

Dr. Lehrman, a psychiatrist since 1947, is the retired Clinical Director of Kingsboro Psychiatric Center in Brooklyn and a former faculty member of the Albert Einstein and Downstate Medical Schools. He has been a member of a Reform Temple since 1960.

## **HOMOSEXUALITY: A POLITICAL MASK FOR PROMISCUITY: A PSYCHIATRIST REVIEWS THE DATA**

**I**t should be obvious that a fundamental conflict exists between Judaism's core insistence on sexual fidelity and the sexual "freedom"—promiscuity—at the heart of the homosexual political movement; and it is indeed a political movement. But surprisingly, many Jews—primarily the non-Orthodox who subscribe to the liberal, freedom-oriented agenda of today's surrounding society—accept the tenets of the homosexual movement and the psychiatric establishment supporting it as if they were holy religious principles formulated by today's most widely worshipped idol, "Science". The false beliefs underlying many Jews' acceptance of homosexuality include:

(1) a spurious mystique about homosexual feelings in adolescents, college students particularly—that their mere appearance suggests an essentially irreversible "homosexual orientation"—which may lead clergy or other counselors to misdirect them into a homosexual life style;

(2) the feeling that the traditional ban on homosexuality as comparable to adultery and incest—and therefore sinful and/or criminal—is incorrect;

(3) seeing homosexuality as inborn, irreversible and therefore outside an individual's choice;

(4) considering fidelity a significant option for today's same-sex couples, and

(5) the belief in the existence of a "homosexual orientation", as distinct from homosexual choice and habit.

## JEWISH FIDELITY VS. HOMOSEXUAL PROMISCUITY

### *Judaism's sacred, passionate fidelity*

The sacred, passionate, life-long fidelity of wife and husband has always been Judaism's sexual ideal. Born in the Ancient Near East, Biblical Judaism was acutely aware of the sexual ethics that pervaded its context. Religious rite and sexual gratification were combined in the Baalish saturnalias against which the Bible inveighs so powerfully. At these ceremonies, sexuality was completely free, sometimes in association with child sacrifice. Day-to-day bans on adultery, incest, homosexuality, and group sex were totally abandoned; anybody could and did have intercourse with anybody else. This blatant human sexuality in honor of the gods would, it was believed, stimulate them to copulate also, thus making the herds, crops, and women more fertile.

Judaism is unequivocal in its condemnation of these orgies, with the Bible reserving its most scornful language for them. Central to the Jewish sexual ethic was an utter abhorrence of homosexuality, along with incest, adultery, and bestiality. All were associated with the customs of the Canaanite people. These particular activities also violated the ideal of passionate, fruitful marital fidelity, and undercut the family unit as the bedrock of society.

Condemnation of homosexuality, however, is by no means directed at specific ancient rituals alone. Among the cardinal sins of Judaism, which one is bidden to lay down his life rather than engage in, are murder, idolatry and *gilui arayot*, the immoral uncovering of nakedness (*Lev.* 18), which includes adultery, incest and homosexuality. Indeed, the Torah reserves its most intense condemnation for homosexuality: *to'eva*—abomination. Later, the rabbis justified including the *Song of Songs* in the sacred Canon by equating its portrayal of sexual fidelity with Israel's relationship to God.

The sweet and special sacredness of the marital *mitsva*—of the conjugal embrace specifically—and its importance in strengthening wives and husbands throughout their lives have been almost totally neglected by the psychiatric establishment and those it has influenced. Freud himself stopped having conjugal relations when he was 40.<sup>1</sup> Jewish liberals sometimes seem embarrassed, rather than exultant, over the *Song of Songs'* intense sexual pleasure. Someone like the Reform Jewish author of this article need not obey the details of the traditional *nidda* laws to recognize their value in (1) keeping marital love-making fresh by postponing it periodically, (2) resuming love-making only after

a cleansing ritual bath, and (3) scheduling that resumption for a woman's most fertile period.

*Homosexuality's passionate promiscuity—and its medical consequences*

Promiscuity, described as "sexual freedom" and a core value of today's homosexuality, is the very opposite of Jewish fidelity. In 1948, homosexual promiscuity was described as relatively rare in this country.<sup>2</sup> The gay liberation movement of the 1970's totally reversed this situation. By the 1980's, many gay men were having sexual relations with several, sometimes anonymous, partners each week, especially in major cities. This transformation of gay life is mirrored in the medical records of venereal disease. The rate of syphilis among white males in the United States increased by 351 percent between 1967 and 1979, due in very large part to increased homosexual activity. Cases of gonorrhea increased from 259,000 in 1960 to 600,000 in 1970, to over 1 million in 1980<sup>3</sup>.

A central feature of gay urban life today, the *New York Times* reports, is "sex clubs, bathhouses, and weekend-long drug parties where men may have intercourse with a dozen partners a night".<sup>4</sup> Concern about the diseases and public horror this blatant promiscuity evokes has led some "moderate" gay leaders like Larry Kramer to seek community acceptance of homosexuality by asking gays "to adopt a culture rooted as much in art, literature and relationships as in 'what's between our legs and what we do with it'".

