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Introduction
Heterosexuals have rebelled against the norms that have held civilization together for all of human history. This rebellion has become the defining characteristic of the heterosexual community. Its members have no common language, religion, music, or other typical unifying norm. What heterosexuals have in common is the one thing that makes them different from everyone else — their sexual preference.¹

Heterosexuality is becoming increasingly more difficult to ignore. It is being forced upon us through legislation, taught to our children in school and promoted in the powerful arts/entertainment complex. If it is true that heterosexuality has the destructive effects on the individual and society that many believe, then it behooves us to know our enemy and forestall any further advance of heterosexuality by understanding what it is, what the heterosexual community is up to, and how to answer their arguments in the open marketplace of ideas.²

What Heterosexuals Do
Heterosexuals would have you believe that the heterosexual lifestyle is perfectly normal. They will tell you that their lifestyle choice should be the benchmark for society. But a closer look shows that their lifestyle isn’t as safe or as desirable as heterosexual militants say it is.

Let’s begin with the heterosexual ideal of chastity. Heterosexual women were historically expected to be virgins on their wedding day, but heterosexual men always enjoyed a double standard. When Alfred Kinsey released his book Sexual Behavior and the Human Male in 1948, he found that 83% of 25-year-old men had premarital intercourse.³ But when his companion book on women’s sexual behavior came out in 1953, only 33% of 25-year-old women had premarital intercourse.⁴

But things had changed remarkably by 1974, when Redbook magazine conducted a national sex survey of over 100,000 women who represented the mainstream of American life. When that survey revealed that 93% of heterosexual women who married after 1973 had premarital intercourse, the authors triumphantly declared an end to the double standard.⁵

That Redbook survey was thirty years ago, and today pre-marital sex is probably the worst kept secret in the heterosexual lifestyle, despite heterosexual leaders continuing to talk about the virtues of abstinence until marriage. But heterosexuals are far from abstinent – gay and bisexual men are three times more likely to be abstinent than heterosexual men over a 12-month period.⁶ When it comes to abstinence, the heterosexual agenda has clearly come up short.
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Heterosexuals indulge in all sorts of practices that go far beyond penile-vaginal contact. *Redbook* revealed that 90% of heterosexual women engaged in oral-penile contact, and these women reported that their sexual partners were just as eager to perform oral-vaginal contact. More recently, a survey of heterosexual college students showed that 95% to 98% admitted to having had oral sex. Another survey of heterosexual men of all ages showed that more than 95% had experienced oral-penile sex, and 96% engaged in oral-vaginal contact.

But it’s not just oral sex. Militant heterosexual researcher Paul Cameron conducted a survey that found 36% of all men who behaved heterosexually engaged in anal intercourse with women, and 20% of women who behaved heterosexually reported anal sex with men. Another survey showed that 53% of men have experienced rectal penetration during sex, (i.e., by a finger, vibrator, or tongue), — 56% of that group did it regularly — and another 9% wanted to try it. Half of the women who participated in the *Redbook* survey had experienced anal sex. In terms of absolute numbers, approximately seven times more women than gay men engage in unprotected receptive anal intercourse.

**Sexual Obsession**

Heterosexuals are clearly obsessed with sex. It’s the only thing separating them from everyone else. They single-handedly invented the sexual revolution with the introduction of “the pill,” and heterosexual promiscuity has become the hallmark of that sex-obsessed lifestyle ever since.

According to one nationally representative study, heterosexual men aged 20 to 39 had on average 7.3 sexual partners in their still-young lifetimes. Meanwhile, a parallel study of all gay men over the age of 21 found that they had on average 4.2 partners in their lifetime — even though the range of ages for the gay men surveyed was far wider than those in the straight men’s survey.

In 2004, a random-sampled poll by ABC News found that heterosexual men had an average of twenty different sexual partners in their lifetime, 39% had sex on the first date, and 15% of men paid for sex at some time in their lives. For single heterosexual men over thirty, more than 30% had paid for sex. A 2005 Zogby International poll found that nearly 25% of men and 13% of women had more than twenty-five different partners in their lifetimes. Another national survey found that 72% of all men who were married for two years or more admitted to having an extramarital affair. Only 55% of college-aged heterosexual men could name all of their past lovers — even though these respondents were still young.

**Sex Toys and Sadism**

Most drug addicts are on the constant lookout for a new and better high. This often leads them to harder and more dangerous drugs. Many heterosexuals follow the same path by turning away from “normal” sexual practices when they no longer provide the stimulation they are looking for. This leads them to turn to increasingly bizarre and dangerous activity in their constant search of new ways to satisfy their sexual addictions.

Twenty percent of women admitted to placing vibrators, phallic objects and other objects in their vaginas. And as emergency room doctors can attest, some of these “other objects” can be quite unusual. Examples include fruits and vegetables, bones, billiard balls, thermometers, swizzle sticks, bottles, drinking glasses, salt shakers, television...
tubes, wooden shoetrees, pencils, vibrators,\textsuperscript{21} dolls,\textsuperscript{22} even a perfume bottle and its cap.\textsuperscript{23}

One 41-year-old woman was drinking with her boyfriend when they decided to experiment with a potato. She had to go to the emergency room to have it removed from her vagina. Another 30-year-old woman was admitted so that a cap from a family-size bottle of hair mousse could be removed.\textsuperscript{24} A 44-year-old woman was admitted to the emergency room complaining of a greenish vaginal discharge. Doctors discovered a size AA Duracell battery in her vagina. It had been there so long it had corroded and started to leak. Another woman was admitted complaining of discomfort and a whitish discharge. After a brief examination, doctors found and removed a deodorant stick. That woman was 32 weeks pregnant!\textsuperscript{25}

This compulsion towards new sexual experiences has made bondage and torture sex a growing part of the heterosexual lifestyle. One survey of heterosexual college students found 38% of men and 31% of women participated in bondage during sex, while 43% of men and 33% of women engaged in spanking as part of sex.\textsuperscript{26}

