuous relationships onto the non-homosexual society. Thus, marriage changes from being between a single male and a single female to being between a group of males or a group of females and in some cases a mixture of males and females.

Gareth Kirkby, gay activist and editor of a Canadian gay newspaper *Capital Xtra*, writes, “Remember the headlines...that claimed we were flocking to city hall and churches to get the deed done as courts legalized same-sex marriage in province after province? ...It was a lie. Very few among us are eager to embrace marriage rights... Marriage is a heterosexual institution designed by the church, endorsed by the state, with the intention of controlling the sexuality of women and by extension, their husbands... I don’t expect the wedding rate will pick up. We have something better in our relationships, something that allows for a variety of friendships, f-k buddies, lovers, sisters and ex’s. We don’t put all the pressures on one person... We don’t need the limitations of marriage. So we’re taking a pass. But what waste of time and money, and a tragic diversion of focus, in that decade-long fight.”³¹⁵

³¹⁴ Amy Lowell, “Do lesbians need marriage?” *MCV*, 4 June 2004, p. 6

³¹⁵ Gareth Kirkby, *Gay marriage fight wasn’t worth it* (17th October 2007).

Even **Marshall Kirk** and **Hunter Madsen** - masterminds of modern “gay” propaganda - write, “In short, the gay lifestyle - if such a chaos can, after all, legitimately be called a lifestyle - it just doesn’t work: it doesn’t serve the two functions for which all social framework evolve: to constrain people’s natural impulses to behave badly and to meet their natural needs. While it’s impossible to provide an exhaustive analytic list of all the root causes and aggravants of this failure, we can asseverate at least some of the major causes. Many have been dissected, above, as elements of the Ten Misbehaviors; it only remains to discuss the failure of the gay community to provide a viable alternative to the heterosexual family.”³¹⁶ They affirm that a “gay” lifestyle runs contrary to the heterosexual family as a matter of principle and that the two are simply not compatible. Thus, whilst some gays try to introduce “marriage” and “family” concepts into homosexuality and to pressure governments to legalize them and develop legislation regarding them, others see this as a waste of time. These concepts are not compatible with what it fundamentally means to be a homosexual.

From the above sample quotes the following affairs become clear: The smarter, shrewder homosexuals understand that the very concept of marriage runs counter to homosexuality in which there is an innate tendency towards promiscuity. That fighting for the legalization of “*gay marriage*” is a waste of time because homosexuals do not really want to get married and statistics prove it. That “*gay marriage*” is merely symbolic and does not affect homosexuals in their relationships. That legalizing “*gay marriage*” is nevertheless a way to undermine marriage in principle since marriage is purely a heterosexual institution founded upon the union of a single male with a single female. If marriage is redefined to include *same-sex marriage* and *open marriage* (known as *polyamory*), marriage as a concept can be destroyed and this is of tremendous tactical benefit to homosexual causes.

³¹⁶ *After the Ball*: (Doubleday, 1st edition, May 1989) p. 363.

WHAT HOMOSEXUALS WANT AND HOW THEY ACHIEVE IT

Homosexual activists demand the following sequential affairs from societies and governments:³¹⁷

First, they want government to legally sanction their behaviour which is centred around the practice of sodomy (anal sex). They also want such behaviour normalized and promoted to children in the name of “human rights.” This is done by demanding governments to abolish anti-sodomy laws, abolish age of sexual consent laws and enforce sexual liberation indoctrination within schools.

Second, once their high-risk behaviour has been legally sanctioned by the government, the government must police it at society’s cost. This is done by demanding the government to enforce testing for HIV-AIDS and other transmissible diseases in gay bars, clubs and bathhouses.³¹⁸

Third, they want society to bear the financial cost for treating the consequences of their high-risk behaviour through the nation’s health services and a whole host of other programs.³¹⁹

³¹⁷ See <http://banap.net>, a website by an ex-homosexual (gay “apostate”).

³¹⁸ “A leading U.S. AIDS health service provider on Monday said hundreds of patrons of gay sex clubs and bathhouses have been exposed to HIV because Los Angeles County officials failed to regulate the venues.” *AIDS group urges HIV testing in LA bathhouses*, Reuters Health, (4th May 2004).

