

Normalising Homosexuality

Zaskia Elena Andrea*

Bachelor of Anthropology and International Relations, Bolivia.

ABSTRACT

Homosexuality is not broadly accepted in many societies of the world, including mine located in Santa Cruz Bolivia. Personally, I have studied abroad and been exposed to different people and ways of thoughts and now returning home I can only wish to share my understanding with the rest of my people. Since most of their unacceptance is due to uneducated guesses or simply the lack of education on the topic, I have decided to approach this, including the basic assumption I have made on the education or exposure to homosexual couples. Therefore, I decided on starting a project dedicated to the education and acceptance of openly homosexual people and couples. The mode of the project is questionnaires' and a few sets of talks and demonstrations to a public of different views. The tests will be taken separately by members of the LGBTQ and those who attend the talk.

Keywords: Homosexuality; LGBTQ; Bisexuality ; Tran sexuality

INTRODUCTION

Homosexuality is not broadly accepted in many societies of the world, including mine located in Santa Cruz Bolivia. Personally, I have studied abroad and been exposed to different people and ways of thoughts and now returning home I can only wish to share my understanding with the rest of my people. Since most of their unacceptance is due to uneducated guesses or simply the lack of education on the topic, I have decided to approach this, including the basic assumption I have made on the education or exposure to homosexual couples. Therefore, I decided on starting a project dedicated to the education and acceptance of openly homosexual people and couples. The mode of the project is questionnaires' and a few sets of talks and demonstrations to a public of different views. The tests will be taken separately by members of the LGBTQ and those who attend the talk.

The first questioner shall be in an interviewing manner to members of the LGBTQ about their actual life growing up and their view on society, and then about the wishful life in a utopian society in which they can imagine themselves been born in. This will show their way of thought and impulse me on what to present when giving the talk. This presentation will also take into account their ideals and even though it will contrast with their real life sometimes, the presentation aims to present a good, healthy gay lifestyle that is not very utopian like, but keeps a healthy lifestyle of someone we would call successful, ignoring sexual orientation and family state. We aim to understand the interviewed, while adding goals set by society already on defining what a successful person is.

Thereafter the talk shall be prepared based on information about actual so called 'successful couples' in first world countries adding the view of a healthy life style while growing up imagined and wished by the interviewed part of the LGBTQ community. The place shall be a public government building and-or a public university room so the most quantity of people can attend to. It will be open and only requesting as encouraging the subjects to try to stay in contact by answering the questionnaires' and asking any question they kept after the meeting.

The reason behind our focus on showing success according to society standards instead of their problems, or issues growing up is considering the nature of the project. This project focuses on education on the human factor to a society where the LGBTQ community is already seemed as containing hardships or strange customs. Therefore, we aim to explore a different kind of concept which is putting these people who are usually in disadvantage at the top of the game, following a similar pattern of successful life style as the rest but in a homosexual relationship. We want to improve this view by showing a fictionally constructed group of people who have already finished conquering all the traps set by a normal society which ignores their existence.

Our goal is to present citizens who could easily be named as role models for society, according to the Cambridge dictionary a role model is 'a person who someone admires, and whose behaviour they try to copy [1]. We shall follow Mandy's view of a role model to show our characters as good citizens. These characters lead by example, they not talk of what they want to do but show it and do it. Strive for high standards at all times, respect others, and keep

*Correspondence to: Zaskia Elena Andrea, Bachelor of Anthropology and International relations, Bolivia. E-mail: zaskiaelena@hotmail.com

Received: November 4, 2020; Accepted: November 20, 2020; Published: November 28, 2020

Citation: Zaskia E.A (2020) . Normalising homosexuality. Anthropology 8:220. doi-10.35248/2332-0915.20.8.223

Copyright: ©2020 Zaskia E.A. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

learning. Therefore, in this project the characters will be assigned with good jobs, well-earned for their personality so it becomes credible. Our intention is to show the good side, in contrast to other projects which dedicated to LGBTQ's sexual lives, HIV, or abuse against them. Our project will go a different direction with the aim of promoting education hopefully followed by acceptance to integrate LGBTQ into their personal views of society.

Second, we shall interview random people who were born and grew up in Santa Cruz about their views on the LGBTQ and the reason why their view has come to be. So we aim to be able to point out if private life, encounters, tv, social media, or common sense (however they came to their conclusion) has made the biggest impact in their views on LGBTQ, also the differences on views on individual parts of the LGBTQ being: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, and queer. We hope to use the findings of this study to shape our talk about LGBTQ so it can maybe have a slightly higher influencing success rate.

This project is aimed to help the LGBTQ community by enhancing the knowledge of them as real human beings living in our society, and forming part of a healthy life style in the pursue of their personal goals and dreams. I would like to make clear the fact that not because they do not fit the normal standards of people in our society, it does not mean they are meant to be perfect or lack of imperfections, to be accepted. The LGBTQ community are still normal members of our society and shall be respected as such. Even if our presentation will show this successful people, we shall point out the fact that no matter of sexual orientation or gender people are allowed to be normally themselves.

Next based on those first two questionnaires' we shall make a talk. When having the talk, the first two interviews will help us approach it, one to show *what* should be demonstrated and spoken about in the talk, meanwhile the second survey to non-members of the LGBTQ shall help us approach the *how*, since we want them to stay until the end and hopefully have the least amount of rejection possible. We are hoping to speak in a non-intrusive manner and in ways that the whole topic can be understood. We are going to be very careful since earlier approaches that have been seen as too extreme or harsh in their way of speaking, even accusative could cause huge backlash and the simple result of a closed mind not wanting to hear a word more. Moreover, we shall stay as far away from political parties or political talk as possible. Because historically this has only backlashed on the community and caused the same as harsh words (even when facts were given drily) and the closing of the mind of those listening, creating a complete disregard towards LGBTQ people, and even accusations towards them, as selfish or egoist, even insults. Therefore, we shall try to speak to everyone in their own way of speaking, always politely in nature and respecting as many communicational boundaries as possible, yet we aim to express everything. As sugar coated as possible but it will be spoken.

Our main aim is to normalize homosexuality as heterosexuality is normalized in the culture, which is why we shall show a couple living a simple happy life. We aim to normalize it and hopefully it can awaken something in the mind of the listener that will keep helping normalise it in the future. Our society is a heteronormative society, which means that every day through mundane actions heterosexuality is privileged and taken from granted [2]. Therefore, we shall aim to tackle this.

We hope this talk can help the LGBTQ community's level of acceptance among the assisting population and not only that, but

to demonstrate that they can be part of our society and they are as normal as the rest of the population. Right now LGBTQ groups refuge in their own social groups, therefore our aim is to reach people outside those groups so LGBTQ can be assimilated into the bigger society they do not actively part take on as openly gay.

