

MELVIN AND MAUDE

a satire

by

ERIC RUDOLPH

September 2013

Introduction

In a quiet suburb outside of Denver, Colorado, lives a six-year-old boy named Coy. Some time ago, Coy started wearing his sister's dresses around the house and playing with her dolls. At first, the parents, both committed progressives, thought it must be a phase Coy was going through. Eventually, he would outgrow it. But when Coy persisted in referring to himself as a "girl," they sought the expert opinion of a child psychologist, who promptly diagnosed Coy as "transgendered." Although he was born with the anatomy of a male child, Coy is actually a "girl," the psychologist declared.

The local elementary school principal had apparently never heard of transgenderism. ("Transgender" and "transsexual" are interchangeable terms. In the course of this writing I shall use both.) As kids are bound to do during a long school day, Coy had to use the restroom, but instead of going to the little boys' room, Coy insisted on using the little girls' room. The principal refused. Of course, Coy's progressive parents found a progressive lawyer and filed a complaint with the Colorado Civil Rights Division in February of 2013.

The case immediately caught the attention of the progressive media, which ran a series of stories to promote public awareness of transgenderism. In referring to Coy, the journalists used personal pronouns that conformed to Coy's gender preference: "she" and "her" instead of "he" and "his." Psychiatrists and academics were enlisted to help explain the idea that it was possible for a six-year-old child to have the sex organs of a boy but the gender of a girl.

Most folks in the community were dubious of transgenderism. But the parents and the "experts" were certain that Coy was a "girl" trapped inside the body of a boy.

Cases like Coy's are becoming more common as the so-called Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (LGBT) movement sweeps across the culture. Delaware recently became the eleventh state to redefine marriage to include homosexual couples. In June this year, the Supreme Court invalidated two key pieces of legislation: Proposition 8, a California initiative that amended the state constitution providing that "only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California"; and the federal Defense of Marriage Act, which prevented the federal government from recognizing same-sex marriages. Everywhere you turn, the LGBT cause gains more ground, while the opposition continues to retreat.

The liberal establishment celebrates every LGBT victory as yet another milestone passed in the long march to equality. Just fifty years ago, society overwhelmingly rejected homosexuality. But today the gay rights cause has become the civil rights movement of the early twenty-first century, according to the liberal elite. Those fighting for same-sex marriage are said to be on the right side of history. In what they're calling the "new normal," tolerance of homosexuality is now enforced throughout the culture. Being labelled a *homophobe*, one opposed to the homosexual agenda, is the equivalent of being called a racist.

In deference to the new normal, the mainstream opposition long ago conceded that the various LGBT lifestyles are perfectly normal expressions of sexuality, no less legitimate than heterosexuality. They oppose initiatives like same-sex marriage only out of regard to tradition. Or, for example, they oppose allowing homosexuals to serve in the military, saying "same-sex attractions might impair combat

readiness”. But they generally accept the LGBT lifestyle as a legitimate alternative to heterosexuality.

The only folks still expressing moral disapproval of homosexuality itself are traditional Christians, and this is because the Bible condemns homosexuality as a sin. But the mainstream rejects such appeals to Scripture. Like Transubstantiation and the Immaculate Conception, biblical condemnation of homosexuality is a “religious opinion,” they contend, and religious opinions cannot form the basis of public policy in our secular society. Public policy must be based on reason, not revelation. And “reasonable” people all agree that homosexuality is perfectly “normal” behavior.

But is the new normal really normal? And just what exactly are the rational arguments used to support the various LGBT lifestyles? Unfortunately, the liberal media and its allies won’t tell us. Their image of the LGBT worldview is largely false. To see what the new normal really looks like, you have to go straight to the source and read a little lesbian-gay-bisexual-transgender literature.

The LGBT movement has its origins in the socialist-anarchist tradition of Marx and Engels, as well as the lesser-known Charles Fourier and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. These socialist-anarchist thinkers believed that the first human societies were socialist collectives. Everything was held in common, including sex partners. Men, women, and even children practiced free love. The snake that entered this paradise was monogamous marriage. It was the first form of private property, one in which parents assumed responsibility for their own family unit at the expense of the collective. The more successful families bequeathed property and wealth to their children. The division of mankind into separate families was the beginning of the class system and, therefore, the source of inequality in the world today. Rejecting marriage, traditional gender roles, and monogamy, the socialists wanted to abolish the private family and replace it with the collective. They envisioned a future classless society of gender-neutral citizens practicing free love. To prevent the development of new classes and ensure that everyone had an equal start in life, they thought that children should be raised by the collective instead of by their biological parents.

Resurrected in the 1960s, the idea of free love and socialism influenced the leaders of the counterculture, the feminist movement, and the LGBT movement. Harry Hay, the father of the gay rights movement, joined the American Communist Party in the 1940s and imbued his followers with the socialist vision of the gender-neutral classless society.

Harry Hay’s LGBT universe rests upon two basic ideas. First, all sex acts are morally neutral. No one variety is any better than another; there is no moral difference between the traditional marriage bed and a bathhouse orgy of fifty homosexuals. The purpose of any sex act is what they call the “pair-bonding experience,” not procreation. How you and your partner or partners achieve the pair-bonding experience is left entirely to your imagination. Gay sex, group sex, sadomasochism, coprophilia – all are legitimate means of achieving the pair-bonding experience. The concept of morally neutral sex acts adopts a perspective of moral relativism, which basically holds that there are no objective standards of morality. Whatever you feel is right, is right.

The second idea central to the LGBT worldview is that sex and gender are two different things: the former is determined by biology, the latter by culture and individual perception. When it comes to

determining your “gender identity,” it is your perception that counts, not your anatomy. If you perceive yourself to be a woman, then you are a woman, regardless of whether you were born with a penis or a vagina. In transgendered persons, there is a conflict between sex and gender. Like six-year-old Coy, the male transgender-transsexual is not a confused little boy who wants to become a girl; “she” is a girl trapped inside the body of a boy. And in order to bring congruity between “her” sex and gender, “she” often chooses to undergo a sex change operation.

The sex/gender dichotomy, which applies not just to transsexualism but to all of the other LGBT lifestyles, adopts philosophical subjectivism. At its extreme, subjectivism asserts that there is no such thing as objective reality. Reality consists of individual perception and experience. You have your reality, and I have mine.

Both moral relativism and philosophical subjectivism defy rational criticism. The reason is that, to criticize an idea, there must be rational criteria for reaching an agreement. If perception is reality, then reality is whatever you want it to be. After reading a little LGBT literature, this perspective becomes readily apparent. Like falling down a rabbit hole into Wonderland, the LGBT universe is a place where reason doesn’t exist, where up is down, black is white, and little boys are actually little girls.

My original intention was to write a critique of homosexuality from a natural law perspective. But after perusing the pertinent literature, I realized it made no sense to use rational arguments against a worldview that is essentially irrational. The appropriate medium is satire. To make my point, I decided to follow these LGBT ideas to their logical conclusion, reductio ad absurdum. If anatomy is irrelevant in determining your gender identity, then it’s equally irrelevant in determining your species identity. So I introduce you to *Melvin and Maude*, the story of a donkey trapped inside the body of a man.

Although the characters in *Melvin and Maude* are fictional, the arguments are quite real, for they are the same arguments being used before the Supreme Court to advance causes such as same-sex marriage. Policies are only as good as the ideas on which they are based. Both moral relativism and philosophical subjectivism are very bad ideas. Relying upon them as the basis for major social policies such as marriage will inevitably lead to disaster.

As for Coy, the “transgendered” six-year-old, the door to the girls’ restroom is now open. On June 17, 2013, the Colorado Civil Rights Division issued a decree that the school district “discriminatorily denied” Coy “full and equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations in a place of public accommodation due to (her) sex and sexual orientation.” (*Denver Post*, June 25, 2013) The family held a celebratory news conference on the steps of the state capitol. Sporting a pair of pink sneakers and a sparkly tank-top, Coy sat quietly in front of the news cameras, biting “her” fingernails. The parents were later asked about the next step in the process of Coy’s transgenderism. They said Coy will probably be given female sex hormones, which will prevent the development of male features (facial hair) and promote the growth of female features (breasts). At some point down the road, Coy will have the option of sex reassignment surgery. In this procedure, the surgeons will first remove Coy’s testicles, then hollow out his penis and invert it into a “vagina.” Welcome to the new normal.

Melvin and Maude

* * *

One beautiful morning in the summer of 2024, a friendly young donkey named Melvin decided to cut off his feet with a chainsaw. Melvin's problem wasn't physical handicap; his feet worked just fine. His problem was identity. Melvin felt trapped inside a human body and wanted to cut his way out.

Melvin had never heard of the term "species role," a word that defined the way Melvin was supposed to behave in public just because he had been born with human anatomy. Because of his human anatomy, Melvin was pressured by society to look, act, and talk like a human. Because of his body, he was given a human name by his human parents. But Melvin wanted none of it, not the human name, not the human parents, least of all the human anatomy.

Deep down in his soul, Melvin knew he was a donkey. It was true, he didn't have hooves or long furry ears; he couldn't bray like an ass. But Melvin longed to be a donkey, he craved the pleasure of acting like a donkey, at first in the privacy of his basement, eventually in the company of other donkeys who lived in the pasture behind his home. Melvin was convinced that he was in fact a donkey and this whole human business was all a horrible mistake. There had somehow been a mix-up, he wanted to tell the whole world about it, yet he was forced to keep it a secret, even though he didn't know why.

Species was still something of a mystery when Melvin was growing up. Except for a handful of radical psychiatrists, the medical community was in agreement that human anatomy was destiny, and the only acceptable outlet for someone born with human anatomy was to behave like a human being. But for Melvin, having to deny himself the pleasure of acting like a jackass was intolerable. Driven to the verge of suicide, Melvin took the desperate step of trying to remove his hated human appendages with a chainsaw.

Before the chain cut into his alien flesh, Melvin chickened out. In utter despair, he fell to his knees and beseeched the heavens: "Why am I cursed with this body? How can I get rid of it?"

His whole life, Melvin had been trapped inside a human body, like a prisoner languishing in the cruelest kind of solitary confinement. Melvin didn't know it at the time but he wasn't alone, there were many others just like him, each confined to their own anatomical prison cell, desperately wanting to escape. Melvin didn't know it but he was also a genetic Argonaut, destined to become one of the first transspecie. With the help of a few visionary psychiatrists and physicians, Melvin would become living proof that anatomy wasn't destiny.

He was born on December 1, 2001, a balmy Tuesday. Seeing the attributes of a male child, the doctors declared him a "boy" and his parents, Bill and Betty White, promptly named him Melvin. Life was hard growing up on the red hills of central Mississippi. Melvin refused to play with the human boys because they liked football and video games. Melvin would sneak out at night to the pasture to be with the long-eared donkeys. He was bullied and excluded by the human boys. "Donkey Boy," they called him. During high school, Melvin wanted to learn how to pull a plow, but sadly he was forced to take classes on math and science. Forced into the society of humans, Melvin desperately wanted to escape. But how? he wondered.

After graduation Melvin married a human female. It was an unhappy marriage and soon fell apart after she realized Melvin had no interest in human sex. She grew tired of Melvin coming home late at night, smelling of livestock, grass wedged between his teeth. A divorce followed.

