

Sorcerers, Demons and Obsession

The motion picture has become one of the marvels of all time; a true Wonder of the World in its magical powers. But what is wrought on the screen for every man and his family to see and ponder has been even more wonderful.

—Walt Disney

If there was one film that epitomized the anti-biblical theme running through some of Disney's early works, it was the 1940 release of *Fantasia*—an almost total glorification of witchcraft, sorcery and satanism set to classical music.

Adorning the film were a veritable menagerie of centaurs (in Greek mythology, a half-man, half-horse creature descended from Ixion), centaurettes, fauns (baby centaurs complete with cranial horns) and water nymphs (in Greek my-

thology, a form of female divinity, immortal or long-lived, associated with various natural objects or places and regarded as young, beautiful, musical and sexually amorous). There were also unicorns, vulcans (gods of fire), demons, Chernobog (in Slavic mythology, a god of malignant evil) and a bevy of malificent evil spirits, demons and grotesque fiends—the complete antithesis of the God of the Bible.

Just a description of the various sections in the movie may cause some to question how or why Disney marketed this film to children. For example, Cinebooks' *Motion Picture Guide Review*, in labeling *Fantasia* as a revolutionary integration of great works and wonderfully imaginative animated visuals, illustrates perhaps the most famous section in the movie, "The Sorcerer's Apprentice":

When the old sorcerer goes to bed, Mickey Mouse, the title character, tires of carrying buckets of water and scrubbing the floor, so he tries on the conjurer's tall conical hat (which glows slightly to suggest its magical properties) and commands a broom to grow arms and legs and tote the buckets. As Mickey watches the broom tirelessly fetching, he nods off, awakening from his dreams to find the room half-filled with water. He feverishly tries to stop the broom, but it will not stop. . . .

When he grabs an ax and chops the broom to pieces, each piece grows arms and legs and continues the task, although they are now completely submerged. The sorcerer appears at the top of the stairs and with a wave of his hand restores the room. With the slightest trace of suppressed amusement, he retrieves his broom from the sheepish Mickey, then gives the mouse a swat across the backside with it.¹

Twisting the Sacred

In an affront to Roman Catholics, "Ave Maria"—Schubert's classic song tribute to Mary, the mother of Jesus—is one of the most touching and beautiful songs of all time, yet Disney chose to use it in the section of *Fantasia* called "Night on Bald Mountain," in which evil spirits rise from a graveyard and fly through the night to the mountaintop where Chernobog, the "black god," waits for them to pay homage to him. As the spirits swirl around him, Chernobog, who resembles a fusion of Dracula with a cow head, revels in his mastery of the underworld. As the dawn breaks, the spirits return to the graveyard and Chernobog retreats back inside the mountain. As he does so, in true Draculian fashion, strains of "Ave Maria" are heard in the background.

Though it seems malevolent in and of itself, this section of *Fantasia* is more than a mere con-

juring up of make-believe. In the original Latin, the lyrics to "Ave Maria," which even Protestants could appreciate, are as follows: "Ave Maria, gratia plena, Dominus tecum. Benedicta tu in mulieribus, et benedictus fructus ventris tui Jesus."² Translated exactly, it means, "Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus"—virtually the exact greeting Elizabeth gave Mary after Elizabeth's unborn son, John the Baptist, leaped in her womb at the very presence of the mother of the Son of God (Luke 1:39-45).

How ironic that a celebration of evil, such as *Fantasia's* "Night on Bald Mountain" presents, is scored with a song that glorifies the One who defeated the very demon the movie promotes and glorifies.

In the late 1960s, *Fantasia* became a cult film for the hippie generation of druggies, many of whom believed that the entire Disney staff must have been high when they made it. Arthur Babitt, the animator responsible for some of the movie said, "Yes, it is true. I myself was addicted to Ex-Lax and Feenamint."³

Disney biographer Richard Schickel says there were several low points in *Fantasia* besides the Bald Mountain sequence. Some critics, for example, panned the movie's creation-of-the-world scenes. The garish volcanic eruptions, with their evolutionary overtones, seemed out of place when set to Stravinsky's "Rite of Spring"⁴

Schickel goes on to comment about the film:

To make sure everyone got the idea that this was art, the girl centaurs were originally drawn bare-breasted, but the Hays office insisted on discreet garlands being hung around their necks. The torsos and heads that topped the horse bodies of these creatures belonged to adolescent girls styled to resemble the teenager down the street.

