

DON FEDER

Glamour-izing the gay lifestyle

Our troops will soon be entrenched on Capitol Hill. But the culture is still enemy territory. Its fortifications even stud the pages of air-head fashion magazines.

In the November issue of *Glamour* — nestled among sex surveys and articles like "The Secret Life of Models" — is a gay rights editorial that could have been lifted from the *Nation* magazine.

Glamour (circulation: 2,186,214) offers food for thought for those with modest appetites. As a lady in readers' services explained to me, over the past decade the magazine has become quite socially conscious.

Its editorial is a sneering attack on family advocates. In the gay rights debate, their rallying cry is no special rights, *Glamour* discloses, "yet you won't hear anyone explain what these special rights are, because they don't exist."

Ah, but they do.

Among them is the right to forced association — to compel others to employ you or rent to you on the basis of your sexual habits. Homosexuals are the only "sexual minority" for whom such privileges are claimed.

If someone shows up at your three-family house and announces: "Hi. I'm a promiscuous heterosexual/cross-dresser/pedophile/sadomasochist," you can ever so gently close the door in his face.

If, however, he says: "Hi. I'm a homosexual," in cities and states with gay rights laws, reject him — for any reason — at your peril.

Glamour portrays family activists as purveyors of "bogus statistics" and bigots who paint a distorted picture of gays as perverts and pedophiles.

It's almost funny, listening to the gay-OK crowd accuse the opposition of manipulating statistics, when they are guilty of hyping the biggest lie in the entire debate — the myth that 10 percent of the adult population is homosexual — for a decade and more.

Despite the refutation of this Kinsey-induced fantasy by the highly respected Alan Guttmacher Institute (whose 1993 report said only 1.1 of the population is exclusively homosexual), some in the movement cling to the discredited statistic.

On the pathology of the gay lifestyle, a soon-to-be-published study by Judith Reisman, Ph.D., should create quite a stir.

Reisman compared 10,000 personal ads that ran from 1988 to 1992 in the "Washingtonian" (a mainstream magazine with a mostly straight readership) and the "Advocate," a gay periodical. Both are published in Washington, D.C., and have nearly identical reader age and economic demographics.

Reisman found 98 percent of "Advocate" advertisers were seeking casual sex. Among the "Washingtonian" personals, 87 percent wanted long-term fidelity.

Commonly used abbreviations in the "Washingtonian" included "S" for single, "J" for Jewish and "NS" for non-smoking. In the "Advocate," ISOs (in search of) typically were looking for "B/D" (bondage and discipline) and "S/M" (sadomasochism), or presented themselves as "daddies" in search of "sons."

On the subject of pedophilia, *Glamour* deploys the oft-cited figure that a child is 100 times more likely to be molested by a heterosexual than a homosexual. Leaving aside the fact that there are 50 to 100 times more heterosexuals in the adult population, this simply isn't true.

In a letter to *The New York Times* (Feb. 28, 1993) Lynn Hecht Schafran, director of the National Judicial Education Program for the National Organization for Women's Legal Defense Fund — a group not widely renowned for homophobia — cites a study by an Emory University researcher.

Schafran notes that of 377 non-incestuous pedophiles, the study found 224 men who targeted 4,435 girls and 153 men who acknowledged assaulting 22,981 boys. That's about 20 victims per heterosexual pedophile and 150 per homosexual abuser.

How does the movement treat this disturbing phenomenon? A March 26, 1992, editorial in the homosexual San Francisco "Sentinel" trashed a lesbian reader who complained about the inclusion of the North American Man-Boy Love Association in gay pride parades.

Calling the reader a "homo-homophobe," the publication blandly observed, "NAMB-LA's position on sex is not unreasonable, just unpopular... When a 14-year-old boy approaches a man for sex, it's because he wants sex with a man... The love between men and boys is the foundation of homosexuality."

Perhaps *Glamour* could enlighten its fashion-conscious — but otherwise unconscious — readers by reprinting this as its next editorial on the subject. It might even shake a few out of their L'Oreal-induced stupor.

The culture will have to be retaken street by street, block by block, house by house.

Don Feder's column appears Monday and Thursday.