

## **An Open Letter to Leaders of the "Social Conservative "Movement.**

*from Judith A. Reisman, Ph.D.*

*Institute for Media Education*

*October 5, 1994*

1896 words

Just when the American electorate is clamoring for representatives of strong moral character, "social conservatives" are arbitrarily and severely narrowing the "social" issues debate. I am very concerned about recent declarations by the social conservative Brahmins at the Christian Coalition meeting in Washington, D.C. John Leo reported their "carefully constructed" call in the *Washington Times* (October 1, 1994) for a "new ordering of priorities" and a "values vocabulary overhaul" which seems designed to sweep away the "divisive" moral/social issues from the conservative debate.<sup>1</sup>

Recently signaling this change in the debate, conservative leader in the House, Republican Whip Newt Gingrich was reported in Robert Novak's recent column as reneging on his promise to support an education bill amendment which would have barred schools from tax-funded promotions of homosexuality to our schoolchildren.<sup>2</sup> The reason, wrote Novak, given by "Gingrich and associates" was his desire to prevent another screaming session on the house floor between two Republicans: conservative Rep. Robert Dornan of California and Rep. Steve Gunderson of Wisconsin. Gingrich is intent on minimizing bitter GOP disputes."<sup>3</sup>

Dan Quayle, who has been painted by the media as "Mr. Values," was recently quoted on homosexuality as banally saying its "That's their choice."<sup>4</sup> The Republican leadership believes "a kinder gentler image won't hurt the Republican party at the polls" so they are according to Leo spiking what they now would have us believe is the anti-women, anti-homosexuality and anti-black talk of abortion, homosexuality and illegitimacy. On a national level Republicans have in the past have largely upheld the social issues, but as they and their leader, Haley Barbour, quest for ever bigger inclusive tents, they become increasingly indistinguishable from the Democrats daily.

More difficult to understand than the Republicans is Mr. Ralph Reed, Christian Coalition's political savant, who seems to be joining in the swelling chorus singing out the need to put aside factional concerns. Leo reports in Mr. Reed's new book of 267 pages, *Politically Incorrect*, homosexuality gets passing comment. It is said that Mr. Reed may be attempting to move the perception of the Christian Coalition away from that of fanatics "just concerned with abortion and homosexuality." Stepping up again, Mr. Reed, in a recent *Insight* magazine article is quoted intoning the liberal code word, "diversity" in tune with the elite establishment.

And now big, virtuous, beloved-by-many Bill Bennett, along with David Boaz of the Cato Institute, points us toward the teflon sins of straight white males namely "trophy wives" and "divorce" especially in the middle class. The social conservative Brahmins have indeed shifted the rhetoric and upon closer inspection they line up nicely with the liberal humanist left, who blame all of society's ills upon white males. It seems we are either watching the artful work of thespians or Americans whose worldview reflects God's absolute order rather than man's capricious and relative nature, are passé in the Republican party; and may be in danger of becoming ghettoized in the "social conservative" movement.

<sup>1</sup> John Leo, *The Washington Times*, 1 October 1994, p. D3)

<sup>2</sup> Robert Novak, *The Voice Tribune*, 28 September, 1994.

<sup>3</sup> *The Advocate*, the national homosexual magazine, 4 October 1994, p. 40. (Gunderson lives with another man in the D.C. area.).

<sup>4</sup> Leo, *Supra*.

As we listen to the high-minded Republican party Brahmins weigh in, if their communal comments are any indication, they say they want to be even handed and stake out the values debate more "fairly." Mr. Reed and Dr. Bennett are the leaders, says Mr. Leo, of the "social conservative movement: Republican division." Because no-father homes are a real concern to anyone who values families, no matter what class - upper or lower, Mr. Bennett and Mr. Reed are due credit for directing national attention to the too high divorce rates. Agreed, not all of society's moral ills can be nailed to the door of homosexual/feminist advocates. But, dear sirs, if we are to start down this path, let's go all the way and expose the causes for the high rates of middle class wedlock trauma. In finding and isolating a cause there is hope of a realizing a cure, much more responsible and profitable than cursing the symptoms of widespread divorce, illegitimacy, acceptance of homosexuality and abortion.

