Newsweek Hit Piece Attacks and Slanders Me Because of My Question to Pete Buttigieg!



I'm not whining about *Newsweek*, just wanting to hold their feet to the fire. After all, they did spell my name correctly and pulled a good photo from one of my lectures at the University of North Dakota.

The Newsweek piece, written by Jason Murdock about my article published on numerous websites, was filled with errors. Even the first word of the headline was wrong! It yelled, REPUBLICAN PREACHER RUNS SHOCKING BLOG POST ABOUT PETE BUTTIGIEG, CLAIMS GAY PEOPLE DIE YOUNGER THAN 'NORMAL PEOPLE.' I have not been a Republican in decades

although I admit to voting for Republicans most of the time, but I'm as independent as a hog on ice.

Journalists should try that sometime.

A quick phone call or email from Jason would have kept him from adding to the accelerating charges of fake news. All journalists are taught to verify the facts; maybe Jason was sleeping during that class.

Jason called my article "Pete, Since You Brought it Up, How 'Gay' Are You?" offensive and of course it was. It is impossible to deal with perversion without being offensive; however, if we got into the details, it would be disgusting. The author suggests I was offensive because I mentioned that homosexuals don't live as long as normal people. Well, that may be offensive but it is also a fact. However, most main stream journalists deal in fantasy, falsehood, and fiction—not facts. They have an agenda that must be disseminated without regard for reality.

Homosexuals die about 20 years earlier than normal people because their lifestyle is actually a deathstyle. The human body was not made to endure violent attacks—their use of illegal drugs; their autoerotic playtime; their bondage and sadomasochism; their fisting; ad nauseam—all shorten lives. After all, if eating fried foods will shorten your life, living the dangerous, diseased, and depraved life that many homosexuals live will kill quicker than friend chicken.

The hit piece charged:

"The former lawmaker said it was his right as a voter to ask 'how gay Pete is' and if his medical records would be made public. Boys, asserting that 'homosexuals are notoriously promiscuous,' made a series of baseless claims and suggested Buttigieg should address them."

It is interesting but common that Newsweek did not list any baseless claims and they rejected my welldocumented charges knowing few readers would discover their deception. And, yes a politician has an obligation to answer questions, but then maybe Pete has been given a No Obligation to Answer card. That isn't surprising since homosexuals have demanded and received numerous special rights from cowardly judges, legislators, college presidents, media personalities, and Hollywood.

The word claims suggest that my assertion about the promiscuity of homosexuals is not true when everyone with an I.Q. equivalent to his ring-size knows it is true. It's like saying some people claim the earth is round.

The hit piece suggested that homosexual promiscuity is dubious, so let me be clear: no honest, informed, and sane person disagrees, debates, or even sees a need to discuss the issue—homosexuals change partners as often as they change socks—almost.

A 2006 study of 2,294 homosexuals in the homosexual magazine The Advocate reported that 248 men admitted to having more than 300 sexual partners with fewer partners for the others.

The classic Bell and Weinberg study produced with the help of the American National Institute of Mental Health, consisted of about 1100 men. That pre-AIDS report revealed that 83% of the homosexual men in their survey said it was likely they had sex with 50 or more partners in their

lifetime while 43% estimated they had sex with 500 or more partners. But it gets worse because 28% had sex with 1,000 or more partners!

Even if they are "married," male homosexuals set aside a "night with the boys." Of course there are exceptions but, let's say it all together now, "Homosexuals are notoriously promiscuous."

However, the Bell et al. study discredited theories "claiming that sexual orientation is caused by family dynamics or trauma." That basically gave support to the "born that way" defense but no informed person believes that anymore.

The above claim that homosexuality is not influenced by family or trauma was shot down by Neil E.
Whitehead in the Journal of Human Sexuality:

"It is simply a myth that there are no sociological data showing influence on adult sexual orientation."

Jason reproduced major points of my column which added some much needed juice to his article:

"Purporting to cite 'the largest study ever conducted,' he said 23 percent of homosexuals 'participate in golden showers.'"

Jason was careless in his use of purporting. He used the wrong word because I did not purport—claim or assert or allege to cite "the largest study ever conducted" that revealed that 23% of homosexuals "participate in golden showers." I cited the report and received no rebuttal.