KEY WORDS

Sex

It can be either one of male or female designed by birth according to one's genitalia and reproductive system, although in some cases a third sex would be that of a person born with both genitalia, or a uterus and penis at the same time. A typical man or of male sex are those born with a penis, meanwhile the holders of uterus and vagina happen to be females.

Gender

On the other hand is designated at birth by our human society. The fact that girls are dressed in pink and boys in blue is a gender definition. In our culture girls get earing holes when they are one day old meanwhile boys do not. This is a gender difference. Gender is what we think certain sex should behave like or the rules it must follow.

Homosexuality

It is when a person is attracted to a person of the same gender. This includes *Gay* which are males attracted to males, and *Lesbians* which is females attracted to females.

Bisexuality

It is when a person is attracted to people belonging to a different gender to that of his/her own.

Tran sexuality

It is when a person is not satisfied with the gender assigned at birth, sometimes this include a dissatisfaction with his/her own genitalia and sex so proceeds to adopt the opposite gender in which s/he feels happy with themselves.

This paper is on the mundane conversations and everyday things mothers do to privilege heterosexuality, thus creating a heteronormativity in their social context. It is a survey taken to mothers of children who are aged 3 to 6. The data suggest that mothers are parenting in a heteronormative-gendered environment, assuming that their children are and will turn out to be heterosexual. Moreover, mothers seem to be mostly making gay and lesbian invisible to their children. The research demonstrated that the construction on gender by the parents has a strong influence in children's sexuality, 'because their behaviour and dress are particularly limited in an early childhood and often it implies their sexuality.

This paper examines how heterosexuality may become a normative since a young age regardless of the child's ultimate sexuality. Parents assuming that their children will be heterosexual is the first step to heteronormative. Mother used friendship and desire in the children's words to read heterosexuality, for example, if the child said she liked a boy or girl from his kinder garden or asking to marry a tv actor. Mothers used gender behaviour to read homosexuality, for example if the boy liked dolls, or the girl doesn't, the fact that they are not following their gender identity would make the mother read it as the case of maybe their child turning out to be homosexual in the future. Mothers ultimately

showed 3 different approaches to homosexuality, there were those who prepared for their child to be gay or lesbian due to family members who already were and were very open about it with their children, then those who said they'd still love their child regardless but parented in a heteronormative way, completely making gay and lesbians invisible to their children's knowledge and did not approach it in any way. Then were those from conservative religions who said they are raising their kids in a way that makes it impossible for them to turn out gay or lesbian, by exploiting heteronormative. To do this they emphasize the importance of a two-parent home, children's affirmation of their identity as female or male, and children's identification with the same-sex parent. 'The research presented in this article suggests that mothers begin to construct heteronormative understanding for their children in early childhood. This likely contributes to older children's and adult's sense that heterosexuality is natural.'

Paths to homophobia [3] studies sworn officer's environment and thoughts about homosexuals in the order. It also includes civilians employed by a medium sized police department in the south west. So far, most studies focusing on discrimination on the work place used non-random gays and lesbians as their subject, in this case all the units including all heterosexuals were included in the study. Law enforcement has resisted to the integration of women and racial minorities in the past so here we examine their take on homosexuals in the order. The respondents do resemble the whole population of sworn officers at Saguaro in terms of sex, age, and rank.

Psychological research has shown that less educated, single, or male tend to be more homophobic than those who are young, female, married, or more educated. The study found that women are less likely of propagating myths about homosexuals, and do not have a superiority complex against them either.

The reasons behind this is that homophobia rises from a unacceptance of one's own homosexual tendencies according to some scientist. Meanwhile, others argue that homophobia serves as an identity maintenance in groups, to avoid being labelled as different. For example, the person re assures his own sexuality by dissing homosexuals to a homophobic stance, as a proof to their own group. 'In short lesbians, and gay men may threaten one's psychological sense of self, in terms of sexuality, masculinity, and group identity.'

Claims made against homosexuality can be both moralistic, and legalistic claims continuing to propagate myths such as gays molesting children. Also, the propagation of myths such as gay men being effeminated to make it a direct enemy of gender roles. From the group perspective we have certain religious groups such as protestant denominations, however Catholics do not take part on strong anti-gay or lesbians preaching. The police force is a group known to lean on hypermasculinity, where they fear that homosexuals can bring negativity into the force, such as special privileges for LGBTQ that could threaten their natural ways.

The conclusion is that major anti-gay or anti-lesbian arguments centre around promoting negative stereotypes, and asserting heterosexuals as superior, helping them create a group disposition.

Hiebert [4] suggest that the term homophobia should be abandoned to adopt **Homoppression** which is a more accurate term to its significance. Homophobia refers to a phobia, a phobia is an irrational fear usually inexplicable. However, the term homophobia is usually referred when there exist moral or religious disapproval

that does not elicit the feeling of fear. Contrary they are assuming the superiority, normative, and privilege, of heterosexuality, reflecting intolerant attitudes and behaviours against LGBTQ. Hiebert starts from the history of homophobia a generation ago. When in Canada the three major social institutions were treating homosexuality or none-heteronormativity as a disease and problematic, stigmatizing LGBTQ members. 'The legal system condemned them as criminals, the religious system rebuked them as immoral, and the medical system classified them as mentally ill.' Homoppression is a term characterising an oppressing society, since oppression is one form of systematic social justice. Thus, is society taking away LGBTQ's dignity and liberty to express themselves. Even if the medical and legal system do not oppress them anymore in first world countries where they are now allowed to marry and adopt, there are some moral and religious codes that still want to oppress them. Hiebert also makes mention of something many religious people who answered the survey for Normalizing heterosexuality 2009 used to excuse themselves for disliking homosexuality, and that is love. Hiebert says that many homoppressors will insist that they genuinely love LGBTQ people as 'confused sinners' and they love the sinner but not the sin, therefore, they go on campaigns to converting them into heterosexuals, and if this fails, they request them to abstain of any sexual act if not heterosexual. Obliging them to live in constant singleness, 'assured only that they are loved, despite of their perversions.' However, there are people who disapprove of LGBTQ choices and life styles but they do not try to take away their rights or force them to live a kind of life they would approve of. These people cannot be called homoppressors. Their love is empathetic.

