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Why write about homosexuality?

“We need to write about homosexuality because it is addressed in the Bible, it is a moral issue, and it affects society. Therefore, it also affects religious and social institutions. As the influence of homosexuality increases, it will continue to invade our churches, our homes, our families, and affect change around us. Therefore, we need to have rational and biblical defenses for the Christian position, as well as an examination of the problems that homosexuality brings.”

Matt Slick
Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry

Why Write About Homosexuality? : http://carm.org/write-about-homosexuality

“In the old days, there was ‘sodomy’: an act. In the late 19th century, the word ‘homosexuality’ was coined: a condition. A generation ago, the accepted term became "gay": an identity. Each formulation raises the stakes … one can object to and even criminalize an act; one is obligated to be sympathetic toward a condition; but once it’s a fully fledged 24/7 identity, like being Hispanic or Inuit, anything less than whole hearted acceptance gets you marked as a bigot … the transformation of a ‘crime against nature’ into a co-equal civic identity within little more than the span of one human lifetime is one of the most remarkable victories ever achieved by any minority group in the Western world. A minority that didn't even exist in a formal sense a century ago has managed to overwhelm and overhaul a universal societal institution thousands of years old.”

Mark Steyn,
Chicago Sun Times political commentator

‘There’s No Stopping Them Now,’ Chicago Sun Times, 13th July 2013
“Homosexuality is something they have rather than something they are... As soon as somebody has a homosexual inclination, they say, ‘I am a homosexual.’ And I say, ‘No. You are a human being, and you have homosexual desires. But you are first and foremost a human being.’”

James Loder

“There is no ‘gay gene’ as such, and media reports to this effect have been very misleading.”

Dr David de Pomerai

Prof. of Biology, Nottingham University

How informed are we?

“I look forward to one day seeing the rainbow flag fly over every government building, and above parliaments across the world - maybe Russia, Uganda or Yemen.”

Nick Clegg,
Deputy Prime Minister

“The modern change in opinion concerning homosexuality, though presented as scientific advance, is contradicted rather than supported by science... A masterful public relations campaign orchestrated by the [gay] pride extremists’ has achieved a “transformation in public morals consistent with widespread abandonment of the Judeo-Christian ethics upon which our civilization is based. Though hailed as progress, it is really a reversion to ancient pagan practices supported by a counterculture restatement of Gnostic moral relativism.”

John McKellar, openly homosexual founder of HOPE (Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism)

“It is important, finally, to remember that priests and bishops are very susceptible to what Rondeau calls the illusion of being informed and enlightened. Why? Because priests and bishops are pastoral people and, in this postmodern age, they need very much to be liked and they need to be seen as caring, sharing and compassionate. If being liked takes first place, then truth takes a distant second or third place... Love without truth will lead us all astray. Truth with love will set us free.”

Fr. Val J. Peter

“We are up against people and organisations that use a myriad of means and large amounts of money to foster deeply flawed visions of human love and corrupt the values of society... We need to be willing to put in a similar level of effort to preparing the ground of society for the gospel. The reaffirmation of the ordered reality of human nature is the start of this process.”

John Deighan
Parliamentary Officer for the (Roman Catholic) Bishop's Conference in Scotland
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A Compendium of Issues and Arguments Surrounding The Same-Sex Debate

NOTE:
This is a condensed reference work, not intended as an easy read on the subject!

‘Homosexuality’
in the text of this overview may refer either to orientation or to behaviour depending on the context,
which usually should make clear which meaning is meant.

This overview provides material in the area of human sexuality to help those committed to a biblically orthodox (as opposed to a culturally determined) understanding of sexuality to think clearly, distinguish issues accurately and articulate arguments convincingly in the home, with friends and colleagues, and in the public arena.

Information and arguments on both sides, with brief quotes, are given in bullet-point form. Homosexual views are quoted from homosexual sources wherever possible. These sources make up nearly a third of the total document.

Examples have not been limited to the UK, but are taken from countries around the Western world since homosexuality and gay activism are world-wide inter-connected phenomena.

It is offered as a resource manual to provide a ready reference compendium of facts and issues related to the societal changes faced by Christians in this area of human sexuality and relationships, for developing:

1. A Christian apologetic for today (to explain the Gospel in terms that relate to our sex-conscious culture).

2. An educational programme for congregations (to teach a Biblical view of sexuality and equip church people to speak up for Biblical teaching in this area in the face of humanist / secular / revisionist opposition). Part of this programme must surely include a positive challenge to develop:

3. A mission to reach out to those caught up in homosexuality informed by an examination of the problems that same-sex attraction brings to individuals.

Note on print style:
Views and quotations by non-traditionalists are printed in italics.
Traditionalist responses / statements are printed in roman type.
Biblical texts are printed in roman type.

CONTACT THE COMPILER:
No doubt this overview is incomplete and in places requires correction. Any constructive comments and suggestions for improvement are welcome. The writer may be contacted at:
paulandcathie@gmail.com
“Of all the contested terrain in the culture war, the subject of homosexual rights is the most awkward to discuss. Almost all of us know homosexuals who are decent, intelligent and compassionate people, and we have no inclination to wound them.”  
Robert Bork, Former Solicitor General of the United States

“Archbishop Justin has recently spoken of a ‘revolution’ in Western culture, which we cannot ignore. This revolution has not been violent, or a spontaneous grassroots response to oppression, but the result of a planned manipulation of popular philosophy and the takeover of institutions and sources of information which shape us.”  
Andrew Symes

“If you repeat a big lie often enough it becomes the truth.”  
Josef Goebbels, Nazi Minister of Public Enlightenment

“It has been said that ‘He who controls the language, controls the debate.’ Nowhere has this been more evident than in the culture war over the issue of human sexuality.”  
Tim Wilkins, Speaker, Writer

“When a man stops believing in God he doesn’t believe in nothing, he believes in anything.”
Erroreously attributed to G.K. Chesterton

“Whoever marries the spirit of this age will find himself a widower in the next.”
Attributed to Dean Inge

“By far the most important channel of transmission of culture remains the family: and when family life fails to play its part, we must expect our culture to deteriorate.”
T.S. Eliot

“Whether these matters are to be regarded as sport, or as earnest, we must not forget that this pleasure is held to have been granted by nature to male and female when conjoined for the work of procreation; the offence of male with male, or female with female, is an outrage on nature and a capital surrender to lust of pleasure.”
Plato

“It has actually become necessary in our time to rebut the theory that every firm and serious friendship is really homosexual… Kisses, tears and embraces are not in themselves evidence of homosexuality.”
C.S. Lewis
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“There are two books laid before us to study, to prevent our falling into error; first, the volume of the Scriptures, which reveal the will of God; then the volume of the Creatures, which express His power…”

Let no man… maintain that a man can search too far, or be too well studied in the book of God's word, or the book of God's works.” 13

- Francis Bacon, Formulator of the ‘scientific method’

Calvin describes Scripture as putting glasses on us to see creation’s ‘impressions of deity’ clearly.

Gaydom Unveiled

“Being queer means pushing the parameters of sex and family, and in the process, transforming the very fabric of society.”  
Paul Ettelbrick, National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy director

“Gay liberation was founded... on a sexual brotherhood of promiscuity.”
Gabriel Rotello, Gay author

“Our whole legal structure is supposedly based on Christianity whose archaic and irrational teachings support the family and marriage as the only permitted condition for sex... We gay men and women do deny these values of our civilisation.”
Peter Tatchell, Co-author of GLF Manifesto, 1971

"It’s not about rights. It’s about redefining truth and censoring all criticism so that militant homosexuals can be comfortable in their ‘lifestyle’ without having to be disturbed by reality... In truth, there is something wrong with homosexuality."  
Jessica, blogger

We're awash in the tide of unconstrained instinctive behaviors which are all being labeled "okay" because nobody really has a sense, any more, as to what's right and what's wrong. In Joseph Campbell's words, "Follow your bliss." This has led us into a growing barbarism.

Jeffrey B. Satinover, Orthodox Jew, psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, and physicist

“My activist brothers and sisters in concert with the judicial elite, the cowed politicians and the liberal media have seriously jeopardized decades of work to ensure tolerance and privacy, because of their greedy, relentless pursuit of lifestyle affirmation.”

John McKellar, gay dissident

---

19 John McKellar, “There’s HOPE for the world”, Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism, August 2003, posted by Robert A. Jason in [http://www.theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/22SxSo/PnSx/1Sx/McKellar%20HOPE02.htm](http://www.theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/22SxSo/PnSx/1Sx/McKellar%20HOPE02.htm) (Accessed on 20th March 2014)
Part 1. Homosexuality
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   a. Complementary: The Biblical Design
   b. Androgyny / Unisex / Ambigender / Polygender: A Popular View
   c. Great Sex Charade: Sex as Indicator of Intimacy
      • “So Many in Society!” How prevalent really?

C. The Nature of Homosexuality
   a. An Identity, A Behaviour or An Inclination?
   b. Spectrum of Views on Orientation and Practice
      • The Scientific Evidence
   d. ‘Can’t Change’ and Other Unsupported Claims
      • Not an ‘illness’: ‘Healing’ v. ‘Transformation’
   e. The Human Desire for Security and Intimacy:
      • Bonding in Music and The Arts
      • Authentic Intimacy always to be related to Sex?
      • Love: Confusing ‘Philia’ with ‘Eros’.
         (e.g. David & Jonathan)
   f. Grim Facts about Homosexual Practice
      • Homosexual Lifestyle ‘The Pits’
        • Higher Prevalence of Promiscuity
      • Myth of A Normal Healthy Gay Lifestyle
        • Staggeringly High Risk of HIV
        • Mental Health: Intrinsically Insecure, Depressive and Suicidal
        • Reduced Life Expectancy
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      • The Progression of the Social Status of Homosexuality
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      • UK Government’s association with the LBGT lobby.
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      • “Lovely Guys” Anecdotal Impression
      • “The world Has Moved On!”
      • “Distinguish ‘good’ from ‘bad’ sex!”
      • “It’s OK if there is life-long commitment, monogamy, fidelity and love!”

D. Recent History: The Politics of Gaydom
   a. History of A Western Cultural Revolution
      • The Emergence of Gay Awareness
      • Genesis of Stonewall
      • The AIDS Epidemic
      • Gay Pride Carnivals / Festivals
   b. The Goal of The Gay Agenda: ‘Normalisation’
      • The Present Reality: A Social Revolution
      • The Planned Stratagem: to Change Attitudes
      • Transforming Society’s Values and Norms
   c. Blueprint for Revolution
      • The Initial Strategy: “Overhauling of Straight America”
      • The Strategy Developed: 8 Graduated Tactics
      • Three Phases of the Gay Campaign.
        • Phase 1: Desensitization.
        • Phase 2: Exaction Pricing,
          (Psychological Terrorism).
        • Phase 3: Conversion.
   d. A Clever Marketing Strategy: Use of Spin
      • Positive Rebranding of Homosexuals (e.g “Gay” less offensive!)
      • Linguistic Manipulation (e.g. ‘Marriage’ re-defined, use of ‘homophobic’ charge)

E. Issues Relating to Gay Rights Agenda
   a. The Chief arguments Summarised – For and Against Approval
   b. Liberties Threatened: Injustice in Governmental Decision-Making
      • Shutting Down Opposition to The Gay Agenda
      • Civil and Religious Liberties at Risk
   c. Potential Areas of Conflict: Rights v. Beliefs
   d. Traditionalist Response to Homosexual Behaviour
      • ‘Discrimination’ a neutral concept
      • Discrimination and Political Correctness.
   f. The Morality (or Otherwise) of Homosexual Practice

• ‘Homophobia’ As Denial of Human Rights
• Marketing Strategy – ‘4 Ps’:
  o Product, Price, Place, Promotion

• Gay Lobby Tactics
  • Engaging Sympathy
  • Subterfuge: Subversion of Truth by Substituting Propaganda
  • Over-egg the Scientific Evidence
  • Phony Comparison with Racial Discrimination
  • Influencing The Media
  • Creative Arts Role in Challenging Traditional Values
  • Pop Music: ‘Trojan Horse’ Gay Infiltration
  • Indoctrination in The Schools

• Consequences of The Revolution: The New Intolerance
  • Democracy Cut from Its Judeo-Christian Roots
  • Caves in to: Egalitarianism, Humanism, Relativism, and Libertarianism
  • Increase in PC / Governmental Authoritarianism
  • ‘Diversity’ a Trojan Horse to Enforce Repression
  • Hounding of Traditionalists
  • Pressure to Moderate Personal Beliefs & Conform
  • Totalitarian Belligerence of Political Correctness.
  • Pressure on Therapy Research and Practice
  • Pressure to Ban Reparative Therapy

• Society’s Slippery Slope
  • The Progression of the Social Status of Homosexuality
  • Incremental Steps
  • Gay Lobbyists’ Goal: Normalisation of Homosexuality.
  • False Assurances of A Soft Revolution.
  • Western Culture Shift
  • Now Pedophiles Follow Gay Tactics
  • UK Government’s association with the LBGT lobby.
1. HOMOSEXUALITY

A. INITIAL CLARIFICATIONS

a) Recent History – Trends in Public Opinion

- Recent history of the permissive society: “In the 20th century sexual roles were redefined once again. For a variety of reasons, premarital intercourse slowly became more common and eventually acceptable. With the decline of prohibitions against sex for the sake of pleasure even outside of marriage, it became more difficult to argue against gay sex. These trends were especially strong in the 1960’s, and it was in this context that the gay liberation movement took off.”  

