

# The Gay Agenda



Nawal Husnoo, 2011



**Left:** Daniel Griffin, **Right:** Nawal Husnoo.

Copyright 2011 © Nawal Husnoo.

Permission is hereby granted to use parts of this work in accord with the Creative Commons License, Attribution-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported (CC BY-ND 3.0). Legal note: In accordance with the license, I stipulate the following waiver: you are hereby allowed to copy whole paragraphs from this work, but not individual sentences. Any paragraph-wise reproduction must be quoted thus: [Gay Agenda, 0:5], including a bibliographic reference "*The Gay Agenda*, Nawal Husnoo, 2011." You may copy and share the whole document, in its original form, freely, without charges, for both commercial and non-commercial purposes.

License (Human readable):

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0/>

Full license (Lawyer readable):

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0/legalcode>

Cover illustration: Daniel Griffin.

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>		<b>8</b>
0:1	A citizen . . . . .	8
0:2	Fantasy . . . . .	8
0:3	The silent majority . . . . .	9
0:4	The real world . . . . .	9
0:5	Quoting this booklet . . . . .	10
0:6	Use it freely! . . . . .	10
0:7	Acknowledgements . . . . .	10
<b>1 The Gay Agenda</b>		<b>11</b>
1:1	Dream . . . . .	11
1:2	The Closet . . . . .	11
1:3	Vicious homophobes . . . . .	12
1:4	It gets better . . . . .	13
1:5	An agenda? . . . . .	14
1:6	Love thyself! . . . . .	14
1:7	Stand up . . . . .	15
1:8	Education . . . . .	15
1:9	Hit them where it hurts . . . . .	16
1:10	Greener pastures . . . . .	16
1:11	A better place . . . . .	17
<b>2 Homophobia</b>		<b>18</b>
<b>Definitions</b>		<b>18</b>
2:1	Homophobia . . . . .	18
2:2	Antisemitism . . . . .	18
2:3	Definitions . . . . .	18
2:4	Bigot . . . . .	19

2:5	Tolerance . . . . .	19
<b>Homophobes</b>	. . . . .	<b>20</b>
2:6	Four homophobes . . . . .	20
2:7	Type I . . . . .	20
2:8	Ex-gays . . . . .	20
2:9	Type II . . . . .	21
2:10	Types I & II . . . . .	22
2:11	Type III . . . . .	22
2:12	Type IV . . . . .	22
2:13	Type V - no such thing . . . . .	23
2:14	Majority . . . . .	23
2:15	The respect they deserve . . . . .	23
<b>Interracial marriage</b>	. . . . .	<b>24</b>
2:16	Black civil rights . . . . .	24
2:17	Class or behaviour? . . . . .	24
2:18	Bullied by parents . . . . .	25
2:19	Interracial marriage . . . . .	25
<b>3 A fulfilling life</b>		<b>26</b>
3:1	Life . . . . .	26
<b>Family life</b>	. . . . .	<b>26</b>
3:2	Family . . . . .	26
3:3	No family for you . . . . .	27
3:4	First class citizens . . . . .	27
3:5	Marriage . . . . .	28
<b>Coming Out of the Closet</b>	. . . . .	<b>28</b>
3:6	Coming out to oneself . . . . .	28
3:7	Come out as soon as it's safe! . . . . .	29
<b>Adults Need a Firm Hand</b>	. . . . .	<b>30</b>
3:8	Parent's reticence . . . . .	30
3:9	Firm hand . . . . .	31
<b>The Importance of Education</b>	. . . . .	<b>31</b>
3:10	Education . . . . .	31
3:11	Homophobia is curable . . . . .	32
3:12	Ex-homophobes . . . . .	32
3:13	Acceptance . . . . .	33
<b>The Importance of Pride</b>	. . . . .	<b>33</b>
3:14	It's no party . . . . .	33

3:15	Know your history . . . . .	34
	<b>The Virtues of Civil Marriage . . . . .</b>	<b>34</b>
3:16	Civil Marriage . . . . .	34
3:17	Travel . . . . .	35
3:18	Diseases . . . . .	36
3:19	Education . . . . .	36
<b>4</b>	<b>Common Homophobic Lies . . . . .</b>	<b>38</b>
	<b>Arguments from religion . . . . .</b>	<b>38</b>
4:1	Religion . . . . .	38
4:2	Civil rights . . . . .	39
4:3	Gay-friendly religions . . . . .	39
4:4	Adam and Steve . . . . .	39
4:5	Sodom and Gomorrah . . . . .	40
4:6	The wrath of God . . . . .	41
4:7	Holy matrimony . . . . .	41
	<b>Arguments from morality . . . . .</b>	<b>42</b>
4:8	Morality . . . . .	42
4:9	Right and wrong . . . . .	42
	<b>Arguments from the Slippery Slope . . . . .</b>	<b>42</b>
4:10	Slippery slope . . . . .	42
4:11	Incest and Polygamy . . . . .	43
4:12	Bestiality and Pedophilia . . . . .	43
4:13	Threesomes and orgies . . . . .	44
	<b>Arguments from Family Life . . . . .</b>	<b>44</b>
4:14	Procreation . . . . .	44
4:15	Extinction . . . . .	45
4:16	A father and a mother . . . . .	46
4:17	Childless . . . . .	46
4:18	Protect Marriage . . . . .	47
	<b>Arguments from Nature . . . . .</b>	<b>48</b>
4:19	Nature, not nurture . . . . .	48
4:20	Natural and normal . . . . .	49
4:21	Recruitment . . . . .	49
4:22	Medical condition . . . . .	50
	<b>Arguments from Choice . . . . .</b>	<b>51</b>
4:23	Choice . . . . .	51
4:24	Choice to be heterosexual . . . . .	52

4:25	Choice to be bullied for life . . . . .	53
4:26	Choice to fake . . . . .	53
4:27	Choice to murder/smoke/take drugs	53
4:28	Choice in numbers . . . . .	54
	<b>Arguments from Cultural Identity . . . . .</b>	<b>55</b>
4:29	Identity . . . . .	55
4:30	Inherited bigotry . . . . .	56
4:31	Media . . . . .	56
4:32	Baby steps . . . . .	57
	<b>Arguments from Personal Arrogance . . . . .</b>	<b>58</b>
4:33	Respect for bigotry . . . . .	58
4:34	Respect for racism . . . . .	58
4:35	Gay friends . . . . .	59
4:36	Freedom of speech . . . . .	59
4:37	Freedom of information . . . . .	60
4:38	The people . . . . .	61
4:39	For their own good . . . . .	61
4:40	Protect children . . . . .	61
4:41	Special rights . . . . .	62
	<b>The End (A new beginning) . . . . .</b>	<b>63</b>
5:1	Reality wins . . . . .	63
5:2	Not powerless . . . . .	63
5:3	Change is coming. . . . .	63
	<b>Appendix . . . . .</b>	<b>64</b>
	<b>Friendly people and organisations . . . . .</b>	<b>64</b>
6:1	Tolerant people . . . . .	64
6:2	It Gets Better . . . . .	64
6:3	Collectif arcenciel . . . . .	64
6:4	Louis Marinelli . . . . .	65
6:5	ILGA . . . . .	65

# Preface

**0:1 A citizen** I am a citizen of the Republic of Mauritius, a secular democracy in the Indian Ocean, an island off the coast of Madagascar. Mauritius has been called the *Paradise Island*, first by Mark Twain and more recently in the advertising material promoting the Mauritian tourist industry. While it is true that Mauritius is a vibrant democracy, a melting pot of cultures from Europe, Africa and Asia, the island has a dark secret, that Mauritians have refused to even think about until very recently. The truth is, that for the gay people in Mauritius, the island is nothing like a paradise. Gay children, like everyone else, are expected to grow up to become law-abiding, tax-paying responsible adults that contribute to community life and the advancement of society, but they are in turn denied the basic civil rights that many take for granted. Gay people are denied legal protection from discrimination and persecution and they are denied the right to civil marriage, adoption and family life. They are forced to repress a basic part of their humanity. This is slavery, by any other name.

**0:2 Fantasy** A small minority of homophobes have taken it upon themselves to actively and intentionally misrepresent gay people in public life. They want us to believe that gay people are abnormal, mentally sick, inferior, immoral or downright evil, comparing them to pedophiles, rapists and murderers. I describe four types of homophobes in this book. Type I homophobes are in fact themselves gay or bisexual and they repress their true nature to such an unhealthy extent that they are not engaging with reality anymore. They live in a fantasy world, where their pretended-heterosexual lifestyle is somehow morally desirable. They are terrified of the homosexual thoughts they are unable to repress completely. Type II homophobes are married to Type I homophobes and they also live in their

own fantasy world, because they are terrified that their partner is going to wake up from this nightmare one day and leave them. Types I and II homophobes have no idea what a healthy relationship feels like and they want to recruit others to be miserable like them, by persecuting other gay people. Type III homophobes are the minority of religious people that are fundamentalists, people who are unable to tell right from wrong for themselves. They can't possibly comprehend the division between religious life and civil life. Mauritius is a secular democracy, but they insist that the civil rights of an arbitrary minority be dictated according to their arrogance and prejudices.

**0:3 The silent majority** In this book, I describe a fourth type of homophobe — Type IV homophobes or the silent homophobes [Gay Agenda, 2:12]. These people form the majority of the Mauritian population. They are intelligent, rational, educated and emotionally stable. The only reasons they don't currently support equal civil rights for their gay brothers, sisters, neighbours or teachers, is that 1) they haven't really thought about how unfair the current situation is and 2) what they did hear on the matter came from the vocal and vicious Type I, II and III homophobes. The silent majority Mauritians have been misled — they have been lied to by the vocal homophobes. I have attempted to demonstrate this on comments sections to news articles and online forums, by quoting evidence from the real world. But I noticed that the vocal homophobes kept repeating the same arguments again and again, quoting long discredited evidence from organisations that have been shown beyond reasonable doubt to be actively misleading people, preying on vulnerable children and young adults that are desperate to fit in their society [Gay Agenda, 2:8]. These organisations rely on these emotionally and ethically bankrupt homophobes, those that are willing to stick to their fantasies in the face of a mountain of contrary evidence. For this reason, I have put together this booklet, to classify and refute these false arguments in a systematic fashion.

**0:4 The real world** Now, in the real world, if gay people are given a chance, they can be not only law-abiding, tax-paying citizens, but they can also be intellectually and emotionally fulfilled adults. They can do very well in their education, build successful careers, loving relationships and happy families. They can bring up happy, educated, well-adjusted

and tolerant children [Gay Agenda, 3:4]. They indeed do all of this, in culturally superior societies where they don't face persecution and oppression. Gay couples can actually get married today, in Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain and Sweden, as well as Mexico City, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Vermont and Coquille.

**0:5 Quoting this booklet** If you want to quote from this booklet, you may use the style [Gay Agenda, 0:5], where "Gay Agenda" refers to this booklet, the first number represents the chapter number and the second number represents the paragraph number. The quote must include a bibliographic reference "*The Gay Agenda*, Nawal Husnoo, 2011." **MISQUOTATION ALERT: You must copy a whole paragraph at a time, under all circumstances. Any other use would be considered in violation of copyright.**

**0:6 Use it freely!** I hope you find this work useful! Feel free to distribute copies to your friends and family. I would like to encourage you to visit the website for this booklet, <http://www.gayagenda.com/>, where I also list some details about people that support equal civil rights for gay people and I ridicule some obnoxious homophobes by confronting their fantasies with the real world. The online and PDF versions of this booklet are also available at the same address. A Facebook group is also available and I would be grateful if you joined it to show your support: <http://www.facebook.com/gay.agenda.book>. A Youtube announcement is available at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=97jXHhKTQng>.

**0:7 Acknowledgements** I wish to thank Daniel Griffin, my lovely partner, for helping to proofread and re-write certain paragraphs more clearly. I am grateful to my sensible and level-headed friends Iannish Sadien and Robert Concannon, for their editorial advice. I also wish to thank the sane and rational minority of people on the webpage <http://www.facebook.com/oneman.onewoman>, for their lavish display of common-sense in the face of relentless prejudice.

# Chapter 1

## The Gay Agenda

**1:1 Dream** The dream of every child is that he or she will one day grow up, find a job, find somebody to fall in love with and marry and raise a family. Most gay boys and girls in Mauritius, however, have never had the luxury of holding this dream. At the time puberty sets in, these teenagers realise that they are attracted to other teenagers of the same gender. They are told by parents, community elders, teachers and lately, councillors, that there is something wrong with them. In some communities, they are led to believe that God (whichever one happens to apply to the particular, arbitrary and accidentally selected religion of their particular household or community) does not agree with that and that they would burn in Hell for eternity. In a mature society, this would be considered child abuse, but in Mauritius it is considered religious liberty. I fully support religious freedom, but like every freedom, it cannot infringe on the freedoms of other people [Gay Agenda, 4:1].

**1:2 The Closet** In fact, gay teenagers are made to feel so marginalised and lonely that they learn to hide their love interests from a very young age. Even young adults that are gay in Mauritius have to suppress their love lives. Some eventually come out of the closet. Many people end up going through a loveless marriage and a divorce decades later. Others live in loneliness because they are unable to find someone like them, because the others are also hiding from persecution. They are led to hate themselves because they are constantly denying themselves what any heterosexual is able to do with such freedom — having a relationship, getting married, having a family and talking about their loved ones without fear

of persecution. A few manage to find somebody they truly love, but even then they are forced to hide this relationship from fear of persecution by neighbours and relatives and society in general [Gay Agenda, 3:3]. In the face of this level of hatred and persecution, many gay teenagers are driven to depression and some commit suicide. Others grow up with an intense self-hatred from the repeated failure to change their sexual orientation. The fear of rejection from friends and family is a strong incentive to repress one's own feelings. They are vilified, demonised and persecuted by people who should know better. Parents, who are supposed to love their children unconditionally, take part in the persecution — there has been the case of a daughter being committed to a psychiatric hospital by her parents (<http://goo.gl/6nZlw>, Catholic New Times, *Trauma for young lesbians in Mauritius: in Mauritius, parents send their daughter to a mental hospital for loving another woman. Human-rights organizations demand better treatment for lesbians and gay men*) because she was in a lesbian relationship. In addition to all this, even if some gay people manage to achieve emotional freedom from the constant persecution and bullying by their families and communities, they have absolutely no legal protection or marital privileges when it comes to marriage, adoption, inheritance or medical emergencies.