McCormick [5] cites two books on his research about the liberation of attitudes towards homosexuality in the UK and US in these past 30 years. It was necessary for them to prove that homophobia has been decreasing. Dean conceptualizes the US as a post-closeted culture. The zeitgeist is characterized by 3 different eras. Ghaziani characterises the closet era by concealment, isolation and shame, lasting until the mid 1940's. Then the coming out era lasts from 1945 and 1997, characterized by a live style lived openly gay. Lastly the third era emerged in 1998 as the coming out era, and it's known as the post gay, characterized by the acceptance of LGBTQ and queer politics. All of these happening in the US and UK specifically but it gives us an outlook of the process of assimilation of a society. According to Dean heterosexuals' range between homophobic to antihomophobic. Their behaviour can be different a range between homophobic to antihomophobic. Their behaviour can be different according to their gender, for example homophobic women have no problem assisting a gay bar or having lesbian friends, meanwhile a homophobic man does not dare those things. Unfortunately, these works are quite old, since only 6 participants were millennials in 2005, the time the study took place. According to McCormack the attitudes could have changed, and men could be more gender fluid now than in the past.

PRESENTATION

Our study will not focus on an empathic approach since our talk will not focus on the problems and difficulties people from the LGBTQ face. An empathic project would aim to make the listeners put themselves on the hardships members of the LGBTQ have faced and could face in the worst of cases, but our aim is to attract them with a different attitude according to what we see fit in this culture. The culture extremely appreciates success and the show of one's abilities therefore our presentation will aim to conquer them

with sympathy for our LGBTQ people. The differences between empathy and sympathy reside on empathy is the listener putting himself in the place of the other person, and understanding them from their own suffering [6]. However, sympathy is understanding the other person according to his experiences as told by the experiencer and feeling real concern for them [7]. According to (alliative Empathy) empathy is preferred by cancer patients when it comes to the people treating them and hospital personal, for them sympathy was not enough. However our focus is not the reaction of the listeners as an action to the LGBTQ people, but a reaction within themselves towards the LGBTQ people, therefore the sympathetic approach has a higher chance of truly influencing their external views without putting up an act, because our project is not for them to try to impress the LGBTQ but to view the LGBTQ people positively.

For this project we are investigating the factors that play a role on people's empathy factors. So far it has been found out that things that seemed obvious have actually shown in research to not play a part at all. For example, self-esteem of the person expected to feel empathy, as in shown in [8,9]. Although contrary to these studies [10] there is a 15% positive correlation between self-esteem and empathy on medical students in three shanghai universities, quoting that "Enhancing medical students' self-esteem may be an efficacious way to improve medical students' empathy."

The main aim of this project is to test if showing a perfect picture while educating, and opening the mind of the listeners into this new kind of information, the person will soften their views, hopefully support the LGBTQ community on reaching their goals of success at the end. For this we will try to keep it nice and approach them in a way they feel not threatened so we don't influence their empathy levels to a declining point. According to Huang Li, Thai J, Zhong Y, Peng H, Koran J and Zhao X) there is a positive relationship between self-esteem and empathy, "Factors affecting self-esteem... may subsequently negatively affect empathy levels." Therefore, this paper is focusing on keeping the listeners self-esteem to a normally high level as essential to not attacking them for any lack of interest in the past towards the topic.

The presentation will mostly focus on homosexual couples. Transsexual will not be the focus on this writing. In Bolivia the change of one's sex is allowed [11], and afterwards marriage can occur, therefore a non-typical couple can be created. Since it is harder to distinguish them from a normal couple if surgery to change one's sex has taken place, we shall leave this to a side on this writing. Therefore, the whole project will focus on homosexual couples of the same sex and gender. By now it is important to clear up what we mean by sex, and what by gender. As enhancing on other key words.

FIRST SURVEY

To start this project one survey needs to be filled, so we get information towards the planning and making of the presentation. Our first aim was to get 500 people, instead our aim declined as the novel covid19 took over our society. Thus, we are forced to isolate by government law, otherwise we can go to jail, so the surveys were those we took beforehand and through online means. At the end we will use the data learnt from 100 surveys. The bright side is that it was able to diversify age, and educational background to 50/50. From young ages to the elderly, from educated to uneducated people. We shall go step by step displaying the data collected explaining how we obtain information to create the talk.

1. First question about knowledge of the meaning behind homosexuality, gay or lesbians. Most people were aware of these concepts, only 1.5% were unaware of the terms.

2. 70% of people who took the test define themselves as heterosexual. Almost 10% define as bisexual, and the rest between queer and gay.

3. When asked if homosexuality was good or bad around 70% said it was good while the rest marked not good.

4. When asked the reason behind their thought process the answers vary, the biggest one was 'freedom of expression' with almost 50%, while the others such as religion, morals, politics, other and personal, shared the next 50%. In here they also were allowed to give their own opinion, most people wrote that lgbtq deserved respect. While others wrote that it was a bad influence for children. Most of those filled by youth said they don't care as long as they don't bother them. Most people showed that it would be ok, as long as lgbtq are not in their way.

5. We kept our questions on the topic, since we aim to approach from simple knowledge of lgbtq to the opportunity of them getting married and adopting children. This question was about gay marriage. 50% agreed to it, while 35% disagreed, having the last 15% answering 'I don't know'

6. Our next question was about gay couples being able to adopt children and raise them as their own. This question was a big one, since people who even agreed to gay marriage, disagreed to them adopting children and raising them as their own. 50% said that it was all right, but the other 25% said that it was not ok, while the other 25% simply said that they didn't know. Various answers were given to back up their choice as denying adoption. The first and loudest one was the citing of Adam and eve, from the bible as an example of god, on how he wants romantic relationships to be like, closing it into heterosexual couples. Those who opted for a scientific approach answered that male and female make babies, and asking if another way can create a functional family. On the logical side there was the example of heterosexual couple those who opted for a scientific approach answered that male and female make babies, and asking if another way can create a functional family. On the logical side there was the example of heterosexual couples having gay children, homosexual couples can create heterosexual children, for those who worried that the child would be gay or lesbian. On this point of a gay couple having children there was also those who aimed for moral and values, saying that as long as they are good parents who can teach morals and values then there was no problem with them adopting children and raising them as their own.

7. We asked about the time they found out what gay or homosexual meant, most answered between the age of 10-16, the rest said they've always known it and 16-21 years old.

8. We also asked if this first mention of the topic was in a negative or positive way, 75% said it was a bad reputation, meanwhile the rest it was good.

9. The first time they heard about lgbtq was through their parents, television, and school. A few indicated through religion, movies, and other in a smaller quantity.

