



# EYE ON BUREAUCRACY

John Lofton, Editor

Volume XI, Number 3

April, 2000

## **NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS SUBSIDIZES HOMOSEXUAL PROPAGANDISTS IN THE CULTURE WAR**

The good news about the film that was made with \$7,500 worth of your hard-earned Federal tax dollars and mine is that it is an "award winning" production. The bad news is that it was voted "Best Documentary" by: The San Francisco International Lesbian and Gay Film Festival; the Chicago Lesbian and Gay Film Festival; the Turin, Italy, International Lesbian and Gay Film Festival; and several other rabidly pro-homosexual groups.

### **TAX-SUBSIDIZED PBS AND TAX-SUBSIDIZED NEA WORK IN TANDEM**

The film I am alluding to is titled "It's Elementary: Talking About Gay Issues in School". It was produced by Helen S. Cohen and Debra Chasnoff. And it was funded, in part, by \$7,500 from the National Endowment for the Arts through the Portland, Oregon, Art Museum.

### **YOU PAY TO TEACH "TOLERANCE" OF PERVERSION**

When I viewed this 90-minute abomination on Maryland Public Television (MPT), it was preceded by a message from the CEO of MPT Ron Shuman. With a (if you'll pardon the expression) straight face, Shuman said that this film is "about teaching tolerance in school" concerning "alternative lifestyles", that its intention is to "promote dialog, not to draw conclusions for you".

But, this is a lie. If Shuman had been "Pinocchio", his nose would have been roughly the size of the Washington Monument. "It's Elementary" is a blatant piece of pro-lesbian, pro-sodomite propaganda which most definitely does teach a conclusion. And this conclusion is that homosexuality is fine instead of what it really is — an alternative death style.

### **MENTAL CONDITIONING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS**

Here's some of what we see in this film which we are told was shot at six elementary and middle schools where "experienced teachers" talked to their students about homosexuality "despite today's political climate":

- One little boy says: "I don't think it is bad. I mean, the prejudice or people who are against gay people or lesbian people — they're not terrible or horrible people."
- Another little boy says: "Who really cares if you're gay, if nobody knows in the world? It's like, what's the big whoop?"

### **CHILDREN ARE TAUGHT THAT EVIL IS GOOD**

- In one New York City class of fourth graders (!), a teacher is asking the class to write down whatever comes to their mind when they hear the words "gay" or "lesbian". She tells the class not to worry

because: "There's no right or wrong answer" — which sounds like a "conclusion" to me. We see the teacher of this class looking into the camera and saying, falsely, that "it's not true" that you're talking about sex when you talk about homosexuals; you're talking about "a community, a people relating to each other".

### **GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS ARE HOMOSEXUAL INDOCTRINATION ACADEMIES**

— In another New York City school, we see eighth graders taught by an obviously lesbian teacher. She (?) is talking about the class assignment which is to write a one- or two-page paper about whether teaching about homosexuality should be in the curriculum. One girl objects to the heterosexual nature of the "Cinderella" story saying that for this to be "equal" there should also be a book about two princesses falling in love and living happily ever after.

— At an elementary school in Peabody, Massachusetts, we see a photo exhibit in the lobby of homosexual "families". It's titled "Love Makes a Family". The principal says these are "lovely, lovely photos" — which, again, sounds like a conclusion.

### **AMERICA IS CHANGING? AMERICA IS BEING CHANGED!**

At this school, we see one fifth grade (!) boy asking if "a woman's sperm can fertilize her own eggs?" The teacher corrects him saying that only the man has sperm and there is a baby only if a sperm fertilizes an egg. We see this teacher telling his class that he's read that only one in three kids are born in a "family" where the man and woman are married. He adds, approvingly: "So, America's changing."

— In a middle school in San Francisco eighth grade social studies, we see a teacher teaching on "stereotypes". He says he wants his students to think about "stereotypes" as they think about lesbians and gay men. He asks for papers on this subject. One young male reads his paper confessing that he has put homosexuals down but this was not right, that this was "ignorant".

Then, incredibly, it's show-and-tell-time in this class. We see two real live homosexuals — a male and a female, I think — who are there, in person, to answer questions. But, but, they say, they are not there to "recruit" anybody. They are just there to talk about themselves.

### **HOMOSEXUALITY IS ABOUT THE CONDUCT WHICH GOD SAYS IS AN ABOMINATION**

For example, the male sodomite tells how he had a Dad who was a pastor and that he grew up in a Pentecostal church. He says he "came out" at 17. The lesbian says she "came out" when she was about 19 or 20.

One male student asks, with a smirk: "How do you guys do it?" The male sodomite says well, they are not allowed to answer questions about their "personal sex lives" because this is prohibited by the rules of the school district.

OK. You get the drift. You get the message here — I hope.

So, how do the producers of this disgusting, anti-Christian garbage justify spending \$7,500 worth of your hard-earned Federal tax dollars and mine on such filth? Well, not very well, actually. Here's the way it went when I interviewed Helen Cohen, a co-producer of "It's Elementary":

### **WHY DOES YOUR CONGRESSMAN VOTE TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THIS GARBAGE?**

Q: How do you justify Federal funding of such a film about such a highly controversial subject?

A: Well, I think, I believe the arts in general, of all kinds, are kind of an essential part of our society and what makes our culture our culture. And there's bound to be controversy and things people like and don't like whether it's visual art or music or anything. And I feel a responsive government is going to fund the kinds of things that really nurture culture and art and make for a healthy society. So, I think it's really tragic that funding has been cut on the basis of things being too controversial. People can deal with

controversy in a lot of ways. It's an opportunity to have dialog and debate and discussion. And I think that's healthy — social discourse.

Q: Well, some social discourse is healthy and some is not. But, why should the Federal government be involved in funding such films as yours? I mean, if the arts are as important as you say, then fine, get out and prove this by raising your money in the private sector.

A: But, if you look at other countries, film makers and other artists are getting a lot more support from the government and you don't have to spend nearly as much time fund-raising. And, you know, kind of wasting time on that sort of administrative — it's a drain on creative energy basically when you have to spend a huge amount of time in production on raising money. This just puts that many more obstacles in front of us.

Q: But, I repeat, if art, or specifically your film, is as important as you say, then the way to test this is to try and raise money in the private sector, not get it from the Federal government.

She says there should be a more "streamlined" and quicker way for artists to get money from the Feds, that such money should be "easier to get".

Q: If I asked you, I'm sure you would say yes, you believe the Federal government should obey the Constitution, right?

A: I would say yes.

Q: Then where in the world do you see in the Constitution the authority for the Federal government to fund the arts, specifically a film like yours?

A: But, do you see anything in the Constitution that allows the government to give money to poor people who can't support themselves?

Q: No.

A: Right. But, I believe the government should do that. So, obviously, we're on different pages on this.

Q: But, we're not! We agree the Federal government should obey the Constitution.

A: But, I guess we could argue about what that means. I believe the Federal government should play a role in equalizing the playing field.

Q: But, what the Constitution says is that if something is not specified in the Constitution then the national government cannot do it and —

A: I really don't want to discuss this.

Q: And this is left up to the States and/or the people.

A: Right.

Q: I mean, we should all be concerned about the legality of what our Federal government is doing, right?

A: Right.

There was, however, some encouraging news in this wretched film. In that New York City fourth grade class, when asked what they think of when they hear the word "homosexual", some of the kids said they think of the words "sick, weird, gross, pervert". Amen! Exactly right! And it is also sick, weird, gross and perverted for any of our Federal tax dollars to fund such a film as "It's Elementary".

Congress approved funding this program as part of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations 2001 (H.R. 4578) by a vote in the House of 204 to 172 (Roll Call no. 291, 6/15/00) and 97 to 2 in the Senate (Roll Call no. 211, 7/18/00).

Those Representatives (**REPUBLICANS**, Democrats, *Independents*) who voted "aye" were:  
**Alabama:** ADERHOLT, BACHUS, CALLAHAN, EVERETT, RILEY **Alaska:** DON YOUNG  
**Arizona:** HAYWORTH, KOLBE, SALMON, SHADEGG, STUMP **Arkansas:** DICKEY,  
HUTCHINSON **California:** BILBRAY, BONO, CALVERT, COX, DOOLITTLE, DREIER,  
GALLEGLY, HORN, HUNTER, KUYKENDALL, JERRY LEWIS, McKEON, OSE, PACKARD,

