

Abstract

Allegations like “proven genetic reason for homosexuality” or “proven inefficacy of sexual orientation change efforts” are put forward at popular science educational events for scientifically unsophisticated people. In this article I will demonstrate that modern academia is dominated by persons who project their socio-political views into their scientific activity, making scientific process strongly biased. These projected views include a spectrum of political claims, including those with regard to non-heterosexual individuals, and namely that “homosexuality is a normative variation of sexuality among humans as well as animals”, that “same-sex attraction is inborn and cannot be changed”, that “gender is a social construct not limited to binary classification”, and so forth. In this paper it will be demonstrated that such views in modern academia are considered orthodox, steadfast and settled, even when there is lack of convincing scientific background, whereas alternative views are instantly labeled “pseudoscientific” and “false” even when there is a certain factology behind. One could mention many factors as the reason for this bias – dramatic social and historical legacy which led to the emergence of “scientific taboos”, intense political struggle that gave rise to hypocrisy, “commercialization” of science, leading to the pursuit of sensations, etc. Whether it is possible to completely avoid bias in science remains a controversial issue. However, it is possible to create conditions for an optimal equidistant scientific process.

Keywords: bias in science; scientific integrity; social controversy; LGBT.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12731/2658-4034-2019-2-6-49>

INTRODUCTION

In April 2017, the USA Today published a video entitled “Psychology of Infertility” [1]. This was a story of three couples who could not have children even after long time of regular unprotected sexual intercourse – that is, they suffered from infertility, defined so by the World Health Organization [2, p. 1522]. Each couple solved the problem of infertility in a certain way — through in vitro fertilization, adoption and use of a surrogate mother. This stylish popular science video described in details the history of each pair.

One important note: the authors of this video in an absolutely ordinary way and without the slightest amount of humor listed a same-sex couple — two married males, Dan and Will Neville-Reyben – among the two opposite-sex couples who had reproductive medical problems (that is, *disorders of reproductive functions* which lead to infertility). The authors of the video on a touching musical background lucidly explained to the viewers that the “infertility” problem of Dan and Will is that they have no uterus [3]. USA Today probably assumes that for some part of its audience such subtleties of human biology are unknown. Anyway, one of the main leitmotifs of this news was the argument that medical insurance should cover the expenses of homosexual couples for “infertility” treatments.

Messages of similar nature, full of biological absurdity, are not uncommon in nowadays media, and, truly speaking, begin to dominate the professional, and especially, popular science. Allegations like “*proven genetic reason for homosexuality*”, “*proven inefficacy of sexual orientation change efforts*” and “1,500 species of *homosexual animals*” are put forward at popular science educational events for scientifically unsophisticated people. In this article I will demonstrate that modern academia is dominated by persons who project their liberal views into their scientific activity, making science strongly biased. These liberal views include a spectrum of advocative claims with regard to non-heterosexual individuals (those, who usually identify themselves as “lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgenders” – LGBT), e.g. that homosexuality is a normative variation of sexuality among humans as well as animals, that same-sex attraction (SSA) is inborn and cannot be changed, that gender is a social construct not limited to binary classification, and so forth. I will refer to such claims as LGBT-advocative. At the same time, there is a vast amount of evidence that contradicts the above mentioned ones, I will refer to them as LGBT-sceptical. I will demonstrate that LGBT-advocative views in modern academia are considered orthodox, steadfast and settled, even when there is lack of convincing scientific background, whereas LGBT-sceptical views are instantly labelled “pseudoscientific” and “false” even when there is a certain factology behind.

SCIENCE AND POLITICAL IDEOLOGY

I will start with a brief mentioning of the basic principles of science. What is science? Science is a way of knowledge based on scientific method. The latter includes several steps, which are fundamental for science. These are: (1) defining the problem (what needs to be studied); (2) searching for what have already been studied by others to answer the problem; (3) development of the hypothesis: assumption of an explanation of the problem; (4) experiment: testing the hypothesis; (5) analysis of the results: study of the results of the experiment and finding out to what extent the hypothesis was confirmed; and, finally, (6) conclusions: bringing to the other results of the experiment and analysis.

However, as noted by Professor Henry H. Bauer in 1992, nowadays Academia is increasingly turning away from scientific method in order to match the liberal ideology as the only decisive way to “scientific” interpretation of the world around [4]. Thus, the mainstream scientific method turned out into the following: (1) defining the problem and avoiding as far as possible the “tabooed” topics, e.g. races and sexes as biological construct, sexual orientation as social construct; (2) searching for what have already been studied by others and selecting the results which do not contradict the established ideology; (3) development of the hypothesis: assumption of an explanation of the problem which does not contradict the liberal ideology; (4) experiment: testing the hypothesis; (5) analysis of the results: ignoring and reducing the significance of the “unexpected” results while magnifying and overestimating the “expected” ones; and, finally; (6) conclusions: bringing to the other results which triumphantly “support” the liberal ideology. Prof. Bauer is not the only one, who is worried by this ideological shift of science. Similar was noted by Professor Ruth Hubbard [5], Professor Lynn D. Wardle [6, p. 852], Dr. Steven Goldberg [7], Dr. Alan D. Sokal and Dr. Jean Bricmont [8], American columnist Kirsten Powers [9], and Dr. Austin Ruse [10].

Professor Nicholas Q. Rosenkranz from Georgetown Law School and Professor Jonathan D. Haidt from New York University even founded “Heterodox Academy” – an Internet project focused on “[T]he question, then, is whether colleges and universities welcome and celebrate viewpoint diversity. While some individual institutions do (see our Guide to Colleges), many American universities are typified by an ideological monoculture.” [11].

Dr. Bret Weinstein who resigned from the Evergreen State College after he refused to take part in the so called “Day of Absence” of whites and was bullied by infuriated students and activists [12], later founded together with his brother Dr. Eric Weinstein and other scientists a community which was half-jokingly called “Intellectual Dark Web” [13]. Journalist Bari Weiss described this community in the following way “First, they are willing to disagree ferociously, but talk civilly, about nearly every meaningful subject: religion, abortion, immigration, the nature of consciousness. Second, in an age in which popular feelings about the way things ought to be often override facts about the way things actually are, each is determined to resist parroting what’s politically convenient. And third, some have paid for this commitment by being purged from institutions that have become increasingly hostile to unorthodox thought — and have found receptive audiences elsewhere.” [13].

