



The Homosexual Agenda: Urine for a Shock

When dozens of books on homosexual issues were found doused in urine in a Harvard University library, the campus police (HUPD) were quick to label it a “hate crime.” But now it turns out that what could have been construed as an attempt at literary improvement was just the work of an all-thumbs library official.



[Writes](#) *The Harvard Crimson*:

Upon an investigation by HUPD, it was revealed Monday morning that “our own library personnel” had accidentally spilled a bottle, containing what was reported to be urine, that had been found on the shelf, according to Hammonds [College Dean Evelyn Hammonds].... Faculty of Arts and Sciences spokesman Jeff Neal wrote in an e-mail that ... the spill was reported by the library employee — the same person who caused the spill, according to his understanding — and cleaned up the same day that it occurred.

Yet not everyone considers the story cleaned up. While campus homosexual groups claim to be relieved by the news, Harvard College Queer Students and Allies co-chairman Marco Chan nevertheless wonders, “Why was there a bottle of urine on the shelf?”

I don’t know, but presumably liberal Ivy League undergrads find walking to the bathroom too much trouble.

But the real trouble was caused by deeming the incident a “hate crime,” a label that itself is applied based on bias. Think about it: There is a pattern on college campuses of liberals targeting conservatives with attacks and vandalism. In 2004, liberals ran up on stage and [threw pies](#) at pundit Ann Coulter while she was speaking at the University of Arizona. In 2006, Columbia students violently [stormed the stage](#) during an appearance by Minuteman founder Jim Gilchrist, erected a banner with text written in both English and Arabic and forced the cancellation of his speech. The same year at the University of Georgia, [liberals stole](#) 1,200 copies of the conservative campus paper the *Georgia GuardDawg* and placed demeaning remarks on the paper’s distribution bins. Yet, despite the fact that these cases represent a mere sampling of incidents driven by anti-conservative bias on college campuses, no one even thought to charge the perpetrators with hate crimes. But why not?

Some may point out that hate-crime standards only protect certain categories, such as race, sex, religion, and “sexual orientation.” And this is precisely the problem. If we really believe that authorities can and should punish criminals driven by hateful motives more harshly, it should be applied across-the-



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 16, 2010

board. Otherwise, “hate-crime laws” is a misnomer. We should then call them what they are: Favored Group Status laws.

In fact, given the main argument used in favor of hate-crime laws, it’s apparent that their application would be especially appropriate in the cases of conservative victims. After all, leftists tell us that hate-crime perpetrators deserve greater punishment because their misdeeds affect not just their immediate targets but *serve to intimidate a whole group*. Well? This is precisely what leftists’ attacks on conservatives are designed to do; not only that, they succeed in this aim. Conservative students, and even some like-minded professors (all three of them), are often afraid to voice their beliefs for fear of scorn, ostracism, grade reduction/career destruction, and even violence. In fact, when you consider that the set of social codes known as political correctness has this very effect on the wider society (e.g., the Juan Williams affair), you realize that it is nothing but one big hate crime, an example of a wrathful segment of the population intimidating another, much larger segment of it into not voicing Truth.

And that really is the goal of that manifestation of political correctness called hate-crime laws. This is why even falling into a protected category may not help you if you’re the wrong sub-category within it. Consider how white-on-black crime is more likely to be labeled a hate crime than the black-on-white variety. Or think about the very different media reactions to the [Matthew Shepard](#) and [Jesse Dirkhising](#) cases. Both occurred within a year of one another. Both involved two men who tortured and murdered their victim. Yet while 21-year-old Shepard received endless copy and was used as a propaganda tool for enacting hate-crime laws, 13-year-old Dirkhising received hardly a mention. The difference? While Shepard was a homosexual murdered by two heterosexuals, Dirkhising was a heterosexual murdered by two homosexuals. Oh, and the Shepard case was *labeled* a hate crime — [incorrectly](#) it seems.

Of course, if the Harvard book-dousing had been an intentional act, perhaps the culprits would have been wise to point out that there is some kind of accepted nexus between urine and homosexuality. Just consider, for instance, homosexual “artist” Andres Serrano’s work depicting a crucifix immersed in a jar of his own urine. No one suggested that such sacrilegious treatment of a religious symbol is hateful, despite the assumption that soaking books on homosexuality in urine would have to be. I wonder, does labeling something “art” mean never having to say you’re sorry? I guess that some haters get government funding while other “haters” get a government reining.

As for the Harvard story, it doesn’t really have a happy ending. Dean Hammonds assures us that the 36 artistically-enhanced books — reportedly worth thousands of dollars (to somebody, anyway) — will be replaced. It seems that she doesn’t share this writer’s opinion that the mishap improved their value markedly.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe