

**JALHF Conference  
Rome – May 21, 2018**

**Dr. Gerard van den Aardweg**

**“The ‘normalization’ of Homosexuality and *Humanae Vitae*”**

Homosexuality must be defined in terms of *attraction*.<sup>i</sup> It is the condition of being chronically or periodically sexually attracted to the same-sex, along with rudimentary or reduced heterosexual interest, and this *after* adolescence, say 17-18 years. According to the best estimates less than 2% of men have these attractions, and less than 1.5% of women.<sup>ii</sup>

The term “gay” I shall use for those who choose to declare their tendency normal and live it out; that is the majority today; however about 20% do not want to identify themselves as gay and to live that way. This group has no public voice and is discriminated against by the gay establishment. It is crucial whether or not a person normalizes his attractions. Doing this, he suppresses his reason and conscience, for the inner perception that homosexual activities are *contra naturam* is inborn and universal.<sup>iii</sup> Starting thus to lie to himself, he must suppress his awareness of the normality of man-woman love and of normal marriage with its fertility, and is forced to cling desperately to rationalizations that justify his choice to see himself as normal, healthy, and morally good. Thus he alienates himself from reality, locks himself up in wishful thinking and, not willing to seek the truth about himself, wants to change the natural feelings and opinions about homosexuality of 98% of mankind which he feels as hostile to him. In reality, it is not society, culture, or religion that persecute him but his own conscience.<sup>iv</sup> Gay normalization turns things upside down; not I am crazy, but the rest of you are. The gay ideology proclaims that gay sexuality, including its inherent polygamy, is a natural instinct, that faithful non-contraceptive marriage is unnatural, and so is diametrically opposed to *Humanae Vitae*. It hates marriage, out of jealousy and rebellion. Insofar as it has infiltrated in the Church, which is rather far, it is out to eliminate its main obstacle, *Humanae Vitae*.

The gay ideology propagates various justifications, all of them falsehoods. It thrives on the dogmas of biological causation, or of being born-that-way, and of the immutability of the disorder. In fact, the biological theory was never proved. Since the gay ideology began to tyrannize the scientific establishment after the gay putsch in 1973, when the American Psychiatric and Psychological Associations gave up their scientific integrity, renewed efforts have been made, and mostly by activist gay investigators, to finally detect some biological cause. But interestingly, precisely the opposite result was obtained. The biological myth is exploded. Homosexuals have normal hormones, genes, and brains.<sup>v</sup> Even the pro-gay British Royal College of Psychiatrists declared in 2014 that homosexuality is not an inborn variant of sexuality.<sup>vi</sup> But this reality hardly penetrates. Also the dogma of unchangeability is fiercely upheld, for the possibility of change not only threatens a key argument of the normalizers but also a necessary argument for many to justify their personal lifestyle. Due to the political and social advance of the gay ideology, change-directed homosexuality treatment and counseling have increasingly become tabooed; yet psychological counseling and Christian self-help initiatives outside the mainstream continued and demonstrated the viability of such approaches. Just a short note: overcoming these tendencies is mainly a battle with oneself,<sup>vii</sup> but a major, and even radical and lasting change has been resulted in many cases,<sup>viii</sup> mostly with the support of a sustained religious inner life.<sup>ix</sup> The gay-promoting political establishment tries to stamp out these activities and publications. Hence, for instance, the actual Bill of Prohibition of homosexuality treatment in Ireland. Surely, a homo-tyranny is upon us. In 2003, prof. Spitzer of

Columbia University, the same psychiatrist who had managed the surrender of the APA to the militant gay lobby, published his study on the effects of sane counseling of 200 homosexuals, male and female. A minority changed profoundly, most others improved, both as to sexual orientation and overall emotional balance. No signs of harm, but a noticeable decrease of depressions.<sup>x</sup> A hurricane of hatred from the gay establishment fell over him, with such violence that he felt a broken man who (some months later) assured me he would never, never again involve himself with that terrible subject of homosexuality.

One classical rationalization is the idealization of gay love as superior to “vulgar” hetero-love: it would be more tender, refined, noble, creative, progressive, etc. This betrays the childish naivety of these people, who are emotionally fixated to their teens, when normal sexual love between adults is yet outside the scope of the youth. Homosexual pedophiles on their part likewise childishly idealize man-boy love.<sup>xi</sup> Same-sex sexual feelings are pubertal: 40% of male homosexuals are (whether or not exclusively) attracted by adolescents, and for two-thirds of homosexual men the ideal partner may be under 21 years.<sup>xii</sup> Thus pederasty, contact with minors, has always been one of the most common expressions of homosexuality. (By the way, the priest scandals overwhelmingly concern pederasty, these priests are ordinary homosexuals<sup>xiii</sup>.)