For those who have not previously been interested in this problem, the reign of ideological dogmatism in science may seem unbelievably absurd. They may think that in science only those facts that have been confirmed beyond controversy are the only truth, and everything else is based on assumptions, hypotheses, theories and socio-political constructivism. Nevertheless, putting forward assumptions, hypotheses, theories and socio-political constructivism as “proven facts” is observed in an increasingly wide range of issues [14, p. 12], some of which have a great public response. For example, is same-sex attraction (SSA) a “variation of human sexuality,” or is it a non-physiological (non-reproductive) deviation of sexual behavior, along with sexual attraction to children, animals, or inanimate objects? In these matters, as well as some others, the scientific method fell victim to political views [15, p. 14].

Consider the following: nowadays in Academia, researchers who declare themselves having “modern” views significantly outnumber those declaring “conservative” views [16]. An impressive list of peer-reviewed publications revealing the same problem can be found in the database of the above mentioned Heterodox Academy [17]. And LGBT advocacy is one of the main aspects of current liberal ideology.

In a private discussion, one of my colleagues who is a practicing Ph.D. psychologist in one of the largest cities of Russia (asked me not to disclose his name, because he was afraid of consequences of having an alternative opinion) half-jokingly told me about a very simple formula of “modern” science to judge on topics related to homosexuality: anything gay affirmative equals objective science and exemplary scholarship; anything gay negative equals biased and bigoted pseudoscience from right-wing extremists (personal communication, October 14, 2018). That’s about

it. In other words, in “modern and mainstream” science to doubt the “normality” of homosexuality is to doubt the “progress” and “freedom” of postmodernism and popular culture. In order to ascertain this phenomenon, only the simplest observation of popular science discourse is sufficient. Governments and rich non-governmental foundations have officially established certain beliefs regarding homosexuality as if they were unquestionably and without controversy proved true, such as that only women can give birth to people (I am afraid that in a very close future the semantic fundamentality of my last example is far from rosy).

“SCIENTIFIC” IS IN NO WAY EQUAL TO “POLITICALLY CORRECT”

Some say that science, as political and social discourse, should be very sensitive to a range of topics, because of bitter legacy of the human history. But scientific fact has nothing to do with politics. There are certain biological differences between human races (phenotypes) [18], there are certain biological differences between human sexes (heterochromosomes) [19] and so on. Indeed, such facts were partly used as “argument” for unimaginable crimes, atrocities and inequality throughout human history, and humanity and society must always keep this in mind. No argument for discrimination exists.

However, the aforementioned sad pages of history do not cancel the existence of physiological phenotypes and sex differences in humans, because they occur naturally and biologically. For instance, a male cannot give birth because of the biological particularities of his organism (absence of uterus, first of all, as aptly noticed by USA Today). We may just avoid talking about it or change the meaning of “female” – this adds nothing to the unshakable reality of science. Scientific facts exist independently of their interpretation by the ideologists of political doctrines, regardless of being listed in any declaration or disease classification, and irrespective of political correctness.

In my opinion, establishing an equal sign between “political correctness” and science is one of the greatest contemporary problems and this fact discourages novelty and innovation. Some researchers share similar opinion [20]. According to HarperCollins in British English “political correctness” means “demonstrating *progressive* ideals, especially by avoiding vocabulary that is considered offensive, discriminatory, or judgmental, esp. concerning race and gender” [21]. And according to Random House Webster’s in American English “political correctness” is “marked by or adhering to a typically *progressive orthodoxy* on issues involving especially ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or ecology” [22]. Russian thinkers Dr. Anton V. Belyakov and Dr. Oleg A. Matveychev defined “political correctness” without undue sentiments: “Political correctness is one of the products of the postmodern society, characterized by multiculturalism, methodological anarchism, social fragmentation and advancement of narrower identities. Democracy in such a society appears as a social order that entails not the power of the majority, but the protection of the rights of every minority first of all, down to a single individual. In fact, even the most democratic state is unable to protect all declared rights or ensure the realization of the ambitions of each member of society. A *simulated* solution to this problem is promoting the use of politically correct language, which suggests avoiding the words and statements referring to race, gender, age, health, social status, and the appearance of members of certain social groups, that may be deemed offensive and discriminatory by them.” [23, p. 34].

Nowadays in the United States (and the rest of the world) “political correctness” is the battlefield between liberals and conservatives [24]. But I would like to step away from socio-political discourse to science. If we strip the term “political correctness” of its “politically correct” wrapper, it would mean nothing but another kind of censorship, regardless of its proclaimed purpose, be it noble or evil. In reality, “political correctness” comes down to the desire to succumb everyone and everything to a definite ideological model.

I am deeply convinced that such censorship is extremely harmful to science, as some other researchers noticed [25]. Certain cultural and political beliefs have become social dogma from which no one has the right to retreat, be they scholars, teachers or students. Any scientist who wants to gain recognition and funding must submit to “political correctness”.

It is obvious how seriously “political correctness” distorts science, because it negatively affects universalism, openness, disinterestedness, skepticism, which are perceived in scientific activity as something taken for granted, as well as simple honesty and lack of hypocrisy.

On this occasion, Professor Tom Nichols noticed in an article in “Foreign Affairs”, “I fear we are moving beyond a natural skepticism regarding expert claims to the death of the ideal of expertise itself: a Google-fueled, Wikipedia-based, blog-sodden collapse of any division between professionals and laypeople, teachers and students, knowers and wonderers – in other words, between those with achievement in an area and those with none ...” [26].

WIKIPEDIA AND YOUTUBE

Wikipedia is one of the most visited Internet sites, which positions itself as an “encyclopedia” and is accepted by many non-specialists, as well as schoolchildren, as an unquestioning source of truth. The site was launched in 2001 by an Alabama entrepreneur Jimmy Wales. Before starting the Wikipedia website, Jimmy Wales created the Bomis Internet project, which distributed paid pornography – a fact that he diligently sought to remove from his biography [27].

It is a commonplace opinion that any user can add an article or edit an existing article in Wikipedia. In fact, any information that does not correspond to “a typically progressive orthodoxy” will be censored by means of complex intricate mechanisms for checking the article under which there is an institution of so-called mediators — editor-judges representing certain movements and groups, such as an LGBT-mediator who can ultimately edit or reject articles [28]. Thus, despite its official policy of supposed neutrality, Wikipedia is strongly biased.

In an article in “FrontPage”, David Swindle analyzed and demonstrated that the Wikipedia project represents the point of view of its most persistent and permanent editors, some of whom (especially in areas of social controversy) are activists seeking to influence public opinion: “Consider Ann Coulter versus Michael Moore. Coulter’s entry (on August 9, 2011) was 9028 words long. Of this longer-than-usual entry, 3220 words were devoted to “Controversies and criticism” in which a series of incidents involving Coulter and quotes from her are cited with accompanying condemnations, primarily from her opponents on the Left. That’s 35.6 percent of Coulter’s entry devoted to making her look bad. By contrast, Moore’s entry is 2876 words (the more standard length for entries on political commentators), with 130 devoted to “Controversy.” That’s 4.5% of the word count, a fraction of Coulter’s. Does this mean that an “unbiased” commentator would find Coulter eight times as “controversial” as Moore?” [29].

