If the rise of Nazism in Germany was made possible, at least in part, by the homosexualization of German society, what does this bode for America as we watch the steady advance of the “gay” agenda in this culture? Should we expect to witness something like the rise of a Third Reich on American soil? Or would the effect on American society be of an entirely different character? Is the “gay” movement in the United States sufficiently similar to its German counterpart as even to warrant concern? (Certainly the German “gay” culture was far more militaristic than the homosexual movement here, for example). Or is this the wrong question? Is there something about homosexuality (or the broader problem of sexual libertinism) that inevitably destroys the society that embraces it?

In many ways these are questions beyond the scope of this book, yet the implications of the material we have presented compel us to address them. Perhaps the most helpful approach is to search the history of homosexual activism in America for parallels with the German experience.

As we noted in the previous chapter, the first openly homosexual organization in the United States was the Ameri-
can chapter of the German Society for Human Rights, started in 1924. The SHR was an aberration, however. The American homosexual movement really only began in the
1940s after the Allied defeat of the Nazis. We must begin our time line, then, with the observation that the center of international “gay” power in the world did in fact shift from Germany to the United States after the demise of the Third Reich. This represented a huge setback for the “gay” movement, requiring it to begin “from scratch” as it were, since America in the 1940s was at least as family-centered as Germany had been in the 1860s.

We know that the implicit goal of homosexual political activism is to legitimize homosexual conduct and relationships in a society. This necessarily requires a society to abandon its commitment to marriage as the exclusive domain of acceptable sexual conduct. The abandonment of this standard logically opens the door to every other form of sexual promiscuity. Clearly, such a transformation of attitude is now occurring in America. What we will find is that this transformation is not the result of random social forces, but of deliberate and systematic political activism by the “gay” movement.

**Harry Hay and the Mattachine Society**

In the words of Jonathan Katz, “a link of a kind peculiar to Gay male history connects the abortive Chicago Society for Human Rights (1924-25) and Henry Hay, the founder of the Mattachine Society” (J. Katz:407). This “peculiar link” is the fact that the man who recruited Hay into homosexuality (at age seventeen), Champ Simmons, was himself seduced by a former member of the SHR. In a perverse sort of way, then, it seems appropriate that Hay would become known as the “founder of the modern gay movement” (Timmons:cover). (In another account, Hay claims his earliest homosexual experience was a molestation at age fourteen by a twenty-five-year-old man) (ibid.:36).

On August 10, 1948, at the tail end of an eighteen-year stint as a Communist Party leader, Hay began to organize a
group that would become the Mattachine Society (ibid:132). Not until the spring of 1951 did it receive its name, but from the beginning it was seen as a vehicle to destroy social restraints against homosexuality in American culture (J. Katz:412f). The name Mattachine was taken from “medieval Renaissance French...secret fraternities of unmarried townsmen” (ibid.:412). The organization’s stated agenda was to preserve the “right to privacy.” Like the SHR, the Mattachine Society became controversial upon the arrest of a prominent member. Dale Jennings, one of the founders of the organization, was arrested for soliciting an undercover police officer to commit a homosexual act in a public restroom (ibid.:414).

Hay was not a fascist, but he was a neo-pagan. He participated in occultic rituals at “the Los Angeles lodge of the Order of the Eastern Temple, O.T.O., Aleister Crowley’s notorious anti-Christian spiritual group” (Timmons:76). Hay provided musical accompaniment to ceremonies performed by the lesbian “high priestess.” Later in life he founded a New Age group called Radical Faeries, which met in an asram in the high desert of Arizona to offer invocations to pagan spirits (ibid.:265).
In some ways, Hay can be compared to Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, the “grandfather” of the gay rights movement. Hay is his American counterpart in the sense that both men launched enduring social movements in their respective cultures. The avowed purpose of each was to undermine the Judeo-Christian moral consensus in respect to homosexual relations. And both had been molested as boys (though some suggest that this is the rule rather than the exception among homosexual men). But unlike Ulrichs, Hay became increasingly militant over the course of his life until, in the 1980s, he participated in California’s notoriously violent ACT-UP demonstrations (ibid.:292). ACT-UP, the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power, was one of the earliest manifestations of homo-fascism in the “gay rights” movement. Though Hay was in his 70s, and is not directly linked to any of the property destruction associated with ACT-UP demonstrations, his presence validated the terrorist tactics of the group. Hay also openly endorsed pederasty as an essential part of the “gay rights” movement (ibid.:296).

Harry Hay and the Mattachine Society spawned large-scale political and social activism among homosexuals that soon outgrew their expectations and their control. Their highly motivated activists operated in groups designed like communist cells, each a “secret fraternity” bound by the common vice. As Hay stated in a later interview, “[we wanted to] keep them underground and separated so that no one group could ever know who all the other members were” (J. Katz:410). Slowly at first, from innumerable obscure sources, came theories, public statements and actions in support of the social acceptance of homosexuality. And as the power of the homosexualist political lobby grew, so did the ugliness of its demands and its methods.
Alfred Kinsey and the Kinsey Institute

While Harry Hay would soon take the homosexual movement public with the Mattachine Society, most homosexual activism continued to be carried out by hidden cell groups and individual “in the closet” activists. One such activist was Alfred Kinsey. No one but Kinsey’s closest associates and sex partners knew that his image as a respectable family man and college professor masked his role as one of the most dedicated homosexual change-agents in America.

In 1948, sex researcher Kinsey released his culture-shattering book, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. The first major sex study of its kind, the Kinsey Report purported to show that Americans were far more promiscuous and sexually deviant than they said they were (Reisman and Eichel, 1992:2). For over forty years, Kinsey’s data went more-or-less unchallenged and the conclusions that he drew continue to serve as the “scientific” justification for the so-called sexual revolution. His theory of sex as a mere “outlet” released human behavior from what Marcuse called “the repressive order of procreative sexuality.” All forms of sexual expression were equalized in the Kinsey model.

Recently, several studies have shown that America is not the hotbed of promiscuity and deviancy that Kinsey's study made it appear to be, *even after forty-six years of influence*
by that study, which was loudly trumpeted as “fact” by the
media and much of academia. *U.S. News and World Report*
reported that one such recent study, conducted by the Na-
tional Opinion Research Center at the University of Chi-
cago, that it showed that “[f]idelity reigns. Fully 83 percent
of Americans had sex with one person or had no sex part-
ers in the past year, and half of Americans have had only
one partner in the past five years” (*U.S. News and World

Kinsey’s study was tailor-made for the homosex-
ual/pederast community. Indeed, just weeks after its re-
lease, Harry Hay formally launched the Mattachine
Society. We have no proof that Kinsey and Hay actually co-
ordinated their efforts, although we know that Hay and
Kinsey met together more than seven years before the pub-
lication of the first Kinsey report (Timmons:111). We also
know that influential Kinsey co-worker, Wardell Pomeroy,
later became a member of the Mattachine Society’s advi-
sory board, perhaps indicating a deeper relationship be-
tween the Kinsey organization and the Mattachines
(Marotta:80).

Kinsey’s vastly inflated figure of the number of homo-
sexuals in America is the basis of the enduring myth that at
least 10% of the population is homosexual. His seven-point
Kinsey Scale, “in which bisexuality occupied a middle
‘balanced’ position between heterosexuality (0) and homo-
sexuality (6)” (ibid.:10), attempted to establish homosexu-
ality as a norm by definition. He further declared
adult/child sex harmless. This “finding” was based on data
gathered by pedophiles from experimentation with hun-
dreds of children as young as two months old (ibid.:36).

In *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, Reisman and Eichel state that
Kinsey “purported to prove that children were sexual be-
ings, even from infancy and that they could, and should,
have pleasurable and beneficial sexual interaction with
adult ‘partners’” (ibid.:3). Reisman and Eichel go on to
suggest that Kinsey deliberately overlooked criminal sexual child abuse and purposefully falsified data to further his personal sexual and political agenda. They cite former Kinsey coworker Gershon Legman who said that “Kinsey’s not-very-secret intention was to ‘respectablize’ homosexuality and certain sexual perversions” (ibid.:34). They also reference sociologists Albert Hobbs and Richard Lambert who observed “that the Kinsey authors seemed purposefully to ignore the limitations of their own samples in order ‘to compound any possible errors in almost any way which will increase the apparent incidence of [homosexuality]’” (ibid.:24).

Was Kinsey a homosexual, a pedophile or both? One historian proposed that Kinsey “may have discovered in himself the homosexual tendencies he would later ascribe to a large proportion of the population” (Robinson in Reisman and Eichel, 1992:204). But Reisman and Eichel suggest he manifested more of the behaviors of a pedophile. “In addition to his interest in sex experiments with children,” they write, “Kinsey was an avid collector of pornography (and maker of sex films) — an elemental feature of the pedophile syndrome” (Reisman and Eichel, 1992:205). In a later work, Reisman reports more specifically that Kinsey produced and directed films of homosexual sado-masochism at Indiana University, and that his collection of pornography included films of children engaged in sexual acts (Reisman, 1998:80f).

There is no question, however, that Kinsey fits the profile of a homosexual activist. Like the militant homosexuals who benefited from his work, Kinsey was “indignant about the effect of Judeo-Christian tradition on society,” write Reisman and Eichel. “It is clear that he shared [co-researcher Wardell] Pomeroy’s view that Christians inherited an almost paranoid approach to sexual behavior from the Jews” (ibid.:6). Pomeroy, incidentally, is known for his support of adult/child sex. In a 1992 article on
pedophilia, author Michael Ebert quotes Pomeroy as saying, “People seem to think that any [sexual] contact between children and adults has a bad effect on the child. I say this can be a loving and thoughtful, responsible sexual activity” (Ebert:6f).

The Kinsey Institute should be recognized as the American counterpart and successor to the Sex Research Institute of Berlin. Indeed, E. Michael Jones, editor of *Fidelity* magazine told one of us (Lively) in conversation that he had perused some of the surviving documents of the Berlin institute in the basement of the Kinsey building. Like its German predecessor had been, the Kinsey Institute is dedicated to the legitimization of sexual perversion.