**1:3 Vicious homophobes** Most of this persecution is done by a viciously vocal minority. Their arguments are based on ignorance, arrogance and lies and they rely on the fact that most people will take their words at face value. They will typically use arguments ranging from religious arrogance to claiming that civil marriage for gay people is a slippery slope leading to legalisation of murder or rape. They are keen to downplay the number of gay people in the world [Gay Agenda, 4:28]. They can only do this by coercing enough gay people to hide in the closet. In addition to this, they typically attempt to artificially inflate their numbers by claiming to speak for the people of Mauritius — the silent majority [Gay Agenda, 4:38]. In reality, most people only support the position of these vicious homophobes based on the lies. Once one exposes these lies, intelligent, rational, educated and emotionally stable adults never fail to change their position and support their gay brothers and sisters. Yet another tactic commonly used by bullies is to dehumanise their victims. The homophobes not only want to portray gay people in a bad light, but they go to great lengths to suppress evidence [Gay Agenda, 4:40] of

happy, emotionally fulfilled and successful gay people. They will claim that gay people can't possibly be happy and must be mentally ill. These homophobes are so stuck in their fantasy world that they are unable to engage with the real world: the world where gay people wake up in the morning, go to school, go to work in the office, save lives in hospitals and protect life and property in law enforcement. They want to stop gay couples from holding hands in public, or from greeting each other with a hug [Gay Agenda, 4:37; Gay Agenda, 3:3]. Gay people have to put up with a lot of flaunting and openly sexual behaviour by heterosexuals in public, but as soon as a gay person kisses his or her partner, it becomes a matter of public decency. Oh the hypocrisy.

**1:4 It gets better** Things will get better, despite what the homophobes want us to believe. If you are a gay child/teenager they want you to believe that you are inferior. They want you to believe that you are not worthy of finding love and happiness. Don't believe them. A civil rights campaigner, Dan Savage, has started a project called "*It gets better*" [<http://www.itgetsbetter.org/>], where you can see over 22,000 heart-warming videos. Most of the contributions are from gay people that have gone through years of mental torment and bullying before finding their place in society. Today, many of these gay people work for Pixar, Disney, IBM, Apple, Google, Microsoft, Facebook and many other corporations and governments that recognise their contributions. Some of the videos are made by heterosexual relatives of gay people or simply heterosexual people who want to make life better for gay people. It can happen for you too — you too can be free, you too can have a partner that you absolutely love, you too can have a partner that loves you back exactly the way you are: no more pretending, no more hiding, you can live your life as a free man or woman. You should know that things are going to change. Things will get better. In fact, today, at this moment, right now, there are places on Earth where you would be welcome. There are fabulous places where gay men and women can walk down the street holding the hand of the person they truly love. Across University campuses in the UK, most of Europe and the Americas, there are societies for gay students to meet and socialise, over a beer, a coke or hot chocolate, depending on your preferences. Outside of Universities, there are places and groups where gay people can meet others and form lifelong friendships and sometimes find love. It is really true. In Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Iceland, the

Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, and Sweden, you can even get married to the person you love.

**1:5 An agenda?** The expression “*homosexual agenda*” is routinely used by the most vicious homophobes, usually the minority with a religious bent, to portray the gay community in a bad light. They will often refer to the “*homosexual agenda*” in their speeches and articles, claiming for example, that gay people want to turn all children gay [Gay Agenda, 4:40]. In reality, of course, gay children are born from heterosexual mating: nobody can turn anybody gay — nor heterosexual, for that matter. I decided to refer to this booklet as *The Gay Agenda* because it seems proper to co-opt this expression for a work promoting education and acceptance of gay people in society. As I set out in the following paragraphs, I want to make Mauritius a better place by stamping out ignorance, while denouncing arrogance and lies. I will show in this booklet that all of the arguments that are used to deny gay couples the right to a private life, marriage and family life, are invalid. I will consider my work done when Mauritius becomes a safe place for gay men and women. The first step is to repeal the colonial law that bans gay men from getting intimate. Next, we need to enforce laws to protect gay men and women against discrimination at school, in the work place, the home, the community, social interactions and sport. We must demand equal rights for gay couples — civil marriage equality, adoption rights and the normal tax breaks available to heterosexual couples. We must demand not only tolerance, but complete acceptance as equal human beings, equally worthy of respect and dignity. That, is the true Gay Agenda.

**1:6 Love thyself!** If you are gay, you are not alone. About 3–10% of any human population is bisexual/gay, despite what the homophobes want you to believe [Gay Agenda, 4:28]. The reason you don’t see that many gay people around you in Mauritius, is because they have been coerced into hiding in the same way as you probably have been [Gay Agenda, 4:37]. Whatever the homophobes tell you, you should know that you have a lot to give to humanity. You too are a worthy person and you are entitled to the same human rights as everyone else. You have been given the gift of life by your parents and whether or not they can come to terms that their child is different from what they expected is their problem. You have your own life to live. If they can’t deal with it, it’s their own loss. In

fact, experience strongly suggests that they will make progress a lot faster in accepting you if you are comfortable in your skin and are financially and emotionally independent enough to make a stand. You live only once, so get it right — *If you're not happy, you're doing it wrong, or doing the wrong 'it'.*

**1:7 Stand up** The civil rights that a small minority of very lucky gay Mauritians can enjoy abroad in culturally more advanced countries, were not handed to us on a silver plate. It was fought for, by people who devoted their lives to this cause. In fact, like in any other civil rights movement, people have been tortured and murdered for opposing oppression of gay people (<http://goo.gl/VqFPu>, Instinct Magazine, *Anniversary Of Deadliest Gay Massacre In U.S. History*). The torture and murder of gay people that stand up for their civil rights continues to this day in many barbarian countries (<http://goo.gl/t75Qw>, The Christian Science Monitor, *Murder of gay activist David Kato sends chill in Uganda*). We have a duty to stand up and to be counted. We have to make a difference, we have to make Mauritius a better place. We can make this progress, but people have to stand up for themselves. People who have left because of the persecution, have a moral duty to make it clear that that's why they were leaving. I personally know several gay people from Mauritius that have chosen to leave the island and move to more civilised places, where they are treated as first-class human beings and allowed to live their lives freely, loving the person of their choice without fear of persecution and discrimination.

**1:8 Education** Our Government needs to realise it works for a constitutional republic. The government is elected to serve *all* the people of Mauritius, not just the vicious and vocally squealing bigots, nor even the majority alone. The editors of our national newspapers, radio and TV stations need to realise the crucial role they can play in educating people. They can help us rid Mauritius of homophobia. The Ministry of Education needs to start programs against homophobic bullying in schools and train teachers and counsellors to stand up for their gay pupils and students and to help them face homophobia.

**1:9 Hit them where it hurts** If the Mauritian government refuses to act on homophobia, we need to make sure that the international community knows about it. Many governments would be reprimanded by their people for supporting a regime that condones homophobia. Many corporations have faced backlash, bad publicity and loss of business for supporting homophobic groups and regimes. If they want to invest in Mauritius, we need to make it clear to their shareholders that Mauritius does not respect human rights. Most people in the civilised parts of the West respect their own gay relatives as first class citizens. They would not want to spend their tourist money on a country that would persecute their gay brothers, sisters, sons or daughters or deny them basic civil rights simply because of who they love. If we make sure these potential tourists know Mauritius is institutionally homophobic they will go on holiday or enjoy their honeymoon somewhere else. If Mauritius wants their business she needs to treat all her citizens fairly and obey international agreements on Human Rights.

**1:10 Greener pastures** Given that life for gay men and women in Mauritius is currently a living hell, with persecution from parents, relatives and community leaders. Some gay Mauritians decide to move abroad to a society that is culturally more advanced, typically, but not restricted to, the Western countries. There, they discover that gay people have a community, they have a place in society and are free to love and live as they wish. If you are at school or college, your education can be your way out of the loneliness, misery and bullying. There are many countries that either have full civil rights equality for gay couples, or at least have very much better laws than Mauritius for protecting lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people. You should do your best to obtain at least your A Levels and if possible a degree from the University of Mauritius and learn a foreign language. It will be hard work, but it will be worth it in the end. You should not only consider places like the UK, the US or France, but consider also countries of Northern Europe, such as Finland, Sweden, Iceland, etc, as well as North America (Canada, some US states), South America (Argentina, Brazil, etc) and so on. In many cases, you will need to learn a new language, typically Spanish or Portuguese. Many countries don't recognise same sex couples for immigration rights (eg: US) — in that case, you would need to both put your applications separately and hope that you both get accepted, or simply find a friendlier

country.

**1:11 A better place** I grew up hating myself because I believed the homophobic nonsense I was told by my parents, some of my teachers and the elders in my community. I only learnt that they were completely wrong in my late teens and managed to break free from depression when I was 22. I am now in a happy and emotionally fulfilling relationship with the man of my dreams — he is funny, intelligent, sweet, he is a hard worker and we have a happy future to look forward to. I am one of the lucky ones, as I never succeeded in taking my own life even in my lowest moments. I don't want a single other child to go through what I went through. I want my country to be a safe place for people of all colours, races, genders and orientation. It all starts with a dream. If you are gay, you too can be happy. In fact, gay couples are already allowed to have civil marriages in Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, and Sweden. It is now time to make Mauritius a better place.

## Chapter 2

# Homophobia

### Definitions

**2:1 Homophobia** Before we begin addressing the arguments put forward by homophobic bigots, we need to clear the matter of the definition of the words *homophobia* and *bigotry*. Homophobic bigots are keen to point out that they are not afraid of gay people and they merely “disagree with the homosexual lifestyle”, or are simply “expressing their opinion”, or even better, “standing up for God’s word”.

**2:2 Antisemitism** It will come as a shock to them, therefore, that the definitions of words are not necessarily related to their etymology. Take the word “antisemitic”. Antisemitism refers to any law, words, phrases, sentences, behaviours and people that discriminate against people of Jewish origin, based solely on their religious/racial background. Jewish people are not the only Semitic people, but antisemitic refers to discrimination against Jewish people only.

**2:3 Definitions** Similarly, the Oxford English Dictionary, which is known as the definitive record of the English language, defines homophobia as “*an extreme and irrational aversion to homosexuality and homosexual people*”. If you want gay men and women to remain in the closet [Gay Agenda, 1:2], you are a homophobe. If you want a chance to indoctrinate your children to hate gay people before they know anyone who is both gay and happy [Gay Agenda, 4:37], or find out that they are themselves gay, you

are a homophobe. If you want it to be illegal for gay men to be intimate with each other [Gay Agenda, 3:19], you are a homophobe. If you feel threatened by a gay couple holding hands [Gay Agenda, 4:40], you are a homophobe. If you feel that a gay couple having a civil marriage will “destroy marriage” [Gay Agenda, 4:18], you are a homophobe. Homophobia includes each and every word, phrase, sentence, leaflet, speech, official position, practise or law that treats gay men and women or gay couples in a way that is different from the way it would treat heterosexual men and women or heterosexual couples.

**2:4 Bigot** Another word that homophobic bigots struggle with is *bigot*. Once again, the Oxford English Dictionary defines a bigot as someone *having or revealing an obstinate belief in the superiority of one’s own opinions and a prejudiced intolerance of the opinions of others*. Homophobic bigots are bigots because refuse to engage with reality and accept that gay people deserve the same civil rights as any heterosexual. At this point, any self-respecting homophobic bigot will spring to their feet and shout “*But you are a bigot yourself! You don’t respect my sincere religious (or non religious) beliefs that gays are evil/sick/weird/icky/dangerous/disease-ridden/mentally ill*” (delete as appropriate, depending entirely on personal prejudice).

**2:5 Tolerance** Once again, the bigot shows the limits of his/her ability to reason. Tolerance does not mean tolerating intolerance. It is not intolerance to ban racist comments — black people don’t have to put up with racists to be seen as tolerant. It is not intolerance to ban bullying or harassment — women don’t have to put up with sexual harassment from insecure, perverted or predatory men to be seen as tolerant. Tolerance, you see, does not involve condoning intolerance. In any case, I don’t ask for tolerance of gay men and women. I demand full acceptance and respect [Gay Agenda, 1:5]. Intolerance has no place in civilised society. If somebody has a problem living in the 21st century, then they should consider moving to Iran, Saudi Arabia, Uganda or Tennessee.

## Types of homophobes

**2:6 Four homophobes** I have only ever come across four kinds of homophobes. The demarcation is not always clear cut, but absolutely all

homophobes belong to one or more of the four types [Gay Agenda, 2:7; Gay Agenda, 2:9; Gay Agenda, 2:11; Gay Agenda, 2:12], to various degrees, without exception.

**2:7 Type I** A Type I homophobe is a gay or bisexual person that represses their own sexuality. They tend to be viciously homophobic and self-hating closeted homosexual or bisexual homophobes. Usually, either they are religious or they live in a religious community. In general, this kind of people will have been bullied and brainwashed into believing being gay and engaging in a gay relationship is wrong, dangerous or undesirable.