20 (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

- A Washington Post poll showed the swing towards acceptance of gay marriage in the last decade in which the NO vote dropped from 55% to 36% while the YES vote crossed over from 41% to 58%.  

21

Note: Evolving attitudes to marriage must not be confused with the contentious notion of ‘Marriage itself evolving’. [See 2.C.e]

---


b) A Complex Issue

- “What is ‘gay’? Labels such as ‘homosexual’ and ‘heterosexual’ have only become popular over the last century, a relatively recent development in western culture. Researchers still disagree about how these labels should be defined and attempts to identify and validate different ‘orientations’ on the basis of underlying biological factors have not been successful. The reality seems to be the existence of a variety of sexual ‘attractions’. (Sexual ‘behaviour’ constitutes a separate study, including the evaluation of its moral status and implications for society.)

- Patterns of Same Sex Attraction (SSA) can be understood either in terms of differences of feelings and desire, differences of types of behaviour, the various labels that people choose to apply to themselves, or some combination of all three.” (Glynn Harrison, psychiatrist)


c) Key Issues re the SS Debate

For Society at large:

- The Elephants in the room:
  - Is homosexuality natural or unnatural / abnormal? (Nature or Nurture?)  [See 1.C.c]
  - Has homosexual practice been proved empirically to be harmful? (Healthy or Unhealthy?) [1.C.f]
  - Can gay practice be morally justified or not? (Good or Sinful) [1.E,f, 3.B-C, 4.C.c, 4.D.]
  - What percentage of the population is actually ‘gay’?  [See 1.C.f]

- Whose wisdom guides public opinion?
  - God’s revealed Word?  [3.A-C]
  - Human rationality informed by scientific ‘findings’?  [4.A.b]
  - One pressure group’s propaganda?  [1.D-E]

For the Church:

- Whose wisdom guides church decisions?
  - God’s revealed Word? If so:  [3:A-C]
    - Which parts are relevant?  [3.B]
    - How should they be interpreted?  [3.B]
    - How seriously does the Bible take the consequences of SS practice?  [3.C.c]
  - Scientific evidence? If so:
    - Who has provided the most reliable evidence?  [1.C.d]
    - What is this evidence?  [1.C.c]
  - Public consensus? If so:
    - Why should opinion polls be relied upon to establish truth?  [2.C.d]

d) Origins, Pronunciation and Usage:

- Whereas same-sex relationships have been around since before the dawn of history, the term ‘homosexual’ first appeared in print 1869.
  - The ‘homo’ element of ‘Homo-sexual’ comes from the Greek word ‘hemos’ meaning ‘same’ and is pronounced ‘hom-o’ (as in ‘Thomas’).
  - It should not be confused with the Latin word ‘homo’ meaning ‘man’ and pronounced ‘home-oe’ (e.g. ‘Homo sapiens’, the first syllable as in ‘home’).

‘Homosexual’ refers to the same-sex orientation in general, rather than to any male component of same-sex. ‘Homosexuality’ is primarily about the ‘same-ness’ of the sexual partners, not their ‘male-ness’.
• ‘Homosexual’ v. ‘Gay’. It may be helpful in this survey to distinguish ‘homosexual’ from ‘gay’. While the term ‘homosexual’ simply describes an attraction that some have to others of the same sex (in the same way ‘heterosexual’ describes attraction to one of the opposite sex), the label ‘gay’ is used to describe a socio-political identity and lifestyle that a high profile community of ‘homosexually inclined’ persons adopt. Sam Allberry, who experiences Same Sex Attraction himself, writes: ‘In western culture today the obvious term for someone with homosexual feelings is ‘gay’. But in my experience this often refers to far more than someone’s sexual orientation. It has come to describe an identity and a lifestyle.’  
  
  o Note: ‘There is a certain group of homosexual men who do not seek fulfillment through coming out into a gay identity. These men have chosen to grow in another direction [e.g. celibacy]. The word homosexual names an aspect of such a man’s psychological condition. But he is not gay.’  

(R.S. Harris in ‘Homophobia’ first coined 1969. ‘Homophobia’ / ‘bi ry’ should be applied only to those expressing hatred / contempt of homosexuals as persons (e.g. labeling them ‘queers’ / ‘fags’, etc.), despite the wider application by the gay lobby to describe anyone opposed to their agenda. “To reject homosexual practice, by way of informed disapproval, should not be automatically construed as a rejection of the inherent dignity held by people who are attracted to their own sex. Rejecting or questioning ideology underpinning the gay worldview is often translated as a rejection of homosexual people, as persons.”  

• A ‘gay lifestyle’? Many homosexuals (rightly) object to the ‘gay lifestyle’ stereotype of promiscuous lives base on sex and pleasure-seeking. Gay blogger Justin Lee says, “Being gay just means that some of us are attracted to the same sex and not the opposite sex. Some of us respond by being celibate; some eventually find someone to fall in love and settle down with. We live many different lifestyles, from monks to partiers.”  

Certainly it is a misrepresentation to tar all homosexuals with the same promiscuous brush, as if every homosexual exhibits disreputable behaviour called ‘a gay lifestyle’. “Knowing what someone’s orientation is doesn’t tell you anything about their behavior, and knowing about someone’s sexual behavior (or lack of it) doesn’t tell you what their orientation is. This is so important to understand, because it’s at the heart of why gay people get so angry about issues like this.”  

• ‘Homophobia’ v. ‘Gay’. It may be helpful in this survey to distinguish ‘homosexual’ from ‘gay’. While the term ‘homosexual’ simply describes an attraction that some have to others of the same sex (in the same way ‘heterosexual’ describes attraction to one of the opposite sex), the label ‘gay’ is used to describe a socio-political identity and lifestyle that a high profile community of ‘homosexually inclined’ persons adopt. Sam Allberry, who experiences Same Sex Attraction himself, writes: ‘In western culture today the obvious term for someone with homosexual feelings is ‘gay’. But in my experience this often refers to far more than someone’s sexual orientation. It has come to describe an identity and a lifestyle.’  

o Note: ‘There is a certain group of homosexual men who do not seek fulfillment through coming out into a gay identity. These men have chosen to grow in another direction [e.g. celibacy]. The word homosexual names an aspect of such a man’s psychological condition. But he is not gay.’  

(R.S. Harris in ‘Homophobia’ first coined 1969. ‘Homophobia’ / ‘bi ry’ should be applied only to those expressing hatred / contempt of homosexuals as persons (e.g. labeling them ‘queers’ / ‘fags’, etc.), despite the wider application by the gay lobby to describe anyone opposed to their agenda. “To reject homosexual practice, by way of informed disapproval, should not be automatically construed as a rejection of the inherent dignity held by people who are attracted to their own sex. Rejecting or questioning ideology underpinning the gay worldview is often translated as a rejection of homosexual people, as persons.”  

c) What is Reliable Evidence For Forming A Judgement?

• Scientific studies. “All scientific knowledge is provisional but it lies on a spectrum from very solid to very speculative.” John Butterworth, (Particle physicist, working on the Large Hadron Collider)  

• Personal experience. Often anecdotal, personal experience cannot be denied, but neither is it proof of normative behaviour or right activity.  

• Divine revelation. Neither of the above can provide the basis for any final judgement. Christians will naturally privilege what God says over human understanding, some appealing to the Word documented in Scripture, others to the Holy Spirit prompting the believer.

To Whom Should We Listen? - Two Books
“laid before us to study, to prevent us falling into error”

1. The Book of God’s Word (Scripture) revealing His will
2. The Book of God’s Works (Creation / Science) expressing His power - Francis Bacon

- Problems With Scientific Research. S. Jones and M. Yarhouse have pointed out that “research on sexual orientation generally or homosexuality specifically is plagued by pernicious problems.
  o One problem is the diversity of persons to whom the description ‘homosexual’ is applied and the question of whether to categorize people by behavior (which behaviors and to what degree?), self-identification, or some other variable…
  o A second problem has been the research focus upon male homosexuals (gays), with very little in comparison being done with lesbians…
  o A third problem is the difficulty or impossibility of obtaining a random and representative sample of homosexual individuals…
  o Fourth, failure to replicate [independently check] findings has plagued research in this area.” 29

They also note that research data has sometimes been based on ‘a questionable survey design’, or been derived from research containing ‘sampling biases’.  

- Language of advocacy. How opposing advocates express their views can indicate the character of their cause. Abusive, vitriolic smears and intemperate language do not convince, while respect for, and courtesy towards, opponents, at least lends dignity and credibility to the arguments being defended.

B. MODELS OF SEXUALITY

a) Complementary: The Biblical Design

- Here, maleness and femaleness are seen as important and positive differences, and as fundamental to reality and to the nature of each person. God created us, male and female, and it was good. (This stress on the reality and importance of sexual differences contrasts with androgyny – male-female ambiguity.) Masculinity and femininity—maleness and femaleness—are seen as co-operating in a mutually supportive fashion. (This also contrasts with the exploitive model of sexuality – of women by men.)

b) Androgyny / Unisex / Ambigender / Polygender: A Recently Popular View

- “Sexuality understood as basically arbitrary, and of male and female as not only equivalent but as more or less interchangeable, except for minor differences in external genitalia and associated sensory pleasure…The androgynous understanding of sex means that any form of sexual pleasure is okay since there is no natural character to sexuality. It is an arbitrary social convention defined by each person. Once sex as recreation, rather than as procreation, is established, individual moral relativism goes with it. The result is the world of today’s pornographic exploitation, in which sex with either sex, including—even especially—sado-masochistic sex, sex with children, and now sex with animals, is justified; if you enjoy it, it’s okay.” (Paul C Vitz, Prof. of Psychology, NYU) 30

c) The Great Sex Charade: Sexuality as Indicator of Intimacy

- “The great sex charade is the popular celebration in the media and in our society and culture at large of sexuality as the major indicator of intimacy between persons. Our culture is rife with the attention-getting power of sexuality, and we are saturated with the notion that sexual attractiveness is the key to


interpersonal success and true happiness. But we do not ask what is at the core of interpersonal success.

- Culturally co-opted sexuality is a charade, a game designed to conceal the underlying reality it suggests. It is a deceitful rampant pretense to satisfy something in us that is far more profound, namely, the longing for an intimacy that ultimately ties us into the life of God.”


- Tertullian, 2nd C Christian writer, cited this saying: "Vide", inquiant, "at invicem se diligant", in Apologeticum ch 39, 7


- 1.5 per cent of adults in the UK identified themselves as Gay, Lesbian or Bisexual. James Loder, ‘The Great Sex Charade’, 27

- "Rebel love: Homosexuality," Tertullian, 2nd C Christian writer, cited this saying: “Vide”, inquiunt, "at invicem se diligant”, in Apologeticum ch 39, 7


36 “Why I am no convert to gay marriage”, The Telegraph, 29th March 2014

- "Why I am no convert to gay marriage”, The Telegraph, 29th March 2014

a) An Identity, A Behaviour or An Inclination?