\*\*\*

Now, to give you a general idea of what follows, I want to give you some key psychological facts and insights. I must restrict myself to male homosexuality, but most of it also applies to lesbianism with this difference that “father” must be substituted for “mother”, “girlish” for “boyish”.

Same-sex feelings usually arise in adolescence, in boys who are wanting in boyishness or manliness, more specifically, in daring and fighting spirit. They lack boyish firmness and tend to be overly soft to themselves. This character trait, which in pronounced form appears as “sissiness” or effeminacy, makes them feel uncomfortable among their same-sex companions and inferior as to their manliness. This trait is not inborn, but the effect of upbringing, parent-child interactions and habit formation. In a nutshell: frequently, the prehomosexual boy’s *underdeveloped or suppressed* masculinity results from some combination of a mother who overly dominated his emotional life, in some way or other, while the masculinity-encouraging influence of the father was insignificant or negative. Variations of this pattern occur in at least 60% of cases of male homosexuality. (Other factors of importance can be physical defects or handicaps, exceptionally young or old parents, upbringing by grand-parents, sibling relationships.) Very often, the boy was unhealthily attached to and dependent on his mother, while the bond with his father was defective. He may have been overprotected, babied, adored as mother’s favorite, over-indulged; or over-“domesticated”, treated with too much maternal coercive interference; but not as “a real boy”, sometimes in a feminizing way. There is no doubt that these parent-child interactions factors are well-established.

Yet more closely correlated with later homosexual attractions is the factor of maladjustment to the same-sex world of boyhood and adolescence, the factor of “peer isolation”. Feeling the outsider, inferior in manliness, is traumatic. This feeling of *not belonging* may animate passionate *longings* for friendship and idolization of youths who in the eyes of the boy possess the sort of manliness he feels he has not. During puberty such longings may engender erotic fantasies about physical affection from some adored but inaccessible comrade. Such daydreams are pathetic, they spring from self-pity or self-dramatization about being lonely, having no friends, not being “one of the other boys”. Especially when accompanied by habitual masturbation, they reinforce the boy’s yearnings and nourish his self-pity and feeling the tragic outsider. These feelings are addictive. In short, homosexual partner seeking is an anxious chasing after impossible pubertal illusions. It is fully self-centered: the other one is totally claimed, he must be totally for ME; it is begging for love, demanding love, not loving. When this craze is not outgrown before adulthood, it may take control of the person’s mind, so that it becomes an autonomous drive. As a result, he partly or even largely remains emotionally the teenager in much of his thinking and feeling, his personality habits,

relationships with his parents and others, his feelings with respect to his own sex and the opposite sex. He never becomes mature and is dominated by immature self-love, excessive self-centeredness, especially in his same-sex cravings. Film maker Pasolini was one of numerous examples; of himself, he said he had “an infinite hunger for the love of bodies without souls.” A German gay fashion designer called it an enslavement to drinking salt water, the more you drink, the greater your thirst. Anyway, gay relationships are exercises in “selfism”. “I lived with a succession of roommates, some of whom I professed to love”, said a middle-aged gay man. “They swore they loved me. But homosexual ties begin and end with sex. ... After the first passionate fling, sex becomes less and less frequent. The partners become nervous, want new thrills, begin to cheat each other.” His summary of the average gay life is sobering, the realistic truth devoid of pubertal idealizations and propaganda lies: “Gay life ... is a rough world, I wouldn’t wish it on my worst enemy.”<sup>xiv</sup>

Don’t believe the propaganda for the noble, faithful, loving gay “marriage” of devote Catholics. It is a trick to sell acceptance of gay sex.<sup>xv</sup>

Otherwise, the just quoted gay man illustrates the fact that treatment, or self-education no doubt must fight the sexual addiction, but above all the person’s generalized infantile self-seeking, self-love and self-pity. Fighting the vices, exercising the virtues; above all the virtues of sincerity, loving, responsibility, and fortitude or character strength. Homo-sex is neurotic sex. Homosexuality and pedophile homosexuality a sexual neurosis, but also a sickness of the soul.

