

## News and Current Events :: Former Homosexual Suing CA over Ban on Gay Cure

**Former Homosexual Suing CA over Ban on Gay Cure - posted by Trekker, on: 2012/10/4 14:34**

STUDENT WHO GOT 'GAY CURE' SUES CALIFORNIA OVER NEW LAW

By SUSAN DONALDSON JAMES | Good Morning America – Wed, Oct 3, 2012 2:00 PM EDT

A college student who claims he once had same-sex attractions but became heterosexual after conversion therapy has filed a lawsuit against California, which has enacted a law that bans so-called "gay cures" for minors.

The lawsuit, also joined as plaintiffs by two therapists who have used the treatments with patients, alleges that the law banning the therapy intrudes on First Amendment protections of free speech, privacy and freedom of religion.

The student, Aaron Blitzer, who is studying to be a therapist in that field, said the law would prevent him from pursuing his career, according to court papers filed Monday in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California.

The lawsuit names as defendants California Gov. Jerry Brown, as well as 21 other state officials, including members of the California Board of Behavioral Sciences and the California Medical Board.

The other plaintiffs are Donald Welsch, a licensed family therapist and ordained minister who operates a Christian counseling center in San Diego; and Dr. Anthony Duk, a psychiatrist and practicing Roman Catholic.

Both say the law would restrict their counseling practices, according to the lawsuit.

"It's an egregious violation of the rights of young people feeling same-sex attraction, and of parents and counselors who feel it would be beneficial for the individual needs of a young person," said Brad Dacus, president and attorney for the conservative Pacific Justice Institute, which asked a federal judge to prevent the law from taking effect.

"The legislature had an errant assumption that every individual struggling with same-sex attraction is caused by their DNA," he said. "It ignores thousands, including the plaintiff, who have gone through therapy and are now in a happy and healthy heterosexual relationship."

Dacus declined ABC News' request for direct access to the plaintiffs.

Just this week, California lawmakers voted to outlaw therapy aimed at changing the sexual orientation of minors who say they are gay, making California the first state to adopt such legislation. The law is set to go into effect Jan. 1, 2013.

The bill's sponsor, California state Sen. Ted Lieu, said the therapy -- called "conversion therapy," "sexual orientation therapy," "reparative therapy" or "sexual orientation change efforts" -- amounts to "psychological child abuse."

"I read the lawsuit and, as a matter of fiction, it is a good read," Lieu said in a prepared statement after the suit was filed. "But from any reasonable legal standard, the lawsuit is frivolous. Under the plaintiffs' argument, the First Amendment would shield therapists and psychiatrists from medical malpractice and psychological abuse claims simply because they use speech in practicing their medicine. That is a novel and frivolous view of the First Amendment." Lieu is not named as a defendant in the lawsuit.

Several members of the California Board of Behavioral Sciences and the California Mental Board were named in the lawsuit.

"Our board voted to support that piece of legislation after working with the author's office to further define sexual orientation change efforts," said Kim Madsen, executive officer for the sciences board, which licenses and oversees therapists.

She had no comment on the lawsuit, but said the board would investigate any complaints of conversion therapy after

Jan. 1.

The law's critics say that it infringes on the rights of families and therapists, particularly young people who have same-sex attractions as a result of being victims of sexual abuse.

Dacus said the law makes them "victims twice, as a result denying them counseling and healing."

He said that counseling in "direct violation" of religious or personal beliefs, "only precipitates greater confusion and depression and the likelihood of suicide."

"This legislation is a classic example of psychiatric ignorance combined with political neglect," he said, complaining of "compromises" that members of the California Psychiatric Association. made with state legislators to enact the law.

"They clearly say that one size fits all and ignore the complexity of same-sex attraction and varying degrees of such attraction, depending on age and background," said Dacus. "It's out of place for the legislature to put such restrictions on it."

Members of the California Psychiatric Association. have "mixed feelings" about the law, according to Randal Hagar, director of government relations for the organization.

"There is no psychiatrist who would engage and practice it and, if they did, they would be subject to ethical sanctions," he said.