³¹⁹ “Debate over the community’s expectations on sexual behavior is exposing a cultural divide among gay men, sparking a separate discussion within the gay community on its values and ethics. One side says it is unfair to condemn gay men who engage in risky sex without considering the underlying causes of the behavior. The other side wants the coddling of those whose behavior is fueling the epidemic to stop.” *Response to rising HIV divides gay community*. Seattle Times, (6th January 2004). “Health officials and AIDS activists nationwide are alarmed at the increasing correlation between new HIV diagnoses and methamphetamine use among gay men. The drug’s ability to heighten arousal and ease inhibitions is proving deadly combination - leading to sexual behavior that increases the chances of infection with HIV and syphilis... One recent Centers for Disease Control and Prevention study based on San Francisco data showed that use of both

Fourth: They want governments to threaten and punish those who do not validate this behaviour due to personal morals and values or religious tradition. Lobbying as “human rights” organizations, they apply pressure upon ministers, governments and public and private institutions in numerous ways. Through this they acquire **special privileges** in projecting their culture on to society whilst legal action is taken against those who wish to assert and preserve their traditional culture and values, be they Muslims, Jews or Christians.³²⁰

meth and Viagra was connected to a marked increase in unsafe sex” *Gays’ Rising Meth Use Tied to New HIV Cases*. Los Angeles Times, (19th January 2005). “More than half of us are ignoring everything we know about sexual safety and health and refusing to protect ourselves. It should come as no surprise that the CDC just announced that new HIV diagnoses among gay and bisexual men across the country increased for the third consecutive year.” *Is the badge of the ‘sexual outlaw’ killing us?* published by gay magazine “Advocate” online (13th October 2003). “Syphilis is on the rise in the United States for the first time in more than a decade, largely because of outbreaks among gay and bisexual men in several U.S. cites, the government reported on Thursday.” *Syphilis rate increase linked to gay, bisexual men*. “Advocate” online (4th November 2002).

³²⁰ On 3rd August 2015, the Telegraph newspaper reported on Tory MP, Mark Spencer in an article titled, “MP: use anti-terror powers on Christian teachers who say gay marriage is ‘wrong’.” The article states, “New Extremism Disruption Orders should be applied on those who ‘teach’ traditionalist Christian views about marriage in the classroom... Christian campaigners said Mr Spencer’s remarks confirmed what they had previously warned: that those who believe marriage should only be between a man and a woman would now be ‘branded extremists’.” In another report by the BBC, “Transport bosses were right to ban a Christian group’s bus advert suggesting gay people could be helped to change their sexuality, it has been ruled. The High Court ruled Transport for London’s process in introducing the ban ‘was procedurally unfair’. But it ruled TfL was acting lawfully in banning the Core Issues Trust’s proposed advert because it would ‘cause grave offence’ to those who were gay. The posters read: ‘Not Gay! Ex-Gay, Post-Gay and Proud. Get over it!’ They were a response to a bus poster campaign by gay rights group Stonewall, which carried the message: ‘Some people are gay. Get over it!’ The High Court’s ruling also said the Stonewall advertisement was ‘highly offensive to fundamentalist Christians and other religious groups whose religious belief is that homosexuality is contrary to God’s teachings’. ‘Ex-gay’ London bus advert ban ruled lawful, BBC News (22nd March 2013). “A Christian group has failed in a bid to overturn a decision to

Fifth: They want the muzzle placed on ex-gays who have voluntarily left the homosexual lifestyle and on gay activists who reject and strongly oppose “gay marriage” and on all voices - **including those of homosexual academics, researchers, writers and social critics** - who express any form of opposition to their goals and pursuits. Often, they may be described as “self-loathing faggots” and “homophobes.”

Sixth: A pedophile subculture is part of the broader “gay rights” movement and mainstream homosexual activists indirectly serve the cause of this subculture and its goals to legalize pedophilia by campaigning against “sexual ageism.” The campaigning strategies that were taken with respect to “gay rights” are being implemented with respect to “child rights” by which it is meant, “a child’s right have sex with adults.” Instead of saying “homosexual pedophiles desire sex with children” which is the empirically accurate depiction of the affairs, it is deceptively and cunningly presented as if children *want* to have sex with adults and are being discriminated against. Thus, “child rights” will be campaigned for using the “anti-discrimination” card. **Marshall Kirk** and **Hunter Madsen** write in their homosexual propaganda manual, “And when we say talk about homosexuality, we mean just that. In the early stages of any campaign to reach straight America, the masses should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the imagery of sex should be downplayed

