

Twitter Thread by DJ Cthulhu, LLC ■■



DJ Cthulhu, LLC ■■
[@RealDJCthulhu](#)



This is rather different than my usual content, but I was inspired to do this by a conversation I had on here. Today I'm going to talk about a weirdly homophobic psychology textbook I had. I no longer have the original book, but I was able to track it down as a PDF.

[THREAD]

1/

The book in question is Psychology, Ninth Edition, by David G. Myers; published in 2010. So this is a fairly recent book, but it still has some rather outlandish stereotypes and outdated ideas. 2/

Although this book has weird ideas on many groups, I'm going to specifically focus on its thoughts on LGBTQ+ people. 3/

First, let's start with gay people. The section on sexual motivation, begins by saying most gay people don't know they're gay until their 20s, which is not the case for most gay people I've ever spoken to. Perhaps it thinks they don't know they're gay until they come out? 4/

You may notice that it cites Michael Bailey and Kenneth Zucker, both of whom are homophobic and transphobic researchers who have been heavily condemned by the rest of their field. It will also cite Ray Blanchard later, aka the weird chaser guy. 5/

Next, it goes on to give some statistics. I don't know if these statistics are accurate, but I feel like the estimate that less than 1% of people are bisexual is a bit low. 6/

This book also suffers heavily from bisexual erasure. Aside from the statistic that 0.17% people are bisexual, its definition of sexual orientation doesn't mention bisexuality and a margin declares that bisexual men are exactly like gay men for all practical purposes. 7/

Asexuals also get a margin and nothing more (and the stipulation that they are only "seemingly" asexual). 8/

Oh wait, there is more mention of bisexuality...where it declares that actually bisexual women are just really horny. This is also very reminiscent of some MRA ideas about women. 9/

And here we get to the Ray Blanchard stuff. If you don't know who Ray Blanchard is, he's a "sexologist" who promoted the completely discredited model of trans women as feminine gay men or perverted straight men. He's also infamous for believing that bi men don't exist. 10/

We have Blanchard's very dubious conclusion that being gay is caused by having older brothers and being right handed. I have no idea whether this is true, but given that almost everything else Blanchard has said is now discredited, I am very suspicious. 11/

Skipping over an acceptable, if mundane, section about gay animals, we get to some neurosexism. According to this book, gay men's brains are just like straight women's so both are bad at math. 12/

No, really, there is a graph saying that straight women are bad at spatial abilities, gay men are closer to straight women in abilities, and lesbians are better than straight women but not as good as straight men. 13/

Setting aside that there is more to spatial ability than rotating an object, and that math is more than geometry, pretty much all contemporary research shows that gender gaps in education and performance are due to social factors, not biology, so I find this highly suspect. 14/

Notably, it's also from a paper published in 2003, before any US state had legalized gay marriage and when sodomy laws were still common, so I question sampling and biases in the research. Maybe later I'll track down the original paper and take a look. 15/

And we finish the section with some good old-fashioned slut-shaming and Victorian morality. This seems very similar to the arguments used by conservative groups to argue for abstinence only sex education. 16/

Now that we've discussed the book's conclusions on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and asexual people, you may wonder what it has to say about transgender or non-binary people. This is easy, because as far as this book is concerned, everyone is cisgender. 17/

There is no mention of trans people at all, and the section on gender identity explains that everyone will identify with their assigned sex at birth. Intersex people are also not mentioned. There's also a good helping of neurosexism. 18/

Interestingly, David Reimer is mentioned. 19/

The book also has a lot of outdated gender stereotypes in that section, but that's another story for another thread. Thank you to [@4ndreaCD](#) and [@CritFacts](#) for suggesting that I do this thread. 20/20

[@threadreaderapp](#) unroll