- **Who is gay?** Human sexual attraction is a spectrum rather than a division (straight v. gay). “To a considerable extent, different definitions of homosexuality underlie a great many contradictions in the literature.” (David de Pomerai, Biology Prof. at Nottingham)³⁸ “The question ‘what is gay?’ is a complicated one. Some people insist that the only valid ‘label’ is the one we choose to give to ourselves. For them, the term ‘gay’ may form a critical part of their self concept. Christians, however, would insist that their identity ‘in Christ’ is the defining principle of their lives, whatever their experience of different sexual desires.” (Glynn Harrison)³⁹

- **Identity?** – “*Personal identity is properly constituted around sexual orientation.*” “Self-identifying as homosexuals.” Who goes around saying, “I’m a heterosexual!”? This is the product of subjective value judgements rather than objective science. Sam Allberry avoids using the term ‘gay’ of himself because “the kind of sexual attractions I experience are not fundamental to my identity. They are part of what I feel but are not who I am in a fundamental sense. I am far more than my sexuality.”⁴⁰ Ex-lesbian Pamela Ousley says, “Homosexuality is *not* an identity, it is a behavior. A person practices a behavior but is defined, confined, and limited by an identity. When a self identification is false it robs a person of his/her God-given identity. Since homosexual-identification is not a true identity it can be repudiated and abandoned. This news should offer great hope to anyone feeling trapped in an unwanted self-identifying place called homosexuality.”⁴¹[See I.C.c] – ‘Gay’ Genes? – Nature v. Nurture: The Scientific Evidence; 1.D.d) - A Clever Marketing Strategy: The Use of Spin] Professor James Loder says, “Homosexuality is something they *have* rather than something they *are*... As soon as somebody has a homosexual inclination, they say, ‘I am a homosexual.’ And I say, ‘No. You are a human being, and you have homosexual desires. But you are first and foremost a human being.’”⁴²

### The Issue:

**What matters** is not the urges that individuals may *feel*, but **what they do with these urges**.

- **Homosexuality as an identity** did not emerge until 1870 – before that the terminology referred to practices alone. (Michel Foucault, historian). “While same-sex sexual behavior has long been recognized, ‘heterosexual’ and ‘homosexual’ as distinct human identities is a social construct that comes out of the 19th century, maybe a little earlier. Sexual identity is *not* a biblical concept, and I don’t think this concept is true to the way God made us. Not many cultures have said sexuality is so important that, beginning in childhood, you need to explore it and think about it, and you can’t be a healthy adult without expressing and knowing it. That, in my view, is a sign of a culture that has made an idol of sex.” (Jenell Williams Paris, Prof. of Anthropology, Bethel University)⁴³

- Some have claimed they *chose to become* gay or bisexual, (e.g. as an experiment or for notoriety). One UK survey conducted in 1994 amongst 19,000 people found only 3.6% of men and 1.7% of women had

---


³⁹ Glynn Harrison, *The science behind same sex attraction*, in Nucleus, Christian Medical Fellowship, Spring 2008,  


⁴³ Jenell Williams Paris, Faculty Forums, Bethel University, St Paul, Mn.  
ever been involved in genital same-sex activity, but when asked about such activity in the past 5 years, the numbers dropped to 1.4% of men and 0.6% of women, suggesting for the majority it was a passing phase. Further of all surveyed only 1% of men and 0.3% of women were exclusively gay. (Wellings, Field, Johnson & Wadsworth, UCL Medical School) 44 [See 1.A.b) – Great Sex Charade; 1.D.h) - Plausibility of Same Sex Behaviour]

- **An Addiction?** - "This is an addictive sort of behavior and at the same time a kind of frigidity. You are not satisfied, so you increase the dose, with the result that you multiply the frustration." (Wolfgang Joop, Gay fashion designer) 45

- **The Political Reason For A ‘Gay’ Identity:** "Gay and lesbian identities are largely the product of homophobic prejudice and repression. They are a self-defence mechanism against homophobia. Faced with persecution for having same-sex relations, the right to have those relationships has to be defended - hence gay identity and the gay rights movement." 46 (Peter Tatchell Blog, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Range of Theories about Homosexual Orientation and Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Homosexual orientation / inclination, whether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Innate</strong> – from birth (essentialist view: due to nature), or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Acquired / learnt</strong> through experience (social constructionist view: acquired by nurture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Most traditionalists</strong> have no issue with such orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Some react negatively</strong> to orientation (as ‘preference’) as well as rejecting practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Homosexual behaviour (sexual activity with same-sex partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Involvement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- From: A. None – celibate homosexuals (with traditionalist values),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Through: B. ‘Best-case’ – only faithful monogamous sexual partnerships (revisionist values),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To: C. ‘Worst-case’ – promiscuity and depravity (amoral values).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Condemnation</strong> (by traditionalists) of all non-celibate homosexuality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Acceptance</strong> (by revisionists) of loving, faithful, committed, lasting, monogamous sexual partnerships (without judging).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Celebration</strong> (by gay activists) of gay relationships in general as ‘gifts’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) **Causation:** “Gay” Genes? – Nature, Nurture or Notion? The Evidence of Science

- **Is It Natural? Is It Normal? Equivalent to Heterosexual Relationships?**
  - “Despite… the claim that one’s “sexual preference” is nobody’s business but one’s own, the intuition that there is something unnatural about homosexuality remains vital.” (Michael Levin,) 47
  - Gay activists portray their lifestyle as normal and healthy, equivalent in every way to their heterosexual counterparts, contrary to traditional belief that Sex within marriage of a man and a woman is the normal outlet for relational intimacy, sexual activity between tow of the same sex being an abuse of bodily parts.

---


46 Peter Tatchell quoted by Peter Saunders in “What causes homosexuality Peter Tatchell? Well it depends on which view is most politically convenient at the time”, *Christian Medical Comment*, 31st January 2013, [http://pjsaunders.blogspot.co.uk/2013/01/with-respect-to-causes-of-homosexuality.html](http://pjsaunders.blogspot.co.uk/2013/01/with-respect-to-causes-of-homosexuality.html) (accessed on 25th March 2014)

• Homosexual / Heterosexual Equivalence? Equating homosexual relationships with heterosexual ones insists that men and women are interchangeable when it comes to forming a valid, constructive intimate relationship. “The politically correct attitude not only insists that heterosexual and homosexual relationships are equivalent, but also erases differences between relationships between two women and relationships between two men. If men and women are profoundly different-and both science and common sense tell us they are-then an all-female couple is even more different from an all-male couple than either homosexual bond differs from a heterosexual union. This distinction helps explain the oft-noted quirk in public attitudes that sees stronger opposition and denunciation, in the Old Testament and elsewhere, to a physical relationship between two males than intimacy between two females. A physical connection between a female couple, like a physical connection between man and woman, is based primarily on acts of affection. The most common sexual practice between two men involves an act of aggression - inflicting more pain than pleasure for at least one of the parties.” (Michael Medved, political commentator.) 48

• A Traditionalist Verdict
  o “Medical statistics tell me homosexuality is unhealthy. 49 My Christian faith teaches me it is unrighteous. Common sense tells me it is unfruitful and unnatural... I believe homosexuality is wrong. Just like I believe adultery and sex outside of marriage is wrong. But even though I believe I have good reasons for opposing homosexuality as a normative lifestyle based on science, medicine, and faith, that is not why I strongly oppose it. I believe anyone who insists everyone know what they do in their bedroom and with whom is perverse. Normal people do not define themselves solely on the basis of who they are sexually attracted to.” (Ray Rooney) 50

• What’s At Stake? – Gay Strategy for Public Recognition: ‘Born This Way!’
  o Gay manifesto authors Marshall Kirk (a neuro-psychiatrist) and Hunter Madsen (a social marketing expert) advised that: “The public should be persuaded that gays are victims of circumstance, that they no more chose their sexual orientation than...their height... For all practical purposes, gays should be considered to have been born gay— even though sexual orientation, for most humans, seems to be the product of a complex interaction between innate predispositions and environmental factors during childhood and early adolescence.) To suggest in public that homosexuality might be chosen is to open the can of worms labeled ‘moral choice and sin’ and give the religious right intransigents a stick to beat us with. Straights must be taught that it is as natural for some persons to be homosexual as it is for others to be heterosexual - wickedness and seduction have nothing to do with it.” 51 [See 1.D.a) – History of a Western Cultural Revolution, 1.E.f) – The Morality of Homosexuality, 3.B.b) –Skewed Hermeneutics]

  o “Baby, you were born this way.” Lady Gaga’s smash hit "Born This Way," was a rallying cry for sexual minorities facing discrimination. Gay columnist Matthew Parris, however, has written that he hates the words ‘I can’t help it’ on the lips of fellow homosexuals: “The very words carry a kind of whimper. I hate this plea. It isn’t accepted as an argument for paedophilia and shouldn’t be. I’d want to be gay whether I could help it or not.” 52 Historian Dr. M. Duberman, founder of the Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies, says, “no good scientific work establishes that people are born gay or straight.” Being gay is a relatively recent social construction. 53

49 See 1.C.f) - Grim Truths about Homosexual Practice
51 Kirk and Madsen, After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of the Gay’s in the 90s, (New York, Doubleday, 1989) p.184
52 Matthew Parris, ‘Who’s totally Gay? There’s no straight answer,’ The Times, 21st April 2012’
Why Are Some People Homosexual? - Four Possible Explanations

1. Are Homosexuals born that way? (The popular assumption) (Nature)
2. Do they become homosexual through their environment? (Nurture)
3. Do they become attracted to those of their own sex through their own volition? (Notion)
4. Do they become homosexual through a combination of all three? (Multi-factors)

• NATURE: Born Gay?
  o Un-argued Presumption: Born Gay. "I knew I was different to other boys almost from the age of 7 or 8. I have absolutely no doubt that I was born gay, yet I find it bizarre that some find that difficult to accept. There are still misguided souls who believe that people choose to be gay." 54 (Radio presenter Iain Dale). Response: "No debate as to what his feeling different at 7 or 8 was caused by. No exploration of the different theories of emotional and environmental development or biology, no discussion around whether his feeling different from other boys was the trigger for developing homosexuality at puberty OR an expression of him already being intrinsically homosexual. There is no grappling with the various theories around genetics, hormonal and other influences in the womb, no examination of the multiple twin-studies on the subject which explore the variances in genetic / non-genetic components of homosexuality and their wide variability across the sexes. Gosh, we could at least have explored the male sibling evidence which is a brilliant text book example of how the same empirical evidence can be interpreted in both a nature and nurture way." (Peter Ould, ex-homosexual Anglican blogger on human sexuality) 55
  o "it's normal and natural because wired that way! It's in my genes!" Most homosexuals have been children of two heterosexual parents. So, one might ask, whence this gay gene? Gay activist Peter Tatchell rejects “the flawed theory which claims a genetic causation for homosexuality”. 56 He writes, “New research claiming gayness is biologically determined does not add up. Something as complex as human sexual life is bound to evolve from a multiplicity of factors... The singer Tom Robinson was a happy, well-adjusted gay man who, to his own surprise, one day met and fell in love with a woman. He is now equally happy and well-adjusted in his straight relationship. If he was hard-wired at birth to desire men, how can he now desire women?... Much as I would love to go along with the fashionable "born gay" consensus (it would be very politically convenient), I can't. The evidence does not support the idea that sexuality is a fixed biological given.” 57
  o “Sexual orientation is biologically determined at birth." Richard C Friedman and Jennifer I. Downey, gay-activist psychiatric researchers at Columbia University, in their conclusions oppose the essentialist argument that homosexuality is biologically determined: "At clinical conferences one often hears...that homosexual orientation is fixed and un-modifiable. Neither assertion is true...The assertion that homosexuality is genetic is so reductionistic that it must be dismissed out of hand as a general principle of psychology." 58
  o ‘‘Genetic Cause”. A Measured Response to Gay Activists’ Claims.
    ▪ Bailey and Pillard published studies of male and female homosexuals which advanced the genetic causation hypothesis. 59 But Jones and Yarhouse queried their lack of concordant


55 Peter Ould, Ibid
56 Peter Tatchell, The Times, 20th February 1997
replication and a perceived volunteer bias in their sampling methods (recruiting only in gay magazines, not the public at large). They made it clear, however, that “Our core concern with the Bailey and Pillard studies is engendered by the large size of the genetic influence they claim to have obtained, not by the claim of genetic influence per se.” In other words, genetic influence is involved but is only a small part of the story.

- “There is no ‘gay gene’ as such.” (- Dr David de Pomerai, Biology Professor at Nottingham) Many other factors and influences involved. Gay activists will often claim that certain scientific studies ‘prove there is a gay gene’ when in fact the ‘experts’ themselves offer a more nuanced opinion. (It is important to trace all quotations to their sources as authors can frequently by quoted out of context, especially when quoting a promising admission by an antagonist.) Dean Hamer, author of the “gay gene” study, admits: “We knew that genes were only part of the answer. We assumed the environment also played a role in sexual orientation, as it does in most, if not all behaviors.”

- Francis Collins, heads of the human genome project states that homosexuality is “a predisposition, not a pre-determination.”

- Familial, cultural and other environmental factors contribute to same sex attraction. Arguing whether a person is “born gay” or “chooses to be gay” assumes a false dichotomy, whereas the truth lies between these two polarized positions. Further, as has been pointed out by Jeffrey Satinover, the genetic traits with which a person is born do not determine whether a person will use the traits he or she has been given, any more than a basketball player of necessity is a great performer just because he is six feet nine inches tall! As he concludes: “The whole subject of behavioral genetics is complex. It does not lend itself to sound bites at all.” (Satinover)

- **NUTURE: Environment?**
  - When assessing biological factors, if a balanced scientific study of causation is to be made, it is important that psychosocial factors are also assessed. The crucial thing from a scientific point of view is to follow the evidence rigorously.
    - “Homosexuality is a developmental problem that is almost always the result of problems in family relations, particularly between father and son. As a result of failure with father, the boy does not fully internalize male gender-identity, and develops homosexual. This is the commonly seen clinical model.” (Joseph Nicolosi, Clinical Psychologist) A 2006 Danish study of 2 million people concluded: “Our study provides population-based, prospective evidence that childhood family experiences are important determinants of heterosexual and homosexual marriage decisions in adulthood.”