The sequence ends with the most explicit statement of anality ever made by the studio, which found in the human backside not only the height of humor but the height of sexuality as well. Two of the little cupids who scamper incessantly throughout the sequence finally draw a curtain over the scene. When they come together, their shiny little behinds form, for an instant, a heart.⁵

Disney, though, may have wanted the Bald Mountain scene in *Fantasia* for other than artistic reasons. According to Schickel, Disney was riddled with obsessions, one of which was a preoccupation with death.

Dark Predictions

Reportedly, at a party a fortuneteller predicted Disney would not live past his thirty-fifth birth-

day, a prediction that haunted him even after he passed that date. At best, he figured he'd been given a short reprieve, and for the rest of his days he avoided funerals and, when forced to attend, fell into long, brooding depressions.⁶

Disney even avoided reporters who wanted to write his story. His logic: Biographies are only written about dead people. According to Schickel, Disney worried that such reporters would pry into business and personal secrets (he saw little difference between the two). Moreover, they might somehow reverse the usual order of things, thereby causing his demise.⁷

There can be little doubt that Disney's occultic incursions in *Fantasia* and other films containing satanic teachings made him vulnerable to the whims and wiles of the spiritist he eventually encountered at the party. The fortuneteller's prediction affected him more, perhaps, than any other single incident.

Fortunetelling as part of the occult is directly forbidden by the Bible. In their book *Fast Facts on False Teachings*, Ron Carlson and Ed Decker deem fortunetelling deadly:

God speaks clearly about the area of fortune-telling. Modern-day prophets and prophetesses claim to predict the events to come in your life and in the nation. But God in His Word gives us two tests to determine a true prophet. The first test is found in Deuteronomy

18:20-22. The prophecy must be tested. Does the prophecy come true or not? If it does not come true, you know that the prophet is not of God. The Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament were 100 percent accurate when they spoke from God, or they were stoned to death.⁸

The second test that God gives us to determine a true prophet is found in Deuteronomy 13:1-5. You must test the teaching. Are these prophets leading you to the worship of the true and living God? Even if the prophecy comes true, you must test the teaching by the Word of God, as Second Timothy 3:16-17 instructs.⁹

Marc Eliot says that Disney's absorption with his own death was a contributing factor in popularizing a huge three-part series hit for him: "Davy Crockett."

Walt looked to his personal angels and demons to produce a remarkable work of entertainment. No doubt, to Disney, Crockett's appeal lay in his single-minded fundamentalist commitment to American virtue, at least in Walt's version, where the life of the frontiersman/politician/patriot was sanitized and

the stoic whose most often-repeated line in the series, "Be sure you're right, then go ahead," became yet another of Walt's externalized alter egos.¹⁰

With just three episodes and a dead hero at the Alamo, Disney's Crockett took the world by storm. Many felt that Davy Crockett was even bigger than Mickey Mouse. There is, however, a unique twist to the Crockett story. Eliot adds this interesting postscript:

Because the series ran over the course of several weeks, it would have been easy for Walt to change the last scene of the last episode and have Davy live. More than likely, it was Walt's obsession with his own aging and death that dictated his glorifying depiction of alter-ego Crockett's premature passage through the heavenly gates.¹¹

Embellishing Tradition

One of Disney's best animated fairy tales remains *Cinderella*—a tale true to the original traditional story with a few comic embellishments, including Gus and Jaq, the mice who befriend Cinderella during her trials and tribulations at the hands of fate.

While there have been over 500 different versions of this fairy tale throughout the world, the

most widely known and accepted version comes from a seventeenth-century French rendering.

Succinctly, *Cinderella* is the story of a poor, downtrodden girl, who becomes the victim of a cruel stepmother, but appears before her Prince Charming in a gorgeous disguise given her by her supernatural helper, her fairy godmother.

Untrue to the original ninth-century Chinese version, though, French author, Charles Perrault, added some details of his own to the story, which remain as part and parcel of the original legend.