"Sex Panic", a more radical gay group, opposes any such efforts to reduce gay promiscuity. One of its founders, a Rutgers English professor who regards promiscuous sex as the essence of gay liberation, calls it "an absurd fantasy to expect gay men to live without a sexual culture when we have almost nothing else that brings us together". "To the many homosexuals who had been discriminated against for the way they had sex," the *Times* says, "liberation means having as much sex as possible as publicly as possible".

One of the striking differences between homosexuals and the heterosexual community is the much larger number of sexual partners homosexuals have. This is demonstrated by a host of studies, including some conducted by homosexuals themselves. *Sex in America* (1994) found that while 68% of men and 76% of women had only one heterosexual partner in the previous year, only 2.6% of homosexual men and 1.2% of lesbians had so limited themselves.<sup>5</sup> An earlier study estimated the number of lifetime partners for the American population as a whole at 7.15 (8.67 for those who never married).<sup>6</sup> Another found that

while fear of AIDS had lowered gay men's promiscuity, the average gay male would still have had fifty sexual partners in a given year (down from seventy) and altogether over six hundred sexual partners between ages 18 and 30.<sup>7,8</sup>

The work of Professor Alfred Kinsey, the generally acknowledged expert on homosexuality, provided major "scientific" support for the concept of sexual freedom. His personal life explains why.<sup>9</sup> He was a married man with children who took his male graduate students on field trips and seduced them. He organized and filmed group sex among his senior staff, their spouses, and outside volunteers. His distorted statistics, such as his 1948 claim that 37% of American males had engaged in homosexual activity to orgasm, wildly exaggerate the incidence of homosexuality. And his widely accepted, seemingly scientific "spectrum" of homosexuality-heterosexuality, based on the assumption that each subject had many sexual partners, also ignores, and thus denies, fidelity.

The profoundly destructive effects of gay promiscuity on health precede, and extend far beyond, AIDS. (This syndrome, we should recall, was initially called "gay-related immune deficiency" syndrome [GRID] because its first cases were all homosexuals). Root-Bernstein pointed out in 1993 (p. 291) that as long ago as 1968, at the very beginning of "gay liberation" and long before AIDS had been defined, Drs. Harry Most and Benjamin H. Kean noted that the Manhattan homosexual community had begun to display the disease profile typical of a "tropical isle" or third world community.<sup>10</sup> Root-Bernstein also noted that the increase in promiscuity among gay men associated with the liberation movement made rectal trauma, use of recreational drugs, and the transmission of many viral and bacterial infections far more common than in the decades before 1970.

Even though AIDS continues to be a leading cause of youthful homosexual death, the liberation movement helped shape homosexuals into an important, organized, supposedly martyred political force. That force succeeded first in persuading many honest liberals to defend homosexuality and libertinism as issues of persecution and civil liberties. Such cooperative efforts and friendly relations between gays on the one hand, and liberals and Jews on the other, have led many of the latter to drop their objections to homosexuality and accept it instead as occupying the same moral level as heterosexuality and traditional marriage. In reality, however, the liberal defense of homosexuality is founded upon false beliefs, and ultimately reaches mistaken conclusions.

## THE FALSE BELIEFS

### *The false mystique about homosexual feelings*

Homosexual feelings can be aroused in any of us—as, for example, from seeing the filmed homosexual couplings presented in some college sex education classes. Although relatively few people recognize the normality of such feelings, they are no more important or “abnormal” than those evoked by underdressed movie starlets. However, a fraudulent mystique that attributes unwarranted significance to such feelings has gained increased recognition.

If we recognize the lack of significance of sexual feelings, including the homosexual, and that feelings should not be equated with behavior, we can dismiss them easily. When, however, as often occurs, such feelings evoke fear or shame, and we attempt, panic-stricken, to deny or repress them, they can become major sources of obsession and torment. People who thus become preoccupied with homosexual feelings, including young people unsure of their sexual identity, can easily come to believe they are indeed “homosexual”, especially if a clergyman or therapist confirms that as their “orientation.” The gay communities found everywhere are then more than willing to re-confirm and strengthen such “orientations” by enlisting these youngsters in their homosexual culture and activities.

### *Misinterpreting adolescents' fluid sexual feelings: a significant danger*

Adolescents' sexual feelings are particularly fluid. Many youngsters are quite unsure of themselves sexually, especially when they leave home for the first time to enter college. It is therefore particularly important for those who counsel teenagers to recognize the fluidity of these feelings. Clergy and counselors should not repeat the error of the Presbyterian minister at Harvard who proclaimed his pride in being able “to help those who are discovering that they are gay or lesbian, to help them understand that that's not an obstacle to their blessedness in God's eyes”.<sup>11</sup> Recognizing the normality and lack of significance of such feelings can enable people to take them easily in stride.

Two personal experiences demonstrate the decisive importance which competent counseling can have. Three years ago, an active homosexual in his mid-twenties, a recent immigrant from Russia, was brought to me by his mother who—having heard me lecture on homosexuality—wanted me to stop his sexual activities. He said that while he did eventually want a wife and family, his homosexual activi-

ties were too much fun, and too rewarding financially, for him to want to stop—and his mother's intense nagging did not help either. During our two visits, I described to him the fluidity of sexual feelings, the medical dangers and probably shortened life-span from his continuing homosexuality, and that the longer he remained involved, the harder he would find it to change; such is the nature of habit. While offering to continue seeing him if he wanted me to (he did not), I placed full responsibility for changing on his shoulders. I also persuaded his mother to stop nagging. Last year, she happily phoned that he was engaged to be married.

