

Lecture Note A

We live in a world of relationships. Although we recognize ourselves and others as individual beings, the designation is more a convenience than a definitive reality. All humans enter the world and live as members of a social group. While the degree of social interaction varies widely from person to person throughout life, the social aspect of the human experience is universal. Even taking into account the occasional cave dwelling hermit or the ship-wrecked resident of a deserted island, no human lives his or her entire life as a self-contained monad. We are social creatures and as such our very survival, at least at times, depends upon other people.

Beyond basic survival our sense of who we are is defined by our relationships with others. Any life role, such as parent, teacher, criminal, or counselor requires that another person or persons occupy a logical complimentary role; such as, child, student, victim, or client. While one role does not necessarily create the other (victims certainly don't create criminals), a role requires a logical compliment to exist. As such, there is no teacher without the complimentary role of student, nor is there a leader without the complimentary role of follower.

Nested social systems

The concept of the individual person occupies a place of preeminence in many cultures, particularly those associated with the western world. In these societies, individual achievement and accomplishment are lauded and illuminated, often eclipsing the collective aspect of human endeavor and achievement. Individuals may be viewed as the basic unit of human existence. The individuals possess a brain which allows volitional thought and senses which allow interaction with the environment. Such a perspective of individual preeminence is in no way wrong. It is, however, incomplete.

Given the universal social nature of the human experience, the concept of the individual can also be viewed as an arbitrary construct in which the larger social aspect of human existence is parsed for convenience. The singular biological individual only exists as part of a larger social system. Although we are born, live, and die in the confines of a somewhat autonomous human body, we are inextricably connected to other people throughout our lives, and dependent upon these people for existence and survival. In consideration of this fact, concepts of connectedness and social relationships, in many ways, provide more valid and accurate descriptors of human existence and human experience compared to the concept of the individual.

This aware, that the individual exists only as part of a larger social system, holds profound implications for understanding human behavior and ultimately, we may conceptualize humanity as a single social group. However, the totality of humanity is commonly divided into smaller subsystems for heuristic purposes (Becvar, Canfield, Becvar; 1999.) If we conceptualize the various connections that individuals have with others, we recognize that any defined relationship such as a couple, family, or community only exists as a subsystem of a larger defined social system. Moving from the simple to the more complex, we progress

from a recognition of the individual, to the couple or dyad, to a basic social group such as a family, to a larger social group such as an extended family, to an even larger group such as a community or tribe, and to still larger and more complex social systems based on some criteria of ethnicity, race, nationality, or culture.

Relational dyads and pair bonding

It remains a biological fact that newborn humans cannot survive without adult support. Under optimal environmental circumstances, it is questionable whether any human under three or four years of age could survive independently. An infant's survival is dependent upon the nurturing of an older human. Under adverse or harsh environmental circumstances, even adults require support to survive. The human biological need for support defines us as a social species.

Despite cloning and advances in reproductive technology, at the dawn of the 21st century our ability to reproduce as a species still requires sexual pairing. Our survival is dependent upon reaching an age of viability, which requires the support of at least one other person. This reality has led to the formation of common human social connections. The most elemental and essential to the process of human reproduction is the male-female dyad. The most essential to infant viability is the parent-child dyad (adult- infant dyad)

In many societies, the human social unit consisting of one adult male, one adult female, and their offspring constitute the basic human biological unit of the family. In western societies this has come to be known as the nuclear family. However, in many other societies, the extended family, consisting of multiple generations living in the same household or close proximity, constitute the primary human social unit.

The family is built on the social structure of a monogamous marital dyad, consisting of one male and one female. However, monogamy is by no means the universal model for intimacy and families. Many human cultures, presently and throughout human history, have primary or secondary family social structures which are polygamous, consisting one husband and several wives. Many tribal societies are organized around a polygamous family unit. By custom and law, polygamous marriages are not uncommon in many Muslim societies. By contrast, in many western countries polygamous is illegal.

There are also many variations on both monogamous and polygamous family structures. Divorce, single-parent households, multi-generational extended households, and various alternative lifestyles yield a variety of family configurations. Regardless of form, the family unit provides the basic structure which, among other things, supports reproduction and support of offspring.

To this end, all human cultures appear to have some form of recognition of pair bonding between men and woman. However, the western concept of monogamous marriage is by no means universal and the ideal of life-long sexual fidelity is an ideal driven by a particular social value, rather than by human biology.