Not invented by Disney by any stretch of the imagination, Perrault came up with the idea of the glass slipper, the pumpkin coach and the concept that Cinderella had to leave the ball by midnight when her magic finery would revert to rags.¹²

Perrault not only embellished the story with inventions of his own, he also omitted some of the important points found in the folk-tale versions.

In those, the heroine is usually helped by her dead mother, or by agents sent by her mother, and the prince carries off a false bride, who is denounced by a bird. And, in most of the folk versions, Cinderella receives supernatural help from a domesticated animal—a cow or a sheep—who is often her dead mother reincarnated. Perrault changed this animal into a fairy godmother, a curious half-pagan, half-Christian conception that Disney embraced for his version.¹³

Christian forgiveness toward her stepsisters, and even marries them off to two grand noblemen of the court. This is in striking contrast to the end of the story as told by the brothers Grimm. In their version, which was based on German oral tradition, the stepsisters' eyes were pecked out by pigeons, and for their wickedness and falsehood, they were punished with blindness as long as they lived.¹⁴

Perrault also drew heavily on the Christian concept of morality depicting that the only true gift is grace.

According to Carlson and Decker, the Cinderella view of her dead mother appearing to her aligns surprisingly close to Hinduism and reincarnation.

Hinduism teaches that based on the law of karma, your good and bad deeds will determine how you will come back in your next life. If you live a bad life and do not do the things required in Hinduism and Buddhism to renounce this world of illusion, you may come back as a lower form.

The first thing that invalidates this [belief] is the fact of the personality of God. The fact that God is personal, that He created us as personal beings, that He has personally revealed Himself to us and that we can have a personal relationship with Him totally does away

with the . . . need for something like reincarnation.¹⁵

As for Cinderella's fairy godmother (depicted as a chubby bundle of innocent chuckles à la Clarence, the angel in the Jimmy Stewart film *It's a Wonderful Life*), the roots of her actually being Cinderella's dead mother run deep throughout the entire movie.

Gary Kinnaman, senior pastor of Word of Grace Church in Mesa, Arizona, seems to intimate that the dearly departed fairy godmother may actually be a dark, demonic force. In his book, *Angels Dark and Light*, he writes of the dangers in communicating with the dead:

As a student of the Bible, I have to believe that reports of the actual souls of the departed revisiting the living probably have their basis in some demonic activity, perhaps a demon in the disguise of a loved one. . . . The Bible, I think, leaves a very slight crack in the door between the living and the dead. In the Gospel accounts, James, Peter and John saw Moses and Elijah, long-departed Old Testament saints, talking with Jesus on the mountain of Christ's transfiguration. The dead, we learn from this, are not really dead. But we also have to notice how Moses and Elijah never said a word to

seem to acknowledge their presence. Jesus—not the disembodied spirits of Moses and Elijah—is the center of the account and the focus of everyone’s attention. Jesus is the only link between heaven and earth, the ladder upon whom angels ascend and descend (John 1:51). Jesus is our intermediary, not a medium.¹⁶

Along with Disney’s obsession with death came his overwhelming fixation to do everything his way and to make the name Disney recognized worldwide.

In an almost arrogant fashion, Disney adopted, then reworked, some of the most endearing and classical fairy tales of all time. “Grist for a mighty mill,” Schickel described it, “in the ineffable Hollywood term.” Disney, Schickel said, treated these classics as “properties” to do with as the proprietor of the machine would.¹⁷

It was long known that Disney was playing fast and loose with the stories of others. But Schickel says the copying was rampant and shameful.

You could throw jarring popular songs into the brew, you could gag them up, you could sentimentalize them. You had, in short, no obligation to the originals or to the cultural tradition they represented. In fact, when it

came to billing, J. M. Barrie’s *Peter Pan* somehow became Walt Disney’s *Peter Pan*, and Lewis Carroll’s *Alice [in Wonderland]* became Walt Disney’s *Alice*.¹⁸

It could be argued that this was a true reflection of what happened to the works in the process of getting to the screen, but the egotism that insists on making another man’s work your own through wanton tampering and by advertising claim is not an attractive form of egotism, however it is rationalized. And this kind of annexation was to be a constant in the later life of Disney.¹⁹

If this chapter seems to be a stretch, stay with me. There’s more.