History will inform us on this matter. After World War II, appearing on the eternal timeline was an agent for change who would introduce into this generation the ancient "erotic" religion. Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey, a Darwinian, began what is now known as the sexual revolution when he published his first study, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* in 1948. A second study would follow in 1953, on the human female.

Kinsey's reports changed America and the world from Indiana University aided largely by Rockefeller grant money.<sup>5</sup> His research yielded a revolutionary amoral sexual philosophy which he and the media respectfully urged upon America.<sup>6</sup> Cole Porter mentioned Kinsey in song and captured his philosophy, in "anything goes." Kinsey so influenced Hugh Hefner, that Hefner mainstreamed the "new" anything goes philosophy of human sexuality to middle class American males through his *Playboy* magazine in 1953. The first issue of the magazine showcased, "Miss Golddigger," an attack on marriage and celebration of divorce, as well as a feature article on how to trick a reticent girls out of their virginity. The Playboy Empire expressed itself politically by pouring millions of dollars into the "sexual rights" movement changing American laws and breaking down the moral and legal supports of the American family, laws which had been in place since the country's founding.

Michael Bracewell writes in the (London) Manchester Guardian, "40 years of fantasy with Playboy," Oct 2, 1994, p. 20

<sup>5</sup> R. Wormser, *The Foundations: Their Power and Influence* (The Devin-Adair Company: New York, 1958), p. 100-105.

<sup>6</sup> Reisman & Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex & Fraud* (Huntington House 1990):

- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, sex could and should be commonly shared with anyone and anything—jealousy was passé.
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, people left to their own were naturally bisexual. It was only through religious bigotry and prejudice that people were focused into heterosexuality and monogamy.
- Kinsey "reported" that based on his findings, children were sexual active from birth and potentially orgasmic from birth. That children are never harmed by adult/child sex and often benefit thereby.<sup>6</sup>
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, all sexual taboos and sex laws were broken; thus, all taboos and sex laws should be eliminated.
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, all orgasms are equal whether between, for example, husband and wife, boy and dog, man and boy, girl, or baby.
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, masturbation is a critical aid to sexual, physical and emotional health and it can never be excessive or pathological.
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, all forms of sexual experimentation before marriage will increase the likelihood of a successful long-term marriage.
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, adultery was natural, thus healthy and acceptable.
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, there was no medical or other reason to forbid adult-child sex or incest.
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, all sodomy is natural, thus healthy and acceptable.
- Kinsey "reported" that, based on his findings, homosexuals represent 10-37% of the population or more. (Kinsey's findings were always very fluid on this point.) Some educators have interpreted his findings by saying that only 4% to 6% of the population is exclusively heterosexual so the "heterosexual" bias in the U.S. should be ended. (*Wall Street Journal*, December 31, 1992.)

As...Joseph Smith had a dream of the Mormon Church, so Hugh Hefner...had a great American dream. But Hefner's dream was secular in conception and spiritual in its dimensions. With a nude centerfold of Marilyn Monroe as his Mary Magdalene, Hugh Hefner was founding a church for the men of America....With distribution to rival the Gideon Bible, Playboy magazine would go out into the world to spread the word. And then the church would proliferate, with Playboy clubs in major cities, where relaxing men could feel at ease with themselves and soothe the wounds no wife could soothe after bouts of corporate heroism...Now with the publication of the luxurious hard back Forty Years of Playboy...Hefner's beautiful dream has been bound in leather (so to speak) and has found its place as a major phenomenon in the history of American culture....back in his whirlpool bath, Hef must be laughing his head off.

Meanwhile, Kinsey's California disciple in the early fifties, was communist dialectician, Harry Hay. After reading Kinsey's Report, Hay immediately declared his homosexuality, left his wife and two children, and began the Mattachine Society, the origin of the political homosexual movement. Hay lived a typically homosexual life, viewing pornography and all sex experience, including sex with boys, as necessary. Homosexual historians have lionized Hay for his "profound contribution" to homosexuality. It was Hay who positioned homosexuals as a "minority" only seeking "civil rights," thus equating homosexuals as a "cultural minority" with blacks as a "racial minority." The homosexual movement still follows Hay's original strategy to claim "discrimination" protections as "cultural minority" victims. Today, Harry Hay, an old man with long-gray hair, wears the "fairy shawl" of spiritual leadership and marches in public parades with and in full support of NAMBLA, the North American Man-Boy Love Association.<sup>7</sup>