The absence of competent counseling can have the opposite effect. One autumn some twenty five years ago, a Jewish former patient phoned that his son, a 17-year-old Ivy League freshman, who had left home less than two months earlier, had just “discovered” he was “gay”. I asked to talk to the boy, to show him that his current homosexual feelings were fluid, and that these transient emotions should not lead him permanently to exclude the possibility of marriage and family. The father refused, saying he wanted the lad to be “free” to make his own choice. His choice of homosexuality—at 17—was then strengthened by involvement with the college's very active “gay community”. Although this particular man is alive, well and “gay”, the consequences for many youngsters of “discovering” they are homosexual and joining the homosexual culture can be devastating: deprivation of the joys of spouse and family, a life-span reduced 25 or more years by AIDS and other sexually-associated diseases, and children unborn to the Jewish community.

*The alleged obsolescence of tradition's ban on homosexuality: the laundering of homosexuality*

The laundering of homosexual activities—to make them acceptable by separating them from admittedly sinful and/or criminal adultery, incest, and bestiality—began in the late 19th century and continues to the present.<sup>12</sup> The first step in that laundering was to transform homosexuality from a sin or crime, in which responsibility was retained, to a responsibility-removing illness.<sup>13</sup> The second was the American Psychiatric Association's 1973 excision of homosexuality from its list of mental disorders.<sup>14, 15</sup> Although sexuality is an aspect of behavior in which morality is particularly important, psychiatry tends to see moral judgments as outside its purview. Instead of returning homosexuality to its earlier moral status of sin and/or crime, the specialty accepted it as

an alternate life-style. For example, Dr. David Reuben, in his 1969 best seller *Everything You Always Wanted to Know about Sex but Were Afraid to Ask*, criticized homosexuality, and especially its promiscuity. But now he maintains that “you may believe that homosexuality is good or bad, but as a physician and a scientist, I cannot pass that kind of personal judgment. Nothing in this [new] chapter should be—or can be—interpreted as being against or in favor of homosexuality.”<sup>16</sup>

In the 1850’s, Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, a German homosexual, began the separation of homosexuality from the other biblically banned sexual activities by claiming that its devotees represented a kind of a biologically predestined, inborn “third sex”—“Uranians”—who could neither help their sexual behavior nor be responsible for it, and should therefore not be punished.<sup>17, 18</sup> Karoly Maria Kertbeny, the Hungarian-German homosexual who invented the term “homosexuality” in 1869, maintained that “all scientific and practical knowledge about the nature of homosexual behavior render laws against it obsolete and anachronistic, and place a special obligation upon the ‘modern constitutional state’ to help society ‘escape from the monstrous curse’ of Judeo-Christian fanaticism (sic) that had claimed ‘millions of innocent victims’”. Although homosexuality had been seen for millennia as a transient sinful activity which, like adultery, anyone could engage in, Ulrichs and Kertbeny began the effort to establish it as a new, separate and permanent category of people.

Efforts to separate homosexuality from adultery and incest became more effective around the turn of the century when “science” began to demand that devotees such as Oscar Wilde not be penalized because they were supposedly not responsible for their behavior. The movement to remove criminal punishments for homosexual activity was led by physicians: Dr. Havelock Ellis was an English sexologist whose wife was a lesbian; Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld, a Jewish physician, was the widely respected, *de facto* leader of liberal, socially-accepted German homosexuality. In 1897, he founded in Berlin the Scientific Humanitarian Committee, dedicated to repealing paragraph 175 of the Prussian legal code which criminalized homosexuality, and was its guiding light for 35 years.

Dr. Sigmund Freud also denied that homosexuality was either sin or crime. Many of those uncomfortable with their homosexual feelings and/or activities sought psychiatric and psychoanalytic treatment to correct them, and it sometimes succeeded. These physicians’ voluminous writings on homosexuality as an illness gradually established them

as experts in the public eye, even though they knew nothing about the thinking and behavior of that majority of homosexuals who were satisfied with their “life-style”, and whom they consequently never saw.

Faulty interpretations of Darwin’s new theory of evolution strengthened the already widespread belief in the biological predestination of human behavior.<sup>18,19</sup> Differences between Frenchman and German, Jew and Gentile, male and female, and homosexual and heterosexual were all seen as resulting from inborn biological factors, including racial ones. Gradually, homosexuals came to define themselves as a separate, perhaps biologically different, class—a self-fulfilling prophecy which helped them join in creating such a class. “The sodomite had been a temporary aberration”, the gay French philosopher, Michel Foucault, pointed out, but “the homosexual was now a species”.<sup>21</sup> Homo-sexuality, which had been what people did transiently, now defined permanently who they were.

In Germany, as in this country, two different overlapping ideologies existed among the homosexuals: the liberal “Femmes” and the radical “Machos”.<sup>22, 23</sup> (I do not use Lively and Abrams’s term “Butch” for the latter group because it refers today to a specific type of masculine lesbian.) The liberal “Femmes” supported the rule of law, saw homosexuality as existing on the same moral level as heterosexuality, wanted same-sex marriage established within that law, and opposed pederasty with very young children and sadomasochism. Dr. Hirschfeld led the German “Femmes”, a disproportionate number of whom—there as well as here—were Jewish.