Endnotes

1. *Microsoft Cinemania '95* (Redmond, WA: Microsoft, 1995), CD-ROM.
2. *The Servite Prayer Book* (Newbury, Berkshire, Great Britain: Our Lady’s Priory, 1951), p. 26.
3. Arthur Babbit, “Fantasia” (subsection “Limited Returns”), *Cinebooks’ Motion Picture Guide Review*, Microsoft Cinemania ’95 (Redmond, WA: Microsoft, 1995), CD-ROM.
4. Richard Schickel, *The Disney Version* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968), pp. 242-243.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*, p. 146
7. *Ibid.*

8. Ron Carlson and Ed Decker, *Fast Facts on False Teachings* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1994), p. 246.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 246-247.
10. Marc Eliot, *Walt Disney: Hollywood's Dark Prince* (New York: Carol Publishing, 1993), pp. 228-229.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Marshall Cavendish, *Man, Myth and Magic*, Vol. 2 (New York: Marshall Cavendish, 1995), p. 484.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*
15. Carlson and Decker, pp. 246-247.
16. Gary Kinnaman, *Angels Dark and Light* (Ann Arbor, MI: Vine Books, 1994), pp. 144-145.
17. Schickel, p. 296.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*

What the Bible Says about Witchcraft and Spiritism

Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards, to be defiled by them: I am the LORD your God. (Leviticus 19:31)

Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils. (1 Timothy 4:1)

*Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, **witchcraft**, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God. (Galatians 5:19-21, emphasis added)*

Shall a man make gods unto himself, and they are no

Mickey Comes Out of the Closet

*The era we are living in today is a dream
come true.*

—*Walt Disney*

By the mid-1990s Walt Disney Corporation had become one of the most powerful and influential entertainment organizations in the world. With the enormous revenue brought in by its theme parks, for example, it could absorb any box office disasters. And Michael Eisner had his share of them.

It was no secret within the Hollywood community that Disney corporation was looking around for another company to devour. But the general public was amazed when, on July 31, 1995, Disney announced its plans to merge with Capital Cities/ABC at a value of approximately \$19 billion.

In a joint statement, Michael Eisner and Thomas Murphy, CEO of Capital Cities/ABC, said the opportunities were unlimited.

The combined company will become a vital and dynamic force in the entertainment and media business, reaching family audiences worldwide and providing them with unparalleled news, information and entertainment both inside and outside the home. . . . The combined enterprise will be better equipped to grow, to provide valuable services for our viewers, listeners, readers, sports fans and vacationers, and to capture the imagination for future generations.¹

Stockholders reeled from the news. Wall Street moguls positioned themselves to cash in on the venture. And likely Glitterville's elite, behind closed doors, were snickering at the deal they were sure Uncle Walt would never have countenanced.

Yet Another Surprise

Meanwhile, the American consumer was in for yet another surprise. The Disney corporation was coming out of the closet. For years, insiders understood the corporation to be increasingly homosexually oriented—not unlike other major

Hollywood studios. But when Disney gave in to gay lobbying forces and extended health insurance to partners of homosexual workers, North America's religious community was generally dismayed.

For two years Disney's own homosexual union, the Lesbian and Gay United Employees (LEAGUE), had been pressing the organization for these insurance benefits.² In April, 1994, the union presented the Disney corporation with a detailed analysis of the fiscal and social ramifications of homosexual partner health benefits. LEAGUE rebutted concerns about high costs of the coverage by citing a nationwide study that found employers didn't boost their costs by extending benefits to homosexuals. Its report told of tangible gains made by companies that had adopted similar health plans, including Viacom, Time/Warner and MCA/Universal.³

In a rebuke to Disney's pro-gay decision, Traditional Values Coalition chairman Lou Sheldon cites another study.

"Homosexuality is like a revolving door," Sheldon says, referring to a survey that only twenty percent of all homosexuals are gay for life. "The remaining 80 percent are merely passing through and would never actually remain gay long enough to enjoy the benefits of the Disney package. So Disney has sold its image for not even a bowl of porridge. This is certainly not the organization Walt Disney founded."⁴

tion evidently had similar feelings. It saw Disney's agreeing to cover homosexuals in their insurance program as tantamount to approval of that lifestyle.

