

PART 6, SPLC AGAINST JONAH: THE USE OF SO-CALLED SCIENTIFIC FACTS



In this article we investigate how the SPLC and radical gay-lib factions use scientific facts as weapons against JONAH, there where these ‘facts’ turn out to be mere opinions.



Paragraph 13 Phony ‘scientific facts’

Pivotal to the trial of JONAH was the radical gay-lib notion that feelings of same-sex attractions can never, ever change. The judge barred all experts witnesses who stated the contrary to come forward and state their case. Therefore, the jury was forced to accept as given, that homosexuality is immutable. Which means that anyone with any other information was on his way out, or rather he/she didn’t even come in. Such is the power of mainstream beliefs: they even make it into becoming court verdicts without any further ado.

The same occurred in the assignment that the 2009 Task Force on Sexual Orientation Change Efforts received beforehand from the American Psychological Association. They were ordered right from the start to conclude that all therapy must be gay affirmative and that the underlying “science facts” are not to be doubted:

“We see this multi-culturally competent and gay affirmative approach as grounded in an acceptance of the following scientific facts:

Same-sex sexual attractions, behavior, and orientations per se are normal and positive variants of human sexuality—in other words, they do not indicate either mental or developmental disorders.”

But the point is: that so-called “scientific fact” does not exist. It is an opinion. There is no scientific article, report or dissertation where we can read how scientists went about to look into this subject and come up with this “scientific fact”. If there were such research, then it would be interesting to know what the paradigms were, what questions were asked, who the sub-

jects were, who the researchers were, and in what way valid conclusions were drawn. What was the train of thought?

If such a research method does indeed exist, wouldn't it be interesting to use this new "*scientific*" method to investigate whether other forms of sexual behavior including pedophilia, sado-masochism, wife-beating, exhibitionism and strangling your sexual partner are also normal 'variations' of human sexuality? It must be a cinch to do so with this scientific method which supposedly is available somewhere, thereby answering the question if pederasts, masochists, sadists and stranglers are merely normal.

If we use this elusive but highly original piece of scientific pioneering, then we could conclude that all problems that these persons suffer are also merely the result of, what gay-lib calls the sexual minority stress syndrome (a term invented by activist gay psychologists to blame society).

I demand to see and use this scientific method to publish new insights on sexology, but where is it?

I will probably get the Nobel Prize for Medicine if I do, and I am looking forward to it. But in the meantime, let me not join in the fun of labelling mainstream beliefs as a scientific fact, thereby being a phony scientist. These phonies attribute all personal woe to external social forces. That certainty has never been established and is a dogma which stems from the seventies: anti-psychiatry, the driving force of gay-lib. In the gay social ghetto it has become mainstream since then (see our [article](#) on the subject).



The whole 2009 report by the American Psychological Association on orientation therapy is grounded on this "*scientific fact*", but in fact it is only an opinion. And in a paranoid fear of oppression, we see people confusing opinion with scientific facts. Therefore the report is a house of cards, built on a so-called scientific fact which turns out to be only a world-view when you investigate it thoroughly.


Sexuality does not come in 'variations', as much as sense of hearing or eyesight do not either. The fact that one guy has "an eye for the ladies" and another does not, doesn't mean we are facing different 'variations' of eyesight. If one individual thinks the voices of children at play are music to his ear, when at the same time someone else can't stand the sound of these "brats", that doesn't mean they have different 'variations' of hearing. The same applies to sexuality.

Sense of hearing, eyesight and sexuality are broad human possibilities, and each and every

individual is endowed with the full scope of these gifts. The contrary has never been established. We are dealing with opinions ventilated by people who have resistances towards the opposite sex as we have seen in the previous article, [part 5](#). And that is merely a temporary human state, due to the fluidity of sexual feelings. You can learn to appreciate those brats, you can learn to appreciate the opposite sex. These feelings are not fixed for ever more.