The radical “Machos”, many of them high-ranking Nazis, were, in contrast, brutal, anti-Semitic, lawless and power-centered. Their sexual ideal was the man-boy relationship, which they saw as morally superior to relationships with women, whom they openly despised. The late Roy M. Cohn and J. Edgar Hoover can perhaps be seen as examples of American “Machos.” One purpose of the Nazi “Machos” repeated violent attacks on Hirschfeld and other often-Jewish “Femmes”, which began long before Hitler took power in 1933, was to show Germany that the Nazis, despite the many notorious homosexuals in their ranks, really opposed homosexuality, and that the Jews supported it. Many Jews did in fact oppose the harsh Prussian punishment of homosexuality.

Jewish physicians and experts in sexuality in turn-of-the-century German-speaking Europe were particularly accepting of Hirschfeld’s “science”-endorsed, illness-based separation of homosexuality from the

other sexual sins. Professor Sander Gilman points out how “in the work of Krafft-Ebing, Tamowski, Moll and others, homosexuality was generally understood as being an innate, biological error that not only manifested itself in ‘perverted’ acts, but was written on the body of the homosexual through the appearance of specific, visible signs”, such as the quality of the voice.<sup>24</sup> Freud saw it at first as a quasi-biological “fixation at an earlier stage of sexual development” (p. 135).

“The push to understand the homosexual as different but not ill may well stem from the analogy between homosexuality and Jewish identity in the medical model of Freud’s time,” Gilman points out (p. 136). A “powerful association [existed] between Jews and disease in *fin de siècle* racial biology”. The “diseased nature of the Jew” was supposedly manifested by his suffering from constipation, neurosis and homosexuality. Jews were allegedly “more highly prone to specific forms of mental illness” (p. 101), with their inclination to homosexuality being seen as the result of their biological feminization, due in part to the view of circumcision as a kind of castration.

Many educated Jews therefore saw themselves as biologically different from gentiles, and essentially inferior—like homosexuals or women; some even saw themselves in relation to gentiles specifically as women were to men. As late as 1920, Dr. Moses Julius Gutmann, “one of the most prolific authors on the special diseases that affect the Jews” (p. 56), maintained that “the number of Jewish homosexuals is extraordinarily high”, and that “the Jew [was] overwhelmingly at risk for being (or becoming) a homosexual”.

These medical and scientific writers on homosexuality—both Jewish and Gentile—saw sex only in biologic terms. Few even among the Jews knew about the marital *mitsva*, which defines sex as sacred—in marriage; Freud certainly did not. Aware of Judaism’s long-standing religious ban on homosexuality, and of that ban’s strict observation over the centuries, they were completely unaware of the valid family-stability reasons for that ban. One Adlerian psychoanalyst even claimed that “Jewish religious education in the East lay at the center of this mental illness that affected the Jews of Vienna” (p. 56).

Hirschfeld, the respected *de facto* leader of liberal, socially-accepted German homosexuality, played an important but little known role in keeping many “Machos”, including Nazi party leaders and members, out of prison. He had opened his Sex Research Institute in 1917 in Berlin to show scientifically that homosexuality was congenital and should be decriminalized. In addition to campaigning (with consider-

able success) to make it respectable, and publishing many scientific papers, the Institute offered medical services including sexual counselling, treatment of venereal disease and sexual deviance, and advice on abortiom procedures. At that time, the science-oriented Prussian courts gave people convicted of sex crimes the choice between treatment at the Institute or going to prison. The Institute therefore “had extensive records on the sexual perversions of numerous Nazi leaders, many of whom had been under treatment there prior to the beginning of the Nazi regime”.<sup>25</sup>

On May 6, 1933, the Nazis broke into the Institute, and four days later sent thousands of its books and files up in smoke in the first of their notorious book burnings. Ludwig L. Lenz, its Assistant Director, who was working there the day of the raid and managed to escape with his life, asked later, “Why was our purely scientific, completely non-party Institute the first victim of the new regime?”. “We knew too much”, he answered:

It would be against medical principles to provide a list of the Nazi leaders and their perversions, [but] not 10% of the men who, in 1933, took the fate of Germany into their hands were sexually normal. Our knowledge of such intimate secrets regarding members of the Nazi party and other documentary material—we possessed about 40,000 confessions and biographical letters—was the cause of the complete and utter destruction of the Institute. (p. 5)

Although the Nazis are generally seen as having been fiercely anti-homosexual following the Roehm purge of June 1934, Lively has assembled persuasive evidence suggesting that Nazi Macho homosexuality actually continued unabated—Reinhard Heydrich being a prime example—but much more hidden.<sup>26</sup> While much more historical exploration of this issue is needed, the destruction of sexual morality by the Nazis’ pervasive homosexuality can perhaps be seen as playing a major role in the destruction of all morality characterizing the Holocaust itself.