It was during this period that Melvin read a magazine article about Bill Baxter, a former New York City firefighter who in 2022 went to Johns Hopkins Medical Center, underwent surgical treatment, and returned home a German shepherd named “Bruno.”

Baxter’s species reassignment was a logical progression from sex reassignment. Back in the 1960s Dr. John Money, head of the Psychohormonal and Gender Identity Clinic of Johns Hopkins University, pioneered research into what he called “transsexualism.” Born anatomically male or female, the transsexual prefers the gender role of the opposite sex. In order to bring anatomical congruity with their gender role preference, Dr. Money believed that transsexuals needed surgery and hormone treatment. The first sex change operation was performed at Johns Hopkins in September 1965. A woman trapped inside a man’s body, the patient gave up her penis and testicles in order to achieve her goal of becoming a complete woman.

Bill Baxter (“Bruno”) was the logical next step. His case was the first time the public became aware of transspecieism and the fact that it was possible for a human to actually change species. Inspired by Baxter, Melvin Allen White entered the new transspecies program at Johns Hopkins. He was scheduled for a species change operation for the spring of 2025.

A team of Baltimore surgeons removed Melvin’s feet and hands, the skin and muscle were rolled back upon the appendages like tube socks, the bony stumps were squared and sanded smooth.

Medicine had come a long way since the days of Dr. Money’s first sex change operations. One of the major advances was the ability to splice human and animal DNA in order to grow organs for species reassignment surgery.

Melvin’s specially grown donkey hide and long ears were surgically attached. When he awoke on April 5, 2025, Melvin was a complete jackass.

Returning to rural Mississippi, Melvin moved to the pasture behind his old house. The excitement he felt grazing alongside his fellow donkeys is difficult to describe in human terms. Finally liberated from the prison of his human body, Melvin emitted a loud Hee-Haw.

Digesting grass and raw oats took some getting used to. At first the other donkeys shunned poor Melvin. But after a while he was treated as one of the herd.

One day Melvin caught wind of a female donkey loping through the fields of new alfalfa. Her stink floated on the early morning breeze like perfume. It was love at first scent.

A two-year-old donkey, Maude was ready for breeding. Initially, she played hard-to-get with love-struck Melvin. But Melvin’s persistence paid off. Pretty soon the pair was inseparable. They grazed together. They dusted for insects together. They brayed beneath the stars: Hee-Haw- Hee-Haw. Their love was equal to any human love. Melvin figured the only appropriate way to express their love for one

another was to go get hitched.

Sadly a lot of people in America frowned upon such relationships. Unfortunately for Melvin and Maude, jurisprudence had failed to keep pace with progress. In the eyes of the law Melvin was a human being, despite his recent operation, and Maude was still a donkey, which made their affair a “crime.” Although marriage had long since been extended to all manner of human relationships – gay, polygamous, incestuous – transspecies marriage was still illegal in all fifty states. A few reactionary states in the Deep South even had anti-bestiality statutes on their books.

But Melvin knew that the arc of the universe bent toward justice. He was certain that those who were fighting for transspecies liberation were on the right side of history. In the end, the forces of hate and intolerance would be defeated.

Confident in the justice of their cause, Melvin and Maude galloped to the Jackson County Courthouse in downtown Appleton. The justice of the peace refused to issue a marriage license: “We don’t marry your kind,” he said in a deep southern accent. A trickle of tobacco juice coursed down his chin.

It was the voice of hate echoing out of the past. Melvin heard screaming and bullwhips cracking and asked himself *How long? How long?* He couldn’t believe that such intolerance still existed in America. But here it was, staring him in the snout, denying him equal rights.

The ACLU immediately agreed to take Melvin and Maude’s case into federal court. The famous civil liberties group assigned the case to prominent civil rights attorney Heiman Sheister. Sheister thought Melvin and Maude would make an excellent test case to challenge the laws against bestiality and transspecies marriage, the most prominent being the Federal Defense of Human Marriage Act.

Winding its way through the legal process, the case was finally docketed before the bench of Judge Reuben Stamp in the Middle District of Mississippi. Judge Stamp was something of an enigma. A divorced father of two, Stamp lived alone on his 300 acre ranch. He was a Republican appointee and for many years a reliable conservative on the bench. Then came a series of decidedly liberal opinions, reversing everything he had once stood for. Unbeknownst to those who gathered to witness the historic arguments in *White v. Black*, Judge Stamp was in the midst of his own identity crisis.

In the days leading up to the trial, the streets of tiny Appleton were the scene of massive demonstrations organized by the North American Man-Animal Love Association. The demonstrators tossed handfuls of donkey manure at a phalanx of cops, chanting “No justice ... No clean streets.” The NAMALA demonstrations were joined by a smaller contingent of activists committed to the cause of man-cow equality, yelling “We’re here... We love steers ... Get used to it.”

It was standing room only in the ancient courthouse. Built during the Great Depression, the courthouse was decorated with WPA murals depicting workers and farmers; its hardwood floors creaked when walked on; overhead ceiling fans circulated the stale summer air. Judge Stamp entered through a side door, a short fat dour-looking man.

Melvin and Maude were tethered to the plaintiff’s table, a large bale of alfalfa off to the side to keep

the two lovers occupied during breaks.

Sheister delivered an impassioned opening statement:

Ladies and gentlemen and donkeys, we are here to witness history, for what will be decided here today is whether we as a nation will go forward together or remain mired in the past, whether we will see a new birth of freedom or remain enslaved by prejudice. You may not realize it but this case has already been decided. Fifteen years ago in a case called *Perry v. Schwarzenegger* a courageous judge named Vaugh Walker ruled that love has no gender, that the state of California had no right to exclude same-sex couples from marriage. Today, I ask nothing less for Melvin and Maude. I will use precisely the same argument to demonstrate that love has no species, that the government has no more right to exclude transspecies couples like Melvin and Maude from marriage than it does same-sex couples. To paraphrase Judge Walker's ruling, the Federal Defense of Human Marriage Act does nothing more than enshrine in the Constitution the notion that human couples are superior to transspecies couples; it unconstitutionally burdens the exercise of the fundamental right to marry and creates an irrational classification on the basis of species. ¹

Representing the State of Mississippi was Assistant Attorney Michael Veracitino. Ten states and the District of Columbia had filed amicus briefs in support of the plaintiffs. The *New York Times* had called transspecies marriage the civil rights issue of the 2020s. History was clearly on the side of Melvin and Maude. But here was this hayseed lawyer planning to stand in the door of progress. With a small mountain of books and papers on the table in front of him, Mr. Veracitino looked like a high school teacher preparing his lessons. In his opening he repeated the familiar reactionary argument that changing the definition of marriage would negatively impact the stability of the family. He even had the temerity to suggest that the love that Melvin and Maude shared for one another was farcical, and allowing the two lovers to marry upends the concept of reality. Mr. Veracitino argued: "When a man becomes a donkey and donkeys fall in love and get married, we have fallen down a rabbit hole and entered Wonderland."

The focal point of the trial was the state's cross examination of Dr. Canard, expert witness for the plaintiffs. A professor of psychology at Harvard's Center for Tolerance, Diversity, and Equality, Dr. Canard was the nation's foremost authority on sex, gender, species, family, and marriage. He was also the author of the controversial book *Barnyard Fever: The Transspecies Phenomenon*, which was voted Book of the Month by the Oprah Chopra Book Club. Called to the stand, Dr. Canard was a slight, balding man with wire-frame glasses and a light-brown suit made of Sumatran hemp.

MR VERACITINO: Dr. Canard, this case involves the plaintiffs' desire to be married. Just so we're on the same page, can you please give us a definition of marriage?

DR CANARD: As currently defined, marriage is a civil right; it's a "personal relationship usually arising out of an emotional state of being in love."²

MR VERACITINO: I noticed that you used the words "current definition." Obviously there used to be a different definition of marriage. Can you take us back in time and describe marriage as it was traditionally defined in our culture?

DR CANARD: I'd be glad to. Before the sexual revolution, marriage was an institution of oppression designed to hold women and children in subjection to men; it was the cornerstone of a class system called patriarchy.

MR VERACITINO: "Patriarchy" is a male-dominated culture, right?

DR CANARD: Basically, with the necessary emphasis on the unjust treatment of women and children. First and foremost, marriage was a commitment between a man and a woman to form a household for the primary purpose of raising children. Sex resulted in children, and children, it was thought, did best when raised by their biological parents. Boys were expected to model themselves after their fathers, girls after their mothers. Once grown, they were expected to find mates of their own and marry – the class system perpetuating itself.

The family's basic division of labor assigned the husband the duties of provider and the wife the duties of child care. He was the "head" of the household; she was his "helpmate." Under the marital bargain called "coverture," the wife "agreed" to merge her legal and economic identity with that of her husband, in effect, selling herself into slavery. She "consented" to obey him on all important matters affecting the family, and in exchange he was obliged to support her and the children, providing them with the basic material goods of life. "With protection goes obedience," was the old saying. A truly barbaric formula.

Marriage wasn't just a personal relationship between husband and wife; it was also a commitment made to God and country. The union couldn't be dissolved unless one of the spouses proved in open court that the other spouse had somehow broken their vows, by, for example, committing adultery or failing to provide basic material support. For centuries the criminal statutes of Western governments punished such familial offenses. This public aspect of marriage formed the core of the institution for a thousand years. Marriage was, in effect, a socially approved sexual relationship, the only socially approved sexual relationship. Non-conformists were ostracized or persecuted. Sexual relationships outside of monogamous heterosexual marriage – fornication, adultery, and homosexuality – were "sinful" and "criminal."

MR VERACITINO: What about love? In today's world love forms the entire criterion of marriage.

DR CANARD: Like the definition of marriage itself, the pre-enlightenment era had a very different notion of love. Love, they believed, is to will the good of another, to place another's interest before one's own, especially when it's not in one's interest to do so. People thought that true love grew out of marriage rather than preceded it. Romance and passion were different from love. Although passion might bring two lovers together, the thing that will keep them together is love, and love takes time to form. There was an element of compulsion involved in their idea of love, as, for example, when a mother is compelled to care for her helpless child. They felt that unless society compelled spouses to fulfill their marriage vows, most unions would quickly fall apart. Today, we rightly consider this kind of co-dependency to be toxic.

MR VERACITINO: Yes, we do have a much more evolved definition of love, don't we? Love is the emotion we feel when something pleases our senses. We "fall in love" with a boy or a girl or a

donkey or vanilla ice cream. We may choose to express our love by marrying the object of our affection, but when this emotion wears off we “fall out of love” and it’s time to move on and find a new object of affection. In the case of marriage, we get a divorce; in the case of ice cream, we switch to chocolate. Is that about right?

DR CANARD: Yah, that’s it.

MR VERACITINO: Doctor, you mentioned the so-called division of labor. Can you tell us a little about its origins?

DR. CANARD: Back in the old days, folks believed that nature had created a division of labor between the sexes. Nature, they thought, had designed females to care for children and graced them with a “feminine” temperament: A woman was supposed to be passive, gentle, nurturing, a natural subordinate. Conversely they believed that nature had designed males to be breadwinners and fitted them with a “masculine” temperament: The ideal man was aggressive, strong, a natural leader. Today we call these assumptions sexism.