**The Sexual Revolution**

Within five years of the Kinsey report, Hugh Hefner launched *Playboy* magazine (and the modern pornography industry), whose initial target audience was the very generation of young men to whom Kinsey had been speaking on his college lecture circuit. More significantly, it popularized Kinsey’s “gay” ethic of sexual license with the much of the rest of the male population of America. Hefner himself is quoted as saying that if Kinsey were the researcher of the sexual revolution, he (Hefner) was the pamphleteer (Reisman, 1998:108).

We are not suggesting the Hefner is homosexual, only that *Playboy* magazine serves as a tool of “gay” social engineering in that the existence of a thriving pornography industry serves the “gay” cause by morally corrupting the men who use it. It logically makes them less likely to oppose homosexuality on moral grounds and more likely to support public policies which legitimize sexual license. Exposure to pornography, especially at a young age, can also be a gateway into the “gay” lifestyle itself.

In the same manner, the “gay” cause is advanced by a
successful abortion industry (which also arose in response to the sexual revolution). The choice to kill their unborn children morally compromises both men and women (making them unwilling to criticize the choice to engage in other forms of immoral behavior), and ensures that the outcome of an unwanted child will not be a lasting deterrent to those who have chosen sexual license over family. This explains why homosexuals, who by definition cannot bear children together, are among the most militant advocates of abortion on demand.

The acceptance of sexual indulgence as an important social value inevitably initiates a downward moral spiral in a culture. In American society, the selling of the idea of recreational sex to young college-aged men in the 1950s created a “market” for immodest and sexually adventurous young women, which in turn helped to legitimize the idea of female promiscuity. In the 1960s, once immodesty and promiscuity became acceptable for some women, the pressure increased for all women, competing for the attentions of men, to adopt these behaviors. This was especially true of the youngest of marriage-age women of that generation, whose personal morals and values had been influenced by a decade of sex-saturated pop culture.

The wholesale entrance of women into the world of sexual license created a number of societal demands: for a feminist political movement to “liberate” women from social expectations about marriage and child-rearing (National Organization for Women formed 1966); for contraception on demand (Griswold v. Connecticut -- 1966); for abortion on demand (Roe. V. Wade --1973); and for “no fault” divorce (state-by-state liberalization of divorce laws began in the early 1970s). The result of these policies has been the achievement of the “gay” goal as embodied by Kinsey’s teachings: the progressive denormalization of marriage and the steady normalization of sexual license. The most recent census data, published in
1998, showed a fourfold increase in divorce from 1970 to 1996, while the population of “cohabiting” couples who had never married had more than doubled.

Among the side-effects produced by these dramatic changes in the life of a people, side-effects which have increased steadily since the 1960s, are the escalation of crime (especially violent crime), the proliferation of sexually-transmitted and other diseases, and the escalation of mental illness and chronic substance abuse. These are all results which one would expect to find in a generation of citizens raised in unstable homes. Each and every one of these social problems is a direct consequence of embracing the “gay” ethic of sexual license as popularized by Kinsey. Meanwhile, as the pursuit of sexual hedonism became the personal goal of an ever larger percentage of the non-homosexual population, the “gay” movement continued its advance.

**The Stonewall Riot and “Gay” Militancy**

“Two, four, six, eight -- Smash the family, smash the state”
(Popular slogan of 1970s “gay” activists --Oosterhuis and Steakley:2)

By 1969, the development of a growing homosexual subculture in America had spawned an open homosexual presence in major cities. So-called “gay bars” sprang up in Los Angeles and New York, hosting a bizarre mix of “street queens,” drug addicts and boy prostitutes (Marotta:71). In New York, homosexuals regularly engaged in public sex acts with anonymous partners “in the backs of trucks parked near the West Village piers” (ibid.:93) and in the public restrooms. Homosexual activity occurred so frequently in the bushes of one public park that the authorities were forced to cut down the trees to stop it (Adam:85). In response to police efforts to discourage this increasingly offensive behavior, homosexuals began to organize to de-
mand the “right” to public deviancy. Emboldened by their numbers, they began picketing businesses such as Macy’s Department Store, which had cracked down on homosexual behavior in their restrooms (ibid.:85).

On the evening of June 27, 1969 the “gay rights” movement officially adopted terrorism as a means to achieve
power when a surly mob of “drag queens, dykes, street people, and bar boys” physically attacked police officers conducting a “raid” on the Stonewall Bar on Christopher Street in New York. Stonewall was “one of the best known of the Mafia controlled bars” (Marotta:75), and was being closed for selling alcohol without a license. It was also a haven for sexual deviants. As police began to take some bar patrons in for questioning, a mob of homosexuals gathered across the street. Homosexualist Toby Marotta’s The Politics of Homosexuality includes an eyewitness report by a writer for the Village Voice:

[A]lmost by signal the crowd erupted into cobblestone and bottle heaving...The trashcan I was standing on was nearly yanked out from under me as a kid tried to grab it for use in the windowsmashing melee. From nowhere came an uprooted parking meter—used as a battering ram on the Stonewall door. I heard several cries of “Let's get some gas,” but the blaze of flame which soon appeared in the window of the Stonewall [where the police officers were trapped] was still a shock (ibid.:72).

By morning, the Stonewall bar was a burned-out wreck, and homosexual leaders had declared the violence a success. Interestingly, the anniversary of this event is known today as “Gay Pride Day” and features parades and other events most notable for their public sex and nudity (ibid.:158). It is ironic that the very activists who emerged from this new militant environment developed (in 1970) the strategy of claiming victim status through the use of the pink triangle and commemoration of the homosexuals who were persecuted by the Nazis (Adam:86).

The rise of homosexual militancy reflected the emergence of an aggressive “Butch” faction of the American “gay” movement, similar to that which occurred at the turn of the last century in Germany. (Ironically, while these masculine-oriented “gays” assume an attitude of superior-
ity over “Fems,” in both Germany and the United States the “gay” movement was actually launched by effeminate homosexuals and only later became dominated by “Butches”). In The Making of the Modern Homosexual, author Gregg Blachford observed that during this time “homosexuals themselves moved away from the previous stereotype of ‘swish and sweaters’ towards a new masculine style [that became] the dominant mode of expression in the subculture” (Blachford:187).

Following the Stonewall riot the Mattachine Action Committee of the Mattachine Society’s New York chapter clamored for “organized resistance” (Adams:81), but control of the movement was taken out of their hands by a still more radical group of activists. These men quickly formed the Gay Liberation Front, so titled “because it had the same ring as National Liberation Front, the alliance formed by the Viet Cong” (ibid.:91). At the heart of this new circle of power was Herbert Marcuse (ibid.:88), a long time Socialist who had learned his politics (and perhaps homosexuality) in pre-Nazi Germany. Homosexualist historian Barry D. Adam writes,

Herbert Marcuse, who had been a youthful participant in the 1918 German revolution and had been steeped in the thinking of the life-reform movements of the Weimar Republic, caught the attention of many gay liberationists. His Eros and Civilization, published in the ideological wasteland of 1955, bridged the prewar and postwar gay movements with its implicit vision of homosexuality as a protest “against the repressive order of procreative sexuality” (ibid.:84).

The Stonewall riot became the new symbol of the “gay rights” movement. In its wake, Gay Liberation Fronts sprang up across the country, using methods of intimidation and coercion to achieve political gains. Immediately they targeted the medical community, whose increasing effec-
tiveness in treating homosexual disorders threatened the logical premise of the movement (Rueda:101ff). “Gay Liberation Fronts,” writes Adam, “stormed San Francisco, Los Angeles and Chicago conventions of psychiatry, medicine and behavior modification,” shouting down speakers and terrorizing audience members (Adam:87ff). As extreme as it had itself become, the Mattachine Society predicted the GLF’s “violent tactics” would fail to inspire the movement (Marotta:136), but they were wrong. Though the GLF collapsed in 1972, in part because of a conflict between “drag queens and machos” [“Fems” and “Butches”], their philosophy prevailed (Adam:90).

On December 15, 1973 the board of trustees of the American Psychiatric Association capitulated to the demands of the radicals. The homosexuals had begun to speak of unyielding psychiatrists as “war criminals” (ibid.:88), with obvious implications. Possibly in fear for their safety, and certainly wearied by constant harassment, they declared that homosexuality was no longer an illness. The resulting referendum, demanded by outraged members of the association, was conducted by mail and was partially controlled by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (Rueda:1982). The homosexualists won the vote and the new official definition of homosexuality as a disorder was changed to include only those who were “unhappy with their sexual orientation” (Adam:88). Historian Enrique Rueda writes,

This vote was not the result of scientific analysis after years of painstaking research. Neither was it a purely objective choice following the accumulation of incontrovertible data. The very fact that the vote was taken reveals the nature of the process involved, since the existence of an orthodoxy in itself contradicts the essence of science (Rueda:106).
Weimar in America

How does all of this compare to the German experience? One striking parallel is the span of time over which homosexuality became culturally accepted in each country. In Germany, approximately twenty-five years passed from the formation of the Scientific Humanitarian Committee by Magnus Hirschfeld until sexual perversion was being openly practiced in Germany (roughly from 1897 to the mid-1920s). In the United States, the emergence of widespread overt homosexuality occurred in the early 1970s, a quarter-century after Harry Hay formed the Mattachine Society.

Another similarity is the extent to which perversion advanced once the moral barriers were lowered. Let us briefly compare the two societies.

Under the Weimar government, established after Kaiser Wilhelm II’s abdication in 1918, many traditional attitudes were questioned, including those about sexuality. As America does today, Weimar Germany experienced tremendous conflict as these policies clashed with traditional Judeo-Christian values.

Feelings on the ‘sexual question’ ran high. There were disputes about the roles of the sexes and about attitudes toward marriage, the family and child rearing, and these disputes were
bound up with arguments about social policy and demographic trends (Peukert: 101).

In this climate the homosexualists made significant gains. Almost immediately, major German cities became havens for every form of sexual expression. William Manchester writes of “transvestite balls, [where] ‘hundreds of men costumed as women and hundreds of women costumed as men danced under the benevolent eye of the police,” and of “mothers in their thirties, teamed with their daughters to offer Mutter-und-Tochter sex” (Manchester:57). Plant writes of “luxurious lesbian bars and nightclubs [that] never feared a police raid” (Plant:27).