Journalist Joseph Farah writes that Wikipedia: “... is not only a provider of inaccuracy and bias. It is wholesale purveyor of lies and slander unlike any other the world has ever known ...” [30]. One of the the co-founders of Wikipedia himself, Larry Sanger who left the project, admitted that Wikipedia does not follow its own declared neutrality policy: “Wikipedia doesn't live up to its policy and in fact deliberately misinterprets it on some issues. Although I founded Wikipedia, I'm also long gone from the organization and am now probably its biggest critic, so...” [31].

Researcher Brian Martin in his work *Persistent Bias on Wikipedia* writes: “Systematically biased editing, persistently maintained, can occur on Wikipedia while nominally following guidelines. Techniques for biasing an entry include deleting positive material, adding negative material, using a one-sided selection of sources, and exaggerating the significance of particular topics. To maintain bias in an entry in the face of resistance, key techniques are reverting edits, *selectively invoking Wikipedia rules*, and overruling resistant editors ...” [32, p. 379].

All Wikipedia entries on LGBT issues must be approved by the above-mentioned mediators, and any facts they deem inappropriate would be removed on the pretext of belonging to “fringe theories — anything that departs significantly from the prevailing views or mainstream views in a particular field.” For example, adding to Wikipedia article on reparative therapy some statistical data indicating that sexual orientation change efforts can be successful for some individuals, was reversed within minutes under the standard pretext – “WP:FRNG” – “professional mainstream associations consider reparative therapy useless and even dangerous, and therefore all other opinions are unfounded and represent fringe theories.”. This mode of mediation is mandatory for all articles on LGBT topics. It is the LGBT representative who decides what will be published about LGBT and what will be not – this is the actual Wikipedia rule. And this is, slightly speaking, not quite the proclaimed principle “any user can add an article or edit an existing article”.

Thus, all Wikipedia articles related to LGBT are written in a biased, self-serving way, and present mainly a compilation of carefully edited information from questionable or unscientific, or even artistic sources – all of them are considered “scientifically appropriate” if they are LGBT-advocative. Whereas any source that is LGBT-sceptical will have to pass a thorough and scrupulous control and approval from the mediators (see the principle

told by my colleague above). Generally, without the moderation and last word of LGBT mediators it is impossible to add a new LGBT article or update an existing one. Their judging criteria is simple: “either good or nothing.”

For example, for a very long time Wikipedia article on homosexual behaviour in animals contained a claim that this type of non-reproductive behaviour was seen in 1500 species of animals. This was presented by Wikipedia as a scientific fact in spite of the lack of adequate sources.

In fact, the “1500 species of homosexual animals” was an advertising slogan launched by an employee of the Norwegian Museum of Natural History named Petter Bøckman during an exhibition in 2006. Bøckman himself included this phrase in an article in Wikipedia in 2007. Only 11 years later, after facing an intense opposition from the LGBT editors and appealing personally to Bøckman, this false information was deleted: during the discussion, Bøckman was unable to provide the source and acknowledged the fallacy of the statement [33].

Finally, as the administration of Wikipedia acknowledges itself: “As a private website, Wikipedia has the legal right to block, ban, or otherwise restrict any individual from editing its pages, or accessing its content, with or even without reason.” [34]. But who cares? It is this modern “encyclopedia” that is the main source of “knowledge” for huge numbers of people across the world.

Another source of information for modern society is YouTube – a video hosting platform owned by the Google corporation. YouTube has censored channels with non-liberal and LGBT-sceptical discourse, among these are PragerU and MassResistance. Tucker Carlson from FoxNews mentioned internal office memo dated April 2017, which describes in detail how YouTube censorship is organized and maintained [35]. One of the reasons why the scale of this censorship is not so obvious to most people is that the company instead deleting “politically incorrect” videos puts them under a “restricted mode”. Such videos are blocked in campus networks, schools, libraries, and other public places; they cannot be viewed by minors and unregistered users. Videos in “restricted mode” are intentionally sent to the very end of the search list, so that they are more difficult to find. Least but very important – they can’t be monetized, meaning that their authors cannot earn on them. Imagine, for example, that one day the New York Times disappeared from newspapers stands – they just stopped selling it in public. Of course, one can get it, but only by subscription and, besides, exclusively for free. That is, the publishers were forbidden to make money by selling newspapers. Obviously, such actions would fall under the definition of censorship.

Interestingly, that the censorship criteria for videos on YouTube (as stated in the memo) is, “controversial religious or chauvinistic content,” as well as “extremely controversial, provocative content”. No clear definitions are given. The decision is made solely by YouTube on the grounds of organizations like Southern Poverty Law Center, which shares radical liberal and LGBT-advocative ideology [36].

HARASSMENT OF DISSENTERS

Numerous, well-funded and, as a result, influential groups and organizations like the Southern Poverty Law Center create a situation in which any expression of opinion, even if this opinion is fully scientifically reasoned, but does not fit into the rhetoric of LGBT movements, leads to high risks of losing career and authority. Such accusations are supported by mass culture in the media and show-business.

Professor Robert L. Spitzer (1932-2015) was one of the most important figures during the controversial actions within (and from the outside of) the American Psychiatric Association in 1973, and had made perhaps the most crucial for the homosexual movement decision to remove homosexuality from the classification of sexual deviations [37]. Constantly arguing that same-sex attraction itself did not fit the criteria of psychological disorder, Spitzer was praised and gained respect from community of gays and lesbians.

However, almost 30 years later, at the conference of the American Psychiatric Association in 2001, Spitzer reported about his findings, that “66 percent of men and 44 percent of women [with initial same-sex attractions] achieved a good degree of heterosexual functioning”, later published in “Archives of Sexual Behavior” [38, 39]. The homosexual community was infuriated – the findings were in deep contradiction with one of the principle claims of the homosexual movement – “immutability” of SSA. “Now the hero of the gay movement had suddenly become a Judas” [40]. The Spitzer’s paper was severely criticized by the familiar opponents of sexual orientation change efforts (SOCE), e.g. A. Lee Beckstead, Helena Carlson, Kenneth Cohen, Ritch Savin-Williams, Gregory Herek, Bruce Rind, and Roger Worthington [41]. Interestingly, as Dr. Christopher H. Rosik noted, some heavily criticized aspects of the Spitzer’s 2003 paper were the following: relying on the personal communications of the

respondents from a sample, collected with an assistance from counseling organizations and National Association for the Research and Therapy of Homosexuality [42]. This is the highest hypocrisy: the paper, delivering the study results which do not correspond to the claims of the homosexual movement was blamed for the very same shortcomings of research methodology, which were used as an argument for LGBT movement in other papers. For instance, the LGBT-advocative publication of Shidlo & Schroeder was similarly based on personal communications and self-reports [43]. Actually, the whole field of psychology and other social sciences heavily relies on subjects' self-reports. Also, an enormous proportion of pro-homosexual publications on children raised by same-sex couples is based on small samples, collected by homosexual organizations [44].