No one, not even Margaret Sanger has so dramatically retooled American values as has Dr. Kinsey. Fully entrenched by the sixties, Kinsey's "scientific" interpretation of human sexuality fostered a monopoly of "sexologist" who dispense to American institutions Kinseyan "authority" for a vast array of public programs from AIDS prevention to all "accredited" public and private school sex education. In the "gay nineties" even the institutional church is purveying enlightened sexuality to its members using Kinsey, not the scriptures, as their authority. Catholic children are now trained by Kinseyan sexologists, who say Jesus wanted them to teach small children about sex. Southern Baptist wives are urged, by sex education materials the church uses, to submit to their husbands and perform the practices of "prostitutes and whoremongers." Yes, in these days of AIDS, good Baptist ladies are instructed that while they may prefer not to swallow because they find the taste of ejaculate offensive, they are otherwise told to "relax and enjoy oral-genital sex," if they so choose.<sup>8</sup>

Mr. Leo reports Bennett's statement "When we loosened the marital bond on the middle class of this country, we destroyed it for many of the poor." But, how did this "middle-class loosening" occur? Is it verboten to address causes? Shall we treat only the symptoms, divorce, abortion, illegitimacy, homosexuality, without identifying what is the cause of the "loosening" and then perhaps discuss cures?

Social conservative women, who have been left holding the family bag by playboy husbands and increasingly like Mrs. Hay, homosexual husbands, want to know. Could it be that the "loosening" Mr. Bennett rightly identifies occurred because two generations of educated and middle-class boys have grown into manhood fantasizing themselves as playboys, in penthouses where they were hustlers of women and girls, or, boys? It is relevant research data which reports most boys had their first sexual

<sup>7</sup> Timmons, Stuart (1991). *The Trouble with Harry Hay, Founder of the Modern Gay Movement*. Boston: Alyson Publications, Inc.

<sup>8</sup> McGee, Dan & Sandra. *Celebrating Sex in Your Marriage* (Nashville, Tennessee: Family Touch), p. 139-140. Southern Baptist Christian Sex Education series. The McGee's cite, Dr. John Money as an authority.

relationship (autoerotic) with pornographic paper dolls, mere images. What of the millions of middle class boys who grew to be disappointed and resentful husbands when their "bone of my bone" wives, never looked or performed like his personal fantasy fold-up *Playboy* paper dolls? Gentlemen, are we too far past the cause that we can only deal now with the symptoms of the symptoms? Or is there still time at least to warn the young about the cause to stop the cycle of pain and family destruction?

To create sound public policy and legislation the public must have the whole truth. My concern is that many of our leading "social conservatives" and professing religious men, may themselves be victims and/or adherents of the Kinseyan philosophy; or, are the social conservatives telling us we are all guilty and there can be and should be a happy coexistence with Kinseyians and the "anything goes" sexual philosophy. Ladies, we who consider the position of woman, in creation, a blessing not bondage, are left in mournful wonder at our losses. How many American women dedicated to the blessings of family are the poorest of the poor for the loss of our unborn to abortion, the loss of our husbands to homosexuality, pornography and divorce, the loss of our children to STD's and AIDS and the all too often stunted lives resulting from illegitimacy.

The greatest betrayal to us is that our government and trusted institutions are some of the most vigorous advocates for the degenerative Kinseyian philosophy which robs us of that which is dear most unfairly. The ladies in the social conservative movement must demand that those who would champion our cause, be fearless in addressing the whole truth of "divorce in the middle class." The greatest threat to the future of our nation and its families comes from the indoctrination of our children in the Kinseyian philosophy through sex ed programs and the use of Kinseyian authority for moral/social decision making at the highest levels in all of our American institutions which now also includes the church. If the rhetoric of Republican Party leadership and our social conservative champions is to shift, let them not abandon the "priority" given to abortion, homosexuality and illegitimacy in the public debate. Rather let us dedicate ourselves to pursue the causes for all these societal ills and vigorously seek complete and total cures.

## JOHN LEO

**B**ill Bennett wants America to talk more about divorce, less about homosexuality. "I understand the aversion to homosexuality," he told the Christian Coalition conference. "I understand the difference between approval and tolerance. But if you look in terms of the damage to the children of America, you cannot compare what the homosexual movement, the gay rights movement, has done with what divorce has done to this society."