Steakley records that “[o]fficial tolerance was manifested...in the unhindered consumption of narcotics in some homosexual bars, and transvestites were issued police certificates permitting them to cross-dress in public” (Steakley:81). And historian-biographer Charles Bracelen Flood speaks of “sad alleys patrolled by prostitutes of all ages and both sexes, including rouged little boys and girls” (Flood:196). “Berlin’s specialized establishments included a bathhouse featuring black male prostitutes” that was frequented by Ernst Roehm, writes Flood, and “there was a se- date nightclub for lesbians, the Silhouette, where most of
the women, sitting on hard benches along the walls, wore men’s clothes with collar and tie, but the young girls with them wore dresses with accentuated femininity” (ibid.:197).

Germany’s version of Madonna was a woman named Anita Berber, “the role model for thousands of German girls...[who] danced naked...and made love to men and women sprawled atop bars, bathed in spotlights, while voyeurs stared and fondled one another” (Manchester:57). Rector describes the Weimar scene as a “sexual Mardi Gras” (Rector:15):

There were about as many — if not more — homosexual periodicals and gay bars in Berlin in the 1920’s as there are now in New York City, and Berlin of the time was abuzz with the feasibility of forming a national homosexual political party. The sexual revolution, with its free-and-easy attitudes, including wife swapping and group sex as a moral precept, was a German “invention” of the Twenties...abortions were shrugged off and condoms were on sale in open display in grocery stores and almost every other public mart [Quoting from T.L. Jarman, Rector continues]...Freedom degenerated into license...Bars for homosexuals, cafes where men danced with men,...pornographic literature in the corner kiosks—all these things were accepted as part of the new life (ibid.:13).

Today, all of these things are manifest in American society as well. The lid to Pandora’s Box that had been cracked open by Kinsey, Harry Hay and the Mattachines is now flung wide. Rueda writes,

...there are no fewer than 2,000 [homosexual bars in America]...They range from small “sleazy” places in dark and dangerous alleys to plush establishments...Some bars cater to a conventional-looking clientele. Others specialize in sadomasochists or transvestites. There are bars which purposefully attract young people, prostitutes
who serve to attract older homosexuals who in turn purchase drinks for the youngsters while sexual deals are arranged. Printed guides for traveling homosexuals...[specify] the availability of prostitutes or “rough trade” (i.e., homosexuals who enjoy appearing violent or who actually behave violently) (Rueda:33).

American cities also host “bathhouses,” which are not actual baths but meeting places for anonymous homosexual encounters. “People walk in there and have sex with multiple partners and have no idea who they’re having sex with,” reports former homosexual John Paulk. “I know this first
hand and from the many many people I was associated with in the gay lifestyle” (“The Gay Agenda” Video). Paulk reports that these “bathhouses” remain open despite the AIDS epidemic. He also describes the activity called “cruising” in which homosexuals meet for anonymous sex in public restrooms and other public locations. While this has apparently always been common behavior in the homosexual community, Paulk implies that it is far more widespread today than ever before. This is substantiated by other observers of the “gay rights” movement (Grant, 1993:36f).

A great deal more could be written about the varieties of homosexual perversion that have proliferated in America's cities and towns today (and increasingly dominate the entertainment media). Indeed, the authors feel that the behavior of homosexuality needs to be exposed to a public whose attention is systematically drawn away to “cover” issues (e.g. “victim” status, “rights,” etc.). But it is our intention here to focus on the social, political and spiritual ramifications of this behavior.

**Consequences**

Leaving religion aside, the rationale for a society to limit sex to marriage is fairly basic. Marriage “sanctifies” what is otherwise merely self-centered pleasure-seeking, while also protecting individuals and society from most of the problems associated with “unwanted” children, sexual diseases and serial relationships. (How many of our most pressing social problems today are directly or indirectly related to these factors?)

Once a society abandons marriage as the prerequisite for sexual relations, however, there remains scant logical grounds to restrict any form of sexual deviance or promiscuity. For example, on what grounds can a society deny homosexuals freedom of conduct if non-homosexuals have been permitted to engage in similar disease-transmitting
sexual acts? And if public health considerations no longer outweigh the “right” to sexual freedom under the law, what justifies continued limitations upon sado-masochism, incest, bestiality and even pedophilia? A society is left with no bases for regulating sexual conduct but its surviving moral standards and the legal concept of “mutual consent.”

Can we have confidence that America’s moral standards will present a lasting barrier to the continued escalation of sexual deviance? Certainly not with regard to consensual sex between adults. A quick perusal of the menu of available pornography on the Internet reveals that battle has been lost. But will the line hold against the legitimization of adult-child sex? The answer to that lies in the hands of the “gay” activists, whose dedication to their own sexual freedom has driven the sexual revolution.

Pederast film, advertised in a homosexual magazine. The only barrier to pederasty in America today is age-of-consent laws. Elimination of age-of-consent laws was one of the planks of the 1972 “Gay Rights” Platform.
The 1973 victory of “gay” politics over scientific objectivity in the American Psychiatric Association had far-reaching consequences. After the fall of the APA’s medical standard against the normalization of homosexuality, “gay rights” activists made tremendous gains in public acceptance of, or at least tolerance for, open homosexuality. This fact is especially alarming when we consider that the APA has now taken action which some construe as “normalization” of pedophilia as well. The September, 1994 issue of “Regeneration News,” the newsletter of a homosexual recovery group in Baltimore, features an article about this change. Regeneration Director, Alan Medinger compares the new set of criteria for diagnosing pedophilia with the prior standard:

In the earlier DSM-III-R [Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Psychiatrists], pedophilia was diagnosed as a disorder if “[t]he person has acted out on these urges or is markedly distressed by them...but the new standard defines pedophilia as a disorder only if the fantasies, sexual urges, or behaviors cause clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning” (Medinger, reprinted in Stop Promoting Homosexuality...
The APA has taken a step which can be interpreted to imply that adult sex with children is normal as long as the perpetrators are not unhappy with their sexual orientation. The APA has taken exception to this interpretation.

Although many contemporary homosexual activists, especially lesbians, attempt to distance themselves from their pederastic comrades, the fact remains that pederasts (as was true in Germany) have always been at the forefront of the movement, albeit often “in the closet.” And the “right” of adults to have sex with children has always been a basic goal of the movement. In February of 1972, for example, a national coalition of homosexual groups met in Chicago to draw up a list of priorities for the movement. Prominent on the list was the demand for “a repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent” (Rueda:201ff). Already in Canada the age of consent has been lowered to age 14 (Mulshine:10).

The organizations dedicated specifically to “pedophile rights” or “pederast-rights” in the United States are made up of homosexual men (Rueda:173ff), and in major cities with an active homosexual community “gay” bookstores carry numerous titles which endorse man/boy sex (Grant, 1993:22). Tom Reeves, a self-admitted pederast who was part of the early “gay rights” movement, is one of a number of writers in an anthology called Varieties
of Man/Boy Love. He explains the role of pederasts in homosexualist activism:

Almost every one of the early openly homosexual writers was a pederast. Pederasty was a constant theme of early gay literature, art, and pornography. The Stonewall riots
were precipitated by an incident involving an underage drag queen, yet that detail was not viewed as significant. Curtis Price, a fourteen-year-old, self-described “radical hustler,” formed the first gay liberation organization in Baltimore. Many of the leaders of early gay liberation and the founders of the major gay groups in the U.S. were boy-lovers (Reeves in Pascal:47).

Another of the early leaders of the “gay rights” movement was David Thorstad, also a self-identified pederast. Thorstad was president of the Gay Activist Alliance (*Stop Promoting Homosexuality* Hawaii Newsletter, November, 1994:6), one of the largest of the groups which formed in New York in the wake of the Stonewall riot. The GAA invented “the strategy of ‘zapping’ politicians,” writes Marotta, “that would later become [its] trademark...[they] had learned that homosexuals could infiltrate political gatherings and make themselves heard through sheer brashness” (Marotta:137). The GAA also developed the strategy of using these “carefully staged confrontations” to force
politicians to enact “anti-discrimination” policies (ibid.:150). The GAA reorganized early in 1974 as the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (Adam:88).

Thorstad, along with Reeves and others, later went on to form the North American Man/Boy Love Association in Boston in 1978 (NAMBLA Bulletin, September, 1992:2). NAMBLA, which is the largest “peryast rights” organization in the country, cloaks its agenda in rhetoric about concern for the rights of children to have “sexual freedom.” (Pascal:49). In recent years NAMBLA has come under attack by some elements of the “gay rights” alliance, who have tried to exclude the group from some of the higher profile media events. But this has evoked a violent response from its defenders. When NAMBLA was denied a role in the 1986 Los Angeles “Gay Pride Parade,” marcher Harry Hay donned a sweatshirt printed with the legend, “NAMBLA Walks With Me.” Timmons writes that Hay, “could not contain his outrage” that NAMBLA was excluded (Timmons:296). More recently, as reported in the NAMBLA Bulletin, Hay was a featured speaker at NAMBLA’s annual membership conference, June 24-25, 1994:

[He] gave an inspiring talk about reclaiming for the 1990’s the spirit of homoerotic sharing and love from various ancient Greek traditions of pederasty. A remarkably balanced and sensitive account of the conference appeared in the August 23 Advocate from a writer who was invited to attend (NAMBLA Bulletin, September, 1994:3).

Other homosexualist-run “children’s-rights” organizations include the Rene Guyon Society, which was formed in 1962 “to make it possible for adults to provide sexual stimulation for virtually all children” (Rueda:177), and a group called Project Truth (NAMBLA Bulletin, September, 1994). (While we’re discussing homosexual splinter groups we
should mention the Eulenspiegel Society, formed in 1971 to promote “Sado-masochist rights” for homosexuals whose “special concern is freedom for sexual minorities and particularly those whose sexuality embraces S/M” — Rueda:175).

Membership of groups such as these in the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) caused it to be expelled from the United Nations Economic and Social Council in September of 1993. Attempting to forestall its expulsion, ILGA tried to separate itself from pederast groups but quickly learned that support for the “boy-lovers” was too deeply entrenched in the association. ILGA’s ouster of ten-year member NAMBLA and a couple of other high-profile groups caused European pederast member-organizations to step forward in protest. Division within ILGA continues (NAMBLA Bulletin, September 1994:3).