Finally, after almost 10 years of stance, Prof. Spitzer, at the age of 80 and suffering of Parkinson's disease, succumbed to pressure. He wrote a letter of apologize to the editor of "Archives of Sexual Behavior" stating that he [Spitzer] has re-assessed the interpretation of the findings and came to conclusion that the critics were correct [45]. He also apologized to the whole homosexual community "for the harm". Doctor van den Aardweg recollects on telephone talk with Prof. Spitzer some time after the publication of his 2003 article and attempt to resist the critics [46]: "I asked him if he would continue his research, or even if he would try to guide a few people with homosexual problems and who sought "alternative" professional help that is, help and support to change as much as possible from homosexual to heterosexual interests ... His reply was adamant. No, he would never touch the whole subject ever again. *He had nearly broken down emotionally after terrible personal attacks from militant gays and their supporters.* There was an outpouring of hatred. A man can indeed be broken by such a traumatizing experience." [46, emphasis added].

Another researcher, whose works are often quoted by homosexual activists, is Professor Charles Roselli from the Oregon Health and Science University. Professor Roselli studies neurobiological processes on models of domestic sheep. In the early stages of his activity Prof. Roselli carried out experiments to study sociosexual behavior of domestic rams. He hypothesized that some hormonal intrauterine disbalance may impair rams' sexual behavior. In his early publications on this topic the research of Prof. Roselli was focused on the sheep industry – improving of the breeding and its consequences for the economy – and acknowledged the fallacy of studying human sexual orientation on animal models: "Research aimed at understanding the factors that regulate the sexual behavior and fertility of rams is of obvious importance to the sheep industry. The information gained about the hormonal, neural, genetic and environmental determinants of sexual partner preferences should allow better selection of rams for breeding and, as a consequence, be economically important. However, this research also has broader implications for understanding the development and control of sexual motivation and mate selection across mammalian species, including humans. In this respect, it is important to realize that *male-oriented sexual partner preference in the ram cannot be strictly equated with homosexual behavior in humans*, because human sexual orientation involves perceptions, fantasies and experiences, as well as observable sexual behavior." [47, p. 243, emphasis added].

In his 2004 review paper Prof. Roselli acknowledged that he did not find convincing evidence for his hypothesis, and mentioned various hypotheses explaining same-sex mounting in some rams [47, pp. 236-242], he was very sensitive to LGBT in his formulations and interpretations and was in no way LGBT-sceptical or offensive. However, Prof. Roselli was harassed by LGBT activists for making autopsy of the rams – indeed there was no other way to study the ram brain anatomy [48]. Prof. Roselli was instantly declared "homophobe", in an article titled "Hands off homosexual sheep!" in the Sunday Times it was claimed that "not only did Roselli's research open up a Pandora's Box of scientifically rationalized homophobia, but Roselli himself was leading the secret charge against homosexuality, conducting his research so that he might eventually uncover the biological basis of homosexuality and eliminate it" [49, p. 48]. PETA organization represented by well-known athlete and LGBT activist Martina Navratilova [50], joined the uproar. Activists sent Roselli and various University of Oregon employees about 20 thousand email letters with threats and insults ("[you] should be shot!", "please die!", etc.) [49, p. 49].

In his later publications, Prof. Roselli, probably taught by bitter experience in confronting mainstream ideas, switched to LGBT-advocative rhetoric and is not reluctant to study human sexual orientation on animal models: "Sexual partner preferences *can be studied in animals* by using sexual partner preference tests and recording the amount of time spent alone or interacting with the same or opposite sex stimulus animal. Although imperfect, tests of sexual partner preference or mate choice in animals have been used to model human sexual orientation" [51, p. 3, emphasis added].

Doctor Ray Milton Blanchard from the University of Toronto is an authority in the field of sexology, who served on the American Psychiatric Association DSM-IV Subcommittee on Gender Identity Disorders. Dr. Blanchard suggested a hypothesis that same-sex attraction (including homosexual pedophilia) and transsexualism (gender identity disorder in DSM-IV, now gender dysphoria according to DSM-5) are caused by sex-specific immune reactions similar to Rhesus incompatibility [52]. Although Dr. Blanchard's scientific discourse is tempered and almost LGBT advocative, he is harassed by LGBT activists for considering transsexualism a disorder. This was sort of blasphemy in modern LGBT ideology and Dr. Blanchard was severely criticized [53]. Moreover, in one of the interviews Blanchard noted that: "I would say if one could start from scratch, ignore all the history of removing homosexuality from the DSM, normal sexuality is whatever is related to reproduction." [54]. With regard to transsexualism Dr. Blanchard stated "The first step in politicizing transsexualism – either pro or con – is ignoring or denying its essential nature as a type of mental disorder" [55].

LGBT activist from the Bilerico project Brynn Tannehill wrote: "If Dr. Blanchard were some wingnut with no positional authority or credibility, *it would be easy to dismiss him*. But that is not the case — to the contrary, he was on the DSM committee in charge of paraphilias and sexual disorders" [56, emphasis added]. If you got the meaning properly the activist is complaining that Dr. Blanchard "has authority", otherwise it "would be easy to dismiss him".

Dr. Mark Regnerus from the University of Texas has not had the Blanchard's authority when in 2012 he published in a peer-reviewed journal "Social Science Research" his findings that same-sex contacts of the parents have negative impacts on children [57]. The publication caused the effect of a bombshell far beyond the community of scientists who work in the field of family sociology. Dr. Regnerus was instantly denounced as a "homophobe" and was accused of advocating against the legalization of homosexual "marriages", although Regnerus didn't put forward any arguments of that kind in his article. Mainstream media called Regnerus "a bull in the china shop of mainstream sociology" [58].

Sociologist Gary Gates, director of the Williams Institute on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Law and Public Policy at the University of California headed a group of two hundred LGBT-friendly sociologists who signed a letter to the chief editor of "Social Science Research" with a request to invite scholars with specific expertise in LGBT parenting issues to submit a detailed critique of the paper and accompanying commentaries for publication in the next issue of the journal [59].

Especially interesting is that Gary Gates himself, who lives in same-sex partnership, was heavily criticized by LGBT-activists "as a traitor to the cause" [58] for publishing a study that only 3.8 percent of Americans are self-identified homosexuals [60]. This opposed the "10%" misquote of the famous entomologist Alfred Kinsey. As Gates frankly revealed "[W]hen the study was first published, prominent gay bloggers and their followers labeled me "irresponsible," hailed one critique of my work as a "great takedown," and even compared me to the Nazis." [61].

Anyway, just a year later Gates led the movement to discredit the LGBT-sceptical study of Mark Regnerus. LGBT activist Scott Rose addressed an open letter to the President of the University of Texas, demanding sanctions against Regnerus for his publication as an "ethical crime" [62]. The university responded that it had begun a check to determine if Regnerus had the "corpus delicti" in order to launch a formal investigation necessary. The verification did not reveal any inconsistencies in Regnerus' actions with ethical scientific standards, and no investigation was launched. However, the story was far from over. Regnerus was harassed in the blogosphere, the media and official publications, not only in the form of criticism of his scientific work (analytical methods and statistical data processing), but also in the form of personal insults and threats to health and even life [63].

Christian Smith, Professor of Sociology and director of the Center for the Study of Religion and Society and the Center for Social Research at the University of Notre Dame, commented on this issue: "Those who are attacking Regnerus cannot admit their true political motives, so their strategy has been to discredit him for conducting "bad science." That is devious. His article is not perfect—no article ever is. But it is no scientifically worse than what is routinely published in sociology journals. Without a doubt, had Regnerus published different findings with the same methodology, nobody would have batted a methodological eye. Furthermore, none of his critics raised methodological concerns about earlier research on the same topic that had greater limitations, which are discussed

in detail in the Regnerus article. *Apparently, weak research that comes to the “right” conclusions is more acceptable than stronger studies that offer heretical results*” [64, emphasis added].

Dr. Lawrence Mayer and Dr. Paul McHugh, who published a comprehensive review of scientific research entitled “Sexuality and Gender: Findings from the Biological, Psychological, and Social Sciences” in the journal “New Atlantis”, came under heavy pressure from the “LGBT” movement [65]. In their work, the authors very gently and carefully showed the groundlessness of the rhetoric of the homosexual movement regarding the cause of homosexual attraction, concluding that “The understanding of sexual orientation as an innate, biologically fixed property of human beings – the idea that people are “born that way” – is not supported by scientific evidence” [66, p. 7].

Dr. Quentin van Meter, a colleague of Dr. Mayer and Dr. McHugh at Johns Hopkins University, said that initially they [Mayer and McHugh] planned to publish their article in any of the major peer-reviewed specialized scientific journals, but the editors refused them again and again, stating that the work is “politically incorrect” [67].

The article by Dr. Mayer and Dr. McHugh was immediately subjected to fierce attacks from LGBT activists. Human Rights Campaign (HRC) – an organization, which, according to its webpage, is the largest representative of LGBT with an annual budget of about \$50 million, published their statement on the work of Meyer and McHugh, saying that these authors were “misleading” and that the “report’s falsehoods attack the entire LGBTQ community”, etc [68]. Activists began to put pressure on the editors of “The New Atlantis”, demanding to discredit the article. Moreover, HRC activists appealed to the administration of Johns Hopkins University, where Mayer and McHugh worked, demanding to punish them and publicly disavow their findings. Otherwise, they threatened to affect the institution’s ratings. The editors of “The New Atlantis” published an official response to the allegations of HRC, called “Lies and Bullying from the Human Rights Campaign”, in which they commented on some of the most odious attacks. “This blatant effort to intimidate Johns Hopkins University by insisting that the entire university must answer collectively for everything written by its faculty is a *disturbing strategy designed to make impossible respectful disagreement in the academy on controversial matters*. The HRC’s claim that its efforts “pose no threat to academic freedom” is nonsense; intimidation tactics of this sort undermine the atmosphere of free and open inquiry that universities are meant to foster.” [69, emphasis added].

Similar pressure from LGBT activists is related to the publication of Dr. Lisa Littman, an assistant professor of behavioral and social sciences at Brown University. Dr. Littman studied the reasons for the surge of “rapid-onset gender dysphoria” among youth and concluded that their sudden drive to transition might spread through peers and may be a harmful coping mechanism [70]. Before declaring themselves transgenders, teenagers watched videos about transition, communicated with transgender people on social networks and read transgender resources. Also, many were friends with one or more transgender people. A third of the respondents reported that if there was at least one transgender teenager in their circle of communication, more than half of the adolescents in this group also began to identify themselves as transgender people. A group in which 50% of its members become transgender people is an indicator 70 times higher than the expected prevalence of the phenomenon among young people. In addition, it turned out that, before the onset of gender dysphoria, 62% of respondents had one or more diagnoses of mental disorder or neurodevelopmental disorders. And in 48% of cases, respondents experienced a traumatic or stressful event before the onset of “gender dysphoria”, including bullying, sexual abuse or parental divorce. Dr. Littman suggested that social and peer contagion play a significant role in the causes of gender identity disorder. The first is a “spread of affect or behaviors through a population” [71]. The second is “the process where an individual and peer mutually influence each other in a way that promotes emotions and behaviors that can potentially undermine their own development or harm others” [72]. The results of the study were even placed on Brown University webpage. But again, this publication was met with accusations of “transphobia” and demands for censorship. The university administration readily caved in and quickly removed the research article from its own site. According to the dean, the community activists of the University were “expressing concerns that the conclusions of the study could be used to discredit efforts to support transgender youth and invalidate the perspectives of members of the transgender community” [73].

Professor Jeffrey S. Flier, former dean of Harvard Medical School, commented on this issue: “In all my years in academia, I have never once seen a comparable reaction from a journal within days of publishing a paper that the journal already had subjected to peer review, accepted and published. One can only assume that the response was in

large measure due to the intense lobbying the journal received, and the threat — whether stated or unstated — that more social-media backlash would rain down upon PLOS One if action were not taken.” [74]. Prof. Kenneth Zucker of the University of Toronto is a former Head of the former (closed in December 2015) Child Youth and Family Gender Identity Clinic at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH).

Prof. Zucker has published an impressive list of works in the field of gender identity disorders, he served on workgroups for the DSM-IV and the DSM-IV-TR, and headed the American Psychiatric Association workgroup on "Sexual and Gender Identity Disorders" for the DSM-5. Prof. Zucker is in no way LGBT-sceptical, and it was under his chairing, that American Psychiatric Association “updated” the diagnosis of “gender identity disorder” into “gender dysphoria,” dropping, to the pleasure of LGBT advocates, the word “disorder.” [75].