**2:8 Ex-gays** Once they have made the decision to repress their feelings, Type I homophobes need to denigrate gay men and women or gay couples to justify their own failure to accept themselves. Thus they will build a bogus narrative whereby civil marriage for a gay couple is evil, will destroy heterosexual marriage, will spread diseases, etc. They will often claim to have been “cured of homosexuality”, although in practise, these kind of people are often caught out. There have been numerous cases of “ex-gay councillors”, homophobic male senators and others that have been caught with male prostitutes [Gay Agenda, 3:6]. Others have publicly renounced “ex-gay therapy” after wasting decades of their lives being miserable trying to be somebody else. For example, the leaders of the notorious organisation NARTH admit freely on their website, *“Like other therapists, most clinical members of NARTH practice whatever type of therapy they were trained to practice, including but not limited to: interpersonal therapy, cognitive therapy, family therapy, behavioral therapy, EMDR and psychodynamic approaches of which Reparative Therapy is one type. Quite simply, this is psychotherapy, nothing more and nothing less.”* Thus, they cannot change somebody’s sexual orientation (which is not a psychological condition at all, but a biological part of that person) and they don’t even claim to be able to do this anymore, at least not in public. Their only business is to teach somebody how to repress themselves, brainwashing them into hiding from their true selves. They claim that their victims came to them freely, but who would voluntarily submit themselves to a soul-destroying regime to suppress their personality? Well, people who have been bullied into it. In fact, Michael

Bussee, a co-founder of Exodus International (another vulture organisation preying on vulnerable people), has issued an apology at the web address <http://www.beyondexgay.com/article/busseeapology> (Beyond Ex-Gay, *Statement of Apology by Former Exodus Leaders*). He admits that “*not one of the hundreds of people we counseled became straight.*” All that they managed to do in the “most successful” cases were to either reduce or eliminate the person’s interest in a relationship at all. Instead of changing their orientation, they have simply destroyed a part of their humanity completely. Exodus International and other similar organisations purporting to offer “therapy” are nothing more than swindlers and vicious predators in search of vulnerable victims that are willing to destroy their own self-esteems and waste their lives [Gay Agenda, 4:21]. These vulnerable people need protection from the likes of NARTH or Exodus. A successful left-handed artist does not need “therapy” to learn to use their right hand to make mediocre paintings. That artist needs a welcoming community where creativity is nurtured and allowed to flourish. In the same way, gay people that have been bullied into trying to change their sexual orientation need a welcoming community that allows them to live freely [Gay Agenda, 4:37] and allowed to exercise their capacity to love. They don’t need a community that will bully them into suppressing a significant part of their personality.

**2:9 Type II** A viciously homophobic heterosexual person who has romantically been rejected by a bisexual or gay person in the past, or is in a relationship with a closeted gay person and fears that their current partner, who is either gay or bisexual might leave them now and break their heart. Type II homophobes are emotionally very insecure. They are terrified that their lover — or, in the case of arranged marriages or marriages for “honour”, money, etc, the person who is effectively their cell mate — will leave them and break their heart (or destroy their reputation, in the case of marriages without love). They, in consort with the Type I homophobe [Gay Agenda, 2:7] that they have married, tend to build the same bogus narrative and will pretend that gay relationships can never be as worthy as a heterosexual relationship.

**2:10 Types I & II** Both Types I and II homophobes have no idea what a healthy relationship is and as such, are unable to judge which relationships are worthy of encouraging or discouraging. In many cases, they

will claim that gays have the same rights as them, as long as gay people marry people of the opposite sex, just like they have chosen to do — they need to keep recruiting other vulnerable gay people to justify their deceitful and loveless heterosexual lifestyle. Obviously, they will consider free gay men and women who choose to form healthy relationships with people they are actually in love with, to have “*made a choice to be gay*” [Gay Agenda, 4:23]. In reality, they are the ones choosing to be miserable and want others to be miserable with them. Typically, they will also claim the only purpose of marriage is to make children [Gay Agenda, 4:14].

**2:11 Type III** A religious person who takes scripture in a very literal sense, i.e. a religious fundamentalist. Type III homophobes have been brought up to believe they are unable to decide for themselves what is right and what is wrong [Gay Agenda, 4:9]. They are unable to engage in critical thinking and their arguments are based on straw-man arguments, equivocation and non-sequiturs. So great is their arrogance from their religious education, that they think they have the right to impose their arbitrary prejudices on law-abiding, tax-paying citizens of a secular republic.

**2:12 Type IV** Type IV homophobes are intelligent, rational and emotionally stable people that have been misled by the abject lies spewed and repeated *ad nauseam* by Type I, II and III homophobes. This is the category of people that we can hope to influence because we can win their hearts through debate, reason and evidence. They tend to be very friendly once they realise how unfairly they have been treating gay people and they will happily provide emotional support to any gay family members or friends. Their support for the gay community and civil rights of gay people in general can be extremely valuable. If we can convince them, they will go out to vote in our favour whenever homophobes of Types I, II and III manage to bring the civil rights of gay and lesbian people to a public debate or referendum [Gay Agenda, 4:38].

**2:13 Type V - no such thing** We could claim there is a fifth type of homophobes, that is somebody that has something to hide, for example a recent sexual escapade in their marriage, or somebody that has divorced and re-married multiple times (strictly forbidden by the Bible). Others

will claim that they “support traditional family values”, while living in a cohabiting couple. This person will often be viciously homophobic, just like Type I, II and III homophobes. In fact, this person will almost always be accurately described by Types I, II or III.

**2:14 Majority** Type I, II and III homophobes often claim that the majority of people in Mauritius “*don’t agree with homosexuality*” (this is the same as saying they don’t agree with left handedness or blue eyes). It turns out, that most Mauritians that are old enough to vote are in fact well educated, intelligent, emotionally stable heterosexual mature adults. They are Type IV homophobes and their only opposition to the civil rights of gay people are based on ignorance because of the lack of mention in the education system and the lies spewed by the Type I, II and III homophobes. The latter have to artificially inflate their numbers to give the impression they have political clout — they do this by claiming to be the voice of these Type IV milder homophobes. It is important to make this clear in any national debate of this nature, as it turns out that most people will support equal civil rights for gay people once they understand that the current laws are unfair. The fact that gay people are a minority is not an excuse to deny them equal civil rights. If there were only one or two gay people, they’d still be humans that deserve equal civil rights [Gay Agenda, 4:28].

**2:15 The respect they deserve** Some people have commented that I seem to harbour a lot of anger towards society. This is not true at all. My harsh words are directed at the small minority of homophobes, the Type I, II and III homophobes, that want to misrepresent reality to force everyone to put up with their fantasy. My feelings towards such people do not include anger. Disgust and contempt would provide a far more appropriate description. Some people claim that “these homophobes deserve the respect I am asking from them”. This is completely wrong. I do not seek any respect from these homophobes. They neither deserve any respect, nor are they even able to show respect. They compare law-abiding, tax-paying, innocent gay people with murderers and pedophiles and they pass off their false propaganda as truth. My only intention is to expose their lies and demonstrate that their views are not compatible with the real world. The condescending tone I adopt in certain paragraphs of this book is directed at these Type I, II and III homophobes, but not the Type

IV homophobes, who are in fact intelligent and rational adults — I do indeed respect the Type IV homophobes and I think we should all respect them because these are the people we live with and the people who can help us build a better Mauritius.

## Interracial marriage

**2:16 Black civil rights** Black people the world over have suffered severely at the hands of oppression until very recently. Many communities of black people around the world are still recovering from the centuries of abuse, which continued until well after the abolition of slavery. In the 1960s, black people had to drink from the “coloured fountain”, were banned from “whites only” restaurants and had to sit at the back of the bus in the US. Interracial couples were vilified in the same way gay couples are vilified today. In fact, it was only in 1967 that the Supreme Court of the United States of America ruled that the ban on interracial marriage was unconstitutional and interracial couples were allowed to marry. Sadly, many black people, especially in the US, seem to have forgotten all about this and are happy to sprout religious verses that condemn gay couples, from the very same book that was used only a generation ago to condemn interracial marriage and civil rights equality for black people.

**2:17 Class or behaviour?** Many homophobic bigots, including some black homophobic bigots are quick to express outrage at the comparison of the civil rights movement for gay people to the black civil rights movement and the right for interracial couples to marry. They claim that black people are a class of people based on skin colour which, they rightly claim, is immutable. They then claim that a gay intimate relationship is a chosen behaviour and therefore they reject the comparison. They couldn't be more wrong. Firstly, gay men and women don't have a choice in being gay [Gay Agenda, 4:19, Gay Agenda, 4:23]. No gay man or woman that grew up in an accepting and loving family ever chose, out of their own accord, to stop being gay and pretend to be heterosexual and have sex with members of the opposite sex. Gay men and women have only one choice — whether to live as free, healthy and fulfilled humans in a healthy, fulfilling and stable relationship with a person they love, or to live a lonely life of celibacy or even worse, living in a loveless marriage

just to fit in with their religious family or community.

**2:18 Bullied by parents** In this respect, being gay is no different from being black: neither class of people can really change this part of them that their respective societies want to oppress. Even worse, a black child that goes home to his black parents and tells them he has been bullied for being black will be reassured by his parents and will be told that he is a worthy human being. A gay child that goes home to tell his homophobic parents that he has been bullied, will often find that his parents will now impose a soul wrecking regime of prayers and behaviours to attempt to bully them into behaving in the society's accepted manner, irrespective of the detrimental effects this will have on the person's growth [Gay Agenda, 2:8].

**2:19 Interracial marriage** There are chilling similarities between the modern day homophobic movement to deny gay couples the same civil rights as heterosexual couples and the anti-interracial marriage campaigns from five decades ago. When these are pointed out (use of religious texts, claims of offence to morality, claims that interracial marriages couldn't produce children or would result in mentally ill children or children that would be bullied and the list goes on) many homophobes will immediately say, once again, there is a difference between the two and will claim that gay couples engage in gay intimacy and this is a behaviour, not a characteristic. Once again, they are utterly wrong. There is nothing to say an interracial couple couldn't marry people of their own race. Having sex with somebody of a different race is a behaviour that some people consciously choose to engage in. Yet, crucially, the fact that it is a behaviour is *not an excuse to deny them the same civil rights as any other couples*. Thus, the comparison between the two cases is fully justified. For more information, I would refer the reader to an excellent document found at the (shortened) web address <http://goo.gl/RxLbU> (Vermont Freedom to Marry, *Arguments Against Interracial Marriage and Equal Marriage.pdf*).

## Chapter 3

### A fulfilling life

**3:1 Life** A fulfilling life means different things for different people. In the general case, sentient, rational and emotionally stable human beings are happiest when they feel like they have a purpose in life. This purpose can be related to their family life (e.g. bringing up children, helping educate them and seeing them grow into happy adults and productive members of society), their jobs, a charitable institution they work with and so on.

#### Family life

**3:2 Family** Human beings are social creatures, so most humans crave the feeling of understanding and being understood, valuing and being valued, by others — respectful human contact. Many heterosexual couples take this for granted, as they are not only expected to grow up, find a job, get married with a person of their choosing (which is not a problem at all for them, as they are biologically programmed to be attracted to people of the opposite sex) and have children. In fact, the right to family life is a fundamental human right, guaranteed by the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights: **Article 12:** *No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.* and **Article 16:** *Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to mar-*

*riage, during marriage and at its dissolution. [...] The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.*

**3:3 No family for you** In many countries of the world, this fundamental human right is denied to gay men, women and couples. In Mauritius, gay men and women are either coerced into a loveless marriage, or are forced to remain alone, denying themselves the wonders of a happy family life. Even if they resist the overwhelming pressure to conform and the constant homophobic emotional bullying, they are then unable to show their love and commitment to their partner because not only are they denied the basic civil rights of marriage and adoption, they also face a huge risk if they are seen together in public. It's even more dangerous if they attempt to show any affection for each other. In the more civilised world, it is common to see gay couples holding hands in public, doing their shopping together or holding each other for warmth while waiting for a bus. In Mauritius, this is denied to them — there have been many cases of young men being severely beaten up and wounded for the crime of loving someone [Gay Agenda, 1:3; Gay Agenda, 4:37].

**3:4 First class citizens** This means that gay couples in Mauritius are unable to live freely as first class citizens. This is not so in the more culturally advanced countries like Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden and in certain jurisdictions such as Mexico City, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Vermont and Coquille. In fact, in the countries and states mentioned here, gay couples are first class citizens, with the rights to love, the rights to family life, the same rights, duties and privileges granted to heterosexual couples. Gay couples can adopt children and the evidence from the last several decades show unequivocally that gay couples are equally good at being parents as are heterosexual couples. In fact, there is some evidence to suggest that lesbian couples are even better than heterosexual couples, producing children that are more well-adjusted, open-minded and tolerant than those brought up by heterosexual couples (<http://goo.gl/1OOru>, Times Science article, *Study: Children of Lesbians May Do Better Than Their Peers*). Gay male and lesbian couples tend to make or adopt children when they are ready to take the plunge to become parents. Their child

comes into a family that has been demonstrably stable in both the emotional and financial sense, as opposed to the numerous heterosexual families formed by shotgun marriages, where the mother had to drop out of school early or suspend her education temporarily because she got pregnant “unexpectedly”. It is therefore clear that gay couples are just as good as any heterosexual couples at bringing up children and some are even better than heterosexual parents.