Another apologist for pederasty is Larry Kramer, founder of ACT-UP. In Report from the Holocaust: The Making of an AIDS Activist, Kramer had this to say about adult/child sex: “In those instances where children do have sex with their homosexual elders, be they teachers or anyone else, I submit that often, very often, the child desires the activity, and perhaps even solicits it” (Kramer:234). According to Reeves, “Queer Nation and Act-Up” were home to “both boys and men” who wanted “additional cultural activity beyond...their illegal relationships” (Reeves in Pascal:73).

Pedophilia and its promotion is not limited to male homosexuals. Virginia Uribe, a lesbian teacher in Los Angeles, has been at the forefront of a movement to “affirm gay teenagers,” through school-based pro-homosexual “counseling” (Homosexuality, the Classroom and Your Children, 1992) Her own program, called Project 10 (named for the oft-quoted “statistic” of 10% homosexuality in the U.S. population, a figure demonstrated in several re-
cent studies to be nearer 2%), included a book for young people called One Teenager in Ten. This “resource” for troubled teens features lurid pornographic stories, including a graphic lesbian sex scene between a twelve-year-old girl and her twenty-three-year-old dance teacher. The apparent goal is to activate children’s sexuality at increasingly younger ages. At a conference promoting Project 10 to public school teachers in Oregon, University of Washington sociologist Pepper Schwartz admits targeting prepubescent children for “affirmation,” saying, “At this point, getting the majority to say ‘gay’ is good” at nine or ten years old is going to be difficult, but just because it is difficult doesn’t mean it’s not the right thing” (Homosexuality, the Classroom and Your Children, 1992).

The beneficiaries of “sexual freedom” for children and teens are often predatory adult homosexuals. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force is on record that “gay teens should be supported in coming out” (Mulshine:10), but writer Paul Mulshine notes that “the guidance, and the sex, tends to come from adult gays who bring the teens out...A study published in the Journal of Pediatrics showed that of a sample of gay teenagers who had steady sexual partners, the mean age of the partners was 25 years” (ibid.:10). He cites a “1985 study of arrests in 12 U.S. jurisdictions [for child sex abuse, which] showed...on average, about 40 percent of arrests for pederastic homosexuals” (ibid.:11).

Though some deny that the “right” of adults to have sex with children remains a fundamental component of the “gay rights” movement, the evidence suggests otherwise.
Alyson Publications, the leading publisher of “gay” titles, markets books aimed at pre-schoolers, such as Daddy’s Roommate and Heather Has Two Mommies, right alongside Gay Sex: A Manual for Men Who Love Men. The latter contains detailed instructions for pedophiles and pederasts on how to successfully avoid discovery and arrest. “Avoid situations,” advises author Jack Hart, “where a number of men have sex with the same boy, or group of boys, over a period of time” (Hart:123). No doubt these guidelines are gratefully received by pederasts in the community, a constituency that is larger than most people realize. For example, Reeves claimed in a 1979 speech that he personally had met “over 500 men” who “were struggling with their attraction to boys.” “Almost to a man,” said Reeves, “they are teachers and boy scout leaders and boys club leaders” (Rueda:97).

Scouts Under Siege

Fortunately, America’s version of the Wandervögel, the Boy Scouts of America, has largely been spared the problems associated with its German cousin. This can be attributed to its commitment to Judeo-Christian ideals as represented in its pledge to be “reverent toward God” (Hillcourt:10). Still, the number of homosexuals that have infiltrated the organization is alarming. From 1973 to 1993 over 1,416 scout leaders were expelled for sexually abusing boys (The Washington Times, June 15, 1993).

Beginning in 1991 and continuing to the present time, the Boy Scouts have been targeted by “gay rights” militants for their policy against allowing homosexuals to be scout leaders. An ostensibly “spontaneous” outcry against the Boy Scouts arose across the country, led by the once-venerable United Way agency, which pulled its funding from the Scouts in various cities. United Way’s funding withdrawal was quickly followed by other homosex-
ual-controlled or co-opted entities including Levi Strauss, Wells Fargo, Seafirst Bank and Bank of America (which later reversed itself) \((\textit{Oregonian}, \text{July 11, 1992})\). Self-admitted lesbian, Roberta Achtenberg, then serving on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, led a campaign to coerce the Bank of America into support for the homosexuals’ demands. Shortly thereafter, Achtenberg was appointed Assistant Secretary for the Department of Housing and Urban Development \((\textit{Los Angeles Times}, \text{January 29, 1993})\), one of more than two dozen homosexuals appointed to high-level posts in the Clinton Administration \((\text{Grant, 1993}: 107)\).

In the streets, the Boy Scouts was mocked by “Queer Scouts, a focus group of Queer Nation” \((\textit{Bay Area Reporter}, \text{August 1, 1991})\), while homosexualists at the highest levels of government attempted to intimidate the organization into submission. Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders used her post to castigate Scout officials \((\textit{U.S.A. Today}, \text{June 2, 1994})\) and Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt signed an order prohibiting Boy Scouts from volunteering in national parks \((\textit{The Washington Times}, \text{May 28, 1993})\). In San Francisco and San Diego the Boy Scouts were barred from operating day programs in the public schools \((\textit{San Francisco Chronicle}, \text{September 14, 1991})\) and in San Diego, city officials launched an investigation of the Scouts under its legal powers to prevent “discrimination” against homosexuals \((\textit{San Francisco Chronicle}, \text{October 18, 1992})\).

So far the Boy Scouts have withstood the onslaught, but late in 1992 the organization received a letter from NAMBLA predicting that it will eventually succumb to homosexual demands. The letter is addressed to Ben Love, Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, and was published in the \textit{NAMBLA Bulletin}, November, 1992:
Dear Mr. Love,

At its 16th membership conference, held in Chicago, August 7-9, 1992, the North American Man/Boy Love Association unanimously adopted the following resolution:

“NAMBLA calls on the Boy Scouts of America to cease its discrimination against openly gay or lesbian persons in the appointment of its scout masters. This will permit scouts to be exposed to a variety of lifestyles and will permit more of those individuals who genuinely wish to serve boys to do so.”

I feel especially honored to have been asked to alert you of this resolution...I have also been a scout and a scout leader and share with so many in NAMBLA affection for the movement.

We recognize, of course, that the action for which we call is inevitable. What a great added contribution your organization will make possible to all the boys and girls who participate in it when you take this step. May it be taken in the near future.

We share a common mission — to bring greater understanding and light and purpose to the young as they grow. We invite you to join with us in cherishing individual integrity, and in seeking the opportunity for every boy and girl in our country to find their own truth. We encourage you to help every person associated with your organization to be able to express those values from themselves which to them represent for themselves the Good, the True, and the Beautiful. As we work together toward these ends Light will guide our way.

We express these sentiments most respectfully,

Very Cordially,

Leland Stevenson
Stevenson’s letter is reminiscent of the one Wilhelm Jansen sent to Wandervoegel parents in which he told them, “you will have to accustom yourselves to the presence of so-called homosexuals in your ranks” (Mills:167). As we see, however, Stevenson’s ideological allies have far greater political power in the United States today than Jansen’s had in Germany in 1912.

On June 28, 2000, the Boy Scouts prevailed in the landmark Supreme Court case of Dale v. Boy Scouts of America. Dale, an open homosexual, had sued the Scouts under a New Jersey anti-discrimination statute for denying him the opportunity to be a scout leader. The court ruled that forcing the Boy Scouts to accept practicing homosexuals would violate their constitutional right of “expressive association.” Rather than accepting this ruling, however, the “gay” movement stepped up its campaign against the Scouts, targeting the donor base of the organization. To this date, the Boy Scouts has stood firm.

Unfortunately, the moral courage of the Boy Scouts of America is not shared by all youth organizations. The Girl Scouts allows lesbian leaders in its organization and has expelled at least one heterosexual leader who refused to keep this policy secret from parents. Brenda Mailand, a Girl Scout employee in Lansing Michigan was fired after she refused to sign the following pledge:

As an employee of the Michigan Capitol Girl Scout Council, you may not proactively inform members, parents of members, prospective members or parents of prospective members, or members of the general public (including media) of the Council’s and GSUSA’s position on sexual orientation (Private letter, February 9, 1993).
The Big Brothers/Big Sisters organization actively promotes "gay rights" through its organization. In 1991 Big Brother/Big Sisters' Board of Directors lobbied the Boy Scouts to change its policy against homosexual leaders, saying "the use of 'non-traditional' volunteers in the service delivery to youth can serve the best interest of children" (Private letter, August 9, 1991). Homosexual "big brothers" and "big sisters" are actively recruited in some cities (Just Out, March 1, 1991). Absent a reversal in American cultural trends, it seems likely that the barrier to adult-child sex will fall in the not-too-distant future. What then? Can any society hope to escape disaster whose citizens have, to such a profound degree, lost the capacity to restrain themselves and others regarding sexual perversion? We cannot necessarily predict the future from what happened in Germany, but the possibility of following a similar path is very real. That path leads from sexual license to violence, murder and sadistic cruelty.
Atrocities

“The wicked prowl on every side when vileness is exalted among the sons of men” Psalms 12:10.

Has sexual perversion led to increasing violence in America? Fortunately, to this point America has not experienced the wide-scale atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis in Germany, but the actions of certain male homosexuals in recent history are reminiscent of the worst SS butchers. As noted in a January 21, 1984 editorial in The New York Times, “Many of the most violent multiple murders have been committed by homosexual males.” The correlation is even closer that the Times observation would suggest. Robert Hazelwood, a well-respected former agent of the FBI’s Behavioral Science unit, offered the following insights:

With reference to your question about homosexual killings, I will provide you with what I have learned in more than 34 years of professional law enforcement experience, countless training and educational programs provided by the forensic communities (pathologists, mental health, legal) and law enforcement, as well as my own experience in having consulted on more than 4,000 homicide cases (cases involving from 1-30 victims) including over 300 homicides involving homosexual males.