None-the-less, all human cultures appear to have some sort of ritualized pair bonding between men and women. The sexual pairing between a particular man and a particular woman may be a brief encounter or it may be a life-long bond, depending upon social and cultural customs and mores. The reasons for entering into a dyadic relationship certainly go beyond biological imperatives of reproduction. People form close social relationships to meet a number of life needs (i.e. companionship, economic support, mutual support, division of labor, child rearing, sexual gratification, social status, etc.) Depending upon the customs and values of a particular society, the pair bond may be brief or life-long; the bond may be formal or informal.

Biologically, humans as well as most other living organisms on our planet produce far more offspring than could ever reach adulthood. Historically, disease, famine, and war have taken a large toll in human life and until relatively recently in human history these realities have kept human population levels somewhat stable. Only in the last several hundred years has technology brought about great advances in food production, health care, medicine, and sanitation, resulting in a dramatic decrease in infant mortality and subsequent increase in human life expectancy.

As such, it is no longer necessary for all humans to reproduce in order to maintain stable population levels. In fact, the notable decrease in worldwide infant mortality means that more people reach adulthood and reproduce. In many regions of the world, this increased life span has resulted in over population, depletion of resources, and overall reduction in the standards and quality of life for many people.

Scientific advances in human cloning research aside, heterosexual pairing is necessary for human sexual reproduction and to ensure continuation of the human race. However, while heterosexual relationships represent the vast majority of human pair bonds, they are by no means the universal. Gay and Lesbian relationships have been noted throughout human history. Although the causes and origins of homosexuality remain largely speculative, it is well established that homosexual behavior is a common form of human sexual and relational expression. While cultures vary in terms of their level of tolerance and acceptance for homosexual unions, such relationships are common and increasingly accepted in many countries, representing an alternative sexual and relational lifestyle for many.

As a species, we have been extremely successful, at least in terms of proliferation. However, with the current world population exceeding six billion people, the social reproductive strategies which have served us so well in the past may no longer work to our benefit, at least in the immediate future. At a macro level, the mechanisms which govern global human reproduction are not clearly understood and we can only trust that the successful evolutionary strategies of human reproduction will have emerged over the millennia will continue to work to our favor in the future.

The human sex drive remains strong and our present social-sexual behaviors continue to ensure an abundance of humans. However, a biological sexual/reproductive imperative only offers a partial explanation as to why humans pair up. Many couples remain together beyond child bearing age and many people form dyadic relationships for non-reproductive

purpose. Many people, at least in cultures which do not persecute homosexuality, form same sex relationships for many of the same reasons as do heterosexual couples.

One explanation to be offered is that the human tendency to engage in social pair bonding serves a primary biological purpose which ensures reproduction, but that human existence does not depend upon every couple reproducing. Perhaps in addition to facilitating human reproduction, of which most people engage, the formation of dyadic relationships also fulfills a number of other essential survival or life enhancement needs.

A child born to this couple may be reared within the context of this nuclear family unit, or the child may be separated from its biological mother at birth and reared by others.

Family

Regardless of the term we use to describe our social grouping (e.g. family, community, tribe, race, culture), this cultural identity and affiliation plays a role throughout our lives. From birth we are immersed in the beliefs, values, customs, traditions of our culture. The language we speak, the food we eat, the manner in which we worship and countless other expressions are learned in the context of our culture.

As adults we may embrace, modify, or reject the values of our culture, but we can never escape our own cultural influence. Throughout our lives, our cultural origins serve as the reference points by which we judge all other subsequent views and beliefs. Although we may separate from our cultural group and adopt different customs and beliefs we remain connected to our cultural origins.

For most of us, our membership in a particular cultural group is a circumstance of birth or fate. We do not choose our parents, nor at least initially, do we choose the culture into which we are born. While some people transcend their culture of birth through adoption or other circumstance, the vast majority of humans are born into, live, and die within the social context of a particular cultural group.

Either as a consequence of birth circumstances or by conscious choice, we live our lives in the context of a particular social community, whose beliefs and understanding of the world provide a foundation by which we judge, understand and give meaning to the world. From early infancy we acquire an awareness of our world. We come to identify with a particular community, region, or nation. Although we may exchange the community in which we live for another community, our origins invariably provide the basis by which all other life circumstances are compared.