Paragraph 14 freedom of speech

A ban on orientation therapy is a violation of freedom of speech. This has been stressed by orientation therapists. As an attempt to get rid of that argument, some gay-libbers have insisted that orientation therapy should be based on meticulous scientific research. Strange that this criterium is not upheld for Gay Affirmative Therapy which has no body of knowledge to lean on at all. Gay-lib is not making a fuss about that, it is therapy given by heterosexuals that is under attack, and they are desperately searching for arguments to prevent people from seeing therapists who do not share their world-view. They go further to state that science has nothing to do with freedom of speech, that scientific facts are not a matter of opinion and that opinions have nothing to do with it. But this is a very inappropriate view on science.



A scientific report should always consists of two elements, not one. It should consist of the research which meets certain standards. But that is not all. It should also consist of explaining the paradigms, the train of thought, the world-view which underlies the scientific question being asked, the context of the whole research process. And contexts differ, world-views differ, and in order to express and question each other's world-view we need freedom of speech.

Let me take an example of scientific questions which reflect world-views: How can we tell for sure which spell the witch living in the local forest has cast, thereby causing the failure of our crops? Then we charge on to name seven spells and meticulously investigate each and every one of them, in order to find which spell actually did the trick. People have been put to the stake, women have been burnt thanks to this kind of "scientific research". And yet we knew for sure that it was the spell which involved boiling two frogs and using the spit of the local badger, that comes up with the highest probability figure: 95.4% certainty. The scientists used statistics, they used field research on frogs and badgers (and goats, bulls and thistles to go with it), they did their job. That is science, and that is rubbish.



Why is that rubbish? After all, they did the maths, they did the field research, and the results were peer-reviewed. And a very, very important man signed the document, a highly distinguished spokesman on agricultural affairs, he even wrote twenty pages on his importance when he published the results, not to mention the two awards he got last year from very important institutes. These institutes have discredited the use of frogs and badgers, and they all use copy and paste to discredit the practice of using frogs and badgers as public statements. These institutes are not to be taken lightly. Surely we now know what to look for when it comes to improving crop yields!



There is something very wrong in these “scientific facts”. A scientific report should not only consist of the maths and the conclusions, but should also account for the pre-scientific stance that the researchers took before charging ahead. Every researcher has a pre-scientific stance, notion, view; every researcher takes things for granted and may even not be aware of the fact that he/she has a pre-scientific stance. There is nothing wrong with having these stances, to the contrary, everyone has them. But to make the scientific report acceptable, they should be named first and then accounted for. To that end, we need freedom of speech.

What if anyone doubting that very distinguished gentleman and those very important institutes were beforehand to be considered a menace to society, a potential threat to agriculture, a heretic who may very well be scheming and colluding with the witch at hand, perhaps a wizard even with evil tricks of his own? After all, he expressed his doubts, so he is clearly not on our side. And that must have consequences: all those who doubt important institutes are a menace to society, to welfare, to the food supply, therefore they have blood on their hands due to the starvation of the ten families we witnessed last year. Well not quite witnessed, but there was rumour from all around. So yes, we must assume that families have suffered, probably even have died. There are sufficient people who agree.

Freedom of speech is necessary, even if it is against overwhelming odds, against mainstream beliefs and against activist bullies. An activist bully by the name of Dr Lee Beckstead wrote twenty pages on his own importance when he sent a so-called “scientific expert account” to the judge at the trial of JONAH. He reiterated that several important, very important professional organizations shared his view on witches, oops a typo, I meant orientation therapists. And he knew for sure that these therapists were up to no good. Everyone knows that, it has become mainstream belief.

And the judge then read his “scientific” report, took a pre-judicial stance, and declared beforehand that these cultural heretics were not allowed to speak in court. The world had suffered enough.



There is something very wrong with this judge, with gay bullies who pose as scientists, and with the way that many onlookers just take a back seat to view the spectacle of it all, eating popcorn as JONAH is put on trial, and subsequently burnt at the stake.

(to be continued)

Job Berendsen MD

[Next Part](#)

[Complete Series](#)

[Home](#)