When a deceased male is found nude or partially clothed and the murder involves “overkill” (i.e., much more violence than necessary to kill) and/or multiple stab wounds to the heart or throat and/or mutilation of the genitals then the investigator begins with the supposition that the crime is a homosexual-related murder. From my own experience, I can assure you that this assumption is proven true in at least 95% of the cases (Private letter, July 12, 1999).
Dr. Brian Clowes cites some alarming statistics showing that eight of the top ten serial killers in the United States were homosexuals and that homosexuals were responsible for 68 percent of all mass murders (Clowes:97). The following is a list of nine leading homosexual serial killers, eight of which were among the top ten most prolific killers as of 1992. Clowes’ sources are listed in the text and are reprinted from *Debating the “Gay Rights” Issue*:


Jeffrey Dahmer: 17 Murders...a convicted child molester
and practicing and admitted homosexual, lured 17 young men and boys to his apartment, had sex with them, then killed them and dismembered them. He ate parts of his victims bodies...Dahmer was active in “gay rights” organizations and had participated in “gay pride” parades. Michael C. Buelow. “Police Believe Suspect Killed 17.” The Oregonian, July 26, 1991, pages A1 and A24. Also: “Relative in Dahmer Case Sues.” USA Today, August 6, 1991, page 3A. Also October 1991 Focus on the Family Letter.


William Bonin was executed by lethal injection at California's San Quentin prison on February 23, 1996. As reported in the Orange County Register, February 22, 1996, Bonin, the so-called “Freeway Killer,” killed at least 21 boys and young men and dumped their bodies along California freeways (our original source mentioned only 14). After having been jailed in the early 1970s for raping boys, Bonin had vowed that in the future “there will be no witnesses.”

Although various stories reported that Bonin had raped men at gunpoint in the army and had been engaged in sex with a man at the time of his final arrest, the media failed to identify Bonin as “gay.” Standard “gay” rhetoric denies that male-on-male child molestation qualifies as homosexual conduct. Here, the perpetrator clearly was homosexual in his adult sexual relations as well, but the “gay” label was scrupulously avoided.

Thomas Hamilton of Dunblane, Scotland, is Britain's
worst mass-murderer in modern history. Hamilton killed 16 children at an elementary school on March 13, 1996. According to The New York Times, Hamilton was obsessed with boys. Ousted from the Boy Scouts in 1974 for “complaints about unstable and possibly improper behavior following a Scout camp,” Hamilton later formed his own boys’ club. Once again, children complained that “he was overly familiar, made them take their shirts off and was obsessed with photographing them.” Upset that he had been branded a “pervert,” Hamilton apparently took his revenge against the town of Dunblane by killing their children.

In a spree of “gay-on-gay” violence not seen since Nazi Germany, one homosexual man, Gaetan Dugas, was directly responsible for killing over a thousand homosexual men by deliberately infecting them with the AIDS virus. Indirectly he may be responsible for tens of thousands, eventually perhaps hundreds of thousands of AIDS deaths. One of the first known AIDS carriers, Dugas was known as “Patient Zero” because he caused so many of the earliest infections (Clowes:97).

Even after his diagnosis Dugas “justified his continued sodomy with the excuse that he was free to do what he wanted with his own body. Even when he was in the final stages of AIDS he would have anonymous sex with men in homosexual bathhouses, and then show his sexual partners his purple Kaposi’s Sarcoma blotches, saying, ‘Gay cancer. Maybe you’ll get it’” (“The Columbus of AIDS.” National Review, November 6, 1987:19).

As reported in the Marin Independent Journal, February 5, 1996, the first known murder connected to the Internet resulted from a homosexual encounter between two men in East Windsor, New Jersey. After meeting “through an online chat room, an electronic gathering place for gay men,” they decided to get together. “But their offline meeting Jan. 4 turned deadly, police say, when George Hemenway shot Jesse Unger in the head, as a
15-year-old boy looked on.” According to the story, the last homicide in this Trenton suburb of 22,000 was 10 years ago and also “stemmed from a homosexual ‘street encounter,’ police say.”

Other major news stories have had a homosexual element that assumes greater significance when viewed in the context of the homo-fascist connection. For example, just days after du Pont fortune heir John E. du Pont attracted national attention for his role in a shooting and a dramatic police standoff at his Pennsylvania mansion, details of his bizarre private life began to emerge. A single man who lived with his mother until her recent death, du Pont used his personal fortune to support his hobbies, which centered on traditionally ultra-masculine themes: collecting guns and military artifacts (such as an armored personnel carrier he drove around his estate) and collegiate-style Greco-Roman wrestling.

A Gannett News Service report published in the January 30 edition of the Marin Independent Journal contains allegations that du Pont was a homosexual who used his wealth to recruit others into the homosexual lifestyle. “‘You really don't want to hear the whole truth. It would blow you away,’ said Andre Metzger, a wrestling coach who sued du Pont for sexual harassment. Metzger said du Pont used the Foxcatcher training facility to gain access ‘to kids and adults’ for homosexual relationships.”

Around the turn of the millennium, America was stunned by a string of mass murders in public high schools. The most horrific of these was the attack by teenagers Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris on their classmates at Columbine High in Littleton, Colorado. Fifteen died that day, including Klebold and Harris, who committed suicide. There are two important facts which are relevant to our study. The first is that according to fellow students, the killers were homosexual. The Gay Today news website reported, in an article titled “The Waking Dream: Homo-
erotic violence at Columbine High,” that “according to some accounts, Klebold and Harris were allegedly ‘bisexuals,’ which is a teenage code word for the “G” (gay) word, which teens, especially high school teens in Colorado, cannot use.” NAMBLA Bulletin editor, Bill Andrietti wrote that

A gay angle surfaced almost as soon as the shootings hit the news, with rumors circulating that the boys with the bombs and guns were -- variously -- certainly gay, absolutely heterosexual, or self-avowed bisexuals...Many gay public relations experts thought it best to downplay Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold’s possible homosexuality...[while a press release from the homosexual Metropolitan Community Church reported that] Campus jocks remember calling Eric and Dylan “faggot,” “homo,” and “queer” because “they showered together” or “were seen holding hands.”

But asking whether Klebold and Harris were “really” gay misses the point. Like a wick soaked in gasoline, their relationship was soaked with homoeroticism. The theme of braving death together in battle runs through the literature of queer love....In his diary, one of the two spun out a fantasy of living on an island alone with the other....Whether they had girlfriends or not, Harris and Klebold shared a pact unto death that, if twisted horribly, also was romantic (Andrietti, Bill. “Homosexuality and the Massacre, The Guide, June 1999).

The second relevant fact is that the killers deliberately selected April 20th to launch their killing spree because it was Adolf Hitler’s birthday. This choice was attributed, by surviving students, to the fact that “they believed in...what Adolf Hitler did”....“They’re white supremacists” (Meek, James Gordon. “Littleton’s Casualties of War,” Gridlock Magazine, undated, quoting from The Washington Times and The Washington Post).

Not all of the school mass killers were alleged to be ho-
mosexuals, although a possible homosexual connection was raised in several of the incidents with the highest number of victims. Michael Carneal killed three and wounded five students as the victims prayed together at Heath High School in Paducah, Kentucky. Carneal denied being a homosexual, but had been accused of being “gay” by fellow students (Martinac, Paula. “Lesbian Notions” Called Out LGBT Religious News Service, May 24, 1999).

Mitchell Johnson (13), the older of the two boys who killed five and wounded ten at Westside Middle School in
Jonesboro, Arkansas had been repeatedly sexually abused by a relative of his day care provider when he was six or seven years old. It is assumed that the abuser was male. (*Arkansas Democrat Gazette*, April 7, 1998).

Luke Woodham attributed his murder of his mother and two students (nine others were wounded) to rage over a failed romance with a girl, but he had also been angered over being called “gay” at school (*Time.com*, July 6, 1998). By itself, this is rather unpersuasive evidence that Woodham struggled with homosexuality. However, we find it most interesting that in a pre-rampage explanatory note to a male friend, Woodham referred those who would be looking for clues about his motives to a section from *The Gay Science* by Friederich Nietzsche (*The Cincinnati Post* website, 11-09-98). The section contains Nietzsche’s famous commentary on the theme that “God is dead.” *The Gay Science* is not about homosexuality, but we wonder if reference to it might be intended to convey a cryptic message about Woodham’s struggles. (Nietzsche’s homosexuality is an acknowledged fact in “gay” circles these days -- see Charles Stone, “Of Whom Nietzsche dreamed,” *Harvard Gay and Lesbian Review*, Winter 1999.) Interestingly, Woodham identified this and two other books as his favorites: *Necronomicon*, a book of magic, and *Mein Kampf* (ibid.).

More significant than the possible homosexual inclinations of the killers is the fact that school shootings have arisen in the context of rampant moral degeneracy among students. The degree to which America’s children have been corrupted was documented in a 1999 PBS *Frontline* special “The Lost Children of Rockdale County.” Following a 1996 outbreak of syphilis among teenagers in the middle-class community of Rockdale, Georgia, officials were shocked to learn that large numbers of local schoolchildren, from twelve years old and up, were routinely engaging in group sex together. Girls of fourteen were admitting to hav-
ing had from 30-100 sex partners. Not only were the children not ashamed of their actions, according to one health care worker, students were “laughing and high-fiving” each other as they tested positive for syphilis.

Three years later, on the one-month anniversary of the Columbine massacre, Rockdale County became the site of its own school shooting. Fifteen-year-old Thomas Solomon shot and wounded six of his fellow students at Heritage High School in the city of Conyers (Grigg, William Norman. “Another Lost Generation?,” *The New American*, October 23, 2000). Grigg writes

To [the] grim indices of cultural decline must be added the recently coined category of “school shooters” -- murderous teenage sociopaths....One of the most potent indictments of our degenerate culture is found in the...FBI report “The School Shooter: A Threat Assessment Perspective”...listing the warning signs intended to help school officials recognize and evaluate potential shooters within their student populations. Relatively few social commentators have been willing to explore the unspoken assumption behind that report -- namely, that our present culture...can be expected to generate teenage mass murderers on a regular basis (ibid.).