We now realize that sex and gender are two different things. Sex is objective and derived from nature; gender is subjective and derived from culture.

MR VERACITINO: In other words, there are no differences between the sexes, other than anatomical? I, for example, was born with male sexual anatomy, but post-natal cultural influences fitted me out with a “masculine” temperament and assigned me a masculine gender role?

DR CANARD: Correct.

MR. VERACITINO: I could just as well have grown up in a culture that assigns its males the role of child care and its females the role of breadwinner, where the gender roles are essentially reversed?

DR. CANARD: That’s right.

MR VERACITINO: What about the influence on behavior of the sex hormones testosterone and estrogen?

DR CANARD: Negligible.

MR VERACITINO: But doctor, levels of testosterone in males increase dramatically at puberty and reach a peak in their early twenties. Under the influence of testosterone boys become physically stronger than girls, naturally equipping them for heavy labor and fighting. The history of warfare is almost exclusively a male phenomenon. The female body, on the other hand, is almost exclusively devoted to reproduction. This suggests to me that nature has equipped men and women differently and cultures have merely divided up the labor assignments accordingly: women for mostly child care and men for mostly fighting and heavy labor. The physical and emotional investment it takes for human females to bear and raise children requires that they have extra protection and support. In every culture I’m aware of that support has traditionally been provided by males. Isn’t it possible that “gender roles,” as you call them, have their origins in natural differences?

DR CANARD: No.

MR VERACITINO: Does the sex hormone testosterone make males naturally stronger?

DR CANARD: The influence of sex hormones is negligible.

MR. VERACITINO: So the reason there are no female linebackers in the NFL is solely because of sex discrimination?

DR. CANARD: Yes, the gender roles traditionally associated with being a “man” or a “woman” have no biological basis whatsoever. They are entirely derived from culture.

MR. VERACITINO: If you’ll indulge me for a minute, I’d like to read a quote from anthropologist Margaret Mead, who was certainly no right-winger: “We know of no culture that has said, articulately, that there is no difference between men and women except in the way that they contribute to the next generation; that otherwise in all respects they are simply human beings with varying gifts, no one of which can be exclusively assigned to either sex.”³ In other words, gender roles appear to be derived from nature.

DR. CANARD: I disagree with Ms. Mead. Gender roles originated in class oppression, not biology. In his landmark book *The Origins of Family, Private Property, and the State*, Friedrich Engels assures us that the earliest societies were actually matriarchal, “that women as mother, being the only well-known parent of younger generations, received a high tribute of respect and deference, amounting to a complete woman’s rule.”⁴ Women were “physically strong and adept at self-defense,” while men performed mostly domestic tasks or were “excluded from those societies.”⁵ The principle of fertility was considered sacred; therefore, female deities were worshiped.

MR VERACITINO: That’s fascinating. I thought all societies were essentially patriarchal. Can you give us an example of a matriarchal culture?

DR. CANARD: Well. . . no . . . As Engels readily admitted, matriarchal societies “belong entirely to prehistoric times.”⁶ So I really can’t give you a specific example.

MR. VERACITINO: Didn’t Engels base his assertions on ancient myths and the American Indian kinship system, which he interpreted as “proof” of a primeval matriarchate?

MR. CANARD: Frederick Engels was an honest scholar.

MR. VERACITINO: This is the same Friedrich Engels who was the friend and comrade of Karl Marx, the father of communism?

DR. CANARD: Yes, it is.

MR. VERACITINO: If I’m not mistaken, Engels, as well as Marx, are the intellectual founding fathers of the sexual revolution, and the radical feminist movement, and the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender movement. *Origins* was the key influence on the work of such prominent lesbian feminists as Kate Millet, Shulamith Firestone, and Andrea Dworkin. The founder of the gay rights movement, Harry Hay, was himself a loyal member of the Communist Party and a great fan of *Origins*.

DR. CANARD: Congratulations Mr. Veracitino, I see you've done your homework.

MR. VERACITINO: I've read all of your books, Dr. Canard, and it's obvious to me that you're a great fan of the sexual revolution. Would you say that the sexual revolution is really just one front in the larger socialist revolution?

DR. CANARD: I would.

MR VERACITINO: Do you also support the goals of the larger socialist revolution?

DR. CANARD: Any supporter of the sexual revolution is a supporter of the socialist revolution, because the two are coterminous.

MR. VERACITINO: What about the Gulags and mass murders in the Soviet Union, China, Cambodia, and a dozen other communist countries?

DR. CANARD: Engels and Marx can't be held responsible for the actions of a few misguided followers. Both men were dedicated scholars who pointed the way to a "radiant tomorrow." As Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "Karl Marx had a great passion for social justice."⁷ We must separate socialist theory from what happened in a few socialist countries.

MR. VERACITINO: Sort of like separating Nazi theory from what happened in Nazi Germany?

DR. CANARD: I won't even dignify that question with a response.

MR. VERACITINO: Okay, back to our discussion of "socialist theory," specifically gender roles. Given the fact that every known culture in recorded history is patriarchal, how did we lose our matriarchal "origins"?

DR. CANARD: A vast right-wing conspiracy that stretches all the way back to the very dawn of history. The first societies were socialist collectives, as well as being matriarchal. There was no private property; everything was held in common, including sex partners, there being no exclusive relationships. "Not only brothers and sisters were originally man and wife, but also the sexual intercourse between parents and children was permitted," said Engels.⁸ Children were raised by the collective. Having no private property, there was no cause for conflict, no crime or war.

The reason early societies were matriarchal was because women were thought to generate life spontaneously. People had yet to make the connection between sex and procreation. As the sole life-giver, women were revered, and even worshipped.

The snake that entered this socialist paradise was paternity. When man discovered that his seed was necessary to generate life, he decided to overthrow the benevolent matriarchate. First, he enslaved his biological children. Second, he turned their mother into a personal slave. Third, he invented monogamous marriage, which gave him sole title over his "wife" and children – property. To symbolize the triumph of patriarchy, warlike male deities with large aggressive phalli replaced the gentle mother goddesses. Thus was born marriage. Engels said "Monogamy was the first form of the family not founded on natural but economic conditions, *vis* the victory of private property over primitive and natural collectivism."⁹ It has been all downhill ever since.

MR VERACITINO: Why was the creation of monogamous marriage and family a bad thing?

DR CANARD: Patriarchal marriage and family introduced the idea of exclusion into the world, that some persons, namely one's biological relatives, are more deserving of one's labor, loyalty, and affection than others. Rich families started to monopolize property, which had formerly belonged to the collective. They bestowed superior resources and education on their children, while poor families had only inferior resources to pass on to their children, giving the rich an unequal start in life. An unequal start in life naturally led to unequal outcomes. As families accumulated wealth and property and passed it on to their heirs, economic classes developed. To protect their accumulated property, the rich class banded together and organized the modern state; its laws designed to protect their property and keep the poor class in subjection. Out of the economic class system was hatched all the other forms of oppression: racism, homophobia, ageism, and speciesism. Everything can be traced back to that original sin: monogamous marriage.

MR VERACITINO: I'm just trying to get my mind around the idea that marriage and family were invented as part of some conspiracy to enslave women and children. Can it be that every thirteen-year-old girl dreams of wearing a wedding dress like every slave dreams of wearing chains? That seems so incredible to me? ¹⁰

DR CANARD: Most people blithely accept oppression; they even come to enjoy it

MR VERACITINO: As far as slave systems go, marriage and family has to be the most ingenious one in history. Slave revolts, as you know, are quite common in history. On several occasions, the Helots of ancient Greece rose up against their Spartan masters. In 70 B.C. Spartacus and his army of slaves nearly sacked Rome. But in the annals of history there has not been one instance of housewives organizing a slave revolt to overthrow patriarchy. Quite a remarkable achievement. How has patriarchy managed to keep its women and children slaves in line across countless centuries?

DR CANARD: Through an elaborate process of indoctrination. From the time they are old enough to walk, little boys and girls are brainwashed into accepting their gender roles. Boys are taught to be aggressive, girls to be passive. Boys are told that they are stronger, girls that they are weaker. Boys are told that the world is their oyster, girls that their place is in the home. And the slaves are told that nature has decreed it, that nature has assigned each a gender role and to refuse it is a crime against nature.

MR VERACITINO: Truly remarkable. Who designed this vast system of indoctrination?

DR CANARD: Although masculine and feminine gender roles exist in every known culture and probably originated in prehistoric times, the intellectual foundations for heterosexist gender roles were laid by Aristotle and the Christian Church. For a thousand years the Church promulgated the idea that man served a certain purpose in the universe. Before the advent of modern science it was still possible to convince people that the universe constituted a moral order and that every object in it was guided from within by its own nature to fulfill a certain purpose. Aristotle insisted that there was a kind of life that befits a hippopotamus and one that befits a human being. A hippo wades around in rivers and eats river grass. A man becomes a husband and father, a woman becomes a wife and

mother. Marriage and family were, therefore, part of the natural order of things.

MR VERACITINO: Were they wrong, doctor?

DR CANARD: They were.

MR. VERACITINO: Then what purpose does man serve in the universe?

DR CANARD: None whatsoever. Man wasn't made for any purpose; he is the product of random material processes, nothing more.

MR VERACITINO: Please elaborate on this random universe, if you will.

DR CANARD: In the seventeenth century, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton began the process of "expelling the idea of purpose" from the universe when they rejected Aristotle's notion of final causes. The aim of their science was to predict and control events. To predict an eclipse, what they needed to know was not its final cause, or its purpose, but its efficient cause. Observation proved that the moon passed between the earth and the sun every so many days and that was all they needed to know – no reason or purpose, just a mechanical process.

The mechanistic model of the universe is what separates the modern worldview from the medieval. According to the modern worldview, the universe is "purposeless, senseless, meaningless. Nature is nothing but matter in motion. The motion of the matter is governed not by purpose but by blind forces and laws."¹¹

MR. VERACITINO: As I understand it the mechanistic model of the universe had a devastating impact on religious beliefs.

DR CANARD: Accepting the implications of the mechanistic model made it impossible for many intellectuals in Europe to believe in the God of the Scriptures, the Jehovah who intervenes directly in the world with miracles and guides the events of history through this divine providence. Such direct intervention violated the mechanical laws of nature. But at the same time the complexity of the universe, especially the complexity of life, made it impossible for them to believe that mechanical laws alone could have put everything together just so. William Paley said, "In crossing a heath, suppose I pitched my foot against a stone and were asked how the stone came to be there; I might answer that . . . it had lain there forever . . . But suppose I found a watch upon the ground, and it should be inquired how the watch came to be in that place, I should hardly think to answer the way I had before . . . The watch must have had a maker ..." ¹² It was the same with complex life-forms. Paley thought there had to be a God, a supreme watchmaker to build objects like human beings. So thought most educated folks – until Darwin.

MR. VERACITINO: How did Darwin change opinions about the origins of life?

DR CANARD: The nineteenth century witnessed another revolution in science, even more momentous than the one two centuries earlier. First, the study of rocks revealed that the earth was much older than previously thought, many millions of years older than the biblical account of six thousand years. Second, the work of Charles Darwin showed that complex life-forms could have

slowly evolved from primitive life-forms, if given enough time.