\*\*\*

I return to the main theme. The advocacy for homosexuality-normalization began in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century when contraceptive sex became acceptable through the propaganda for free love, sexual reform and divorce. It was sponsored by all Malthusian movements: the socialists, Marxists, freethinkers, humanists and feminists. In 1897 the Marxist physician Magnus Hirschfeld founded the Scientific Humanitarian Committee, and in 1917 the first Institute for Sexology in Berlin. The motto of his enterprise was *per scientiam ad justitiam*, through science to justice, which expressed the eternal falsehoods of the gay normalization ideology, then as now. Namely, the normality view is based on science, and homosexuals and lesbians are denied their natural sexual rights. Society and religion must change their attitudes.

Activist homosexuals and lesbians have played key roles in the sexual reform movement. Understandably, because they are animated by deep-seated anti-marriage sentiments. Homosexual organizations have always been adamantly pro abortion, sterilization and contraception; no pro-life manifestation or a horde of screaming, provoking gays and lesbians try to disturb it. That is one reason why Planned Parenthood and the Population Movement “encourage increase of homosexuality”<sup>xvi</sup> and why the hostility of Freemasonry to normal marriage has been powerfully instrumental in the legalization of both contraception and homosexual “marriage”.<sup>xvii</sup> And so we see Hirschfeld, an effeminate, very polygamous homosexual, act as the leader of the International Congress for Sexual Reform in Vienna, 1930, where he “pathetically exclaimed: ‘Better a love without marriage than a marriage without love!’ (‘Lieber eine Liebe ohne Ehe, als eine Ehe ohne Liebe!’).”<sup>xviii</sup> He was quite aware that “free love” implies contraception, and that contraceptive habits erode the resistance to homo-sex.

The by far most influential sexual reformer after the war, the father of the sexual revolution of the 50s and 60s was also a sex-enslaved homosexual, (and probably a pedophile homosexual, too): Alfred Kinsey, the founder of the institute of sexology named after him, and the mastermind behind the de-humanizing sexual education of today. Like Hirschfeld, he was obsessed with the wish to abolish society’s moral standards based on normal marriage and to normalize homosexuality, pedophilia, and incest. To him, faithful marriage was unnatural, homosexuality and all sexual abnormalities natural; abortion should be legitimized; masturbation, contraceptive sex, adultery,

prostitution were healthy. Also Kinsey posed as a great scientist, but his intensively propagated books were gay propaganda based on fraudulent research.<sup>xix</sup>

A third example: Simone de Beauvoir, Jean-Paul Sartre's companion, the mother of radical feminism and of the gender theory. Her influence in France directly led to the foundation of the Ministry of Women's Rights and the De Beauvoir Commission on Women. Her book *The second sex*,<sup>xx</sup> touting the puerile slogan that one is not born but made a woman through cultural and familial coercion, "the Bible of the Women's Movement, set in motion an unstoppable train".<sup>xxi</sup> She was a lesbian, who, which is frequent among lesbians, "had never felt the wish to have a child, [and] could not imagine what impels a man and woman to wish for it".<sup>xxii</sup> She was animated by "disgust, fear, hatred of motherhood".<sup>xxiii</sup> "Babies filled me with horror", she said. "The sight of a mother with a child sucking the life from her breast ... it all filled me with disgust."<sup>xxiv</sup> The disturbed femininity underlying her lesbianism made her a passionate rebel against marriage and motherhood, a fierce propagandist of contraceptive sex and abortion with a destructive impact.

Militant homosexuals and lesbians, although they certainly do not represent even the 2% of the population with homosexual tendencies, have tremendously contributed to the present contraceptive mentality and habits through their influence in the sexual reform and feminist movements. But not less through the successful normalization of their own lifestyle. This success has still further obscured the perception of many, especially in the younger generations, of the moral and psychological degeneracy of contraceptive relationships in contrast to the beauty of faithful, child-directed marital love. For, if sexual relations involving the disgusting genital contacts between two men or women are officially celebrated and such liaisons, which are inherently not even monogamous and most neurotic, are given the status of "marriage", then any sterile heterosexual relation becomes normal by comparison. A study on the effects of gay "marriage" in Scandinavia concluded that it had "driven home the message that marriage itself is outdated and that virtually any family form ... is acceptable."<sup>xxv</sup> This necessarily means increased contraception.