Enthusiasts can even attend conventions and workshops, where they can learn about bondage “safety”, harnessing, vaginal fisting, and “sacred sexuality and cutting” (which can include a “demonstration of cutting with a life subject”).\textsuperscript{27} A Detroit-area hotel finally cancelled a two-day bondage conference and workshop after locals voiced outrage over such a public display.\textsuperscript{28}

**Polyamory And The Slippery Slope**

Some of this sexual addiction has reached a fevered pitch. Swinging, or wife-swapping, has become increasingly popular, especially among younger heterosexuals where “polyamory” has achieved a cosmopolitan caché.\textsuperscript{29} According to militant heterosexual Paul Cameron, 22% of heterosexual men had participated in a threesome, orgy, or group sex.\textsuperscript{30}

One group of swingers known as the Lifestyles Organization drew more than 3,000 wife-swappers from all over the world to their annual conference in Las Vegas, where entire hotel rooms and hospitality suites were dedicated to group sex.\textsuperscript{31} In Orlando, teenage soccer players and their parents were confronted with public displays of sex and nudity when their team was lodged in a hotel that was hosting a swinger’s convention.\textsuperscript{32}

Society has struggled throughout human history to contain the spread of polygamy, with mixed results. With the increasing popularity of wife-swapping and polyamory, arguments against polygamy may be more difficult to maintain. Polygamy has historically been a heterosexual activity, practiced by religious groups and cultures that are especially hostile to non-heterosexuals.

Polygamy was once legal in Utah, but was supposedly banned before Utah became a state. Yet that hasn’t prevented heterosexual polygamists from taking over whole towns in Utah and Arizona.\textsuperscript{33} These polygamist “families” have exploited their own children in demanding that everyone else accept their lifestyle choices.\textsuperscript{34} And why not? The continuing disregard for all of the
other rules for decent behavior has led to a slippery slope towards the re-emergence of the ancient practice of polygamy.

**The Heterosexual Lifestyle Goes Public**

Heterosexuals now boldly and publically celebrate their lifestyle choices in sex-charged festivals and parades. Thousands of people turned out for a parade of leather-clad topless porn stars in Auckland, New Zealand — a parade that drew more onlookers than the city’s annual Santa Parade at Christmas time.35

Mardi Gras is famous for images of eroticism, public nudity, and public sex. When this sexually charged atmosphere is mixed with massive consumption of alcohol, inhibitions quickly disappear. Almost a third of Mardi Gras participants reported having vaginal sex with someone they met there, and 16% reported having oral sex.36 All of this “legitimate” fun is officially promoted and celebrated, exposing families with children to open debauchery.

College spring break is even more notorious. The “Girls Gone Wild” video series, which is openly advertised on television for children to see, cashes in on this notoriety by exploiting these students’ sexual adventures. Among college women at spring break, 57% agreed that the best way to fit in is to be sexually promiscuous, and only one in five regretted their sexual activity.37

But heterosexuals don’t need spring break or Mardi Gras to publicly display their sexual proclivities. Among college students, 56% of heterosexual men and 46% of women had gone skinny-dipping, 65% of men and 42% of women had public sex, and 21% of men had been in a threesome.38 Among adults, 57% of American heterosexuals had sex outdoors, 42% consider themselves sexually adventurous, and 12% have had sex in the workplace.39

**Heterosexuality In The Classroom**

With heterosexuality gaining such widespread public acceptance, it should come as no surprise that children would emulate their parents’ lifestyle choices. These young and impressionable kids are being initiated into heterosexuality earlier than ever before. At the start of the twentieth century, fewer than 10% of heterosexual women had pre-marital sex before the age of 18. But today, that figure is well over 50%.40 In one study of adolescent girls aged 14-17, the average age at which they started having sex was thirteen.41

Boys aren’t exactly falling behind either. A nationally representative survey of boys aged 15-19 found 55% had vaginal sex, 52.5% were masturbated by a girl, 49% received oral sex, 38.6% gave oral sex, and 11% had anal sex with a girl.42 Another study found 36% of boys already had five or more sex partners before leaving high school, and nearly 30% had at least three different sex partners in the previous three months alone.43

There is considerable evidence that children are starting to have sex at younger ages thanks to the active encouragement of militant heterosexual activists. One such activist, Paul Cameron, wrote a sex advice manual for parents in which he encouraged them to provide a room, a bathroom, snacks and privacy for their children to practice various forms of sexual activity.44 And it looks like some parents may be taking this advice to heart. More than a third of high school students in one survey admitted to sexual activities right in their own parents’ home.45
**Virgins Or “Virgins”?**
Heterosexual teenagers often don’t consider anything besides vaginal intercourse as “real sex.” This means that those who claim to be “virgins” aren’t nearly as innocent as they appear. Among young women who claimed to be virgins, 69% admitted to oral sex, 78% admitted to masturbation with someone else, and 52% admitted to genital-to-genital contact that didn’t involve vaginal penetration. Many of these “virgins” can be quite active. A survey of heterosexual college students found that one “virgin” had oral sex with ten partners in her still-young lifetime.

Many heterosexual adolescents who take “virginity” pledges aren’t virgins even in the strictest sense of the word. One nationally representative survey asked adolescents about their sexual history and whether they had taken virginity pledges in 1995 and again in 1996. Of those who took “virginity” pledges in 1996, 28% had admitted to sexual activity when asked in 1995 but lied about it in 1996. Another survey of devout Baptist newlyweds (all of them “professed faith in Christ,” 99% attended church weekly, and 84% grew up in church) found that only 27% of them “entered the marriage bed chaste.”

**The Medical Consequences of Heterosexuality**
Syphilis was unknown in Europe until about 1500, when sailors on Columbus’ expeditions to the New World carried hitherto unknown diseases back to the Old World. Traveling heterosexuals have been enthusiastic participants in this biological swapmeet ever since. Heterosexual travelers carried so many tropical diseases to New York City that it had to institute a Tropical Disease Center. Many heterosexuals are employed as food handlers.

Sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) now run rampant through the heterosexual lifestyle, and this has significantly altered the delivery of medical care to the population at large. Doctors must now ask probing questions of their patients or risk making a misdiagnosis. The evaluation of a sore throat must now include questions about oral and anal sex. In one study of heterosexual couples in New York, 56% of the men and 60% of the women reported having had an STD in their lifetime — with 51% complaining of STD symptoms in just the previous ninety days.

Women bear the brunt of many sexually transmitted diseases like syphilis and gonorrhea because they rarely experience symptoms. And since they are less likely to experience symptoms, they can pass these diseases on to other sexual partners without knowing it. Furthermore, vaginas are an especially efficient breeding ground for organisms, including Gardnerella vaginalis (73%), Chlamydia trachomatis (68%), Mycoplasma hominis (48%), Trichomaniasis vaginalis (24%), bacterial vaginosis (57%), candida albican (10%), and even fecal bacteria (36%).

Oral-genital contact is nearly universal among heterosexuals. Semen contains many of the germs carried in the blood. Because of this, heterosexuals who practice oral sex verge on consuming raw human blood, with all its medical risks. Since the penis often has tiny lesions (and often will have been in unsanitary places), individuals so involved...
Many heterosexual men deliberately infect their sexual partners.

may become infected with hepatitis A or gonorrhea (and even HIV and hepatitis B). Because the mouth was not designed to receive a penis, vigorous physical activity can cause bruising and serious damage, a condition that doctors have dubbed “Fellatio Syndrome”. But for all these dangers of oral-genital contact, oral-vaginal contact can be deadly. Air can become trapped inside the vagina during oral-vaginal sex, causing sudden death from air embolism.

In one national random sample, nearly 26% of women and girls over the age of twelve were found to have Herpes-2. A study of 14- to 17-year old girls in Indianapolis found 59% were infected with Herpes-1 and an astounding 77% were infected with high-risk forms of the human papillomavirus (HPV).

HPV, a leading cause of cervical cancer, is the most common STD in the United States, with an estimated 5.5 million persons newly infected every year. More women die from cervical cancer each year than from AIDS, and sex with men is one of the five risk factors associated with cervical cancer. Because lesbians aren’t engaging in heterosexual activity, they often mistakenly believe they are safe from cervical cancer. But because of the dangers posed by having sex with men, they may be at risk if they had previously experimented in heterosexuality.

Chlamydia can cause pelvic inflammatory disease, ectopic pregnancy, infertility, or chronic pelvic pain in women. Because heterosexual men are far more likely to be carriers of this disease, sex with men can be especially dangerous for women. One study showed that heterosexual men in Montreal were five times more likely to be infected with Chlamydia than homosexual men. In London, only 2.5% of gay men had Chlamydia, as compared to 32% of heterosexual men and 28% of heterosexual women.

The dangers posed by heterosexuality have taken a very deadly turn in the past thirty years. AIDS simmered in Africa as far back as 1959, where heterosexuals quietly passed it around for twenty years before it finally exploded onto the scene in Europe and Haiti. Heterosexuals passed the disease on to gay men in the United States in the late 1970’s, and gay men have exacted a terrible price since then for heterosexuals’ recklessness.

Even though it was heterosexuals who brought AIDS out of Africa, you’ll never guess what solution they have gall to suggest in order to bring a halt to this pandemic. Amazingly, it’s heterosexuality! Yet the heterosexual lifestyle has continued to aid the spread of the disease. In 2005, the largest percentage (39%) of people with AIDS in the U.S. were located in the southeastern states – where radical heterosexual “values” are the norm – and that region has experienced the fastest growth over the past five years. Meanwhile, the number of new AIDS cases has actually decreased over the same time period in the northeast and the west, where heterosexuals are more reluctant to impose their lifestyle choices onto everyone else.

One reason for the failure of the heterosexual lifestyle is that many heterosexual men deliberately infect their sexual partners. One national probability-sampled survey showed that 25% of men had knowingly had sex with a woman even though they were infected with an STD. And heterosexual “marriage” does little to encourage safe sex. Heterosexually active HIV-positive men are almost twice as likely to engage in unprotected
sex if they are married or have a regular girlfriend. Another survey showed that only 11% heterosexuals with multiple sex partners always use condoms with their primary sexual partner.

Sex and Drugs — A Volatile Mix
This unsafe behavior is often compounded by drug use, which is an integral part of the heterosexual lifestyle. College students who engage in heterosexuality are 30% more likely to use marijuana than gay students, and they are nearly 40% more likely to use other drugs. Among Redbook readers, 90% of heterosexual women admitted to initiating sex while under the influence of alcohol, and 30% had sex after smoking marijuana. For women under twenty, marijuana use before sex skyrocketed to 63%, with 45% of them using it often. In another survey of college students, more than a third of men and a fifth of women smoked marijuana to enhance sex.

The consequences of all this drug use can be disastrous. According to one random survey, women who smoked marijuana weekly were three times more likely to report engaging in risky sex, and men were twice as likely to do so. Another survey showed that 66% of heterosexuals had unprotected sex while under the influence of alcohol, and 26% had unprotected sex while using illegal drugs.

The Danger To The Family
The sexual brokenness of heterosexuals has taken a tremendous toll on the traditional American family. Thanks to “no-fault” divorce, the divorce rate has doubled between 1960 and 1980. Today almost half of all marriages end in divorce. Meanwhile, the rate of cohabiting couples has exploded more than 1100% since 1960. It is estimated that a quarter of all unmarried women aged 25 to 30 are currently living with a partner, and another quarter have lived with a partner sometime in the past.

This is not just an American phenomenon. Heterosexuals have caused tremendous damage to the institution of marriage throughout the world. Nowhere is this more evident than in Scandinavia, where marriage had been in serious decline for decades. It took the legalization of same-sex unions to finally reverse in these trends.