As we can see, our nation is already reaping the destructive consequences of having embraced the “gay” ethic of sexual license. Once a nation of high moral values and strong families, we are now a fractured and morally confused society. It is not certain that we shall go the way of Germany, but absent a reversal of the current trend, it is very likely that we shall face some form of cultural disaster before the homosexualization of America is complete.
Chapter Ten

CLOSING THOUGHTS

The Danger of “Gay Rights”

Scott Lively

I am writing this conclusion to the third edition on the same day that President Bill Clinton has called for “hate crimes” legislation based on “sexual orientation” (code words for homosexuality). A few days ago, in an act unprecedented in the history of the presidency, Mr. Clinton aligned himself with the homosexual cause at a fund-raiser for the Human Rights Campaign Fund, the “gay” movement’s largest political action committee. Knowing what it cost this president in 1993 to endorse “gays in the military,” I am wondering what “gay” leaders might have promised the president in exchange for this new endorsement. Or can it be that public perception of the “gay” movement has changed so much that the Clinton administration (notorious for its reliance on polls and “focus groups”) has decided that it is now safe for the president to identify himself and his office with the “gay” political agenda.

This question has personal significance for me, since I was one of the few people to publicly challenge
then-candidate Clinton on his support for “gay” issues during his first run for presidential office. In response to my questions during a live Town Hall television program (simulcast from Seattle, Washington and Portland, Oregon), Mr. Clinton said he was against promoting homosexuality as a valid, alternative lifestyle to young people. At that time he also affirmed the right of the Boy Scouts to exclude “gay” scout leaders.

I raise this issue to contrast the benign public image of “gays” with the face of the “gay” movement that we have seen in these pages. Those whose perceptions of the “gay” movement have been shaped primarily by the popular media may find President Clinton's pro-“gay” political actions appropriate, even laudable. Such people have been persuaded that “gays” are society's victims in need of protection. But the “gay” movement I have seen and investigated is neither benign, nor are its members “victims.” It is vicious, deceptive and enormously powerful. Its philosophy is Machiavellian and its tactics are (literally) Hitlerian.

What explains the dichotomy of perspectives on the “gay” movement? If any of the facts in this book are true, then the image of the “gay” movement Bill Clinton and other pro-“gay” opinion makers would like you to accept cannot be true. Are typical heterosexual supporters of “gay rights” simply unconcerned about the association of homosexuality with personal and societal dysfunction and violence? Or have these presumably well-intentioned people been denied complete information?

I have always been cautious of the word conspiracy, yet this is the word which best describes how the “gatekeepers” of American popular culture have helped to shape public opinion on this issue. The truth about homosexuality and the Nazi Party (indeed most information that might reflect negatively on the “gay” movement) appears to have been deliberately suppressed. We know that so-called “gay rights” has become a virtual cause celebre among the
self-styled cultural elites in government, academia and the news and entertainment media. Over fifty years ago Samuel Igra also observed that homosexualism “had become a veritable cult among the ruling classes” in Germany prior to the rise of Hitler. I have come to believe that America’s cultural elitists, perceiving themselves to be the moral arbiters of our society and the protectors of “gays,” have used their power and their positions to protect and shield the “gay” movement from all unfavorable publicity. More than this, they have colluded to promote an image of “gays” as sterling citizens.

When I initially learned the truths set forth in this book, I was first astonished and then angered. Why had this information never surfaced during the many months in which the Oregon campaign to stop the “gay” agenda was continually being compared (in the local and national media) to the Nazi regime? The information is certainly not hidden. Anyone with the most basic research skills could easily find many of the two hundred-odd sources we have cited in this book. Are we to believe that the hundreds of trained journalists, college professors and politicians who helped guide the debate on that campaign (and many similar events) failed to discover any of these sources? We must assume that at least some of these professionals knew of these facts but decided not to inform the public. At best this represents an appalling level of arrogance (allowing that they might have disregarded these facts as not credible — denying “common” people the right to make up their own minds). The more plausible (and more frightening) conclusion is that the facts were withheld because of their likely negative impact on the “gay” movement.

“Gay” political power derives in large part from the public perception that homosexuals are victims. As Kirk and Pill so baldly admitted in *The Overhauling of Straight America*, “gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the
role of protector.” What would happen to the protective instinct of Americans if they knew that many of the worst villains of the Third Reich were “gay”? How closely would America scrutinize the “gay” agenda if “homoeroticism” were revealed as the very foundation of Nazism? (And I believe the movement would not survive such scrutiny). The evidence points to a conspiracy of silence — a nearly universal self-censorship by the same opinion-makers who mock conspiracy theories and decry any form of censorship.

If the facts in this book are true, and if it is also true that the “gatekeepers” of our public information are deliberately keeping these facts from us, can we hope to educate our fellow citizens before the “gay agenda” plunges this nation into social chaos? The outcome is uncertain. Surely, however, there have been times in the past when the inevitable repetitions of history were derailed by a few warning voices. It is our hope that the facts we have presented here will penetrate the fog of media-sponsored misinformation and “political correctness.”

Have we exaggerated the urgency of our task? I think not. The future of America, indeed of civilization itself, depends upon the preservation of the natural family -- God’s model for effective human society and the training ground for healthy human relationships. Yet the goal of the “gay” movement is the devaluation of the Judeo-Christian sexual ethic (monogamous heterosexual family-centered marriage) and its replacement with a “gay” affirming pagan alternative.

The “gay” movement in America (as contrasted with the German version) is different in style but not in substance. It remains characteristically selfish and hedonistic, but more importantly it continues to be defined by what it is against: Judeo-Christian family-based society. This “gay” vision for America is best defined in a widely circulated satirical essay written by a homosexualist under the pseud-
onym “Michael Swift” (probably to remind us of the political satire of Jonathan Swift. Although the writer intends to discredit this view of the homosexual agenda, its very eloquence (in the context of our study) belies this attempt. Echoing from the ancient Spartan culture, from the Teutons, from the Knights Templar, from the SA under Ernst Roehm, and now from the American “gay rights” movement comes this, our final glimpse into the fascist heart of homosexualism:

This essay is outre, madness, a tragic, cruel fantasy, an eruption of inner rage, on how the oppressed 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 [Project 10], in your dormitories [forced homosexual roommates], in your gymnasiums, in your locker rooms, in your sports arenas, in your seminaries, in your youth groups [Wandervoegel, Boy Scouts], in your movie theater bathrooms, in your army bunkhouses (“gays in the military”), in your truck stops, in your all-male clubs, in your houses of Congress, wherever men are with men together. Your sons will 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 your freedom. You say you are no longer satisfied with men; they make you unhappy [radical feminism, lesbian separatist movement]. We, connoisseurs of the masculine face, the masculine physique, shall take your men from you then. We will amuse them; we will embrace them when they weep. Women, you say you wish to live with each other instead of men. Then go ahead 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 with depth and feeling the mind and body of another man.

All laws banning homosexual activity will be revoked
[anti-discrimination ordinances, minority status based on homosexuality]. Instead, legislation shall be passed which engenders love between men [graphic “pro-gay” sex and AIDS education, mandatory “sensitivity training.”].

All homosexuals must stand together as brothers; we must be united artistically, philosophically, socially, politically and financially [the multi-faceted and powerful “gay rights” movement]. We will triumph only when we present a common face to the vicious heterosexual enemy [suppression of internecine conflicts and other negative information about homosexuals by the homosexualist dominated media].

If you dare to cry faggot, fairy, queer, at us, we will stab you in your cowardly hearts and defile your dead puny bodies [“hate crimes,” speech codes, fines].

We shall write poems of the love between men; we shall stage plays in which man openly caresses man [the play Bent and a multitude of others; the lesbian counterpart in the television show, Ellen]; we will make films about the love between heroic men which will replace the cheap, superficial, sentimental, insipid, juvenile, heterosexual infatuations presently dominating your cinema screens [Hollywood promotion of homosexual “love-making” and of the “gay rights” agenda in movies and television]. We shall sculpt statues of beautiful young men, of bold athletes which will be placed in your parks, your squares, your plazas [public funding of homosexual pornography by the National Endowment for the Arts, National Public Broadcasting Service]. The museums of the world will be filled only with the paintings of graceful, naked lads.

Our writers will make love between men fashionable and de rigueur, and we will succeed because we are adept at setting styles [invention of “gay-speak” — “gay,” “homophobia,” “diversity,” “sexual orientation”]. We will eliminate heterosexual liaisons through usage of the devices of wit and ridicule which we are skilled in employing.

We will unmask the powerful homosexuals who masquerade as heterosexuals [outing]. You will be shocked and frightened when you learn 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 [a commonly used bumper-sticker]; we have infiltrated your ranks [strategic “surprise” announcements by “conservative” homosexuals, e.g. Mel White, former ghostwriter for Christian leaders]. 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 [Brand/Friedlander, Fuehrer principle]. Those who oppose us will be exiled [the “Fems”].

We shall raise vast, private armies, as Mishima did, to defeat you [Rossbach and Roehm, Frederick the Great]. 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 [Plato's Banquet].

The family unit — spawning ground of lies, betrayals, mediocrity, hypocrisy and violence — will be abolished [homosexual “marriage” and adoption]. The family unit, which only dampens imagination and curbs free will, must be eliminated [Plato's Republic]. 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 [Sparta].

All churches who condemn us will be closed [attacks on the McIlhennys, St. Patrick’s Cathedral]. 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 [Kummerlings]. Since we are alienated from middle-class heterosexual conventions, we are free to live our lives according to the dictates of the pure imagination [Nietzsche, Hitler]. For us too much is not
enough.

The exquisite society to emerge will be governed by an elite comprised of gay poets [Adolf Brand, Stefan George, Plato’s “philosopher-kings”]. One of the major requirements for a position of power in the new society will be indulgence in the Greek passion [pederasty]. Any man contaminated with heterosexual lust will be automatically barred from a position of influence [SA leadership]. 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 [Holocaust revisionism, extravagant claims that historical figures (like Lincoln) were homosexual], history filled and debased with your heterosexual lies and distortions. We shall portray the homosexuality of 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 [Hans Blueher].

We shall be victorious because we are filled with the ferocious bitterness of the oppressed who have been forced to play seemingly bit parts in your dumb, heterosexual shows throughout the ages [victim-plunder strategy]. We too are capable of firing guns and manning the barricades of the ultimate revolution [ACT-UP, Queer Nation, blood terrorism].