\*\*\*

In sum, any approval or suggestions of approval of the falsehoods of the gay ideology undermine the teachings of *Humanae Vitae*. Yet for about half a century such suggestions are to be found in important documents of the Catholic Church. Let us see:

In 1975, the *Declaration on certain questions of sexual ethics* of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith wrote that "A distinction is made, and it seems with some reason, between homosexuals whose tendency ... is transitory or at least not incurable, and homosexuals who are definitively so because of some innate instinct ... judged to be incurable." At the time, the distinction between so-called "nuclear" and superficial homosexuality was a favorite pseudo-scientific contention among the gay normalizers in professional circles. It was shortly after the gay lobby in the American Psychiatric Association had "normalized" the definition of homosexuality from "disturbance" to "condition". The Vatican *Declaration* uncritically gave authority to the gay dogmas "born that way" and "immutable". Perhaps sheer naivety, but in any case blameworthy ignorance and incompetence. The "born that way" statement has been followed in several later Church documents.<sup>xxvi</sup> And with serious consequences. Instead of opposing the secular world's fatalist gay propaganda that homosexual inclinations had to be accepted as a fact of nature, the authority of the Church poured some more oil on the flames. Instead of helping parents to prevent a homosexual orientation in their children, of teaching parents the wisdom about natural femininity and masculinity both in their marriage relations and educational roles of father and mother, they came with the passive and hope-less message of acceptance and "nothing can be done about it".<sup>xxvii</sup> But In fact, also in 1975 the biological theory had not a leg to stand on, as there was not a single bit of solid evidence for it, while there was ample evidence for the psychological causation.

Really troubling are the statements on homosexuality in Nrs. 2357 and 2358 of the Catechism of the Catholic Church of 1992. They create the false impression of homosexuality as a complex, profound mystery of nature, which view is one of the trump-cards of the gay normalizers. The mystery view is emphasized in the puzzling affirmation: "Its psycho-genesis remains largely unexplained." Is this meant to support the myth of biology? At any rate, it is conform to the gay policy to totally ignore the psychological approach, representing it as unscientific and insignificant. It is highly misleading and incorrect. Correct would have been a text in the sense that the psychological causation had the most convincing and scientifically best arguments. But apart from this, the "largely unexplained" contention is a (mis-) judgment that lies out of the domain of theologians. It belongs to that of the human sciences. (Remember the Galileo lesson). In truth, all non-morality statements on homosexuality must be removed from the Catechism. Like in the parable, they are weeds, sowed among the wheat of sound doctrine when some people were asleep.

Another dubious statement speaks of the "not negligible number of men and women [with] profound homosexual tendencies." In 1992, this was support for the Kinsey propaganda that 10% of the male population was homosexual, which would indicate how "normal" it was. And then we read this simplistic half-truth: "They do not choose their condition ... [which] is an ordeal for most of them." Very dubious, furthermore, is the melodramatic representation of homosexual people as innocent victims of discrimination, as is suggested in the following admonition: "...they must be treated with respect, compassion, delicacy. Every mark of unjust discrimination against them must be avoided." This over-dramatization is grist to the mill of the gay propaganda. Precisely the massive public indoctrination with the image of the homosexual as the victim of social oppression, in combination with the born-that-way fallacy, has been devastatingly effective in overcoming public resistance to the gay claims to "equal rights" for their sexuality. Why not a sober reminder of the normal duty of charity?

Anyway, the rhetoric of compassion and melodrama has been fully developed in subsequent Church documents to create an atmosphere where objection to homosexual practices begins to feel as unchristian. A case in point is the "Message" of the American Bishops to parents of (allegedly) homosexual children, *Always Our Children* (1997). It is all pastoral unction, dramatization, and psycho-babble about: "Accepting and loving your child as a gift of God", "sexual identity helps define the unique person we are", "chastity means ... integrating one's thoughts etc. ... in a way that values and respects one's dignity and that of others", "All homosexual persons have a right to be welcomed in the community", "A shocking number of homosexual youth end up on the streets because of rejection by their families...", "Accept and love yourselves as parents ... do not blame yourselves for a homosexual orientation." The Interim Report of the Vatican's Synod on the Family in 2014 continues in the same whining style that is typical of the gay propaganda about the victimhood of the repudiated homosexual, but now its intention to legalize homosexual relations and to tinker with *Humanae Vitae* is more evident. "Homosexuals", it says, and it clearly does not exclude *practicing* and *self-normalizing* homosexuals, "have gifts and qualities to offer to the Christian community"; the faithful must "provide them a place of fellowship in our communities" because they "oftentimes want to encounter a Church which offers them a welcoming home." Thus they are poor outcasts; but with a right to be warmly accepted in the Church. It are the faithful must be educated, who are lectured for their mercilessness, not those who live immorally: "Are our communities capable of ... accepting and valuing their sexual orientation?" The gay union is presented as respectable love: "...there are instances where mutual assistance to the point of sacrifice is a valuable support in the life of these persons."