10. Finally, in the last question we get independent answers about the topic. On the bright side we have people's values, many of them pride on their humanistic views, so would not negatively intervene

in lgbtq's rights. They see their freedom to choose is what makes the system work. Most of them mentioned that lgbtq rights are normal and they do not give it much thought. On this pattern we can separate those who believe that lgbtq are good, and those who even though they do not condemn it, they do not accept it. At the end all those who would help lgbtq rights to fully happen see lgbtq as normal humans. Due to this normality many showed their despise towards them. Lgbtq were mention to be too pushy with themselves, and show off when possible. These people feel angered by the believe of lgbtq always trying to get attention or be too showy. Moreover, negatively they see it as immoral and anti-religion, they feel their moral beliefs are threatened. At the end there are those who are simply uncomfortable at the thought of lgbtq. For this we believe only exposure and education can help in the pursue of a positive view.

Next we will propose answers and logics to deal with their negative view, while pursuing a positive view of lgbtq. We do not only aim to try to expand on lgbtq but push for support when passing lgbtq right laws.

APPROACHING FIRST SURVEY.

The presentation will start from zero, we will first introduce lgbtq separately: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transsexual, and Queer. Followed by the more formal words such as homosexuality and heterosexuality. Thereafter, the introduction to the understanding of gender, male, female, or non-binary. Then we shall explain our society as a heteronormativity ruled society. We will explain deeply basing on (Normalizing heterosexuality, 2009, American sociological review.).

Then we shall explain international human's rights. Human rights are globally recognised and recognizes that every person is free and independent to live their life, while not perturbing others, independently of race, age, religion, or sexuality.

Next, we will refer to the lines of opposition and refute them in accordance. We will separate each point into: Religion, Morals, Biology, and Logic. Religion will be mostly Christianity since it is the most prominent religion here.

Religion

Against: People use the bible "You shall not lay with another man, as with a woman" to attack lgbtq people, proposing that homosexuality is forbidden by god.

Pro: The quotation is poorly translated, and it is not accurate. The bible doesn't talk about sexuality, "There is only one reference to sexual behaviour between women, and that is in Romans 1:26. The context of this reference has to do with Gentiles rejecting the true God to pursue false gods; i.e., idolatry. And, the sexual behaviour described is orgiastic, not that of a loving, mutual, caring, committed relationship. What is condemned is the worship of false gods [12]. Moreover, the bible does not say anything about homosexuality, since the word didn't even exist in Hebrew at the time.

Moreover, another point to notice is would any of those biblical people treat and look down on others just because of their sexuality. Putting the question out, would Jesus really be a homophobic. Anyone who grew up in this society talking of Jesus as pure love and understanding would realise that there would be no meanness. Then, we also have the fact that half the things the bible says is mostly ignored, such as not eating sea food, or dressing on different

silks, or clothing that shows too much. Some things we even do on daily basis like wearing jewelry.

Morals

Many people interviewed thought of homosexuals as immoral people, not only because of their sexuality, but because their sexuality makes them more prone to cheating, divorcing, and as people who simply search to be sexually satisfied. There is no proof that any of this is true, contrary most studies have shown that their relations are as serious in their life as a heterosexual couple's.

Biology

Another tool used to refute homosexuality is the believe that a gay couple can't have biological children, and that only couples of the opposite sex are natural. Adding to the fire is the believe that god created Adam, and Eve as to show what is natural for him.

First, there are also heterosexual couples who are not able to give children due to whatever reasons, and this fact doesn't make them any less of a legitimate couple.

Second, what is really natural? It is demonstrated that gay behaviours have been observed in all range of animals. Animals do not think when behaving, they just do, therefore their behaviour is fully natural. Thus, homosexuality is more than natural in all sort of living beings on earth, from mammals to reptiles, fish, insects, and birds.

Third, Adam and Eve's answer is not only sexist because it makes seen woman and less than a man, and more prone to sinning. God never asked them to repopulate, so procreating was not an aim, it only came as a punishment after they were expelled. Moreover, a book cannot dictate what is natural and what isn't. Only science can tell, and it has proven that homosexuality occurs all the time in nature.

Logic

First the type of relationship that other people have doesn't affect you in any way. Their existence does not harm anybody. Moreover, it is love between two responsible adults, who have the right to live and express themselves in our society. They have the human right that we all share which is the right to be of any gender, and sexuality. People in love asking for the right to marry and be openly in a romantic relationship are deserving of our understanding. Like the saying goes if you don't like gay marriage, then don't have a gay wedding. But other people are allowed to have their own ceremony to demonstrate their commitment with each other, and society.

Many people agree to all of the above, but have two problems with it. One is that they do not like lgbtq demonstrating their relationship openly. It makes them feel threatened, moreover, they believe that this shows children a bad example. Second, they believe they are showing off, and trying to force others to accept them. Many of these people believe that being gay is all right, having a gay relationship is ok, but it should be kept private and not be demonstrated in public, and should be treated as a +18 topic.

One problem these people use to be mean or homophobic is the believe that homosexuality is a choice, and lgbtq openly chose to be different. Let's start by the basics which is why anyone would openly choose to be part of a minority that is openly attacked, and their rights taken away in many parts of the globe, sometimes they are not even allowed to continue living. Logically no one would choose the mode hard of living. We need to make them

understand that being gay is not a choice, neither the environment, it is something naturally born within people. Other people argue that it is in their biology, so many parents of lgbtq's use this against their children, because they are the first openly gay in the family it must be him or her choosing to become gay by force. So, they do not accept their children being the first gay in the family, however before it was harder to admit one was gay and many lived hiding it their whole life, also it has not been demonstrated that genes are what made people gay.

Finally, there is the believe that homosexuality is an evolutionary anomaly. In 1973 the American psychiatrist association removed homosexuality from its list of mental disorder.

What Causes Homosexuality? - Family Research Council by A People [13].

There are two theories overall that explain how homosexuals are made. One theory state that it is genetic and people are born gay. The other theory is that people are made gay according to their environment and psychological factors.

According to Wardell B. Pomeroy, Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research (1972), there was absolutely no evidence of inheritance. However, a number of studies during the 90's supports the idea of inheritably gay. First is the study of Simon LeVay (1991) who studied the brain of cadavers, including 18 men known to have been homosexual, he compared their brain with another 16 men and women known to be heterosexual. According to this study he found that INAH 3 was twice as large in heterosexual men as in the women. Suggesting that INAH 3 in the brain is related to homosexuality. However, the heterosexual cadavers, were assumedly heterosexual, there was no security of it. Also, three of the homosexuals had larger clusters than the mean size of heterosexuals. Even though there was a correlation it could not prove causation. Moreover, many of the cadavers died due to HIV, so the cluster might relate to the illness than to homosexuality. There have been more brain studies, one study L. S. Allen and R. A. Gorski (1991) found that the brain part known for anterior commissure was larger in homosexual as opposite to heterosexuals. They examined 120 individuals and found no variation in the size of the AC with age, HIV status, sex, or sexual orientation. The study has not been corroborative. Then it appears J. Michael Bailey and Richard C. Pillard, (December 1991) study on twins. The method employed to test fell short of the ideal genetic epidemiological study. Which would involve systematic ascertaining sample of twins. This study failed to prove genetic and biological hypotheses. In Bayne and person's analysis the evidence suggest that homosexuality is mostly environmental, rather than genetic. This is not the only twins study made, another study Scott L. Hershberger (1997) also failed to prove that homosexuality is biological. This study also concluded that it was mostly environmental, than genetic. "the adoptive brothers of homosexual twins are more prone to homosexuality than the biological siblings suggest that male homosexuality may well be environmental." If homosexuality was fully genetical, then both identical twins should share their sexuality yet, every twin has demonstrated to have his own sexuality.