The American Psychiatric Association has outlawed conversion therapies for more than a decade, insisting they are harmful.

#### California Psychiatrists Negotiated With Legislators

On the other hand, said Hagar, the CPA is concerned about any bill that "basically prescribes any kind of treatment" or one that might lead "downstream" to someone legislating against another practice "they don't like."

"The difference here is that there is a very strong public policy argument that says why this practice ought to be limited," he said. "There is no evidence it does what it purports to be. It is, in essence, fraud ... and there is other evidence that it does harm. It concerns us greatly."

The CPA negotiated for months with legislators to hone language on the bill so that therapists could address "legitimate" talks on sexual orientation and gender identity issues, according to Hagar.

"We were wary of a form of the bill where they can't possibly engage in a discussion," said Hagar, who noted that the association supported the final version of the bill.

They also leaned on another precedent: Electroconvulsive shock therapy is highly regulated with judicial oversight.

"You can't give it to minors -- period," he said.

"I think the bill is clear and clean and did have a definition of supportive exploratory therapy that leads to be accepting and see themselves as a person of strength rather than a flawed person," he said.

ABC's Alice Gomstyn contributed to this report.

**Re: Former Homosexual Suing CA over Ban on Gay Cure - posted by Lordoitagain (), on: 2012/10/4 18:40**

Thanks for posting! We hope that something can be done to return freedoms to the citizens of CA.

**Re: Former Homosexual Suing CA over Ban on Gay Cure, on: 2012/10/4 21:43**

Read this earlier on my phone, it was quite enlightening.

The law does need drastic amendments, just to downright deny the right of the individual to seek alternative measures in helping them choose for themselves what they want for their lives and to seek help through therapy, is barbaric.

The difficult part of this change is the testimonies of those who were helped through therapy. Once a government sees that there is nothing wrong with homosexuality, to say that these people were helped to become heterosexuals will be a slap in the face. They think why change at all since there is nothing wrong with being homosexual.

Besides bringing in the bible in saying it's wrong, we have to be a bit wiser here in stating that this is a matter of freedom of choice and that if they have a choice than they should have the benefit of obtaining a therapist to help them find what they are looking for.

What the state doesn't want is for anyone to have the option to change. What they won't admit to is that the confusion of homosexuality is causing suicides. They are putting the blame on those that say change is possible.

What I would like to know is, how will they stop anyone who is obtaining therapy online?

**Re: - posted by Lordoitagain (), on: 2012/10/5 8:07**

When freedoms are taken away, it is because the belief system of the "powers that be" have shifted away from the earlier belief system that permitted the freedoms. When Islam becomes the dominant belief system in a country, censorship of freedoms is based on what thus saith the Koran.

In the debate involved in this law, one may clearly see that the belief system has shifted to base the foundation on Scientific Research. Science has become the authority instead of the Bible. Over and over on the internet, you read their conclusions about the issue, and then their support: "research indicates" ... "a study done by Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ with X amount of young people indicated \_\_\_\_ " ...

One of them that I read regarding the argument that homosexuality is genetic said that a study was done in identical twins. It explained that identical twins have absolutely the same genetic makeup. Then it went on to say that "almost all" of the identical twins had "the same sexual orientation". Even an uneducated person can clearly see the hole in their science! Since identical twins have 100% the same genes, then for the theory that sexual orientation is genetic to be true, 100% of the identical twins would have to have "the same sexual orientation."

Other scientific data never enters their research, such as the suicide rate amongst "gay children" in the 1800s and early 1900s when the foundation for belief in this country was largely based on Biblical principles and not on the "authority" of Scientific Research. There was hardly a suicide rate, and there were hardly any known homosexuals. That data never enters their research for comparison.

