



CNN Liberal Wants Daughter to Be Lesbian — and Admits It's a Choice

We used to hear parents say they want their children to have it better than they did. But that was back before today's relativism made "better" an incomprehensible term (at least, to the uncomprehending). Now there are dwarves who want to use genetic engineering to [design dwarf babies](#) for themselves. And then there's Sally Kohn, who recently penned an [article](#) entitled "I'm gay. And I want my kid to be gay, too."

SALLY KOHN



No, she doesn't mean happy. Kohn, a CNN political commentator and lesbian who lives with another woman, presents her rationale, writing:

More often than not, we define happiness as some variation on our own lives, or at least the lives of our expectations. If we went to college, we want our kids to go to college. If we like sports, we want our kids to like sports. If we vote Democrat, of course we want our kids to vote Democrat.

I'm gay. And I want my kid to be gay, too.

But unlike the doleful dwarves, Kohn isn't looking to the wonders of genetics and designer — or, as some have [said](#), "deformer" — babies. Her daughter is born and six years old, and Kohn makes it very clear that it's important the girl, as she puts it, "has the choice" and that this is "all I ultimately care about."

This is a striking admission. For a long time now, homosexuality-activist doctrine has stated what the online Huffington Post insists [here](#), that there's so much "proof" homosexuality is inborn that the issue is only debated by two-brain-cell troglodytes. But Kohn implies that there's no question nurture plays a role. As *American Thinker's* Z.T. Arnold [wrote](#), analyzing Kohn's description of her sex-neutral child-rearing practices:

If being gay isn't a choice, why go out of your way to deconstruct any sort of gender-role narratives with toys and books? If being gay isn't a choice, why always remind your child that instead of her toys being used as a mommy and a daddy, there can be two of each? If being gay isn't a choice, why push so hard for you[r] child to adopt that sort of mentality and lifestyle?

Of course, all the above are things Kohn admitted she does. She just wants her daughter to understand that "being gay is equally desirable to being straight," she writes. She only takes issue with "the idea that heterosexuality should be compulsory," that the "problem is not the idea that homosexuality could be a choice."

Wow. Welcome, Miss Kohn, to the world of ignorant, homophobic bigots.

That's not me talking, but some of her leftist fellow travelers who obviously haven't gotten the memo that the "problem is not the idea that homosexuality could be a choice." For example, John Nelson at *Atheist Analysis* [writes](#), "If you honestly think being gay is a choice then you are ignorant or homophobic or both, [sic] it's that plain and simple" (and Thus Spake Nelson). And actor Morgan



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 26, 2015

Freeman [opined](#), “These people who are ignorant enough to think that being gay is a ‘chosen lifestyle’? That’s the *height* of ignorance. It’s like saying being black is a chosen lifestyle.” I never knew being black was any kind of lifestyle — but I’m still learning.

Kohn touches on this Immutability Law of homosexuality activists and explains its origin and utility, writing:

The idea that no one would choose to be gay is widely held — even in the gay rights movement. In the early ‘90s, partly as a response to the destructive notion that gay people could be changed, activists pressed the idea of sexuality as a fixed, innate state. Scientists even tried to prove that there’s a [“gay gene.”](#) These concepts about sexual orientation helped justify the case for legal protections. The idea that folks are “born gay” became not only the theme of a Lady Gaga song, but the implicit rationale for gay rights.

Rationale? Or rationalization? Another homosexual who questions the inborn narrative, saying the “I can’t help myself” notion is insulting, is *New Republic’s* Brandon Ambrosino. Morgan Freeman might want to give him a talkin’-to, as the writer [avers](#), “When we conflate race and sexuality, we overlook how fluid we are learning our sexualities truly are. To say it rather crassly: I’ve convinced a few men to try out my sexuality, but I’ve never managed to get them to try on my skin color.” But Freeman needn’t bother because *Slate’s* Mark Joseph Stern was on the case rebutting and strutting and [writing](#), among other things, that an [“excellent retort”](#) by E.J. Graff argued “that America isn’t yet progressive enough to contemplate homosexuality as a choice.”

Very interesting. One could get the idea from the above that what matters with respect to the inborn argument isn’t its validity, but its *utility*. In other words, America isn’t yet left-wing enough to look at the truth — unobscured by propaganda — and accept the homosexuality agenda.

Of course, even if homosexuality were innate, the inborn thesis would always be nonsense — as it relates to the morality of homosexual behavior (or anything else). Interestingly, the aforementioned E. J. Graff tried to explain why himself, [writing](#), “If someone could prove that being a child molester or serial rapist or homicidal sociopath were genetically predetermined, would we welcome those desires into our public square? Hardly. They fail the ‘I’m not hurting anyone’ test. Which means the argument is really ‘I’m born that way and *there’s nothing wrong with that.*’” But Graff has it only half right. As I [wrote](#) earlier this month:

Some may now say that murder is different because it hurts another person. (Of course, others contend that indulging in deviant sexual behavior with another also hurts the person.) But this is a change in yardstick that renders the inborn argument irrelevant. After all, whether or not an action reflects inborn urges tells us nothing about whether or not it hurts another.

Stating the obvious, the inborn argument could be applied to anything inborn. Logically translated it says: If a feeling is innate, the actions associated with it are okay. This eliminates morality completely and replaces it with biological determinism (BD). This is why accepting the BD argument means accepting everything that can be proven to be inborn — even if it’s pedophilia, bestiality, or murder. It’s just a slightly more sophisticated way of saying “If it feels good, do it.” But biology does not determine morality.

... To abide by the principle of biological determinism — the force governing animals — would beget an animalistic society.

In other words, “I’m born that way” in Graff’s last sentence is at best extraneous information, at worst



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on February 26, 2015

fallacious implication. The pro-homosexuality argument really should read: ~~I'm born that way and there's nothing wrong with that~~ because _____.

But that blank is never filled in — not with anything reasoned, anyway. Instead we hear arguments callow, contradictory, and confusing (sometimes intentionally). And there just could be a reason for that.

Photo of Sally Kohn: screenshot from self-promotional website



Subscribe to the New American

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

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

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



What's Included?

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

Subscribe