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See the 1993 report, “Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth: Breaking the Silence in Schools and in Families” here (and an earlier version here).

In early 1993, Kevin Jennings¹ – Obama’s “Safe Schools Czar” from 2009 to 2011 – authored the Education Committee report for the revolutionary Massachusetts “Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth.” Titled Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth: Breaking the Silence in Schools and in Families,² it was the template for the “Safe Schools” programs in the Massachusetts Department of Education.

The ideas Jennings crystallized in this report provided the seeds for expansion of his organization GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network) on the national level. The report also served as a model for other states’ programs.³ Now, Jennings has carried its ideas to the federal Department of Education, Office of Safe & Drug Free Schools. Given its historical significance, his 1993 report deserves scrutiny.
Jennings admitted his manipulative approach in a 1995 speech to fellow GLBT activists, explaining that he and the Governor’s Commission “framed the issue” as one of “student safety.” That way, no one could object to the homosexual and transgender indoctrination the activists planned to push in the schools. Whoever opposed their efforts could be accused of heartless disregard for students! Jennings said in that speech:

If the Radical Right can succeed in portraying us as preying on children, we will lose. Their language — “promoting homosexuality” — is laced with subtle and not-so-subtle innuendo that we are “after their kids.” We must learn from the abortion struggle, where the clever claiming of the term “pro-life” allowed those who opposed abortion on demand to frame the issue to their advantage, to make sure that we do not allow ourselves to be painted into a corner before the debate even begins.

In Massachusetts the effective reframing of this issue was the key to the success of the Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth. We immediately seized upon the opponent’s calling card — safety -- and explained how homophobia represents a threat to students’ safety by creating a climate where violence, name-calling, health problems, and suicide are common. Titled our report “Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth,” we automatically threw our opponents onto the defensive and stole their best line of attack. This framing short-circuited their arguments and left them back-peddaling from day one.

Finding the effective frame for your community is the key to victory. It must be linked to universal values that everyone in the community has in common. In Massachusetts, no one could speak up against our frame and say, “Why, yes, I do think students should kill themselves”: this allowed us to set the terms for debate.

In Massachusetts, we made creating an environment where youth could speak out our number one priority. We know that, confronted with real-life stories of youth who had suffered from homophobia, our opponents would have to attack people who had already been victimized once, which put them in a bully position from which it would be hard to emerge looking good. More importantly, we made sure these youth met with elected officials so that, the next time these officials had to vote on something, there would be a specific face and story attached to the issue. (Emphasis added.)

Already in 1993, Jennings was employing the “bullying” accusation as an intimidation tool.
The Commission on Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual & Transgender Youth describes Jennings’ report on its website:

The Commission’s groundbreaking Education report presents compelling evidence of the need for change in the school environment regarding GLBT youth issues. Focusing on testimony by gay and lesbian teenagers, members of their families, and school personnel at Commission sponsored public hearings, as well as national studies and professional articles, this report outlines existing problems and makes recommendations on how to address them.6

Background on the Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth

Kevin Jennings was appointed “Safe Schools Czar” in the U.S. Department of Education in May 2009 largely on his record as founder and long-time director of the organization GLSEN,7 the Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network. (His fundraising for Obama among GLBT activists surely helped.) Jennings had co-founded GLSEN (originally GLSTN,9 an activist teachers’ network) in 1990 in Massachusetts while he was teaching history at the elite private school, Concord Academy. In 1992, homosexual radical David LaFontaine10 asked him to join the newly established Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth as co-chair of its Education Committee. It was in that role that Jennings became the primary author of the report, Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth.

Liberal Republican Governor William Weld had a debt to repay to the homosexual activists who had helped him win a close race against a socially conservative Democrat opponent.11 One payback was his establishment of the Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth, and naming LaFontaine as its Chairman.

LaFontaine was the leader of the Massachusetts Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Civil Rights. In 1990, that group allied with the extremist ACT UP (to which Kevin Jennings belonged12) to stage a vulgar, riotous demonstration outside the Cathedral of the Holy Cross in Boston. A mob of 700 angry “homosexual militants pelted newly ordained Catholic priests (and their relatives) with condoms as they left a church induction ceremony.”13 They shouted obscenities and gave the priests and well-wishers the finger. They simulated oral and anal sex, shouting “You say No F***, We say F*** you!”14
Protest at the ordination of priests, Cathedral of the Holy Cross, Boston, June 16, 1990; posted at The History Project. David LaFontaine, later named Director of the Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth, helped organize this protest which included ACT UP. Possibly, Kevin Jennings was in the crowd since he was involved in ACT UP.

ACT UP (the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power) is perhaps most famous as the group that invaded St. Patrick’s Cathedral by the hundreds during Mass in December 1989, screaming, “Stop killing us! Stop killing us! We’re not gonna take it any more! You’re killing us! Stop it! Health care is a right!” Their placards read, “The Cardinal lies to his parishioners,” “Cardinal O’Connor won’t teach safe sex,” and “Stop the murderous AIDS policy.” Demonstrators lay down in the aisles and even smashed a communion wafer at the altar.15

Jennings describes his participation in ACT UP demonstrations outside the White House and U.S. Supreme Court during the 1987 “gay rights” march on Washington. His association with ACT UP was further corroborated by his current “partner” in a GLSEN YouTube video. In 2009, Jennings was publicly thanked for his help with a Harvard University retrospective exhibit entitled, “ACT UP New York: Activism, Art, and the AIDS Crisis, 1987–1993,” indicating he has some standing within the organization.16
Kevin Jennings admits taking part in this 1987 ACT UP demonstration outside the U.S. Supreme Court with his “partner” at the time, Bob Parlin. Both would become founders of GLSEN, members of the revolutionary “Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth,” and design the “Safe Schools” programs in Massachusetts in the early 1990s. (Photo: JEB, Queerly Visible)

Apparently, this network of sexual-radical rabble-rousers brought Jennings and LaFontaine together.

LaFontaine’s activism didn’t stop at sidewalk riots. He had even been arrested in the State House in 1990 for shouting down a religious leader at a press conference opposing an exhibit of homo-erotic photos by the infamous Robert Mapplethorpe.  

None of that seemed to disqualify LaFontaine in the Governor’s eyes. He went on to mastermind the establishment of the Governor’s Commission (1992), the passage of the students’ “gay rights” bill (1993), and the first Youth Pride parades. (LaFontaine’s infamous ACT UP-style extremism may be the reason his 1996 introductory letter is no longer included in the online Making Schools Safe report, but is included in the earlier version.)
Explicit perversion and sadomasochism? No problem! David LaFontaine (Kevin Jennings’ associate on the Commission for Gay and Lesbian Youth) was arrested in 1990 for his raucous defense of the display of Robert Mapplethorpe’s homoerotic photos in the Massachusetts State House including this photo. (We have reason to believe an even worse photo than this was in the exhibit. See “Self Portrait with Whip” at Christie’s Fine Art.)

Jennings: A Radical Teacher “Worshipped” by His Students

Kevin Jennings clearly agreed with LaFontaine’s goals and tactics, and so agreed to join the new Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth. Commission Director LaFontaine needed Jennings’ experience as a high school teacher who worked directly with teens, as few others on the Commission could claim that.

Jennings relates in his memoir that the 1987 “gay rights” march on Washington, D.C. (including ACT UP demonstrations) inspired him to become a radical activist in the schools. He realized the power he had over his students, and decided he had to “come out” to them. That, after all, was what the gay rights march had told everyone to do at that first national “coming out” event on October 11, 1987:

In October [1987], Bob [his “partner”] and I set off for Washington to join several hundred thousand of our closest friends in the second national march for equal rights for gay people. It’s trite to say that the experience transformed me, but it did. A half million people turned Washington into an all-gay city that weekend, kidding on the subway, holding hands on the street, defiantly and jubilantly enjoying a freedom they were rarely afforded back home in Alabama and Montana and Utah and Concord, Massachusetts. When the massive throng gathered on Sunday for the march, stretching as far as they eye could see, some contingents waited for hours before even stepping off. The high was indescribable: here we were, marching hundreds of thousands strong past the symbols of our nation. We chanted “Shame! Shame! Shame!” at the White House, a building from which we had gotten only silence and inaction as over forty thousand Americans, mainly from our community, were killed by AIDS by the end of 1987. We chanted “Shame! Shame! Shame!” at the Supreme Court, which had ruled just the year before in Bowers v. Hardwick that laws criminalizing same-sex sexual behavior
were constitutional. In this case, Justice Byron White memorably wrote in the majority opinion that claims of gay activists were “facetious,” and Chief Justice Warren Burger stated in a concurring opinion that to invalidate sodomy laws would be to “cast aside a millennia of moral teaching” that was “firmly rooted in Judeo-Christian moral and ethical standards.” (Huh? I thought we had separation of church and state … gotta revise my lesson plans when I get back to Concord.) … It gave me a new sense of confidence, and I returned to Concord ever more determined to live a life of honesty. …

I grew increasingly frustrated at the lack of opportunities to be honest with my students. … the atmosphere [at Concord Academy] was one that encouraged and valued innovation. But for me, the best part of the job, as always, was being able to be an important figure in so many kids’ lives. Fifty percent of the students were boarders, often living thousands of miles from home, so Concord expected its faculty to take a strong interest in their students outside of the classroom as well as within it.  