Finally, there's the study of genes, searching or the gay gene Dean H. Hamer, (1993). Hammer interviewed various families with more than one gay son, he found out a significant amount of them had a gay maternal uncle. Also, found that they had a weak father's link. This would suggest that the 'gay gene' would be on the X chromosome inherited by the mother to their sons. Hamer

claimed: "We have now produced evidence that one form of male homosexuality is preferentially transmitted through the maternal side and is genetically linked to chromosomal region Xq28....[I]t appears that Xq28 contains a gene that contributes to homosexual orientation in males." However, there is no gay gene in the sense of inheritance of eye or hair colour. Moreover, he did not claim all cases of homosexuality were like this. Thus, he took into account the environmental variables. Afterwards, this scenario has not been replicated, discrediting Hamer's theory. Byne and parson's concluded that the genetic theory remains unproven.

They key problem to homosexuality as fully genetic it's that homosexuality would have died out already. If not genetic, there is also the theory of homosexuality being due to the hormones when pregnancy. If it's a baby girl pregnancy and there is more testosterone in the womb, she would inheritably be a lesbian as a grown up. However, data showed to disprove this theory.

Up to now all theories referring to the 'gay gene' has not been proved, however some data showed that genetics may play an indirect role when people show liking to the same sex.

Prior 1973 most researched focused on early childhood to the causes of same sex attraction. Then, the attention shifted to parents, according to Freud (1916) described mothers of homosexual's as a key indicator in their children's future sexuality. The mother would be extremely loving while fathers were mostly absent. By 1962 Irvyn Bieber made a study that proved that rule, mothers overly loving, with detached or absent fathers creating a gay child. By 1964 a British study also found to support this theory with 70% of homosexuals having exactly that paternal patterns. in 1963's Daniel G. Brown found that from 40 people, 30 complied with the case of mother-son relationship and father's absence, following the above's pattern. By 1965 a study in genetic psychology monographs also found the same, adding support to this theory. Afterwards many other studies have proven the same pattern of parents-child's relationship. Such as Marvin Siegelman (1974) Ibid (1974) Daniel G. Brown (1963).

There has been found a big correlation between child's sexual abuse making them into homosexual adults. It seems it affects the propensity of the child turning gay.

Finally, the last believe of homosexuality, is the "Exotic becomes erotic" it is a recent theory offered by Daryl Bem of Cornell university. It suggests that children's perception of different is what makes it likeable.

If homosexuality were genetical and biological one must await to find them globally everywhere; however, it seems that urbanized areas are the meeting point of most homosexuals. As with urbanization higher education is also correlated to congregation of homosexuals.

GAY MARRIAGE

What is marriage?

In Bolivia marriage can be written or oral according to Bolivian law of 11 October 1911. It is a union between two adults who are not related. The people in marriage is treated as a family under the protection of the state. After both people are united under marriage, everything they earn and buy belongs to both of them. They are able to adopt children and raise a family.

So far marriage happens all over the globe, but gay marriage is only allowed in some developed nations. Since the 2000s the trend of

allowing gay partnerships to occur and become gay marriage has happened in most civilised nations, from the USA to Europe. Gay marriage consists of the union of people of the same sex, all the laws and recognition by the government implemented. From the share hold of belongings and state, to the recognition as a proper family.

Those against gay marriage [14] haven't openly made their case, letting it boil down to leaving the old marriage rules would show open prejudice against the LGBTQ community, therefore most young people are eager to allow gay marriage as a law. Many people have spoken from the conservative gay community. An example of this is Sullivan who sees gay marriage as a civil union that economically is convenient for both people; meanwhile it also shows a strong bond between two people. Covering, both the psychological and economic stands. Arguing that marriage is good for society so gay marriage is also beneficial for society. The author who is openly gay, believes that one thing that really makes marriage is the fact that men and women together can create a life, while science may change this in the future it's still not fully natural for a gay couple. According to the author, marriage is not a simple choice and it has a long history that must be respected. Gay marriage would not make marriage just another contract, since the two people are bonding for the same emotional reasons. According to the author, gay marriage takes some seriousness off marriage, and it will make gay men cheat easily. Also claiming gay couples would divorce and separate more often. Gay marriage is not as harmful as polygamy but it would make the institution seen less feasible.

In this essay we see that the author has some assumptions about gay couples, probably based on his own views, but a large study has not been made on the topic of cheating or breaking up more often, therefore he has made the assumptions due to his own experience, which cannot reflect the entire society.

Fear Itself Meditations on Gay Marriage. David Moats [15]. The author explains how people badmouthed the simple thought of gay marriage as if it was just natural, to diminish it so harshly. The author recalls his time growing up in a paranoid USA where everything even similar to communism didn't have a place on the table, even less in an open talk. He shares the similarities between both, for a society that it's constantly changing. Now he states it is exchanging the fear of communism with the fear of sex. Still on the horizon there was feminism, gay rights advocates, creating a sexual revolution. A common reaction of those who oppose it, it's to compare gay marriage with the most unethical thing they can think of. This way trying to put gay marriage with things that are morally corrupted such as bestiality and murder. In a group talk, many LGBTQ people spoke from their heart about their feelings, from how they grew up as, or the fact that they've been with their partner for many years, dissipating the picture of promiscuity and immorality. Then, she quotes other happenings, stories of those who were gay and how they didn't choose it. It includes gay partner's children's point of view. People were uneducated about these topics in the past, so putting something dramatic as compared it to unmoral things was easier. It spoke of fear turned into hate. Education against fear, can be of great help.