These affiliations, or more importantly the interactions we encounter in these various social affiliations, define us as individuals. Social institutions offer us personal identity and transmit an awareness of this identity. Collectively, this sense of identity may be referred to as a culture.

Throughout human history, this is the way it has always been. Families, living units, communities, tribes, nations, have formulated belief and value systems and transmitted

those belief and value systems to their members. The youth learn from the older members of society.

The process of education is more accurately a process of indoctrination in which a particular society imprints upon its members the collective set of beliefs. To this purpose, we construct formal and informal methods for educating members of our society. This process begins at birth and continues throughout our lifetime. The family unit, particularly during childhood and adolescence, plays a central role in the lives of most people, however as most parent can attest, the influence of the family is only partial. Peer relationships, as well as membership in various community groups, play an important role in this process of cultural assimilation. Schools, colleges, and universities exist for the primary purpose of teaching the beliefs society. For many, a particular religious affiliation or belief system occupies a position of central importance. On a larger scale, expressions of popular culture are defined and conveyed through various media such as television, radio, cinema, theater, music, art, books, magazines, and cyber media.

Cultural Identifiers

For convenience and utility, we often parse humanity into separate and distinct groups. Using some criteria to distinguish one cultural group from another, is both useful and problematic. Cultural identity, however it is defined, serves to create alliances and mutual support. It also creates a sense of division with other people who differ from members of the identified group in some aspect.

As such, we grapple with the similarities among and distinctions between Europeans and Asians; Christians and Muslims; Protestants and Catholics, etc. etc. While useful in some contexts, such cultural labels are social constructions which illuminate some trait or demographic variable as essential while minimizing or ignoring other variables as irrelevant or incidental. Thus the term Christian or African American, or any of a number of other cultural identifiers, provides a label which allows comparison within and between groups of people.

Between the individual and the totality of humanity, there are any number of criteria which might be employed to identify and distinguish one person from another. Language, race, religion, gender, age, sexual orientation, and many other identifiers may be used to distinguish one person from another. These identifiers, in and of themselves, have no meaning beyond what one attributes to them. However, used singularly or in combination, such identifiers serve as a taxonomic tool for identifying groups, distinguishing between us and them.

This challenge in selecting any factor as a basis for establishing cultural identity is to recognize which factor, or set of factors is essential to cultural identity and which factor(s) are merely incidental. While race has been widely recognized as distinctive cultural identifiers, in some contexts this variable may be merely incidental with factors such as religion or sexual orientation playing a more central role in cultural identity.

The following is a partial list of factors which may be used as a basis for establishing cultural identity:

Language	Family structure/child rearing practices
Race	Values/beliefs
Religion	Gender
Ethnicity	Age
Nationality/national origin	Food preference
Sexual orientation/ sexual practice	Music/art preference
Socio-economic status	Similar clothing
Physical attractiveness	Common Recreational interests (i.e. sports)
Education/ Intelligence	Shared history of oppression
Political/philosophical orientation	Physical limitations
Social group membership	history of oppression
Common Customs/traditions/rituals	

Consider which of these "cultural identifiers" are essential and critical to one's cultural identity, and which are merely incidental.

B,Canfield

Lecture Notes B

Constructing Reality / Concepts for understanding the world

All human cultures offer some type of explanation as to how the world works. Religions teach about the origins of humanity, instruct adherents in proper moral living, and offer explanations of death and eternity. Similarly, various philosophical schools offer conceptual frame works for organizing thought to assist in developing an understanding of the nature of things.

While various philosophical schools present differing perspectives on the world and ways of organizing thought. While philosophical differences are sometimes diametrically opposed and irreconcilable, at other times the differences are merely variations in emphasis.

Realism

The realist view of the world holds that everything in the world exists independent of any observer. In this view, everything has an "intrinsic" essence which exists independent of an observer. The realist view holds that the formulation of any concept or belief is merely an intellectual task of accurately identifying the inherent essence of some "thing". One is either right or wrong, depending upon how accurate one identifies the inherent essence. In this view, at least in its purest form, embraces a world of absolutes in which fact, truth, and reality are identical concepts. The philosophical tradition of "realism" which holds that truth exists independent of any observer and that we, as thinking creatures, either systematically seek it out truth and reality, or merely stumble upon and discover it.