**Re: - posted by DEADn (), on: 2012/10/11 12:27**

Quote:

-----  
Here's what I think. Let's not let the hype (not sure of the right word here) around this issue make us forget the reason why there is a ban: as all the major psychological and psychiatric organizations will attest, conversion therapy doesn't work. It may be that this student who is suing California believes that it works but we have many, many studies showing that it does not and that it causes a great deal of harm. A corollary in the medical field might go something like this: medical doctors determine after a series of studies that a drug doesn't work and in fact in many cases causes people to get sick so they ban it. Some person somewhere, however, took the drug and believes that it made him better, so this one person wants to negate all the studies that show the drug doesn't work and he wants to make it legal just because he believes it worked for him. Should we disregard all the studies because someone holds a belief (probably false) contrary to all the research and make a treatment legal that shouldn't be? Also, it sounds to me, after reading the article, that there is a religious group involved who is trying to push an agenda over the scientific findings  
-----

This is a quote from my FB page from a Psychologist. I am part of closet group in psychology and the rule of banning therapy for homosexuality was brought up. All the posters (not all in the group) said it was good because homosexuals cannot be changed. So, I went to look for the post that was originally posted to this topic and posted it to FB to get a response. The above is a quote from a Professor.

What strikes me is at the end when he mentions religion pushing an agenda over scientific findings. This is part of the cultural war on America and how the Church in America is steadily being discredited every day.

I was on a road to study psychology along with communications and I have often wondered if I would ever find myself in the midst of a seminar conversation in which a religious idea was thrown out because scientific findings rule the day. I can understand why it would be so but how does a Christian confront such a thing? Saying 'The Bible says so' or 'Because God's says so' doesn't really cut it in a scientific world.

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2012/10/11 12:41**

I was on a road to study psychology along with communications and I have often wondered if I would ever find myself in the midst of a seminar conversation in which a religious idea was thrown out because scientific findings rule the day. I can't understand why it would be so but how does a Christian confront such a thing? Saying 'The Bible says so' or 'Because God's says so' doesn't really cut it in a scientific world.

---

i think the issue is just what you said "saying God says so doesn't really cut it in a scientific world." Of course it wouldn't t here are many in the scientific world who do not believe in Gods existence so they will reject anything and everything that comes from that point of view. i often wonder why Christians run around attempting "to prove" things to those who flat out don't want to hear and will reject anything said anyway. God does not have to prove Himself to us(He does) but He does not have to. as a christian i live by faith and the Holy Spirit confirms to me all that God says is true. its one of those things were i know, that i know, that i know(you know:)

i just don't think that you can prove the things of God to some people even if they had all the evidence laid out right in front of them, they just don't want to see and don't have ears to hear.

just my thoughts  
rdg

**Re: Former Homosexual Suing CA over Ban on Gay Cure, on: 2012/10/11 12:58**

My question is... why is the state getting involved in something like this anyway? The whole law seems extremely unconstitutional.

Oh wait... duh, it's California.

... nevermind.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by DEADn (), on: 2012/10/11 13:02**

I often think that science looks so hard at the specifics that it causes them to weed out the whole. In this case they get so caught in how things operate to the most minut detail that I believe the thing that put it into motion escapes them. Instead they borrow ideas such as evolution in order to create the theory that this is why something is put together as it is.

When we contrast Satan and God in workings Satan is always looking to put something on display. A 'Look at me' mentality so when someone screams louder and consistently people will take note. God does the opposite. Words in the secret places of the heart. Even Elijah, I think it was him, did all kinds of stuff in the Name of Jehovah but fled to a cave and was eventually scared by the subtle void of Jehovah.

It is the battle of interpretations in science and the hardness of man's soul to understand and believe what he is seeing vs what is reality. In Science God is no reality because God can not be an experiment. His Creation can be and creation is used to theorize how creation came to be because experimentation.

Psychology follows the same path. I often ask what roles does spirituality play in psychology because if psychology stays only in the physical then the science is flawed and is missing something. After all, we all know love exists but how can you do an experiment on love? Yet it is there. How can a person measure forgiveness? Yet it is there.

I often meditate on how can a Christian bring Jesus to the world of science in a constructive way. One of the answers is a gentle conviction of the Holy Spirit - not of works so no man can boast. Many times it takes a gentle conviction and a sudden opening of the eyes of the heart to cause a person to understand why wonder how something can be true.

John