ban its bus adverts, which suggested gay people could be helped to change their sexuality. The group, Core Issues, was ordered to pay £100,000 in legal costs after the High Court rejected its case. It was trying to challenge a Transport for London (TfL) ban of its posters, which read ‘Not Gay! Ex-Gay, Post-Gay and Proud. Get over it!’. Core Issues vowed to continue fighting. The 2012 campaign was a response to a bus poster campaign by gay rights group Stonewall, saying: ‘Some people are gay. Get over it!’. *‘Ex gay’ ad ban appeal costs Christian group £100,000*, BBC News (10th June 2015). Refer also to the following news items, *£86k fine upheld for anti-gay bakery that refused to make cake for lesbian couple*, The Independent (4th July 2015). “The Christian owners of an Oregon bakery are facing a hefty fine after refusing to bake a cake for a lesbian wedding.” *Bakery Fined \$135K for Refusing to Serve Gay Wedding*, Fox News (7th July 2015).

and gay rights should be reduced to an abstract social question as much as possible. First let the camel get his nose inside the tent - only later his unsightly derriere.³²¹⁺³²² And later in the book, the true long term objective is revealed, in explicit words, "In time we see no reason why more and more diversity should not be introduced into the projected image, i.e., drag queens, **pedophiles**, etc."³²³ Mainstream gay activists are working to the clearly understood plan that after the "nose" of homosexuality has gotten into the tent, work will commence on entering the "unsightly derriere" into the tent straight after, in the name of *child rights* and fighting against "*sexual ageism*" using all the same tactics to project a nice image of pedophiles as ordinary, all-right, lovely people. In an interview in the Electronic Mail and Guardian (30th June 1997), South Africa, gay activist and pedophile Kevin Bishop was promoting the work of the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) in South Africa and revealed his agreement with NAMBLA that the next social movement in Western politics will be an attack on "sexual ageism," which prohibits sexual contact based on age differences. In the same interview Bishop said, "Scratch the average homosexual and you will find a pedophile."

From what has preceded, "gay rights is not about the attainment of truth nor social justice but the achievement of power. The battle centers on the control of public discourse through marketing and persuasion, to shape what society thinks about and how they think about it."³²⁴ Once legal and political power is attained - and they have been largely successful - they want to project and force their lifestyle

³²¹ Meaning, first let us at least push our noses through the door and once we are in, our backsides will follow. The meaning of this statement is that once the positively portrayed homosexual is in the tent, the pedophiles, sadomasochists and other subcultures will immediately follow suit behind them.

³²² Kirk and Madsen, *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of the Gay's in the 90s* (Doubleday, 1989), p.8.

³²³ Ibid. p. 186.

³²⁴ Paul Rondeau in *Selling Homosexuality to America*. Regent University Law Review (14:485).

on to others and desire to change the very fabric and structure of society as is stated in their own words. **Kirk and Madsen** write unabashedly about how homosexual activists should achieve their goals, “The homosexual agenda can succeed by conversion of the average Americans emotions, mind, and will, through, a planned psychological attack in the form of propaganda to the nation via media.”³²⁵

³²⁵ Kirk and Madsen, *After the Ball* (Doubleday, 1989), p. 153.

HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVISTS AND THE USE OF LANGUAGE

It is explicitly clear from Kirk and Madsen's "*After the Ball*" manifesto that propaganda is the key weapon for "gay activism." A central element of propaganda is playing with the meanings and definition of words: "To one extent or another, the separability and manipulability of the verbal label is the basis for all the abstract principles underlying our proposed campaign."³²⁶ In what follows, we will look at some of the key terms used by homosexual activists in their marketing of same-sex conduct to societies and nations and they include: *homosexuality*, *sexual orientation*, *diversity*, *discrimination*, *tolerance* and *homophobia*.

Homosexuality is a behaviour, it is same-sex sexual conduct and nothing more. Evidence from many disciplines establishes that it is acquired, not genetically determined. The claim that it is immutable like skin colour is fallacious and scientifically fraudulent but because this idea is the basis for their lobbying activities, the homosexual movement insists that homosexuality is innate and unchangeable.³²⁷ Even Kirk and Madsen who laid out the propaganda strategy for the newly devised "gay rights" movement explicitly state, "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."³²⁸

This indicates that homosexuals are using a legal, political and social strategy and not a scientific one because credible science will not

³²⁶ *After the Ball* (Doubleday, 1st edition, May 1989) p. 149.