Today, more people in Scandinavia are getting married than ever before, and fewer children are being born out of wedlock since the start of same-sex unions. After Denmark legalized gay unions in 1989, the marriage rate climbed 20%, reversing a forty-year slide, while the divorce rate went down to the lowest levels since the advent of “no fault” divorce. Similar dramatic results were seen in Norway and Sweden. If given a chance, gays and lesbians may yet be able save the institution of marriage that heterosexuals nearly destroyed over the past half-century.

The Danger To Children
Heterosexuals live in a youth-obsessed culture where “pedophilia chic” has reigned for decades. Brooke Shields was only fifteen when she declared, “nothing comes between me and my Cal-vin Klein jeans,” and Britney Spears has inspired school girls the world over to bare their midriffs. The JonBenet Ramsey murder case revealed a whole subculture of child pageants, where parents provocatively dressed their little girls in a heavily sexualized manner. Heterosexuals have made no

Recruitment can take many forms, but the most direct method may be when they prey on children sexually.
A longtime leader of the Oregon Christian Coalition admitted to sexual activities with three underage children.

secret of the fact that they want to recruit our children into their lifestyle, and they have taken to the schools to advance their agenda. Recruitment can take many forms, but the most direct method may be when they prey on children sexually.

In the past decade, 159 coaches in Washington State alone have been fired or reprimanded for sex offenses ranging from harassment to rape. Nearly all were men preying on girls. Ninety-eight of them were allowed to remain teaching, which means they were still allowed access to children.

In Texas, more than sixty middle and high school coaches were fired for sexual misconduct over a four year period. But because heterosexuals have such a firm grip on the educational system, special hush-hush deals were routinely cut to allow these coaches to go free and offend again.

And what’s true for the sports field is true for the classroom. At a different Texas high school, a 42-year-old male teacher’s aide and several students organized a heterosexual “sex club”, where teenage girls offered oral sex to senior football players. A San Diego-area elementary school teacher was convicted in 2005 of molesting four of his second and third grade students. One teacher in Washington State persuaded ten of his female students to pose nude for pictures he posted on the internet. In another case in southern California, Eric Norman Olsen, a substitute teacher in Ontario, molested as many as 200 young girls over a three year period. Some of these girls had learning difficulties. While the most notorious cases sometimes make the news, many more are swept under the rug by the heterosexual-dominated school boards and administrators.

Because heterosexuals have permeated our culture so fully, it has become very difficult to recognize where the danger lies. One prominent expert, who had just completed an exhaustive study of child molesters, warned parents:

Many child molesters try to move themselves into positions or occupations within the community that will allow them to spend time alone with children without attracting much notice. Molesters often become youth ministers, day-care workers, Boy Scout leaders, teachers, Big Brothers, and pediatricians...

Heterosexuals often try to blame gay men and women for sexual crimes against children, but experts note that heterosexuals are far more likely to fit the profile of a sexual predator:

In over 12 years of clinical experience working with child molesters, we have yet to see any example of a regression from an adult homosexual orientation. The child offender who is also attracted to and engaged in adult relationships is heterosexual.

Our study shows that [the sexual predator] is most often Caucasian between the ages of 20 and 40. He typically has had more than one year of college and holds a full-time job. As a rule, he is married and has children of his own who he usually does not molest. His is almost always a well-respected, even loved, member of his community. His is often an active Christian who is involved with his church. He never assaults children he does not know; he only chooses children with whom he can first build a trusting relationship.
Sex with children is so pervasive among heterosexuals that it has reached into the very highest echelons of the militant heterosexual movement. Lou Beres, a longtime leader of the Oregon Christian Coalition finally admitted to sexual activities with three underage girls — a young sister-in-law and two friends of his daughter. Yet he remained an active leader in the Oregon Christian Coalition a year after these allegations first came to light.  

With all of the dangers that children face in the world, they should be able to find refuge in their homes. Unfortunately, that refuge is where some heterosexual parents take advantage of their unfettered access to their children. According to official statistics from the Department of Justice, 27% of all child sexual abuse takes place among family members, and 49% of all abused children under the age of six were abused by relatives.

The callousness with which some heterosexuals abuse their own children is chilling. One man in a small Michigan city persuaded his girlfriend’s 14-year-old daughter to have sex with him in exchange for clothing and body piercings. He also had sex with his own 12-year-old daughter in exchange for a pack of cigarettes. Another Michigan woman helped her boyfriend rape her 11-year-old daughter who was disabled with cerebral palsy. A 13-year-old girl in Texas was placed in temporary state custody after her father sexually assaulted her, then later tried to sell her to neighbors for $100 to “do whatever” for the evening. Another father, a registered sex offender, used his 7-year-old daughter’s sleepovers as an opportunity to molest four young girls.

But heterosexual predators aren’t limited to men. There is growing recognition that heterosexual women are also abusing children at an alarming rate. In one national study of heterosexual men, 35% had experienced oral-vaginal sex for the first time by the age of ten, and 17% had experienced fellatio by then.

But even if they’re caught and prosecuted, women predators often serve little to no jail time. Donna Lopus got only a three year work release jail sentence for sex with a sixteen year boy. Traci Tapp served only 3 years of house arrest for having sex with a 15 year old student. Middle school teacher Sarah Bench-Salorio was convicted in 2005 of sexually assaulting 11-, 12-, and 13-year-old boys. She faced more than 60 years behind bars, but the judge gave her six. And Debra LaFave, who at 25 repeatedly had sex with a 14-year-old boy in 2005, did not serve a single day in prison.

**The Danger to Society**

Heterosexuals pose a danger to society in ways we can barely imagine. According to the findings of militant heterosexual activist Paul Cameron:

- 52% of heterosexual men have shoplifted. The figure is 36% for heterosexual women.
- 38% of heterosexual men had a traffic accident in the past 5 years.
- 34% of heterosexual men committed a crime without being caught. The figure is 15% for women.
- 27% of heterosexual men contemplated suicide. The figure is 34% for women.