Gay Marriage, Liberalism, and Recognition. The Case for Equal Treatment. Jacob M. Held. Public Affairs Quarterly [16]. The topic of gay marriage is not discussed much about, but once it is, the arguments on each side, show weakness and many prove invalid. People who use religion as their argument, have full freedom to choose to do so, and not marriage as a gay couple, but other people

have the right to do if they please since this is about politics. We don't live in a theological society. Marriage should be secular. Another group, use the definition of marriage as the union of a man and a woman, or of opposite sexes. Moreover, another group who defines marriage as a means to an end, and that is reproduction. This view is inherently biological, which is a theological stand in marriage. Failing to address childless couples. In opposition of gay marriage there's also the believe in tradition, as "it has always been a woman and a man" and as with any tradition it should get updated in today's progress, as we did with slavery and women's rights. There is also the legitimate concern of the institution of marriage losing its strength, and raises the argument, of gay marriage destroying the institution. But because they value the institution of marriage is that LGBTQ want marriage. Finally, another reason why gay marriage is unaccepted by some people is that if we allow gender to be interchangeable, we could allow anything to be, thus, allowing polygamy or marriage with animals. Gay marriage is different from those things because happens between two independent adults who are in love, and have full consciousness of what they are doing, unlike animals or children. "The best argument for gay marriage may simply be that there is no compelling argument against it". The first case for gay marriage is that it will have the same stabilization on society as common marriage. This means that it would promote family values within the gay community. As we could see all the anti-gay marriage cases are not really logical, therefore gays are not forced to create a case for gay marriage, those against it are those who must make a case. Gay people would like their rights to be extended to be able to marry a person of the same gender, and it is logical that they deserve it. Even though the case against it are not study based researched, we must speak about it and educate people on what seems more logical. Civil union doesn't count because it doesn't give all the rights as marriage do, economically a marriage is more convenient.

ADOPTION AS A GAY COUPLE

"Consider some of the concerns often raised. People argue that children raised by homosexual parents will have a distorted sense of sexual identity. But no study has shown this to be the case."

There is the argument of children of gay parent's will be ridiculed by other people, but the problem here is not the parents but those who ridicule.

Gay Marriage, Same-Sex Parenting, and America's Children. William Meezan and Jonathan Rauch. The Future of Children. [17]. The authors investigate if heterosexual parenting and homosexual parenting is interchangeable. The community in itself is hard to find, but according to studies, children of same sex parents are doing as well as children belonging to heterosexual couples. Even though it investigated same sex couple's raising children, none of them were legally married. It was found that lesbian mothers or gay fathers were just as any other normal parent. It was also found that there's no evidence of children being confused sexually or question their gender identity. Also, teenagers demonstrated to not have any problem with their gender identity or sexuality. It also found that children did better with two parents, regardless of sex and gender; instead of with one parent alone. Same sex marriage is convenient because it gives more stability and durability to the couple when raising a child.

APPROACHING SECOND SURVEY

The second survey was aimed only to LGBTQ members, and people who identify as queer. Our first intention was to get 100

participants, unfortunately the outbreak of COVID19 has gotten in the way. We can't go out so we only trust contacting person to person, At the end through online inviting we got 26 people that fit the criterium. 15 people are gay, 2 are lesbian, and 9 bisexuals. They realised their sexual preference in different part of their lives, we have 3 people realising at age 1 to 10. 11 people realising from 10 to 16, another 11 people realised at ages 17 to 21, and finally 1 person at ages 22 to 26.

After asking at what age they realised we proceeded to ask the how of this happened. They mostly realised at a young age when feeling more than normal affection to classmates and friends of the same sex. Most of them realised they were not straight when accepting the fact that they fell in love with someone of the same sex. Since they were children they could see others of the same sex as more than friends. Many of them have not left the closet, meaning that they haven't come out saying to their parents and friends that they are gay. It means that they keep their relationships and tastes private. On the other hand, those who have come out the closest did it to make a statement. Many explain how they did it to show support for the lgbtq self-expression shows. They meant to **make a statement** of marking the importance of their freedom to live their sexuality. Moreover, most of them first came out to their parents. Thereafter, to show support they showed themselves sure of their sexuality and stating it as normal. Acting of it as normal it helped reinforce the thought that it was actually normal. Compared to heterosexual's thoughts of it being a personal preference by choice, these lgbtq members do their best to make their likes and preference been seen as normal. So that is one thing they reach for, normalising homosexuality.

People around them did not act happy or in a good manner once they came out of the closet, although only 1 person had a horrible backlash, the rest are between ok and well. When asked how would have they desired their families and friends to react the main answer was 'normal' they didn't want it to be especial or look down upon, what they aimed for was to get a normalising reply. The second most common reply was calm and indifferent, they wished for them to be indifferent and with motivational support.

Next, we asked them about a perfect world that comes to their mind, how do they imagine this world to be. At first it came the word discrimination, a world without discrimination, many went in detail how they wish they could just go out and hug or kiss their partner in public. How they wish for the world to see them as normal, and specifying for taboos and stigma against lgbtq to not exist. They said even a world that does not need activism or open shows of lgbtq, a world that doesn't need this extra support, where they have indeed normalised homosexuality. Then they also specify not to have to hide their relationship status, and violence against lgbtq. They asked for respect as equals without any one being supreme over the other one. Finally, they asked for empathy with the community because we still haven't achieved that normalisation of homosexuality, we so are looking to achieve one day. A world where people wouldn't judge someone based on their sexuality, and avoid attacks physical or mentally against lgbtq members. A world where homosexuality is natural and not any different from the straight community. A person's sexuality is not defining.

We asked them for the main things they would want the world to change. As expected, many of them answered with the abolishment of prejudices and homophobia. Second what they all answered was to exchange religious and cultural values for a more modern humans' rights as a rule. They said they'd like for people's mind

to be changed for a more open one where education is the norm. Those were the overall answer, the application of human rights over religion, and education over prejudices.

We asked what is the thing that most affect them when treating with homophobic people. The strongest answers were "they do not affect me at all" and "nothing". But others were plain unhappy for how they were being treated like. Many mentioned that homophobic people anger them because for some reason they think they are superior and feel like they can judge them. Their irrational hate and anger towards lgbtq community. Moreover, other than acting superior they paint lgbtq as one of the worse things in the world, as if not following the normal heteronormative will cause disgrace in the world. Many lgbtq fear rejections and being treated badly, so they stick to their families or group of friends where they feel can be protected against the harsh anger of homophobia. Hurt by their harsh words, they try to avoid homophobic people and to never cross paths with them. Thus, they have created a slight fear in them, making them not wanting to be alone against the world. They fear humiliation being that the other person might be worse, but just because of their sexuality they are judged.