Anyway, at the former Gender Identity Clinic, Prof. Zucker was working with patients between ages 3 and 18, contrary to favored mainstream principles of “gender-affirmative” paediatric services, that is to “help” the social “transition” of such children — express their preferred gender to others through their name changes, clothes, behaviour and other means — until they reach the legally permitted age to start interventional “transition”, e.g. taking hormones and undergo surgical intervention. Instead, Dr. Zucker believed that at that young age gender identification is quite malleable and gender dysphoria will likely disappear with time [76]. This was contrary to LGBT ideology and the activity of Dr. Zucker was since long time under pressure from LGBT activists. In spite of the acknowledged existence of various treatment models of gender identity disorder [77], the administration of Centre for Addiction and Mental Health decided to launch an external review of the activity of Dr. Zucker [75]. Two reviewers wrote in their report “in the course of this review, two predominant themes emerged as areas of concern for the reviewers: firstly, the GIC appears to operate as an insular entity within CAMH and the community at large, and secondly, the GIC appears to be out of step with current clinical and operational practices. The feedback to the reviewers reflected the very polarized views in this field, indicating that client and community stakeholder feedback was both positive and negative regarding the clinic. Some former clients were very satisfied with the service they received while others felt the assessment approach was uncomfortable, upsetting and unhelpful. The professional community recognized the academic contributions of the clinic while some community stakeholders voiced concerns with regard to the present model of care.” [78, emphasis added]. The reviewers also invited unidentified stakeholders to comment on their experiences in the clinic, and one of them claimed that Dr. Zucker “asked him to remove his shirt in front of other clinicians present, laughed when he complied, and then referred to him as a ‘hairy little vermin’ [79]. Dr. Zucker was fired immediately (the clinic’s second full-time staffer Dr. Hayley Wood was laid off earlier), so the Gender Identity Clinic was shut down. Well, the fact that “some community stakeholders voiced concerns” (despite the fact that the practices of Gender Identity Clinic were academically acknowledged) and an unconfirmed accusation in unethical referral — by the way subsequently retracted by the accuser [80] — was sufficient to apply censorship.

Dr. Robert Oscar Lopez from California State University, who himself was raised by a lesbian partnership and identifies as bisexual, published in 2012 an essay "Growing Up With Two Moms: The Untold Children’s View", telling his dramatically unpleasant experiences of being raised by a couple of two women, which turned him subsequently into a strong LGBT-sceptical in the issues of gay marriage and children adoption. This resulted in an immediate backlash in blogs, with some calling it “hate speech” [81]. Lopez continued writing in the same discourse, which landed him in “hate speech” lists of LGBT advocative organizations like Human Rights Campaign [82] and GLAAD [83].

Any LGBT-sceptical expression of opinion is immediately labelled as hate. As another person raised in a homosexual couple, Heather Barwick, wrote in an open letter to gay community: “Many of us are too scared to speak up and tell you about our hurt and pain, because for whatever reason it feels like you’re not listening. That you don’t want to hear. If we say we are hurting because we were raised by same-sex parents, we are either ignored or labeled a hater.” [84]. Brandi Walton, person with similar history has written in her open letter: “... I would never align myself to a community as intolerant and self-absorbed as the LGBT community, a community that demands tolerance with fervor and passion, yet does not give it in return, even to its own members at times. In fact, this community attacks anyone who does not agree with them, no matter how lovingly any difference of opinion is expressed” [85].

IDEOLOGICAL DISTORTION OF SCIENCE

Scientists and all related people should always try to keep science outside cultural and political continuum. Science, as an eternal and depersonified striving to search for a knowledge of the world around us, decides what is “right” on the basis of the evidence, not on “concerns voiced by some community stakeholders”. If there is no such evidence or they are contradictory, then we can talk only about theories and hypotheses. Science should be universal, that is applying the same criteria for interpretation of the experiments and research. No ideal publication exists, every scientific work has its own limitations and flaws. However, if a limitation is identified in a research or publication, which provides LGBT-sceptical results, and this limitation pushes away the definitive conclusions, then the similar limitation, identified in a research or publication, which provides LGBT-advocative results in absolutely similar way pushes away the definitive conclusions. For instance, plenty of methodological limitations were shown in famous LGBT-advocative works by Alfred Kinsey [86-88] and Evelyn Hooker [89-91]. However, these works are considered as those containing definite and established scientific facts, which were used for crucial socio-political and scientific-administrative decisions. At the same time, any limitation in a LGBT-sceptical publications effectively nullifies it and turns into “pseudoscience”. Otherwise this is a classical example of the Mote and the Beam (Matthew 7:1-5).

Dr. Loren D. Marks from the Louisiana State University published a review of 59 papers [92] in 2012 that had been published on the children of same-sex parents and has since been used as a background for the positive statement of same-sex parenting by the American Psychological Association [93], showing plenty of limitations of those papers. The review of Dr. Marks was not only ignored by mainstream scientific organizations, but also called “a lowbrow meta-analysis of studies” that was “inappropriate for a journal that publishes original quantitative research” [94].

In many ways, as shown above, the researchers reasonably fear and avoid to disclose LGBT-sceptical results and even work in such “tabooed” directions. For instance, the former president of the American Psychological Association (1979–1980), Dr. Nicholas Cummings believes that social science is in decline, since it has established the dictatorship of social activists. Dr. Cummings stated that when the American Psychological Association does conduct research they only do so “when they know what the outcome is going to be...only research with predictably favorable outcomes is permissible” [95].

Another former president of the American Psychological Association (1985–86), Dr. Robert Perloff denounced the organization as “too politically” correct and beholden to special interests” [96]. Clevenger already in 2003 in his work described the systemic bias associated with the publication of articles on the topic of homosexuality [97]. He showed that there is an institutionalized bias that prevents the publication of any article that does not correspond to a certain political and ideological understanding of homosexuality.

Clevenger also concludes that the American Psychological Association, like other professional organizations, is becoming increasingly politicized, which leads to doubts about the veracity of their statements and the impartiality of their activities, although they are still high authority and used in judicial and legal matters. Issues of researchers who contradict liberal doctrine are drowned and marginalized. But any LGBT-advocative information is momentarily spread in news media and across Academia.