Darwin's theory of evolution destroyed the purposive worldview. Gone was the need for God, a supreme watchmaker. The snails and snakes and birds and bees and you and me, were put together by a "blind watchmaker," said Richard Dawkins.¹³ The new Garden of Eden is a primordial mud puddle where the first protozoa oozed into existence. After a billion years of natural selection, here we are, piloting spacecraft, building cities, litigating whether to allow donkeys to get married.

MR VERACITINO: The modern worldview must have also had a profound impact on Western philosophy, for if the scheme of the universe is without purpose and meaning, then the life of man is without purpose and meaning.

DR. CANARD: I couldn't have said it any better.

MR VERACITINO: Where does this leave the individual? As human beings we like to think of ourselves as the center of the universe, as a child of God, or at least the end product of a rational universe.

DR CANARD: Anthropocentric fairytales. In the scheme of things the life of one human being is no more significant than the life of one sand flea.

MR VERACITINO: Sounds pretty bleak. I may not be a professor of psychology but I do know that man needs a sense of meaning and purpose in his life. If he cannot get it from God or nature, where does he get it?

DR CANARD: Himself. Without a transcendent creator or metaphysical principle giving order to the universe, man is free to give life the meaning and purpose which he chooses to give it. And his life has no other meaning and purpose. Man must become the "measure of all things," as Protagoras put it.¹⁴

MR. VERACITINO: This changed the nature of truth, didn't it? Formerly truth was derived from God, or nature, or accepted authority, and it was something objective that all rational persons were obliged to acknowledge. Modern philosophy turns this formula on its head. The source of all truth henceforth becomes the individual's subjective will. We must write the table of "our own law," said Friedrich Nietzsche.¹⁵

DR CANARD: That's correct.

MR VERACITINO: What about ethics? Central to traditional systems of ethics is the idea that nature can tell us how to live just as surely as it can tell us how apples fall from trees. There is a natural law that allows us to tell right from wrong. Lying and cheating are similar to violating the law of gravity.

DR CANARD: Vestiges of the old worldview. Early in the twentieth century, G. E. Moore and the logical positivists demonstrated that moral judgments are different than factual judgments. Factual judgments are true or false; and in the realm of fact there are rational criteria to reach agreement as to what is true or false. "The earth orbits the sun," for example, is a factual judgment that can be

verified by astronomical observation. Any rational person is obliged to agree with that judgment. But moral judgments are nothing but preferences, expressions of feeling and attitude. "This is right" means roughly the same thing as "I approve of this; so you ought to do likewise." Being expressions of feeling and attitude, moral judgments are neither true nor false; and agreement in moral judgments is not to be secured by any rational method, for there is none. Particular judgments may combine moral and factual elements: for example, "Murder being destructive of human life, is wrong." That murder is destruction of human life is a factual judgment, but that it is wrong is a moral judgment. When it comes to moral judgments there are no right actions or wrong actions, only "authentic choices" and "inauthentic choices," said Jean-Paul Sartre. If you feel good about what you do, then you have made an authentic choice.¹⁶

MR. VERACITINO: In other words, whatever you feel is right is right?

DR. CANARD: Right.

MR. VERACITINO: If I feel good about murdering my wife in order to cash-in her life insurance policy, have I made an "authentic choice"?

DR. CANARD: I don't know. I am not you.

MR VERACITINO: Don't the facts of human experience provide us some basis for making good moral judgments? All rational persons agree that life is better than death, liberty is better than slavery, happiness is better than unhappiness. These facts provide rational criteria for building an ethical system that seeks to advance these natural goods.

DR CANARD: You're missing the point. Nature doesn't care whether you live or die, whether you are free or languishing in chains, whether you are happy or sad. These are human preferences. You can argue that living in a society which protects life, liberty, and happiness offers practical advantages to living in a society which does not, but you cannot argue that life, liberty, and happiness are intrinsic natural goods.

MR VERACITINO: What about the words of our Declaration of Independence? – "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

DR. CANARD: Jefferson wrote lovely poetry, but let's not confuse poetry with reality. In reality, man wasn't created; he is the result of natural selection. Nor was he endowed by his "Creator" with certain unalienable rights. Rights come from the consensus that exists in a particular society at a particular time in history.

Our rights evolved from the Constitution of 1787, the Bill of Rights, and the dozens of Supreme Court decisions that have expanded upon those beginnings.

MR. VERACITINO: If there are no rational criteria for securing agreement about moral judgments, how does a society avoid anarchy, if everyone is free to decide for themselves what is right and wrong?

DR. CANARD: Consensus.

MR. VERACITINO: Murder, rape, and robbery become wrong only if the majority of people in a given society agree that they are wrong?

DR. CANARD: Correct.

MR. VERACITINO: But the consensus applies only to a particular society. Another society could reach a different consensus, and there are no objective criteria to determine which consensus is the right one?

DR. CANARD: You need only look at the diversity of ethical systems throughout history to see the impossibility of determining what the right one is. The Carthaginians and Aztecs were big fans of human sacrifice. Who am I to say that they were wrong? Nearly every society, including our own, has practiced some form of slavery. In Gypsy culture it's considered a great honor to be an accomplished thief and liar. Different strokes for different folks.

MR. VERACITINO: How is moral progress possible if there are no grounds to criticize other cultures for their behavior? How could anyone criticize Stalin for murdering millions of his own people if the majority of Russians supported his regime?

DR. CANARD: Consensus is merely a way of facilitating cooperation within a particular society, not a method of establishing the truth of moral judgments that will apply to all people at all times.

MR. VERACITINO: A society could one day decide that murdering your parents for the inheritance is wrong, then turn around the next day and decide that offing the old folks is perfectly acceptable.

DR. CANARD: Sure, why not? Sixty years ago abortion and euthanasia were treated as murder. Today, they are fundamental rights.

Mr. Veracitino shook his head briefly, and returned to his table to gather a new stack of books and papers. Dr. Canard removed his glasses and carefully wiped them with a handkerchief. Returning to the lectern, Mr. Veracitino resumed questioning.

MR VERACITINO: Thank you doctor for taking us on that little tour of the modern mind. I believe it has helped lay the foundation for the case at hand, the two plaintiffs Melvin and Maude and their desire to be legally wed. I have a few questions concerning gender identity, as opposed to gender role. I understand the two are different. How is gender identity formed? Nature or nurture, or a combination of the two?

DR CANARD: We must turn to the pioneering work of Dr. John Money, former head of the Psychohormonal and Gender Identity Clinic at Johns Hopkins. He oversaw the nation's first transsexual and sex reassignment program back in the 1960s and 1970s. Money is the guy who coined all the terms we use today, like "gender identity" and "gender role." He fashioned the scientific arguments later used by the LGBT movement.

Gender identity is one's personal experience of gender. Gender role, on the other hand, comprises the stuff that an individual says and does to present himself or herself in public as a boy or

girl, man or woman. Social pressures have historically formed the significant part of gender role. Money theorized that basic gender identity, or an individual's sense of himself or herself as a male or female, is almost completely formed within the first three years of life. It consists of two parts: sex and gender. Sex is determined by hormones, chromosomes, and genitals; gender is determined by the social roles taught to us from birth, and individual self-perception. When sex and gender are in agreement, you have a male who is masculine, or a female who is feminine. In the case of the male transsexual, sex and gender are in conflict. Although she has the anatomy of a man, she believes she is a woman, and wants to adopt the gender role of a woman, presenting herself in public as a woman. Therefore, she seeks sex reassignment surgery to bring congruity between sex and gender, becoming a complete woman. Dr. Money concluded that the important part of gender identity isn't anatomy; it's perception. Instead of compelling the male transsexual to accept masculinity in accordance with her male anatomy, Dr. Money thought the humane thing to do was to bring the transsexual's anatomy into conformity with her perception.

Dr. Money said the only "unalterable biological difference" between the sexes is that "women menstruated, gestated, and lactated, while men impregnated," but even these differences could be overcome with a little help from science. The male transsexual is "psychosexually a female," which is the only thing that counts.¹⁷

MR VERACITINO: Am I correct in saying that Dr. Money's sociocentric model also rewrote the textbooks to assert that interpersonal bonding, not heterosexual procreation is the primary purpose of any sex act? Sex between transsexuals with their artificial organs is just as "natural" as sex between married heterosexual couples.

DR CANARD: Yes. Dr. Money came to the conclusion that a person's gender identity is ultimately determined by the object of his or her affection, who, whether male or female, evokes erotic attraction. For a male heterosexual, it is a female; for a female lesbian, it is another female; for a bisexual, it is both male and female.

MR VERACITINO: You're talking about sexual orientation.

DR CANARD: Precisely. Dr. Money is also responsible for inventing that term.

MR VERACITINO: As I understand it, sexual orientation is an "enduring sexual, romantic, or intensely affectional attraction to men, to women, or to both men and women"¹⁸; this definition from one of your old mentors, Dr. Gregory Herek. Dr. Herek testified for the plaintiffs in *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, the case that legalized same-sex marriage in California.

DR CANARD: I know Dr. Herek well. His definition, though, is somewhat dated, in that the objects of affection are limited to adult *homo sapiens*.

MR VERACITINO: How would you define sexual orientation, doctor?

DR CANARD: An enduring sexual, romantic, or intensely affectional attraction to _____, fill in the blank.

MR VERACITINO: Are there no limits to the objects of affection?

DR CANARD: None whatsoever. It must be remembered that when Dr. Herek gave that limited definition fifteen years ago, same-sex marriage was legal in only a handful of liberal states. Less than a half-century before *Perry*, homosexuality was a criminal offense in forty-nine states. American jurisprudence was just emerging from the dark ages. People back then still thought in terms of a natural basis for gender identity. One of the more effective arguments the LGBT movement used back then was the idea that homosexuality was immutable, like left-handedness.

MR VERACITINO: Something natural, in other words.

DR CANARD: Exactly. Despite the fact that it contradicted everything in the sex research, the “natural” argument proved highly effective in changing public opinion. After the liberal media saturated the American people with this message, the man-in-the-street came to believe that homosexuals were born that way, or, in common idiom, God had made them that way. And if homosexuals were born that way, they couldn’t change, and society had no business excluding them from child adoption services, military service, and marriage.

MR. VERACITINO: The last half hour of testimony seems to indicate that you have serious objections with the natural argument.

DR. CANARD: Fundamental ones. Let me illustrate my point by returning to the work of Dr. Money. Toward the end of the 1970s he published a book titled *Lovemaps: Clinical Concepts of Sexual Erotic Health and Pathology, Paraphilia and Gender Transposition in Childhood, Adolescence and Maturity*. Certainly not a *New York Times* best seller, but a very influential book in the academic community. In this book Dr. Money tried to resolve the nature versus nurture problem. He theorized that every one of us has a unique “lovemap,” a subconscious tour guide that leads us to the object of our affection. The first lines of our lovemap are drawn in the womb, under the influence of sex hormones. During childhood, erotic play further sketches the contours of our lovemap until puberty, when we mature into a fully functioning lover. “Healthy” adults then try to “match” lovemaps with someone else, an ideal lover, according to the contours of our own lovemap.¹⁹

Dr. Money thought that frustrated childhood sex play sometimes created a “vandalized lovemap.” Individuals with “vandalized lovemaps” are incapable of “healthy pair-bonding.” Some go without sex entirely, becoming celibate. Others become sex addicts, engaging in sex with compulsive frequency. Still a third group with “vandalized lovemaps” find release in a “paraphilia,” another term for perversion. A paraphilia is essentially a short-cut around normal sexual behavior. Paraphiliacs are incapable of becoming aroused without some substitute imagery, object, or ritual. Paraphilia can range from a shoe fetish to cross-dressing to pedophilia. The paraphilia probably formed when sexual arousal became associated with a particular activity. A pedophile, Money speculated, had had a sexual relationship with an older person as a child; his attraction to children is a “repetition of the earlier affair.”²⁰ A shoe fetishist had probably first experienced arousal while playing hide-and-seek in his mother’s shoe closet.