- **NOTION: Choice?**
  - Sex And The City star Cynthia Nixon said “I gave a speech recently, an empowerment speech to a gay audience, and it included the line ‘I’ve been straight and I’ve been gay, and gay is better.’ And they tried to get me to change it, because they said it implies that homosexuality can be a

---

60 Stanton L. Jones and Mark A. Yarhouse Science and the Ecclesiastical Homosexuality Debates, Wheaton College, 1997, p. 8 [http://www.wheaton.edu/CACE/Print-Resources/%7Emedia/6768CD03F127430A92B64526EDDF4317.pdf](http://www.wheaton.edu/CACE/Print-Resources/%7Emedia/6768CD03F127430A92B64526EDDF4317.pdf)
65 Joseph Nicolosi, Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality; (Lanham, Jason Aronson, 1991) p. 25
choice. And for me, it is a choice." "A certain section of our community is very concerned that it not be seen as a choice, because if it's a choice, then we could opt out." 67

- John McKellar writes, “My activist brothers and sisters, along with their ever-willing accomplices in media and academia, relentlessly drum into the public psyche that homosexuality is 'not a choice', because no-one would choose to be gay in a homophobic society.
  - First of all, there is an element of choice in all behaviour.
  - Secondly, despite media fanfare and trendy hypotheses, there is no conclusive scientific evidence as to the biological, genetic, psychological and social influences on sexual orientation.

The modern change in opinion concerning homosexuality, though presented as scientific advance, is contradicted rather than supported by science. Once again, we have a transformation in public morals consistent with widespread abandonment of the Judeo-Christian ethics upon which our civilization is based. Though hailed as 'progress', it is really a reversion to ancient pagan practices supported by a counter-culture restatement of gnostic moral relativism.” 68 (McKellar)

- Morality and The Limits of Science:
  - Scope: “Science is the arbiter of what is positive.” This represents a paradigm shift within the discipline of practising psychologists who decided to embrace the “minority narrative of homosexuality”. “The social sciences do not contain within themselves adequate resources to adjudicate among conflicting ways of understanding the good... Such judgments are the domain of religion, theology, and philosophy.” (Stanton Jones, psychologist) 69
  - The Moral Realm Inaccessible via Science: Reviewing an “even-handed, nuanced treatment of homosexuality that disagrees with everybody” by gay theologian Pim Pronk, Gene B. Chase summarizes Pronk’s first 262 pages: “No evidence on the level of what ‘is’ can lead to a conclusion about what ‘ought to be’. No historical evidence, no biological evidence, no sociological evidence, no psychological evidence can force a moral conclusion. These sciences simply do not have the tools to lead to the moral realm. Thus Pronk disagrees with almost everyone’s argument for homosexuality. John Boswell's argument from the frequency of homosexuality in history, John McNeill's argument from the psychological experience of gays who claim that homosexuality is normal for them, Evelyn Hooker's argument that gays are not per se socially deviant, arguments from hypothalamus studies—all of these arguments are easy to dismiss. 'Is' does not mean 'ought'!” 70 This claiming a biological factor in criminality doesn’t make thieving acceptable! The answer is that no one knows, and it doesn’t matter, because though “Our urges may be programmed; our behaviour is not.” (Barry Seagren, apologist). 71 We all struggle with desires either inborn or acquired from social influences.

  - While most people do not choose the sexual attractions that they feel, everyone is responsible for the sexual behaviour in which they choose to engage. “Acting on homosexual attraction is voluntary. Claims of genetic or environmental determinism do not relieve individuals of moral responsibility for their sexual behavior.” (Christian Medical and Dental Associations) 72 [See 1.D.a) – History of a Western Cultural Revolution, 1.E.f) – The Morality of Homosexuality, 3.B.b) – Skewed Hermeneutics]

---

68 John McKellar, Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism, PFOX http://pfox.org/Homosexuals_Opposed_to_Pride_Extremism.html
71 Barry Seagren, Address, (Sermon communicated privately to the compiler, 2013)
• The Integrity of Science Compromised
  
  o Integrity: “The average person comprehends neither the complexities of good scientific research nor the extent to which politics has corrupted the scientific process.” (John McKellar) 73
  
  “Politics and science go hand in hand. In the end it is gay activism which determines what researchers say about gay people.” (Vern Bullough, Humanist Sexologist and activis for gay rights, quoted in Out of Harm’s Way) 74 [See 1.D.e) – Gay Lobby Tactics]
  
  o Methodology: “To avoid misunderstanding the phenomenon of homosexuality, we must grapple with the Achilles heel of research into the homosexual condition: the issue of sample representativeness. To make general characterizations such as “homosexuals are as emotionally healthy as heterosexuals,” scientists must have sampled representative members of the broader group. But representative samples of homosexual persons are difficult to gather, first, because homosexuality is a statistically uncommon phenomenon… This infrequency makes it hard to find participants for research studies, leading researchers to study easy-to-access groups of persons (such as visible participants in advocacy groups) who may not be representative of the broader homosexual population. Add to this the difficulty of defining homosexuality, of establishing boundaries of what constitutes homosexuality (with individuals coming in and out of the closet, and also shifting in their experience of same-sex identity and attraction), and of the shifting perceptions of the social desirability of embracing the identity label of gay or lesbian, and the difficulty of knowing when one is studying a truly representative sample of homosexual persons becomes clear.” 75
  
• Conclusion: A Combination Of Nature And Nurture
  
  o Even if there is little scientific evidence to support the notion that homosexuals are innately conditioned in their orientation (and Homosexuality originates overwhelmingly in nurture rather than nature), this does not mean that it is necessarily a chosen condition. Peter Ould (former statistician and post-gay) writes, “The best scientific evidence points towards a complicated combination of nature and nurture in the development of sexual orientation and identity, and to argue that it is simply down to one particular psycho-dynamic model for all men who have same-sex attraction is simply naively ignoring the overwhelming evidence to the contrary.” 76 “The complex of factors which results in the orientation toward homosexuality probably differs from person to person. Thoughtful persons reflecting on the causation literature must strive to rid themselves of the simplistic thinking that demands a single cause for this complex phenomenon. Some of these influencing factors may be genetic in origin, but genetic influence may not mean a ‘sexual orientation gene;’ rather, other higher-order traits may dispose some children to atypical social relationships, patterns of psychological identification, and so forth. Like Byne and Parsons (1993), we favor an interactional hypothesis for the formation of sexual orientation, one which suggests shifting ratios of influence from different sources for different persons, and with nature and nurture in constant interaction.” 77 (Jones/Yarhouse)

Causation

“A more reasonable viewpoint, based on science and experience, accepts that sexual orientation forms in the average person through a blend of innate tendencies, environmental influences, and life experiences.” 78

W.P. Campbell

---

73 McKellar, Ibid
74 David Noebel, reported in Worldviews: Humanist Sociology http://www.allaboutworldview.org/humanist-sociology.htm
78 W.P. Campbell, Turning Controversy Into Church Ministry, (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 2010) p. 85
d) “Orientation Can’t Change!” and Other Unsupported Claims

- Distinction between ‘healing’ an illness and ‘transforming’ an orientation.
  - It is now generally agreed that homosexuality is not an illness. Attempts therefore to ‘heal’ those with SSA are inappropriate. But “sexual transformation (where a person’s sexual orientation is transformed from homosexual to heterosexual), despite the controversy surrounding it, has been demonstrated many times, although there are also cases where transformation has been short lived.” (David W. Torrance)  

- Complex Evidence For Change. Stanley L. Jones, after examining the complexity of the evidence, concludes: ‘Homosexual orientation is, contrary to the supposed consensus, sometimes mutable. ‘Homosexuality’ is a multifaceted phenomenon; there are likely many homosexualities, with some perhaps more malleable than others. Not all interventions are the same; not all practitioners are equally skilled. Perhaps most important, those seeking change vary considerably in their intensity of motivation, in their resourcefulness, and in the context in which they try to change. Most of those seeking change and most of those who actually attain some level of change are highly religiously committed, and these individual who believe in a God who intervenes in their lives are embedded in communities of care and are motivated by their core understanding of who they are as a person before God.”  

- “Sexual orientation cannot be changed and attempts to change are harmful.” But people do change. “For example, Sue Wilkinson, professor of Feminist and Health Studies at Loughborough University, was quoted in the Times saying: ‘I was never unsure about my sexuality throughout my teens or 20s. I was a happy heterosexual and had no doubts. Then I changed, through political activity and feminism, spending time with women’s organisations. It opened my mind to the possibility of a lesbian identity.’” She added: “I’d had a very happy marriage and a very good relationship with men. My husband took it very badly.” No kidding! Gay dissident John McKellar believes it is possible to heal the homosexual condition. He admits that he still struggles and has some failures, but decided to leave the "official" gay scene as "it was too risky and the relationships were always a dead end." He says reparative therapy is helpful and necessary in helping some gay men and lesbians out of the lifestyle. More attention should be given to the benefits and success stories associated with reparative therapy, he believes, while maintaining that self-control and discipline are necessary virtues in anyone's battle to take control of their sexuality.  

- Regarding the right to change Glynn Harrison says: “We need to protect the individual's right to bring his or her feelings and behaviour into line with his or her religious and moral values, rather than the other way around – if that is their choice.” He concludes: “With [certain] safeguards in place, people have the right to choose for themselves how they want to manage SSA within the framework of their religious values.”  

- Options for religious people with SSA
  - Some may decide to change their values and beliefs to bring them into line with their attractions, possibly seeking out some kind of gay-affirming counselling or support.
  - Others may decide to bring their feelings and desires into line with their religious convictions, holding to the teaching of the Bible and the traditional teachings of the Church.
  - Some people may decide to explore the possibility of change through participation in forms of counselling or pastoral ministry.

---

80 Stanton L. Jones, Ibid, p.28  
• Others may prefer to make a commitment to pursue a celibate lifestyle by relying upon the informal support of friends, their faith and the presence of the Holy Spirit in their lives. 

• The premier researchers in human sexuality from Columbia University School of Medicine note: “At clinical conferences one often hears . . . that homosexuality is fixed and un-modifiable. Neither assertion is true. . . . The assertion that homosexuality is genetic is so reductionist that it must be dismissed out of hand as a general principle of psychology.”

• Gender engineering: “Gender is a social construct; therefore I can do what I like with whom I like.” A “push in Sweden to eliminate gendered behaviour in children” is based on the ideological notion that gender is mostly socially constructed. The preponderance of scientific (biological and psychological) evidence indicates that the social gender engineering proposed in Sweden is wrong. Male and female are different but equal and the equality agenda is damaged rather than served by trying to eliminate difference.” (William Reville, Emeritus professor of biochemistry). Also male and female being differently constructed sexually, we ignore the Creator’s purpose at our peril. Note: Many gay people also object to this notion as it conflicts with their notion of a ‘gay gene’ determining gender.

• “Gays are as psychologically healthy as straights.” Homosexual orientation associated with anxiety, substance-use disorders and suicidal thoughts. Homosexual relationships are intrinsically insecure. [See I.C.f] - Grim Truths about Homosexual Practice

• “Homosexual relationships are basically equivalent to heterosexual ones.” Cuts against a fundamental gender-based given of the human condition, thus often the cause of distress.

• Claims made regarding the ‘naturalness’ of homosexuality:
  - “Homosexual intercourse is natural – animals do it!”
    - But animals can also be very cruel, even to the extent of eating their own offspring. No-one advocates that just ‘because it’s found in the animal world’! In any case Christians believe that, unlike animals, human beings are made in God’s image and should not behave like animals.
    - ‘Natural’ has a scientific meaning (i.e. ‘as found in nature’) that differs from its theological meaning (i.e. ‘according to God’s ordering of creation’). Patterns of behaviour found in nature do not always conform to biblical standards of human morality. It is natural for some animals to prey on others. In the Biblical meta-narrative the Fall accounts for disorders found in creation, including biologically induced homosexual behaviour.
  - “Homosexuals can’t be blamed for expressing their natural tendencies.” Flawed natural tendencies should be subject to restraint. The primacy of self-expression is a non-Christian philosophy that minimizes or even denies an internal conflict between Spirit and flesh.

e) Artistic Creativity and The Human Desire for Happiness, Security and Intimacy

• Alienation Pain Engenders Artistic Creativity
  - “At a young age we learn the rituals of deceit, impersonation and appearance, and anyone who believes political, social or even cultural revolution will change this fundamentally is denying reality. Yet, this alienation and desperation deepens our artistic insight and allows us to create civilization. Look at such historical icons as Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Tchaikovsky, Somerset Maugham, Gore Vidal - who were homosexual and who undoubtedly experienced hardship and repression. But look what they gave to the world. Look how they advanced the cultural heritage.” (John McKeller)
**Bonding in Music and The Arts:**
- “Music and the arts were always a tolerant environment for gay men. Everyone draws on a central emotional core in the act of creativity, and when the normal outlet of intimacy is blocked, the heart will find alternative ways to express itself, sometimes with enormous intensity.” (Stephen Hough, gay RC pianist) 88 Sex within marriage of a man and a woman is the normal outlet of intimacy. [See 2.D.b] – The Significance of Complementarity

**Has Authentic Intimacy always to be connected with Sex?**
- “To share a life of intimacy with another is the way most men and women are meant to live whole and holy lives. Such relationships are about more than making babies. They are about making love, because to do so is to be fully human.” An affirmation of companionship at the beginning of time (Gen 1) + new discoveries about sexual orientation in the natural world = a radical challenge to previously confident assessments of the morality of gay relationships. 89 (Stephen Hough) Intimacy and sex are not co-terminus! Abraham had an intimate relationship with God. Parallels with the natural world are not relevant: we don’t celebrate cruelty simply because it occurs in nature! [See 1.B.c] - The Great Sex Charade: Sexuality as Indicator of Intimacy