Science has recognized the existence of certain immutable facts in the physical world, which exist independent of any observer. Barring external influences, the speed of light is a constant, the rate at which an object falls to earth is a constant at terminal velocity, volume of space occupied by a gallon of water at sea level at 60° degrees, etc. While all of these phenomena can be altered, given certain constant conditions, these phenomena are recognized as immutable facts of nature. For many centuries, this view has held a preeminent position in Western thought and include such labels as literalism, fundamentalism, absolutism, and modern tradition.

This position has also created justification for embracing one's beliefs as inherently right and those of dissident voices as wrong.

Conceptualism

The "conceptualist" view regards a concept or belief about anything as subjective. That is, anything that is known or understood is ultimately defined by the beliefs of the observer. In this view, all concepts are products of human consciousness, unrelated to any "facts" of an independent reality. In this view of the world, something is true or false, right or wrong if one believes it to be that way. A concept of any thing is merely an arbitrary notion reflecting the individual and cultural bias of the observer. This concept is expressed under the labels of "relativism" and "post modernism".

An integration of these two schools allows a more complete explanation of the reality of "concepts". It can be posited that both an "objective reality" exists independent of any observer,

but that this "reality" requires recognition and attribution of "meaning" by the observer.

Therefore, any "objective reality", while possessing immutable factual elements, may have multiple meanings, depending upon the understanding and interpretation of various individual observers.

The two major religions of the world, Christianity and Islam, posit the existence of God (Allah) as a supreme being, who exists independent of any individual observer. As such, the notion that the concept of God is a human construction challenges many who have been brought up in a culture which expects unquestioning faith in religious matters. However, such a view does not deny the possible existence of God. What the conceptualist view holds is that God may very well exist, but we have no means of understanding his existence aside from our ability to create our own concept of God.

One might therefore think that any true believer of Christianity or Islam would be required to embrace a realist philosophy. However, the belief in God as an entity independent of any observer is not the same as recognizing the inherent nature of God. Any concept of God requires that each observer to create or endorse an understanding of God that is personally meaningful. Indeed some religions point out the unknowable nature of God surpasses all understanding.

In regard to human knowledge and understanding, man (in the non-gender specific meaning of the term) has to be the measure, since he has to bring all things into the realm of the humanly knowable.

This notion is particularly helpful in developing a framework for "cross cultural counseling." which typically pairs a counselor and client with culturally divergent points of reference. Any view of a "reality" (e.g. concept, behavior, event, etc.) will invariably be filtered through the culturally differing perspectives of each observer. Counselors are taught to speak the language of the client. This is important in terms of joining and understanding the client's reality.

However, there are situations when the client's view of reality is clearly "out of touch" with their environment, at least in a functional sense. Effective counseling is not just a matter of "speaking the client's language", but assisting the client in developing a way of thinking, or more accurately behaving, in a manner that is more functional in the cultural context of the client's world.

The notion of the client being able to construct reality and meaning independent of the context of the society and culture in which the client lives ignores the social rules and pressures which shape expectations of client behavior. Clients who deviate too far from cultural behavioral norms are invariably punished in some manner.

In order to evaluate something, it is necessary to accept several axiomatic principles. For the most part, all of our concepts, all our ideas and notions about the world are formed on the basis of differentiation and integration, the ability to compare similarities and contrast differences. It is through this process that we attribute meaning to all things. Through this

process, the concept of "chair" is distinguished from the concept of "table", the concept of "fast" from "slow", "slavery" from "freedom", etc, etc.

This intricate process of differentiation and integration applies to all of our concepts except the concepts of "existence", "identity", and "consciousness". Existence, identity and consciousness are concepts in that they require identification in conceptual form. However, their uniqueness lies in the fact that they are perceived or experienced directly, but grasped conceptually. The concepts of "existence" and "identity" are every entity, attribute, action, event, or phenomenon that exists, has ever existed, or ever will exist.

The concept of "consciousness" refers to every state or process of awareness that one experiences, has every experienced, or will ever experience. Consciousness is a state of awareness. We become aware through a process of comparison. We examine a new "thing" in terms of how it is similar (integration) or different (differentiation) with what we know.

This process of awareness or "consciousness" begins at birth and is initially limited to the level of physical "sensation". Sensations are experienced immediately in the physical sense and are not retained in memory. However, after experiencing a sensation, the human mind immediately creates a perceptual memory or "percept". It is through the formulation of a percept that we "conceptualize" and retain in our memory experiences of physical sensations such as "pleasure" or "pain". However, the actual experience of "pleasure" or "pain" remains experiential.