Further we followed asking what was the perfect life they can imagine. It started with a sense of illusion for many, being that they saw the question too utopian like. At first many said that it was impossible so why bother thinking about it, and that perfection doesn't exist. We started with disbelief of a better life. For those who were not negative from the start were a bit more open starting with the normalisation of homosexuality, the fact that they should not have to come out the closet, where it doesn't matter what their preference is or is put under less pressure. A free life where everyone is the same disregarding gender and sexuality. One request we heard often is to be able to live with their same sex partner without it being frowned upon. Also shows of affections in public, if heterosexuals can kiss in public, so should the rest. The acceptance of families with parents of same sex. Their perfect life was non-discriminatory where they can marry to the person they love and raise children together, just as any other family. Thereafter many asked for peace of mind just like any other person. Many of the people mentioned how it was impossible and did not feel too well answering such a utopian like question, finally a place and state of life where their dreams can come true.

In overall people were pretty realistic, but their hopes and dreams spoke very clearly to us, the want the normalisation of homosexuality for the sexualities to become equal, then they wished to be free to form families in their own with same sex parents. They dream of normal parenting and living standards.

PREPARING TALK

At first our plan was to have an open talk in a government building, however due to the lockdown caused by COVID19 we are unable to proceed this way. Thus, we have been forced to explore a different kind of approach. We will use the force of internet to expand to our citizens. The plan is to record the talk to upload it into you tube. Then share it to our participants, the more the merrier. After the video every person will be invited to fill in a survey.

Step 1

Explain key words such as lesbian, bisexual, gay, transsexual, and queer. Followed, by the explanation of sex and genders as different things, since there is a big misconception towards them. This will help them understand the concepts better.

Then I will approach religion. First, I will explain why it wouldn't matter paying any attention to it, however if the person is religious, we shall explain how the bible rejects many things that don't make sense and we don't even follow. After wards how the bible mentions something similar to gay couples ambiguously, we can't be of certainty. Of course, everything is reproached directly from the bible ignoring intermediaries such as father's of the church. We shall take everything literally from the bible. Explain why intermediaries can be extremely homophobic.

Thereafter, we shall explain why logically is ok to be lgbtq. Logically we shall explain why it is normal to let them live their lives. And how their sexuality is completely unrelated to their part in society, or other people.

Step 2

Introduction of gay couple, based on real people.

We invited two guests to join our conference. A homosexual couple that has been together for over 6 years. Christian is a psychology university student about to graduate, and his boyfriend is called Carlos who has already graduated the public university and has started to work. His job allows him to share a health insurance with his boyfriend Christian. They are both very dedicated people and dream of one day soon marry in any of the neighbouring countries where gay marriage is allowed.

They are both good members of society; they study and work following the norm. They share their love in private and in general behave well publicly. The respect they show others should be returned full circle. They are deserving of being treated as anyone else, moreover they should be allowed to show their love if they chose to.

We finalised by showing a normal couple already living and working in our society, showing that it is not the end of the world, or a new concept, the fact that there are gay couples already forming part of our city and communities.

VIDEO FEED BACK AND SURVEY

Once they have finished watching the video people are requested to fill in a survey. It starts by asking their personal opinion on the video. Followed by a question of knowledge, as to what is homosexuality for you? Then we move on the family sphere, asking if they would accept a homosexual child if any. Thereafter we move on to asking if they would openly support the gay rights movement. According to their answer why would they or why wouldn't. Thus, leaving suppositions, we go to reality by asking if they already have shown support to the lgbtq members in the past. Why did they or why they didn't. Finally, we go to the openness of society. Would they accept public gay show of affection? Last, we ask if they accept lgbtq further rights, such as marrying and adopting. At the end we leave a blank space for people to give us any opinion we haven't asked.

At first, I was worried the demographic would be only young people, but thanks to the internet and some family help we got broader demographics, from 16 year olds to 60 years old. In age we are varied, unfortunately we faced the challenge of most of the people being highly educated, since many were from the public university, and the rest lawyers of more than 20 years of experience. We couldn't truly reach the less educated people.

Our latest survey was filled by 50 people after watching the video. We started with a basic question on their actual position towards

lgbtq, is it normal? Only for the 51% of people view homosexuality as a normal part of our communities and everyday life. The rest replied that homosexuality was not common in our culture and communities.

After wards we focus on the emotional part, we asked if they would accept a son or daughter with homosexuality tendencies. Over 80% said they would accept a gay child, even those who found homosexuality as a not normal part of society. This question is important because no matter the view on the topic if someone loved happened to be homosexual, people are prone onto accepting their family members, and recognize their rights.

Next, we go back into their thoughts of society by asking if they would engage into personally fighting to protect lgbtq rights. 65% of the people said that even though they respect lgbtq they would not actively engage in protest or fights for lgbtq rights. This is what we call silent support. Even though they would not actively engage they personally have empathy towards lgbtq members and their rights.

We kept asking about taking action for the community lgbtq, most people around 70% said they would not fight for the rights of adopting a child for same sex couples. However, they would not fight against it either; they would be once again silent supporters of lgbtq right. There was a 30% who said they would actively engage in activism and demonstrations to support lgbtq right of adoption.

So far we have people who would not actively engage in activism to support lgbtq, however they do accept lgbtq people as normal part of their communities, societies and even family.

This sum being higher than before, they would openly show their support for lgbtq members to gain the same rights of adopting and marrying as any other heterosexual couple. The silent supporters as we see now are mostly common in educated people in the subject, it is the first step towards open recognition of lgbtq rights. Once they decide to not go against them, accepting them as normal or family, they are more prone to change their stand in a more actively kind of way, with the pass of time.

Next is what would take for people to help the lgbtq community by activism or open support. First there is if they are part of the society then they should be supported. Then there is the fact that so many kids don't have a family so it would be good is there are more adopting parents. They say that is a personal business so other people shouldn't judge. Then there was the simple mind of simply not wanting to get into an argument, so silently supports. Religious supporters claim that under god we are all the same, no matter the sexuality or gender. Then we have those who support gay marriage but not adoption, this is something to be treated with time and exposure. The explanation behind them allowing same sex couple to adopt is because they believe in the kindness of theirs. They believe a good home is made by the people no matter sex or gender. There are many abandoned children out there, without a loving family and healthy environment. And a gay couple can offer love and safety for those children. As long as there is love people can easily accept homosexual couples in their normal society. Everyone deserves being loved as much as they give love out. If the couple does not only have love but money, there's no reason why shouldn't they adopt.

On the other side there are people who show their disinterest by saying "I don't care, I don't respect them" with the known excuse that there should be a mom and a dad. Many simply believe that only

heterosexual people can raise a child well. They claim for society to be degenerate if homosexual couples can adopt children and have their own family. Then the harsher people stand by the believe that a gay couple is unable to raise a child, that only straight cis male or female can raise children. Many people believe that if they support the lgbtq rights movement more people would become gay. The religious who go against gay marriage and adopting believe that is against their religion to support lgbtq communities. They claim that the child would be “confused” if raised by two gay parents. Which has been proven wrong already. The meaner people refer to lgbtq as perverse people. Many harsh people still believe that being gay is a mental illness. Also, they think that the adopted children would become mentally ill. Finally, some simply dislike lgbtq communities because according to them, they are against their religion.