*That homosexuality is inborn*

My 1983 *Judaism* article on homosexuality and Judaism described four current attitudes toward homosexuality. Two saw it as a matter of choice, which the other two denied.<sup>27</sup> The “choice” attitudes are the traditional—that it is sinful and therefore deserves banning—and the “free” view, that the ban is obsolete, scientifically discredited, and irrel-

evant. The “non-choice” views are that homosexuality is the nearly-impossible-to-reverse result of childhood experiences within particular types of family, or that it is inborn biologically. Psychoanalytic claims that homosexuality’s cause is necessarily a particular type of family constellation were disproved long ago; and while homosexual experiences during childhood, especially with an adult, greatly increase the likelihood of subsequent adult homosexuality, that outcome is far from certain since each of us, making his own choices, handles such experiences differently.

The highly-publicized, biologic, responsibility-denying explanations of homosexuality, all of which have also been discredited—with much less, if any, publicity—contradict all that we know about comparative animal behavior.<sup>28</sup> As we mount the evolutionary scale, the control of sexual and other behavior shifts from the biological and hormonal to regulation through experience as recorded and shaped by the central nervous system. In lower species, where sexual behavior is driven by the mutual attraction of male and seasonally receptive female, homosexual activity is essentially unknown. Only when we reach the level of the monkey do we find that homosexual copulation can sometimes continue to occur even when heterosexual partners are available—but only among animals with previous pre-pubertal homosexual experiences.

Levay’s highly publicized 1991 claim of differences in a particular brain area between homosexual and heterosexual men allegedly presents a biological basis for human homosexuality, but not only has his methodology evoked many questions—about his subjects’ sexual behavior, for example, and the exact location of the brain areas he claimed to compare—but the mechanisms through which these obscure brain areas supposedly produce the complex sexual behavior we call homosexuality have never been explained.<sup>29</sup> The mere existence of such brain differences would no more “prove” that they “cause” homosexuality than the higher incidence of dark skin among criminals “proves” that African-American biology, as manifested by skin pigmentation, “causes” crime. Correlation is not causation. Indeed, some of the more responsible gay writers categorically reject such biological explanations. Lauritsen and Thorstad, for example, maintain that “homosexuality occurs because it is part of healthy human sexual potential, not because of physical or psychic hermaphroditism, hormonal imbalance or any of the other explanations devised by priests, psychiatrists and others of their ilk”.<sup>30</sup>

The great variation in frequency of homosexuality in different human societies also speaks against its being biologically determined. So does the rapid change in frequency which can occur within a particular society—as has taken place in this country over the past thirty years. Berkeley sociology professor Claude S. Fischer recently summarized the relative influences of genetics and environment on human thinking and behavior:

Americans have essentially the same genetic makeup as their grandparents and yet lead immensely different lives, hold starkly different values and even display different cognitive skills. Or consider the social and psychological gaps that develop between immigrants and the kin they leave behind—or even between immigrants and their own children. The effects of environment are so powerful and omnipresent that we fail to see them and instead get tantalized by trivia.<sup>31</sup>

*Homosexuality's alleged irreversibility*

It is a common misconception that homosexuality is irreversible once that behavior has begun. There is, in fact, little to substantiate such a notion. A rather clear-cut and conscious acceptance of personal homosexuality—both as “orientation” and behavior—was that of Michael Johnston,<sup>32</sup> now president of the Christian Kerusso Ministries of Newport News, VA, which is devoted to helping homosexuals change. “Growing up in Alaska, shy and a late bloomer,” he went “through adolescence never quite feeling that he fit in with other boys. In college, he was drawn to a group of theater students. ‘A friend introduced me to homosexuality,’ he says. Attracted by the pleasure of the experience, he spent 11 years as an out and active gay man.” Although many gays, perhaps even a majority, claim in retrospect that they also never fit in with other boys, such feelings are quite common among adolescent boys, most of whom do not later become homosexual.

Johnston's discovery in 1986 that he was HIV-positive led him to re-evaluate his life. “Eventually I decided I could not live as a Christian and be an active homosexual.” In 1988, he consciously changed his view of himself as a homosexual, stopped homosexual activity and “today”, married and with a child, he says, “I can tell you I am not the man I was in 1986”. Formerly “a homosexual”, he is one no longer.

But the organized gays at Harvard Law School, insisting that gays cannot change, recently tried to prevent him from speaking there. And the well-organized gay caucus in the American Psychological Assoc-

iation has been trying to get the Association to define as unethical any psychotherapeutic efforts aimed at helping gays to change, even when they eagerly want to do so.<sup>33</sup>

John N. Paulk, of Colorado Springs, who is now also professionally involved in religious efforts to help homosexuals change, describes a similar experience.

Between the ages of 18 and 24, I was an openly homosexual man and gay-rights activist. During these years, I had committed relationships with various men, but in the late 1980's, after a suicide attempt, I was in utter despair. My endeavors at lasting homosexual unions were ineffectual. Nearly five years of gay-affirmative therapy brought me to the conclusion that homosexuality itself was the source of my loneliness and unhappiness. With counsel and a strong motivation to change, I slowly unearthed a dormant heterosexual identity. Today, more than 12 years later, I'm happily and heterosexually married. My wife and I enjoy raising our infant son. As a family, we provide each other with stability that my homosexual unions could never provide.<sup>34</sup>

Johnston's and Paulk's reversibility of homosexuality is far from unusual. Psychoanalytic psychotherapy once helped as many as half of those seeking to change their homosexuality, but, with the appearance of ubiquitous gay support groups operating in the opposite direction, its success rates have fallen. One George P. S..., Harvard '71, in his autobiographic 25th Anniversary Report (1996), describes himself as having been "comfortably and increasingly publicly gay" throughout his "time at Harvard and for several years after that".<sup>35</sup> Then, to his great surprise, he fell in love with a female co-worker, married her in 1978, fathered a son, and was very happy with her until she suddenly died in 1992. Since then, he has "repeated the process of coming out [as gay, in which he'd] last participated in the '70's".