"Historically Disney has reinforced America's values," said convention spokeswoman Barbara Denman. "We noticed there had been an erosion in its moral leadership."⁵

Gay Theme Nights in the Parks

In addition, Denman says, the Convention is opposed to homosexual and lesbian theme nights at Disney's parks. It also opposes the kinds of motion pictures Disney is producing through its various studios such as Miramax.

John Dreyer, speaking for the Disney corporation, says the company regrets the stand of the Florida Baptists:

The standard against which our commitment to family entertainment should be measured is the value and high quality of Disney-branded family entertainment that we produce. . . . [Disney] is the world's leader in producing entertainment for the entire family.⁶

But Dreyer was in no mood to back down on the medical, vision and dental insurance decision for same sex domestic partners. "We felt

we should bring [these benefits] in line with our nondiscrimination policy," he said. When asked why the health benefits would not be extended to unmarried heterosexual domestic partners, Dreyer was emphatic. "We're just not going to extend it, and we're not really interested in debating it."⁷

To fully understand Disney corporation's position on the medical insurance issue, one has to know the corporation's makeup. According to Los Angeles-based *Buzz Magazine*, the "happiest place on earth," as Disney likes to bill itself, is also one of the gayest. "There are hordes of gay and lesbian people at Disney," says Garrett Hicks, an openly homosexual employee there.⁸

In the past few years, Disney has earned a justified reputation as a haven for lesbians and homosexuals. This is true not simply on the creative side, as one might expect, but in Disney's hallowed mahogany row as well.

According to *Buzz Magazine*, homosexual executives in the Disney organization include Hollywood Pictures production vice-president Lauren Lloyd; studio producer Laurence Mark and supervising animator Andreas Deja, who was responsible for the Gaston character in *Beauty and the Beast*. They include Steven Fields, vice-president at Disney's interactive division; Rick Leed, head of production who oversees Disney's hit sitcom, "Home Improvement"; and senior vice-president Thomas Schumacher, one of the described "guiding lights" behind *Lion King*.⁹

A Subliminal Attraction

Schumacher confirms that there are a number of homosexuals at Disney at various levels. He believes they are drawn to the company because of what they pick up subliminally from the Disney cartoons.

"Thematically, the animated films promote the right to be who you are," Schumacher says, "and not to change for anyone else. The characters make their own family. They bond and have close friends. They grow up and grow old together. Anyone who is disenfranchised is touched by that."¹⁰

When LEAGUE was first formed, the Disney corporation refused to let them identify themselves by the Disney name. At the 1993 gay march on Washington, LEAGUE had prepared a banner that read, "Lesbian and Gay United Employees . . . part of the family at the Walt Disney Company." A corporate directive demanded them to cover up the reference to Walt Disney. Less than a year later, Disney gave the union permission to identify the employment status of LEAGUE members with the Disney name on its banner, as long as the banner stated that there was no official Disney endorsement or participation.¹¹

At Orlando's Epcot Center, Jimi Ziehr, a training coordinator, says homosexuals outnumber straights at one of the operations. Quips Ziehr, "There's nothing in the closet at Guest Relations."¹²

Does Disney have an official position on the mitigation of homosexuals to the "House that Walt Built"? Perhaps the answer has come from senior Disney publicist, Richard Jordan. "Someone in personnel must have a sweet tooth," he says.¹³

If anyone is to be thanked or reviled for the pro-homosexual temperament at Disney, it is the former head of the Disney film entertainment division, Jeffrey Katzenberg. He himself is heterosexual but sympathetic to the gay agenda.

"Katzenberg was very sensitive to gay issues," says Deja, "and it was always very comfortable to work with him. He was fine with a lot of things that concern gay people. . . . I think [that] created a good atmosphere for anybody who was gay at the studio."¹⁴

Katzenberg is now gone from Disney with more than hard feelings between him and one-time boss and friend, Eisner. He now is part of the Dream Works organization with Steven Spielberg and the openly homosexual David Geffen.¹⁵ Reports have it that the pro-gay Hollywood golden boy threatened to sue Disney and Eisner for \$300 million unless they could reach a last-minute settlement. Disney corporation is of the opinion that Katzenberg is owed only about \$100 million.¹⁶

With Katzenberg gone, Disney has shelved plans for a movie version of the homosexual-themed musical, *Falsettos*. But not for lack of interest in the subject. "Jeffrey Katzenberg understood the political nature of the issues," says Schumacher. "Michael Eisner . . .

but he doesn't grasp the complexity of the problem."¹⁷

No Changes at ABC

When Eisner gobbled up ABC, he said he saw no reason to change any of ABC's programming. The network's strategy, he said, was working.