Kevin Jennings probably did not exaggerate his rapport and influence with his teenage students. His current “partner,” Jeff Davis, said that when Jennings taught at Concord Academy he was very close to his students, who came to “worship him.” They called him “Kevin.” “He disrespected the entire, like, Mr. Jennings thing that we all had to grow up with. No stories were ever forbidden when he was there.” Davis also described how, after starting GLSEN in 1990 in Massachusetts, Jennings left teaching in 1994 to become its national Executive Director, mesmerizing kids at school speeches around the country. (After all, the subject was sex.)

Jennings’ Authorship of Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth

While Jennings acknowledges working with other activists on the 1993 report in his memoir (Mama’s Boy; Preacher’s Son), his blogger bio on Huffington Post states he was the principal author:

As more and more educators and students began contacting him for help, Kevin saw a need that wasn’t being met and in 1990 founded the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, a local volunteer group in the Boston area bringing together LGBT and straight teachers, parents, students and community members who wanted to end anti-LGBT bias in the state’s K-12 schools. In 1992 Kevin was appointed to co-chair the Education Committee of the Governor’s Commission on Gay & Lesbian Youth by Massachusetts Governor William Weld. He was the principal author of its report Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth, whose recommendations were adopted as policy by the Massachusetts State Board of Education. The Commission led the fight that made Massachusetts the first state in the nation to outlaw discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation against public school students and to establish a statewide program to insure educational equity on issues of sexual orientation in 1993. (Emphasis added.)

Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth was the first of the few publications of the Governor’s Commission. Jennings is named as one of four co-chairs of its Education Committee responsible for that report. The other three co-chairs, however, show no high-profile careers, then or now. One, Al Ferreira, was a high school art teacher in Cambridge (and faculty advisor to his high school’s pioneering gay/straight alliance club, or GSA); one was the student leader of that GSA; the third has no discernible identity (online). The GLSEN-Boston 2000 conference program also confirms that Jennings was the primary author.

In his 2006 book, Jennings claims he joined the Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth to “run its education committee.” From his memoir, Mama’s Boy, Preacher’s Son:

… in the spring of 1992, [Governor William] Weld just decided to appoint one [a Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth] under his own auspices [via Executive Order], and to call it the Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth. David [LaFontaine] was asked to chair it. Having heard about GLSTN [now GLSEN], he was calling me to ask me to run its education committee. It became quickly apparent that many commissioners had little or no knowledge of youth, and that the ones who
did came mainly from social services and knew little about schools. Basically, I was being handed the school portfolio and asked what the governor should recommend.  

While the hearings were underway, a working group of folks from the GLSTN network labored to fashion the commission’s recommendations. We eventually settled on five major items: policies protecting gay and lesbian students from harassment, violence, and discrimination; training for school personnel; school-based support groups; school-based counseling for family members of gay and lesbian students and age-appropriate inclusion of gay and lesbian issues in school curricula. With a clear direction in place, we set about writing the report for the commission, which was to weave together research and student testimony to explain the rationale and urgency behind these recommendations.  

There was only one point of contention. What were we going to call the report? Here I went head-to-head against another commissioner, who came to this work from a background as a family therapist. She insisted that it be called “Breaking the Silence.” It was 1992-93, the height of the AIDS crisis, and the slogan “Silence=Death” was everywhere. [Jennings was a member of the ACT UP group behind it] demonstrating graphically the cost of silence. To me, though, our goal was different. We weren’t asking schools to break the silence: we were asking them to take action and create a better learning climate. Plus, many people had no desire to see gay people break their silence and would much prefer that we remain silent forever. I proposed that we call the report “Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth.” After all, that was what we were seeking to do, and who isn’t in favor of schools being safe? We took our two potential titles to the commission, where my argument carried the day.  

Jennings fails to mention that the report appeared with the alternate title as an italicized subtitle.  

As we sent a draft of the report over to the governor’s office for review, we nervously realized that we had probably gone far beyond our original mandate, which was to study the issue of gay youth suicide. Perhaps the governor would back away from our recommendations, which would mean they were dead on arrival. But we argued that you could only deal with the issue of suicide if you addressed the hostile climate that was its root cause, and the governor’s staff seemed persuaded by the argument.  

The group never did go on to “study the issue of gay youth suicide” (though it got away with claiming, without evidence, that it knew the “root cause”) – and in fact the Safe Schools program never went on to show any evidence they were even having an impact in preventing youth suicides by children who thought they were gay. There was no accountability built into the system.  

Jennings continues:  

Word came back: you can print the report as written, and the governor would publicly endorse four of its five recommendations (policies, training, school-based clubs, and school-based counseling) but would say that curriculum issues should be left up to local school districts to decide. As a teacher, the curriculum loss was a bitter pill, but the sweeping endorsement of the others was far more than I had hoped for. We had the seal of approval from the governor to tell schools that they should incorporate sexual orientation into their policies, they should train their teachers, they should have Gay-Straight Alliances, and they should have counseling that helped families adjust to the fact their kid was gay instead of trying to convince the kid it was just a phase.” In other words, the governor was willing to tell schools to do everything that Concord Academy [where Jennings taught] (of which his wife was an alumna) wouldn’t do of its own volition. The irony was not lost on me.  

When we released the report on February 23, 1993, it was front-page news in the Boston Globe. I was elated and had a copy in my hand in the faculty room, reading the stunningly favorable coverage from the state’s newspaper of record.  

A few weeks later, the state board of education voted unanimously to make the four recommendations backed by the governor the official policy of the state of Massachusetts [though as recommendations only], and a line item was put in the education budget to create a program to implement the new
The program – Safe Schools for Gay and Lesbian Students – would be the first of its kind in the nation. Having no idea how to design such a program, the department of education turned to us for guidance, and a series of meetings ensued that were actually quite comical. Accustomed to drowning in a sea of their own memoranda, the department’s bureaucrats wanted more “process” than the freewheeling GLSTN types did, and one shouted in frustration at a meeting, “We need paper! Paper, paper, paper!” After several fruitless meetings, they realized they had no expertise or ability in this arena and decided to bring my partner, Bob, on to develop and implement the program.

One thing was left. Policies are nice, but laws are better, so we turned our attention to the state legislature [to lobby for the students “gay rights” bill, passed in 1993].

But what “expertise or ability” did the “freewheeling GLSTN” activist Bob have?

Radical GLBT Activists in Charge of Governor’s Commission and DOE “Safe Schools” Program Development

An early GLSTN newsletter (1996) confirms that,

GLSTN was instrumental in the fight that made Massachusetts the first state to ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation against public schools students in December, 1993. In 1994 GLSTN was chosen to develop the faculty training component of the Massachusetts Department of Education’s "Safe Schools for Gay and Lesbian Youth" program, the first state-wide effort to provide comprehensive training to school staffs on the needs of gay and lesbian youth.

As noted, Jennings’ “partner” at this time, Bob Parlin, was “to develop and implement the program.” Parlin has no apparent “expertise” in psychology, counseling, suicide prevention, or program development, though he has quite a resume as a “gay” activist. He was a founding member of GLSTN. Jennings dedicated his first book, Becoming Visible: A Reader in Gay and Lesbian History for High School and College Students, to his mother and to “Bob, who taught me to love.”

Parlin was Vice President of the Board of Directors of GLSEN-Boston in 2000, the year of its “Fistgate” TeachOUT conference. There, he gave a workshop on “integrating GLBT issues in the early elementary years.” Parlin was (and still is) the GSA club advisor and a history teacher at Newton South High School (but apparently also knew how to teach GLBT issues to elementary-school children).
Thus, Governor Weld essentially handed over the Massachusetts schools to a “freewheeling” sodomite couple (Jennings and Parlin) and their GLSEN friends, to do with as they pleased. Since no one in the state education department had any idea how (or why) to design a “safe schools” program, Jennings’ “lover” got to dictate whatever radical ideas came to mind.

Jennings said that many on the Commission had “little or no knowledge of youth.” But they did have connections to the most extreme elements of the “gay rights” movement, including ACT UP, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, the organizers of the 1987 and 1993 “gay rights” marches on Washington, assorted church blasphemers, and a pro-pedophilia “gay” porn publisher.33 (The Commission’s college report, Making Colleges and Universities Safe for Gay and Lesbian Students, even lists ACT UP as a student “resource.”34)

Jennings’ Mindset during Period of 1993 Report: “Angry”

Jennings’ membership in ACT UP in the late 1980’s and 1990’s reveals an angry mindset. According to ACT UP founder, Larry Kramer,35 at this period, “There was a lot of terror and anger by a younger generation who were much more comfortable with their homosexuality.”