**Love, Security and Happiness**
- “My life changed. Massively. When I met someone and it made me feel so happy, so safe and everything just feels great. That someone is a guy.” (Tom Daley, 19yr old Olympian Swimmer) 90
- Actress Ellen Page told LGBT teens at a Las Vegas conference, “I’m here today because I am gay...” (standing ovation) “…because I feel a personal obligation and a social responsibility...because I am tired of lying by omission. I suffered for years because I was scared to be ‘out’... What I have learned is that love, the beauty of it, the joy of it, yes, even the pain of it, is the most incredible gift to give and to receive as a human being... (clapping)... And we deserve to experience love fully, equally, without shame, without compromise. There are too many kids out there suffering from bullying, rejection or simply being mistreated because of who they are...too many drop-outs, too many suicides... Thank you for giving me hope, and please keep changing the world for people like me. Happy Valentine’s Day!” 91

**Confusing “Philia” with “Eros”!**
- “Philia love between men is far better, far stronger, and far more fulfilling than erotic love can ever be. But society now promotes the lowest form of love between men while sabotaging the higher forms.” (Doug Mainwaring, homosexual politician) 92 Jonathan and David were intimate friends, but with no suggestion of a sexual relationship (other than what some would read into it!) [See 3.B.b] – Skewed Hermeneutics “It has actually become necessary in our time to rebut the theory that every and serious friendship is really homosexual... Kisses, tears and embraces are not in themselves evidence of homosexuality.” (CS Lewis) 93

---

89 Ibid
f) Grim Facts about much Homosexual Practice

Note:
It should not be assumed from reading this section that all homosexuals follow a similar lifestyle.
It should be borne in mind that most revisionists find such assumptions highly offensive.
Many will know of ‘a nice guy next door’ [See 4.B.a] - Arguments From Observation and Experience]
whose homosexual lifestyle bears no resemblance to what follows.
Nevertheless, the tendencies described do occur widely in the general gay community,
just as immoral behaviours are found amongst heterosexuals.
The issue is the degree and extent experienced generally in either community.
"If you don't swing with the Sodomites, you're nowheresville on the A-list." 94 (Camille Paglia)
[For the Bible’s portrayal of homosexual lifestyle see 3.C.a] The Key Texts: Genesis 19 and Judges 19

• Sexual Health: Myth of A Normal Healthy Gay Lifestyle

  o “Being Gay is just as healthy as being straight.” 95 (APA) The kind of sex in which male
homosexuals engage is inherently dangerous to human health and contrary to nature. The
human body was not designed for the kinds of uses to which it is put in homosexual encounters.

  o Dr. Timothy J. Dailey (Former Senior Fellow, Center for Marriage and Family Studies, Family
Research Council) maintains that homosexual activists “downplay the growing and
incontrovertible evidence regarding the serious, life-threatening health effects associated
with the homosexual lifestyle” and “portray their lifestyle as normal and healthy, equivalent in
every way to their heterosexual counterparts.” 96 [For equivalence claim see 1.C.c] – Causation
Hollywood and the media propagate the image of the fit, healthy, and well-adjusted
homosexual. That the reality is different was recently conceded by the homosexual newspaper
New York Blade News: “Reports at a national conference about sexually transmitted diseases
indicate that gay men are in the highest risk group for several of the most serious diseases.
Scientists believe that the increased number of sexually transmitted diseases (STD) cases is the
result of an increase in risky sexual practices by a growing number of gay men who believe HIV is
no longer a life-threatening illness.” (Bill Roundy) 97 Homosexual activity is breeding a culture
of sexual irresponsibility. “The CDC [US Centers for Disease Control] notes that while
homosexual men make up only a very small percentage of the male population (4%), MSM
account for over three-quarters of all new HIV infections, and nearly two-thirds (63 percent) of all
new infections in 2010 (29,800).” 98

• Higher prevalence of promiscuity:

  o “The classic study of 156 males in homosexual relationships by gay couple psychiatrist
McWhirter and psychologist Mattison, described in The Male Couple (1984),... found that not a
single male pair was able to maintain fidelity in their relationship for more than five years. Outside affairs,
the researchers found, were not damaging to the relationship’s endurance, but were in fact essential to it. (Joseph Nicolosi). 99 By comparison the heterosexual rate of

95 “Being Gay Is Just as Healthy as Being Straight”, American Psychological Association,
http://www.apa.org/research/action/gay.aspx (Accessed on 8th April 2014) This view was based on a (disputed) interpretation
of Dr. Evelyn Hooker’s studies of homosexual and heterosexual males in the 1950s that led to the American Psychiatric
Association’s decision in 1973 to remove homosexuality from their list of disorders. [See 1.D.a] – Landmarks, and for
Stanton’s repost: 1.D.e) – Gay Lobby Tactics]
96 Timothy J. Dailey, The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality, Family Research Council,
January 2014)
98 Thaddeus Baklinski, CDC warns gay men of ‘epidemic’ HIV rates, Live Leak,
http://www.liveleak.com/view?i=552_1375614574#8H8MBCsFPbxK2bOs.99 (Accessed 28th January 2014)
infidelity is much lower, despite high divorce rates: 23% men, 12% women were categorized as
unfaithful in an American survey of over 1,000 marriages. “Research on maladaptiveness is
inconclusive primarily because of the lack of agreement as to what constitutes maladaptiveness.
The clear evidence of **relational instability** and **promiscuity** among **male homosexuals** must
figure as problematic for Christians.” (Jones & Yarhouse) 100

- Gay author Gabriel Rotello notes the perspective of many gays that "Gay liberation was founded .
  . . on a 'sexual brotherhood of promiscuity,' and any abandonment of that promiscuity would
  amount to a 'communal betrayal of gargantuan proportions.'" Rotello's perception of gay
  promiscuity, which he criticizes, is consistent with **survey results**. A far-ranging study of
  homosexual men published in 1978 revealed that 75 percent of self-identified, white, gay men
  admitted to having sex with more than 100 different males in their lifetime: 15 percent claimed
  100-249 sex partners; 17 percent claimed 250-499; 15 percent claimed 500-999; and 28 percent
  claimed more than 1,000 lifetime male sex partners. (Rotello) 101

- **Staggeringly High Risk of HIV and Greater Proportion of Smoking, Drug Use and Depression:**
  - The UK's National Director of Health and Wellbeing has warned of an increasing and potentially
catastrophic HIV epidemic in homosexual men in every part of the world. Professor Fenton's
presentation at the British HIV Association's Autumn Conference held 14-15 November 2013 in
London **blamed the MSM HIV epidemic on two characteristics of homosexual sex: anal
intercourse and promiscuity.** "It is now estimated that **anal sex** is 18 times better at transmitting
HIV than vaginal sex. The chance of HIV being caught from having receptive anal sex once with
a partner with a detectable HIV viral load is about 1.4% or one in 71 encounters; but because
people have sex together more than once, the per-partner likelihood of catching HIV from a sero-
different partner is, in gay men, about 40%.... The rates of **smoking** (at 27 to 66%, according to
area), **recreational drug use**, lifetime depression (about 40%) and lifetime severe anxiety (at
20%) are all roughly **double in gay men** what they are in the general population," Fenton said,
adding that MSM also have higher rates of **traumatic experience** such as **child sexual abuse**
(CSA) and **intimate partner violence** (IPV) than the general population.” (Prof. Kevin Fenton) 102

  - “In the USA, 91.2% of all HIV infections in young men aged 13 to 24 are amongst those men
having male to male sexual contact (with no other aggravating factors like needle use) and only
4.1% from men having sex with women. If we assume the Kinsey figure of 1 in 10 people being
‘gay’, then that means that a young gay man is **222 times** more likely to get HIV through his
sexual activity then someone who doesn’t have sex with someone of the same sex. But of course,
the Kinsey figure is way too high, so let’s apply the more reasonable figure of 2% of the
population being homosexual. Now the factor is **1,112 times more likely to acquire HIV if you
have sex with someone of the same sex.” (Ould) 103

- **Mental health: intrinsically insecure, depressive and suicidal**
  - Homosexual orientation is often associated with **anxiety, substance-use disorders and suicidal
thoughts**, because homosexual relationships are **intrinsically insecure**. A national survey of
lesbians in America found that 75 percent of the nearly 2,000 respondents had pursued
psychological counseling of some kind, many for treatment of long-term depression or sadness:
(J. Bradford, et al., "National Lesbian Health Care Survey: Implications for Mental Health Care,”

---

100 Stanton L. Jones and Mark A. Yarhouse, *Homosexuality: The Use of Scientific Research in the Church's Moral Debate*,


102 Kevin Fenton, quoted by Thadeus Baklinski, in article: ‘Britain’s public health chief warns of catastrophic global gay

103 Peter Ould, *Some Staggering Statistics, An Exercise in The Fundamentals of Orthodoxy*, 16th September 2013,
The Tragic Irony of AIDS: Reduced Life Expectancy

- “The ugliness and premature ageing of this wasteful disease were especially painful and grotesque in view of gay men's historic idealization of youth and beauty.” (John McKellar) 107

Homosexual Lifestyle ‘The Pits’

- “History shows that male homosexuality flourishes with urbanization, soon becomes predictably ritualized and always tends toward decadence.” (John McKellar) 108

- “Gay authors Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen…with searing honesty they tell us ‘the gay lifestyle – not our sexuality but our lifestyle – is the pits.’ [After The Ball, p 276. See I.D.c) – Blueprint For Revolution], and then for 60 pages give us chapter and verse exactly why – the pathological lying (p 280), the rejection of morality (p 289), the narcissism and self-centred behaviour (p 295), the HIV/AIDS-inducing contempt for ‘safe sex’ (p 299), the self-indulgence and self-destruction (p 302), the fear of aging and loss of youthful looks (p 317), the transience of relationships (p 318), the drugs and heavy drinking (p 336). ‘(T)he fast-lane lifestyle leads to exhaustion and dissatisfaction, loudly expressed, by gays who feel that ‘something is missing’, that their lives are ‘empty’ – as indeed they are: of health; of peace of mind; of contentment; of love; of genuine interconnection with others’ (p 305).” (Alan Craig has written a devastatingly frank open letter to Tom Daley after the latter came out as gay. This paragraph is taken from it.) 109

Conclusion:

“Given the grim realities of the homosexual lifestyle, it is unwise to promote this behavior in our schools [See I.D.e] Gay Tactics:]; allow homosexual couples to adopt children or become foster parents; or legalize homosexual marriage. It is a behavior that should be discouraged at all levels of our society—in government, in academia, in churches, in education, in the media, and in our homes. Homosexuals are clearly deeply dysfunctional and self-destructive. They deserve our compassion and help, but not our approval for the dangerous behaviors they engage in.” 110


106 Ibid

107 McKellar, Ibid


109 Alan Craig, From A Father’s Heart To Tom Daley, Alan’s Angle, 17/12/13 http://www.alansangle.com/?p=1379 (Accessed 19th December 2013)

D.