He was trying to denigrate the study without dealing with it which is common among desperate people. The Gay Report was done by Karla Jay and Allen Young and involved 4,400 respondents. Homosexuals admitted to their usual vile practices, and homosexual leaders have been criticizing it from its publication. What critics never reveal is that both Jay and Young were "gay!"

It is much worse today. In a 2006 study of a group of "male S&M practitioners," 47.3% admitted participation in "watersports" according to The Health Hazards of Homosexually.

Since Pete said:

"I'm gay as a... I don't know, think of something really gay, that's how gay I am."

I want to know what he meant. No doubt some homosexuals are rather straight-laced compared to others but just how "gay" is Pete? We know he won't go into details but on a scale of 1 to 10 with 10 being the most degraded, diseased, and dangerous, where is Pete?

Most people expect a national magazine to produce quality work but not this time. Newsweek's source, the Friendly Atheist is so embarrassing it

would make any honest reader run for a barf bag.

My article appeared on May 15, was picked up by Joe.My.God. on the 17th, the Friendly Atheist on May 18, and was critiqued by Newsweek on May 21. Newsweek did not do any original reporting, just some ramblings from the Friendly Atheist and some of my brilliant comments. So, it was not a total loss.

The Friendly Atheist piece gives support to the would-be censors out there who want to eliminate bad writing. The blogger is Hemant Mehta whose claim to fame is "selling his soul on eBay." He titled his blog, "Christian Bigot: Pete Buttigieg Can't Be President Because Gay People Die Young." Hemant is right in calling me a Christian but completely wrong using the B word. Evidently, he is infected with the virus that makes leftists lash out rather than support their position. Accusations are much easier to make than answers and argumentation. Hemant probably doesn't even know he is infected. Tragic.

He then accuses me of declaring that Pete would not be a good president but I never suggested that. Far leftists have a difficult time with reading or comprehending, or with telling the truth.

In response to my demand that Pete release his medical records, Hemant seems to run off the rails. He charged:

"His bigotry isn't worthy of a response, but it should be noted that Donald Trump never released his proper medical records."

However, the president is examined every year and his medical reports are released.

After his embarrassing gaffes, Hemant dug a deeper hole by writing:

"The rest of the article is no better, with Boys arguing that we should know everything about Buttigieg's sex life."

I did not write that we should know everything about Buttigieg's sex life. As a voter, I want to know if his "gay" lifestyle will affect his effectiveness as president.

Hemant continues with his convoluted tirade by charging:

"Boys doesn't bring up how Donald Trump had an affair with a porn star (without protection)"

-although Hemant failed (again) to research the facts. Had he not been so lazy or incompetent, he would have discovered many of my critical articles about Trump. I voted for him because the alternative was Horrific Hillary. Trump's affairs were despicable, deplorable, and dumb (and without protection, super dumb) just as homosexual perversions are disgusting.

Finally, Hemant runs out of steam, takes a deep breath, wipes the foam from his quivering lips, and writes:

"This is conservative Christian 'logic' for you. A gay guy in a monogamous marriage is somehow a threat to family values, but President P****grabber is somehow a man of virtue."

I wrote nothing about Pete's "monogamous marriage" and neither Hemant nor I know if Pete's "marriage" is monogamous or not although many studies do not reflect faithful homosexual "marriages."

The national homosexual magazine, The Advocate reported in 2006 that less than half of homosexual "couples" were monogamous, a fact supported by the Male Couples Study and others.

Moreover, it is a fact that homosexual "marriages" or live-in arrangements last two to three years according to Male and Female Homosexuality, by Saghir and Robins and other studies.

Moreover, I made no reference to family values nor did I refer to Trump being "a man of virtue." I doubt if Trump can spell virtue but he is at least doing what he promised to do, something few presidents have done in a hundred years.

Is Pete travelling in the homosexual fast lane that always comes to a dead end?

Just how "gay' is Pete?

As seen here at <u>Don Boys: Common Sense for Today</u>. Posted here with permission.

Dr. Don Boys is a former member of the Indiana House of Representatives who ran a large Christian school in Indianapolis and wrote columns for USA Today for eight years. Boys wrote 18 books, the most recent being Muslim Invasion: The Fuse is Burning! and is available here. Follow Dr. Boys on Facebook at Don Boys, Ph.D. and TheGodHaters, Twitter, and visit his blog.