Jennings describes his unhappiness and anger while a teacher at Concord Academy. The school’s administration was not as “progressive” on the issue of homosexuality as he wished. He felt he was “mistreated” there, denied his “equal rights,” (i.e., not being allowed to do everything he
wanted to push homosexuality to his students), and he “wasn’t willing to settle for less.” He admits he was “angry”:

… the governor was willing to tell [Massachusetts public] schools to do everything that Concord Academy (of which his wife was an alumna) wouldn’t do of its own volition. The irony was not lost on me. …

With the end of my time at Concord drawing nigh, I thought of how I had changed during my years there. While I had seen the effects of the Gay-Straight Alliance and GLSTN and the governor’s commission and the battles over school policies on others – how it gave them new confidence, gave them a voice – I had missed how these effects had been even greater on me. When I had started at Concord in 1987, I had seen being treated equally as a privilege that, if the school were benevolent, it would grant me and other gay people on the staff and among the student body, and I would have felt enormously grateful for it. But by 1993 I saw it for what it was – a right – and I wasn’t willing to settle for less. Not getting it made me angry which, I had finally come to understand, is the appropriate reaction to being mistreated. But I knew that many in the school saw me as unreasonably and needlessly angry, so (ever the educator) I tried in my final chapel talk to help people understand why they saw only my angry side. …

Standing at the pulpit [in Concord Academy] for the last time, I looked out over the student body assembled in the white clapboard chapel. … I tried witnessing one last time to help them understand what the world looked like from where I sat.

This, most likely, is my last chapel, as my life’s course will soon be taking me out of the Boston area. I decided I would speak to you about an emotion with which I have often been closely associated during my years here. That emotion is anger.

“I know the anger that lies inside me like I know the beat of my heart and the taste of my spit. It is easier to be angry than to hurt. … It is easier to be furious than to be yearning.”

When I first heard these words, written by the black lesbian poet Audre Lorde, I experienced a shock of recognition. Anger is an emotion I experience daily as a gay man in a homophobic society. I don’t know if I need to explain to you why I would be angry as a gay man. But I am angry because in forty-two states you can be fired from your job because you are gay.

I am angry because there are large parts of this country where I cannot live, because there are jobs I will never hold, because there are streets I cannot walk down safely, simply because I am a gay man.

… I yearn to live in a different society from the one we share today. I yearn for the day when it won’t matter that I am gay. I yearn for the day when I can walk down the street with my partner and feel safe. I yearn for the day when I will feel like I really belong. …

I know things can get better, but I know they will only get better if we first get angry at the injustices that still exist…. (Emphasis added.)

**Jennings’ Sources for Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth**

The documentation in Jennings’ report is weak. There is neither proof that there is a problem (an “epidemic of gay youth suicide” and violence), nor reason to believe that his recommendations would help students. But he knew what he wanted to recommend to the Governor and the Department of Education before he wrote the report. He then assembled anecdotal, emotional stories to promote his cause.

The Commission held five public show hearings across the state in the fall of 1992, which “were widely covered by the mainstream print media, by radio, and television.” Youth, parents, teachers, and human service professionals testified about their personal experiences. “The testimony forms the heart of this report.” (Executive Summary, p. 1) Questionnaires were administered at one Massachusetts high school, a handful of community support groups for gay
and lesbian youth, and several “gay/straight alliance” clubs in high schools (which are only reported in part). Youth “voices” were thus used to set the direction for state education policy.

Few specific “scholarly” references appear in the body of the report. The most important source is a discredited 1989 study (by Paul Gibson, for the U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, “Report of the Secretary’s Task Force on Youth Suicide”) claiming that 30% of youth suicides are by gay and lesbian youth, making them “two to three times more likely to attempt suicide than their peers.” (Intro., p. 5. More detail on this study below.) The Gibson report also claimed that “26% of young gays and lesbians are forced to leave homes because of conflicts over their sexual identity and that gay and lesbian youth form [a] large component of the homeless youth population.” (Gov. Weld, Executive Order No. 325 establishing Governor’s Commission.)

Jennings cites a wildly exaggerated 1984 report by the extremist National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, wherein “gay adults” claimed they had experienced high levels of “verbal or physical assaults in secondary school because they were perceived to be gay or lesbian” – without a breakdown of how many of the “assaults” were simply verbal. (p. 9) Another key source is a report by a community-based agency for gay and lesbian youth in New York City, whose clientele would have been the most troubled and/or targeted group possible. (p. 11) One “scholarly” source cited, James Sears, claims that, “8 out of 10 teachers in training harbored anti-gay attitudes. Fully one-third were rated as ‘high-grade homophobes’.” (p. 21) Such activist terminology, which could refer to anyone holding traditional views of morality or marriage, reveals a radical bias.

Sources listed in the bibliography include studies by homosexual radicals and sympathizers, for example: Journal of Homosexuality; The Gay Report – Lesbian[s?] and Gay Men Speak Out about Their Sexual Experiences and Lifestyles; Institute for the Protection of Lesbian and Gay Youth; National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, etc. Those which are not specific to homosexuality nor by homosexual activists (e.g., Hendin, Suicide in America) are not cited in the body of the report. Their inclusion in the bibliography appears a ploy to lend heft to the document.

**The 1993 Education Report, Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth**

_Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth_ confirmed the “broad mandate” of the Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth, as laid out in Governor Weld’s original February 1992 Executive Order. At the swearing-in of the Commission in June 1992:

> Governor Weld urged the Commission to make curbing the high rate of suicide among gay and lesbian youth its top priority.... According to the executive order, the Commission has a broad mandate. Preventing suicide and preventing violence against gay and lesbian youth are its priorities, and it is also charged with working to end all forms of discrimination against youth who are gay or lesbian. (Intro., p. 5)

Yet Jennings claims in his memoir (Mama’s Boy, Preacher’s Son) that the recommendations in his report went beyond the original charge to study gay and lesbian youth suicide. “As we sent a draft of the report over to the governor’s office for review, we nervously realized that we had probably gone far beyond our original mandate, which was to study the issue of gay youth suicide.” Perhaps initial talks with Governor Weld had emphasized the need to simply study the issue of youth suicide. But Weld’s Executive Order (No. 325), dated February 10, 1992 – a whole year prior to the release of Jennings’ report in February 1993 – seems to have included a broader mandate:

WHEREAS, this Administration is committed to protecting the physical, emotional, and psychological health and well-being of all young people in the Commonwealth; and
WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in its 1989 “Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide”, estimates that 30% of completed youth suicides annually are by gay and lesbian youth; and

WHEREAS, the same report states that suicide is the leading cause of death for gay and lesbian youth; and

WHEREAS, the 1989 Report estimates that 26% of young gays and lesbians are forced to leave home because of conflicts over their sexual identity and that gay and lesbian youth form a large component of the homeless youth population; and

WHEREAS, this Administration is committed to abolishing harassment, violence, and discrimination against young people because of their real or perceived sexual orientation; and

WHEREAS, Massachusetts has been and continues to be in the forefront of the national movement to end discrimination and prejudice directed at gays and lesbians; and

WHEREAS, many of the problems facing gay and lesbian youth are within the purview of state government and can be corrected by promulgation of information, training and the implementation and diffusion of formal guidelines and state policy; and

WHEREAS, the health of the Commonwealth is served by strengthening the physical and emotional health of both individuals and their families;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, William F. Weld, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Supreme Executive Magistrate, do hereby create the Governor's Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth and order as follows:

1. The Commission shall consist of at least sixteen (16) members who shall serve without compensation. The Governor shall designate the chair of the Commission. The membership of the Commission shall include at least one parent of a gay or lesbian person; one high school student; one college student; one representative from an educational institution; and one representative of the mental health profession.

2. The Commission shall meet on a quarterly basis with the Secretary of Education, Secretary of Health and Human Services, Public Health Commissioner and the Secretary of Communities and Development or their designees and shall advise the Executive Office of Health and Human Services on an ongoing basis.

3. The Commission shall investigate the utilization of resources from both the public and private sectors to enhance and improve the ability of state agencies to provide services to gay and lesbian youth.

4. The Commission shall report to the Governor and make recommendations to the Governor relating to the concerns of gay and lesbian youth. The report shall be filed with the Governor on or before September 30, 1992.59

So was the mandate just to study the suicide issue, or a much broader charge to “provide services to gay and lesbian youth” and make recommendations for state agencies with the goal of ending discrimination? Jennings’ confusion on this point is typical of material produced by the “freewheeling GLSTN” activists. (Note also that Jennings’ February 1993 report came out five months after the due date stated in Governor Weld’s Executive Order.)

The report begins by “Identifying Problems Faced by Gay and Lesbian Youth in School” (Intro., p. 6 on) in exaggerated language:

At the hearings and through our research, the Commission found that gay and lesbian youth face numerous, often unendurable, obstacles growing up gay or lesbian in this society…. Society at large creates a mythology about gays and lesbians, and virtually denies the existence of gay and lesbian youth. Parents, family, peers, and teachers are generally ignorant of what it means to be gay or
lesbian. Gay and lesbian youth have little chance of talking with a knowledgeable or understanding person concerning his or her gay or her lesbian identity. Overt hostility, in addition to ignorance and silence, surrounds gay and lesbian youth….

Inspired by the testimony of these youth, the Commission has chosen to first focus on schools, where the prevailing unsafe climate denies equal educational opportunity to lesbian and gay youth. Virtually every youth who testified before the Commission cited the need for action to change their school environment. Often the first person experiences these youth related were horrifying – stories of violence, abuse, and harassment, both from peers and adults.

… Massachusetts Public Schools need to abolish abuse, harassment, and violence against these youth. (Emphasis added.)

Parents and families are accused of ignorance and hostility, along with peers and teachers. Jennings implies that laws already on the books against abuse, harassment, and violence are not adequate to protect all children, or ignored only when the victim is gay or lesbian.