Words like that from the CEO of a major family-oriented studio sounded a bit incongruous. ABC's "NYPD Blue" and its "real life" portrayal of police officers as foul-mouthed, vulgar-acting, sex-hungry beef on the hoof is hardly family entertainment.

In addition, the ABC that Eisner says he won't change has had a long and unenviable history of pro-homosexual shows. For example, in the scene on the "Thirtysomething" series, two male characters appeared in bed together, talking about the one-night stand they've just had.¹⁸

Later the network aired the same two characters exchanging a passionate midnight kiss at a New Year's party. That episode cost ABC more than \$500,000 in advertising earnings.

With so much money—the industry's lifeblood—draining away on homosexually oriented movies and TV programming, why does a network like ABC insist on running such stuff? Robert Iger, president of ABC Entertainment during that time, said the sum and substance reflected his "social and creative responsibilities."¹⁹

Michael Medved points out that this attitude is commonplace in the entertainment industry:

While "gay control" of the movie business is a myth, gay influence is very much a reality. No one could deny that the formidable gay presence in the entertainment business encourages industry leaders to take a far more sympathetic view of homosexuality than does the public at large.²⁰

Some Seepage at the Disney Corporation

With influential homosexuals making decisions at Disney, it would seem only natural for the gay agenda to seep into the so-called family films. It has.

For example, in *Aladdin* the Genie gurgles to his young master, "I'm getting fond of you, kid—not that I want to pick out curtains or anything." Also in *Aladdin* is the campy, homosexual-like performance of Iago, the parrot. And the Genie itself turns into a stereotypical swishy clothier.

In *Beauty and the Beast*, the conceited Gaston throws his legs over the arms of his chair and exclaims, "I do all my decorating with antlers." One of the homosexual workers on the film said that Gaston was modeled after "preening West Hollywood muscle clones."²¹ (Next to San Francisco, West Hollywood may be the homosexual capital of the world.)

An opinion editorial in the *Boston Globe* complained that Scar, the deviant, conniving lion in *Lion King* “speaks in supposed gay clichés” and ambles with “effeminate gestures.”²²

Officials at Disney worried that the “gay shtick” in some of its animated movies was going too far. But the scenes stayed in, much to the delight of Disney’s homosexual cadre.

Another of Disney’s ventures is its own book publishing company, Hyperion, named after Walt’s beloved studio situated on the street of the same name. Far from family-oriented, Hyperion is a haven for what some call antifamily and antibiblical intellectualization via the printed word. One of the most infamous books to come out of Hyperion is the 1995 book, *Growing Up Gay in America*, by “Funny Gay Males.”

“Disney is becoming more bold in its promotion of the homosexual agenda,” says Donald E. Wildmon, American Family Association president. “More and more families are waking up to the fact that Disney is using its huge influence with America’s children and families to suggest that dangerous, perverted sexual behavior is okay.”²³

According to Hyperion’s director of publicity, Lisa Kitei, *Growing Up Gay* (which has been accused of being no more than a recruitment weapon to entice boys into the homosexual lifestyle), debunks some ridiculous myths and creates a few of their own.

“Funny Gay Males” traces the gay boy’s progress through life. Where do gay children come from? Is it nature? Is it nurture? If straight kids are found in the cabbage patch, are gay kids discovered under the arugula? Or are we gay kids simply delivered by pink flamingoes?

Claiming that gay boys are different even in infancy, when they would have preferred lavender blankets rather than the traditional blue, the authors present gay versions of fairy tales and nursery rhymes.²⁴

Growing Up Gay in America could be no less than a no-holds-barred guided missile aimed right at the hearts of America’s children. For example, the authors state that a gay kid is not just a child who will one day turn into a gay adult.