\*\*\*

To conclude, it is not amazing that so much subtle and less subtle gay propaganda is echoed in Church documents. Since the priest scandals, the reality that, at least since the 1950s, a

disproportionally high percentage of seminarians and priests are homosexual has surfaced. Many of them must have “normalized” their feelings for themselves. And many of them must have arrived at the higher echelons in the Church, also because many homosexual priests tend to ambitiously strive after ecclesiastical careers and are successful in that.<sup>xxviii</sup> There has been subversive gay networking within the Church, even on high levels, to normalize homosexuality. Moral theologians provide the arguments, some openly, like Charles Curran: “The Church should accept the normal value and goodness of same-sex relationships”. In general, gay or pro-gay priests dissent to *Humanae Vitae*, and conversely, many dissenters to *Humanae Vitae* are pro-gay, although they do not show their colors.

As a matter of fact, from what happened in the world, we can learn that the promotion of contraceptive sex has for a large part been the work of people driven by the wish to normalize their own abnormality and impose their immorality on the society at large. Now it is rather probable that the existing attempts within the Church to amend the doctrine of *Humanae Vitae* is likewise strongly motivated and orchestrated by gay priests. Not out of compassion with parents, for whom observing *Humanae Vitae* would be too difficult. Because gay men, having little affinity with and understanding of adult marital love, are motivated in this issue by more ego-centered feelings: *Humanae Vitae* stands in the way of their own, dubious ideals.

---

<sup>i</sup> Not in terms of *behavior* as is done in the amateurish definition in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Nr. 2357). Its definition moreover muddles homosexual as the sexual disorder together with same-sex practices that are not motivated by attraction, such as initiation rites in primitive tribes.

<sup>ii</sup> British Office of National Statistics, 2010.

<sup>iii</sup> Cf. Flacelière, R. *Amour en Grèce*. Paris: Hachette, 1960. Historian of sexual customs Karlen states: “Nowhere is homosexuality or bisexuality a desired end in itself. Nowhere do parents say: ‘It is all the same to me if my child is heterosexual or homosexual.’”(Karlen, A., quoted in: Socarides, Ch. W., *Beyond sexual freedom: Clinical Fallout*. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 1976, **XXX**, 385-397.)

<sup>iv</sup> An excellent analysis: Reilly, R.R. *Making gay okay: How rationalizing homosexual behavior is changing everything*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2014.

<sup>v</sup> For surveys of the data: van den Aardweg, G.J.M. Homosexuality and biological factors: Real evidence—none; misleading interpretations: plenty. *NARTH Bulletin*, 2005, **13**, 3, 19-28; Whitehead, N.E. & Whitehead, B.K. *My genes made me do it! Homosexuality and the scientific evidence*. Belmont, Lower Hutt, New Zealand: Whitehead Associates, 2010; Mayer, L.S. & McHugh, P.R. Sexuality and gender. *The New Atlantis*, 2016, Nr. 50, 1-143.

<sup>vi</sup> *Position Paper*.

<sup>vii</sup> van den Aardweg, G.J.M. *The battle for normality*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1997.

<sup>viii</sup> For an Italian publication: Marchesini, R. *Omosessualità*. Pro Manuscrito, 2016. First ed. *Omosessualità maschile*. Roma: Ateneo Pontificio Regina Apostolorum, 2011.

<sup>ix</sup> This means, perseveration in prayer and regular small mortifications, reception of the Sacraments (for Catholics), and in the everyday fight against one’s character defects and vices and for the strengthening of one’s virtues.

<sup>x</sup> Spitzer, R.L. Can some gay men and lesbians change their sexual orientation? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 2003, **32**, 403-417.

<sup>xi</sup> Cf. the self-justifying *Corydon* of André Gide. Paris: NRF Gallimard, 1924.