Another striking example of that reversibility is the well-known case of the five leading lesbians who recently fell in love with men. Lillian Faderman explained in *The Advocate*, the largest circulation national gay magazine, that "people in real life can move in and out of these categories, spending one portion of their lives as straight and another as gay, and then perhaps straight again, or vice versa, or all of it at once, or none of it at all".<sup>36</sup> She thus acknowledges that "in real life", homosexuality can indeed be a temporary status.

The changes of partner she describes are, of course, quite different

from the traditional, life-long fidelity of Jewish husband and wife. People, including those engaging in homosexuality and/or promiscuity, can change, but only if they want to. Maimonides was right (and Freud wrong) in saying, “we all choose each day between good and evil, and by our choices we can become as holy as Moses or as evil as Jeroboam”. Lauritsen and Thorstad’s acknowledgment that homosexuality is a matter of personal choice reaffirms that sexual behavior can indeed change—and in either direction—despite the repeated, well-publicized claims by many gay groups that homosexuality is a one-way street.<sup>37</sup>

Many reports on variably successful efforts to change homosexuality appeared in the psychiatric literature before the American Psychiatric Association’s 1973 decision to remove it from its list of disorders. Few have appeared since, largely because of attempts, like those in the American Psychological Association, to define any such efforts as unethical. Nevertheless, several Protestant denominations, and the Roman Catholic Church, have groups such as Michael Johnston’s and John N. Paulk’s seeking out homosexuals wanting to change, and helping them do so. It is therefore both striking and unfortunate that Judaism, with its higher incidence of homosexuality, and, consequently, greater need for such change groups, apparently has none.

*That “gay marriage” will end homosexual promiscuity because fidelity is a significant option for same-sex couples*

Jews’ direct, personal acquaintanceship with bright, charming, productive and often wealthy gays is often a major reason for their support of homosexuality. These gays deny or minimize the promiscuity issue, seem to be living stable lives as couples, and now ask for official religious recognition of their supposedly permanent loving relationships. Stating eight times that “we, unlike our ancestors, are aware of the possibility of committed, stable, monogamous and loving relationships between members of the same gender”, the Central Conference of American Rabbis’ (Reform) Responsa Committee on homosexual marriage, for example, believes that “gay marriage”—of which it nevertheless does not approve—might help end homosexual promiscuity.<sup>38</sup> This belief ignores, however, (1) the continuing central importance of “sexual freedom” to gays today, (2) the defiance in both behavior and ideology associated with homosexuality—even among gay couples allegedly committed to one another—and (3) *Sifre* to *Leviticus* 19, which points out ancient Jewish recognition of

the many types of homosexual relationships among the pagans.<sup>39</sup> In view of this author's forty-year membership in a Reform congregation, this intense disagreement with the C.C.A.R. Committee is voiced only with a heavy heart.

David P. McWhirter, M.D., and Andrew M. Mattison, M.S.W., Ph.D., themselves a gay couple, interviewed 156 such couples and found that only seven (none of them together more than five years) had a totally exclusive relationship.<sup>40</sup> 95% of these couples were therefore not faithful, while only 5%, all of them short-termers, were. To these authors, "the single most important factor that keeps couples together past the ten-year mark is the lack of possessiveness they feel. Many couples learn very early in their relationship that ownership of each other sexually can become the greatest internal threat to their staying together." This is, of course, the direct opposite of the marital "forswearing all others".

Gay activists Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen describe the "the cheating ratio of 'married' gay males, given enough time, [as] approach[ing] 100%. . . .<sup>41</sup> Many gay lovers, bowing to the inevitable, agree to an 'open relationship,' for which there are as many sets of ground rules as there are couples". Paulk cites gay psychologist Tom Moon, in the January, 1997, issue of *Out Smart*, Houston's largest gay magazine, that "gay male couples are basically unstable and that many gay men 'seem to feel that it is perfectly appropriate to ignore their couple status altogether and assume that every man is "fair game" ' ".<sup>42</sup> "Since many homosexual unions are fleeting", Paulk notes, "many members of the gay community actually deplore the idea of equating themselves with heterosexuals through the shared privilege of matrimony. *What gay people want is legitimization, not marriage*" (italics added).