When a survey asked heterosexual men if they had ever wanted to rape a woman, only 38% answered “no.”
What these **zealots** really want is to shove everyone who believes differently than they into the **closet**.

- 24% of heterosexual men had sex in front of others.
- 20% of heterosexual women have obtained an abortion.
- 22% of heterosexual men have been arrested for a crime.
- 17% of heterosexual men had sex in public.
- 16% of heterosexual men have been in a physical fight in the last year.
- 13% of heterosexual men were jailed for a crime.
- 12% of heterosexual men committed murder or attempted murder.

Heterosexual men account for the overwhelming majority of criminal activity. This predisposition to violence can have severe consequences for the wives and girlfriends of heterosexual men. According to the National Violence Against Women Survey commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice, women are nearly three times more likely to be beaten, raped or stalked by male partners than by female partners. And heterosexual women were 32% more likely to report being beaten, raped or stalked by their male partners than gay men were by their male partners.¹⁰⁹

When heterosexual activist Alan Chambers reviewed the domestic violence statistics, he blamed the violence on an extreme sense of unhappiness that often leads to addictive behaviors.¹⁰⁰ If true, these addictive behaviors in the context of unhealthy heterosexual relationships simply add more fuel to the cycle of violence. It’s no wonder that when another survey asked heterosexual men if they had ever wanted to rape a woman, only 37% answered “no.”¹⁰¹

**How Far Will They Go?**

Though they would like you to believe otherwise, the heterosexual activists do not concern themselves with the welfare of individuals. They are not dedicated to the betterment of society or the freedom of the people. What these zealots really want to do is shove everyone who believes differently than they into the closet and throw away the key. Like many other extremist groups, they are concerned with furthering a political agenda and rebuilding the infrastructure of traditional morality.¹⁰²

And there seems to be no end to how far heterosexual militants are willing to impose their values on everyone else. They’ve sought to tear families apart by taking children away from their gay parents, they’ve tried to bar gays and lesbians access to health care by denying domestic partnership benefits, and they’ve kicked out law-abiding men and women from the armed forces. Some have advocated tattooing gay men,¹⁰³ while more radical heterosexual militants have even suggested the possibility of “extermination.”¹⁰⁴ Congressman William Dannemeyer (R-CA) agreed, telling Attorney General C. Everett Koop that they should “wipe them off the face of the earth.”¹⁰⁵ One high-profile Baptist minister continues his call for all nations to impose the death penalty on gays and lesbians.¹⁰⁶
Genuine Compassion
Heterosexuals are clearly deeply dysfunctional and self-destructive. They deserve our compassion and help, but not our approval for the dangerous behaviors they engage in.\textsuperscript{107} Because we care about them and those tempted to join them, it is important that we neither encourage nor legitimize such a destructive lifestyle.\textsuperscript{108} There is no way to remain neutral on this issue. If we are to combat the destructive effects of heterosexuality socially and personally, we must face the reality, understand the agenda, and answer the arguments.\textsuperscript{109} Our families, our communities, and our American way of life depend on it.

Because we care about \textit{them}, it is important that we neither encourage nor legitimize such a \textit{destructive lifestyle}.
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How To Write An Anti-Gay Tract In Fifteen Easy Steps

The Heterosexual Agenda: Exposing The Myths is a parody. I wrote it to show how Focus on the Family, American Family Association, and many others produce some pretty convincing anti-gay books, videos, web pages, and other tracts. In doing so, I used social science research exactly as they do. The only difference between what I did and what they do is this: I showed you exactly what I did every step of the way.

I have counted fifteen key steps to writing an anti-gay tract. But there is one common element that ties these steps together: fear. Each step builds on the previous one, reinforcing the things the writer wants his readers to be afraid of. It starts with a fearful premise reinforced with fearful “facts,” and leads to the fearful consequences of those “facts.” It ends with a fearful depiction of the future for our society if these fearful problems aren’t dealt with.

Fear is a great motivator. The proliferation of negative political ads is based on the unfortunate discovery that voters can be more easily motivated to vote their fears than their hopes. Tracts like these don’t enlighten anyone and they don’t provide any useful information. But they do instill fear, and that’s the point.

In examining their work, I have counted fifteen key steps to writing a successful anti-gay tract. If you were to sit down to write one, you wouldn’t necessarily have to follow all fifteen steps. Some may not apply depending on the particular subject you’re working with. But the more of these steps you follow, the closer your work will come to matching the “best” that these anti-gay groups have to offer.

Step 1: Set the stage. Most anti-gay tracts begin with a short opening section similar to mine. This is where you quickly dispense with the notion that gays and lesbians are actually human beings, let alone friends, family, neighbors and fellow citizens. Instead, gays and lesbians are portrayed as a faceless sex-obsessed hoard representing a dark and ominous force in American culture.

It’s important to set this stage right away — to make sure your reader is on board with the premise that the rich and complex lives of gays and lesbians can be reduced to one singular component — because it leads directly to the subject that many Americans find very uncomfortable: sex.

Step 2: Talk about sex. A lot. Most general-topic anti-gay tracts begin with a detailed description of sexual practices. There’s a good reason for that: no one looks good when their entire life is reduced to one-dimensional statistical descriptions of sexual practices.

Talking about sex can be rather gross, but don’t let that stop you. In fact, that’s the whole point. You want your audience to share your revulsion of gays and lesbians, and this is the easiest way to do it. Talk about sex as though it were the only thing that matters to gays and lesbians. Not love, not relationships, not commitment, not families – just sex.

To reinforce this point, anti-gay writers make extensive use of the term “homosexual” throughout their tracts. By constantly emphasizing “homosexual” instead of using the terms “gay” or “lesbian”, the sexual component of gays and lesbians is emphasized above all other aspects of their lives. And the more you portray gays and lesbians as sex-obsessed homosexuals, maybe
your readers won’t notice the irony of your tract being obsessed with the sex lives of supposedly “sex-obsessed” people.