The problem Dr. Money struggled with in *Lovemaps* was how to classify homosexuality. Was it just another paraphilia like pedophilia? Was the homosexual’s lovemap healthy, or vandalized?²¹

Since the days of Sigmund Freud, psychiatry had classified homosexuality as a form of pathology. “Anatomy is destiny,” said Freud. The only acceptable outlet for a person born with male anatomy was to behave in a masculine way, which included, among other things, sexual attraction to females. According to Freud, the male homosexual had had a warped upbringing, a domineering mother and a passive father. Rather than modeling himself after his father or some other masculine adult male, the homosexual chooses his domineering mother as his role model. Lesbians, it was thought, usually had a profound hatred of men related to some early childhood abuse, rather than a specific attraction to other women.

For decades psychotherapists prescribed drugs and shock therapy to gays and lesbians to “cure” them of their “disease.” A sad chapter in the history of science.

Anyway, beginning in the late 1940s, a new spirit of tolerance started to emerge. Finally, in 1973, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its diagnostic manual.

Dr. Money had been on the frontlines of this battle to end the persecution of homosexuals. Dr. Money himself was a bisexual. His research into transsexualism was key in establishing the idea that sociological-cultural influences were uppermost in shaping a person’s gender identity, not anatomy, as Freud had contended.

MR VERACITINO: Why did Dr. Money express ambivalence about homosexuality in his *Lovemaps*?

DR CANARD: Because he fell back into the same mistake that the designers of traditional gender roles had made thousands of years earlier.

MR. VERACITINO: Which was?

DR CANARD: That there is a natural basis for sexuality. Dr. Money went groping in the dark, trying to find an objective difference between “natural sex” and “paraphilia,” between “healthy lovemaps” and “vandalized lovemaps.” But there are no differences – once you accept sociological-cultural influences as the primary ingredient in gender identity. It’s all relative after that.

MR VERACINTINO: Why would Dr. Money seemingly abandon his sociocentric model after laboring for years to establish it in the first place?

DR CANARD: Because he wanted to find a way to separate homosexuality from other, less popular forms of sexuality, like pedophilia and shoe fetish. At the time he wrote *Lovemaps*, Dr. Money was in the process of designing therapies to treat pedophiles, who were still listed in the American Psychiatric Association’s diagnostic manual. Pedophiles were also being persecuted as criminals by the state. Dr. Money felt that treatment was more humane than long prison sentences.

Remember, only six years before Dr. Money published *Lovemaps*, homosexuality had been listed in the same manual, right alongside pedophilia.

MR VERACITINO: It seems to me that in trying to resolve the nature versus nurture problem, Dr. Money final came face-to-face with the implications of his sociocentric model. He was correct in thinking that sexuality has both a biological and sociological-cultural component; however, the

evidence is so heavily weighted toward the biological side that you have to wonder whether Dr. Money's own bisexuality biased his early research. While attempting to rationalize his own sexual tendencies, he managed to create a model of sexuality that is untenable.

What is good for man is defined in terms of the ends that he must realize in order to thrive. This is true for all living things. The Red-tailed Hawk, for example, needs to hunt squirrels if he is to feed himself. Therefore, it is in the nature of Red-tailed Hawks to hunt squirrels even if the occasional hawk has for whatever reasons (such as a deformed talon) no capacity to hunt squirrels and must instead subsist on insects and carrion. Man must also realize the ends of his natural capacities if he is to thrive, and this includes the ends of his sexual capacities. These ends are both biological and social. Nature has designed man's sexual capacities to mate and to bond socially with a person of the opposite sex. The male and female persons are physically and emotionally complementary. That some persons have damaged sex organs or twisted sexual desires doesn't change their natural end any more than a Red-tailed Hawk with a deformed talon stops being a creature that by nature hunts squirrels.

DR CANARD: That's the old natural law argument.

MR VERACITINO: It's the only argument that makes sense. If you don't like that argument, then try simple statistics. Between ninety and ninety-five percent of the human population is heterosexual. The remainder consists of homosexuals, bisexuals, pedophiles, fetishists, coprophiliacs, necrophiliacs, rapists, sadomasochists, and so forth. The fact that ninety-five percent of us grow up to be heterosexual proves that sexuality is primarily biological. Culture either builds on our natural capacities, or it distorts them. Healthy cultures nurture young males and females to assume the gender role that nature has assigned them. If sociological-cultural influences were paramount, we would see varied statistical results, with some cultures, for example, consisting of ninety-five percent homosexuals and five percent heterosexuals. But we always see the same division between the ninety-five percent who have been nurtured correctly and the five percent who have not.

That said, the existence of the non-heterosexual minority proves that environmental influences also play a part in the development of sexual capacities. For those individuals in the five percent, conditions have unfortunately distorted their natural sexual capacities, leaving them with "vandalized lovemaps," to borrow Dr. Money's term. The vandalized lovemap expresses itself in the form of a paraphilia, which is essentially a shortcut around normal sexual behavior. Here is the problem most people run into. Paraphilias develop very early in life, usually last a lifetime, and are difficult to change. In this respect, they fit the current definition of a sexual orientation: an "enduring sexual, romantic, or intensely affectional attraction," which causes people to mistakenly believe that these distorted sexual desires are immutable and natural, like left-handedness. But paraphilias have another common characteristic: they have no basis in human sexual biology. This is the factual criteria that separates them from normal sexual behavior.

If Dr. Money had followed his sociocentric model to its logical conclusion, then no factual criteria existed to differentiate between normal sexuality and paraphilia. In my opinion, he couldn't accept those implications, so he tried to find a way to segregate the child molesters, rapists, and shoe

sniffers from the rest of us. But the only way to do that was to resurrect a modified version of the biological model. The problem he wrestled with was how to classify homosexuality. As you correctly pointed out, Dr. Money would have liked to place it in the normal category, but he couldn't do that while maintaining consistency with the rest of his lovemap theory. Why? Because homosexuality meets the criteria of a paraphilia. Am I right so far?

DR CANARD: You are.

MR VERACITINO: Then how do you separate homosexuality from the other paraphilias?

DR CANARD: You don't.

MR VERACITINO: What about the argument that homosexuals are less harmful to society than rapists and pedophiles? Even if you acknowledge that homosexuality is a paraphilia, surely two adults engaging in a homosexual relationship is less harmful than a child molester preying on kindergartners.

DR CANARD: But that distinction is social, not factual. The LGBT movement is not asking society to show a little more tolerance for some paraphilias as opposed to others; it is demanding that society recognize all the LGBT lifestyles as completely normal, natural, and equal to heterosexuality.

MR VERACITINO: Then you have to adopt the sociocentric model and accept pedophiles, shoe sniffers, and coprophiliacs alongside the homosexuals.

DR CANARD: Correct.

MR VERACITINO: Do you accept that there are no differences between homosexuality and pedophilia?

DR CANARD: If you accept the sociocentric model, all forms of sexuality are the same. Transsexualism serves no biological purpose. The idea that the transsexual was "born that way" is absurd. With transsexualism, it is a case of the individual's perception trumping biology. The same applies to homosexuality, pedophilia, or shoe fetish. Two men or two women cannot complete the biological act of procreation. What is the basis of the homosexual relationship then? It's love and affection, and, ultimately, the decision of two men or two women to be together. Isn't it equally possible for a forty-year-old man to love an eight-year-old boy?

MR VERACITINO: The common objection is that the minor child lacks the necessary maturity to consent to a sexual relationship with an adult.

DR CANARD: Well, isn't "maturity" a culturally constructed concept, like gender role? Let's examine the two, shall we? With gender role, society decrees that your biological sex places limits on your ability to perform certain tasks. We rightly label these assumptions sexist. With maturity, society decrees that your biological age places limits on your ability to make certain decisions. Shouldn't we label these attitudes ageist? Alongside sexism, ageism is just another "cage" that society puts us in, said Kate Millet.²² No biological basis exists for this kind of paternalism. I can point to certain eight-year-olds who act more "mature" than some fifty-year-olds. And what about

the so-called age of consent, it changes with time and culture? In the nineteenth century the age of consent in Delaware was eleven; today it is eighteen. Some tribes in Afghanistan betroth their daughters at the age of eight. It's all relative. If society has no right to impose its definition of gender on the individual, it has no right to impose its definition of maturity.

MR VERACITINO: What about the argument that homosexuals were "born that way," unlike pedophiles who were made that way by abusive adults? Most homosexuals claim to have had same-sex attraction since they were adolescents.

DR CANARD: Pedophiles and shoe sniffers say the same thing. Dr. Money's early research proved that gender identity is shaped primarily by post-natal sociological-cultural influences. Well, during the same period of life that homosexuals are developing same-sex attractions, pedophiles are developing attractions to children, shoe sniffers are developing attractions to pumps and high heels. What's the difference? Once formed, these attractions usually last a lifetime, and are difficult to change. The various programs designed to "treat" so-called paraphiliacs have produced dismal results. Despite years of treatment, very few pedophiles and shoe fetishists change their original orientation. Psychotherapists recorded similarly non-transformative results years earlier when they tried to "treat" homosexuals and lesbians.

MR VERACITINO: You're saying pedophilia is a sexual orientation like heterosexuality and homosexuality?

DR CANARD: Yes.

MR. VERACITINO: What about all the horrors associated with child sex abuse and incest?

DR CANARD: Right-wing propaganda. During the latter half of the twentieth century the Religious Right created a big stink about incest and child sex abuse, but it was mostly smoke and mirrors. Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey, the nation's greatest sex researcher, said that child-adult sex was really no big deal: "Children should not be upset by these experiences. If they were, this was not the fault of the aggressor, but of prudish parents and teachers who caused the child to become hysterical."²³ Kinsey's successor Wardell Pomeroy thought that incest could turn out to be a positive experience: "The best sort of incest was between a son and a mother who educated him sexually, then encouraged him to go sow his oats."²⁴

MR VERACITINO: For the record, tell us who Dr. Kinsey was.

DR CANARD: In 1942, Kinsey founded the Institute of Sex Research and published two famous studies: *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953). His work liberalized attitudes about sex and contributed greatly to the sexual revolution of the 1960s and 1970s.

MR VERACITINO: To Kinsey, pedophilia was just another form of sexuality, no less legitimate than any other.

DR CANARD: That's right. Among the many forms of sexuality he studied, Dr. Kinsey documented

the sexual behavior of children. His institute collected a vast archive of sex films, many showing children engaged in sex.²⁵

You see, Mr. Veracitino, once we abandoned the biological model of sexuality, we no longer have criteria to differentiate normal sex from abnormal sex, healthy lovemaps from vandalized lovemaps. Such judgments are mere preferences, expressions of feeling and attitude. The new sociocentric model implies that sex is morally neutral and all varieties of consensual sex are legitimate.