**3:5 Marriage** Civil marriage for gay couples is a must if Mauritius wants to be part of the civilised world. Marriage provides the couple with a public declaration of their love and commitment and brings legal protection for the spouses. It allows the partners to act as next of kin, to make decisions for each other in the case of a medical emergency or to cover their partners in insurance policies. Some people may want to be married before adopting a child, so that the child can be protected by both parents, in case something happens to one. Inheritance is another right that heterosexual people take for granted, but in the case of gay couples, there have been cases of problems with inheritance in cases where the partners hadn’t prepared enough legal paperwork to cover themselves. In many couples, one of the two partners may have a dangerous job, such as in law enforcement, firefighting or the armed forces. In the event of the death of this partner, the surviving partner may easily find that they can’t get the pension they deserve, even if this couple have been together for decades. The stability and protection afforded by marriage is an essential human right that should not be denied to law-abiding, tax-paying citizens based on ignorance, arrogance and bigotry.

## Coming Out of the Closet

**3:6 Coming out to oneself** This is the process whereby a person who is bisexual or gay comes to terms with the fact they are different in a way that attracts prejudice and discrimination, emotional bullying and a risk of violence. Such a person has an overwhelming temptation to give-in and pretend to be heterosexual. Some will regretfully choose celibacy, denying themselves one of the most basic of human emotions, love. Others marry somebody of the opposite sex, even though the idea of having sex with that person repulses them. This is effectively consensual

rape, as the gay victim is emotionally bullied into a sex act he or she would not consent to, given the choice. Such marriages tend to be very rocky and the lack of love has a serious impact on the children. The partners in this marriage are usually Type I and II homophobes [Gay Agenda, 2:7; Gay Agenda, 2:9; Gay Agenda, 2:10]. These victims of society's prejudices, then become the next generation of bullies themselves — they can only maintain the charade as long as they pretend that gay couples are inferior to their fake, heterosexual lifestyle. Such marriages often end up in divorce, often when the gay partner is no longer able to take it, if he/she doesn't commit suicide first. At other times, the bisexual/gay partner in this fake heterosexual marriage will stray and have either anonymous sex or sex with prostitutes, as in the case of the viciously vocal homophobe Reverend Ted Haggard (<http://goo.gl/vcNDi>, Talking Points Memo, *Ted Haggard: I'm Probably What The Kids Call "Bisexual"*) or the medical doctor that carried our horrifying experiments to change the sexual orientation of children [Gay Agenda, 4:21], Dr. George Rekkers (<http://goo.gl/GFNhy>, Miami New Times, *Christian right leader George Rekkers takes vacation with "rent boy"*). Both Reverend Haggard and Dr. Rekkers are excellent examples of Type I homophobes [Gay Agenda, 2:7].

**3:7 Come out as soon as it's safe!** If you are gay, it is crucially important that you come out of the closet as soon as you are able to although it would be wisest to wait until you are financially independent from your parents. There are three compelling reasons to come out of the closet. **1)** Firstly, many people might think that staying in the closet is a sort of insurance policy. You might expect that if you need help from others at some point, being a closeted gay person makes it easier for you to obtain this help from the majority of homophobes around you. If you are living your life as a free man/woman, on the other hand, they may refuse to help you. This is a terribly bad idea, because this is an insurance policy that could become toxic when you really need to claim it. There is no guarantee that you will be able to keep the lies going, and there is a risk somebody will find out that you are gay, and rat you out. By staying in the closet, you are increasing the risk that most people around you will be homophobes who will let you down the moment you really need the help. **2)** The second reason to come out of the closet is that you would need to keep lying to people around you to keep your cover. Lying is

a huge drain on your mental resources, as you will need to constantly maintain the cover — a single mistake can blow a cover that took you decades to build [Gay Agenda, 4:37]. Further, lying to keep your cover can drive you into doing illegal activities. It so happens that in the UK parliament, an MP is not allowed to pay rent to a “partner” for renting a room, but an MP in a heterosexual couple is allowed to claim part of their mortgage fees. Recently, a UK government minister had to resign, because he had fiddled his housing expenses to cover up for his relationship with a man. If he weren’t in the closet, he could have claimed more money for the same house, but because he was closeted, he claimed a smaller amount of money as “rent”. When this was discovered, he had to resign from his top government job. Staying in the closet can lead you to do illegal activities. 3) The third reason is blackmail. If you spend decades building up your cover story and surround yourself with bigots, you are an easy target for blackmail. If somebody discovers you are a closeted gay person, they can make you do a lot of illegal activities or ask you for money in exchange for keeping your secret. The closet is a dangerous place in the long run. Once you leave the closet, you will find yourself surrounded by the people who really care about you and you will not have to worry about being pushed into doing illegal activities or being blackmailed.

## Adults Need a Firm Hand

**3:8 Parent’s reticence** Antoine de Saint-Exupéry said, “*Grown-ups never understand anything by themselves and it is tiresome for children to be always and forever explaining things to them.*” It is understandable why a parent in Mauritius would balk at the idea that their child is gay. This child would face discrimination at school, where his classmates will bully him and his teachers will either refrain from helping him, or will use his personal, bigoted opinions to tell him that gay people are mentally ill. If the emotional bullying doesn’t cause the child to take his own life while he is in school, he will face bullying and discrimination in his home community, often from the parents themselves. In many cases, the child’s family can also face discrimination.

**3:9 Firm hand** Even if the parents are intelligent, rational adults, they have often grown up being told how evil gay people were and will have been indoctrinated with a huge number of completely false preconceptions about gay people. In this case, the only thing to do for a gay teenager, is to wait until they are financially independent to come out of the closet. The biggest problem is not financial independence, but emotional independence. It is part of the Mauritian culture that children will pay a huge amount of respect to their elders. In most cases, this is either beneficial or harmless. When it comes to a gay person, however, this is extremely detrimental. Very few are able to overcome this grip and take control of their own lives. In the end, parents are like very young children — one need to be firm. They will grow up and their emotional intelligence will mature, but they need time. If you are gay, you need to believe in yourself and you need to be confident. Only then can they respect you for who you are. If they really love you, they will come through. They will accept you. But first, you need financial and emotional independence, before you can take control of your own life. Their homophobia is a curable condition [Gay Agenda, 3:11], but you need to be firm.

## The Importance of Education

**3:10 Education** Education is the only effective weapon to fight bigotry and prejudice in the long term. After the ban on interracial marriage was lifted in the US, it took generations to wipe out prejudice based on racial differences. In the same way, in the UK, the historical law “Section 28” that prohibited school from educating pupils that gay people existed, caused a lot of damage to thousands of children that were emotionally and physically bullied but had nobody to turn to — their teachers were forbidden from talking about homosexuality. In more civilised countries, education has been effective in reducing environmental homophobia. It is now clear to the majority of rational adults in these countries that homophobia has no place in civilised society and that all the arguments that are used to deny gay couples their civil rights to privacy, family life and marriage are based on ignorance, arrogance and bigotry. This has been shown in several Supreme Courts, from the culturally superior US states to India. The State of California has recently passed a law requiring

public schools to include the history of the gay civil rights movement in addition to the history of the civil rights movement for other minorities such as religious and racial minorities. Right wing fundamentalists will claim this is promoting homosexuality, but in reality, nobody can turn a heterosexual person gay [Gay Agenda, 4:21], any more than anybody can turn a gay person heterosexual. For example, stating the fact that Tony Blair turned into a catholic is considered “teaching history”. On the other hand, it would be “*promoting homosexuality*” if a teacher teaches students that the celebrated writer Oscar Wilde was gay or that Alan Turing, the man who helped the free world win World War II by cracking the German enigma cyphers, was persecuted by the British state because he was gay and that he was forced to undergo chemical castration that messed with his brain and led to his suicide. Double standards, once again.

**3:11 Homophobia is curable** Many people think that homophobia is part of the Mauritian cultural identity [Gay Agenda, 4:29]. In fact, homophobia is a debilitating mental disease that stops people from thinking rationally when it comes to the civil rights of gay people. Homophobia can be cured through education. In many cases, homophobes will resist facing the real world, where gay couples can be happy, productive members of society and enjoy their family life to the same extent as heterosexual couples do. Homophobes will kick, scream and squeal that their freedom of speech is being hampered [Gay Agenda, 4:36]. In reality, they have freedom of **speech**, not freedom to **make false claims based on fantasy, ignorance and arrogance repeatedly and yet remain unchallenged**. There is no freedom to oppress others in order to avoid engaging with reality.

**3:12 Ex-homophobes** Homophobes face a similar “coming out” phenomenon as gay people. In fact, most homophobes don’t accept the fact that they are homophobes at all [Gay Agenda, 2:3], denying reality in the same way they bully so many gay people to repress themselves. Homophobes will typically claim they “*have many gay friends, but...*” [Gay Agenda, 4:35], or that their irrational aversion to gay people is not a phobia [Gay Agenda, 2:1]. It takes many years for a homophobe to come out of the closet and admit that they have been persecuting gay people for no other reason than their ignorance and arrogance. For example, this happens when a gay or bisexual Type I homophobe, [Gay Agenda, 2:7]

finally accepts that he is unwilling to live a lie any more. If this person is married to a person of the opposite sex, they may consider a divorce, or decide they will continue living together, but they won't be pretending anymore.

**3:13 Acceptance** In other cases, the bisexual/gay partner of an insecure heterosexual Type II homophobe [Gay Agenda, 2:9] decides that enough is enough and they are unable to keep the charade going on. This is usually a huge emotional blow to the heterosexual partner, as they have the feeling they were not good enough. It takes years of counselling to get over the rejection and such people will often turn into very compassionate campaigners for equal civil rights for gay people, to save others from falling for the same trap that their society pushed them into. Yet another case is the Type IV homophobe [Gay Agenda, 2:12] discovers that their child is gay and unwilling to waste their life living a lie to appease the ignorance, pride and arrogance of their parents. This homophobe will usually recite through the homophobic lies in Chapter 4, but they will soon realise that they will lose their children from their lives if they don't change their homophobic views. It takes some adjusting to, but if they really love their child, such ex-homophobes will in general come through [Gay Agenda, 3:9].

## The Importance of Pride

**3:14 It's no party** A number of homophobes have indicated their disapproval of Gay Pride Parades. Gay Pride, they claim, will make ordinary people less inclined to agree to equal civil rights for gay people. They are apparently oblivious to the fact that doing nothing hasn't really worked all that well for gay people over the last thousand years or two. Others claim that they find the parades offensive and Mauritians should stop "importing such behaviours" from countries that, in the real world, are culturally more advanced than the Mauritius. Let me make it clear for homophobes once and for all: Gay Pride Parade is not a party, although it often looks like one. Gay Pride Parade is a peaceful protest by the civil rights movement for gay people. It is a peaceful protest against a society that has, for far too long [Gay Agenda, 1:7], denied civil rights to gay people, forced them into hiding for centuries [Gay Agenda, 1:2] and

continues to bully them into repression [Gay Agenda, 1:3].

**3:15 Know your history** The first Gay Pride march was held on Sunday, 28th June 1970, to commemorate the Stonewall Riots. For the first decade after the Stonewall Riots, Gay Pride events were primarily a protest against oppression and a demand for freedom. Over the years, as homophobic laws got repealed (it took until 2003 for the US Supreme Court to make male-male intimacy legal across the US) the focus shifted from liberation to tolerance and commemoration. A similar story unfolded in many countries around the world, including Canada, Australia and parts of Western Europe. The goal of the Gay Pride Parade in Mauritius is to make a statement: Gay people exist, they are living among us all and they deserve equal civil rights. Homophobia has no place in a civilised society in the 21st century. In addition to the protest, Gay Pride Parade is a cultural asset in countries that have moved on from their barbaric past. In these countries, Gay Pride has achieved its first purpose, which is to give gay people the same protection given to heterosexual couples and families, including freedom from discrimination and persecution. The word "pride" is used in this case as an antonym for shame, which has been used to control and oppress LGBT persons throughout history. Pride is a symbol, a protest and a celebration.

## The Virtues of Civil Marriage

**3:16 Civil Marriage** Some homophobes are willing to admit that gay people should have the same civil rights as heterosexual people, but not civil marriage. They claim that a "*separate but equal*", "civil partnership" should be the answer. In fact, some gay people that have been bullied all their lives, will even support this kind of thinking, if they are made to believe this is the only option. People are entitled to call their own relationships whatever they like, but the state should not discriminate on the basis of orientation. Either the same, single institution of civil marriage should be available to both heterosexual and gay couples or both civil marriage and civil partnership should be available to both classes. The history of human rights shows that the notion of "*separate but equal*" is deeply flawed. A different name for the same legal entity provides the more vicious homophobes a chance to use this as State-sanctioned

discrimination, to claim that gay couples are inferior and to deny them established civil rights — even those that are specifically guaranteed by the civil partnership (<http://goo.gl/jaQA5>, Pink News, *New Jersey gay couples sue for the right to marry*). Equal access to civil marriage for gay couples would remove any doubt that we are all equal before the law. Anyone who wouldn't like a "separate but equal" institution for interracial couples or religious couples, should similarly abhor the notion of "separate but equal" for gay couples. Religious people who claim that marriage refers to holy matrimony for the purpose of procreation have the freedom to petition for their own "separate but equal" marriages to be called *Holy Matrimony* or *breeding partnership* if they want to make it sound different from civil marriage [Gay Agenda, 4:7]. It is unacceptable, however, for them to have a say on the civil rights of a minority in a secular state.

**3:17 Travel** Another major problem with an apartheid-style union for gay people is the problem of cross-border recognition. A couple that has a civil partnership in the UK will find that their union is not recognised in any other country, including those that have full civil rights equality (i.e. including civil marriage) for gay couples. In the same way, the French PACS version of civil partnerships is not recognised elsewhere. The UK and France have attempted to share their discriminatory laws with others, but the countries with full civil rights equality, Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain and Sweden have made it clear that they will not abet nor support discrimination. If the UK or France want the unions of their gay citizens to be recognised in these countries where gay people are treated as first-class human beings, they need to legalise equal civil marriage for gay couples. Fortunately, it is only a matter of time before the UK and France move towards full civil marriage for gay couples. In the US, a gay couple that marry in a culturally superior state like Massachusetts or New York will find that their marriage is recognised by neither the Federal Government, nor the culturally inferior states like Texas or Tennessee. There are several court cases bubbling their way up towards the US Supreme Court and the US will hopefully catch up with the 21st century within the decade.