³²⁷ A very strange phenomenon witnessed from some homosexual activists is their challenge to "ex-gays" to prove they are not still homosexuals and their attacks upon "ex-gays" as "self-loathing faggots." This is because ex-gays of whom there are tens of thousands pose a threat to the homosexual movement. If sexuality is fluid and changeable (which it is), it demolishes the foundation upon which all "gay rights" activism is based.

³²⁸ *After the Ball* (Doubleday, 1st edition, May 1989) p. 184.

validate their claim.³²⁹ The term homosexuality is therefore used with the assumption that it is equal to heterosexuality or to skin colour and other immutable traits, a claim not backed by evidence.

Sexual orientation describes the sexual attraction of a subject to an object. There is no limit to potential sexual orientations. Thus, a homosexual is attracted to the same sex, a bisexual to both sexes, a pedophile to children, a zoophile to animals, a necrophile to dead bodies, and a mechanophile towards cars (pictured is Edward Smith with one of his former “girlfriends”).³³⁰ Very tactfully, “gay rights” campaigners only recognize four orientations officially, *heterosexual*, *homosexual*, *bisexual* and *transgender*. The reason for this is that if they recognized other orientations it would immediately make **the distinction** between **behaviour** and **orientation** very clear and apparent. However, *sexual orientation* as a field of study, is intended to deliberately confuse between the two as a means of protecting homosexual practices. Sound law is always



³²⁹ If homosexuality was genetically determined, there would be a DNA test for it and that is a scary prospect for the movement. Parents may not want to have an allegedly “homosexual” child. The “gay gene” hoax is precarious for the homosexual activists and does not entirely work in their favour.

³³⁰ “A man who claims to have had sex with 1,000 cars has defended his ‘romantic’ feelings towards vehicles. Edward Smith, who lives with his current ‘girlfriend’ – a white Volkswagen Beetle named Vanilla, insisted that he was not ‘sick’ and had no desire to change his ways. ‘I appreciate beauty and I go a little bit beyond appreciating the beauty of a car only to the point of what I feel is an expression of love,’ he said. ‘Maybe I’m a little bit off the wall but when I see movies like Herbie and Knight Rider, where cars become loveable, huggable characters it’s just wonderful. ‘I’m a romantic. I write poetry about cars, I sing to them and talk to them just like a girlfriend. I know what’s in my heart and I have no desire to change.’ He added: ‘I’m not sick and I don’t want to hurt anyone, cars are just my preference.’ Mr Smith, 57, first had sex with a car at the age of 15, and claims he has never been attracted to women or men.” *Man admits having sex with 1,000 cars* in the Telegraph (21st May 2008).

based upon consequences of actions and behaviours. What is lawful is of benefit to the individual and society overwhelmingly and what is unlawful is harmful to the individual and society overwhelmingly. Sexual **behaviour** has consequences upon individuals and societies in a variety of ways and from them is public health. Thus, sexual behaviour must be regulated in the interests of public health. As for the mere thoughts, the attraction, the actual **orientation** itself, that does not actually harm society. Thus the orientation of a necrophile, a zoophile or a pedophile does not create harm until and unless they act upon their orientation. This demonstrates the crucial distinction between *orientation* and *behaviour* and all attempts to blur this distinction have the goal of conferring upon homosexuality a status equal to heterosexuality. However, they are not truly equal as a matter of fact. Every single human being except a hermaphrodite is born with reproductive organs that are either male or female and are thus **innately heterosexual** by **biological design**. Sexual feelings are in turn rooted in and emanate from that heterosexual design. It is self-evident that male-female sexual attraction and vice versa is natural, normal and an immutable characteristic of humanity as a whole. It thus becomes clear that male-male and female-female sexual attraction is not natural or normal because it does not have a biologically designed, physiologically rooted basis. This is scientific fact. It then becomes established that homosexuality, being a form of behaviour, is no different to bestiality, necrophilia, mechanophilia and other sexual behaviours which are deviations from the biologically designed heterosexual orientation. Confusing between *orientation* and *behaviour* and claiming homosexuality is innate and immutable with a view to conferring upon homosexuality a status equivalent to heterosexuality has another higher objective. It is to enable the exploitation of the “civil rights” concept used to combat racism. Having black skin is not harmful to society. Likewise mere homosexual thoughts in themselves do not harm society. But having sex with another man in his anus is harmful to the individual and also to the society in the long term. Sexual orientation theory is the key underlying concept on the basis of which all other terms and phrases are defined.

