

### **Politically Correct Science?**

#### Or Why is Homosexuality Treated Differently than Smoking?

I recently got the following email:

I just read your article about smoking and lung cancer [[Smoking Does Not Cause Lung Cancer \(According to WHO/CDC Data\)](#)]. I have lung cancer and smoked. I have felt so guilty. And it seems like the medical profession has the attitude "Well, that's what you get". Like I caused it, and shouldn't ask for help now. I don't know what to believe, but thank you for at least trying to present another side, or get at the truth. I still feel so guilty, but do feel a little better after reading your article. Thank you.

It made me wonder, why does society, researchers<sup>1,2</sup>, the scientific literature<sup>1,2,3</sup>, the media<sup>1</sup>, etc., blame smokers for causing their lung cancer but they do not blame homosexuals for getting their AIDS? I don't see articles titled, "Homosexual Promiscuity Causes AIDS" in the same manner that I see "Smoking Causes Lung Cancer" articles.

Could it be that homosexuality is a politically correct activity while smoking is not. Besides most smokers are moral conservatives who go to church and believe in traditional values...definitely not the type of people that the politically correct (PC) liberals want around anyway. Besides the PC crowd can not only blame smokers for causing their own lung cancer but for also causing the cancers and diseases of others (even if the facts don't support such correlations).

Am I such a dreamer to one day hope that scientists will just present the data and the findings that their data represents and not outrageous claims that have no basis in the facts derived from their research, let alone in the facts of anyone's research. Below are just a few examples of what usually happens followed by what the facts really support.

What we see: ***Smoking Causes Lung Cancer!***

While the facts are: ***A Smoker's Lifetime Risk of Getting Lung Cancer is Less than 5%.***<sup>3</sup>

What we see: ***Heterosexual AIDS is Epidemic!***

While the facts are: ***A Heterosexual's Risk of Getting AIDS is 200x Less than a Homosexual's.***<sup>4</sup>

Why can't science be communicated without moral and political biases? Shouldn't the theory, facts, and their implications speak loudly enough?

Many researchers now disclose where their financing comes from, yet they do not disclose their political/moral background so that the reader can likewise take these biases into account when reading an article that they have written. For instance, an article that shows a strong correlation between breast cancer and abortion by a pro-abortion researcher would have more weight than if it were written by an anti-abortion researcher. Also beware of the person who says they have no biases, for they not only have undisclosed biases but they are also liars. Everyone with an opinion has a bias, and if there truly is someone without an opinion then they are brain dead and would not have the intelligence to read a scientific article let alone write one.

So join me in yelling out our collective internet windows: "I won't take the biased science anymore!" Come on, I know you can do it.

Dr. Siepmann\*, Editor-in-Chief

\*In the spirit of full disclosure:

- Politics: though a registered Republican, Dr. Siepmann's philosophy is more that of a constitutionalist based libertarian.
- Morality: pro-death penalty, anti-abortion Catholic.

References:

1. <http://www.journaloftheoretics.com/Links/links-bias.htm>
2. <http://www.journaloftheoretics.com/Editorials/Vol-3/e3-4.htm>
3. <http://www.journaloftheoretics.com/Editorials/Vol-1/e1-4.htm>
4. HIV/AIDS Surveillance Report; U.S. HIV and AIDS cases reported through December 2000; Year-end edition vol.12, No. 2 Table 22 (<http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/stats/hasr1202.pdf>). [Homosexuals accounted for 18731 cases of male AIDS in 1999 of which there were about 3M (2% of the 138M male US population <http://www.census.gov/statab/www/poppart.html>, resulting in an incidence of 0.6% while US heterosexual males accounted for 135M of the US males of which there were 4517 cases of AIDS in 1999, resulting in an incidence of 0.003%. Therefore a US male has a 200x more chance of getting AIDS if he is a homosexual than if he is a heterosexual.]

[Journal Home Page](#)

Email comments/questions to: [mail@journaloftheoretics.com](mailto:mail@journaloftheoretics.com)

© Journal of Theoretics, Inc. 2002