CALIFORNIAN WAR ON DISSIDENT VIEWS, PART 10: "THE AASECT, MORE SCAMS"



The American Association of Sexuality Educators, Counselors and Therapists (AASECT) was quoted in the draft of the bill in order to report negatively about psychotherapy. In our view, their few sentences constitute hate speech against bisexuals and slander against licensed therapists. We will analyze each and every sentence of their contribution and demonstrate that we are facing scams, and that their comments are not substantiated by the publications of the American Psychiatric Association or the American Psychological Association, as claimed. They are fabrications.

1. Who are the AASECT

We are dealing with the *"American Association of Sexuality Educators, Counselors and Therapists*" (AASECT), a small organization founded in 1967 with a wide variety of professionals and lay people alike. No professional qualifications are required in order to enroll. Their uniting force is a common secular opinion on the subject of sexuality and planned parenthood. They profess to uphold and *"guard professional standards"*, but how this can be achieved if everyone can join, is totally unclear. On their site they write:

> "*With its history of impeccable standards for training, experience and ethical behavior, AASECT is increasingly recognized as the guardian of professional standards in sexual health"*

From their website, it is not clear who is doing this *"increasingly recognizing"* and how the organization can guard professional standards if it is not a professional organization in any way. Therefore, it is a scam (scam no. 1).

2. Who are members of the AASECT

They claim that their members include:

> "*…allied health professionals, clergy members, lawyers, sociologists, marriage and family counselors and therapists, family planning specialists…"*

Our question would be: what is an *"allied"* health professional? Ally to what? And what has a lawyer got to do with sexuality counseling? Suing for divorce? What is a family planning spe-

cialist exactly and how do you become one? What credentials do you need? The website offers no insight on these pressing questions.

For the sake of PR, they offer each other seven different awards a year, making their work look impressive and convincing. After all, who would doubt the legitimacy of an award?

3. What is their mission statement?

The website says:

> "*In general, AASECT opposes all psychological, social, cultural, legislative, and governmental forces that would restrict, curtail or interfere with the fundamental values of sexual health and sexual freedom that we espouse*"



Strangely enough, the organization embraces the current Californian legislative and governmental forces that seek to restrict, curtail and interfere with fundamental values of sexual freedom, namely the freedom to see a psychotherapist for your private sexual issues, and to discuss these issues in the way you, as an adult, like it. This is yet another proof that the organization with such a mission statement is a scam (scam no. 2).

According to their website, the organization is closely tied to the National Center of Lesbian Rights (a top-down Californian radical lesbian-feminist, and *"anti-patriarchal"*, law firm) and the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association (GLMA), a pseudo-scientific organization which assumes *beforehand* that one is *'born that way'* and whose main goal is to promote this unsubstantiated stance as a scientific fact.

The GLMA is not accepted by mainstream medical associations; therefore they have formed their own medical association, with its own medical standards and its own peer-reviewers to launder their biased research findings into the mainstream narrative.

It must be remembered that once you say *beforehand* that you were *'born that way'*, no other conclusion can result from the so-called research. It is called researchers' bias and it leads to pseudo-science (scam no. 3).

On their website, the GLMA states that,

> *"The GLMA has a role in improving the health and well-being of LGBT people and wel-*

comes and serves everyone who shares in that belief. "

Anyone can join, no specific professional credentials are needed. We read,

"Our members include physicians, nurses, as well as dentists, pharmacists, veterinarians, public health professionals, health policy specialists and health and patient advocates."

So, they also have dentists, vets and pharmacists. Very professional. My dog is acting rather weird, what on earth could it be? Anybody got a clue? Ah, let's try the GLMA.

It can be viewed as an organization that specifically adheres to the belief that some people are truly born different making their interests as gay patients and as gay health care workers inherently 'other', not to mention my dog. In this way the sectarian us/them-thinking is morphed into a physical reality.

It must be stressed that there is no scientific proof that people are born different; therefore a pseudo-reality is created in which the underlying bias fades away from visibility, making it seem ordinary, natural and real. In this way, people are fooled into thinking that they as activists are the true, and only experts on the subject of same-sex attractions. The view that everyone "owns" the subject of sexuality is not part of their paradigm.



There is nothing professional about them; nevertheless, they issue each other numerous awards annually, making the members look absolutely brilliant. They claim to have sections, but fact-checking reveals that to date there is only one section: nursing care. Therefore they have no specific expertise pertaining to mental health. It is a scam to use this false GLMA construction in the bill as part of the authorative sounding term *"contemporary science".*

4. Position on *"conversion therapy"*

in accordance with the NCLR campaign to silence what they call *'conversion therapy'*, the AASECT has issued a statement in 2014 on therapy. But when we look closely, we see merely the pasting and copying of statements directly from the websites of the NCLR and the Human Rights Campaign HRC (gay-lib homosexist extremists, ed.).

They have done no independent research on this field of psychotherapy, nor have they published any research findings on the quantity, quality, content or effects of the alleged *'conversion therapy'*. In this regard, their statement does not live up to any professional standard that they proclaim to *"guard"*.

We just have to take their word for granted that this is their *"position"*. Therefore, if you are looking for a professional statement, then this is a scam (scam no. 4).

In 2017, they published a *"revised position on conversion therapy"* to include the new narrative from the extremist-transgender lobby that has been infiltrating, if not to say hijacking, gay-lib over the last five years.

Despite the fact that some find it generous to appease this new movement which aims to castrate as many children and youths at the youngest age possible before they are old enough to realize what they are irrevocably doing to their body, mind-frame and future, the organization offers no research findings on *'conversion therapy'* to substantiate this *'update'*. What is the update based on? Do we have new findings on transgenders that we can read about?

Of course not, therefore this is yet another proof that this *"professional"* organization is a scam, revision or otherwise (scam no. 5).