Tremble, hetero swine, when we appear before you without our masks.

The Final Word

Kevin E. Abrams

“The foundation of any ‘human’ civilization is a moral and healthy sexual constitution, everything else is window-dressing.”

The Jerusalem Post, May 21, 1996

After we learn of the role “gays” played in the National Socialist movement, the Nazi attitude towards homosexuality may still seem contradictory and confusing, a riddle only partially solved. We may still wonder, if so many of the leading Nazis were “gay,” why they would target homosexuals for incarceration or extermination as today’s “gay” activists claim. How can today’s “gays,” who express so little regard for Biblical ethics, now portray themselves as joint victims with the very Jews who suffered persecution and virtual extermination at the hands of the largely “gay” Nazis? How do the official Nazi invectives against homosexuality reconcile with the fact that “gays” held key positions in the Nazi government throughout its despotic reign, inclusive of the Holocaust. Were the Nazis then victims of their own persecution?

And why are we so compellingly urged by the Left to sanction “gay rights,” when, as the wide spectrum of “gay” and non-“gay” sources listed in this book’s bibliography incontrovertibly show, Germany’s militant “gays” were largely responsible for propelling Hitler into the Chancellor’s office? And now, knowing the extent to which German “gays” contributed to the success of the Nazi movement, how should we interpret a looming “gay” swastika over America?
Spiritual Truth

Jewish scholar Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch who lived in the last century, is remembered for his most profound and extensive treatise on Torah philosophy. HOREB, meaning Sinai (the mountain where the original Torah was given by God and received by Moses), was written and published as a refutation to the Jewish pretensions of the German Reform Religion, which, today, is at the forefront of the movement to promote “gay rights” in America’s Jewish community and within Israel. In opposition to both natural and Divine law, Reform has ordained lesbians as “rabbis” and sanctioned “gay” unions. “Gay” Jews have also imposed themselves on the Holocaust, cynically and pragmatically exploiting the deaths of six million Jewish men, women and children as a dramatic metaphor to portray themselves as victims, as if Hitler had targeted Jewish homosexuals primarily because they were “gay.” But what of the truth in history?

From an ethical monotheistic perspective, Rabbi Hirsch points out in the following excerpt from HOREB, how it is the primary concern and duty of each of us to guard the dignity of our fellow man:

God, who created man to be just, that is to say, to leave and give to all entities in all their relations that which is their due, has also endowed his mind with the faculty of mirroring the reality of things in their various relations so that man may be able to perceive the entities and their relations, and, on the strength of this knowledge, give to them what the teachings of justice lay down as their right.

This reproduction of reality in the mind is truth. Truth therefore, is a precondition of justice; for only according to the image of the things and their relations which appears in man’s mind can man behave towards them; if this image be false, his behavior will be different from what is due to them: he becomes unjust. And thus, if nothing else,
justice itself - which is our Divine calling - will guarantee that, as far as that calling of ours demands, we shall be able to perceive the reality of external things from their reflection within ourselves.

God has knitted together the community of man with the vital thread of love, and has ordained that man should rely on his brother for the spiritual good - namely, truth. But he who, instead of truthfully expressing in words what he has experienced to be real, communicates a false image of it to his brother, who accepts it and bases his behavior on it - either being unjust to his fellow-creatures or, having a wrong conception of their intentions towards him, being destroyed by them - that man turns into a curse that supreme blessing of the Creator; for he who denies truth to his brother, thus violating the highest duty towards him which God has imposed, calls down a curse - he who lies calls down a curse. And as material property is valuable only as a means for a life devoted to justice, and the liar steals the first condition of that justice - namely, truth, and gives falsehood in exchange, thus giving birth to injustice, the liar is even more dangerous than the thief.

The thief takes only the means of life as such, while the liar takes those of a just life, producing, in turn, injustice - and misery. For just as God links the supreme good, justice, to truth, so does He do the same with regard to the minor good, happiness. For to appreciate the nature of things you rely on your knowledge of them; and if somebody deceives you about their true nature, he robs you of a support or causes you to lean on a support that is insecure. And by stealing from another directly something precious - truth - and so indirectly the most precious thing - justice - the liar also kills himself spiritually; for he extinguishes in himself that Divine spark which alone makes of a him a human being created for the benefit of his fellow-men (Hirsch:248ff). [And what of “gay rights?” Never have so few taken so much from so many.]
Who were the Nazis?

We must recognize who the Nazis were. Ideologically, the Nazis were pragmatic, technocratic, tribal pagan utilitarians. They viewed human life with a detached and cynical pragmatism. They exploited whomever and whatever they could to achieve their political and military goals. Typically, the Nazis approached such issues as euthanasia, homosexuality and abortion with a ruthless expedience. Sterilization and abortion were preferred for anyone classified inferior or defective (but never for healthy Aryans).

To the technocratic Nazi mind truth was dictated by the necessity of the moment (dealing thus in lies they brought a curse upon themselves and all they touched). “Defectives” were euthanized and inferiors sterilized, while it was a crime for Aryan maidens to have abortions. While privately tolerating and even promoting homosexuality, the Nazis denounced it frequently in public using trumped-up charges of homosexuality to arrest and remove those who disagreed with Hitler’s military and political goals. Former neo-Nazi Ingo Hassellbach, in his revealing 1996 book, Fuhrer-Ex, confirms how the utilitarian Nazi double standard was applied in other areas: “Opposition to abortion had been one of the consistent planks in the Nazi platform since the Movement’s beginnings in the 1920s, and for a simple reason: abortion was race murder. While permissible, even desirable, among the colored women and Jews of the world, among Aryans it was the ultimate sin” (Hasselbach:111).

The Nazi version of racial eugenics evolved into the key political and military platform of the Nazi Party, which enabled the Nazis to portray the Jewish people as a defective and inferior class, along with the physically deformed and other non-productive members of German society. In effect, however, the Nazis simply projected their own depravities upon the Jewish people, demonized and dehumanized them, and then used them as scapegoats as they
themselves proceeded to plunder the world. Nazi racial theories served as a pretext to justify the elimination of a people whose deeper “offense” was its commitment to an unyielding moral standard.

As Professor Giora Shoham explains in his book, Valhalla, Calvary & Auschwitz, the Nazis, like today’s “gays,” “longed to shed the normative constraints of Judaeo-Christian law and morals and to return to the amoral irresponsibility of their paganism. They resented the Jews, who symbolized to them the imposition of restraints on their hedonistic paganism....When this sense of law and justice is rejected, the tribal chieftain, [and homoerotic warrior] reigns supreme. Thus, the separant power of Odin knew no limits; consequently, the omnipotence of Adolf Hitler, der Fuehrer, recognized no boundaries of law, morality or mercy” (Shoham:27).

Increasingly, as they emerge from the closet, today’s “gays” do bear a striking resemblance to yesterday’s Nazis.

**Left-Right Polarities**

To understand the pagan mind in this context we must recognize the truth about left-right polarities in the political sphere. With minor discrepancies, all left-wing ideology can be identified as “regressive,” and right-wing ideology as “progressive.” Left-wing regressives incite mutual plunder, encourage dependency and pragmatically aspire to the lowest common denominator. Genuine right-wing progressive conservatives encourage creativity, inspire mutual affirmation, trust and human productivity. By nature, all socialism falls on the regressive side, in that “socialism,” is simply a political ideology which often lacks a true sense of social justice. Evil disguises itself as virtue (e.g., the goal of racial purity) because it has no life of its own (which is why sad bondage wishes to be known as “gay liberation.”)

Generally, adherents of the Left fail to do what is nec-
ecessary to guard the dignity of their fellow man. A left-leaning historian, for instance, would fatalistically argue that “history” repeats itself, while a conservative like Voltaire could observe correctly how it is instead “man who always repeats himself.” No wonder left-regressives cannot learn from history. If history just “happens” then little can be learned from it or done to prevent it from happening again. Basing one’s decisions on a revised, corrupted or inverted version of history, however, is another matter. Some of man’s worst follies are committed because of erroneous or falsified information.

In trying to understand the Nazi phenomenon we often ask ourselves how a gang of murdering thugs could have seized power in such a civilized nation? The truth is that Germany during the Weimar period was one of the most uncivilized nations in the world. Hitler himself referred to Berlin as the whore of Babylon. We consistently err in judging the advancement of human civilizations on the basis of art and technology. The Nazis loved classical music, and they were astute in the use of science and technology. The question we must ask about every society is, to what end is human culture is employed? For left-wing regressives, culture serves destruction and death. For right-wing progressives, culture focuses upon life.

A positive and utilitarian attitude toward homosexuality, euthanasia and abortion would therefore (then as now) be a left-wing regressive orientation, and a typical Nazi profile (with very specific contradictions and qualifications). It bears repeating that the Nazis were first and foremost technocratic, utilitarian pragmatists who believed in the survival of the fittest and the societal goals of physical beauty and racial perfection, Aryans being the “fittest” and most perfected, and Jews the least “fit” and least perfect. In truth, racial characteristics are irrelevant. Only the morality of individuals and nations can determine whether they are civilized or barbarians -- builders or plunderers.
How do homosexuals fit into this picture? Although Nazi rhetoric listed homosexuals among the unfit, the Nazis never targeted homosexuals for destruction. To the contrary, unless the homosexual in question was Jewish, or a political enemy, the Nazi organization was often protective of homosexuals. Originally, the SS was founded for precisely the purpose of protecting Viennese homosexuals. The Nazis actually attempted to cure homosexuals at the Goering Institute, albeit in many ways which proved futile. (forcing a gender-weak frightened male to sleep with a female prostitute proved ineffective). “Gay” rights activists often take Nazi propaganda against homosexuals and regurgitate it as historical truth. Nazi and “gay” historical revisionism, with their inversion of history and civilized values, are one. In today’s “gay” victim strategy, the perpetrator is posing as the victim.