We’re learning that the gay child—even before he begins socializing with other gay adults—is already sharing likes, dislikes, interests and outlooks with a worldwide culture of which he’s only vaguely aware. In short, we guessed that something was cooking even before we started baking. We knew we were different the first time we noticed Lee Majors was wearing tight

pants on the Big Valley. We knew we were different the first time we found ourselves daintily shaking a packet of sweetener between our thumb and middle finger just like Aunt Marge. And we knew we were different that first summer we wanted to send a postcard to Johnny saying, "I wish you were here," and the boy in question lived right next door.²⁵

If *Growing Up Gay in America* is just a bit shocking to both the mainstream and the religious community, you ain't seen nothin' yet. Disney has also published the autobiography of transvestite super-model RuPaul called, aptly enough, *Lettin' It All Hang Out*.

Hyped by Disney's Hyperion as a "crossover, cross-dressing sensation," the publishing company says he—uh, she—uh, well, RuPaul is actually a "role model"—pointing to the drag queen as a young man who grew up in poverty and rose through the ranks to a life of fame, riches, success and glamour. Hyperion says that his—uh, her—uh, RuPaul's autobiography is a story of inspiration and charm, of love and humor, of dedication and success.²⁶

The RuPaul book is not really an autobiography in the purest sense of the word. It's more of a how-to manual for other aspiring drag queens. In Chapter 1, for example, the transvestite says the first thing to do is sav a little naver. "I go to my

vanity and pray to the gods of Charles Revson, Max Factor, Flori Roberts and all the other patron saints of beauty," he/she says.²⁷

Then the queen of drag describes in detail how he/she shaves. "I shave my face closely so that if by chance that evening a fan should brush a hand against my cheek, they'll feel the silky smoothness of a baby's bottom."²⁸

From bras, hose, spiked heels and more, RuPaul gives the hopeful transvestite every imaginable tool to transform a male into a female, then back again.

RuPaul lists thirty-five nonnegotiable things one needs to be a successful drag queen. Suggestions include a flawless, fierce attitude, an assortment of make-up, push-up bra, gym socks rolled up tight for breasts, hot pants, mini-dress, perfume (RuPaul suggests "Whore—for she who is") and positive love energy.

But wait, there's more. He/she even gives tips on what the well-stocked "drag purse" should contain and includes compact, lipstick, condoms, tic tacs and mace.²⁹

Finally, it was bound to happen. Disney's syndication arm, Buena Vista Television, has reportedly spoken with the transvestite about hosting a late-night talk show. According to the report in *Variety*, one of the movie industry's trade papers, the late-night show is but one offer RuPaul has considered. A source at Buena Vista confirmed the negotiations with the drag queen.³⁰

9. Ibid.; *AFA Journal*, June 1995 (regarding Thomas Schumacher's sexual orientation).
10. *Buzz*, p. 9B.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.; Barbara Walters, *20/20*, November 11, 1994, quoted in *People Weekly*, November 14, 1994, vol. 42, no. 20, p. 4.
16. Stryker McGuire, "Yeah, So Sue Me," *Newsweek*, April 15, 1996, p. 77.
17. *Buzz*, p. 9B.
18. Michael Medved, *Hollywood vs. America* (New York, Harper Perennial, 1992), p. 310.
19. Ibid., p. 311.
20. Ibid., pp. 312-313.
21. *Buzz*, p. 9B.
22. Ibid.
23. *AFA Journal*, March 1996.
24. *Growing Up Gay in America*, press release by Lisa Kitei (New York: Hyperion, 1995).
25. Funny Gay Males, *Growing Up Gay in America* (New York: Hyperion, 1995), p. 2.
26. Hyperion press release on RuPaul (New York: Hyperion, 1995).
27. RuPaul, *Lettin' It All Hang Out* (New York: Hyperion, 1995), p. 1.
28. Ibid., p. 2.
29. Ibid., p. 79.
30. "News Bites," *Orange County [Calif.] Register*, August 23, 1995, p. Show-3.

31. Roberto Rivera, Editorial, *Christianity Today*, February 5, 1996, p. 13.

32. Robert Knight, Family Research Council, 1996, interview on file with author.