RECENT HISTORY: THE POLITICS OF HOMOSEXUALITY

a) Landmarks In The History Of A Western Cultural Revolution

- The Emergence of Gay Awareness
  - *The Kinsey Report* (1948) claimed that 10% of people are homosexual. (This figure is generally revised today to between 1.6% and 3%.) This led to the following popular assumptions: “Out of the moral fog of the last few decades, the notion emerged that 10% equals normal, and normal equals natural, and natural equals acceptable.” (Thomas Schmidt) \(^{111}\)

- The Trial of Lord Montagu with two others for homosexual activity (1954)
  “was conducted so obviously from the high moral ground of ry and prejudice that homosexuality itself was in the dock, reason, common sense, and natural justice abandoned, the letter of the law triumphant... The severity of the punishment, however...proved to be the tipping point into a long and very slow change in the attitudes of society.” \(^{112}\) (Brian Sewell, gay arts critic)

- Decriminalisation of Homosexuality in Britain (1967)
  - There was no desire to promote a gay public identity. As Lord Arran told those now no longer to be treated as criminals, “I ask that those who have, as it were, been in bondage and those for whom the prison doors are now open to show their thanks by comporting themselves quietly and with dignity. This is no occasion for jubilation, certainly not for celebration. Any form of ostentatious behaviour now, or in the future, any form of public flaunting, would be utterly distasteful and would, I believe make the sponsors of the Bill regret that they had done what they have done.” \(^{113}\)

- Genesis of Stonewall
  - If we “take off the rainbow-colored glasses and objectively explore this phenomenon we call ‘gay rights’,” we find that “It grew out of the ‘sexual liberation’ movement of the 1960s. To be precise, the June 11, 1969, “Stonewall riot” – when a group of homosexuals at New York City’s Stonewall Inn resisted police commands to disperse – is widely regarded as the birth of the ‘gay liberation’ movement.” (David Kupelian, Columnist, editor of Whistleblower magazine) \(^{114}\) Time magazine observed: “The uprising was inspired by a potent cocktail of pent-up rage (raids of gay bars were brutal and routine), overwrought emotions (hours earlier, thousands had wept at the funeral of Judy Garland [See Appendix D ‘Queer as Pop’] and drugs. As a 17-year-old cross-dresser was being led into the paddy wagon and got a shove from a cop, she fought back. ‘[She] hit the cop and was so stoned, she didn't know what she was doing — or didn't care,’ one of her friends later told Martin Duberman, author of the history Stonewall.” \(^{115}\) Before the rebellion at the Stonewall Inn, homosexuals were “a secret legion of people, known of but discounted, ignored, laughed at or despised. And like the holders of a secret, they had an advantage which was a disadvantage, too, and which was true of no other minority group in the United States. They were invisible.... But that night, for the first time, the usual acquiescence

---


\(^{112}\) Brian Sewell, “Why I’m no convert to gay marriage”, *The Telegraph*, 24th March 2014


\(^{115}\) John Cloud, ‘Standing Up For Gay Rights’, *Time*, 21st March 2003, (Retrieved 3rd February 2014) [http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1977881_1977891_1978520,00.html#ixzz2sGyeEKu7](http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1977881_1977891_1978520,00.html#ixzz2sGyeEKu7)

Gaeland was a huge advocate of human rights as well as a gay icon, all the more so after the popular film *The Wizard of Oz.*
turned into violent resistance ... From that night the lives of millions of gay men and lesbians, and the attitude toward them of the larger culture in which they lived, began to change rapidly. People began to appear in public as homosexuals, demanding respect.” (Historians Dudley Clendinen and Adam Nagourney) 116

- The UK gay equality organisation Stonewall was founded in 1989 by political activists lobbying against Section 28 of the Local Government Act that prevented local authorities from promoting homosexuality. “The Equality Act [2006] created a new body: the Commission for Equality and Human Rights, CEHR, which will have the power to take up cases on behalf of those who feel there has been discrimination under the provisions of the Equality Act. Ben Summerskill is one of the Commissioners of the CEHR and Chief Executive of Stonewall, the most influential homosexual campaigning group. His predecessor at Stonewall is Angela Mason who is now head of the department which produced the sexual orientation regulations.” 117

- Sexual Politics
  - Neo-Marxist agenda: NT Prof Peter Jones writes: “We are dealing with a neo-Marxism so committed to a classless egalitarian society that it must eradicate by any means possible embodied gender distinctions, which are the final bulwark of creational difference, written into our DNA. The goal is no longer a classless society but a classless mind and a genderless body—no longer just a fair deal for the worker but a transformation of the human psyche! At this point, such a powerful cosmology takes on an unmistakably religious character.” 118 “Our conception of socialism is not limited to restructuring work and economic activity. It embraces altering the full range of social, cultural, political and familial structures and power relations... all the institutional forces that affect our lives.” 119 (Paul Buhle)
  - “Sexual politics, and especially gay sexual politics, has been about politics as much as it's been about sex from the beginning. The history of the removal of homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) of the American Psychiatric Association in 1973 is a story of intrigue, theatrics and intimidation -- in a word, anything but science. The term "sexual orientation" came out of this same high-water phase of APA's scientific development.” (Gary L'Hommedieu) 120

- The Stance of The American Psychiatric Association.
  - In 1973 the APA amended its designation of homosexual orientation as a mental illness. By 2009 its task force set up to consider Sexual Orientation Change Effects was declaring “Same sex sexual attractions, behaviour, and orientations per se are normal and positive variants of human sexuality.” Stanton Jones considers this to be “the product of value judgements rather than objective science.” Nevertheless the APA stance has become the politically correct view to follow and has prepared the way for the passing of Equal Marriage bills in Parliaments around the Western world. 121

119 Paul Buhle, Marxism in the United States: A History of the American Left (Verso; 1991). Quoted by Peter R Jones in “A Response”, ibid
• AIDS epidemic.
  o The sympathy factor: Then came AIDS, identified in the 1980s, a sexual plague threatening to wipe out millions. “As a public relations matter, AIDS was daunting. This modern plague, if not handled brilliantly in the court of public opinion, could result in homosexuals being widely shunned. On the other hand, perhaps the sympathy factor could be harnessed and multiplied to advance the activists’ cause. The movement definitely needed help.” (Kupelian) 122
  o Significance for the Gay campaign: “As cynical as it may seem, AIDS gives us a chance, however brief, to establish ourselves as a victimized minority legitimately deserving of America’s special protection and care. At the same time,” they warned, “it generates mass hysteria of precisely the sort that has brought about public stonings and leper colonies since the Dark Ages and before. ... How can we maximize the sympathy and minimize the fear? How, given the horrid hand that AIDS has dealt us, can we best play it?” (Kirk and Madsen, Harvard educated authors of After The Ball, 1989) 123
• Abolishment of Section 28.
  o John Deighan writes: “In 2000 we saw the removal of the law which prevented the promotion of homosexuality by local authorities (Clause 2a) because it was maintained that no-one would ever want to promote homosexuality. The logic of removing a law which prohibits what no-one wants to do is applied in no other area unless it is decided that it is acceptable to do the once proscribed activity. This is what could have been anticipated and what has in fact happened. Massive funding was available for groups to create materials and get involved in youth work, especially focusing on the areas of bullying and sexual health services.
• Gender Recognition Act 2004
  o The next stage was the promotion of the concept that sexuality is not biologically determined but rather socially constructed. The Gender Recognition Act 2004 was introduced to allow individuals to choose their ‘gender’ and it is permissible to be of male sex and have a female gender. The Sexual Health Strategy allowed further growth towards the equivalence of heterosexual and homosexual behaviour. No recognition is ever made as to the disparity in health outcomes between the two lifestyles save to insist that homosexual individuals are deserving of greater recognition in the provision of services. The message promoted through the sexual health strategy also led to greater targeting of children and the policy adopted was that children could have access to Sexual Health services without parental knowledge or consent. This removes children from the protection of their family environment and allows increased sexualisation of our culture which aids the view of sex as recreation and separates it from its reproductive natural order.” 124
• Gay Pride Carnivals / Festivals
  o “Pride parades (also known as pride marches, pride events, and pride festivals) for the LGBT community are events celebrating lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) culture and pride. The events also at times serve as demonstrations for legal rights such as same-sex marriage. Most pride events occur annually, and many take place around June to commemorate the Stonewall riots, a pivotal moment in modern LGBT social movements.” 125 “Gay pride or LGBT pride is the positive stance against discrimination and violence toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people to promote their self-affirmation, dignity, equality rights, increase their visibility as a social group, build community, and celebrate sexual diversity and gender variance. Pride, as opposed to shame and social stigma, is the predominant outlook that bolsters most LGBT rights movements throughout the world.” 126
  o The Role of The Creative Arts in Challenging Traditional Values: Glasgay (Gay Pride Festival) Back in 1993, councillors at Glasgow City Council wanted to block the festival under

122 Kupelian, ibid
Section 28 legislation, which prevented the promotion of gay culture. Performers hit back. Sir Ian Mckellen said at the time: "It is their values that are rotten to the core, and Glasgay is a beacon of sanity in a hypocrical and naughty world." 127 Section 28 was abolished by the Scottish Parliament in 2000, and since then an Equality Act, a Civil partnership Act and the Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Act have been introduced. Glasgow City Council is now one of the festival's key sponsors. Jackie Kay said festivals like Glasgay had been the catalyst for change. 

- Passing of the Equal Marriage Bill, 2013
  - Prime Minister David Cameron tweeted his support for the inaugural PinkNews awards in the House of Commons: “Congratulations @mikefreermp and @tinastowell for winning @pinknews awards for their magnificent work on equal marriage.” 128

b) The Goal of The Gay Agenda

- Gay Lobbyists’ Goal: Normalisation
  - The normalization of homosexual behavior to full parity with heterosexual behaviour. “one of the last obstacles to the complete normalization of homosexuality in our society is the understanding that marriage is the union of a man and a woman.”(Robert Bork) 130 [See 2.B.a) – The Purpose of Marriage]

- The Present Reality: A Social Revolution
  - A massive social experiment over the past 30 years has resulted in 1960s values dominating the evolution of family structures: personal fulfillment elevated over old-fashioned concepts of duty and responsibility.
  - Full acceptance of homosexuality within church and society involves a radical reinterpretation of gender, marriage, family and sexual morality – and nothing less than a revolution in social terms. [See 1.D.g) – Society’s Slippery Slope,]

- The Planned Stratagem: A Strategy to Change Attitudes
  - “Archbishop Justin has recently spoken [to the House of Lords] of a ‘revolution’ in Western culture, which we cannot ignore. This revolution has not been violent, or a spontaneous grassroots response to oppression, but the result of a planned manipulation of popular philosophy and the takeover of institutions and sources of information which shape us. The origins are in European and North American academic Marxism; the practical plans developed and shared in popular books such as ‘After the Ball’ by Kirk and Madsen. The spokespeople are articulate and angry activists, often celebrities. The strategy has been to disseminate widely the powerful ideas that homosexual practice is good, that being ‘gay’ is an innate unchangeable condition, that gay people are oppressed victims, that those who say otherwise are hateful oppressors [and bigots], who must be either converted, branded as right wing lunatics, or cowed into silence through legislation. The last ten years have seen the effectiveness of this strategy to


change attitudes within the church.” (Andrew Symes, Executive Secretary of Anglican-Mainstream) 131

• Transforming Society’s Values and Norms
  o Avowed Aim of Gay Agenda: “Change society’s values and norms.” (Peter Tatchell co-author of GLF Manifesto, 1971):
    ▪ “Aim at abolishing the family and the cultural distinctions between men and women.”
    ▪ “What is wrong is the in-turned emotional exclusiveness of the couple...People need a variety of relationships in order to develop and grow, and to learn about other human beings.”
    ▪ “The long-term goal of Gay Liberation... is to rid society of the gender-role system which is at the root of our oppression.”
    ▪ “Our whole legal structure is supposedly based on Christianity whose archaic and irrational teachings support the family and marriage as the only permitted sex.” - “We gay men and women do deny these values of our civilisation.”
    ▪ “It means a revolutionary change in our whole society.” 132
  o “Being queer means pushing the parameters of sex, sexuality, and family and... transforming the very fabric of society.” (Paula Ettelbrick, advocate for the LGBT community) 133
  o Regarding adoption by SS couples, “Urvashi Vaid, former executive director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force in America, said ‘children should be a special target for homosexual rights activists in the attempt to change society.’” SSM is not a touchy-feely, sentimental idea about inclusivity, it is an open invitation for homosexual militants to demand even greater access to children... [But] adoption exists to give children the parents they need, not to give adults the children they want.” (Greenson) 134

• About Superiority, Claiming The High Moral Ground, Not Truth Or Justice.
  o Gay rights is not so much about the attainment of truth or social justice as about the achievement of power. The battle centres on the control of public discourse through marketing and persuasion, to shape what society thinks about and how they think about it.
  o One atheist writer observes: “The speed and ease with which gay marriage has gone from being a tiny minority concern to become the No 1 battle in the modern culture wars has been truly remarkable – and revealing.” Instead of being a response to a popular demand for rights, O’Neill suggests that supporting gay marriage "has become a kind of shorthand way of indicating one’s superiority over the hordes, particularly those of a religious or redneck persuasion... The use of gay marriage as a platform from which to announce one’s superior moral sensibilities can be seen in the way that its backers, those ostensibly liberal reformers, look down with undiluted snobbery upon their critics and opponents... Those who are against gay marriage, whether it is Catholic bishops or conservative politicians, are not seen simply as old-fashioned or wrong-headed, but as morally circumspect, possibly even evil. They are even branded as mentally disordered, being tagged as 'homophobic' (that is, possessed of an irrational fear) if they so much as raise a peep of criticism of gay marriage.” 135 (Brendan O’Neill, writer)

---

c) Blueprint For Revolution

- The Initial Strategy:
  In 1988, two Harvard-trained social scientists, Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, wrote a clever homosexual marketing plan "dismissing the movement's outworn techniques in favor of carefully calculated public relations propaganda . . . laying the groundwork for the next stage of the gay revolution and its ultimate victory over bigotry." 136 (Kirk & Madsen) It was preceded by an earlier essay:
  
  **“Overhauling of Straight America”, Detailed Strategy for Public Acceptance of Homosexuals, Marshall E. Kirk and Erastes Pill (Hunter Madsen), 1987, “The first order of business is desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights. To desensitize the public is to help it view homosexuality with indifference instead of keen emotion.”** (Opening sentence of The Overhauling of Straight America, landmark article by homosexual activists Kirk and Madsen) 137
  
  o **Step 1: Talk About Gays and Gayness as Loudly and as Often as Possible**
    “The acceptability of the new behavior will ultimately hinge on the number of one’s fellows doing it or accepting it.”
    “In the early stages of any campaign to reach straight America, the masses should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the imagery of sex should be downplayed and gay rights should be reduced to an abstract social question as much as possible.”
    “First we can use talk to muddy the moral waters. This means publicizing support for gays by more moderate churches, raising theological objections of our own about conservative interpretation of Biblical teaching and exposing hatred and inconsistency... Second, we can undermine the moral authority of homophbic churches by portraying them as antiquated and backwaters, badly out of step with the times and with the latest findings of psychology. Against the mighty pull of institutional Religion one must set the mightier draw of Science and Public Opinion 138... Such an unholy alliance has worked well against churches before, on such topics as divorce and abortion. With enough open talk about the prevalence and acceptability of homosexuality, that alliance can work here again.”