MR VERACITINO: Where are we heading with this kind of sexual liberation?

DR CANARD: Toward a single standard of sexual freedom. To quote the preeminent lesbian feminist Kate Millet, "The sexual revolution would require ...an end to traditional sexual inhibitions and taboos; particularly those that most threaten patriarchal monogamous marriage: homosexuality, 'illegitimacy,' adolescent, pre-marital sexuality The goal of revolution would be a permissive single standard of sexual freedom."²⁶

MR VERACITINO: Are there any limits to sexual freedom?

DR CANARD: The only limitation is consent.

MR. VERACITINO: Can you give us an example of this "permissive single standard"?

DR. CANARD: Marco Vassi is probably the best example of sexual freedom I can think of. During the Sixties and Seventies of the last century, a generation of sexual pilgrims began to shed their inhibitions and experiment with free love. One of the more colorful characters of that era was Marco Vassi. His amazing story is chronicled in John Heidenry's *What Wild Ecstasy*, the definitive account of the sexual revolution.

Although Marco had been born a Catholic, he converted to the religion of sex in the early Sixties. He called himself the "apostle of free love," the "immaculate bisexual," the "erotic Christ," suffering for the pleasure of others, surrendering himself to the needs of horny gay men. Marco estimated that he had had sex with over five hundred women and twice that many men – in bathhouses, whorehouses, and behind trucks parked along the Hudson River in Greenwich Village. His mission in life was to "explore the depths of degradation," trying to locate the outer boundaries of true freedom.

One night at the bathhouse, Marco was having sex with several men when one of them asked Marco to defecate into his mouth. The thought of it revolted Marco, so he declined the request.

As enlightened as he considered himself to be, Marco discovered that he was still harboring unconscious inhibitions. Later he realized that coprophiliacs – persons who use feces for sexual excitement – were probably the only people to have overcome the oldest inhibition: the fear of defecating in the presence of another. Marco had the profound insight that what society calls "perversion" is actually the best "map for understanding the true nature of fascism, and the most powerful key to unlocking its hold on people."²⁷

Armed with this new understanding, Marco returned to the bathhouse and when the same

request was put to him, his bowels willingly obliged. It was a moment of personal triumph for Marco. He had finally achieved freedom.

MR. VERACITINO: This lovely little anecdote is your definition of freedom?

DR CANARD: There are few moments of true greatness in a nation's history: Thomas Jefferson penning the Declaration of Independence, Abe Lincoln delivering the Gettysburg Address, and Marco Vassi defecating into another man's mouth.

MR. VERACITINO: What exactly did Marco Vassi mean when he said that what society calls "perversion" is actually the best "map for understanding the true nature of fascism, and the most powerful key to unlocking its hold on people"?

DR. CANARD: Like many sexual revolutionaries, Marco Vassi was a student of Wilhelm Reich, author of such works as *The Sexual Revolution* (1945). Reich theorized that the real roots of fascism and Nazism were found in repressed sexuality. And unless we rid ourselves – collectively and individually – of sexual inhibitions, we will never be free.

MR VERACITINO: In other words, sexual prohibitions like "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shall not commit sodomy," "Thou shalt not eat feces" – ultimately lead to the concentration camps?

DR CANARD: Yes.

MR VERACITINO: By defecating into another man's mouth, Marco Vassi was doing his part to liberate us from Auschwitz, figuratively speaking?

DR CANARD: Yes, that's one way of putting it.

MR. VERACITINO: Whatever became of Marco Vassi, the "sexual pioneer"?

DR CANARD: Oh, he died of AIDS.

MR VERACITINO: Doctor, you said a while ago that anatomy has little or no influence on gender identity. If that's the case, what are the complete criteria of determining one's gender identity?

DR CANARD: Good question. With the overthrow of the traditional gender model, which had been based on human sexual anatomy, a "new sociocentric model arose, built on three basic parameters: perception, social role, and presentation."²⁸

MR VERACITINO: These are not just your parameters?

DR CANARD: These are the parameters accepted by the medical community, academia, and the LGBT movement.

MR VERACITINO: Let me see if I understand the formula correctly. If you perceive yourself to be a woman, and adopt the social role of a woman, and present yourself to the world as a woman – then you are a woman.

DR CANARD: You got it.

MR. VERACITINO: Even though you may have been born with male anatomy?

DR CANARD: Correct.

MR VERACITINO: That's a pretty radical definition of identity: "You are what you perceive yourself to be."

DR CANARD: That formula is the foundation of the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender movement. Regardless of whether it was nature or nurture that shaped your gender identity, ultimately you must decide for yourself how to express it.

MR VERACITINO: Why stop at gender? If anatomy is irrelevant in defining one's gender identity, it's equally irrelevant in defining one's species identity. When we use the word "anatomy" we must include genes, DNA, and chromosomes. After all, one's sexual anatomy is derived from one's chromosomes, right?

DR. CANARD: This was the argument I put forward in my book *Barnyard Fever: The Transspecies Phenomenon*. And I'm happy to report that transspeciesism has recently been accepted into the Queer community: Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Transspecies.

MR VERACITINO: As I understand it, the concept of transgenderism overturned the entire discipline of psychiatry. Formerly, when there was a conflict between a patient's perception and reality, the therapist's task was to bring the patient around to reality. If, for example, a young woman perceived herself to be morbidly obese, despite being on the verge of starvation, then the problem was in her mind, not in her body. They call this condition anorexia. The same holds true for most mental illnesses. Being an inextricable part of our DNA, sex is not something we can change like a suit of clothes.

DR. CANARD: You are correct. The concept of transgenderism overturned psychiatry's traditional approach to therapy. Now, if there's a conflict between a patient's perception and so-called "reality," then the problem is reality, and the therapist's task is to make reality conform to the patient's perception.

MR VERACITINO: So, like Melvin White here, if you perceive yourself to be a donkey, and adopt the social role of a donkey, and present yourself to the world as a donkey? ...

DR CANARD: Then you are a donkey.

The courtroom erupted in spontaneous demonstration. One fellow jumped up on his chair, lifted his hands to the heavens and brayed Hee-Haw-Hee-Haw. A stickler for decorum, Judge Stamp slammed his gavel down repeatedly.

After several moments of pandemonium, the bailiffs succeeded in restoring order. The more unruly spectators were escorted outside, where protesters continued to chant, "We're here . . . We love steers . . . Get used to it."

Judge Reuben Stamp then took a few minutes to admonish those who remained: "Were you people

born in a barn!?” Maude emitted a low Hee-Haw.

JUDGE STAMP: Sorry Maude, I didn’t mean to insult you. As for the rest of you people, one more outburst like that and I’ll clear the entire courtroom and hold the remainder of the proceedings behind closed doors.

MR VERACITINO: Doctor Canard, before we were so rudely interrupted, you were saying that the new sociocentric model of identity is based on three parameters: perception, social role, and presentation. Based on those parameters, what is Melvin White? A man? A donkey? A man-donkey?

DR CANARD: I have examined Melvin’s case thoroughly; he’s a classic transspecies. Despite being born with human anatomy, Melvin is psychosexually a donkey. He perceives himself to be a donkey, he has adopted the social role of a donkey, and he has undergone species reassignment in order to present himself to the world as a donkey. Conclusion: Melvin White is a complete jackass.

MR. VERACITINO: Should the state of Mississippi issue Melvin and Maude a marriage license?

DR CANARD: Of course. Transspecies marriage is the civil rights issue of the 2020s; it’s the logical next step.

MR VERACITINO: The “next step” in what?

DR CANARD: In the evolution of marriage. As I mentioned earlier, patriarchal marriage was originally created to enslave women and children. The entire class system grew out of marriage and family. Because it is the source of inequality and injustice in the world, marriage must evolve or become extinct.

MR VERACITINO: What does “evolved” marriage look like?

DR CANARD: The first step in the evolution of marriage came when Western governments eliminated coverture and enacted no-fault divorce laws. Formerly a contract between society and the wedded couple, marriage henceforth became a personal agreement between a man and a woman to be dissolved at either party’s discretion. To obtain a divorce, neither party had to prove fault in open court. The elimination of coverture – the marital bargain compelling the wife to obey and the husband to provide – resulted in a new bargain, heavily favoring females. The wife no longer had to obey, but the husband still had to provide, even after divorce when the ex-wife customarily received fifty percent of his property plus alimony and child support. The ex-husband got to visit the kids every now and then. Patriarchal marriage was turned into matriarchal marriage. Since the mid-1970s half of all marriages now end in divorce. Marriage is no longer a good bargain for most men.

The courts then delivered the death blow to patriarchal marriage when they started to uphold same-sex marriage in cases like *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*.

MR VERACITINO: How did the normalization of same-sex marriage irretrievably change the institution?

DR CANARD: By equating homosexual relationships to heterosexual relationships, the courts removed the last link between marriage and natural law, that ancient edifice that underpinned

Western ethics for a thousand years.

The story of same-sex marriage is one of the most dramatic chapters in the history of the sexual revolution. The LGBT activists of that era employed yet another highly effective strategy. The reactionaries argued that marriage was unlike other relationships because it was oriented toward procreation. Because they cannot procreate, homosexual couples should be excluded from marriage. The LGBT activists countered that marriage had nothing to do with procreation because the law and society already let infertile heterosexual couples marry. Why not treat homosexual couples the same way? If marriage is a personal relationship between two people in love, why exclude loving same-sex couples?

MR. VERACITINO: Excuse me Doctor, but isn't marriage about procreation? While there may be other goods associated with marriage – love, care-giving – it's about making and raising babies, isn't it? The fact is sex between men and women regularly produces children. As children cannot care for themselves, the best place for them is with their biological parents. Society, therefore, has an interest in maintaining strong marriage laws to ensure that parents stick around to raise their own offspring. Absent a strong marriage culture, the state itself would be forced to care for a lot more unwanted and abandoned children, with worse outcomes all around.

The institution of marriage has always been about regulating sex and child care, not love or pair-bonding, which tend to wax and wane during any long-term relationship. It's mating which gives marriage its orientation toward children. An infertile heterosexual couple can mate even if it cannot conceive. But a same-sex couple literally cannot mate. A man and a woman who unite biologically may or may not conceive, depending on factors beyond their control. But a same-sex couple cannot unite biologically, cannot form a marital union. "Gay marriage" is therefore an oxymoron.

Comparing infertile heterosexual couples to same-sex couples was a case of apples and oranges. Imagine the problems of using fertility as a criterion for obtaining a marriage license. The government would have an impossible task devising tests designed to weed out those applicants who were certain not to be able to have children. Some couples who think themselves to be infertile later end up having a house full of kids. Other couples who resolve never to have children later change their minds. Nobody believes that a couple should have to convince the government that they will always love and care for one another before receiving a marriage license. That doesn't mean that marriage has nothing to do with love and care-giving. Marriage most certainly advances the goods of love and care-giving; but if sex didn't make babies there would be no reason for the institution of marriage. If love and care-giving were the primary purposes of marriage, then the state would have no reason to exclude any type of consensual relationship from marriage.