## Decriminalise male-male intimacy

**3:18 Diseases** The only arguments for keeping a ban on intimacy between men are based on, you have guessed, ignorance and arrogance. Both are usually based on a religious argument, whereby the homophobic bigot arrogantly claims to have divine jurisdiction on the intimate activities of consensual adults in the privacy of their home. Some will point out that AIDS was discovered in the gay community first and jump to the conclusion that AIDS is a gay disease passed by male-male intimacy. This shows a troubling amount of ignorance, because AIDS is not a gay disease — heterosexuals are the largest demographic with AIDS in Mauritius. Even if male-male intimacy can be more likely to *transmit* AIDS or other sexually transmitted diseases, an exclusive, monogamous gay couple *cannot possibly create* the AIDS virus or any other sexually transmitted disease out of nowhere. In fact, monogamy, condoms and regular testing are the only scientifically proven ways of combatting sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS — not celibacy enforced by emotional bullying, as it only forces the sexual activities underground, where health charities cannot reach the vulnerable people. This is also true for heterosexuals, a fact that the Catholic pope is unable to comprehend (<http://goo.gl/x2iDN>, The Telegraph, *Pope Benedict XVI: condoms make Aids crisis worse* ). In the real world, the only effective means of containing the AIDS epidemic have been education and easy access to condoms. Condoms worked in Thailand and abstinence hasn't worked in Africa. It is time to wake up and face the real world.

**3:19 Education** In fact, one compelling reason for decriminalising male-male intimacy in Mauritius is that it already happens — one cannot stop gay men from getting intimate any more than one can stop heterosexuals from having sex. A criminal ban on male-male intimacy means that charities are unable to encourage teenagers and young adults to use safety precautions, i.e. condoms and monogamy. A criminal ban is itself vile because holding back this kind of life-saving information can lead unsuspecting young people to take unnecessary risks with their lives. Decriminalisation followed by education would lead to early detection of infection in patients and give them access to life extending medication, as well as help stop the spread of infections. We are on the brink of an AIDS pandemic in Mauritius and we need to make the right decisions,

fast. The current laws are in breach of Human Rights to privacy and family life and we need to make this state of things clear at the international level and ensure that the State of Mauritius incurs a penalty (preferably a huge financial penalty, because that is the only language homophobes understand), until justice is done [Gay Agenda, 1:9].

## Chapter 4

# Common Homophobic Lies

### Arguments from religion

**4:1 Religion** Religious arguments have been used in the past and continue to be used to justify a lot of atrocities. Homophobia has a very intimate history with religious beliefs. Many of the fallacious arguments peddled against equal rights of freedom, protection from discrimination, family life and marriage for gay men, women and couples involve religious concerns. In their fantasy world, a small minority of people that have been victims of religious indoctrination think that they have divine authority to persecute and oppress an arbitrary minority of people. With the typical hypocrisy of religious fundamentalists, they are happy to overlook the real problems of alcohol, dangerous drugs, rape, murder or divorce (all of these are either forbidden or condemned in most holy scriptures) and instead focus on a small minority of vulnerable people that want nothing more than to be able to live their lives as free human beings. They pick on easy victims, because it gives them an excuse to avoid facing the real problems of society. If they were so concerned about protecting marriage, they would be petitioning to ban divorce, not stopping people getting married [Gay Agenda, 4:18], or they would force “sinful” cohabiting couples to get married (again, cohabitation is severely reprimanded in most religious texts, [Gay Agenda, 2:13]). Hypocrisy, by any other name, is just as disgusting. At any rate, the delusional claims to superiority by a religious minority have no place in the civil life of a secular society.

**4:2 Civil rights** On the other hand, many rational, intelligent and emotionally stable religious people are able to go beyond the literal interpretation of their religious texts. For example, nobody considered to be in their right mind would suggest that Mauritian women shouldn't be able to drive, or that a female rape victim that is unable to provide four male witnesses will be considered to have committed adultery and imprisoned, flogged, raped again or stoned to death by a religious court of tribal elders (all of these occur, depending how far back in time a particular country happens to be). Many, if not most Mauritian men are educated and mature enough to recognise that religion has no place telling women that their civil rights are subject to approval by insecure males. In the same way, many otherwise religious people in Mauritius are comfortable enough in their sexuality and happy enough in their lives that they do not care what a gay couple does in the privacy of their bedroom.

**4:3 Gay-friendly religions** Similarly, many religious figures around the world have come to the conclusion that religious beliefs condemning gay relationships are misguided and have proceeded to embrace the wave of change for a better and safer world for all, irrespective of colour, race or orientation. Examples include the muslim organisation <http://www.imaan.org.uk/>, the christian organisation <http://www.gaychristian.net/> and many others. A non-exhaustive list of religious groups that have made some progress joining the 21st century, some of which have accepted the fact that some people are gay and welcomed them, is available at this address: <http://www.hrc.org/issues/4955.htm>. In fact, Hinduism, the religion followed by the majority of Mauritians, does not condemn gay people at all [<http://goo.gl/gC47n>, Slate, *Do Hindus Decry Homosexuality?*], although there exists ignorant, arrogant and deceitful homophobes that are hindu, just like there exists muslim, christian and catholic people that are similarly ignorant, arrogant and deceitful. India has recently repealed the homophobic laws that were imposed by their colonial masters at the time of the British Empire [Gay Agenda, 4:29] and soon after the United Kingdom Hindu Council stated clearly that "Hinduism does not condemn homosexuality" (<http://goo.gl/N2Xr8>, Indian Express, *Hinduism does not condemn gay people: UK Hindu Council*).

**4:4 Adam and Steve** One recurring "religious" argument is "God created Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve." Variants on this line include ref-

erences to procreation [Gay Agenda, 4:14], holy matrimony [Gay Agenda, 4:7] and vivid descriptions of penetrative vaginal sex. This argument is irrelevant in denying gay men, women and couples the same civil rights as enjoyed by heterosexual people. It does not matter if God created Adam and Eve and their children had to commit incest to multiply, or if Evolution by Natural Selection led to modern humans (depending on how well the person making the claim is able to engage with reality). At any rate, the “Adam and Steve” argument is completely irrelevant today and has been irrelevant for at least 6000 years even if you want to believe the Young Earth Creationists. What is relevant is that today, there exists people who are gay. They are humans, worthy of the same human rights as any heterosexual.

**4:5 Sodom and Gomorrah** Another common fallacious religious claim is a reference to the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. The original story comes from the Bible and referred to homosexual rape. Two angels in the form of human males, were sent by God to visit the prophet Lot. The male villagers wanted to rape these two visitors. Lot, in his religious holiness, offered his two virgin daughters to be raped instead of his male visitors, but the crowd insisted on raping the two males. God is said to have destroyed Sodom because of this. The argument, if you are deeply religious and accidentally happen to follow one of the Abrahamic religions, therefore applies to homosexual rape alone, not consensual relationships between adult males. Even if you want to believe the literal word from modern translations that condemn love between gay males, you would have to be utterly childish to expect civil law that regulate the actions of consensual adults to be made according to your whims. Not everybody is religious, nor is every religious person misguided enough to cherry pick which verses to interpret literally and which verses to ignore [Gay Agenda, 4:1] when it suits them. Further, it should be noted that, even if Type I and III homophobes [Gay Agenda, 2:7; Gay Agenda, 2:11] tend to be obsessed with anal sex, lesbian couples are not covered by this particular and arbitrary prejudice. Moreover, many heterosexual couples do engage in anal sex, while many gay male couples do not. In these cases, the “Sodom and Gomorrah” argument is absolutely irrelevant in civil rights of gay people and civil marriage for gay people should be legal, right now.

**4:6 The wrath of God** In fact, some religious homophobes have claimed that legalising intimacy between gay men above the age of consent will bring the wrath of God on Mauritius. Variants of this claim include references to earthquakes, droughts and terrible cyclones. These ignorant homophobes expect their childish claims to be respected under the excuse it is their religious beliefs. Religious freedom does not entitle them to freedom from ridicule [Gay Agenda, 2:15]. Earthquakes, droughts and cyclones are governed by natural forces beyond human or supernatural control. Iran is one of the most viciously homophobic and very religiously pious countries on Earth and experiences earthquakes with intensity above magnitude 6 every few years. Ten countries in the world, Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain and Sweden have laws that grant civil rights to marriage, adoption and protection against discrimination to gay men, women and couples. None of these countries is particularly famous for being troubled by earthquakes, droughts or cyclones. Iceland does have volcanic activity, but it already had volcanic activity before homophobia was stamped out by law.

**4:7 Holy matrimony** Many homophobic bigots with a religious bent are under the mistaken impression that their own, particular, arbitrary and accidentally selected God (i.e. accidentally selected by birth — had they been born in a different household, they would be defending the word of a completely different god with as much zeal and the help of carefully cherry-picked evidence) ordained marriage for a man and a woman. In the real world, marriage existed for thousands of years before any modern religion came about to claim exclusive ownership and was the accepted means for trading women and girls between tribes of savages. Eventually, religions extended this form of marriage to enforce the domination of men over women and claim divine approval for the subjugation of women. Today, civil marriage as recognised by the state is essential for claiming the rights, duties and privileges afforded to married couples by the state, such as medical decisions, house ownership and inheritance. Civil marriage is available to heterosexuals of all faiths and heterosexuals of no faith in Mauritius. Religiously insane people, despite their vocal arrogance, have no monopoly over civil marriage as recognised by the state.

## Arguments from morality

**4:8 Morality** Many homophobic bigots will claim that their objection to equal civil rights for gay men, women and couples is not based on bronze-age religious arguments, but instead based on morality. This is a fallacy. Morality is an evolving concept. It was once considered morally acceptable to own slaves (not only the colonial slave trade, but religiously inspired slavery, which remains morally acceptable even today according to a literal interpretation of many religious texts). It was considered morally acceptable to burn people suspected of engaging in witchcraft. In some less morally evolved countries, even today it is acceptable to amputate limbs, flog and stone people to death. It is totally inappropriate to claim to be morally superior while persecuting gay people.

**4:9 Right and wrong** Yet another fallacious argument from morality is the claim that we need tradition or religious texts to tell us what is right or wrong. Every single religious homophobe that I have spoken to on this matter, assures me he would not commit infanticide, rape, adultery, incest, theft or murder, even if his religious text or moral traditions were not there to stop him (on the other hand, some religious people will defend the form of slavery codified in their respective holy books, using apologetic arguments). In general, though, it appears every single religious homophobe is perfectly able to reason for himself on what is right or wrong as long as it concerns his own life, but as soon as it comes to the civil rights of somebody else, his religious beliefs become a problem and he needs the mental crutch of "*established morality*" to know right from wrong. Once again, this is nothing more than pure hypocrisy.

## Arguments from the Slippery Slope

**4:10 Slippery slope** Many homophobic bigots have made anti-gay arguments involving a slippery slope. The argument goes something like this: if we stop being mean to gay men, women and couples, if we allow gay couples to enter consensual relationships and allow them to marry, a whole lot of nasty things will magically become legal and our society will crumble. Variants include suggestions that civil marriage for gay couples will lead to bigamy, polygamy, incest, bestiality and pedophilia. Others

contend that drug addicts will want their drug consumption to be made legal. It is presumed that in this case, they are referring to “hard drugs” like cocaine, heroin or crystal, as opposed to legal drugs like tobacco and alcohol, which despite their proven toxicity for society, are kept legal for tax and election purposes. In reality, this argument, like every other argument against equal civil rights for gay men, women and couples, is based on ignorance and arrogance.

**4:11 Incest and Polygamy** Most people experience a natural feeling of revulsion at the mention of incest, although the biological factors involved are not well understood. Incestuous sexual relationships can lead to an increase in abnormal deformities in their progeny, but that doesn't seem to stop incestuous relationships in Mauritius. I personally have relatives who married their first cousins and it is considered perfectly acceptable both by law and by religion in Mauritius. I personally think that making babies by incestuous sexual relations is morally reprehensible because of the genetic risks involved for the progeny, but then who am I to judge first-cousins that choose to marry and make children, given they have legal and religious blessings? Furthermore, people from certain religions already practise bigamy and polygamy, as long as only the male gets to have more than one wife (women, of course, aren't allowed multiple husbands). Polygamy is not currently recognised by marital laws in Mauritius, so the religiously sanctioned polygamous relationships are equivalent to adultery in the eyes of the law. There have even been attempts to enshrine polygamy into law by the very same bigots that want to deny monogamous exclusive gay adult consensual couples the right to marry. It is therefore utterly daft to claim that allowing civil marriage for gay couples will lead to polygamy — on the contrary, gay couples want the stability of a monogamous marriage.

**4:12 Bestiality and Pedophilia** When it comes to bestiality, which involves sexual relations between a human and a non-human creature, it is clear to any sane person with some morality why it is different from gay couples. For those of us who don't see the difference, let us recall that a key factor in the legitimacy of a sexual relationship involves the concept of consent. Mentally healthy adult humans are presumed to be able to give their consent, whereas animals are understood to be unable

to give consent. For the same reason, pedophilia is wrong because children are unable to give informed consent. Sexual relations with a person under the age of consent is statutory rape, even if the child agrees to it, or initiates it, because a minor is considered unable to give consent under the law. Once again, all this should be mindbogglingly obvious to most people, but I had to explain it clearly just to make sure there is no misunderstanding. A gay couple made up of two consenting adults in a consensual relationship has everything in common with a consenting heterosexual couple engaging in a sexual relationship, but no more in common with incest, bestiality and pedophilia than a heterosexual couple does.