Jennings lists these five big problems (Executive Summary, p. 2):

- “Harassment of gay and lesbian students in school”
- “Isolation and Suicide”
- “Drop-Out and Poor School Performance”
- “Gay and Lesbian Youth and Their Need for Adult Role Models”
- “Families of Gay and Lesbian Youth”

The last item identifies the youths’ families as a problem to be dealt with in the schools. The “problem” is that parents are not condoning homosexual “identity” or behavior by their child. – here declared a concern of the school and state. Governor Weld noted that one of his goals was to “help [gay and lesbian students] stay at home and stay at school so they can have healthy and productive lives.” (Statement at swearing-in ceremony for commissioners; emphasis added, Intro., pp. 4-5.) In other words, “prejudice” in families was to blame for gay and lesbian children living on the street. A Commission-related group uses a disturbing quote from Governor Weld – “These kids are our kids.” – as its motto. (“These kids” do not belong to their families, but to the GLBT activists running the “Safe Schools” programs.)

After the “problems” are listed, Jennings gives his five-point “Summary of Recommendations for Schools.” (p. 29) All but the fifth were accepted by Governor Weld and approved by the State Board of Education in 1993 for statewide implementation (but as recommendations, not as law or even regulations):

1. “School policies protecting gay and lesbian students from harassment, violence, and discrimination.”

Jennings starts off with a reminder of gay and lesbian students’ special victim status. Speech codes are suggested: “Schools should adopt and publicize policies which prohibit anti-gay language…. Clear guidelines should be established for dealing with anti-gay epithets and speech.” (p. 31)


Teachers and counselors would be “trained” by groups such as PFLAG and (later) GLSEN. (See more on PFLAG below.) They “should be equipped … to respond to the needs of gay and lesbian students, including protecting them from harassment and violence, and intervening to prevent
suicide and dropping out.” Counselors and teachers would be openly trained to undermine traditional values, and would be free to disrespect the wishes of parents.\(^{41}\) (pp. 32-33)

The infamous GLSEN-Boston conferences (where teachers received “professional development credits”) – including the infamous “Fistgate” – fit this bill. Suicide prevention falls under this recommendation, though is not elaborated on. While teachers and counselors will learn “about health problems of gay and lesbian youth,” only “emotional and physical problems” and suicide are mentioned – nothing on their higher risk for HIV/AIDS, STDs, or drug abuse, or depression due to other causes. (pp. 32-33) Would teachers and counselors be instructed not to share certain information with a child’s parents (if spoken in a school “Safe Zone” or “Safe Space”)?\(^{42}\)

---

3. “School-based support groups for gay and lesbian students” where “students can meet each week and discuss gay and lesbian issues.”

Jennings says, “Students are best supported by other students.... The existence of a gay/straight alliance [GSA] in a school should be widely publicized within the school so that all students know of the group’s existence and purpose. Publicity should take the form of pamphlets, information in student and faculty handbooks, posters and flyers, announcements by teachers, etc.” (p. 34)

Prominent bulletin boards and P.A. system announcements also reach all students, encouraging them to attend or support GSAs. The GSAs in turn lead students to dangerous groups such as PFLAG, BAGLY, BostonGLASS,\(^{43}\) Youth Pride,\(^{44}\) as well as the GLSEN conferences (including the infamous “Fistgate” conference in 2000, and the 2005 GLSEN conference where the Little
Black Book was handed out.\textsuperscript{45} (p. 36) Students are told that what goes on in the GSA meetings and in their discussions with school counselors will remain “confidential.” “Safe Spaces” at schools are now labeled, with help from GLSEN’s Safe Space Campaign.\textsuperscript{46} Parents are kept in the dark.

4. **“Information in school libraries for gay and lesbian adolescents”** including “highly visible displays” and referrals to “groups such as BAGLY (the Boston Alliance of Gay and Lesbian Youth) and PFLAG (Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays).” (p. 36).

[More on these groups below.]

See this description of some of the books\textsuperscript{47} that began to appear in the schools in the mid-1990s, thanks to the recommendations in Jennings’ 1993 report.\textsuperscript{48} As early as the mid-1990s, the Lexington High School library’s gay and lesbian resource shelf (paid for with funds from the new “Safe Schools” program) included “…a book telling how gay men at the opera can socialize with ‘the backs of their trousers discreetly parted so they could experience a little extra pleasure while viewing the spectacle on stage.’”\textsuperscript{49} The American Library Association was more than happy to jump on board, flooding local youth sections with GLBT books.\textsuperscript{50}

Note that these first four recommendations were adopted by the State Board of Education in May 1993 as just that: “recommendations” to school systems. They are not required by law or regulation. The DOE page even uses the wording, “Schools are encouraged to…” i.e., not required, not mandated.\textsuperscript{51} The only law in place is the general non-discrimination law applying to schools, which includes “sexual orientation” as a protected category of persons.

5. **“Curriculum which includes gay and lesbian issues.”** “The classroom is the heart of the school experience. Discussion of gay and lesbian issues, and recognition of the contribution of gay people to history and to modern society, should be integrated into all subject areas and departments in an age-appropriate fashion.”

The suggestions Jennings lists under this fifth heading provided a model for recent laws (and a pending bill) in California requiring curriculum integration of GLBT issues.\textsuperscript{52} While the Massachusetts Governor and State Board of Education did not make this fifth item a statewide recommendation, activist faculty were (and are) incorporating “gay and lesbian issues” in the curriculum throughout Massachusetts. It is left up to local school districts to decide what to include (and none will dare to ban such content), but is not prescribed or even recommended at the state level (as of 2011). The report recommends, “students should be introduced to gay and lesbian culture in a variety of contexts, such as literature, history, the arts, and family life.”\textsuperscript{53} (p. 37) For examples of what Jennings considered “age-appropriate” GLBT subjects, see the section below.

After his recommendations for schools, Jennings lists recommendations for families (p. 38. More on this below.) He then makes recommendations to the Legislature to pass a “gay students rights” bill (p. 45); and to three state agencies: the Department of Education, the Executive Office of Education, and the Massachusetts Commission against Discrimination. (pp. 41-44)

Jennings and his fellow activists moved on to pressure the State Board of Education to implement these recommendations in May 1993.\textsuperscript{54} Then, they pushed hard for the “Gay and Lesbian Students’ Rights Law,” signed into law by Governor Weld in December 1993, which added the phrase “sexual orientation” to the categories of individuals who may not be discriminated against in public schools.\textsuperscript{55}

A Few of Jennings’ 1993 Curriculum Ideas and GSA Activities as Context for His Report
What did Jennings consider “age-appropriate” curriculum and activities at the time he was writing this report? He was concurrently assembling materials for use in high schools and colleges, published in 1994 as Becoming Visible, “a reader in gay and lesbian history.” The owner of Alyson Books, a company specializing in homosexual pornography, had sought out Jennings as just the right person to edit the anthology.\(^55\) (That same publisher produced the infamous “family life” storybooks, Heather Has Two Mommies and Daddy’s Roommate, pushed by GLSEN as early elementary indoctrination tools.)

In one chapter of Becoming Visible, Jennings focuses on Harry Hay and his fight for legalized “gay cruising” (anonymous sex in public places).\(^56\) (Hay was a founder of the “gay rights” movement in the U.S.) Cruising was a “civil rights” cause, Jennings informs high school students. This case study could fall under Jennings’s “gay culture” heading, or possibly the “history of civil rights.”

Since Jennings was lionizing Harry Hay to young students, it is important to note the totality of Hay’s identity. Jeffrey Lord (American Spectator) noted this:

… from a talk [by Hay] at a New York University forum sponsored by a campus gay group in 1983. Said Harry: “Because if the parents and friends of gays are truly friends of gays, they would know from their gay kids that the relationship with an older man is precisely what thirteen, fourteen-, and fifteen-year-old kids need more than anything else in the world.” In short, San Francisco’s beloved Harry Hay was a vigorous and well-known advocate of older men having sex with young boys.\(^57\)

The Zombietime blogger makes an airtight case that Jennings would have known of Hay’s support of NAMBLA at the time he wrote his chapter setting up Hay as a hero for his students. The following photos (at Zombietime.com) document Hay’s NAMBLA connections.\(^58\)

[Zombietime.com:] “First of all, these two photographs were included in the book [The Trouble with Harry Hay, 1990, from which Jennings took material for his 1994 anthology, Becoming Visible], showing Harry Hay’s front and back signs at the 1986 Los Angeles Gay Pride Parade. But the photos were not given without context: accompanying text explained in detail how Hay came to NAMBLA’s defense at the parade, something which (according to the book) became famous as “The Harry Hay Incident.” (Valerie Terrigno was a scandal-rocked politician who was also excluded from the parade, as was NAMBLA.)”
And what did Jennings have in mind for GSA activities? His Concord Academy GSA students (and other GSA groups from Brookline High School and Phillips Academy Andover) travelled with their club advisors to the national Gay Rights March in Washington, D.C. in April 1993. They would join their idol Harry Hay in that march.