DR. CANARD: My point exactly! Once society let same-sex couples marry, it had no grounds to exclude any consensual relationship from marriage.

MR. VERACITINO: Such as Melvin the man-donkey and his lover Maude?

DR. CANARD: Precisely. The biological argument against same-sex marriage, which you so

eloquently reiterated, was really a last ditch effort in a lost cause. Marriage was never just about biology, Mr. Veracitino; it was about morality. For a thousand years marriage was the model lifestyle that people were expected to follow. Except for a minority of religious celibates, every man and woman was expected to find a mate and marry. In keeping with natural law, marriage was heterosexual, monogamous, and indissoluble. It was a socially approved relationship, part of God's plan for man and woman, and children were its crowning glory. "Therefore a man leaves his father and mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh," says the Book of Genesis.²⁹ Other lifestyles were "inferior." Other forms of sexuality – fornication, adultery, prostitution, homosexuality, bestiality – were "immoral," "sinful," and "illegal." From this perspective, the very idea of allowing homosexuals to marry was subversive of the entire moral order. Homosexuals were excluded from marriage not because they couldn't procreate, but because homosexual acts were considered to be "intrinsically disordered."³⁰

It took a century of struggle to finally topple this moral pyramid. Slowly but surely the sexual revolution eroded the moral foundations of patriarchal marriage. In the 1940s and 1950s, no-fault divorce and the elimination of coverture reduced marriage to a personal relationship between autonomous individuals. Divorce and single-parent families became common and acceptable. The widespread availability of legal contraception and abortion in the 1960s and 1970s freed women to have sex whenever and with whomever they wanted without the fear of pregnancy. Cohabitation became the norm among young couples. Adultery, fornication, and homosexuality were decriminalized, and then normalized. Hollywood played the key role in this revolution. Its films liberalized attitudes about sex. By the 1980s people began to think in terms of "alternative lifestyles," with homosexuality, wife-swapping, and sadomasochism treated as legitimate alternatives to marriage. When heterosexual monogamous marriage became just another lifestyle choice, the advocates of traditional marriage had no moral ground to stand on.

Progressives still faced an uphill battle to enact same-sex marriage laws, though. In 1996 only twenty-seven percent of Americans supported same-sex marriage.³¹ Hollywood began serving the American people a steady diet of gay-friendly movies and programs, resulting in one of the most dramatic shifts in public opinion in history. By 2012, over fifty percent of the population favored allowing homosexuals to marry.³²

Unfortunately only a handful of states legalized same-sex marriage. The forces of hate fought back with unexpected zeal: passing laws, enacting amendments, holding referendums – the most famous being California's Proposition 8, which wrote into the state constitution that "marriage was between a man and woman."

Several gay couples challenged Proposition 8, claiming that it violated their due process and equal protection rights under the Fourteenth Amendment. The case was argued before Judge Vaughn Walker in 2010, *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*.

Defending Proposition 8, California's attorney gave what is perhaps the most pathetic performance in the annals of jurisprudence. The poor man basically conceded the plaintiffs' cause. He stipulated that "homosexuality is a normal expression of sexuality and that it is not in any way a form of pathology."³³ He accepted without question Judge Walker's "finding of fact," which was

based on a statement put out by the American Psychological Association in 2005: “Children raised by gay and lesbian parents are likely as children raised by heterosexual parents to be healthy, successful and well-adjusted.”³⁴ The APA statement had been based on over fifty-nine studies. The state’s attorney challenged none of them.

With the moral foundations of traditional marriage in ruins, all he had left was crude biology. His only expert, a Mr. Blankenhorn, argued that marriage is inherently about procreation; therefore, it should be reserved to heterosexual couples. Homosexuals, although perfectly normal and equal to heterosexuals in every other respect, cannot procreate so they shouldn’t be allowed to marry.

MR. VERACITINO: I’ve read the *Perry* case, and it seems obvious to me that the state’s attorney made no effort to defend Proposition 8 because he personally sympathized with those who opposed it. He basically sabotaged his own case. Is that your opinion as well?

DR. CANARD: The case was decided on its merits.

MR. VERACITINO: By “merits” you can’t possibly mean the due process and equal protection claims. The idea that the Framers of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments had in mind same-sex marriage when they wrote those amendments is absurd.

DR. CANARD: You and I both know that the Constitution means whatever the latest federal judge says it means.

MR. VERACITINO: By “merits” do you include the plaintiffs’ lineup of experts, and Judge Walker’s subsequent “finding of fact,” specifically, those APA studies?

DR. CANARD: Yes.

MR. VERACITINO: A couple of years after the trial an academic journal called *Social Science Research* published two papers which cast serious doubts on the APA’s assertion that children raised by homosexual couples do just as well as children raised by heterosexual couples. Are you familiar with those two papers?

DR. CANARD: Vaguely.

MR. VERACITINO: I’ll refresh your memory. Loren Marks of Louisiana State University examined those fifty-nine studies cited by the APA and found that three-fourths of them were “based on small, non-representative, convenience samples of fewer than a hundred participants.”³⁵ Marks concluded that the fifty-nine studies lacked scientific methodology: “Not one of the fifty-nine studies referred compares a large, random, representative sample of lesbian or gay parents and their children with a large, random, representative sample of married parents and their children.”³⁶

Another sociologist Mark Regnerus of the University of Texas set out to find what the APA’s fifty-nine studies failed to find. Using children of intact traditional heterosexual families as a control group, he examined a large sample of young adults, looking at outcomes like rates of criminality, suicide, drug use, sexual molestation, and so forth. What he discovered directly contradicted the APA’s 2005 statement. Children of lesbian mothers were four times more likely to end up on

welfare than those raised in traditional families. They were also the group with the lowest level of education and the most likely to be unemployed. Children raised by lesbian mothers were eleven times more likely to report being sexually molested than children raised by biological parents. This rate was four times higher than the next most vulnerable group: children raised in stepfamilies. Children with fathers involved in same-sex relationships were the most likely to be involved in crime; children of lesbian mothers were second most likely. Children of gay and lesbian parents grew up to have the highest rates of depression and the highest rates of STDs.³⁷ And on and on, very depressing statistics, for the advocates of alternative lifestyles. What do you think doctor?

While Mr. Veracitino was rattling off statistics, Professor Canard was becoming visibly agitated. He squirmed in his seat, barely able to contain himself. Finally he burst.

DR. CANARD: Fascist lies!

MR. VERACITINO: I see you disagree with Mark's and Regnerus's findings.

DR. CANARD: Hate speech!

MR. VERACITINO: Both studies were peer reviewed and found to have been conducted using the best methods available. They hardly qualify as "hate speech." Can you point to any factual problems with the two studies, any biases?

MR. SHEISTER: Objection, your Honor. The state's attorney is badgering the witness.

JUDGE STAMP: Sustained. Mr. Veracitino, you are warned not to badger the witness.

MR. VERACITINO: But your Honor ...

JUDGE STAMP: And let the record reflect that *Perry v. Schwarzenegger* is good law and was decided on sound scientific evidence. Also, this court recognizes that the plaintiff, Melvin Allen White, is in fact a donkey. Mr. Veracitino, in referring to the plaintiff, you will no longer use the term "man-donkey."

MR. VERACITINO: How about "jackass"?

JUDGE STAMP: You've been warned.

MR. VERACITINO: Alright doctor, you were saying that traditional marriage was never just about procreation; it was the "model lifestyle" and stood as the cornerstone of society's moral pyramid. Sex outside of marriage was immoral; other lifestyles were inferior. What did the efforts to legalize same-sex marriage have to do with all this?

DR. CANARD: The advocates of same-sex marriage were not looking for membership in the baby-making club. Nor did the case for gay marriage hinge upon whether homosexual couples could care for children as well as biological parents. It was about moral equality; it has always been about moral equality. Judge Walker put it succinctly in his historic ruling: "Proposition 8 [traditional marriage] was premised on the belief that same-sex couples simply are not as good as opposite-sex couples. Whether that belief is based on moral disapproval of homosexuality, animus toward gays and

lesbians, or simply a belief that a relationship between a man and a woman is inherently better than a relationship between two men or two women, this belief is not a proper basis on which to legislate ... Proposition 8 fails to advance any rational basis in singling out gay men and lesbians for denial of a marriage license. Indeed, the evidence shows that Proposition 8 does nothing more than enshrine in the California Constitution the notion that opposite-sex couples are superior to same-sex couples.”³⁸

MR VERACITINO: So *Perry* demolished the moral claims of marriage that some sex acts are good and other sex acts are bad, some lifestyles are superior and other lifestyles inferior?

DR CANARD: Yes. Judge Walker ruled that all sex is created equal, one variety no better than another; all lifestyles are created equal, one variety no better than another. After *Perry* society came to accept same-sex marriage, and when it did it had no grounds to exclude any kind of relationship from marriage. The edifice of patriarchal marriage lay in ruins.

MR. VERACITINO: Am I right in saying that in your perfect world there would be no marriage or family?

DR. CANARD: Most experts agree that the world would be a better place without those patriarchal institutions.

MR. VERACITINO: Experts like B. F. Skinner, who wanted to replace “the family, not only as an economic unit, but ... as a social and psychological unit as well”?³⁹

DR. CANARD: Yes.

MR. VERACITINO: B. F. Skinner wasn’t some hair-brained radical, was he, doctor?

DR. CANARD: Certainly not. He was one of the founders of behaviorism, which is the principle school of psychology today.

MR. VERACITINO: Prominent feminist Kate Millet was another one who thought “the care of children, even from the period when their cognitive powers first emerge, is infinitely better left to the best trained practitioners of both sexes who care for children as a vocation . . . The family, as that term is precisely understood, must go. In view of the institution’s history, this is a kind fate.”⁴⁰

Dr. CANARD: Marriage and family must eventually give way to progress.

MR. VERACITINO: Doctor, I’m sure you are familiar with the horrific history of state-run orphanages and foster care. The negative impact on children raised in these institutions is well documented. Why would anyone want to get rid of the two-parent family?

DR. CANARD: The negative outcomes associated with state-run orphanages and foster care are largely the legacy of living in a capitalist society. In a truly just society, collective child care will be far superior to the traditional family.

MR. VERACITINO: By “just society” you mean a socialist society?

DR. CANARD: I mean a society where resources are shared equally.

MR. VERACITINO: Therefore, the ultimate goal of the LGBTTT movement is the abolition of marriage, as it has been traditionally defined?

DR CANARD: We want marriage to evolve.

MR VERACITINO: “Evolve,” “abolish” – isn’t this a matter of semantics?

DR CANARD: No.

MR VERACITINO: When something was formerly defined as having one set of characteristics and now it has a completely different set of characteristics – hasn’t the definition changed?

DR CANARD: Definitions are relative; they have whatever meaning we want them to have. I believe we already covered this in our little discussion of the modern condition and the meaninglessness of life.

MR VERACITINO: You mean like two plus two equals five, or war is peace?

JUDGE STAMP: Don’t harass the witness.

MR VERACITINO: Let me rephrase the question: Once upon a time, marriage was defined as being heterosexual, monogamous, procreative, and indissoluble; today marriage is defined as a consensual relationship between whatever: men with men, women with women, brothers with sisters, and if the plaintiffs are successful, men with donkeys, excuse me your Honor, donkeys with donkeys – but you don’t see the difference?