A 34% of people said they would openly support activism focused on lgbtq rights. The rest said that they simply wouldn't.

Around 60% respects but do not support a gay lifestyle. Some even reaching the point of calling those activists “radicals”. On the other hand, there are those who just think they are too different from heterosexuals so they can't support them. There is also the belief that they do not need specific rights, which I completely disagree with. People need to be allowed to marry and adopt, moreover their treatment in society is not the same as a heterosexual, facing discrimination, therefore they need specific rights to protect them.

Many would like to openly show their support but there has not been an event where they can openly show their love and support. Many recognise that they are a vulnerable community in our society. A great quantity belief that simply by supporting silently they are showing their support, by simply let it them exists. They are seen as normal and natural, people who deserves respect and happiness. Many agree that the lgbtq community in Santa Cruz, Bolivia is very weak and lgbtq suffer of great discrimination. Many support in silence saying that since childhood they have been taught to respect.

Finally, part of those silent supporters simply do not believe that activists have the best lgbtq interest in their head, so they refuse to be part of the activism, however openly support lgbtq rights.

When it comes to the video I asked if it influenced them in any way, 30% agree that nothing changed their views when watching the video, meanwhile the rest says that they enjoyed the story told.

When it comes to the video I asked if it influenced them in any way, 30% agree that nothing changed their views when watching the video, meanwhile the rest says that they enjoyed the story told. It was their opportunity to show their silent support. They are also reminded of how many lgbtq people has suffered greatly even to death when discriminated.

Many affirm that even though they enjoyed the video they do not agree with homosexuality. It is well spoken and it shows good things but their dislike of homosexuality is still raging on within them. Some even learned things for example when speaking about religion, how the bible never mentions gays at all. Many of them even agree with what I was explaining, so they felt more secure of their own beliefs. My motivation motivated them to be more open with their support for lgbtq. Many mentions how they would use my guideline to argue in favor or lgbtq. Our goal of not coming out strongly or harshly was well received by the public, mentioning that they didn't feel attacked or forced to listen.

Finally, they mention that the video showed a reality which we need to be aware of. So, they can show their support.

Our main goal of being listened to, while approaching everything in a positive manner came to a good end.

Finally, we asked about pride, and around 45% said that it meant nothing important, while 23% said it was good, and the rest said it was not good. And following the branch of open public display, we went on public display of affection by homosexuals. Only 15% said it was good, the rest was between it doesn't matter and bad.

CONCLUSION

Our goal of being listened to while explaining the topic was a success. Everyone agreed that the video was not forceful; neither made them feel any kind of guilt or negative feeling.

People watched until the end even if they disagreed with what was being told or if it didn't resonate with their views. The video was still able to hold those people. For those unsure of their views it gave them a straight path to follow, with every argument put in order. Which many answered was very helpful to put their own ideas in order.

Apart from the good reception we also focus on spotting supporters. First there are the **silent supporters**, who do not discriminate against sex, or gender. Yet, they either didn't have the chance to show their support, or simply was not very keen on expressing their believes out loud. Yet in any voting or in general they do support lgbtq communities. Then, we have those who openly show their views in activism. Finally, there were those who disliked them, we had both openly homophobic and those who would simply not support in public because it goes against their view or morality or religion.

Open supporters

Silent supporters

Silent dislike

Open discrimination

We could separate the people on 4 states. First is openly supportive people who would engage in activism to protect or claim lgbtq rights. Then, we have silent supporters, we have seen that they are happy to receive good information of lgbtq, and happy to silently protect their rights. I noticed that most silent supporters with time and more education into the topic become: open supporters. So they are good to entertain pro lgbtq thoughts with.

As the drawing showed, there's no middle. There is either silent supporter, or silent dislike for the lgbtq. With silent dislikes were all those who replied they didn't care about deepening into the topic, or about lgbtq rights.

Thereafter, we have open discrimination, those who openly admitted they would never support lgbtq, and that they go against a good society. They were open in their dislike. Thus, it is already an achievement the fact that they finished watching the video even if it truly differs to what they feel about lgbtq. I believe is a success to have put the cards on the table, and believe that with time they will soften their views about lgbtq. For this the study must be studied forward in another paper.

Our friendly approach was well received with the people no matter where in the graphic they stand. We shall continue to use this friendly method for further research.

The study included a range of people aged 15 to 70 years old, from both educated and uneducated background. Mostly educated folk. We are thankful for all those who participated in the study, and we look forward expanding the study in the future.

REFERENCES

1. Calder DM, Nursing standard, How to be a good role model, Nursing Standard. 2016; 31 (7).
2. Martin KA. Normalizing heterosexuality: Mothers' assumptions, talk, and strategies with young children. *American Sociological Review*. 2009;74(2):190-207.
3. Bernstein M. Paths to homophobia. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*. 2009;1(2):41-55.
4. Hiebert D. Is it Homophobia or Homoppression?. *Canadian Review of Sociology*. 2016 ;53(4):488-92.
5. McCormack M. The after-effects of decreasing homophobia. 2016; 50(2):6.
6. <https://lesley.edu/article/the-psychology-of-emotional-and-cognitive-empathy>
7. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/empathy-vs-sympathy.html>
8. Con VP, *Psychological Thought*. 2016: 9(2).
9. Loinaz I, Sánchez LM, Vilella A. Understanding empathy, self-esteem, and adult attachment in sexual offenders and partner-violent men. *Journal of interpersonal violence*. 2018.
10. Thai J, Zhao XD, Huang L, Zhong Y, Peng H. et al. The positive association between empathy and self-esteem in Chinese medical students: A multi-institutional study. *Frontiers in psychology*. 2019;10:1921.
11. <https://www.lostiempos.com/actualidad/nacional/20160521/promulgan-ley-identidad-genero>
12. <https://www.hrc.org/resources/what-does-the-bible-say-about-homosexuality>
13. <https://downloads.frc.org/EF/EF08L41.pdf>
14. Lopez MA. The Case Against Gay Marriage. *The Good Society*. 2005;14(1):1-6.
15. Moats D. Fear itself: meditations on gay marriage. *The Virginia Quarterly Review*. 2004 ;80(4):186-95.
16. Held JM. Gay Marriage, Liberalism, and recognition: the case for equal treatment. *Public Affairs Quarterly*. 2007;21(3):221-33.
17. Meezan W, Rauch J. Gay marriage, same-sex parenting, and America's children. *The Future of Children*. 2005:97-115.