**4:13 Threesomes and orgies** I promise to the reader that I am not joking, but one person posted a comment on a homophobic article in a major Mauritian newspaper, claiming that giving equal civil rights to gay couples would lead to marches supporting orgies and threesomes. This complete fool does not realise that there is absolutely no law in Mauritius that forbids threesomes nor orgies. People engaging in threesomes and orgies are people engaging in sexual activities for the sake of sexual activities. This is already perfectly legal. Gay couples, on the other hand, are committed people trying to protect their loved ones and trying to build a family, while society is actively stopping them simply to satisfy the ignorance and outright arrogance of a minority.

## Arguments from Family Life

**4:14 Procreation** Some homophobes contend that the only purpose of civil marriage is for procreation. These people will generally state obvious things like *“if everyone turned gay, who would make babies?”* or *“two men can’t make babies, two women can’t make babies”*, followed by *“the human race will face extinction”*, apparently expecting these to be valid arguments to deny gay men, women and couples the same rights, protections and privileges of civil marriage as heterosexual couples enjoy. This is an extremely silly argument, typically advanced by Type I and II homophobes [Gay Agenda, 2:7; Gay Agenda, 2:9]. Type I and II homophobes have a very unhealthy idea of relationships and marriage [Gay Agenda, 2:10], because they are stuck in a loveless marriage. Those peddling these lies

typically also fall into Type III [Gay Agenda, 2:11] and they want others to be miserable with them. It is a sad fact that many religious people were brought up to feel revulsion and guilt when it comes to sex. These people will publicly squeal that “sex is only meant for procreation”, but in reality, they have as much sex as anyone else (<http://goo.gl/b7NYS>, Nerve, Study: Religious people still have sex, they just feel worse about it). In fact, they just feel guilty about it and want others to feel guilty too. The purpose of marriage for them is procreation for the continuation of an ideology. Nothing about love. Nothing about protecting one’s family. Nothing about the welfare of the children. Children must be made so that their twisted ideologies can be passed on. In fact, George Orwell described this form of marriage very accurately, in the book Nineteen Eighty Four. In the story,

*“The aim of the Party was not merely to prevent men and women from forming loyalties which it might not be able to control. Its real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from the sexual act. Not love so much as eroticism was the enemy, inside marriage as well as outside it. All marriages between Party members had to be approved by a committee appointed for the purpose and – though the principle was never clearly stated – permission was always refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another. The only recognized purpose of marriage was to beget children for the service of the Party.”*

**4:15 Extinction** The World Bank estimated the world population was about 6.8 billion in 2009. 6,800,000,000 souls. This number is expected to reach 7 billion in 2012 and 9 billion by 2050. Only up to 3–10% of any human population is gay [Gay Agenda, 4:28], so there is absolutely no shortage of reproducing couples. Heterosexual couples will keep reproducing, whether or not the world is facing overpopulation. UNICEF estimated that there were 210 million orphans in the world in 2010 (<http://goo.gl/L6DsK>, Mission One Million, *The Need*). These vulnerable children need homes, with loving parents. The contents of the parents’ underwear are neither relevant nor involved in bringing up children [Gay Agenda, 3:4]. On the other hand, if the human race were facing extinction from a lack of reproduction, gay couples could produce children in the same way many heterosexual couples do this today, by *in-vitro* fertilisation, sperm-donation and surrogacy [Gay Agenda, 4:17].

**4:16 A father and a mother** Another lie peddled by these who oppose equal civil rights for gay men, women and couples, is that a mother and a father are essential for bringing up children. In fact, this is an inexcusably offensive statement to make about single parents raising a family. Single parent families make up at least 16% of all families around the world (<http://goo.gl/oOo3N>, The New York Times, *Single Parents, Around the World*). I have even met homophobic single parents that made the same false claim that a child needs both a mother and a father. They claim that children of single parents are more likely to end up in prostitution, drugs and gangs. Every such homophobe however, will earnestly assure me that his/her own children will turn out just fine and will not end up in prison. It is always the children of *other* single parents that will end up in prostitution, drugs and gangs, because “*children need a mother and a father*”. This hypocrisy mirrors that of people making brain-dead arguments from morality [Gay Agenda, 4:9]. In fact, it is perfectly true that children from single parent families are slightly more likely to end up in crime (<http://goo.gl/RqqSh>, Anu Sauvola, *Criminal behaviour of the offspring of single-parent families*). It is completely fallacious, on the other hand, to make the leap of faith that parents with different genitals are essential for the child. A child needs two loving parents, who care for the child, provide love, shelter, clothing and food. It really does not matter what is in each parent’s underwear — the children are not expected to be involved with their parents genitals. In fact, most criminals came from families run by heterosexual parents of opposite sex. What the child really needs, is not what is inside the parents’ underwear, but two committed, stable and loving, mature, intelligent and rational adults. In fact, gay couples excel at this, sometimes more so than heterosexuals [Gay Agenda, 3:4].

**4:17 Childless** Denying gay couples the right of civil marriage on the grounds they will not be reproducing is extremely hypocritical. Reproduction is not a legal prerequisite to civil marriage in a secular state. Many heterosexual couples choose not to reproduce and many others are completely unable to. In some heterosexual marriages, the male is unable to produce sperm of high enough quality or in enough quantities and the couple resorts to in-vitro fertilisation, even going as far as getting the sperm from a donor. There is absolutely no excuse to deny this right to a lesbian couple. In fact, lesbian couples in culturally superior coun-

tries have been doing it for decades and their children are just as healthy, happy and well-adjusted as any other couple's children, although at times lesbians turn out to be better parents than heterosexuals [Gay Agenda, 3:4]. In other cases, the female is unable to produce a baby even if the male is fertile. In this case, heterosexual couples can resort to a surrogate mother, using the male's sperm. The resulting child is then adopted by both the male and the female partner in the marriage and the surrogate mother is not involved in the upbringing of the child. Once again, there is absolutely no excuse to deny this right to gay male couples. Further, heterosexual couples whose children have moved out of the house, are not expected to dissolve their marriage. Conversely, heterosexual couples and single women already can and do make children outside wedlock. Just like heterosexuals that are unable to produce children or choose not to, gay men and women can adopt children as a couple in culturally superior countries that recognise how much gay couples can offer to society, by taking in a child that has been abandoned by his heterosexual parents and giving that child a loving home and a second chance in life.

**4:18 Protect Marriage** Many homophobes, including some of the less vicious ones, claim that giving the civil right of civil marriage to gay couples will “*destroy marriage*”. In fact, in the 1970s, the same argument was used for keeping the ban on interracial marriage [Gay Agenda, 2:19]. It is usually completely unclear what they mean by “destroy”. One homophobe that I have spoken to, used the example of counterfeit money, which devaluates genuine money. I'll point out here, that counterfeit money does indeed devalue genuine money, because it is not backed by official issuing bank. Civil marriage for gay couples, on the other hand, does not devalue civil marriage for heterosexuals. In fact, heterosexuals have done a lot on their own to devalue marriage, for example the celebrity marriages lasting from a few weeks to a few years (or 55 hours, in the case of Britney Spears). No bigot professing to “protect marriage” seems to be interested in banning celebrities from marriage. In my own family in Mauritius, one of my male cousins had a shotgun marriage that lasted just long enough for a child to be born, before the divorce and the next marriage of the same male cousin. Allowing gay couples to marry will not remove this privilege from the heterosexuals, nor make it more common. Indeed, offering civil marriage to gay couples strengthens marriage, as it encourages more couples to make the commitments involved

in marriage and this is good for society. In the more culturally advanced countries such as Argentina, Belgium, Canada, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, South Africa, Spain, and Sweden, gay couples have been able to marry for many years. In the the Netherlands, a culturally superior country where gay couples have been treated like first class citizens for a decade now and allowed to marry, the divorce rate is only half that of heterosexuals (<http://goo.gl/Rq5jD>, Dutch News, *Gay married couples less likely to divorce than straight*). If the “heterosexual” homophobic bigot really wants to protect marriage, he should consider working towards banning heterosexual divorce (funny how certain religious bigots ignore this part of their faith, [Gay Agenda, 4:1; Gay Agenda, 2:13]), not stopping committed and loving couples from marrying. To do otherwise shows his unashamed hypocrisy.

## Arguments from Nature

**4:19 Nature, not nurture** Some homophobes want us to believe that the scientific community is split over the question of whether sexual orientation is decided by nature or nurture. In reality, it is now pretty clear to all reputable scientists that sexual orientation is not a learnt behaviour, although the scientific community is still undecided on the specific question of whether it is determined purely by genetic inheritance (the same way one inherits blue eyes) or purely developmental conditions in the womb or a mixture of both (the way a person’s birth weight is determined by Nature). If it is a purely genetic phenomenon, then a gay person cannot change his sexual orientation, any more than a heterosexual can. If it is purely a result of developmental conditions in the womb, then a heterosexual cannot change his sexual orientation, any more than a gay person can. The same logic applies if it is due to a mixture of genetic and pre-birth developmental conditions. What is entirely clear by now, is that it cannot be changed post-birth (<http://goo.gl/nV4vP>, UC Davis, *Attempts To Change Sexual Orientation*). In addition to being futile, attempts to change sexual orientation can leave the person seriously emotionally and physically damaged (“*The potential risks of ‘reparative therapy’ are great, including depression, anxiety and self-destructive behavior, since therapist alignment with societal prejudices against homosexuality may reinforce self-hatred already experienced by the patient.*” — *The American Psychiatric*

*Association*). In fact, many so-called “ex-gays” turn out to have simply achieved internalised homophobia to such an extreme extent that they are able to repress their true feelings for a while [Gay Agenda, 2:8], although they all suffer from “relapses” and “temptation” [Gay Agenda, 4:21]. In reality, they could have been perfectly happy, fulfilled and emotionally stable people [Gay Agenda, 1:4] if only they accepted themselves and they weren’t bullied into hiding by the society they live in.

**4:20 Natural and normal** Some homophobes will claim that “*homosexuality is not normal*” or “*not natural*”. If they are pressed to explain what they mean by “natural” or “normal”, religious homophobes [Gay Agenda, 4:1—Gay Agenda, 4:6] will claim that their particular, personal, arbitrary and accidentally acquired beliefs state that gay people are not natural or normal — with absolute disregard for the real world. In Nature, i.e. *the real world*, homosexual behaviour has been observed in hundreds of species of animals, including dolphins, sheep, fruit bats and beetles (<http://goo.gl/BqIzL>, National Geographic, *Homosexual Activity Among Animals Stirs Debate*). This strongly supports the hypothesis that sexual orientation is a purely biological phenomenon and in no way a result of culture or fashion (yes, someone has actually blamed fashion in a conversation). Obviously, some homophobes will rejoin that we should not copy the behaviours of animals because animals kill each other and commit rape. Fortunately, it is easy to see for the intelligent reader that this argument is not applicable, because the loving relationship of a gay couple does not involve a victim [Gay Agenda, 4:27].

**4:21 Recruitment** On the other hand, most homophobes using the “*not natural*” argument will claim that animals can’t be gay or they will go extinct. Some may even go further and “deduce” that the lack of reproduction gay people have to recruit to keep their numbers going. Both claims are logical fallacies. Firstly, gay men and women won’t go extinct, because they are usually born from heterosexual parents and have been doing so throughout recorded history. It is a fact of the real world that a fraction of any human population is gay [Gay Agenda, 4:28], regardless of whatever draconian measures are taken by barbaric governments and culturally primitive communities to exterminate gay men and women or to coerce them to pretend to be heterosexual through physical bullying, emotional bullying and torture. This means that in the

real world, one cannot change one's sexual orientation by choice. There have been a few reported cases of people who claim their sexual orientation has changed over their lifetimes, but at best, this change was unintentional. At worst, they are gay men and women who were bullied to live a life of lies by pretending to enjoy heterosexual sex, which amounts to "*consensual rape*" by emotional intimidation. A US researcher, George Rekkers, carried out horrendous experiments on gay children and adults at the University of California in the 1970s. His team failed thoroughly, although they claimed one instance of success. This child grew up to be an emotionally destroyed adult, pretending to be heterosexual for decades, before committing suicide at age 36 (<http://goo.gl/KB3ZV>, *The Advocate*, *Rekers Confronted on "Ex-Gay" Therapy and Suicide*). Dr. George Rekkers was himself recently photographed returning from a European vacation with a known male prostitute he hired from [Rentboy.com](http://rentboy.com). Rekkers claims the male prostitute was hired to "*lift his luggage*"[sic] (<http://goo.gl/X907A>, CBS News, *George Rekers, Christian Right Leader, Denies Gay Prostitution Allegation*). Coincidence? It is impossible for a heterosexual child or teenager to be turned gay for the same reason it is impossible for a gay child or teenager to turn heterosexual. In fact, scientists have tracked down a part of the brain called the 3<sup>rd</sup> *interstitial nuclei of the anterior hypothalamus*, which is consistently denser in heterosexual women and gay men, whereas it is less dense in heterosexual men and lesbians (<http://goo.gl/COFkJ>, Discover Magazine, *Sex and the Brain*). This doesn't mean that gay people are genetically programmed that way, nor that this nuclei is the sole determiner of sexual orientation. What it does show, is that consistent differences exist in the physical substrate of the brain between heterosexuals and gay people. The hypothalamus is a part of the older brain, which evolved in our reptilian ancestors and as far as we know, is built in the womb. Unlike the cerebral cortex, the hypothalamus is not known to change in response to learning. Research by independent teams over the last two decades have consistently pointed in the same direction, finding differences in the density of the nerve connections in the amygdala and other parts of the old brain (<http://goo.gl/skX7z>, Time Science, *What the Gay Brain Looks Like*).