  Hollywood is described by the authors as the best covert weapon homosexuals have to desensitize the mainstream. They applaud the fact that over the past 10 years (up to 1987) homosexual characters have become prominent in films and television programs.

  o **Step 2: Portray Gays as Victims, Not as Aggressive Challengers**
    “In any campaign to win over the public, gays must be cast as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to assume the role of protector. If gays are presented, instead, as a strong and prudish tribe promoting a rigidly nonconformist and deviant lifestyle, they are more likely to be seen as a public menace that justifies resistance and oppression. (It almost goes without saying that groups on the farthest margin of acceptability such as NAMBLA, [North American Man-Boy Love Association] must play no part at all in such a campaign: suspected child-molesters will never look like victims).”
    “First, the mainstream should be told that gays are victims of fate, in the sense that most never had a choice to accept or reject their sexual preference. The message must read: ‘As far as gays can tell, they were born gay, just as you were born heterosexual or white or black or bright or athletic. Nobody ever tricked or seduced them; they never made a choice, and are not morally blameworthy. What they do isn’t willfully contrary - it’s only natural for them. This twist of fate could as easily have happened to you!’”

138 Restated in *After The Ball* as: “Gays can undermine the moral authority of homo-hating churches over less fervent adherents by portraying...[them] as antiquated backwaters, badly out of step...with the latest findings of psychology. Against the atavistic tug of Old Time Religion one must set the mightier pull of Science and Public Opinion.”
Step 3: Give Protectors a Just Cause.
“Our campaign should not demand direct support for homosexual practices, should instead take anti-discrimination as its theme. The right to free speech, freedom of beliefs, freedom of association, due process and equal protection of laws—these should be the concerns brought to mind by our campaign.”
“It is especially important for the gay movement to hitch its cause to accepted standards of law and justice because its straight supporters must have at hand a cogent reply to the moral arguments of its enemies. The homophobes clothe their emotional revulsion in the daunting robes of religious dogma, so defenders of gay rights must be ready to counter dogma with principle.”

Step 4: Make Gays Look Good
“In order to make a Gay Victim sympathetic to straights you have to portray him as Everyman. But an additional theme of the campaign should be more aggressive and upbeat: to offset the increasingly bad press that these times have brought to homosexual men and women, the campaign should paint gays as superior pillars of society. Yes, yes, we know — this trick is so old it creaks.”

Step 5: Make the Victimizers look Bad
“At a later stage of the media campaign for gay rights — long after other gay ads have become commonplace — it will be time to get tough with remaining opponents. To be blunt, they must be vilified... Our goal here is twofold. First, we seek to replace the mainstream’s self-righteous pride about its homophobia with shame and guilt. Second, we intend to make the anti-gays look so nasty that average Americans will want to dissociate themselves from such types.”
“The public should be shown images of ranting homophobes whose secondary traits and beliefs disgust middle America. These images might include: the Ku Klux Klan demanding that gays be burned alive or castrated; bigoted southern ministers drooling with hysterical hatred to a degree that looks both comical and deranged; menacing punks, thugs, and convicts speaking coolly about the ‘fags’ they have killed or would like to kill; a tour of Nazi concentration camps where homosexuals were tortured and gassed.”

Step 6: Solicit Funds: The Buck Stops Here
“Any massive campaign of this kind would require unprecedented expenditures for months or even years — an unprecedented fundraising drive... and because those gays not supporting families usually have more discretionary income than average, they could afford to contribute much more.”

The Strategy Developed:
Two years later in their book After the Ball, Kirk and Madsen stated clearly their plan for mass propaganda for converting America to promote the homosexual cause.

“After The Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90’s”

In this 432 page book (which became the authoritative public relations manual for homosexual pressure groups) they argued that:

- Homosexuals had to change their image replacing that of drag-queens with that of attractive young people, middle-aged articulate women and smiling senior citizens. i.e. look main-stream and ‘normal’!
- They needed to portray themselves as victims of society — “to make straights feel uncomfortable.” Churches, with commitment to biblical morality, were to be portrayed as the oppressors (‘bigots’). “In any campaign to win over the public, gays must be portrayed as victims in need of protection so straights will be inclined by reflex to adopt the role of protector.” They wrote:
- “...by conversion we mean something far more profoundly threatening to the American Way of Life, without which no truly sweeping social change can occur. We mean conversion of the average American’s emotions, mind, and will, through a planned psychological attack, in the form of propaganda fed to the nation via the media.... The campaign we outline in this book, though complex, depends centrally upon a program of unabashed propaganda, firmly grounded in long-established principles of psychology and advertising.”
Working on the assumption that you can persuade someone to adopt a view without appearing to do so, the authors set forth eight graduated tactics purposefully adopted by the "war conference" and cannily designed subliminally to persuade "straight" America that "the gay alternative" is legitimate, acceptable, and good.

1. Communicate with others at their own level while curtailing gay "self-expression."
2. Appeal to the "ambivalent sceptics" or the "muddled middle."
3. "Desensitize" people to the subject by constantly talking about gayness (but hide the negative aspects).
4. Keep the message focused on gay issues (don't fight for other causes).
5. Portray homosexuals as victims, not as threats to the status quo.
6. Give potential supporters a cause they can relate to, such as antidiscrimination; don't ask them to support the practice of homosexuality per se.
7. Make gays look good: portray them as Everyman and Everywoman.
8. Make opponents look bad: portray them as evil and victimizing.

According to Kirk and Madsen, each of these eight tactics had to be handled in such a way as to accomplish three things at once:

A. Employ emotionally powerful images so as to "desensitize," jam, and convert the undecided and the confused. [See Three Phases of the Gay Campaign below]
B. Challenge "homo-hating" beliefs and actions on a (not too) intellectual level.
C. Access the type of public media that "would automatically confer legitimacy" upon the message, while making sure that the message remains "both subtle in purpose and crafty in construction." 139

• Three Phases of the Gay Campaign.
  o Phase 1: Desensitization. “Flood the market with normal-looking gay people doing normal things so that the public no longer takes a double look at people identified as gays. In this phase, it is good to have well-known ministers, priests and even bishops with good reputations stand up and proudly say they are gay. It is good to also write books for school children such as Joey Has Two Mommies. It is good for a parish to be gay friendly when a gay couple wants their adopted child baptized.” (Val. J. Peter, RC Headmaster) 140 "It is not overt coercion. It is one group's covert orchestration of compliance by another group through structuring the consciousness of the second group." (Kirk & Madsen) 141 "I.e. conscious manipulation of you and me to change our Christian views without our realizing the manipulation involved.”

  o Phase 2: Exaction Pricing, ‘jamming’ (or Psychological Terrorism). The economic or emotional price being exacted from target groups for not buying the gay rights agenda, i.e. “a scare tactic that says it is important to beat down anyone who opposes the gay agenda” (V.J. Peter) 142 “Call the opposition homophbic. Laugh them to scorn…. Scare preachers by suggesting laws forbidding them to claim the Scriptures are opposed to homosexual activity. Make it a crime of hate speech.” (V.J. Peters) 143

  o Phase 3: Conversion. "Conversion of the average American's emotions, mind and will through a planned psychological attack.” (Kirk & Madsen) 144 “Laugh to scorn the sacred Scriptures. Why would you rely on Scripture? After all, Exodus 21:7 talks about a good price for selling your daughter into slavery. Then there is Exodus 35:20 where you must kill your fellow employee who works on the Sabbath. You want people to live and let live. You want them to say, 'I changed my mind.' Priests and bishops are very susceptible to what Rondeau calls the illusion of being informed and enlightened. Why? Because priests and bishops are pastoral people and, in this

141 Ibid (Quoted)
142 Ibid
143 Ibid
144 Ibid (Quoted)
postmodern age, they need very much to be liked and they need to be seen as caring, sharing and compassionate.” (V.J. Peters) 145

d) A Clever Marketing Strategy: The Use of Spin

- **Respectability and The Appearance of Normalcy: Positive Rebranding of Homosexuals.**
  “A commodity that is more precious than gold to the gay rights establishment. Respectability. Respectability and the appearance of normalcy.” (Ronald G Lee) 146

Call them gay (less offensive), not homosexuals. Call them a humble, long suffering minority, not a savvy group wanting recognition. "Pederasts, gender-benders, sadomasochists and other minorities in the homosexual community with more extreme peculiarities would keep a low profile until homosexuality is in the tent. Only strong and favorable images of homosexuals should be displayed." (Paul Rondeau, Marketing expert) 147

- **Linguistic Manipulation (e.g. ‘Homophobia’).**
  - It has been said that ‘He who controls the language, controls the debate.’ Nowhere has this been more evident than in the culture war over the issue of human sexuality.” (Tim Wilkins, Founder of Cross Ministry (to gays) and More Than Words conferences) 148 [See 2.A.d) – Can ‘Marriage’ be Redefined? (Humpty Dumpty)]
  - Gay rights activists use rhetoric, psychology, social psychology, and the media—all the elements of modern marketing—to position homosexuality in order to frame what is discussed in the public arena and how it is discussed. In essence, when it comes to homosexuality, activists want to shape "what everyone knows" and "what everyone takes for granted" even if everyone does not really know and even if it should not be taken for granted. 149
  - ‘Sexual Orientation’: ‘Sexual Disorder’ > ‘Sexual Orientation Disturbance’ > ‘Sexual Orientation’ > ‘Affectional Orientation’. “Proponents of the social acceptance of practically all forms of sexual expression have sought to redefine the American vocabulary and impose a new terminology that casts harmful and objectionable behavior in a favorable light. At the same time, our historical understanding of many words is being challenged through societal pressure to conform to a ‘politically correct’ philosophical agenda.”...The term ‘sexual orientation disturbance’ was coined in 1973 when the American Psychiatric Association (APA) debated removing homosexuality from its list of sexual disorders. [Later], the word “disturbance” was dropped, and professionals and experts adopted the phrase “sexual orientation.” [Activists were then able to argue:] If a person’s sexual attractions are part of their “orientation,” or genetic makeup, the thought goes, then those attractions must be completely natural and acceptable, regardless of who the subject of those attractions may be.”... Interestingly, many pro-homosexual groups are [now] themselves declaring “sexual orientation” a misnomer—arguing instead for “affectional orientation” or “emotional orientation.” Why? Because this new terminology takes the focus off of “sex”—the underlying behavior, which may include sodomy, that many in society find so objectionable.” (Tim Wilkins, Founder of Cross Ministry (to gays) and More Than Words conferences) 150

---
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• **Emphasis on ‘Homophobia’ As A Denial of Human Rights**
  
  **o** Psychologist George Weinberg invented the word ‘homophobia’ in his book *Society and the Healthy Individual*, published in 1972 or 1975… He defined it as ‘the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals.’ He offered a fuller definition: ‘a phobia about homosexuals….It was a fear of homosexuals which seemed to be associated with a fear of contagion, a fear of reducing the things one fought for—home and family. It was a religious fear and it had led to great brutality as fear always does’…
  
  **o** One meaning is to attempt to love the homosexual even while condemning homosexual activity as a sin that they feel is hated by God. As *St. Augustine* who said ‘Cum dilectione hominum et odio vitiorum’ which means ‘With love for mankind and hatred of sins.’ It is often loosely translated as: ‘Love the sinner and hate the sin,’ a saying often incorrectly attributed to Jesus Christ…
  
  **o** Jim Rudd, editor of The Covenant News and Director of the Christian Street Preachers Alliance has introduced a novel definition: A homophobe is: ‘A person who is frightened to speak out against…homosexuality.’…
  
  **o** [Religious Tolerance website usage:] Homophobia as engaging in a behavior aimed at restricting the human rights of persons who have a homosexual orientation and/or who engages in homosexual behavior. This behavior can take many forms: signing a plebiscite; sending an Email to one's senator or representative; participating in a demonstration; voting on a school board; voting to elect a homophobe; talking to co-workers or friends, delivering a sermon; etc. These rights include what many believe to be the most important human right: to be married; to have their spousal status recognized and registered; and to be assigned benefits and obligations by the government. Other rights are protection from hate-motivated crimes, protection in accommodation, and employment security.” (religioustolerance.org) (Tim Wilkins)
  
  **o** Note: ‘Gay Rights’ itself is an expression that puts traditionalists on the back foot (at a linguistic disadvantage), suggesting homosexuals either have a right to something or are being denied the basic freedoms of citizenship that others enjoy. (Tammy Bruce, a self-described
  
• **Marketing Strategy:**
  
  **o** The "4 P's" of the traditional marketing paradigm: Product (conception), Price (economic and emotional price that is exacted from targeted groups for not buying the gay rights idea), Place (distribution channel), and Promotion (advertising, lobbying, etc.). Gay rights folk are selling an issue, namely acceptance and approval of their lifestyle, but the methods are the same. "What is pitched is different—a product brand versus an issue—but the method is the same. In each case, the critical thing is not to let the public know how it is done," (Tammy Bruce, a self-described

---

151 AIDS is caused by the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)
152 Kirk and Madsen, *After the Ball, Ibid*
154 Note: similarly the abortion rights movement framed their debate as a question, not of abortion, but of choice, because it is far easier to defend an abstract, positive-sounding idea like choice than the unrestricted slaughter of unborn babies!)
lesbian feminist). Thus homosexuality is packaged and sold as a competitive product in the marketplace, often through education and through positive media coverage.