The meaning of **diversity** is “the state and quality of being different” or “a variety, an assortment.” By itself, the word is neutral and does not have any judgement or position on the elements making up the variety. When used by homosexuals, it is intended as a moral judgement which demands that a culture centred around sodomy is made equivalent to traditional family-based cultures of nations. By inserting such behavioural elements into the definition of diversity, one must also accept cannibalism - still practiced by a number of cultures including the Korowai of Indonesian New Guinea, the Aghori sect of Hinduism and the Yanamamo tribe in the Amazon rainforest - as part of “diversity.” Thus, the criteria for the inclusion of any practice, behaviour, lifestyle or culture within “diversity” have to be stated. Either all cultural practices must be accepted - remaining true to the concept of diversity - or one has to be selective on the basis of criteria which have to include morality and values of society. If a person has no right to consider homosexual behaviour to be immoral because it is culturally acceptable to some people, then no one has a right to consider cannibalism amongst certain tribes or female circumcision practiced by large numbers of Christians in Africa to be immoral. If it is argued that these practices are unnatural and harmful, then it can also be argued empirically and scientifically that having sex with a man in his anus is unnatural and harmful. Thus, the use of the label of diversity is only valid if **morally neutral** criteria are used, examples of which include skin colour, food preferences, styles of cooking, the nature of ones residence and habitat, the variation in language and the variation in all morally neutral customs and habits. **Morally significant behaviours** on the other hand have to be evaluated for their benefits and harms to the individual and society.

Discrimination means “the recognition and understanding of the difference between one thing and another” or “the ability or power to see or make fine distinctions” or “discernment.” This word has been redefined and politically-charged due to modern civil rights movements. Discrimination against harmful behaviour is warranted, justified, and rational. Discrimination on neutral grounds such as

skin colour, race and ethnic background has no rational basis. As with *sexual orientation* the concept of *discrimination* incorporates *morally significant behaviours* and makes them equal to *morally neutral and totally harmless immutable qualities* such as skin colour. Because there is a natural aversion to prejudice on grounds of race and ethnicity and other morally neutral criteria and because *prejudice* and *discrimination* have a strong association homosexual activists have managed to exploit this association to further their own cause. Consider the following: If leaders of certain Christian African nations discriminate against the practice of sodomy on grounds of public health, not wanting their societies to suffer from an increase in AIDS, syphilis and other diseases whose transmissibility is exponentially increased by receptive anal sex, is this discrimination scientifically based and rational? On the other hand, if the leaders of certain nations discriminate against a group of people because their skin is black - as occurred in Europe, America and South Africa until very recent modern history - is this discrimination scientifically based and rational? By asking these and other similar questions one can quickly see how the concept of *discrimination* has been exploited.

This leads us to the concept of **tolerance**. Like discrimination, this term has also been politically redefined in dictionaries. Tolerance simply refers to “the act or capacity of enduring” or “the ability or willingness to tolerate the existence of opinions or behaviour that one dislikes or disagrees with.” This tolerance has to be conditioned otherwise an unrestricted, absolute concept of tolerance will mean enduring harmful, destructive ideas and behaviours. There are certain things which must be tolerated absolutely such as skin colour. There are other things which must have zero tolerance such as racism, theft and murder - these are behaviours, not immutable qualities. Then there are levels of tolerance for ideas and behaviours based upon the relative benefits and harms they bring to society. The same questions raised earlier can be raised with respect to tolerance: When a Christian African leader displays intolerance towards the practice of sodomy on grounds of public health and morality, is his intolerance the same as the intolerance shown

towards people genetically determined to have black skin as occurred in the apartheid of South Africa, America and other places? This brings us to the heart of the matter. Is a state of being such as having black skin the same as voluntary, fluid, changeable behaviour? The answer is clearly no.