**Fifth Columns**

In their quest for power, Nazi homosexuals were no different from today’s “gays.” Then, as now, the strategy was one of deception, infiltration and subversion. Our study of “gay” history reveals how Nazi “gays,” both historically and today, act as subversive fifth columns in their host communities, preparing the way for “gay” Nazi power while overtly and covertly spreading anti-“gay” propaganda in an attempt to veil their own goals. The Pink Swastika documents how top French and British Nazis were “gays” and that American Nazi Frank Collin, who led the 1977 march on Skokie Illinois, was a “gay” pederast. So what of so-called ‘liberty?’

The idea of liberty held by modern liberals is quite new. According to them, liberty connotes a radical individualism that rejects all social norms and institutions which the individual has not agreed to. Subscribers to this idea defend the right of Nazis (who themselves despise the idea of rights) to
march through Skokie, Illinois, but not the right of Skokians and their elected leaders to maintain order and defend the dignity of the principles and customs they hold most dear. Likewise, they support the right of homosexuals and atheists to invade and destroy the Boy Scouts.

In Nazi history, failed fifth column sedition activities in target nations are recorded in the October 12, 1937 *The New York Times* in bold headlines reading, “Czech Nazi Official Is Seized by Police.” The Prague dispatch quoted in the Times reports “a major political sensation caused by the arrest, under the criminal code ‘dealing with homosexuality,’ of Hans Rutha, a high official in the country’s camouflaged Nazi Party.” And from October 17, 1937, further headlines read, “14 members of Czech Nazi Party Held for Morals Offences,” identifying Rutha, as the “‘right hand man’ of the Nazi Party Chief,” i.e., as “gay” Ernst Roehm was to Hitler. On December 3, headlines report, “Members of Youth Organization Face Homosexual Charges.” And on December 10, 1937, a *Times* story from Prague announces that “fourteen Czechs, all the accused, had received ‘suspended sentences’ after trial on homosexual charges” (J. Katz:553f).

Despite such random clues, the world of that day was duped. Left-regressive, self-identified lesbian, Gertrude Stein, felt that Hitler should have received the Nobel Peace prize in 1937. Apparently, Britain’s Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, also thought Hitler could be bribed to honor peace with the September 30, 1938 Munich agreement. His payment was Czechoslovakia, but “peace in our time” only cleared the way for Hitler’s invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939. History shows that militant “gay” efforts often produce a result that is anything but peaceful. Further, while individual “gays” may “come out of the closet” for various reasons, their agenda and the truth about the depth of their infiltration of powerful institutions, remains hidden. We can also learn from the Nazis’ victims
that bribery never satisfies extortionists. They always come back for more, which is why (in our day) demands for “rights” have no end. Each capitulation of American society to “gay” demands draws increasing demands, which will continue until they destroy the institutions which support society, including the homosexuals themselves.

The age of AIDS has launched “gay” activism into full gear. As the liberal dogma would have it, no one is responsible for AIDS; it just happens. Taking its cue from no-fault divorce and no-fault insurance, the Left has also created the concept of no-fault utilitarian sex. British occultist and Satanist, Aleister Crowley sums it up: “do what thou wilt, shall be the whole of the law.” But “do what thou wilt” is no law at all! Crowley’s maxim is in reality a negation of all natural and spiritual law; it only promotes chaos and a left-wing regressive descent into oblivion and non-existence. His maxim reflects a complete lack of concern and respect for the dignity of his fellow man and a contempt for life.

“Gay” Sedition

“Gay” strategists choose to employ the biological model of homosexuality for the dual purpose of denying choice and escaping responsibility. In calling for research into a so-called “gay” gene, their purpose was never to cure or rectify, but to justify homoerotic conduct and the homosexual identity. “Gays” correctly reason that if sexual behavior is a choice, it carries with it both responsibility and accountability. Their insistence that homosexuality is “not a choice” functions to bring ever more recruits into the “gay” fold and keep them there by discouraging them from seeking change. For many of today’s young men, their ability to choose has been hijacked by a sophisticated program of psychosexual sedition and manipulation, largely sustained by the social weaknesses of our time.
To limit the animating source for human behavior to the brain and animal instinct (as many of today’s behavioral scientists do) is both reductionist and left-wing regressive. Human motives and actions are, to a significant extent, determined by the vastly greater non-physical aspects of human existence. Inclinations are non-physical, and behavior causes physical change. (Planting the seed of human life in the passage designed for the expulsion of waste not only causes disease, but also exerts a destructive force upon the individual soul and on the value of all human life).

“Gays” have forgotten that responsibility for personal conduct goes hand-in-hand with our personal dignity and authority. Realistically, we can never dignify something which is profoundly undignified, no matter how hard we strive to. This brings us to another seditious element of “gay” culture, pornography. Dr. Judith Reisman, co-author of _Kinsey Sex & Fraud_ and Founder of the Washington based Institute for Media Education, is an expert on the impact of pornography on society. During a lengthy private conversation, Dr. Reisman asserted that “all pornography promotes homosexuality.” I have pondered her comment many times since then, and have come to see its correctness. In her 1994 analysis, _Kinsey, Hefner & Hay, The Indoctrination of Heterophobia in American Men & Women_, Dr. Reisman explains;

Pragmatically, _Playboy_ (that is, all pornography) manifests a blatant homosexual ethos. Its heterophobia is sustained by an utilitarian analysis of _Playboy_ images and philosophy. It is not too much to say, that just as the imagery of stained glass windows and holy cards once initiated, instructed and indoctrinated potential adherents in a religious faith, the didactic images in “soft” and “hard” pornography similarly initiate, instruct and indoctrinate potential believers in the tenants of its religion, its homosexual morality. Hugh Hefner took great pains to write his own bible; he called it the “_Playboy_ Philosophy.” And on
this note, it is well accepted that “Alfred Kinsey...gave Hefner the research base for the “Playboy Philosophy.”...In fact Kinsey can properly be identified along with his supporters and co-workers, as the one most responsible for justifying the kind of behavior which led to AIDS, and more than Harry Hay, the real father of American’s homoerotic revolution (Reisman, 1994:7f). [In reality, pornography expresses a vicious hatred and contempt for the dignity of all men in that it treats men as nothing more than an appendage to be manipulated by the twisting and exploitation of female sexuality.]

**Sons of Oedipus**

Clinical research concludes that the target of human sexual affections is not predetermined at birth, but conditioned by a combination of environmental and sociological factors. It would be helpful to turn back to the “Oedipus complex,” to present a psychosexual model for the roots of homoerotic attraction. [Oedipus was the legendary figure who killed his father and married his mother.]

Although “gay” research mocks and rejects the validity of this Freudian construct, the idea offers helpful insight into the complex structure and development of the homosexualities. The classic Oedipus complex may be defined as a lust-hate demeanor towards the mother and an irreconcilable combination of longing and contempt for the father. In the words of Dr. Joseph Nicolosi,

Homosexuality is a developmental problem that is almost always the result of problems in family relations, particularly between father and son. As a result of failure with father, the boy does not fully internalize male gender-identity, and develops homosexuality. This is the most commonly seen clinical model (Nicolosi, 1991:25).
Analyst Peter Loewenberg in *The Nazi Revolution, Hitler’s Dictatorship and the German Nation*, writes, “Boys who become homosexuals are often those who were left alone with their mothers and formed an intense attachment to them that was unmediated by the father’s presence and protection.”

The regressive promotion of an androgynous culture advances an equality in which gender distinctions, roles and identity are blurred and inverted. This leads to a loss of healthy self-identity. Paradoxically, the freedom of choice being offered by liberal left-regressive social theorists to today’s youth destroys a child’s ability to choose. In a similar vein, radical feminism actually destroys femininity while emasculating males, and socialism destroys social justice. By robbing our children of their ability to conduct themselves morally, today’s left-wing regressives are grooming a new generation of potential Nazis.

Today, while chronic homoerotic behavior is limited to a small percentage of the population, its roots (either deficiencies in psychic gender patterning, or deviance initiated by adult-child sexual abuse) may be more widespread. Clinical studies reveal that the sexualization of a search for masculinity is the genesis of homoerotic attraction. It follows that the current generation of fatherless youth may be prime candidates for homosexual recruitment. And the same amoral thinking which allows them to consider homosexuality as a “normal” option may also make them dangerously susceptible to the next Hitler. It is no accident that Hitler and his cronies came to power on the backs of emasculated German male youth.

**Akhtar’s Metaphor -- A New Beginning**

A primary goal of any people striving to maintain a civilized human society must be to prepare our children to become reliable and loyal husbands and wives and competent
fathers and mothers. There is nothing in the world a young man wishes to do more than to be able to love, admire and respect his father. This vision can only be fully realized in the context of a healthy natural family.

There are two primary obligations which the parent has toward his children: to instill in them a moral and healthy sexual constitution and to ensure they are equipped with an honest and productive way of providing for themselves and their families. These two personal assets enable any person to live life as a dignified human being. The parents’ obligation, therefore, is to guard the dignity of their children. Conversely, the Biblical injunction contained within the principle of the family is for the children to guard the dignity of their parents. If we kept this in mind, many families could be reunited and divisions resolved. Our challenge is to repair America’s soul before the body perishes.

Dr. Salman Akhtar’s book, Broken Structures, offers a metaphor for healing the broken person which is also applicable to the mending of a nation. Teaching a course on character pathology to a class of clinical psychology interns, Dr. Akhtar was asked if a severely disturbed client could ever be so completely healed by psychotherapy that he would be indistinguishable from a person who had always been well-adjusted. From the book Broken Structures in which Dr. Akhtar tells “The Parable of Two Flower Vases,” I will conclude with his words:

I thought for a moment. Then, prompted by an inner voice, I spontaneously came up with the following answer. Well, let us suppose that there are two flower vases made of fine china. Both are intricately carved and of comparable value, elegance, and beauty. Then a wind blows and one of them falls from its stand, and is broken into pieces. An expert from a distant land is called. Painstakingly, step by step, the expert glues the pieces back together. Soon the broken vase is intact again, can hold water without leaking, is unblemished to all who see it.
Yet this vase is now different from the other one. The lines along which it had broken, a subtle reminder of yesterday, will always remain discernible to an experienced eye. However, it will have a certain wisdom since it knows something that the vase that has never been broken does not: it knows what it is to break and what it is to come together.

Kevin E. Abrams
November 14, 1997
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