<sup>xii</sup> Giese, H. *Der homosexuelle Mann in der Welt*. Stuttgart: Enke, 1958 ; Freund, K. *Die Homosexualität beim Mann*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1963; Zebulon, A. et al. Sexual partner age preference of homosexual and heterosexual men and women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 2000, **29**, 67-76.

<sup>xiii</sup> Cf. Cameron, P. Homosexual molestation of children. Sexual interaction of teacher and pupil. *Psychological Reports*, 1985, **57**, 1227-1236; Cameron, P. Teacher-pupil sex, how much is homosexual? *Empirical Journal of Same-Sex Sexual Behavior*, 2007, **1**, 1-19 (online); Fitzgibbons R. & O’Leary, D. Sexual abuse of minors by Catholic clergy. *The Linacre Quarterly*, 2011, **78**, 3, 252-273; van den Aardweg, G.J.M. Abuse by priests, homosexuality, *Humanae Vitae*, and the crisis of masculinity in the Church. *The Linacre Quarterly*, 2011, **78**, 3, 274-293.

<sup>xiv</sup> Hanson, D. *Homosexuality: The international disease*. New York: L.S. Publications, 1965, p. 41.

- 
- <sup>xv</sup> van den Aardweg, G.J.M. *Science says No: The gay "marriage" deception*. Castlemitchell South, Athy, Co. Kildare, Eire: Catholic Voice, 2015. Italian: *La scienza dice No*. Chieti: Edizione Solfanelli, 2016.
- <sup>xvi</sup> See, for instance, F.S. Jaffe's "Memorandum to Bernard Berelson", in: Elliott, R. et al. U.S. population growth and family planning: A review of the literature. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 1970, 2, 4, II-XVI.
- <sup>xvii</sup> Simon, P. *De la vie avant toute chose*. Paris: Mazarine, 1979; Abad-Gallardo, S. *J'ai frappé à la porte du Temple*. Paris: Téqui, 2014.
- <sup>xviii</sup> Fr. Schmidt, W. *Liebe, Ehe, Familie*. Innsbruck/Wien/München: Tyrolia, 1931, p. 21.
- <sup>xix</sup> Kinsey, A.C. *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948; Kinsey, A.C. et al. *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953; Reisman, J. *Kinsey: Crimes and consequences*. Arlington VA: Institute for Media Education, 1998.
- <sup>xx</sup> de Beauvoir, S. *Le deuxième sexe*. Paris: Gallimard, 1949.
- <sup>xxi</sup> Seymour-Jones, C. *A dangerous liaison: Simone de Beauvoir and Jean-Paul Sartre*. London: Century, 2008, p.XIII.
- <sup>xxii</sup> Lamblin, B. *Mémoires d'une jeune fille dérangée*. Paris: Éditions Balland, 1993, p. 166.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Ibidem, p. 167. Bianca L. was a lifelong friend who as an adolescent had been seduced by her teacher Simone de Beauvoir.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Bair, D. *Simone de Beauvoir: A biography*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1990, p. 170.
- <sup>xxv</sup> Kurtz, S. The end of marriage in Scandinavia. *The Weekly Standard*, 2004, February 2, 26-33. The devastating effect of increased homosexuality on marriage has been known all along. The Nazis reckoned with it in their program to exterminate the Slav Poles. One of the first steps involved legalization of homosexuality (Habiger, M. From Auschwitz to Cairo: Lessons on population management. *HLI Reports*, 1994, Sept., 4-7.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> *La Civiltà Cattolica*, the Jesuit magazine which enjoys authority in ecclesiastical circles, contribute to the biological myth with a misleading, incompetent article by Fr. Serra, a retired professor of genetics of the Gregoriana University. From his erroneous understanding of some research reports, he contended that there would be "a coherent complex of observations indicating with sufficient strength that ... a causal biological component may not be excluded and which even suggests that this has appreciable weight." Curiously, the Editor of the periodical refused discussion of this misleading information. Serra, A. Sessualità: Scienza, sapienza, società. *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 2004, **155**, I, 220-234.
- <sup>xxvii</sup> For instance, the document on sexual education of the pontifical Council for the Family in 1995, and the semi-gay Message of the American Bishops "with homosexual children" of 1997.
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Cf. Nasini, G. *Um espinho na carne*. Aparecida SP: Editora Santuário, 1998.