Whilst confusion regarding the labels of *homosexuality*, *sexual orientation*, *diversity*, *tolerance* and *discrimination* can be appreciated because of the subtleties involved, the final label of **homophobia** - in stark contrast - is a blatant display of outright, illogical sophistry. This term has been hijacked and used as a political battering ram to “jam” and silence dissenters. The original meaning of homophobia is “*a person’s fear of having homosexual inclinations within himself or herself.*” The term was then stolen by homosexual activists and politically redefined to mean “*fear and hate of homosexuals.*” It is used to accuse anyone who does not affirm the practice of sodomy to be a legitimate non-harmful behaviour as a hate-filled bigot. Homosexual activists deny that there can be any *legitimate opposition* to homosexuality which reveals that they do not accept any opposition at all, the height of intolerance itself. Thus, anyone who simply believes homosexuality is not normal or is immoral is a hate-filled bigot, *a homophobe*. As if this was not sufficient, they incorporate the concept of mental illness into this stolen, politically redefined term. Homophobia is therefore a *mental* disease and is equivalent to prejudice and bigotry on grounds of race. With all these concepts loaded into the term, one can see its huge, effective power. Show any opposition to homosexuality on grounds of health, morals or values and you will be immediately labelled as a “diseased, mentally-ill, racist bigot.” In reality, the accusation of homophobia is a form of religious discrimination and can be considered “a hate-crime” against religious people because it denies them the freedom of religion and expression.³³¹

³³¹ “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and

In summary, the key to all of the terms discussed above is the issue of **sexual orientation**. By deceptively presenting a behaviour as a state-of-being (like skin colour), sexual orientation theory allows all of these terms to be redefined and used to pursue political agendas whose attainment would otherwise be extremely difficult if not impossible. These political agendas are then equated with legitimate civil rights movements such as those in America and South Africa in the late 20th century. What we have then, as homosexuals readily admit, is identity politics, not a truly genuine civil rights movement. We will leave the last words to homosexual academics themselves.

Dr. John DeCecco is a psychologist, Director of the Center for Research and Education in Sexuality at San Francisco State University, and Editor of *The Journal of Homosexuality*. Dr. DeCecco calls himself “gay” but insists that such attractions are **a changeable preference not an orientation**. He explains in his book entitled, “*If You Seduce A Straight Person You Can Make Them Gay*”, that the whole “born gay” and immutable characteristic idea is just “gay and lesbian politics” and is aimed at achieving “gay” rights.³³²

Dr. Lillian Faderman - who has won an award from the gay activist group called Lambda Literary Foundation - writes, “And we continue to demand rights, ignoring the fact that human sexuality is fluid and flexible, acting as though we are all stuck in our category forever... The narrow categories of identity politics are obviously deceptive... I’m much less happy when I think of the possibility of huge numbers of homosexuals (two-thirds of women who identify as lesbian for example) running off to explore the heterosexual side of their bisexual potential and, as a result, decimating our political ranks... The concept of gay and lesbian identity may be nothing but a social

observance. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.” Articles 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

³³² *If You Seduce A Straight Person You Can Make Them Gay*, (1993) pp. 17-18.

construct, but it has been crucial, enabling us to become a political movement and demand the rights that are do to us as a minority. What becomes of our political movement if we openly acknowledge that sexuality is flexible and fluid, that gay and lesbian does not signify 'a people' but rather a 'sometime behavior'.³³³

Female homosexual writer **Jennie Ruby** admits, "I don't think lesbians are born... I think they are made... The gay rights movement has (for many good, practical reasons) adopted largely an identity politics."³³⁴

³³³ In the Gay publication, *The Advocate*, 9th May 1995, p.43.

³³⁴ *Off Our Backs*, Oct. 1996, p.22.

CONCLUSION

Genuine ‘core values’ of nations and societies are those upon which nations and societies were built and can be traced over hundreds, if not thousands of years. They are stable and not subject to change or invalidation because the nation’s very existence, strength and continuation was founded upon them in the first place. *The traditional (biological) family unit* is one of those core foundational values. Artificial ‘values’ are those which are thrust upon nations and societies through **political campaigning, media propaganda** and **threatful legislative coercion**. One should not confuse between the two. Had these artificial values been amongst the genuine, core values of a nation, their acceptance would be widespread. They would not require political lobbying or legislative coercion to make them acceptable to the populace. No one ever lobbied to make honesty, giving charity and marriage between a man and woman to be from the core values of a nation. However, sodomy of men and boys has never been accepted by any nation (with few exceptions). The concept of two people of the same sex being exclusively attracted to each other as a *sexual identity*³³⁵ has never existed prior to the 20th century. The cultural norms of human societies all over the world have developed a natural rejection of these behaviours as a means of survival.³³⁶

³³⁵ In those few instances where sodomy was widely practiced in nations such as Greece and Rome, it had nothing to do with any concept of “sexual identity” but was centred around lust, domination, hierarchy and status.