DR CANARD: No, I don’t. Marriage has merely evolved to become more inclusive.

MR VERACITINO: If the term “marriage” can mean anything, it means nothing.

DR.CANARD: I disagree. In the past “marriage” meant exclusivity and oppression; today it means equality and freedom.

MR VERACITINO: Allow me to go back to something you said earlier. You claimed that the LGBTTT movement is an outgrowth of the sexual revolution, which in turn is part of the larger socialist-anarchist movement. Is that correct?

DR CANARD: Yes.

MR VERACITINO: Fourier, Proudhon, Marx, and Engels – all the founding fathers of the socialist-anarchist movement believed that monogamous marriage was the model for the entire class system. All of them preached free love and declared that the ultimate goal of the revolution was to abolish traditional marriage and family. They felt confident of accomplishing this goal soon after overthrowing the bourgeois governments of Europe. Thus eliminating the seed kernel of the class system, mankind would no longer be divided into separate families, classes, nations, and religions. The collective would become the new family, and humanity would get back to that lovely socialist Garden of Eden that Engels wrote about in his book *Origins*. Am I right so far?

DR. CANARD: Essentially.

MR. VERACITINO: Most people mistakenly believe that the hippies of the 1960s were the first to experiment with free love and communes, but they were actually late-comers to these ideas, weren't they? Early in the twentieth century Vladimir Lenin tried to actualize the dream of free love and the collective family soon after his Bolsheviks overthrew the Czar. The Soviet experiment was the first to be attempted on such a large scale. First Lenin issued decrees that annulled traditional religious marriages. The old Czarist statutes that had criminalized homosexuality, adultery, and incest were discarded. Open marriage – free love – was recognized in 1927. In 1921 the Soviet Union became the first nation to legalize abortion. State-run birth control clinics and collective nurseries were established. Progressive teachers like Vera Schmidt set up schools and designed curriculum to educate the next generation without “sexual guilt” and inhibitions, preparing them for the free love lifestyle of the future. But their experiment failed.

As it turned out, only a few libertines and intellectuals actually practiced free love. Most people, even Party members, preferred monogamy and traditional marriage, despite the ban on such unions. Mothers decided to stay home with their kids rather than deposit them in a collective nursery. Consequently the nurseries closed down. Vera Schmidt's progressive school was also forced to shutter its doors after Stalin came to power. Never one to let Marxist theory get in the way of practical policy, Stalin put an end to Lenin's little free love experiment.

DR. CANARD: The Soviets failed because they went too far too fast. The family has been around for thousands of years; getting rid of it in one decade simply wasn't possible. Leon Trotsky admitted as much when he said “You cannot abolish the family, you must replace it.”⁴¹

MR. VERACITINO: Explain this, if you will.

DR. CANARD: The Soviets attempted to impose socialism from the top down. But as Georg Lukacs later postulated in his book *History and Class Consciousness* (1923), the superstructure of capitalist society rests upon an accepted cultural-moral-religious worldview that has taken centuries to evolve. It cannot be dismantled overnight.

MR VERACITINO: In other words, the Soviet goal of abolishing marriage and family wasn't the problem; the problem was the way they went about it.

DR CANARD: Heterosexist patriarchal polities can't be eliminated without significant bourgeois reaction.

MR. VERACITINO: I'll take that as a “yes.” Isn't it true doctor that after those early failures in the Soviet Union the tactics of socialism changed?

DR CANARD: Dialectical materialism is the story of change.

MR VERACITINO: I'll take that as a “yes” as well. Socialism in fact split into two basic groups: revolutionary socialists and democratic socialists. Outside the West, revolutionary socialists such as Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung would keep the militant tradition and found regimes where party elites imposed socialism from the top down through terror, secrecy, and propaganda. Meanwhile, in Western Europe and American, democratic socialists would work from within bourgeois society for

the gradual acceptance of socialism. One of the more successful forms of this gradualist socialism was Neo-Marxism. Rather than trying to overthrow bourgeois society and impose socialism at the point of a gun, as the Soviets were attempting with disastrous results, the Neo-Marxist set out to infiltrate the institutions of Western society – especially those responsible for shaping popular opinion – and gradually erode its ideological foundations. The radical feminists, the leaders of the New Left, and the LGBTTT ideologues adopted the categories developed by Neo-Marxist intellectuals like Wilhelm Reich and the Frankfurt School. Is this correct?

DR CANARD: So what's your point, that the sexual revolution in America has its origins in the socialist movement? McCarthyism went out of style years ago?

MR VERACITINO: My point is that even though the tactics of socialism have changed, the goals remain the same. So why won't you just admit that you and the LGBTTT movement want to abolish marriage?

DR. CANARD: Because "evolve" sounds much nicer.

MR VERACITINO: You're right, shooting people and tossing them into a Gulag was never very "nice," was it? Infiltrating bourgeois society's universities, news rooms and film studios and gradually dismantling its moral worldview has proven more effective, and "nicer" too. Rather than trying to abolish the family outright, you have set about to gradually replace it, as Comrade Trotsky suggested.

DR CANARD: Your questions are cute, Mr. Veracitino, but a little old fashion. Whatever the court decides here today is merely a formality because our revolution has already succeeded. Take a look around you: free love has overthrown the moral claims of heterosexual monogamy. Today, no sexual group can claim the moral high ground. Heterosexuals and homosexuals, transsexuals and transvestites, tops and bottoms, sadomasochists and drag queens enjoy equal respect and freedom. The modern family has become little more than a subsidiary of the state. From pre-school to college, every child growing up today is educated in a government school by government teachers. With homeschooling and parochial schooling outlawed by the Child Protection Act of 2022, the child receives only a government approved progressive education. Hollywood actors and pop singers, all of whom espouse approved progressive opinions, have replaced parents as role models. Where are the individual's true loyalties? Certainly not with his biological family. From cradle to grave, the individual's most vital relationship is now with the collective: Unemployment insurance supports her when she is out of work; food stamps feed him when he is hungry; Obamacare nurses her when she is sick; and social security takes care of him in old age. For all intents and purposes, traditional marriage and family have been consigned to the history books – and good riddance.

MR VERACITINO: I do look around me, doctor, and I see a wasteland: declining birth rates, skyrocketing rates of crime and delinquency, a generation of depressives on Prozac, a welfare state that no longer has the tax base to support its entitlements. Once a colossus that bestrode the world, America today is a morally and financially bankrupt banana republic. That's what I see. The reason we got here is because of men and women like you, doctor. You got a ton of academic degrees but

not one ounce of common sense. Peel back the layers of your “modern,” “progressive” ideology and it’s easy to see it for what it really is: insanity. You are right though, your revolution has succeeded. And so much the worse for the future. No doubt you have a different vision of the future, probably still dreaming of that “radiant tomorrow” that Marx and Engels described so many years ago.

DR CANARD: I do have a different vision of the future. To paraphrase another great American, I have a dream that someday this nation will stand up and live out the new meaning of its creed - “All carbon-based life forms are evolved equals.” I have a dream that someday the sons of homo sapiens and the foals of donkeys will lie down together in the green pastures of specieshood. I have a dream that my in-vitro surrogated children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by their anatomy but by the content of their psychosexual perception. When we let freedom ring, when we let freedom ring from every village and every hamlet; from every borough and every barnyard, we will be able to speed up that day when all carbon-based organisms, men and women, donkeys and Dalmatians, crustaceans and cuticle fungus, will be able to join paws, claws, and tentacles and sing in the words of the unispecies spiritual “Free love at last! Free love at last! Thank God almighty, we have free love at last!”

With the trial concluded, the courtroom cleared and Judge Reuben Stamp retired to his chambers and locked the door behind him. He was deeply troubled, not about the trial, for he already knew how he would rule. He had to come down on the right side of history and rule in favor of Melvin and Maude’s right to marry. No, it was something else that trouble Judge Stamp.

For years Reuben Stamp had been hiding a secret. When he was alone on his ranch with his donkeys, he could be himself. But in public he wore a mask. He was sick of hiding. Watching Melvin and Maude, the courageous young lovers, awakened the urge to open up the barn door and come out. You see, like Melvin White, Judge Stamp was a jackass trapped inside the body of a man. Hee-Haw.

1 *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, Case No. 12-144, 2012 WL 3134429 (S. Ct., Dec. 7, 2012) (granting petition for a writ of certiorari).

2 Perry.

3 Margaret Mead as quoted in Kate Millet, *Sexual Politics* at p. 232 (New York 1970).

4 Frederick Engels, *The Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, trans. Ernest Untermann at p. 13 (Theophania Publishing , 1884, 1911).

5 *Lesbian Separatism: An Amazing Analysis* quoted in E. D. Klemhe, A. David Uline, Robert Hollinger, *Philosophy: Contemporary Perspectives on Perennial Issues*, 4th Edition, at p. 572 (New York: St. Martin Press 1994).

6 Engels, *Origins* at p. 59.

7 David J. Garrow, *Bearing the Cross: Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership*

Conference at p. 545 (New York 1986).

8 Engels, *Origins* at p. 39.

9 Ibid. at p. 67-68.

10 Shulamith Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex* (New York 1970).

11 W. T. Stace, *Man Against Darkness* quoted in *Philosophy: Contemporary Perspectives on Perennial Issues* at pp. 582-583.

12 William Paley quoted in Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design* at p. 4 (New York 1987).

13 Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* at p. 21.

14 Frederick Copleston, S. J., *A History of Philosophy: Vol. I, Greece and Rome, From the Pre-Socratics to Plotinus* at p. 87 (New York, 1944, 1962, 1993).

15 Friedrich Nietzsche quoted in Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*, 3rd Ed. at p. 114 (Notre Dame, Indiana 1981, 2008).

16 Vernon J. Bourke, *History of Ethics, Vol. 2: Modern and Contemporary Ethics* at pp. 211-212, 252-257 (Mt. Jackson, VA. 1968).

17 John Heidenry, *What Wild Ecstasy: The Rise and Fall of the Sexual Revolution* at pp. 95-99 (New York 1997).

18 Perry, id.

19 Heidenry, *What Wild Ecstasy* at pp. 181-182.

20 Ibid. at p. 182.

21 Ibid. at p. 182.

22 Kate Millet, *Sexual Politics* at p. 103.

23 Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey quoted in Heidenry, *What Wild Ecstasy* at p. 397.

24 Wardell Pomeroy quoted in Heidenry, *What Wild Ecstasy* at p. 397.

25 Heidenry, *What Wild Ecstasy* at p. 313.

26 Kate Millet, *Sexual Politics* at p. 301.

27 Heidenry, *What Wild Ecstasy* at pp. 147-148.

28 Ibid. at p. 407.

29 Genesis, 2: 24.

30 Catechism of the Catholic Church.

31 *USA Today*, Gallup Polls, Nov. 26-29, 2012.

32 Ibid.

33 Perry.

34 Ibid.

35 Social Science Research (July 2012).

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

38 *Perry*.

39 B. F. Skinner, *Walden Two* at p. 128 (New York 1948, 1976).

40 Millet, *Sexual Politics* at p. 226.

41 Leon Trotsky quoted in Millet, *Sexual Politics* at p. 108.