5. Opposition to reparative therapy

Let us analyze each sentence of their position on *'conversion therapy'* and demonstrate the flaws that are built into the narrative.

> "*We oppose any 'reparative' or conversion therapy that seeks to 'change' or 'fix' a person's sexual orientation."*

Our comment: it is not only the therapist that they oppose, it necessarily is also the client that they oppose. After all, it takes two to tango.

Licensed therapists are consistently attuned to the wishes of the client in this field as they are to clients in any other field. If a client experiences same-sex attractions (SSA's) and wishes to look into the subject of opposite-sex attractions (OSA's) and if you wish to label this action, you could say that this person is looking for his long lost bisexual potential. Since when does a professional sounding organization have the right to oppose this search?

Therefore, we may safely conclude that this organization is bi-phobic, that is to say, it exhibits an irrational distaste, avoidance, condemnation and hatred of the idea of intimacy with the opposite sex.

It seeks to help youngsters get themselves castrated at the hands of fanatics, and seeks to prohibit adults from thinking about the opposite and same sex at the same time. It sounds like science-fiction: mind control. Their "*fundamental values of sexual health and sexual freedom that we espouse"* have the contours of a monorail.

6. The alleged *'harm'* issue

In their stances document, they say,

> "*Reparative therapy has been proven harmful to minors"*

Such evidence has not been found in any scientific literature. The American Psychological Association wrote in 2009 (report, page 42):

> *"Early and recent research studies provide no clear indication of the prevalence of harmful outcomes among people who have undergone efforts to change their sexual orientation or the frequency of occurrence of harm because no study to date of adequate scientific rigor has been explicitly designed to do so. Thus, we cannot conclude how likely it is that harm will occur from Sexual Orientation Change Efforts."*

In 2009 the APA said it cannot conclude how likely it is that harm will occur. The AASECT offers no scientific rigorous research dating from after that time. Therefore, it is safe to say that this statement on therapy is yet another example of a scam (scam no. 6).

7. The alleged 'benefit' issue

> "*Reparative therapy has been shown to be a negative predictor of psychotherapeutic benefit."*

As we have seen in the previous part of this series, there is an abundance of literature of the benefits of psychotherapeutic help.

The AASECT statement is not based on any research by the organization itself, nor do they deal with clients who are searching or have sought therapy. It is not part of their trade in any way, as little as a dentist is the person who sees into hip surgery (scam no. 7). It has been copied and pasted from other websites. The organization has no right to publish this sentence as its own.

8. The alleged 'coercion' issue

> "*Reparative therapy, for minors, in particular, is often forced or nonconsensual."*

This stance is not backed up with any research to substantiate the claim (scam no. 8). It is an alarmist message, meant to provoke fear.

And even if this alleged coercion were a problem, then it is up to the persons behind the draft

of the bill to demonstrate that coercion cannot be dealt with in the licensed psychotherapeutic community. No evidence about the failure of psychotherapists to regulate their own profession has been brought forward (scam no. 9). Therefore, we are dealing with the creation and dissemination of prejudice against the licensed psychotherapeutic community.

To make matters worse, the draft of the bill does not speak of coercion (scam no. 10). It seeks to ban all voluntary acts of adults when the subject matter does not have the approval of homosexist organizations (homosexism means gay is the only way to go).

The bill itself seeks to prevent consenting adults from receiving information of any kind that perhaps leads to less homosexual feelings and behaviors. It is this sort of state-induced behavioral *"therapy"* that can truly be called forced and nonconsensual.

The way the organization claims to oppose force and coercion, is yet another scam (scam no. 11). AASECT *loves* force, and approves of pushing adults around. Their trade is opinion, and opinion only.

9. Conclusion

The remarks of the AASECT have presumably been handed to them and copied from the HRC organization as being their own. Subsequently, the HRC then copies them back, now bearing the logo of the AASECT as the HRC plots and schemes to use state force in a historically unprecedented attempt to silence other views than their own on sexual deviant behavior. Apparently, persuasion does not sufficiently succeed in making their views ruling as supreme.

The opinion of the AASECT is just as relevant as that of the local gardeners' society, which equally has no experience with psychotherapy of homosexuality; their relevance to the subject is a scam to fool legislators.

The fact that the subject of gender confused psychiatric patients ('*transgenders*') has recently been added to their *"stance"* proves that they are deceiving the general public, since there is no scientific article about *'transgenders'* and *'conversion therapy',* recent or otherwise, stemming from mainstream psychology or the pseudo-science of LGBT-psychology which claims beforehand that you were *'born that way'*, making all change efforts irrelevant.

In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association made a small remark about therapy, saying there was a *"potential risk of some harm"*, a caveat which applies to each and every medical endeavor. It did not forbid psychotherapy for SSA's, nor has any scientific evidence been provided at any other time to necessitate a ban. The HRC, as a lay organization, then went on to expand on this caveat to the extent of a prohibition without sound evidence to explain how and why.

Now, they take it even one step further to make therapy illegal, hiring shrewd lawyers who experiment with each and every keyhole they can find in the legislative process. The HRC is extremely wealthy, encouraging donations based on victim scams to further their cause. Paranoia rules.

Lies and twists of truth come in handy, as long as no one notices. Exposing them is labeled as being *'anti-LGBT'*, a term which has become as nasty as the phrase *'Judenfreund'* (Jew friend), a Nazi label to discourage support for Jewish citizens.

The citing of the AASECT and a host of other organizations that the HRC has managed to ally with or infiltrate, is a form of HRC bullying to huff and puff and make the choir of resistance against therapy as impressive as possible.

But the choir boy was not the composer of the tune.

——– ——–

To be continued

Next Part

Job Berendsen, MD

Home