Consider, for example, a 2014 study with the sound title “When contact changes minds: An experiment on transmission of support for gay equality”, in which Michael LaCour from Los Angeles studied the answers of ordinary people to a question about attitudes towards legalization of gay marriage depending on the sexual orientation identification of the interviewers [98]. LaCour claimed that when the interviewer presented to be homosexual, this significantly increased the likelihood of affirmative answer. The results again spread through the mainstream media headlines. LaCour became almost a star. However, it can be said that his own boastfulness ruined him when an accidentally interested reader revealed that LaCour had completely falsified data in his study [99]. LaCour's publication was retracted [100], but again, this news did not spread in mass media.

The journalist Naomi Riley described the case of Mark Hatzenbuehler [101]. In 2014, Mark Hatzenbuehler, a professor at Columbia University, stated that he found that homosexuals who lived in places with a high level of “prejudice” had a 12 years lower life expectancy than those living in “liberal” areas. Naturally, the news about Hatzenbuehler's research has spread through the headlines of mainstream media, and supporters of the marginalization of non-accepting homosexuality as a norm have received a “scientific” argument. However, these same media outlets were almost silent when in a publication in the journal “Social Science and Medicine” the

aforementioned researcher Dr. Mark Regnerus, scrupulously tried to replicate Hatzenbuehler's results by ten different statistical methods, but none of the methods showed statistically significant results [102].

Indeed, nowadays a real “crisis of replicability” in the social sciences has occurred. In 2015, a large research Reproducibility Project, headed by Dr. Brian A. Nosek from the University of Virginia, was tasked with replicating the results of 100 published psychological studies - only the results of one third of them were reproducible [103].

The editor-in-chief of the scientific journal *The Lancet*, Richard Horton, expressed his concern, “The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a turn towards darkness. As one participant put it, “poor methods get results”. The Academy of Medical Sciences, Medical Research Council, and Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council have now put their reputational weight behind an investigation into these questionable research practices. The apparent endemicity of bad research behaviour is alarming. In their quest for telling a compelling story, scientists too often sculpt data to fit their preferred theory of the world. Or they retrofit hypotheses to fit their data. Journal editors deserve their fair share of criticism too. We aid and abet the worst behaviours. Our acquiescence to the impact factor fuels an unhealthy competition to win a place in a select few journals. Our love of “significance” pollutes the literature with many a statistical fairy-tale. We reject important confirmations” [104].

Back to the case of Regnerus and Hatzenbuehler: The difference between the media attitude to the publications of Regnerus and Hatzenbuehler is obvious: just some conclusions are more acceptable than others. Professor Walter R. Schumm of the Kansas State University noticed in his analysis of the citations of the studies of same-sex parenting: “Results here suggest that, even when outcomes are from the same samples by the same authors at the same time in even the same journals, the more supportive results are more likely to become well-known in the field. Remarkably, this apparent bias is not of a simple garden-variety type in which perhaps progressive scholars would cite articles in their favor and conservative scholars would cite articles on their side. It appears that almost no one cites articles unfavorable to a progressive stance... To the extent that scholars realize that articles supportive of gay rights will be cited much more frequently than nonsupportive articles, there will be pressure to publish supportive results rather than nonsupportive results” [105, p. 378].

In 2006, Dr. Brian P. Meier from the Gettysburg College commented on the media effect of the publication by Adams, Wright and Lohr, who hypothesized that “homophobia” indicates “latent homosexuality” [106]: “However, we do note that no one has published a direct or conceptual replication of this effect with any type of task or instrument designed to measure unconscious forms of sexual attraction. This absence is particularly puzzling given the attention generated by the article. We find it interesting that many diverse sources of information (e.g., journal articles, books, and countless websites) appear to accept this finding as support for a psychodynamic explanation of homophobia, *even in the absence of follow-up empirical research*” [107, p. 378, emphasis added].

In 1996 Dr. Alan D. Sokal professor of physics from the New York University submitted an article entitled “Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity” to an academic journal “*Social Text*”. The editors of “*Social Text*” decided to publish this article [108]. This was an experiment – the article was a total hoax – in this article, Sokal, discussing some of the current problems of mathematics and physics, transfers, in an absolutely ironic way, their implications in the sphere of culture, philosophy and politics (e.g. it proposed that quantum gravity is a social construct) in order to attract the attention of modern academic commentators who question the objectivity of science, this was a skillfully written parody of modern philosophical interdisciplinary research and was devoid of any physical meaning [109]. As Sokal explained: “For some years I've been troubled by an apparent decline in the standards of intellectual rigor in certain precincts of the American academic humanities. But I'm a mere physicist: if I find myself unable to make head or tail of *jouissance* and *différance*, perhaps that just reflects my own inadequacy. So, to test the prevailing intellectual standards, I decided to try a modest (though admittedly uncontrolled) experiment: Would a leading North American journal of cultural studies -- whose editorial collective includes such luminaries as Fredric Jameson and Andrew Ross -- publish an article liberally salted with nonsense if (a) it sounded good and (b) it flattered the editors' ideological preconceptions? The answer, unfortunately, is yes.” [109].

Another confirmation of the deplorable state of modern science was presented by three American scientists – Dr. James A. Lindsay, Dr. Peter Boghossian and Dr. Helen Pluckrose, who for a whole year deliberately wrote completely meaningless and even frankly absurd “scientific” articles in various fields of social sciences to prove: ideology in this field long prevailed over common sense. “We undertook this project to study, understand, and expose the reality of grievance studies, which is corrupting academic research. Because open, good-faith conversation around topics of identity such as gender, race, and sexuality (and the scholarship that works with them) is nearly impossible, our aim has been to reboot these conversations. We hope this will give people – especially those who believe in liberalism, progress, modernity, open inquiry, and social justice – a clear reason to look at the identitarian madness coming out of the academic and activist left and say, “No, I will not go along with that. You do not speak for me” [110].

Since August 2017, scientists under fictitious names have sent 20 fabricated articles to respected and peer-reviewed scientific journals, designed as ordinary scientific research. Subjects of work varied, but all of them were devoted to various manifestations of the struggle with “social injustice”: studies of feminism, culture of masculinity, issues of racial theory, sexual orientation, body positive and so on. In each article, some radical skeptical theory was put forward, condemning this or that “social construct” (for example, gender roles). From a scientific point of view, the articles were frankly absurd and did not withstand any criticism. For instance, they wrote a paper that men need to be trained like dogs to prevent a culture of violence, or a study with a statement that when a man secretly masturbates, thinking about a woman (without her consent, and she will never know about it), he does commit sexual violence against her, or a study with a recommendation for men to anally penetrate themselves to reduce the hostility against transsexualists and so on and on. But what is frightening and shocking that almost half of the papers were accepted and published and most of remaining were in peer-review process by the time this story went on public.