³³⁶ In English Law, “Buggery” is a common-law offence which encompasses sodomy. It was first used in the Buggery Act 1533. In the Offences against the Person Act 1861, Section 61, titled “Sodomy and Bestiality” defined punishments for “the abominable crime of buggery, committed either with mankind or with any animal.” At common law consent was not a defence, nor was the fact that the parties were married. The same act reduced the punishment for buggery from hanging to life imprisonment. In England and Wales, homosexual buggery was decriminalised in 1967 with an age of consent at 21 years which was further reduced to 16 years in 2001. As the law stands, buggery is still charged, exclusively regarding “pseudo-consensual” anal intercourse with those under 16 because children cannot legally consent to buggery although they may appear to do so. Pro-sodomy

Today, the LGBT lobby is very powerful and holds considerable sway. It's **Kirk and Madsen** agenda is supported financially and legislatively by the UN, the EU and regional governments. They also attempt to impose homosexuality upon African, Middle and Far Eastern nations through political pressure, bribery and blackmail and demand that laws are changed to accommodate the practice of sodomy. It will likely be the case that more and more unsuspecting and uninformed Muslims will be put to trial through the far-reaching activities of this powerful and well-funded network. Thus, parents and community leaders need to ensure that effective obstacles are placed in front of the well-organized attempts to force an unhealthy lifestyle of sodomy upon their sons and same-sex attractions upon their daughters.³³⁷

Islāmic values regarding **chastity through sex within marriage and building a stable, happy family** should be imparted from the appropriate age and the **different but complementary roles** of males and females should be highlighted and made clear. The distinctive qualities of **masculinity** and **femininity** should be cultivated in boys and girls respectively so that gender roles are clear and apparent, ensuring a good strong cement for family and society. Implementing

homosexual activists and “gay” lobby groups actively campaign to reduce or abolish age of sexual consent laws because this would open up the world of pseudo-consensual sodomy with younger boys.

³³⁷ From their multiple combined efforts: a) Sexual liberation organizations targeting children by campaigning against age of sexual consent laws, doing so in the name of *child rights*, *human rights*, and *child safety*. b) Sexualizing children on the basis of Alfred Kinsey's horrendous research into infant sex. c) Fighting against alleged *sexual ageism* as a means of breaking the barriers which prevent children from adopting homosexual behaviours. d) Academics working to destigmatize and normalize pedophilia, connecting it with *human rights*. e) Using the fields of psychology and psychiatry to soften public opinion towards homosexuality and pedophilia. f) Using *child abuse* experts (or working as them) to declare parents enemies, oppressors and abusers of their children. g) Using public schools as recruiting grounds by sending trained homosexual spokesmen to speak about *diversity*, *gender issues* and *human rights*. h) Using the literary and entertainment industries to introduce homosexual-pedophilic themes to children.

and adhering to the Sunnah as it relates to cultivation of children,³³⁸ family life and marriage³³⁹ is the means of safety from social and cultural subversion, eroding of traditional family values and recruitment into a potentially harmful, disease-ridden lifestyle.

No sensible parent who has considered the scientific evidence wants their child to adopt a lifestyle with a highly-elevated risk of HIV-AIDS and syphilis which are predominantly homosexual diseases in the West. Similarly, if and when pro-sodomy lobbying groups have successfully lobbied to reduce the age of sexual consent to 12 (as they had done in the Netherlands),³⁴⁰ no parent wants to envisage

³³⁸ Children start being aware of beauty and feel attraction from the age of seven in general. There are rules and guidelines in the Sunnah which aim to protect the innocence, purity and development of the child as they progress towards puberty and maturity (adulthood), thereby keeping them chaste and upon their natural biological inclination. These injunctions such as covering in front of them, separating them in their beds when they reach a certain age, teaching them to seek permission when entering upon their parents at certain times during the day and night and so on are very important and should be adhered to.

³³⁹ Early marriage is encouraged in Islām for whoever reaches legal age and has the means and ability. Forced marriage however is illegal in the Islāmic Sharīah and is a major sin.