Gay author Andrew Sullivan, former editor of *The New Republic*, in his book, *Virtually Normal: An Argument about Homosexuality*, also places sexual freedom ahead of fidelity, even within "gay marriage": "there is more likely to be greater understanding of the need (sic) for extramarital outlets between two men than between a man and a woman, and again, the lack of children gives gay couples greater freedom."<sup>43, 44</sup> He is not alone in seeing

something baleful about the attempt of some gay conservatives to educate homosexuals and lesbians to an uncritical acceptance of a stifling model of heterosexual normality. The truth is, homosexuals are not

entirely normal, and to flatten their varied and complicated lives into a single, moralistic model is to miss what is essential and exhilarating about their otherness. (p. 203)

His citation from St. Thomas Aquinas (p. 41) that “there are natural urges in a particular person that may run counter to the nature of the species as a whole”, and his statement (pp. 71—71) that “homosexuals have delighted in . . . showing in their ironic games with the dominant culture that something in them is ultimately immune to its control”, demonstrate the centrality of defiance in the ideology of homosexuality. Except for the word “healthy”, Lauritsen and Thorstad’s statement is thus correct (p. 56)—that “homosexuality occurs because it is part of healthy human sexual potential”;<sup>45</sup> Judaism sees that particular potential as the *yetser hara*, the evil inclination. And McWhirter and Mattison’s comment, that “the expectation for outside sexual activity was the rule for male couples and the exception for heterosexuals”, is especially relevant.<sup>46</sup>

*That “homosexual orientation”, a pseudo-scientific invention, really exists* Liberal Jews’ acceptance of homosexuality rests on the notion of inborn, irreversible “homosexual orientation”, as distinguished from homosexual choice and habit. As we have seen, that notion is made of whole cloth. People, including homosexuals, smokers and drug addicts, can change their habits, but only if they want to, and doing so may not be easy. Maimonides was correct about our choosing all the time between good and evil.

## ON HOMOPHOBIA

“Homophobic” and “homophobia” are commonly used words, especially in sophisticated Jewish circles. These words should be removed from our vocabularies.<sup>47</sup> They are as profoundly derogatory as “fag”, “kike” and “nigger”, although more subtle, because they imply that people holding traditional ideas of sexual morality are mentally disturbed. Use of these terms is a form of “mad-baiting”, a tactic which avoids sober evaluation of ideas, and particularly of ideas we disagree with, by labeling their advocates “mad” or “ill”. Calling opponents of homosexuality “homophobic” is as wrong as labeling its supporters “fag-lovers”. It is when intense, honest differences exist among people of good will that respectful discourse is most needed.

SUMMARY

Judaism's traditional rejection of homosexuality as an abomination like adultery and incest is still correct, despite the skillful, 150-year-old propaganda campaign in the name of "science" which has "laundered" homosexuality in many liberal eyes from (1) sin and/or crime to (2) "mental disorder" and finally to (3) acceptable "alternate life-style".

The sexual "freedom"—promiscuity—at the heart of the homosexual ideology totally contradicts the fidelity which has always characterized Judaism. The exaggerated importance given today to sexual feelings, and unawareness of the consequences of panic-stricken efforts to suppress homosexual feelings when they occur, have led to the false belief that the existence or persistence of such feelings indicates latent or not-so-latent homosexuality. Misinformed counselors and clergy sometimes misinterpret such feelings in adolescents, whose sexual feelings are usually quite fluid, and wrongly guide them into homosexual behavior and groups. Being told there that their homosexuality is inborn and irreversible, and then allying themselves with the "homosexual community", these youngsters, by joining that community's rampant promiscuity, run the risk of greatly altering and shortening their lives. The "fidelity" of same-sex couples, which, despite its extreme rarity, is often used to justify the acceptance of homosexuality, can hardly be the basis for overturning the entire Jewish sexual tradition, and especially the rabbinic interpretation of the Song of Songs, which equates the faithful, sacred love of wife and husband with that of Israel and God.

NOTES

1. N.S. Lehrman, "On Freud's post-marital celibacy" (Letter), *Commentary*, Sept. 1980, 22.
2. A.C. Kinsey, W.B. Pomeroy, C.E. Martin. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948). pp. 633—636.
3. R.S. Root-Bernstein, *Rethinking AIDS: The Tragic Cost of Premature Consensus*. (New York: Free Press, 1993).
4. S.G. Stolberg, "Gay Culture Weighs Sense and Sexuality," *New York Times, Review of the Week*, Nov. 23, 1997, p. 1.
5. R.T. Michael, J.H. Gagnon, E.O. Laumann, G. Kolata, *Sex in America*. (Boston: Little Brown, 1994).
6. "Adult Sexual Behavior in 1989: Number of Partners, Frequency and Risk," presented Feb., 1990 to American Association for the Advancement of Science, published 1990 by NORC, University of Chicago; cited in