AD HOMINEM CIRCUMSTANTIAE

American philosopher and writer, who lived in a same-sex partnership and identifies herself as “transgender”, Camille Paglia, Professor of Humanities at the University of the Arts in Philadelphia Camille Paglia noted already in 1994: “We should be aware of the potentially pernicious intermingling of gay activism with science, which produces more propaganda than truth. Gay scientists must be scientists first, gays second” [111, p. 91]. This note is to some extent remarkable. It seems to me that this what strongly influences research results is not the scientific observations and, but the transformation of the ideological and social attitudes of scientists. In my opinion, unfortunately, many of those who study homosexuality are clearly aimed at certain results. Researchers who distribute LGBT-sceptical results are often criticized on the principle of “ad hominem circumstantiae”. For example, the fact that a scientist is a believer or supports political parties with conservative views, that the article is published in a “non- mainstream” or non-peer-reviewed journal, etc. At the same time, any attempts to expand this argument by 180 degrees are instantly muffled by accusations of profanation, the absence of “political correctness”, “homophobia” and even the spread of hatred.

Consider the following. Dr. Alfred Kinsey – “the father of sexual revolution in the United States” – was bisexual [112, p. 48] and had sex with other males, including his student and coauthor Clyde Martin [113, p. 59]. Dr. Evelyn Hooker started her famous research being urged by her friend Sam From and other gays [114, pp. 251-253] and her very first report on this issue was published in gay magazine «Mattachine Review» [115]. Dr. John Spiegel, the President-elect of the American Psychiatric Association in 1973 and persistent LGBT advocate was a closeted gay (and member of the so called “GayPA”) [116], along with other colleagues, who contributed to the declassification of homosexuality as sexual deviation: Ronald Gold [117], Howard Brown [118], Charles Silverstein [119], John Gonsiorek [120], and Richard Green [121]. Dr. George Weinberg, who put in use the erroneous term “homophobia” having gay friends, was a devoted LGBT advocate [122]. Dr. Donald West, who formulated that “homophobes” may be “latent homosexuals”, is gay himself [123]. Dr. Gregory Herek, who studied “homophobia” and conceptualized the definition of “hate crimes” is gay himself [124]. The authors of the main studies, which are interpreted as a confirmation of the biological origin of homosexuality are gays: Dr. Simon LeVay (“the hypothalamus study”) [125], Dr. Richard Pillard (“the gay twins study”) [126], and Dr. Dean Hamer (“the gay gene study”) [127]. Dr. Bruce Bagemihl who published a book arguing that homosexuality is widespread and normal across the animals and “implications for humans are enormous”, is gay himself [128]. In the report of the American Psychological Association on SOCE, the conclusion that “efforts to change sexual orientation are unlikely to be

successful and involve some risk of harm, contrary to the claims of SOCE practitioners and advocates” [129, p. V] was drawn out by a Task Force of seven members, of whom Judith M. Glassgold, Jack Drescher, Beverly Greene, Lee Beckstead, Clinton W. Anderson were gays themselves, and Robin Lin Miller is bisexual [130]. The author of another report of the American Psychological Association on children raised by gay couples, which concluded that “Not a single study has found children of lesbian or gay parents to be disadvantaged in any significant respect relative to children of heterosexual parents” [131, p. 15] Professor Charlotte J. Patterson from the University of Virginia, is the past-President of the Society for Psychological Research on Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Issues — Division 44 of the American Psychological Association and invited faculty guest at the LGBT Health Graduate Certificate Program at Columbian College of Arts and Sciences [132]. Dr. Clinton Anderson, whom Dr. Patterson thanked for “invaluable assistance” with the manuscript [131, p. 22] is gay (see above). Among the other seven persons, whom Dr. Patterson thanked for “helpful comments”, Dr. Natalie S. Eldridge is lesbian [133, p. 13], Dr. Lawrence A. (Larry) Kurdek was gay [134], Dr. April Martin is lesbian [135] and “a pioneer in advocating for nontraditional sexualities and alternative family constellations” [136]. And in earlier version of the report [137] Dr. Patterson also thanked Dr. Bianca Cody Murphy, who is lesbian [138].

I will stop this analysis of LGBT-advocative researchers here because this is not the purpose of this paper. I personally consider that *Ad hominem circumstantiae* is a wrong and harmful principle for the science, this should be avoided at any cost.

Moreover, there are gay scientists who deliver LGBT-sceptical results: consider for instance Dr. Emily Drabant Conley, a lesbian neuroscientist from genomics company 23andme [139] who presented the results of a large genome-wide association study of sexual orientation at the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Human Genetics in 2012 finding no linkage of SSA and genes [140]. Although, to my best knowledge and for unknown reasons, these results were not published in a peer-reviewed journal.

But this avoidance of *Ad hominem circumstantiae* applies universally in science. In this case if one says A, they should say B. It is hypocritical to discredit certain publications on the grounds of political views or spiritual beliefs of the researchers, because the publication is in a journal issued by Catholic Medical Association or because a funding from the Weatherspoon Institute is in the background, and at the same ignore the things I provided above on LGBT-advocative researchers. Otherwise, ideally, no *Ad hominem* issues should be used when interpreting any findings.

CONCLUSIONS

Of course, to a certain extent the title of this paper is somewhat provocative. Science itself cannot be divided into politically “correct” and “incorrect”, fashionable and conservative, democratic and republican. Science per se cannot be politically gay or politically straight. Scientific processes – psychophysiological phenomena and reactions, viruses and bacteria – are absolutely indifferent to the political views of the scientist who studies them, bacteria know nothing about “cultural wars”. These are facts, which exist as a given thing, they can only be ignored or those, who mention them, can be persecuted, but it is impossible to knock them out of reality. Science is based on the scientific method, everyone who transforms science into something else, whatever goals they are guided by – humanism, ideology and politics, social justice and social engineering, etc. – are the real preachers of “pseudoscience.” However, the Academia, like any other community of individuals having their own personal convictions and aspirations, is subject to bias. And this bias is indeed strongly expressed. One could mention many factors as the reason for this bias – dramatic social and historical legacy which led to the emergence of “scientific taboos”, intense political struggle that gave rise to hypocrisy, “commercialization” of science, leading to the pursuit of sensations, etc. Naturally, the problem of bias in science is not limited only to a bias on judging on LGBT advocacy and scepticism, but involves many other issues that are often crucial and important for the development of Mankind. Whether it is possible to completely avoid bias in science remains a controversial issue. However, in my opinion, it is possible to create conditions for an optimal equidistant scientific process. One of these conditions is the absolute independence of the scientific community – financial, political and, last but not least, freedom from the media agenda.

REFERENCES

PDF: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332679880>