What did they see and hear with Jennings as their chaperone? View some videos from the event: here (including Brookline High School GSA students with banner at 3 minutes, topless lesbians on a float, the AIDS quilt, an ACT UP demonstration; the sickeningly blasphemous “Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence”; drag queens singing “God is a lesbian dyke.”); here (AIDS quilt, lesbians painting each others’ breasts); here (includes ACT UP); here (mass commitment ceremony); and a cleaned up report here (ABC News).

The 1993 D.C. march was the first major national event to push “bisexuality” and “transgender rights” alongside “gay rights.” The 1993 platform (no doubt studied in Jennings’ history class) also pushed the notion of “youth” rights, and loosening the sexual age-of-consent laws. Excerpts from the platform:

1. We demand passage of a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender civil rights bill and an end to discrimination by state and federal governments including the military; repeal of all sodomy laws and other laws that criminalize private sexual expression between consenting adults. Passage and implementation of graduated age-of-consent laws.

2. The recognition and legal protection of the whole range of family structures. An end to abuse and exploitation of and discrimination against youth. Full implementation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Health and Human Services Task Force on Youth Suicide (the report Jennings cites in his Making Schools Safe report).... Legalization of same sex marriages.

4. Culturally inclusive Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Studies program; and information on abortion, AIDS/HIV, childcare and sexuality at all levels of education.

5. Unrestricted, safe and affordable alternative insemination. That access to safe and affordable abortion and contraception be available to all people on demand, without restriction and regardless of age.

7. An end to economic injustice in this country and internationally. An end to consideration of gender dysphoria [transgenderism, transsexuality, cross-dressing] as a psychiatric disorder. An end to censorship.

A contemporary report gives some idea of the sights and sounds confronting Jennings and his high school students:

… drag queens blowing kisses, gay men with nipple rings parading in studded leather, "Dykes on Bikes" cruising down the avenues, and bare-breasted lesbians showering each other with lingering kisses.

A review of the April 25 evening newscasts on ABC, CNN and NBC (CBS did not air a newscast that night) indicates that viewers saw a sanitized version that made the gay movement seem largely mainstream and respectable, just as march organizers had hoped.

The speakers at the post-march rally provided a stream of obscenities considered too vulgar for mainstream television. For example, a drag queen duo cracked a joke on stage about the military ban on homosexuals that was aired on C-SPAN. "They're afraid we will be demanding blowjobs in the shower," said one, "when it's blow dryers we want." Later, a master of ceremonies, praising the conspicuously absent Bill Clinton, told the throng, "I think we have a leader who is thinking with his heart and mind, and not just his penis." And at another point, a woman told the crowd that she'd like to "fuck" Hillary Clinton.

… a man dressed in a blonde wig, wearing a skimpy flag costume and high heels parading on stage. A white man French-kissing a black man, and a shot of another man in a black mini-dress singing, "Queers Can Do It in the Army." ...
Andrew Kopkind, an associate editor of the *Nation* who is gay … wrote … “In fact, despite the heat there were the inevitable leather chaps and harnesses, a fist-fuckers section and more bare-breasted lesbians. And a fair amount of drags sashayed down the avenues in high heels. But for the first time in the history of gay gala events, the media averted their eyes.”

… a master of ceremonies talking about "crotch politics," and a self-described "big dyke" comedienne who faked an orgasm on stage….

[A Queer Nation spokesman said] even groups like Queer Nation and ACT UP [to which Jennings belonged] made a conscious effort to dress inoffensively for the march. (Emphasis added)

A “gay marriage” website characterized the 1993 March:

The interconnectedness of all social justice was a major theme in 1993. The stated demands condemned “racism and sexism, class bias, economic injustice and religious intolerance” as well as homophobia. The board of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People gave the march a full endorsement, which created the first direct tie between the gay rights and civil rights movements. It was also the first time that the event's title acknowledged the role of bisexuals in gay rights activism.

The “B” and “T” were officially added to the GLBT allied movement in 1993. Bisexuals and transgenders (including transsexuals) were given a platform for their mind- and body-bending demands. One speaker was a transsexual (“male-to-female”) attorney who told of the oppression married men face after sex-change operations.

This radical march took place only two months after Jennings had released his 1993 Education Report, *Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth*, and provides the context in which it should be read. Jennings surely viewed it as a perfectly appropriate field trip for his high school students. And he got the Massachusetts government to agree.

**Radical Assumptions in Jennings’ 1993 Education Report**
It is telling that Jennings quibbled with another commissioner over how to title the report. (See *Mama’s Boy* excerpt above.) Should it be Jennings’ choice, *Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth*? Or the other commissioner’s choice, *Breaking the Silence in Schools and Families* (a nod to the “Silence = Death” campaign by ACT UP)?

Jennings knew he could not risk alienating too many citizens by being too radical in the demand for “gay rights” for children in the schools. Working within the system would be more effective. Perhaps he shied away from the subtitle, “Breaking the Silence in Schools and Families,” for that same reason, hoping to hide the Commission members’ associations with radical ACT UP activists, and the Commission’s intention to interfere with families.

He wanted to emphasize the emotional issue of students being bullied, feeling isolated and unsafe. But the fact that the more challenging subtitle was included put schools and parents on notice that they were in the activists’ crosshairs as complicit in the “unsafe” and hostile environment experienced by “gay and lesbian youth.” School staff and families would have to be re-educated.

Both strategic approaches shared assumptions:

- There is no need to *justify* the inclusion of human sexuality issues in schools.
- There is such a thing as gay and lesbian “identity,” and it is *inborn or at least set during youth* – and should be embraced by the child, and accepted by adults unchangeable.
- There is a hostile environment in schools and homes specifically targeting “gay and lesbian youth,” creating an environment full of fear and intimidation.
- This hostile environment is the “root cause” of the (presumed) epidemic of suicides among “gay and lesbian youth.”
- Suicidal tendencies among these youth are caused by repercussions from the youths’ innate gay or lesbian identities (vs. the possibility that these youth are emotionally or psychologically disturbed due to other causes – and that their sexual identity may be a symptom of that disturbance, and that adopting that identity may increase their turmoil)
- The isolation, aloneness, and alienation described by gay and lesbian youth are qualitatively different than typical teenage angst, and deserve a special response.
- Gay and lesbian youth need to be given “voices” – and all the stories of abuse they relate are unique to their identity group, totally true, and unexaggerated (but turning to law enforcement authorities for help would be a dead end).
- There is (novel) wisdom in these youthful voices that adults should not question, but heed.

Jennings’ emphasizes that his report is all about equal opportunities for *learning*, not about students’ *sexuality*. He wants to defuse critics who would charge he is overly focused on human sexuality issues in the schools. His recommendations are:

> … designed to create an environment where all students might learn, free from fear and intimidation.
> … Massachusetts Public Schools need to abolish abuse, harassment, and violence against these youth. In addition, schools must provide support through school-based gay/straight student groups, from counselors and teachers, and through information in school libraries.” (Intro., p. 7. Emphasis added.)

While Jennings never defines “sexual identity” or “sexual orientation,” the report makes the assumption that young teens (and even younger children; “youth” is also undefined) already have a set “sexual identity” (or may at least be “questioning”). Furthermore, “*bisexual*” and “*transgender*” youth are clearly included as groups needing protection:

> Public health and educational research has documented that gay and lesbian students and other students dealing with sexual identity issues [meaning bisexual, transgender, and possibly
“questioning”] face increased risk of violent victimization, harassment, and discrimination, impeding their ability to do well in school. (Introductory letter from DOE. Emphasis added.)

Jennings spells this out more precisely in the Introduction:

NOTE: For the sake of format consistency, the Commission has chosen to use the phrase “gay and lesbian youth” to describe all youth who suffer from prejudice based on sexual identity. In reality, however, this term is meant to be inclusive of not only gay and lesbian youth but also those who self-identify as bisexual, those whose dress does not conform to gender expectations [“transgender”], those who are themselves heterosexual but have gay and lesbian family members, or those who are simply perceived by others to be gay or lesbian. (Intro., p. 7. Emphasis added. Note that this appeared in both the early and later editions of the report.)

Thus, the extremely radical concept of “transgender identity” (or “gender identity or expression”) was included in the “safe schools” scheme from the very beginning – though the Commission’s strategy was to keep it quiet. (Transgenderism would make its first recognized appearance among the national activism network at the April 1993 Gay Rights March in Washington, D.C., as noted above.) The activists realized they first had to desensitize the public on homosexuality, then move on to include the even more problematic “identities” termed “bisexual” and “transgender.”

By October 2001, the Commission included an introductory letter with the report which states: “… we applaud the courage and vision of the gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender and straight young people of Massachusetts who have been the voices of change in their schools.” (Only in the last few years has the Commission publicly called itself – still without statutory authority – the “Commission on Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual & Transgender (GLBT) Youth.”

In 2007, Governor Deval Patrick’s official proclamation celebrating Youth Pride Day included mention of “gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender youth” for the first time.)

Note also that Jennings’ includes the clause, “gay and lesbian family members, or those who are simply perceived by others to be gay or lesbian.” This greatly increases the size and scope of the community they propose to serve. (More recently, the sexual-radical activists have included those who are “questioning” their sexual orientation or identity in their target population.)