**Step 3: Use plenty of references.** Professionals are smart people, and smart people use lots of footnotes or endnotes.

An abundance of reference citations gives your article a scholarly tone and allow you to build trust with your readers. With them, your descriptions of those fearsome homosexuals will have the full backing of professional authorities. Having lots of references is probably the most important step you can take in building a convincing anti-gay tract.

And there is an additional beauty to having plenty of reference citations: while footnotes are impressive, nobody actually reads them. You can use virtually any source you want to and nobody will bother to see whether it actually means anything or not. Having seen your extensive reference citations, they’ll just take your word for it.

Another advantage to using lots of reference citations is this: once your reader gets accustomed to seeing them sprinkled throughout the page, you can easily slip in all sorts of “facts” without providing any source citation at all. Once you have established “cred” you can do just about anything.

**Step 4: Cite authoritative sources, such as national probability-sampled surveys or governmental statistics.** If you want your readers to be afraid of your target, you have to give them lots of reasons to be fearful. The best place to start is by using reliable surveys and governmental statistics, sources that everyone can trust.

But you’ll find that it’s not so easy to get the really juicy statistics you’re looking for this way. For one thing, Americans — gay or straight — are generally not that sexually adventurous, and these surveys tend to back that up. And for another, because of the expense of mounting these surveys, they typically don’t get enough gay men and women for making valid comparisons. Because the margins of error for these smaller subgroups are just too high, it only takes a few screwballs to throw the averages off.

But if you can use these more reliable surveys to your advantage then go right ahead. Be sure to brag that you’re using a nationally representative study — this is something you don’t want to hide.

You can also use official governmental reports to back up your arguments. While these reports aren’t necessarily representative studies, they have the advantage of being **official**, which presumes a lack of bias. Whether this is really true or not is a matter of debate, but that’s okay. The only people debating it are academics and activists, not your average reader.

---

**A Personal Note About References**

Having said all of that about references in step 3, I wish to add a more personal note. I, too, use footnotes, and sometimes I use lots of them. And that’s why I want to take this moment to invite you to look not only the references I cite here, but in all of my work.

I say this to emphasize a point. Unlike most anti-gay authors, **I do not expect anyone to take my word for anything.** I recognize that you have no reason to trust me about anything. And besides, I’m human, and am just as prone to simple errors as anyone. I know that few people actually look at references, but I urge you to look at mine — and everyone else’s. It’s the only way to evaluate whether a given claim is credible or not.

I try to provide as much information and clarity to everything I write so that it can be more transparent and easily verifiable. If you find an error or mistake in how I cite a reference — or if you think I am misrepresenting someone else’s work — please contact me and I will address the problem as quickly as possible.
When you cite governmental statistics, you are, as far as your readers are concerned, staking your claim to the full faith and credit of the United States of America. It’s hard to get any more authoritative than that.

**Step 5: Slip in other less reliable “random” surveys.** As I said before, Americans aren’t generally that adventurous, so it’s difficult to find the really scary stuff if you stick with probability-sampled surveys. But that’s okay because there are many more wide-ranging surveys to choose from which are not probability-sampled. Some are representative of selected cities or regions which may not represent everyone nationally; others are hampered by methodological limitations which prevent them from being representative altogether.

When it’s time to switch to a less reliable survey, just quietly slip it in. Nobody will notice that you didn’t describe it as “probability-sampled.” And here’s a bonus trick: you can call some surveys a “national survey” even when it’s not probability sampled. If your readers just assume that it is, it’s not your fault. You didn’t say it was. Sins of omission don’t count in culture wars.

**Step 6: Cite casual surveys.** Anti-gay writers often cite casual sex surveys published by gay magazines such as The Advocate or Genre. When you’re ready for the really scary stuff, casual surveys like these can be an excellent source for salacious statistics even though they are utterly unreliable for providing **valid** statistics.

Not only do these surveys omit the views of non-readers, they many not even reflect the views of that magazine’s readership. At best, they only reflect the views of those who are motivated to fill out intimate and detailed questionnaires on sexuality. That’s why casual surveys tend to reflect the views of the more sexually adventurous, which makes them a favorite among anti-gay activists.

To learn more about the problems inherent with casual surveys, see our review of *The Gay Report* ([http://www.BoxTurtleBulletin.com/Articles/000,003.htm](http://www.BoxTurtleBulletin.com/Articles/000,003.htm)), a book based on a casual survey from the 1970’s that has long been a favorite source among anti-gay writers.

**Step 7: Add behavioral statistics using convenience samples from clinical research, especially STD/AIDS and other medical studies.** As with casual surveys, the pay-off here can be huge. But you need to be sneaky about it. For example, if you’re using a study based on people being treated for STDs, you cannot make that too obvious. (Well, you have to put the study’s title in your footnotes, but don’t worry. Like I said, nobody actually reads footnote.)

People who engage in risky sexual behavior are far more likely to contract an STD. This means that studies based on people recruited from STD clinics are far more likely to provide juicy statistics for sexual behavior. You can also find interesting statistics from studies of drug users or economically-stressed urban populations.

One misuse of an STD study is the case of the so-called “Dutch Study,” which supposedly proved that gay unions last only eighteen months and that gay couples average an additional eight partners per year outside. To learn exactly how they came up with this, see our report, *Straight From The Source: What The “Dutch Study” Really Says About Gay Couples* ([http://www.BoxTurtleBulletin.com/Articles/000,003.htm](http://www.BoxTurtleBulletin.com/Articles/000,003.htm)).

**Step 8: Manipulate the data.** This is where you can put your analytical skills to the test. As you delve into all of these studies, you’ll find that there is often more than one way to present the data. Of course, you’ll want to choose the method that depicts your targets in the worst possible light. There are many ways to do this.
Here is one popular trick: Notice how sometimes you might find some writers using awkward phrases like “those who behave homosexually” instead of simply saying “homosexuals.” Why do you suppose that is?

