THE BOSTON HERALD, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1994

DON FEDER

Glamour-izing the gay lifestyle

ur 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 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 nonsmoking. In the "Advocate," ISOs (in search ofs) 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 officited 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.

Homosexual magazine's attack on Christ one of the ugliest ever

The Advocate front cover of December 13, 1994, asks "Is God Gay?" and depicts Jesus Christ in garish colors as a homosexual, complete with sexual devices around his neck and obscene body-part imagery around and on Him.

Inside the magazine is an even more obscene portrayal: a full-color, full-page picture that includes realistic renderings of male and female genitalia. It accompanies a disingenuous article about the merits of the homosexual-oriented Metropolitan Community Church.

One cannot ever justifiably desecrate the image of God Himself for any reason, much less to make a political point. Not to mention days before one of the most sacred days on the Christian calendar. One cannot do this and claim to be seeking mere "tolerance" for all.

The Advocate is not a "fringe" homosexual publication. It is the largest and most respected "mainstream" homosexual periodical in America. However, The Advocate is typical in that, like other homosexual publications, it markets pornography and sexually explicit materials and personal ads.

The Reisman and Johnson Report, a new study by Drs. Judith Reisman and Charles Johnson subtitled "Partner Solicitation Characteristics as an Expression of Male Sexual Orientation," compares five years' worth of personal ads in *The Advocate* with male heterosexual personal ads in *The Washingtonian*, a coffee table monthly published in the nation's capital.

The authors find that 98% of Advocate clients seek casual sex, often through prostitution. By contrast, 87% of Washingtonian clients seek long-term fidelity. A typical Washingtonian ad stresses character traits, while a typical Advocate ad stresses size of body parts, adeptness at certain sexual acts, and such erotica as sadomasochism and fetishes.

Reisman and Johnson conclude, "There is no measured commonality of outcome, purpose, or process between the heterosexual population and the homosexual population under study."

The report also documents that all homosexual publications contain pornography material, but few "mainstream" publications do so. If anyone is "obsessed," with the issue of homosexuality, it is male homosexuals seeking lust, not love.

by ROBERT H. KNIGHT

Director of Cultural Studies at the Family Research Council in Washington, D.C.

As offensive as *The Advocate* cover image is to all believing Christians, the choice of a crucifix is particularly odious to Catholics. Homosexual activists believe that if they can get Rome to abandon Biblical teaching on homosexuality, then the rest of the Christian world would eventually follow.

It is not overstatement to observe that *The Advocate's* cover image constitutes one of the ugliest attacks on religious freedom in this nation's history, right up there with

Andres Serrano's photo of a crucifix in urine. America's pluralism has been protected not so much by abstract law such as the First Amendment, as important as that is, but by a mutual respect for the beliefs of others that preempts attacks like the one in *The Advocate*.

Some people are struggling with uncertain gender identity and others have given up hope of becoming normal and have openly identified with homosexuality. As individuals, these people are in need of compassion and care, and churches should be reaching out to those who are sexually wounded and who seek the same salvation that all of us, as sinners, are offered. But homosexual activism must be opposed in all its forms, because it is not about tolerance and compassion. It is about compelling others, by government force if necessary, to renounce their most deeply held beliefs. Anyone with any doubts about that should

ask the Boy Scouts, who are under attack by homosexual activists in courts all over the country.

As the flagship publication of the homosexual rights movement, *The Advocate* has unmasked the true agenda of homosexual

activists, who have been very careful to hide their actual behaviors by persuading the media to focus only on abstract arguments about civil rights.

The object is to use the media and government power to force us to declare homosexuality as normal and healthy and to live as if traditional moral tenets are now somehow inapplicable or even criminal in their public expression.

In choosing an image that expresses contempt for Christians and for Christ Himself, *The Advocate* reveals the foundation of homosexual activism: hatred of social norms and hatred of God Himself. After all, it is His moral law that they are trying unsuccessfully

to overthrow, and it is He with whom they ultimately have an argument. But they are not behaving very well in that quest.

Many - not all - homosexual activists have shown little regard for civility. Some have marched naked in front of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York; others have invaded the cathedral to shout obscenities and throw the communion Host on the floor. Still others have attacked opponents by: throwing condoms at parishioners in a Colorado church; trashing the offices of pro-family organizations and at least one ex-gay therapist in California; physically assaulting a newspaper editor for declining to use the word "gay"; attempting to criminalize reparative ex-gay therapy; presenting severely flawed genetic and parenthood studies by homosexual researchers as undisputed "fact" and working to suppress other points of view; working to deny parents the means to shield their children from pro-homosexual propa-

ganda in government schools; shouting down, interrupting and otherwise suppressing opponents on television talk shows and in public forums; using the media to denounce as "bigots and haters" any person who op-

continued on page 23