The “broad mandate” of the Commission is stated in the report as: “Preventing suicide and preventing violence against gay and lesbian youth are its priorities, and it is also charged with working to end all forms of discrimination against youth who are gay and lesbian” – and bisexual and transgender. (Intro., p. 5; emphasis added.) “Discrimination” is undefined, but would likely include any statement of opposition or disapproval of homosexuality, opposition to such events as the “Day of Silence,” or even discussions of the health risks of GLBT behaviors.

“Breaking the Silence” thus means giving a voice (or a megaphone) to those identifying as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender – but silencing anyone who disapproves or disagrees. (The obsession with the “silence” concept is also evident in the annual “Day of Silence” – Jennings’ and GLSEN’s creation now afflicting thousands of schools and colleges across the country.)

**Fraudulent Basis for Commission’s Existence and “Safe Schools” Program Recommendations**

The presumed “epidemic” of gay and lesbian youth suicides was the issue the Commission was to study. But Jennings says (in his memoir Mama’s Boy, Preacher’s Son) that his recommendations for a Safe Schools program “had probably gone far beyond [the Commission’s] original mandate … to study the issue of gay youth suicide.”

His claim that the “original mandate” was simply to study the issue betrays the fact that not enough was yet known about “gay youth suicide” for the government to intervene in any way, or
for the commissioners even to make recommendations. Yet Jennings proceeded with his characteristic overreach. And he got away with it.

Even if an “epidemic” of gay and lesbian youth suicides were shown to be a statistical reality, were the 1993 Education Committee members qualified to address it? Recall that the four members included Jennings (a high school history teacher), a high school art teacher, a high school activist student, and someone of unknown profession. Jennings described his fellow GLSEN activists (who, he said, helped him with the report) as “freewheeling” in their approach, and wrote that, “many commissioners had little or no knowledge of youth.”

The Department of Education’s opening summary of recommendations somewhat qualified the report’s exaggerated claims on gay teen suicide:

Public health and educational research has documented that gay and lesbian students and other students dealing with sexual identity issues [i.e., bisexual, transgender, possibly “questioning”] face increased risk of violent victimization, harassment, and discrimination, impeding their ability to do well in school. In addition, due to their low self-esteem, lack of support, and family difficulties, some of these students may be at greater risk for alcohol and other drug abuse, suicidal behavior, infection with HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases, and homelessness. (DOE summary of “Recommendations” in earlier version of report. 67 Emphasis added.)

But the Executive Summary refers to “… the epidemic of suicide by young gays and lesbians as revealed in a 1989 Federal report on youth suicide.” (p. 1. and Intro., p. 5.) That report, by Paul Gibson for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, has been discredited.

At the Commission swearing-in ceremony (June 11, 1992), Governor Weld said, “Half a million young people attempt suicide every year. Nearly 30% of youth suicides are committed by gays or lesbians.” (Intro., p. 4) Jennings further inflates this figure in his report, claiming that, “gay and lesbian youth accounted for approximately one-third of all youth suicides.” (Intro., p. 5; emphasis in original.)

This foundational claim of an “epidemic” of gay youth suicide was unsubstantiated, as various studies have pointed out. “Dr. David Shaffer, one of the country’s leading authorities on suicide among youth, notes that Gibson’s paper ‘was never subjected to the rigorous peer review that is required for publication in a scientific journal and contained no new research findings.’” 68 A 1997 report from Newhouse News Service later confirmed the “epidemic” was bogus. Massachusetts News summarized:

… an article in the Boston Herald in 1997 by the Newhouse News Service [“Gay teen suicide stat refuted,” Delia M. Rios, May 27, 1997] … pointed out that nearly ten years after the original publication of the widely discredited statistic by Paul Gibson [cited in Jennings’ 1993 report], a social worker in Chicago, the figures were still being used even though many organizations had stated that there is no evidence that they are true.

Those organizations include the Center for Disease Control, the National Institute of Mental Health, the American Association of Suicidology, the American Psychological Association, and some gay advocacy groups.

Even Joyce Hunter, the one time president of the National Lesbian and Gay Health Association, has said it is unknown if there is a connection between homosexuality and teen suicide.

Peter Muehrer, chief of the Youth Mental Health program in the Prevention and Behavioral Medicine Research branch of the National Institute of Mental Health and recent winner of the Secretary of Health and Human Services Award for Distinguished Service, has analyzed the original studies on which the Gibson review was based and determined that the conclusions can not be supported by the data.
He wrote, "There is no scientific evidence to support this data." Joyce Hunter said she agrees with mental-health researchers that most gay and lesbian teens, like teens overall, are emotionally resilient people who "go on to develop a positive sense of self and go on with their lives." (Emphasis added.)

Peter LaBarbera wrote on the shaky foundation of the Commission’s existence and recommendations:

In Massachusetts, a recently established Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth set up by Republican Gov. William Weld relied almost exclusively on Gibson's unpublished HHS paper to warn ominously of a gay teen suicide epidemic. Gibson's exaggerated claims became the central rationale for creating a sweeping pro-gay counseling program in the state's schools. In an interview in The Advocate, a national gay magazine, Governor Weld, curiously, uses a Gibson-derived statistic to justify the program while at the same time seemingly acknowledging that this program may have credibility problems: "They say the harassment is one of the reasons gays and lesbians account for 30% of teenage suicides. That doesn't even need to be true for me to say that fighting anti-gay discrimination in the schools is absolutely necessary."

Lobbying by public school students was the key to passage of a student "gay rights" bill in Massachusetts, and, again, Gibson's "30 percent" statistic was a factor. According to The New York Times, a student stood outside the State House for several weeks leading up to the December 6, 1993 Senate passage of the bill holding a sign that said "Gays Make Up 30 Percent of Completed Teen Suicides." David LaFontaine, a gay activist who is now the director of Weld's youth commission, went so far as to say, "Gay youth suicide is like a hidden holocaust in America."

Notwithstanding such wild exaggerations, there is no consensus among experts that anything resembling an "epidemic" of gay teen suicides even exists. Moreover, many observers are aghast that, in this age of AIDS, the danger of suicide would be used to confirm confused youths in an unhealthy, destructive lifestyle that is fraught with anxiety and disease and that often leads to early death.

The myth of a gay teen suicide epidemic is built upon a flimsy statistical foundation. Gibson, a homosexual social worker in San Francisco, uses statistics from mainly homosexual sources and then extrapolates them to the general youth population using the discredited Kinsey estimate of a 10 percent gay population.

A perusal of Gibson's report turns up numerous contradictions and statistical impossibilities. For example, he refers to one author who speculated in 1985 (in the gay newspaper, The Washington Blade) that as many as 3,000 gay youths kill themselves a year—a number that exceeds the total number of annual teen suicides by more than a thousand.

To reach his core conclusions on the high rate of homosexual suicides, Gibson points to assorted gay survey studies that claim homosexual youth are far more likely than their heterosexual counterparts to have considered or to have attempted suicide. These studies rely on surveys of troubled and often runaway youth. Generally, they have found a much higher rate (two to four times higher) of suicidal tendencies in their "gay" respondents compared with their "straight" respondents. Gibson then multiplies this higher rate by the disputed Kinsey figure of a 10 percent homosexual population to produce his figure that 30 percent of all youth suicides involve homosexual youth.

David Shaffer, a Columbia University psychiatrist and specialist on adolescent suicide, has said, "I struggled for a long time over [Gibson's] mathematics, but, in the end, it seemed more hocus-pocus than math." Nevertheless, Gibson's claims have been repeated over and over as homosexual activists have made them part of their lore. (Emphasis added.)

Further, research available at the time Jennings wrote his report indicated a correlation: The earlier a child self-labels as "gay" or "lesbian," the greater the risk of suicide. Dr. N. E. Whitehead wrote: (Emphasis added.)

Now, correlation is not causation. Although there are links, we have to be cautious stating that delaying self-labeling will prevent suicide, or that postponing sexual experience will prevent suicide. It may not. However, from the point of view of policy (which must always err on the conservative side when matters of life-and-death like suicide attempts are involved), it would be highly prudent to:
(a) Discourage early sexual experience
(b) Discourage early self-labeling
(c) Discourage activists who promote early self-labeling

(See also the recent report by the American College of Pediatricians, *Facts About Youth*, on the dangers of early self-labeling as homosexual or transgender.)\(^{72}\)

**Jennings’ Legacy: Unscientific and Unaccountable “Safe Schools” Programs**

The Executive Summary confirms that, “The Commission is charged with making an annual report to Governor Weld.” (Executive Summary, p. 1) But no annual report was issued prior to 2007. (At least, none was made public.) This has been an unaccountable Commission. It has failed to demonstrate positive results from its 18 years of “safe schools” programs in achieving its stated goals:

Prevention of gay and lesbian youth suicide, violence prevention, as well as prevention of problems faced by young gays and lesbians in school and in the family are central to the Commission’s mandate. The Commission is empowered to make recommendations to the Governor, to state agencies, and to private agencies about the creation of programs and policies which will help gay and lesbian youth in Massachusetts. Abolishing prejudice and discrimination is the stated goal of the Commission as expressed by Governor Weld … (Executive Summary, p. 1.)

