

From: Gerard J.M. van den Aardweg Ph.D.
To: chair@psychodrama.org.uk
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2013 11:59 AM
Subject: expulsion Dr. Davidson: protest

Dr. K. Kirk
Executive British Psychodrama Association

Dear Mrs Kirk,

I want to protest against the gravely unjust expulsion of your member Dr. Davidson.

The rationalization your organization(s) present for this injustice is anti-scientific, unethical; and if you think logically, opens the door to more socially destructive and immoral developments.

1. Anti-scientific: Because there is no shred of evidence that people with homosexual tendencies, or paedophile tendencies, or exhibitionistic tendencies, or whatever preferential sexual tendencies there are, and who wish to refrain from enacting their desires or to try to overcome them-- that such persons have "internalized" harmful social or religious taboos and must be regarded as "sick" and irresponsible.

I challenge you to name me only one single investigation, conducted according to the requirements of empirical or experimental research, which would have demonstrated the existence of this "internalization" speculation (fantasy) in homosexually oriented persons averse to acting out or wishing to be helped in the direction to change.

2. Unethical/violation of fundamental human rights: you have no moral or whatever other right or authority to impose your ideological resistance to abstinence- or change-directed homosexuality therapy or guidance.

You/your organization(s) have no right at all to in fact label such therapy/counseling -aspirants as "sick" and impose your "know-better" ideas on them and deny them their freedom of conscience.

I suppose you do not know anymore or forgot the serious abuse under Soviet Communism called "Soviet psychiatry". Dissidents were "diagnosed" by psychiatrists (who betrayed their science and professional duties but obsequiously served the Communist ideology) as "social schizophrenics", i.e., people whose "psychic illness" caused their "insensitivity to the needs of society", so to the Soviet Communist Party line. Under the pretext of that "diagnosis" they were physically and mentally destroyed by the "treatment" they were subjected to in psychiatric clinics.

You are reasoning and acting precisely along the same line. Under the guise of a false, concocted ideological "diagnosis", viz., this "internalization" slogan, you dare label the many homosexually oriented dissidents with respect to the politically predominant gay ideology as "sick", "mentally unable to make choices" regarding the way of life they want to walk and try to prevent them from realizing their choice. Your totalitarian attitude appears from the defamation implicit in your punishing an upright

counsellor such as Dr. Davidson solely for the fact that he does not share your ideology and has good arguments for it; but also from your apparent lack of understanding for and compassion with the needs of the many homosexually oriented (whose predicament Dr. Davidson knows from personal experience) who are left alone by professionals adhering to your ideology.

If your ideological zeal will have more political success, the next step is likely to be, like in the Soviet Union, coercive "treatment" of homosexuals who want to abstain or change, and prison for those who help them or have the courage to spread a politically-non correct alternative view.

Let me be straightforward: are you really ignorant of the vast body of research which shows the self-destructiveness of the gay way of life, medically as well as psychologically (the many SDTs also apart from HIV, internal diseases, psychosomatic afflictions, substance abuse, alcoholism; extraordinary promiscuity, depressions, pathological fears, enhanced suicidal tendencies; and as to homosexual relationships, substantially enhanced domestic violence, jealousy, endless partner shifts, inherent "unfaithfulness")?

Do you realize you are co-guilty of the destruction of many lives by your attempts to outlaw constructive help and depict as "sick" those who do not want to lead such a destructive life, among them the by no means rare person who doesn't want it anymore because he has had his fill of it?

Are these "dissidents" sick, or are you wilfully blind?

3. You are also co-guilty of opening the door to further pernicious developments:

Take the case of the homosexual or heterosexual paedophile. As you can know, minimally about 20% of active male homosexuals upon occasion have or try to have sex with a minor (in general, an adolescent), the strictly paedophile person is directed to children up to the onset of puberty.

Now the homosexual emancipation movement has always been and still is, sometimes less, at other times more manifestly striving for paedophile emancipation (publications abound).

Thus when you denounce people who help non-paedophile homosexuals who want to abstain/change you cannot at the same time promote abstinence/change-directed guidance or therapies of paedophiles: the very gay ideology you serve forbids this, and you would "unjustly discriminate" against paedophiles.

Moreover, your imagined "internalization of social condemnation" -- disturbance must necessarily extend to homosexual and other paedophiles who want to abstain/change and their helpers. As you must know that paedophile tendencies are only exceptionally not obsessive, this means that you will actively promote child sexual abuse as well as you are doing now in the many cases of homosexual men interested in adolescents.

It is to be hoped that at least some within your organization(s) can see the distinction between "science" and "scientism" (or, vulgarly, "junk science").

Gerard J.M. van den Aardweg Ph.D.
The Netherlands

(Author of many articles and several books on the psychogenesis of homosexuality)