This carefully constructed paragraph is no ringing endorsement of homosexuality or the gay agenda, just a plea for a new ordering of priorities. In one form or another, the idea seems to be sweeping through the social conservative movement, Republican division.

Asked about homosexuality recently, Dan Quayle answered, in a straightforward and banal way, "That's their choice."

"Politically Incorrect," a new book by Ralph Reed, executive director of the Christian Coalition, contains only a glancing reference to homosexuality in 267 pages. And

## Values vocabulary overhaul

David Boaz of the Cato Institute has scolded the American Spectator, National Review and the Family Research Council for being "obsessed" with homosexuality. He too wants to talk about divorce. He points out that Cobb County, Ga., which passed an antigay resolution, has a 20 percent illegitimacy rate and two divorces for every three weddings. "Surely," he wrote in a New York Times op-ed piece, "the 1,545 unwed mothers and the 2,739 divorcing couples created more social problems in the county than the 300 gay men and women who showed up at a picnic to protest [the antigay resolution]."

Some of this shift in emphasis can be viewed in very practical (or, perhaps, cynical) terms. A kinder, gentler image won't hurt the Republican Party at the polls. Jim Pinkerton, the columnist and former Bush aide, has said several

times that it's foolish for Republicans not to court gay voters.

The Christian Coalition, depicted by its enemies as an army of fanatics, wants to show that its social agenda isn't confined to a few familiar issues and that gays aren't being scapegoated for family decline. So Ralph Reed explains that the coalition isn't "just concerned with abortion and homosexuality."

But some of this rhetorical shift also seems to stem from a simple sense of fairness. If we are going to talk about the no-father homes of the underclass, let's talk about the middle-class, post-divorce version, too.

After so much targeting of gays, women (for abortion) and blacks (for illegitimacy), it seems appropriate to talk about a form of social devastation indulged in regularly by straight white males, with little criticism and absolutely no stigma. As Mr. Bennett said: "If you leave

your wife and get yourself a 'trophy wife,' you're not going to be greeted with condemnation or even a raised eyebrow by most people, because it has become a convention. But what has the convention done to America society?"

Like Mr. Boaz in his op-ed article, Mr. Bennett's speech talks about illegitimacy as well as divorce. Barbara Dafoe Whitehead's famous Atlantic Monthly article, "Dan Quayle Was Right," did a lot to make a joint discussion of these two subjects possible. Much of the devastating evidence she poured forth about the no-father home applied just as well to Great Neck, N.Y., as it did to Harlem.

But another piece of writing, only now beginning to affect policy discussions, has had even more to do with depicting divorce and soaring illegitimacy as different aspects of the same problem: Myron Magnet's

1993 book, "The Dream and the Nightmare."

Mr. Magnet argues that culture counts and helps to shape society. As a result of the liberation movements of the 1960s, he says, "mainstream culture began to be intoxicated with its own sexual liberation — premarital, extramarital, you name it. If marriages broke up, as increasingly they did, that was OK, because individual, personal fulfillment was more important than family stability."

No need to stay together for the sake of the children. That was an unjustifiable restraint, and besides, kids are resilient. Quality time would make up for the old-fashioned quantity time, and kids would be happy if their parents were happy. Mr. Magnet writes: "We could hardly turn to the poor and say, 'OK, fellas, all this is fine for us, but not for you. You have to cleave to the straight and narrow.' So we destigmatized for everybody much sexual behavior that formerly had been kept in check by strong social disapproval. In the case of the poor, we destigmatized getting pregnant

out of wedlock, even for 15-year-olds, even for 13-year-olds."

The haves began abetting the proliferation of single-parent families among the have-nots, gradually helping the current ideology evolve that no-father homes are just as good as any other kind. Mr. Magnet argues that the new culture devalued all the things necessary to escape poverty, like hard work and family stability, while glamorizing things that keep the poor poor, such as drug use and casual, uncommitted sex.

Echoing Mr. Magnet, Mr. Bennett said in his Christian Coalition speech: "When we loosened the marital bond on the middle class of this country, we destroyed it for many of the poor."

Mr. Magnet's approach enables us to blur the lines of class and race when talking about the family decline we have wrought. It also has the advantage of being correct.

*John Leo is a contributing editor of U.S. News & World Report and a nationally syndicated columnist.*