Rather than demonstrate any improvement in these problem areas, the Commission continues to reference “school climate surveys” or “youth risk behavior surveys” which supposedly show a continuing need for its existence, and for “Safe Schools” programs.\(^{73}\) (See this recent study at Focus on the Family on the unreliability of the “school climate” reports.\(^{74}\))

At the Commission’s 1992 hearings and in his 1993 report, Jennings “breaks the silence” of GLBT youth, employing them as political weapons, milking them for “horrifying … stories of violence, abuse, and harassment, from both peers and adults” (Intro., p. 7), cataloguing the “terrorizing anti-gay violence … they face in their schools.” (Intro., p. 8.) The goal: “to put a human face on the suffering of gay and lesbian youth and to bring their personal stories to the attention of Massachusetts citizens.” (Intro., p. 6)

The section, “Harassment of gay and lesbian students in school” features this Screaming headline: “Nearly half of gay men and one in five lesbians are harassed or assaulted in secondary school.” (p. 9) However, “assaults” are combined with less severe “harassment” in the ratio noted above. And the text continues that the “assaults” were “verbal or physical.” In other words, name-calling incidents very likely made up a large majority of the “harassment” or “assaults.” (The extremist source, the *National Gay and Lesbian Task Force*, is unreliable as well.) Further, without any hard facts, teachers are accused of rampant abuse along with students. (p. 8, 10, 21) One 1989 study (quoted by Jennings) claims that “8 out of 10 teachers in training harbored anti-gay attitudes. Fully one-third were rated as ‘high-grade homophobes’.” (p. 21)

But such wild, exaggerated claims are part of the “freewheeling” GLSEN style. Even gay and lesbian adults in the schools are at risk: “Schools remain as threatening to adult staff as they are for the young people.” (p. 23) Because gay and lesbian teachers are afraid to “come out,” the youth are denied the role models they need. (pp. 20-21)

Couldn’t the supposed violent crimes (regardless of supposed motivation) related in the students’ testimony be dealt with adequately by the local law enforcement? What about the bullying that non-GLBT students face in schools? The report made it appear that “gay and lesbian” students were uniquely targeted and requiring special attention for proper law enforcement (following the “hate crimes” model).
Professor Robert Weissberg (at American Thinker) has exposed the pseudo social-science basis of Jennings’s call for a “safe schools” program:

Let’s start with school crime. Statistics are, admittedly, somewhat imprecise, but according to the Department of Justice, school crime has been dropping sharply since 1992. … “School crime” is hardly a pressing national issue and where it does erupt, humdrum policing is the correct response….

With Jennings at the helm, GLSEN has performed brilliantly thanks to exploiting the patina of social science. With NEA cooperation, he has regularly conducted a “scientific” poll asking self-defined gay students about personal tribulations and the official responses to perceived slights, bullying, snide remarks, being roughed up or anything else possibly inflicting emotional distress. Questions then follow about whether school authorities remedied the alleged abuse. In an instant, voilà, perfect justification for state intervention is created -- young gays everywhere are suffering and school officials stand idly by.

In 2000, for example, some two-thirds of LGBT students taking the survey reported having been made uncomfortable because of their sexuality, 42% reported more serious harassment and five years later, the assault on gay students had not improved -- three-quarters had encountered derogatory remarks (e.g., "you're so gay") and a fifth reported some form of physical abuse.

Overall, many gay students felt unsafe in their schools, no small matter since, according to GLSEN, there are between 2.25 and 2.75 million gay students in American schools. It gets worse: not only do teachers fail to protect these at-risk students, but a quarter of these students heard teachers or staff members make disparaging comments. Now that this poll is being conducted online with privacy protected passwords, we can only expect more reported animosity directed at this two million plus group of students. [It was possible to submit multiple anonymous online responses to GLSEN’s “School Climate Survey.” Even adult activists could submit responses.]

Jennings and his allies have artfully constructed a highly deceptive picture. It is all about impressions, feelings about murky incidents and, of the utmost importance, the accused are not permitted their day in court, even if the incident entailed physical contact (nor are gay-on-gay incidents treated separately). Absolutely everything is unsubstantiated accusation. To the overly sensitive, especially those conspicuously celebrating sexual identity, life itself becomes one travail after the next. Moreover, none of these self-reports necessarily entail illegal behavior, a violation of school rules or are so damaging to a person’s psychological development that they automatically require Washington’s 9-1-1 intervention (if anti-gay actions were illegal they would be reported to the police and subject to investigation, a process that may not be welcome by those screaming that the sky is falling).

The government’s own 2003 study of school-based “hatefulness” reported that sexual orientation comments were exceedingly rare -- just 1.3% of all students ever encountered such remarks. A more clear-eyed assessment is that troubling social interactions are endemic within this age group -- just ask any awkward adolescent about surviving, and one will undoubtedly hear a tale of unrelenting woe, regardless of sexual identification. (Emphasis added.)

In Jennings’ 1993 report, random anecdotes from the 1992 Commission hearings, or an unscientific Commission-devised survey given to 400 students at just one Massachusetts high school (Lincoln-Sudbury), are supposed to be adequate to prove his case. What that survey does prove is that the Commission was already promoting the concept of “sexual orientation” in youth, and encouraging students to see non-conforming youth as victims. The students were forced to think in homosexual activist terms, employing vocabulary such as “sexual orientation,” “bisexual,” “homophobic,” and “discrimination.” (Appendix A. For some unexplained reason, only five of the twelve questions asked were included.)

One leading question in the survey got the hoped-for response: “Sixty percent of students think high schools should have groups for gay and lesbian students.” Other questions included:

How often have you heard homophobic remarks made at your school?
Would you be upset or afraid if people thought you were gay, lesbian, or bisexual?
How would your friend react to finding out someone they knew was gay, lesbian, or bisexual? How do you feel about discrimination against gay, lesbian, and bisexual people?

Throughout the report, Jennings identifies students who testified by their full names and their schools in the report. Some of the students named were only 15, 16, or 17. This flies in the face of later accusations by GLBT activists that pro-family groups are “violating the privacy” of students by publishing photos (without name identification) of children in public places, such as at Youth Pride events, etc., or publishing audio from the 2000 GLSEN-Boston conference “Fistgate” workshop with (unidentified, muffled) teen voices included. (Of course, BAGLY and PFLAG, and EdgeBoston also publish photos of youth events.)

Teachers Need to “Come Out”

Jennings’ claim that “gay and lesbian youth … need … adult role models in school” is essentially a recommendation that schools include openly GLBT adult activists on their staff, and invite sexual radical speakers to lead assemblies and GSA meetings. (p. 20 on) One 17-year-old student testified:

I was constantly denying the feelings I had for other guys. In the process of hiding these feelings, I repressed all emotions. Concord Academy [where Jennings taught] changed all this. It was the first place I encountered that was even slightly gay-positive. When I arrived, an openly gay faculty member [i.e., Jennings] was assigned to be my advisor. Through him, I learned that being gay is not the horrible and disgusting thing society makes it out to be, but instead, a normal and natural part of me. (p. 20)

Just months after he wrote the report, Jennings took his gay/straight club from Concord Academy to the national gay rights march in Washington, D.C. That is one way to be a role model. Another would be to advise a 16-year-old boarding student to “use a condom” in his sexual encounters with strangers met in bus stations, as Jennings did. (Though he did not report the student’s conduct to school authorities or the student’s parents. After all, a student’s talks about “gay and lesbian issues” with his counselor or advisor are to remain confidential, according to Jennings’ recommendations.)

Openly “gay” faculty advisors from Concord Academy, Brookline High School, and Phillips Academy Andover took their GSA student clubs to the April 25, 1993 Gay Rights March in Washington, D.C. (AP Photo)

Jennings writes, “The presence of openly gay/lesbian staff members is a crucial component of any school program seeking to reduce bigotry and provide support for lesbian and gay students.” This is also needed because “8 out of 10 teachers in training harbored anti-gay attitudes. Fully
one-third were rated as ‘high-grade homohobes’…” (p. 25) Hatred is actually encouraged by the adults in schools, he claims:

An atmosphere of intolerance in the schools intimidates gay and lesbian teachers into remaining closeted, thus denying students role models they need. [One teacher who testified said,] “Today in school it’s okay to hate gays and lesbians; it’s actually encouraged by the behaviors and attitudes of faculty and staff. It’s not a safe environment.” (p. 25; see also p. 15.)

Testimony by Jennings’ “partner” at that time, Bob Parlin, is included in the report. Parlin “came out” at Newton South High School so he could be a “role model” to his students. “I actually became closer to my students as a result of coming out,” he said. (p. 23) Parlin gave an interview to Joey Magazine (for “gay youth”) in 2000:

According to Parlin, out is a “normal” condition. “What's great about being out is I don’t have to censor my words or thoughts when I’m in front of a classroom. I don’t have to always be thinking, ‘Am I going to reveal something in the way I'm acting or in what I'm saying?’ I can talk about my weekends or going away with my partner. I can talk about my personal life in the same way that other teachers do – without giving it much thought.” Such candor, he feels, has actually brought him closer to his students. “Once kids know that you’re willing to share something that could be potentially risky, they’re much more open about their own issues,” Parlin explained.….  