³⁴⁰ Pro-sodomy activist groups in the Netherlands such as the COC were very active during the 1970s and 1980s and lobbied for the age of consent to be reduced to 12 years. A new law appeared in 1991 stating that sex with children between 12-15 was illegal but prosecution would only take place if the minor, the parents or child protection services pressed charges. Children could be exploited and put under pressure by pedophiles not to press charges. This opened the door for pedophiles to do as they wished so long as nobody went to the police. The Netherlands became a paradise for pedophiles and prostitution rings for sodomizing boys began to appear. A child porn industry developed and the Netherlands became a tourist centre for homosexual pedophiles from the rest of Europe and beyond. Today, the Netherlands is embroiled in the **Joris Demmink** scandal, a high ranking political figure involved in homosexual child abuse but so far protected from prosecution due to his high connections and the fear that his trial will implicate and expose many other high ranking figures for having full knowledge of or participating in similar abuse. Demmink was the Secretary General of the Ministry of Justice at the Hague.

their 12-year old son arriving at a hospital emergency department with a foreign body such as a light-bulb or broom handle lodged in his rectum. Nor does any parent want to envisage their 12 year old son being “fisted” by a 35 year old man through *pseudo-consent*. In light of the evidence presented in this work, concerned parents with children in public schools have a right to request school boards to disclose any and all activities aimed, directly or indirectly, at hypersexualizing children. The names of activists or speakers invited to the school should be requested so that any possible connections to pedophiles, pedophile organizations or pedophile legitimization agendas can be researched and examined. Any interactions of schools with “gay-rights” activism organizations should be enquired into in order to investigate those organizations for possible direct or indirect support for pedophilia-oriented causes. Recommended reading books for all ages should be scrutinized for any overt or subtle pedophile themes.³⁴¹ The reason for this is simple: To ensure that your child is protected from being recruited into a risky, harmful-to-health, exploitable homosexual lifestyle for the benefit of predatory pedophiles whose existence within **gay activism, education, entertainment** and **politics** is undeniable.

On a final note, we reiterate that it is illegal to incite violence against homosexuals under UK, US, EU and other laws. One may disagree with and factually criticize their ideas, risky lifestyle practices and their openly-stated agendas to market this lifestyle through their own admissions and statements, all well within the law. But incitement to criminal conduct is illegal.

Abū Zaynab ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qawīm
25th July 2015

³⁴¹ In the US, The Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network (GLSEN) actively promotes pro-pedophile books to educational institutions. These books promote and normalize sexual relations between early teens and adults.

WHY HOMOSEXUALITY IS PROHIBITED IN ISLĀM

Homosexuality is a cultural lifestyle centered around the practice of sodomy. In Islām it is strictly prohibited for a man to have anal intercourse even with a woman as it is considered immoral, a minor form of sodomy with men and a doorway to it. Scientific evidence is plentiful that abuse of the rectum in this way is tied to anal cancer and transmission of what are predominantly Western homosexual diseases such as AIDS and syphilis. Pro-sodomy activists employ the courts, legislation, public schools, media, film, literary fiction and other avenues to impose non-factual beliefs upon populations which are then used to legalize sodomy and promote homosexual lifestyles. The greatest non-factual belief around which modern "gay activism" revolves is the claim that homosexual attraction is genetically determined and immutable like skin, eye and hair colour. A grand marketing campaign was devised around this claim by two homosexual activists named **Marshall Kirk** and **Hunter Madsen** after the US Supreme Court ruling in the 1986 *Bowers vs Hardwick* case which rejected privacy right arguments and maintained the right of individual states to criminalize consensual sodomy. They wrote in their 1989 publication titled, "*After the Ball*" the following, "The campaign we outline in this book, though complex, depends centrally upon a program of unabashed propaganda, firmly grounded in long-established principles of psychology and advertising." This hard-hitting book is packed with irrefutable evidence which dissects and dismantles homosexual propaganda and highlights the dangers of sodomy and the cultural lifestyle built around it. It also reveals the irrefutable link between homosexuality, campaigns to overturn age of sexual consent laws and pedophilia. This work is an essential must read for every Muslim parent, teacher and community leader and is an expression of the freedom of speech. Nothing in this work incites violence against homosexuals in any form or fashion. The right to factually and scientifically criticize any idea, belief or practice (such as sodomy) is protected under freedom of speech laws so long as criminal conduct is not advocated. This work is therefore a peaceful expression of the *freedom of speech* within the *rule of law*.