We cannot conjure up an actual physical sensation from memory, only the concept of the sensation. Similarly, while percepts of sensations are retained in our memory and provide a certain link to the past, we cannot project these sensations into the future.

Sensations are merely an awareness of the present and cannot be retained beyond the immediate moment. Perceptual awareness is merely a collective memory of physical sensations. Conceptual awareness is the only type of awareness capable of integrating past, present, and future.

Epistemologically, each human is the measure, since each of us must conceptualize phenomena to a degree that it becomes "known". In order for this to occur, it becomes necessary to accept our own existence and consciousness as fundamental and basic. Any questioning or evaluation of the "existence" or "consciousness" of the evaluator (by the evaluator) is paradoxical and a logical impossibility.

As observers of concrete phenomena we must accept as fundamental, our own "existence", "identity", and "consciousness". These concepts are not created through the process of differentiation and integration but rather exist as fundamentals. One can study what exists and how consciousness functions, but one cannot analyze and prove existence, or consciousness as such. Logically, the concepts of "existence" and "consciousness" are irreducible primaries.

Aristotle held the view that only concrete things exist. But he held that definitions refer to metaphysical essences, which exist in concretes. Aristotle regarded essence as "metaphysical",

objectivism regards it as "epistemological" Man is the measure - epistemologically not metaphysically.

B, Canfield

Lecture Notes C

At the beginning of the 21st century, the population of our planet earth is approximately six billion people. We have been a marvelously successful species capable of flourishing in most land areas of the planet from arctic tundra to tropical rain forests, from coastal swamps to mountainous terrain. As humans, we express ourselves in more than 6,000 different languages, residing in approximately 200 different nations, comprising thousands of separate and distinct cultural groups.

The scope, scale and diversity of our species is truly mind boggling. Dr. Phillip M. Harter of the Stanford University School of Medicine offered the following condensed perspective: If we could shrink the earth's 6 billion population to a village of precisely 100 people, with all the existing ratios remaining the same, it would look something like the following:
There would be:

57 Asians

21 Europeans

14 from the Western Hemisphere, both north and south

8 Africans

52 would be female

48 would be male

70 would be "persons of color" or "non-white"

30 would be white

70 would be non-Christian

30 would be Christian

89 would be heterosexual

11 would be homosexual

6 people would possess 59% of the entire world's wealth and all 6 would be from the United States

80 would live in substandard housing

70 would be unable to read

50 would suffer from malnutrition

1 would be near death

1 would be near birth

1 (yes, only one) would have a college education

B, Canfield

Lecture Note D: Cultural Domination

Multiculturalism holds that, for the most part, all cultural beliefs are inherently and equally valid, that one cultural perspective cannot morally be viewed as superior to another. This view has led to a belief that the domination of one culture over another is morally wrong. A consequence of this is to vilify the dominant culture as oppressive and view the subjugated culture as oppressed.

That history is wrought with demonstrations of human domination and oppression is undeniable in many respects. The rights, identity, and even the very existence of one group of people have been forfeited to the benefit of another group of people.

A commonly held story of multiculturalism goes something like this:

In an earlier era, indigenous people lived upon the land, more often than not, in a state of balance and harmony with their environment and each other. The society of indigenous people possessed their own unique culture and social institutions; their own language, religion, food, social institutions, laws, medicine. When human problems and disputes arose, the society had ways of handling such issues in a manner that the members of that society considered fair and equitable. The beliefs and values of the society were taught to the young and provided guidance for all members of the society. People lived, worked, loved, and procreated, consistent with the natural order of things in the on-going circle of birth, life, and death.

However, this state of stability and relative happiness was disrupted when the indigenous people encountered the outsiders. The outsiders were members of a different cultural group, perhaps identified with a separate and different tribe, clan, or nation. The outsiders, in some aspects, were different from the indigenous people. While the outsiders were similarly human in some respects, in other ways they were different. Perhaps they spoke a different language or had an unfamiliar accent, maybe they worshiped a different God or Gods (or none at all), perhaps they just looked or dressed different, or perhaps they possessed different beliefs, world views, or values. Whatever, the essential differences, the outsiders were not like the indigenous people.

Contact with the outsiders may have occurred in many forms. The initial contact may have been isolated and infrequent, such as the case of explorers or frontiersmen in 16th and 17th century North American wilderness. Or the contact may have been immediate, immense and overwhelming, as in the case of an invading army seeking land and riches, as was the case of the Spanish conquest of central Mexico in the 15th century.