Bob Parlin speculates about another positive influence he might have on his straight students: “For heterosexual boys, I think having an out gay teacher – or several out gay teachers – really forces them to confront their own homophobic tendencies.” But what about boys who are still questioning their sexuality, or who might be gay? “For boys I suspect might be gay, I’ve actually found that they don’t always feel terribly comfortable with me,” Parlin said, “It could be I’m very threatening in just being openly gay, and I think that they’re worried that if they associate too closely with me, people will begin to suspect that they’re gay.”

Thus, Parlin reveals that being “out” as a teacher means you’re sizing up your students’ sexual “identity” and attitudes. And becoming “close” to them. Is this teacher focused on his students’ academic learning, or their sexuality?

Kevin Jennings (right), then national GLSEN president, was keynote speaker at GLSEN-Boston’s infamous “Fistgate” conference in March 2000 (which GLSEN called “TeachOUT”). His former “partner” Bob Parlin, who set up the Massachusetts “Safe Schools” program, was then Vice President of GLSEN-Boston’s board and gave
Families Must Be Re-Educated to Accept Homosexuality

A large section of the report (Section V, pp. 24-28, and “Summary of Recommendations for Families,” pp. 38-40) is devoted to dealing with the “problem” of “families of gay and lesbian students.” This is a very clear statement that Jennings believes the schools have the right to interfere with or even overrule the family’s authority on this issue – and that parents are often the “problem.” Even the subtitle of Jennings’ report reveals the belief that families are incapable of caring properly for their own children: It’s time to break the silence … in families! The accusatory tone is evident:

Families, and parents particularly, are profoundly affected when a child or sibling is gay or lesbian. The expected course of family life is changed irrevocably. And the course it takes, the new actions and attitudes it assumes toward the gay/lesbian teen, can mean the difference between life and death.

If the teen has not come out to his or her parents, a rift develops in which both family and teen feel separated from each other. The secrets needed to maintain silence pile up like the Berlin Wall, increasing the teen’s isolation from his family and his sense of loneliness.

If the gay/lesbian teen reveals his or her identity, the family unit is often deeply shaken. It must revise its image of the teen, but also of itself as a unit. The family must deal with the many feelings that follow, and the reactions of extended family and community.

Parents testifying at the Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth’s Public Hearings spoke of being unprepared for the news that their son or daughter was gay or lesbian.

Some parents turn against their lesbian/gay child in anger and these teens are thrown out of their homes or driven to run away. Sometimes these gay/lesbian adolescents end up on the streets, becoming self-destructive and all too often attempting suicide. (pp. 24-26)

The report lectures parents that they “need help.” Disapproval of homosexuality is “hate or fear” based on “prejudice and mythology”:

Families of gay and lesbian teenagers need help for themselves in dealing both with their feelings and with the prejudice and mythology of the outside world. They need help as well in order to be able to advocate for the physical and emotional safety of their lesbian/gay teen who must navigate through a school and social life made dangerous by those who hate or fear him/her for being different. Parents and families need help in order to alleviate the guilt and shame they feel, and to empower themselves and their son or daughter in this journey. (pp. 27-28)

One father who testified at the Commission hearing said, “Society had ill-prepared me to be the father of a gay son. To be brought up in this society is to be brought up homophobic.” (p. 25) One mother’s “Christian fundamentalist” faith was said to have played a role in her gay son’s suicide. Another mother whose lesbian daughter committed suicide blames society which “can’t accept people who are ‘different’ from the norm.” She said, “I strongly believe seeds of hate are sown early in life. Let's replace them with love, understanding and compassion.” (p. 27)

Jennings proposes these solutions:

- School-based family counseling and re-education to accept homosexuality in their child (whether “requested by families of gay and lesbian youth or by the youth themselves within the school setting”), with the help of trained guidance counselors, the DOE, and PFLAG. (p. 39)

- “Up-to-date books” (i.e., written by GLBT radicals) and information in public libraries, including a “resource guide for families of gay and lesbian youth” (p. 39)
Designated “parent speakers bureaus” in each school district “to advocate for gay and lesbian youth in schools” (p. 40)

**Radical Groups PFLAG and BAGLY Central to Jennings’ Recommendations**

Government-run schools must become re-education camps for families, with an assist from the radical organization PFLAG (Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays) – an extremist advocacy organization which tells families they must accept their children identifying as G, L, B, or T. (p. 37. See PFLAG booklets on transgender children; bisexuality; GLBT youth.) PFLAG has long led children to objectionable sexual literature.80

Note that PFLAG is openly allied with sadomasochist and “fetish” groups. By 2006, their Northeast Regional Conference, called “Transcending Boundaries,”81 was co-sponsored by the New England Leather Alliance and included workshops on “kink” sex and “swinging.” PFLAG also works with a doctor at Boston Children’s Hospital who injects very young “transgender” children with hormone-blocking drugs – for easier sex change surgeries later.82

Jennings’ “Recommendations for Schools” (p. 36) lists as a resource the dangerous GLBT youth “support” group, BAGLY, the Boston Alliance of Gay Lesbian Bisexual Transgender Youth. (BAGLY is also mentioned positively on p. 14.) Appendix B includes excerpts from a survey conducted by BAGLY of youth “ages 13-23” from “seven community-based lesbian and gay youth groups and eight school-based gay/straight alliances” in Massachusetts, “to gauge what high school life is like for students who are lesbian, gay, or bisexual.” (This seems to be a precursor of GLSEN’s “School Climate Survey” in its polling of respondents already “with the program.”) The questions were similar to the survey at Lincoln-Sudbury High School. When asked, “Have you ever heard teachers in your high school make anti-lesbian or anti-gay remarks?” 53% of the respondents said “Yes.”

That BAGLY would play such a huge role in Jennings’ plan for “Safe Schools” is significant. Its original and current director, Sterling Stowell, was a founding member of the Governor’s Commission along with Jennings. Stowell (a man) now identifies and dresses as a female (calling himself “Grace”). He is still on the Commission, and was recently its Vice Chair.

BAGLY has a sordid history. In the years preceding the 1993 Education Report, the group had mixed:

… college and high school students [with] runaways, hustlers and drag queens who lived on the street. That diversity made for some interesting discussions at the group’s Wednesday meetings. Klein [a founding member] said during a discussion on hustling and prostitution, members of the group who were hustlers shared their own firsthand experiences with the other youth. The discussions could also get quite heated. Defrocked Catholic priest Paul Shanley, who was convicted in February [2005] of raping an altar boy, came to a meeting to discuss sexuality and religion. The priest, who had built a reputation of ministering to sexual minority youth, did not receive a warm welcome from the BAGLY youth. “He was attacked by the kids. People were all over him,” recalled Klein. “They kept asking him, ‘Are you gay? Are you gay,’ and he said, ‘I refuse to answer that.’” 83

In 1999, BAGLY was caught encouraging its teen male clientele to join adults at a lakeside resort for “counseling” by offering a stipend.84 In 2005 (and in earlier years), BAGLY’s transsexual director led a shocking discussion on transgenderism for teens at GLSEN-Boston’s conference (often repeated for high school audiences).85 BAGLY’s website has led teens directly to a sex-change site including graphic illustrations of male-to-female “penile inversion” surgery (transforming penis tissue into a “neovagina”).86
Longtime Jennings associate and BAGLY Director, “male-to-female” transsexual “Grace” Sterling Stowell (left) at recent Youth Pride parade. (MassResistance photo)

By 2006, BAGLY was sending youth to the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force “Creating Change” workshop promoting “sex work” (prostitution) to young teens. Peter LaBarbera reported:

There were 77 seats available in the meeting room, very few empty, with an additional 8 or 10 people standing. In the front row, directly in front of the panel, sat teenage students from Boston Alliance of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth (“BAGLY” — “a youth-led, adult-supported social support organization”).

One of the teenage boys on the front row raised his hand and asked: “How do you get started?” He explained: “We suspect that one of the youth in our group is leaning toward sex work. What should we do?”

The panelists did not suggest deterring the youth from pursuing sex work or encouraging the youth to think about a college education. They suggested listening, remaining non-judgmental, and perhaps discussing safety, “but not to the extent that he feels stigmatized.”

BAGLY plays a big role in the Youth Pride Day festivities each May. At its GLBT prom ending the day of festivities in 2006, unscreened adult “volunteers” were in the crowd of youth, one of whom was openly soliciting “pretty boys” to dinner parties with adult men in “private apartments.” By 2007, huge cross-dressing and transsexual men were mingling with young teenagers at the event. By 2009, BAGLY’s annual GLBT prom brazenly included a “gay” sadomasochism theme, with “Mr. Boston Leather” greeting the teens, handing them his “business card.” Since its inception, BAGLY has billed itself as a group for “youth” age 22 and under — openly mixing young teens with young adults in its support-group meetings.

In Conclusion

Clearly, amateurs and radical activists were behind this report and the entire Governor’s Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth in 1993. Its first publication, *Making Schools Safe for Gay and Lesbian Youth*, is a “freewheeling” document, lacking clear organization, logic, objective facts, or grounded recommendations.
Kevin Jennings, its primary author, was unqualified to deal with the real and serious issues of youth alienation, sexual confusion, and suicide. He was simply an activist with an extreme agenda. He certainly lacked the status to lecture a Governor, a Commissioner of Education, school administrators, or parents. And yet his report became the template for GLBT indoctrination for schools in Massachusetts and across the country.
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