**POMBO, RADANOVICH, ROGAN, THOMAS** Colorado: McINNIS, SCHAFFER, TANCREDO  
Connecticut: NANCY JOHNSON, SHAYS Delaware: CASTLE Florida: BILIRAKIS, CANADY,  
 DIAZ-BALART, FOLEY, FOWLER, GOSS, MICA, DAN MILLER, ROS-LEHTINEN,  
 SCARBOROUGH, SHAW, STEARNS, DAVID WELDON, BILL YOUNG Georgia: CHAMBLISS,  
 COLLINS, ISAKSON, KINGSTON, NORWOOD, VITTER Idaho: SIMPSON Illinois: BIGGERT,  
 CRANE, HASTERT, HYDE, LaHOOD, PORTER, SHIMKUS, WELLER Indiana: BURTON,  
 BUYER, McINTOSH, PEASE, SOUDER Iowa: GANSKE, LATHAM, LEACH, NUSSLE Kansas:  
 MORAN Kentucky: FLETCHER, RON LEWIS, NORTHUP, ROGERS, RYUN, WHITFIELD  
Louisiana: BAKER, McCRERY, TAUZIN Maryland: BARTLETT, EHRlich, GILCHREST,  
 MORELLA Michigan: CAMP, EHLERS, HOEKSTRA, KNOLLENBERG, NICK SMITH, UPTON  
Minnesota: GUTKNECHT, OBERSTAR, RAMSTAD Mississippi: PICKERING, Gene Taylor,  
 WICKER Missouri: BLUNT, EMERSON, HULSHOF, TALENT Nebraska: BARRETT,  
 BEREUTER, TERRY New Hampshire: BASS, SUNUNU New Jersey: FRANKS,  
 FRELINGHUYSEN, LoBIONDO, ROUKEMA, SAXTON, CHRISTOPHER SMITH New Mexico:  
 SKEEN, WILSON New York: BOEHLERT, FOSSELLA, GILMAN, HOUGHTON, KELLY, KING,  
 McHugh, QUINN, REYNOLDS, SWEENEY, WALSH North Carolina: BALLENGER, BURR,  
 COBLE, HAYES, JONES, MYRICK, CHARLES TAYLOR Ohio: BOEHNER, CHABOT,  
 GILLMOR, HOBSON, KASICH, LaTOURETTE, NEY, PORTMAN, PRYCE, REGULA, Traficant  
Oklahoma: COBURN, ISTOOK, LARGENT, WATKINS, WATTS Oregon: WALDEN  
Pennsylvania: Doyle, ENGLISH, GEKAS, GOODLING, Holden, Mascara, Murtha, PETERSON, PITTS,  
 SHERWOOD, CURT WELDON South Carolina: DeMINT, GRAHAM, SANFORD, SPENCE  
South Dakota: THUNE Tennessee: BRYANT, DUNCAN, HILLEARY, JENKINS, WAMP Texas:  
 ARCHER, ARMEY, BONILLA, BRADY, COMBEST, DeLAY, GRANGER, SAM JOHNSON,  
 SESSIONS, LAMAR SMITH, THORNBERRY Utah: CANNON, COOK Virginia: BATEMAN,  
 DAVIS, Goode, GOODLATTE, WOLF Washington: DUNN, HASTINGS, METCALF,  
 NETHERCUTT West Virginia: Mollohan, Rahall Wisconsin: GREEN, PETRI, RYAN Wyoming:  
 CUBIN

The 97 Senators who voted "aye" were: Alabama: SESSIONS, SHELBY Alaska:  
 MURKOWSKI, STEVENS Arizona: KYL, McCain Arkansas: HUTCHINSON, Lincoln  
California: Boxer, Feinstein Colorado: ALLARD, CAMPBELL Connecticut: Dodd, Lieberman  
Delaware: Biden, ROTH Florida: Graham, MACK Georgia: Cleland Hawaii: Akaka, Inouye  
Idaho: CRAIG, CRAPO Illinois: Durbin, FITZGERALD Indiana: LUGAR, Bayh Iowa:  
 GRASSLEY, Harkin Kansas: BROWNBACK, ROBERTS Kentucky: BUNNING, McCONNELL  
Louisiana: BREAUx, LANDRIEU Maine: COLLINS, SNOWE Maryland: MIKULSKI, SARBANES  
Massachusetts: KENNEDY, KERRY Michigan: Levin, ABRAHAM Minnesota: GRAMS  
Mississippi: COCHRAN, LOTT Missouri: ASHCROFT, BOND Montana: BAUCUS, BURNS  
Nebraska: HAGEL, Kerrey Nevada: Bryan, Reid New Hampshire: GREGG, ROBERT SMITH  
New Jersey: Lautenberg, Torricelli New Mexico: Bingaman, DOMENICI New York: Moynihan,  
 Schumer North Carolina: Edwards, HELMS North Dakota: Conrad, Dorgan Ohio: DeWINE,  
 VOINOVICH Oklahoma: INHOFE, NICKLES Oregon: Wyden, GORDON SMITH Pennsylvania:  
 SANTORUM, SPECTER Rhode Island: LINCOLN CHAFEE, Reed South Carolina: Hollings,  
 THURMOND South Dakota: Daschle, Johnson Tennessee: FRIST, THOMPSON Texas:  
 GRAMM, HUTCHISON Utah: BENNETT, HATCH Vermont: Leahy, JEFFORDS Virginia:  
 Robb, WARNER Washington: GORTON, Murray West Virginia: Byrd, Rockefeller Wisconsin:  
 Kohl Wyoming: ENZI, THOMAS

John Lofton, a former editor of *Conservative Digest*, is an author, lecturer, and advocate for Christian and conservative causes. He publishes *The Lofton Letter*, a sample copy of which is available for \$2 from: Box 1142, Laurel, Maryland 20725.