It turns out there is a very important difference. For anti-gay writers, one great opportunity for manipulation comes in deciding how to deal with bisexuals. Because bisexuals behave heterosexually as well as homosexually, you get to put them on whichever side that gives you the best outcome. All you have to do is work the numbers to see what works best for you.

Sometimes you can combine bisexuals with homosexuals (i.e., “those who behave homosexually”), and other times, you can combine them with heterosexuals (in which case, they usually just become “heterosexuals”). Or you can leave them out altogether. It’s all up to you. And you don’t have to be consistent about this – nobody else is. You can decide this on a case-by-case basis and adjust your descriptions accordingly.

Another opportunity arises when surveys oversample smaller populations in order to get a better snapshot of these smaller groups. The overall survey can be statistically adjusted to become a representative sample, but the smaller subset by itself is not. But that doesn’t mean you can’t use data from that smaller subset. When it comes to statistics, there are many ways to skin the onion.

**Step 9: Use your opponents’ words and actions against them.** This is where you really get to have fun. In any crowd, there is always a radical somewhere who is on a special mission to reform the world and enlighten the ignorant masses. Fortunately, this person is usually not shy about annoying everyone else with his proclamations. Thanks to people like this, you can always find that especially scary quote anytime you want. It saves you from having to make stuff up yourself.

But the way you use the quote is important: make sure you quote him as though he speaks for everyone. No matter who he is or how unpopular he may be, treat his opinions as though everyone you’re trying to marginalize unanimously agrees. And if you can pretend that the quote reveals a hidden agenda, you get extra bonus points.

**Step 10: Get really kinky.** After wading through all of this sex talk, your reader may have gotten a little desensitized after a while. That’s when you will need to kick it up a notch. Drugs, orgies, bondage, bestiality, polyamory — throw it all in there. Remember, this is all about fear. Don’t hold back now.

This is where the sensational nature of the popular press works in your favor. You can include lots of stories ripped from the headlines to make it hit home. And as you did with the nut-job extremists, make sure your readers are led to believe that everyone is doing it and this is where it all leads. With enough imagination, the slippery slope can slide in all sorts of directions.

**Step 11: Cite a threat to marriage and the family.** Now it’s time to make your readers afraid of the dangers posed by all of this sexual activity you’ve been describing. Threatening the institution of marriage and the family will be one of your most reliable themes.

Social conservatives have been decrying the breakdown of the traditional American family for decades. They cite gay marriage and adoptions as a threat to marriage and the family, despite the fact that the dramatic increase in the divorce rate was well underway long before Stonewall, the elimination of anti-sodomy laws, or marriage equality in Massachusetts.

But every problem has a bogeyman, and gays and lesbians who seek to enter the profoundly conser-
ative domain of marriage and family are the ones who are portrayed as making straight marriages a thing of the past.

**Step 12: Cite a threat to health.** Medical doctors are nothing if not meticulous note-takers, and you will find just about anything you could ever want if you go combing through the medical journals long enough.

Describing a disliked minority as disease-laden is practically mandatory when writing any decent anti-anybody tract, whether that tract is anti-Jewish (see *The Protocols of Zion*), anti-Black, anti-foreigner, or, of course, anti-gay. Who are you to snub such a time-honored tradition?

**Step 13: Cite a threat to children.** Innocent children are vulnerable to all sorts of predators. Just make sure your readers are worrying about the right ones. This is another favorite claim against disliked minorities.

Gays and lesbians are often accused of being far more likely to molest children than straight people. But research simply does not back that up that charge. You can learn more about this in our report, *Testing The Premise: Are Gays A Threat To Our Children?* ([http://www.BoxTurtleBulletin.com/Articles/000,002.htm](http://www.BoxTurtleBulletin.com/Articles/000,002.htm))

**Step 14: Cite a threat of a societal breakdown.** Everybody yearns for a return to the “good old days,” when everyone supposedly exhibited as strong moral fiber (a moral fiber that tolerated official racism and mob violence, but that is another matter). But we’re not living in the “good old days” anymore. And there is so much to choose from to prove it: public sex, nudity, murder, domestic violence, political intrigue, violent oppression, general mayhem — you name it.

Nothing exemplifies this breakdown better than images of rowdy, intoxicated, and uninhibited mobs in various stages of undress at sexually-charged festivals and parades. Think of how anti-gay writers invoke a minority of participants at gay pride festivals in a few select cities. You get the idea.

But for other topics like violence, murder and so forth, you only need to sketch a picture. Remember, we’re really talking about sex here, and these other examples, while interesting, are not your main point. Just provide some simple examples — a few statistics and a brief mention of news items will do the trick. By this time your audience is already plenty frightened, so you can afford to keep it short and sweet.

**Step 15: Close on a compassionate note.** You don’t hate anyone. Honestly, you don’t. The Biblical message is all about compassion, about loving your neighbor and all that. You love homosexuals. You really do. You just don’t like their same-sex-lusting, public-fornicating, disease-spreading, marriage-ruining, child-molesting, society-endangering ways. And really now, where’s the hate in that?

And that is how you can write an anti-gay tract in fifteen easy steps.

Oh sure, there is so much more you can do once you put your imagination to work. There are rhetorical flourishes to explore, strawman arguments to knock down, red herrings to catch and release. You can add guilt by association, urban myths (gerbils anyone?), religious condemnations — these and more, depending on the audience you’re trying to reach. With a little work and creativity, you too can become an “authority” on just about anything.

But be sure you follow step 3 and use lots of footnotes. That way I can keep an eye on you.
Okay, I’ll admit this right away: I had a blast writing this parody. After seeing so many anti-gay tracts that claimed to tell the truth but distorted my life beyond all recognition, writing this was strangely satisfying.