Either because they overwhelmed the indigenous people by sheer numbers, or because they were more technologically advanced and successful in waging war, the outsiders conquered and came to dominate the indigenous people. The technology and trade goods of the outsiders seduced the indigenous people resulting in an erosion, or in extreme cases a total loss, of their previous cultural identity. Typically, the language, religion, beliefs, and customs of the indigenous people were displaced by those of the outsiders. While vestiges of the indigenous culture might remain, over time contact with the outsiders brought destruction to the indigenous culture. The stronger came to

dominate the weaker.

If this story of cultural influence is widely endorsed, that indigenous people (now more accurately viewed as a minority group or culture) are conquered or oppressed by outsiders (now more correctly viewed as the dominant culture, since they are no longer outside), then it is understandable why persons identifying with the minority group would feel both a personal and collective sense of oppression at the hands of members of the dominant cultural group. Similarly, it is understandable that members of the dominant culture might struggle, individually and collectively, with a sense of past and present injustice and inequity.

Cultural evolution and natural selection

Defendants of the cultural domination paradigm hold that the indigenous culture came to be dominated by the outside culture because the outside culture brought values, beliefs, and institutions which worked better than those of the former indigenous culture. Cultural Darwinism in which survival of the fittest, cultural evolution in the sense of natural selection of useful traits.

This view of members of one culture dominating the members of another cultural group is certainly a correct view. But it is not the only correct view. Further, it may not be the most useful view. Alternatively, it may be argued that there is no such thing as a "dominant" culture since cultures which interact exert a mutual influence over one another. As such it is not one culture which dominates another, but ideas. Over time, useful ideas dominate.

B,Canfield

Lecture Note E: Cultural Identity based on Sexual Orientation

Homosexuality refers to a same gender sexual preference. A common term used to describe the sexual orientation of a homosexual man is "Gay". Similarly, the term "Lesbian" is used to describe a woman who is homosexual, (a Lesbian may also be described as "gay"). At present, these terms are not considered offensive to gays and lesbians. However, other commonly used terms such as "queer" or "fairy" may be considered offensive depending upon the context in which they are used.

A Transvestite is a person who dresses and holds himself out to public as member of opposite sex. A transvestite may be either male or female and this behavior may or may not correspond to sexual preference. This behavior varies in terms of length and duration and social context. In some social contexts, a male transvestite may be described by the slang term "Drag Queen".

A Transsexual - holds him or herself out to public as member of opposite sex in terms of appearance and lifestyle. Involves cross-dressing, as well as hormonal or surgical gender modification (sexual reassignment surgery).

Defining Homosexuality

Homosexuality is a same sex" sexual orientation/preference which may or may not include a community orientation. Research concerning the frequency of homosexuality in the general population suggests that between 3 and 11 percent of the population may be considered homosexual by sexual orientation. However, this statistical range is difficult to ascertain since a common definition of "homosexuality" is difficult to establish. A homosexual act, does not necessarily indicate that a person is homosexual.

For example, in prison populations it is estimated that up to 70% of inmates engage in "homosexual" acts while incarcerated. However, most revert to a preferred heterosexual preference and lifestyle upon release. In this example, homosexual behavior is not so much a sexual preference as a form of sexual release in light of limited social options

There is also a very high incidence of same sex acts (fondling, genital stimulation, etc.) prior to puberty. This behavior should not be considered "homosexual", but falls more in the area of "sexual exploration". Even post puberty "sexual experimentation" is not necessarily "homosexual". Homosexuality involves a clear "same sex preference".

Other individuals purport to have a "bisexual" orientation, in which they are more or less equally attracted to both sexes. As such, sexual behavior may be viewed on a continuum from exclusively homosexual, to some heterosexual behavior with homosexual preference, to some homosexual behavior with heterosexual preference, to exclusively heterosexual.

The therapeutic technology exists to modify a person's sexual orientation, but the techniques are highly invasive (Many of these techniques are used to treat pedophiles). However such Sexual orientation reparative therapy is considered unethical and is condemned by all reputable professional associations and training programs. It should be noted that the same therapy to change sexual preference from "homosexual" to "heterosexual" could also be equally effective in changing "heterosexual" to "homosexual". As such, no ethical counselor will attempt or endorse efforts to change a person's sexual orientation.

B,Canfield