**4:22 Medical condition** One way of downplaying the number of gay people is by *stating without proof* that most gay people are simply "emotionally misguided" or that only a very small percentage is actually gay

because of “a medical problem in their head”. The homophobes will typically be very reluctant to say what the two fractions are and if they are pushed against a wall, they will claim a value of about 99% for the first and 1% for the second. This claim is not, of course, based on any reputable scientific research, but on their “*personal experience*” — this is effectively no more than a complete fabrication, an argument from their personal arrogance. Some will go as far as blame the parents of the child, going as far as claiming that the child was either abused sexually or emotionally. In the real world, homosexuality is not a disease nor mental issue. One can neither catch it nor cure it. The American Psychiatric Association removed it from their database of diseases in 1986 (<http://goo.gl/UGTRv>, UC Davis, *Facts About Homosexuality and Mental Health* ) and other culturally superior countries followed suit in the next decade, because being gay does not bring any medical disadvantage other than the lifelong persecution by homophobes. In fact, in the real world, gay men and women are able to live perfectly fulfilling lives, are equally intelligent, equally hard working and can be equally productive, law-abiding and tax-paying members of their respective societies [Gay Agenda, 1:4], when homophobia is outlawed. The only real disease is homophobia. Homophobia is a mental disease that can be cured, by engaging with reality. [Gay Agenda, 3:11] In fact, many people have been cured of homophobia by education. It is no coincidence that racism is also cured by education — both are driven by ignorance.

## Arguments from Choice

**4:23 Choice** Some of the most vicious homophobes claim that “*the homosexual lifestyle is a choice*”. There are two distinct variants to this claim. The first states that gay people choose, out of their own freewill, to engage in gay sex and mistake it for “*what is normal*” [Gay Agenda, 4:20]. The second variant states that gay people have “*homosexual urges*” (duh!) but that they *choose* to engage in same-sex activity. This latter claim is usually followed by a religious argument explaining why gay people should not have a fulfilling life and should instead suppress love from their lives [Gay Agenda, 4:1]. The fact that homosexual behaviour itself is a choice is absolutely not an excuse to deny equal civil rights to gay people [Gay Agenda, 2:19].

**4:24 Choice to be heterosexual** One is then tempted to ask the homophobe when *they* chose to be heterosexual. The most common answer is that they didn't have to choose to be heterosexual, because that's how Nature (or God, depending on their ability to engage with reality) made them. They then proceed to add that being heterosexual is normal, implying the fallacious argument that being gay is somehow abnormal [Gay Agenda, 4:20]. Given that they didn't choose to be heterosexual, given the fact that homosexuality exists in Nature [Gay Agenda, 4:20] and given the kind of relentless discrimination and persecution that gay people have to put up with [Gay Agenda, 4:25], it should be clear to the intelligent reader that nobody would choose to be gay. A much rarer, but completely honest answer to the question of when they chose to be heterosexual, is that they *did* experience homosexual urges "*in the past*", but they "*were able to avoid giving in to sin*" and instead "*chose the heterosexual lifestyle*". In reality, these people are either gay and managed to repress their most basic need for real love by brainwashing themselves through religious means or coercive persuasion, or, as is much more common, they are in fact bisexual. In this case, they are easily able to find a person of opposite sex with whom the idea of having sexual relations doesn't cause absolute revulsion. Their unstoppable sexual interest in people of the same sex, however, terrifies them and to cope with this extreme form of cognitive dissonance, they need to vilify any free, happy and emotionally fulfilled gay person that isn't as miserable as them [Gay Agenda, 2:7]. Note to the intelligent reader: bi-phobia is common in both the heterosexual and the gay communities. A bisexual person is not somebody that constantly cheats on their partner nor somebody that needs to be in a bigamous relationship (that privilege is held by religious people in polygamous sexual relationships). In fact, a bisexual person is just as able to be monogamous as anybody else. Being a bisexual simply means they can fall in love with either a man or a woman, in the same way being ambidextrous means one can write with either hands but not necessarily both at the same time. It would appear that women are more likely to be bisexual than men (<http://goo.gl/cAeHp>, Science Daily, *Study Suggests Difference Between Female And Male Sexuality*) and this can lead to false claims of a change in sexuality, when in reality all that happened was a purposeful suppression of part of it.

**4:25 Choice to be bullied for life** The plain truth is, that nobody would intentionally choose to be marginalised from their home community, to be disinherited by their parents, to be looked down upon by their neighbours, to be insulted by arrogant homophobic bigots [Gay Agenda, 4:37], to face daily discrimination at work, to face abuse in the streets, to be evicted by their landlords, to lose their jobs, to have no protection against discrimination under the law, to have no say over the lives and health of their loved partner in the event of a medical emergency, to pay a substantial amount of additional taxes compared to heterosexual couples, to pay inheritance tax for inheriting the house of their deceased partner and to lose their children in a custody battle because they are not considered legal parents, despite spending a significant fraction of their lives and money helping to bring up a child.

**4:26 Choice to fake** The only choice that is really available to a gay child or teenager in Mauritius is to live a life of misery from emotional bullying and persecution, or to fake being a heterosexual and live a life of misery from loneliness and self-hatred [Gay Agenda, 1:8]. In fact, many gay people in Mauritius choose the latter option, given the alternatives. They waste their lives pretending to be somebody that they are not, wasting away their only chance at finding somebody they can really love. In fact, many gay people in Mauritius have been bullied so much that they start to believe the bullshit that the ignorant and arrogant homophobic bigots around them have been bleating for so long [Gay Agenda, 4:35].

**4:27 Choice to murder/smoke/take drugs** Some homophobic bigots will use an argument from choice that is identical to the argument from slippery slope [Gay Agenda, 4:10], although they try to call it choice. In fact, there are two subtly different variants for this argument and together they demonstrate the *self-sealing argument fallacy*. The first variant claims that “*scientists have not found a 'gay gene'; therefore all homosexual behaviour must be a choice.*” The second variant of this invalid argument says, instead, that “*given that people are born gay, should we also legalise murder, rape, prostitution, drugs, cigarettes and alcohol if somebody shows that people are born that way?*” Together, these two variants make up the self-sealing argument fallacy: if we find there is no gay gene, being gay is an undesirable choice and if we find a gay gene, being gay is something that must be repressed. As I have shown before, the first argument is invalid

and there is no choice involved, other than to repress one's own feelings for life [Gay Agenda, 4:24; Gay Agenda, 4:25]. The second argument is equally invalid. Note to the intelligent reader: yes, cigarettes and alcohol are, in fact, already legal for tax and election purposes, despite the huge cost they bring to society as a whole. The typical homophobic bigot will happily overlook this trivium. In fact, this homophobe will typically display symptoms of religious indoctrination, meaning he is unable to understand right from wrong [Gay Agenda, 2:11]. He is unable to comprehend that murder and rape involve victims and that prostitution, drugs and cigarettes involve health risks, whereas the romantic relationship of a consensual and monogamous adult gay couple doesn't result in a victim (other than victims of homophobia).

**4:28 Choice in numbers** Some enterprising homophobes that are keen to minimise the importance of gay people will claim, that the small number [Gay Agenda, 4:38] of "out" gay people [Gay Agenda, 3:6] in culturally inferior countries like Mauritius as compared to culturally superior countries, means that there is an element of choice involved. Given the dangerous climate for gay people in Mauritius and in other similar culturally inferior societies, it is no wonder that most gay people choose to either live their lives alone and miserable [Gay Agenda, 3:6], or married to somebody they don't love and still miserable [Gay Agenda, 4:23]. It should be noted that misleadingly named *Family Research Council* [sic], which was co-founded by the same Dr. George Rekkers [Gay Agenda, 3:6; Gay Agenda, 4:21] that was recently caught coming back from holidays with a male prostitute, claims that the true number of gay people is 1%, based on studies from 1948, 1990 and 1994, at a time where it was dangerous to be a self-identified gay person even in the western world. Recently, the Iranian Fürher, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad proudly claimed at Columbia University in the US, that there were no gay people in Iran. Indeed, he is personally responsible for the regular murder of gay people in Iran, where homosexuality carries the death penalty. Similarly, in other culturally inferior countries like Jamaica, Nigeria or Uganda, it is extremely dangerous to either be a gay man or woman or to be simply perceived to be gay. In these countries the local barbarians would usually happily carry out the torture and murder themselves and save the state a few bucks. It is therefore no surprise that the number of people that self-identify as gay in these countries would be much smaller than coun-

tries where they are treated like first class citizens and are free to have same kind of housing, jobs and family life as any heterosexual. In fact, if you emotionally bully and persecute left handed people for long enough, the number of *self-identified* left handed people will drop in the same way. If you then claim there are no left handed people in your country, you would be fooling nobody but yourself. For this reason, any estimate derived from counting self-identified gay people can only ever be an underestimate of our true numbers. This website, <http://www.avert.org/gay-people.htm> (Avert, *How Many Gay People Are There?*) provides some realistic estimates. A small minority of enterprising vicious homophobes are keen to downplay the real number (3–10%) of bisexual and gay people in the world, so that they can then claim that equal civil rights for gay people are not needed. Now, even if the number of gay people in the world were only 1%, this would amount to 70 million gay people. As a comparison, there are about 23 million sikhs in the world. Nobody in his right mind would suggest sikhs don't deserve civil marriage because there are so few of them.

## Arguments from Cultural Identity

**4:29 Identity** Many homophobic bigots use some form of argument from cultural identity to justify denying basic civil rights to gay couples and for emotionally bullying gay men and women into repressing their most basic feelings of love [Gay Agenda, 4:33]. This argument revolves around the idea that Mauritian culture has always been mean to gay people, so we should keep this going. We don't want to import "*abnormal behaviours*" from the western countries, such as the US, UK, the Netherlands, etc. Firstly, being gay is not abnormal at all [Gay Agenda, 4:20], whereas homophobia is a curable mental problem [Gay Agenda, 4:22]. Next, the homophobic laws in Mauritius were placed there by colonial Britain and are not part of the cultural heritage of the majority in Mauritius [Gay Agenda, 4:30]. In fact, in India, before colonial rule, gay people were not persecuted by emotional bullying nor made to pretend to be heterosexuals at all. India has now repealed the homophobic laws that were imposed by our common colonial masters in the British Empire. It is ridiculous that the people using the argument from cultural identity are in fact completely missing the point — the discriminatory system they

are defending came from their colonial masters that they are so quick to point their fingers at.

**4:30 Inherited bigotry** Even if homophobia were a distinct part of the cultural heritage of a minority of our population, it makes no sense whatsoever to insist on keeping it, once it becomes clear to us that denying civil rights to a minority is wrong. In fact, slavery was a very important part of our cultural heritage — should we bring back slavery and keep with tradition? Why did we allow women to vote? Why did we pass laws to give them equal pay? That involved copying the western countries in recognising that a woman is a human too and equally worthy as a man. It was the correct thing to do, because the misogynist approach was terribly unfair on a class of citizens whose only crime was to be born with a vagina instead of a penis. In the same way, we need to mature as a culture and accept the fact that all homophobic arguments are based on ignorance and arrogance. In the real world, gay men and women can be equally productive members of society as any heterosexual. It is time to move on and make Mauritius a better place for all of us. Whether or not the US is ahead of us in civil rights (despite their ban on Federal recognition of civil marriage for gay couples) and whether or not Argentina treats its gay citizens as first class citizens, is irrelevant: Mauritius is a secular republic [Gay Agenda, 3:16] and needs to treat all its citizens equally. If we want to keep with “*our african culture*”, as some bigots claim, we should promptly copy South Africa and legislate to allow civil marriage for gay couples. In fact, Africa suffered from the same fate as India and the homophobic laws were introduced by the colonial masters from Europe. As Desmond Tutu said, “*When the missionaries came to Africa they had the Bible and we had the land. They said, ‘Let us pray.’ We closed our eyes. When we opened them we had the Bible and they had the land.*” In addition to taking the land, the colonial masters made the laws that homophobic bigots will cling on to today and claim as their own. What a tragic farce.

**4:31 Media** Some homophobic bigots claim the media is to be blamed for “*leading our youth astray*” by depicting gay couples in movies. Once again, they got it backwards. In fact, the media is constantly bombarding us all with stories of heterosexual couples, showing everything from flirting to romantic relationships to scenes that incontrovertibly depict

heterosexual fornication. Despite this regular brainwashing with heterosexual images and moving pictures, about 3–10% of all humans remain gay. This is true in the US where some states allow gay couples to marry and this is also true in Iran where Mahmoud Ahmadinejad claims there are no gay people (even if his government have to murder a couple of them once in a while to keep the rest subjugated [Gay Agenda, 4:28]). Yet other ignorant bigots claim that tourism has brought this “scourge” to Mauritius. Wrong once again, as gay people have existed as long as people have existed. The reason you are seeing us now is because we have had enough of being trodden upon. There comes a time when every oppressed minority stands up to the oppressor and says *enough is enough* [Gay Agenda, 1:7].

**4:32 Baby steps** Some homophobes will agree that every single argument for denying civil rights to gay people is based on ignorance or arrogance and yet they will defend the homophobic laws and customs. Interestingly, they claim to be open-minded and that they are only trying to explain “*other people’s opinion*” — they want us to take small steps at a time and wait for society to be ready first before we legalise civil marriage for gay couples. Others want us to stop asking for civil marriage, because as they rightly point out, there are other important issues to fight for, such as housing for LGBT children that are kicked out of their religiously insane parents’ houses, or homophobic bullying at school and in society. It is true that these are extremely important issues, but we must not forget the history of civil rights. If women had to wait for domestic abuse to be eradicated before voting, they’d still not have the vote, because domestic abuse hasn’t stopped completely. If interracial couples had to wait for racist attacks to stop before they could marry, they would still not marry today, because racist attacks still happen everyday. If slaves had to wait for abuse of slaves to stop before they were freed, they’d still be slaves today. Similarly, the move towards equality for gay couples must march on at the same time as the fight against abuse towards gay people. In fact, equality before the law and legal protection from discrimination will do far more to help the Mauritian society emerge from the barbarian age [Gay Agenda, 4:30] and enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century than any amount of publicity. Collective ignorance is not an excuse to sustain said ignorance — instead we need to educate the intelligent and rational majority of people if their current opinion is based on the fantasies of a minority of arrogant

and self-serving homophobic bigots. What we need is equality before the law, right now [Gay Agenda, 1:5].