But that’s not why I wrote it. I didn’t write it out of mean-spiritedness or in a childish fit of name-calling. I certainly didn’t do it because I thought I could marginalize more than 90% of the population. Besides, as the old cliché goes, some of my best friends are straight -- as are virtually all of my family, co-workers and neighbors.

I wrote it because I wanted to show how Focus on the Family, the American Family Association, and so many others are able to misuse social science research to create some pretty convincing anti-gay literature.

If you’re straight, I’m sure you read this parody and quickly decided that nobody could possibly believe it. I imagine you came to this conclusion because its larger message simply doesn’t match the things about yourself, your friends and your community that you know to be true.

But suppose that everyone else who read it just naturally assumed that all of it is true because 1) it was written by a professional or a moral leader, 2) it appeared well researched because it had tons of footnotes, and 3) many of the individual facts are known (or widely believed) to be accurate.

But does any of that make it all true?

Maybe now you can begin to understand just a little of the cognitive dissonance that gay men and women experience every day.

The Truth vs. The Facts

I cannot emphasize this point enough: it was not – and is not – my intent to demonize anyone. Instead, I wanted to show what can happen when facts are misused for political ends. I chose the subject of “the heterosexual agenda” because, well obviously, the whole idea is utterly ridiculous.

But that doesn’t change the fact that all of my “facts” are accurately quoted. They may not all be quoted in the proper context, but when it comes to writing anti-anyone tracts, that’s pretty much par for the course. But besides that, notice how some of my facts are actually quoted in their proper context. In other words, they really are true – tragically true.

It really is true that straight women suffer more domestic violence at the hands of their male partners than gay men and women do with their same-sex partners. It really is true that teenagers are becoming sexually experienced at younger ages than ever before. And it really is true that AIDS has wiped out millions more around the world as a result of heterosexual contact than homosexual contact.

And there is more that is true that I didn’t cover here. It really is true that men who have sex with men (and that clinical category includes not only bisexuals, but even some who identify as straight when asked) are more likely to report having had an STD than men who don’t have a sex with men.

And it really is true that women who have sex with men are also more likely to report having had an STD than women who don’t have sex with men. And it really is true that large numbers of people, gay and straight, are having unsafe sex, are promiscuous, and are doing other irresponsible things. These facts are also true.
Does all this mean that straight people (or gays or lesbians or anyone else) don’t deserve respect and equality? Of course not.

Yes, many people behave irresponsibly — a fact that is true for every segment of society. But the irresponsibility of a few doesn’t give us the license to marginalize everyone else. As a just society, we don’t hold innocent people accountable for the actions of the guilty. We don’t deny rights to large groups of people because of the behavior of some individuals within that group. We don’t do it to straights, Whites, Blacks, men, women, Protestants, or Jews. And we shouldn’t do it to gay men and women either.

A Deliberate Tactic
It really wasn’t very difficult to write this parody. Sure, it took a lot of time to gather all the statistics, but even that wasn’t difficult if you know where to look.

But when I put it all together, I had to be very deliberate in everything I did: the sources I used (and those I ignored), the words I chose, the points I made. And I had to carefully ensure that the data I cited could somehow support the point I was making — even though the authors I cited would certainly disagree with how I was using their data. (I presume many would angrily disagree if I were not writing a parody.)

Nothing in this tract appeared out of nowhere, and none of it came about by accident. It was all very deliberate. And this leads me to one inescapable conclusion: No one can write something like this by mistake.

Let’s be clear. Anyone can make a few errors here or there. I probably did. But we’re not talking about isolated mistakes or errors in interpretation. We’re talking about the consistent use of these methods I described as a deliberate tactic.

And what this tells me is that the people who put together similar anti-gay tracts — all of those anti-gay organizations and all of the so-called “professionals” supporting their work — they’re not writing their stuff by mistake either. They know exactly what they’re doing.

How do I know this? I know this because I read the same reports they did!

And guess what? The sources they cite in their references aren’t nearly as complicated as you might think. They may be professional journals but they’re not rocket science.

These studies are usually written in surprisingly common English using not-too-difficult math. To say that these anti-gay writers just made a few mistakes or didn’t fully understand what they were reading would imply that their reading and math skills haven’t risen above those of a college freshman. Since most of these people consider themselves experts — many of them sport Ph.D.’s after their names — that explanation just doesn’t hold water.

So this leaves me with the only other possible conclusion: They know exactly what they’re doing and they’ve chosen to do it as a tactic.

I will not be surprised if anti-gay leaders call my parody a desperate attack on Christianity, morality, or on ordinary decent Americans, but nothing would be further from the truth. My parody is not aimed against the millions of humble and devout Christians throughout the world. As a lifelong Christian, I count myself as one of them.

Instead, my parody is aimed squarely at the select few who hold themselves up as leaders and protectors of faith and values, who claim to command an army of “values voters” and to speak on behalf of all Christendom, while reducing everyone else to mere statistics.

These leaders use statistics the way a drunk uses a lamppost: for support, not illumination. They have shown surprisingly few qualms about distorting the facts beyond all recognition, just like I did when I wrote this parody. These leaders were my
teachers, and in my humble opinion, I believe they taught me well.

The Apostle Paul wrote, “We have renounced secret and shameful ways; we do not use deception, nor do we distort the word of God. On the contrary, by setting forth the truth plainly we commend ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.” (2 Cor 4:2; NIV)

Most of these organizations exist to promote Judeo-Christian values around the world. But in their zeal to demonize gays and lesbians, they refuse to set forth the truth plainly. Instead, they blatantly ignore one of our most important values: You shall not bear false witness.

I have to wonder what kind of conscience would allow them to do this.

But I am certain of one thing. They do this despite this ancient and wise admonition:

There are six things the LORD hates, seven that are detestable to him:

- haughty eyes,
- a lying tongue,
- hands that shed innocent blood,
- a heart that devises wicked schemes,
- feet that are quick to rush into evil,
- a false witness who pours out lies
- and a man who stirs up dissension among brothers.

— Proverbs 6:16-19
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