7. A.N. Marco, "Same Sex Marriage," *Journal of Human Sexuality* (G.A. Rekers, editor), 1996, 45 – 64; p. 55.
8. Study by American Psychological Association's Ethics Committee, reported in *USA Today*, Nov. 21, 1984; cited in A.N. Marco, ref. 7, p. 54.
9. J.A. Reisman. *Kinsey: Crimes and Consequences*. (Arlington VA: Institute for Media Education, 1998).
10. Root-Bernstein, *Rethinking AIDS*.
11. "The Undergraduate," *Harvard Magazine*, Jan.-Feb. 1996, p. 62; discussed by N.S. Lehrman, "The Spiritual Side" (Letter), *ibid.*, Mar-Apr., 1996; and N.S. Lehrman, "Gay Like Me," (Letter) *ibid.*, March-Apr. 1998, pp. 11–12.
12. N.S. Lehrman, "The Laundering of Homosexuality," *Midstream*, April, 1998, pp. 30–32.
13. N. S. Lehrman, "Psychiatry's Undermining of Sexual Morality," NARTH (National Association of Research and Therapy of Homosexuality) *Bulletin*, v.5, no.3, December, 1997, pp. 14-16.
14. R. Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
15. H. Kutchins, S.A. Kirk, *Making Us Crazy. DSM: The Psychiatric Bible and the Creation of Mental Disorders*. New York: Free Press, 1997; chapter 3: The Fall and Rise of Homosexuality, pp. 55-99.
16. D. Reuben, quoted by T. Vinciguerra, "A Sex Manual, Then and Now," *New York Times, Review of the Week*, March 21, 1999, p. 7.
17. E. Fee, Science and Homosexuality. *The Universities and the Gay Experience*. New York: Gay Academic Union, 1974; p. 37; cited in
18. S. Lively, K. Abrams, *The Pink Swastika: Homosexuality in the Nazi Party*. Keiser OR: Founders Publishing Co., 3rd edition, 1997; p. 12.
19. S.L. Gilman, *Freud, Race and Gender*. Princeton NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993.
20. N.S. Lehrman, review of Gilman, *Freud, Race and Gender*; *Aufbau* (New York City), Sept. 13, 1996.
21. M. Foucault, cited by R. Hubbard, "False Genetic Markers," *New York Times*, Aug. 2, 1993, p. A-15.
22. Lively and Abrams, *The Pink Swastika*, p. 6
23. S. Lively, *The Poisoned Stream. "Gay" Influence in Human History. Volume One: Germany, 1890—1945*. Keiser OR: Founders Publishing Co., 1997.
24. Gilman, *Freud, Race and Gender*, p. 135.
25. Lively and Abrams, *The Pink Swastika*.
26. Lively, *The Poisoned Stream*.
27. N.S. Lehrman, "Homosexuality and Judaism: Are They Compatible?" *Judaism* (v. 32), Fall, 1983, pp. 392-404.
28. J. Horgan, "Gay genes revisited; Doubts arise over research on the biology of homosexuality," *Scientific American*, Nov. 1995, p. 26.
29. "Homosexual Brains," *Newsweek*, Feb. 24, 1992, citing S. Levay, *Science*, 253, 1034: 1991, p.56.
30. J. Lauritsen, D. Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement: 1864-1935*. New York: Times Change Press, 1974; pp. 3-6.
31. C.S. Fischer, "Who We Are," Letter to editor, *New York Times Book*

- Review*, March 1, 1998, p. 2.
32. J. Jacoby, "Intolerance from Those Who Ask for It," *St. Petersburg (FL) Times*, Oct. 25, 1997.
  33. E.M. Stern, "A.P.A. Resolution: Still a Threat," NARTH (National Association of Research and Therapy of Homosexuality) *Bulletin*, v. 4, no.1, April, 1996, p. 1.
  34. J.N. Paulk, "The Real Purpose of Marriage," Letter to editor, *Wall Street Journal*, June 17, 1998.
  35. Harvard and Radcliffe Class of 1971, "25th Anniversary Report," Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 1996, pp. 1031-1032.
  36. L. Faderman, in *The Advocate*, April 29, 1997, p. 80; quoted in P. Cameron, *Family Research Report*, May-June, 1997, pp. 1, 6.
  37. Lauritsen and Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement*.
  38. C.C.A.R. Responsa Committee. "On Homosexual Marriage," *CCAR Journal: A Reform Jewish Quarterly*, Winter 1998, pp. 5-35, at p.11.
  39. For this reference, I am indebted to Rabbi Samuel H. Dresner, Professor at the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City. His "Homosexuality and the Order of Creation," chapter 3 in his *Can Families Survive in Pagan America?* (Huntington House, Lafayette LA, 1994), describes the traditional, accepted rabbinical belief that "the flood was caused by a violation of the Laws of natural mating through all branches of creation" (pp. 85-86) and concludes (p. 99) that "the traditional family, the embodiment and expression of the 'laws of nature and of nature's God,' as the foundation of a free society, has become merely one of many 'alternative life-styles.' . . . A free people who succumbs to such a teaching cannot long endure."
  40. D.P. McWhirter, A.M. Mattison, *The Male Couple*; quoted in E. Marcus, *The Male Couple's Guide to Living Together*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1988) pp. 26-27, cited in A.N. Marco, ref. 7, pp. 54-55.
  41. M. Kirk, H. Madsen, *After the Ball*. (New York, Doubleday, 1988); p. 363, cited in A.N. Marco, ref. 7, pp. 54-55.
  42. Paulk, "The Real Purpose of Marriage."
  43. A. Sullivan, *Virtually Normal: An Argument about Homosexuality*. (New York: Knopf, 1995).
  44. N.S. Lehrman, Review of Sullivan's *Virtually Normal*, NARTH (National Association of Research and Therapy of Homosexuality) *Bulletin*, v. 4, no. 2, Aug., 1996, p. 2.
  45. Lauritsen and Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement*.
  46. McWhirter and Mattison, *The Male Couple*.
  47. N.S. Lehrman, "Homophobic?" Letter to editor, *The Human Quest* (formerly *The Churchman*), July Aug. 1995.