## Arguments from Personal Arrogance

**4:33 Respect for bigotry** I have been advised to hide the fact that I am gay, by a relative and also by my parents. One of the arguments given was that I should respect my parents beliefs [Gay Agenda, 4:37], their cultural identity [Gay Agenda, 4:30] and their standing in society. This is a completely selfish argument from their personal arrogance. How dare they suggest that I have to suppress my family life and surrender my civil rights for the sake of their arrogant pride? How dare they suggest that I should suppress all evidence relating to my beloved partner, after the decade of depression I was unfairly forced into, after I nearly committed suicide, after I eventually managed to find my place in society and after I managed to accept myself the way I am, as well as to find love? I would consent to this utterly and inexcusably selfish demand under the following conditions: 1) that the person making this demand accepts to suppress all references to their personal life in public. They should stop mentioning everyday things like *“my husband will pick me up at 2pm”*, or *“my wife likes chocolate”* or *“my mother in law is fat”* or *“today my son is taking his chemistry exam”*. 2) Furthermore, when asked about their marital status, they should say *“no, I am single”* and when pressed for information about any love interests, they should reply *“No, I am not really looking for someone”* — these have to be said, even if they are in fact happily married for ten, twenty or fifty years. In fact, if they are married, they should go the whole way and obtain a legal divorce. If they think civil marriage isn't really all that important for me, they don't need it either. Only if these selfish, hypocritical, egoistic, ignorant, arrogant and homophobic bigots agree to suppress all evidence of their personal lives will I agree to suppress mine. Take it or leave it.

**4:34 Respect for racism** In fact, if my parents were racists, I would not respect their hypothetical beliefs that black people were of inferior intelligence. It is a strict fact of the real world that the average intelligence of black people is indistinguishable from the average intelligence of people of other colours. My own parents are not racists, as far as I

know, but if they were, I wouldn't respect their racism. The fact that my parents are homophobes warrants no more respect than the hypothetical case where they would be racist. Racism is arbitrary discrimination, just like homophobia [Gay Agenda, 2:16].

**4:35 Gay friends** This is a common disclaimer that homophobes use. It is exactly the same as saying "I am not racist — many of my best friends are black — but...". In both cases, it means the bigoted, homophobic bully is about to tell us exactly how he thinks his "friends", who are different from him one way or other, are in fact inferior to people like himself. Homophobes who use this excuse will typically think that their gay "friends" don't deserve the same civil rights, wouldn't make as good parents, or should hide their relationships as if they were petty criminals and should feel shame all their lives [Gay Agenda, 4:37]. They will bully their "friends" into feeling inferior. In reality, these "friends" are not friends at all, but victims of Stockholm syndrome, in the same way some slaves used to think that their owners were particularly lovely for not abusing them as much as they could. The homophobe who uses this disclaimer, just like the racist who uses the same disclaimer, has no basis to expect to be treated seriously in a civilised society. His arrogance makes him a monster. With "friends" like this, these gay "friends" have absolutely no need for enemies at all.

**4:36 Freedom of speech** Many homophobic bigots have either claimed they are using their freedom of speech to sprout their homophobic arguments against equal civil rights for gay people, or have claimed that other homophobic bigots (not them — they are, after all, perfectly rational, intelligent interlocutors) are entitled to their views and should be able to express it freely. This may be the single, unique, rare, exclusive, exceptional time that I agree with them. I agree completely that in a democratic society, every person is entitled to his views and he has the freedom to express these views. Similarly, I claim my own freedom of speech in writing this book and the accompanying website, as well as posting replies to homophobic drivel where I see it. In fact, freedom of speech is only that. There is absolutely no freedom from being challenged. Indeed, given that all the arguments that are used to deny equal civil rights to gay couples are based on ignorance and arrogance, I find it quite easy to show that each and every argument is invalid by confronting them with

the real world. People have the right to live in their delusions in private, but once somebody makes a public claim based on their fantasy (e.g. that gay couples can't be good parents [Gay Agenda, 3:4], or that gay people are mentally ill [Gay Agenda, 4:22]), I reserve the right to point my finger at them and ridicule them in public. Freedom of speech does not come with the automatic right to be taken seriously. Expressing one's bigoted views based on false information as if it came from the real world carries absolutely no immunity from being ridiculed.

**4:37 Freedom of information** One class of homophobes claim they "*have nothing against gays*" as long as they don't have to know about "*what they do in their bedroom*". While this sort of homophobe is right that the intimate activities of a gay couple is non of his business, it is totally unfair to ask a gay person to hide all evidence of his relationship. This is the same as asking one partner in an interracial couple to hide their partner because it offends an insecure racist bigot. In fact, gay people have to put up with heterosexuals talking about their loved ones all the time — "*Today my husband is going to.....*" or "*My wife doesn't like chocolate.*" or "*My elder son is going to University next year....*". Gay people in Mauritius, on the other hand, are expected to suppress all evidence that they are humans, with dreams of a family and aspirations to bringing up children [Gay Agenda, 1:3; Gay Agenda, 3:3]. In the US army, there was a policy called "*Don't Ask, Don't Tell*", which meant that gay soldiers could not talk about their personal lives. There is a lot of evidence that talking about one's personal life, helps the person deal with emotional stress, for example in a dangerous job like policing or firefighting. Similarly, it has been shown that people with creative jobs like artists and people working for publishing companies, tend to perform a lot better when they are able to talk freely about their loved ones (<http://goo.gl/iBT5l>, Slate Magazine, *Half of College-Educated Gays Hide Orientation at Work*). The key thing is that hiding one's relationship takes a lot of mental effort. It involves not just lying, but also remembering every single lie they have told to each person, so that they can maintain the charade. This takes a lot of mental effort that they are not able to devote themselves fully to their jobs. In culturally more advanced countries, gay people are free to talk about their loving relationships and this helps them feel a part of the society they live and work in.

**4:38 The people** A small minority of self-repressed gay or bisexual ignorant, arrogant and homosexual or bisexual homophobes pretending to be heterosexuals, as well as a small minority of religious homophobes will claim that they speak for “*the people*” [Gay Agenda, 2:14] and claim that gay people are a small proportion of the population. In the real world, about 3–10% of any human population is gay [Gay Agenda, 4:28] and this number would, at best, be comparable to half of the population of a certain religious minority in Mauritius and at worst, would still be larger than many religious minorities. In fact, if all the gay and bisexual people in Mauritius got up on election day (and had a good reason to do so, with a viable party to vote for) and also believed in their own civil rights (this battle is not won yet, as many gay people have been brainwashed into believing they are inferior [Gay Agenda, 4:35]), gay people would be a significant political force in Mauritius. In fact, if they can convince their families and relatives to defend their civil rights, their political clout would surpass that of every single religious minority in Mauritius.

**4:39 For their own good** Many homophobes will claim they want gay people to stay in the closet so that they don’t get bullied [Gay Agenda, 4:37], or so that their children don’t get bullied. This is the fallacy of blaming the victim. It is the same as the despicable misogynist religious bigot that blamed victims of rape for not dressing up in a tent, instead of blaming the male rapist. We need laws protecting gay people and their children from hate crime involving homophobic bullying or violence, not force them to hide in fear.

**4:40 Protect children** Many homophobes claim they want to “*protect the children from homosexuality*”. In the real world, homosexuality is not a transmissible condition [Gay Agenda, 4:24], anymore than skin colour can be transmitted. In fact, when they talk about the children, what they really mean is that the children will ask awkward questions: if a parent has told the child that gay people are evil, unhappy, mentally sick and full of disease, how will this child cope with discovering that there are happy and fulfilled gay couples, happy, fulfilled and productive gay people in government, happy, fulfilled and productive gay people as teachers, happy, fulfilled and productive gay people as policemen and firefighters, happy, fulfilled and productive gay people as businessmen? Of course

the child will be confused — reality won't match up to the fantasy that the parent has been forcing upon the poor child! Any argument based on "*protect the children from homosexuality*" will turn out, upon closer inspection, to be based on the personal arrogance of the homophobe making the claim, i.e. it interferes with his freedom to live in his fantasy world where he can safely pretend that gay people are mentally ill, sick, depraved, immoral or evil. He is unable to engage with the real world, where a gay person is every bit as good as any heterosexual.

**4:41 Special rights** Some homophobes claim that gay people are seeking "*special rights*". They claim that gay men have the same rights as heterosexual men and just have to marry women. Similarly, gay women simply have to marry men if they want to get married. Firstly, we seek protection from bullying and discrimination as a minority, because gay people have been discriminated against and continue to be discriminated against in everyday life. Secondly, there have been hate crimes involving physical violence against gay people and their property and this needs to stop for the same reason that it is a crime to shout racist abuse at a person of a different colour or to beat them up with a crowbar. Thirdly, when a gay person is emotionally bullied into marrying somebody of the opposite sex in order to fit in with society's prejudices, the marriage tends to fail. It can take decades, but neither partner can feel happy if one of them is unable to love the other. Legal commitment is not enough in a marriage and love is necessary. It is totally unfair for a heterosexual woman if a gay man marries her, as he is unable to give her the love she deserves (but I suppose the misogynist in most homophobes won't have the emotional maturity to comprehend this point at all). Similarly, it is totally unfair to the man, since he is unable to love the woman he is married to — he would only be able to love a man of his choosing. The same argument applies for a lesbian forced into a heterosexual marriage. In the end, gay people just want the same rights that once interracial couples had to fight for and that heterosexual couples take for granted, along with their shotgun marriages followed by divorce after bringing a child into the world [Gay Agenda, 4:18], or dropping out of school early to marry because of unplanned pregnancy.

## The End (A new beginning)

**5:1 Reality wins** I sincerely hope I have convinced the intelligent layman that gay people deserve equal civil rights in a secular democracy [Gay Agenda, 1:8]. A small minority of homophobes want to suppress all evidence of happy, healthy and successful gay people [Gay Agenda, 4:40] and they want to mislead you into believing their fantasies [Gay Agenda, 2:10], but the overwhelming weight of reality will prevail. In the real world, gay people are law-abiding, tax-paying citizens and if they are given a chance to grow up in a safe environment, they can be intellectually and emotionally fulfilled adults [Gay Agenda, 3:4]. They can do very well in their education, build successful careers, loving relationships and happy families. They can bring up happy, educated and well-adjusted children. They can be valuable members of society.

**5:2 Not powerless** We must all work together to make Mauritius a better place. The homophobes want people to believe that our numbers are too few to make a difference, but this is not true [Gay Agenda, 4:28]. We are certainly not powerless [Gay Agenda, 1:9]. If we can educate our families and neighbours, we can wield political power to make and break coalitions and governments [Gay Agenda, 4:38]. We must ask for equal civil rights from the National Assembly, right now [Gay Agenda, 1:5].

**5:3 Change is coming.** Things will get better. The law needs to change now, but it will take a generation to educate enough people [Gay Agenda, 3:10] so that they can all reject the lies from the small minority of vicious homophobes. The good news is that change is happening right now. It can only get better if we all work together to skip the 50 years of intolerance and move to full equality a lot faster. Let's make Mauritius a better place now!

# Appendix

## Friendly people and organisations

**6:1 Tolerant people** Despite what the homophobes want you to believe, there is a huge number of people out there that are very open minded, welcoming and tolerant. Many people, gay or heterosexual, are fighting every day for equal civil rights for gay people.

**6:2 It Gets Better** A civil rights campaigner, Dan Savage, has started a project called It gets better, where thousands of LGBT people of all ages, colours and genders talk about their experiences growing up, the bullying, the loneliness, but most important of all, they also tell you how much better things got for them. Today, many of these gay people work for Pixar, Disney, IBM, Apple, Google, Microsoft, Facebook and many other corporations and governments that recognise their contributions. Some of the videos are also made by heterosexual relatives of gay people or simply heterosexual people who want to make life better for gay people. It can happen for you too you too can be free, you too can have a partner that you absolutely love, you too can have a partner that loves you back exactly the way you are, no more pretending, no more hiding, you can live your life as a free man or woman. You should know that things are going to change. Things will get better. You can visit the website at this address: <http://www.itgetsbetter.org/>.

**6:3 Collectif arcenciel** The Collectif Arcenciel is an organisation fighting for equal civil rights for gay people in Mauritius, since 2005. Please visit their website (<http://collectifarcenciel.org/>), and join them on Facebook (<http://www.facebook.com/people/Collectif-Arcenciel/1019321968>)!

**6:4 Louis Marinelli** Louis Marinelli was a former strategist for the anti-family organisation National Organisation for Marriage (NOM) [sic]. His work with the NOM group led him to meet real gay couples in the real world, people struggling to live their lives freely and to protect their loved ones because of homophobic laws and groups like NOM. Louis changed his mind, and decided to support equal civil rights for gay couples. You can visit his blog: <http://louisjmarinelli.com/politics/i-now-support-full-marriage-equality>.

**6:5 ILGA** This is the International, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association. They have been fighting for equal civil rights for gay people since 1978. ILGA recently achieved UN accreditation, although Mauritius abstained to vote, after the squealing of vicious homophobes last time our government supported the rights of gay people at the UN. The ILGA website is found at <http://ilga.org/>.