- **Spin:**
  - Today’s society is largely pragmatic, interested in ‘what works’ rather than issues of ‘absolute truth’. Thus it is the artists of persuasion, ‘spin doctors’, that influence society now, whether they be lawyers, lobbyists, marketers or law-makers.
    - Positive spin put on homosexual sex: “[Homosexuals] hold sacred seeds. ... To be gay, lesbian, bisexual, or struggle around gender is literally a gift from God and we [homosexuals] have an enormous amount to teach this nation.” (Elizabeth Birc, Executive Director of the (American) Orwellian-named ‘Human Rights Campaign’).
    - Negative ‘spin’ involves presenting opponents in a bad light.

- **Engaging Sympathy**
  - Acting ‘The Victim’. Pain of the ‘victim’ precludes moral scrutiny. “You skillfully master the techniques of invoking sympathy, hiding the truth and presenting a sanitized portrait of gay life.” (John McKellar, Gay campaigner against gay extremist agendas.)
    - “I believe that one day the world will judge the witch hunt against homosexuals...as an unbelievable perpetrated by supposedly ‘moral’ people against innocent groups, just as harshly as it judges the Spanish Inquisition and the Holocaust. Both the Church and the Nazis believed they were acting in good faith.” (N. McLean). Objecting to a vociferous campaign should not be confused with a ‘witch hunt’ against a particular group of people.
      - Note: when a Roman Catholic bishop claimed that both Hitler and Stalin challenged Christianity with the notion that what they were doing was ‘progress’, he was castigated by gay advocates. Traditionalist have good grounds for fearing a ‘witch hunt’ against themselves by gay activists once they achieve their objectives.
  - "Any society that flatly denies the fact that one or two citizens in every ten have strong homosexual interests, and structures its laws and values around this denial, is, to this extent, seriously ill." Kirk and Madsen, After The Ball. Note: Kirk and Madsen admitted in their 1989 work that the fact of “10% of the population is gay” is actually propaganda. “To one extent or another, the separability—and manipulability—of the verbal label [‘10%’] is the basis for all the abstract principles underlying our proposed campaign.”

155 Quoted in Rondeau, Ibid p. 444
156 Kirk and Madsen, After The Ball, Ibid
158 Quoted in Rondeau, Ibid
161 Kirk and Madsen, After the Ball, Ibid
• Sanitising Homosexual Practice: Talk of Morality / Mention of Unwholesome Behaviour Suppressed
  o What of the morality of homosexual behaviour itself? (Another elephant in the room!) Common homosexual practices such as anal sex, fisting, and anonymous sex – what homosexuals actually do and with how many they do it – must never be a topic. But note: It has been claimed that by a gay writer that “gay liberation was founded... on a sexual brotherhood of promiscuity.” (Gay author Gabriel Rotello) 162

• Deception of The General Public: Orwellian Subversion of Truth by Propaganda
  o “If you repeat a big lie often enough it becomes the truth.” (Josef Goebbels, Nazi Minister of Public Enlightenment)

• Concealing Intentions over SSM: “Fighting for gay marriage generally involves lying about what we are going to do with marriage when we get there — because we lie that the institution of marriage is not going to change.” (Masha Gessen, author and former Russian director of Radio Liberty.) 163

• Incremental advance giving the impression that each step in their ambitions is the last! [See 1.D.g) – Society’s Slippery Slope]

• Feeding Legal Misinformation: Courts today are being influenced by attempts by same-sex advocates to rewrite history to portray evidence of same-sex marriages in past centuries. “So if the argument is made, marriage advocates must be prepared to counter any such historical distortion.” (Dale M. Schowengerdt) 164

• Skewing Research: Social researchers’ findings conditioned by gay activism. [See 1.C.c) – Causation]

• Regarding HIV, “Ralph McInerny once offered a brilliant definition of the gay rights movement: self-deception as a group effort. Nevertheless, deception of the general public is also vital to the success of the cause. And nowhere are the forms of deception more egregious, or more startlingly successful, than in the campaign to persuade Christians that, to paraphrase the title of a recent book, Jesus Was Queer, and churches should open their doors to same-sex lovers…” (Ronald G Lee) 165

• Over-egging The Scientific Evidence
  o Homosexuality as Pathological? An article by E. Hooker, ‘The adjustment of the male overt homosexual,’ in the Journal of Projective Techniques, (1957) challenged the then prevailing view of homosexuality as intrinsically pathological. “But Hooker's study is often interpreted as having accomplished much more, not to have merely demonstrated that ‘it is not the case that all homosexuals are manifestly disturbed,’ but rather she is taken to have proven that ‘homosexuals are as emotionally healthy as heterosexuals’ or to have proven that ‘homosexuality per se is not psychopathological.’ Logically and methodologically, her study accomplished neither of these ends.” (Jones and Yarhouse) 166

Therapies for Unwanted Same-Sex Attraction. Half a century later, the American Psychological Association commissioned a task force on Appropriate Therapeutic Response to Sexual Orientation Change Efforts (SOCE) [Their 2009 Report] acknowledges that there is ‘no
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clear indication of the prevalence’ of harm, because of a ‘lack of rigorous research’. [Yet the various UK medical organisations speak of ‘severe threat to health’ [BACP], ‘overwhelming evidence [of] considerable emotional and psychological cost’ [UKCP], ‘can be deeply damaging’ [RCPsych], ‘is discredited and harmful’ [BMA]. Clearly the claims are going far beyond the evidence found (and not found) by the APA. 167

• Phony comparison with Racial Discrimination:
  o Christian black folk find gay activists’ attempt to liken their pursuit of special rights to the civil rights movement abhorrent. “In common sense and constitutional sense, there is a clear distinction between a marital restriction based merely upon race and one based upon the fundamental difference in sex.” (Minnesota Supreme Court) 166 S-S intercourse is about sinful behavior, not neutral being.
  o Gay activist Brandon Ambrosino writes: “One of the reasons I think our activism is so insistent on sexual rigidity is because, in our push to make gay rights the new black rights, we’ve conflated the two issues. The result is that we’ve decided that skin color is the same thing as sexual behavior. I don’t think this is true. 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. In other words, one’s sexuality isn’t as biologically determined as race.” 169

• Confusing Genetics, Identity and Race
  o “Many think homosexual orientation is genetically caused, even though the best science says “not so fast.” The latest and best behavioral genetics study of identical male twins looked at 71 twin pairs where one male co-twin could be defined as gay. How often do you think the other identical twin in the genetically-identical pair was also gay? They found that in only 7 cases out of the 71 was the second identical twin also gay. When it comes to race, 100% of identical twins match for race. Sexual orientation, whatever it is, is clearly not like race if only 10% of twin pairs match on this variable, so the analogy with race breaks down. This identical twin discordance suggests how little we understand about the homosexual condition, and how hasty it is to define personal identity around sexuality.” 170

• Influencing The Media
  o The movement began influencing public opinion through the media. Note in the UK: Broadcaster Andrew Marr, has said (2006): “The BBC is not impartial or neutral… It’s a publicly-funded, urban organisation with an abnormally large number of young people, ethnic minorities and gay people. It has… a cultural liberal bias.” 171 But the media should not control public opinion. People should think for themselves instead of having everything filtered through what some ‘expert’ projected by the media thinks!

• The Role of The Creative Arts in Challenging Traditional Values
  o Playwright Jackie Kay said festivals like Glasgay had been the catalyst for change. “I think it’s completely culture that’s changed attitudes; I think that when politics changes, culture will have

166 Quoted by Austin Nimocks in ‘One Man, One Woman, and the Common Good: Marriage’s Public Purpose’ http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2011/07/3595 (Accessed 5th February 2014)
been there first." She said creative people, from poets to visual artists, were always one step ahead. She added, “But that's the way it should be. You should always have cultural voices that question the status quo.” - Jackie Kay, playwright, lesbian partner for 15 years to current Poet Laureate Carol Ann Duffy )172 [See 1.D.a) – Landmarks… Gay Pride Carnivals]

- Pop Music: A ‘Trojan Horse’ Gay Infiltration Into Mainstream
  o In 1976 Britain’s first gay super-club opened, “based on the New York clubs; it had the same crazy energy. The next few years were about opulence, glamour and celebrity...[and sex, drugs and VIPs. With increasing popularity] after years of being forced to hide their sexuality by law, the gay bands started to hide their sexuality to sell records to straight people. [With] Saturday Night Fever selling 30 million copies, disco was no longer ‘decadent’... it was middle-aged mums and dads in village halls. As [gay] disco went mainstream...those [gay] people who were so revolutionary it was just like bringing the Trojan horse in there.” (Channel 4 Documentary, Queer as Pop: From Gay Scene to Mainstream, Channel 4, 27/12/13)173

- Indoctrination in The Schools
  o Onslaught on marriage from children's earliest years. E.g. Elementary picture reading book (2-5s) Daddy's Roommate begins: “My Mummy and Daddy got a divorce last year.” (p.1). “Now there’s somebody new at Daddy’s house. Daddy and his roommate Frank live together.” (p.2). “Being gay is just one more kind of love. And love is the best kind of happiness.” (p.3). “The themes of adult selfishness, divorce, and same-sex union converge in Daddy's Roommate. This story is particularly sad. The little narrator here has no name! This isn't surprising, since children in these books exist to affirm their parents. What is alarming is that the educators, who stand firm behind these books, and who routinely tout the self-esteem catechism in schools, overlooked the sagging sense of self exhibited by the book's tots. The nameless narrator tells us his parents have just divorced. With nary a reference to the sadness of this event, he blurs out; "Now there's somebody new at Daddy's house. Daddy and his roommate Frank live together, work together, eat together, sleep together." From here on in it's pretty much detailing the good times the dwarfed child spends with the two larger-than-life men. Mommy, like the child, is a conduit in the service of the men's outing. She tells no-name boy that Daddy and Frank are gay and that "being gay is just another kind of love." "Daddy and his roommate are very happy together," chants the child, "and I am happy too!" So long as Dad has found his true self, so will the boy arrange his feelings accordingly. It's a cruel farce that has a child spouting homilies in the service of a parent's project.” (Amazon.com reviewer).174 “Introducing kindergarten and grade one students to alternative behaviours and lifestyles is psychological pedophilia. You don't have to engage solely in physical contact to molest a child. You can diddle with their minds and their emotions.”175 (John McKellar)
  o “HIV education is woefully inadequate in most schools. Teaching pupils how to roll a condom on a banana is not good enough. Very few students learn what to do if a partner refuses to wear a condom ie. how to negotiate safer sex. There is no popularisation of less risky alternatives to intercourse, body rubbing, oral sex... These safer alternatives should be explained, glamorised and encouraged, in all secondary schools. In addition, the safer sex information taught in schools is mostly oriented to heterosexual sex. Gay and bisexual students, and the many straight kids who experiment with homosexuality, get no specific advice on how to have gay sex safely. Age-appropriate frank and detailed HIV awareness and prevention education should be mandatory in all schools from primary level onwards, before pupils become sexually active and

---
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adopt unsafe sexual habits. If safer sex is imbibed at an early age, it is more likely to be practised when a person is older.” 176 (Peter Tatchell)

- “Sensitivity” training courses in schools and work places, supposedly in defense of homosexuals under pressure from homophobic bullying, actually promote the homosexual agenda which is to achieve universal approval. “They want acceptance and they want you to welcome them with open, loving arms, approving of what they do.” (Matt Slick) 177

- Gay Lobby’s Pressure on Schools in America: “GLSEN, which stands for Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network, is stepping up its efforts to establish homosexual clubs on all school campuses. Their goals don't stop at clubs according to their publications, they 'extend to incorporating homosexual concepts into all curriculum, holding diversity seminars for teachers and students and ensuring that only positive discussions about homosexuality are allowed into elementary school classrooms, including kindergarten.' GLSEN also pushes for all schools to hold bisexual awareness days, strategy instruction for homosexual teachers to promote a pro-homosexual atmosphere and instill the message to children that the definition of family includes parents of the same sex.” (NewsWithViews.com) 178 “School officials are being increasingly pressured by pro-homosexual organizations to integrate homosexual education into school curricula. These organizations recommend promoting homosexuality as a normal, immutable trait that should be validated during childhood, as early as kindergarten. These organizations also condemn all efforts to provide treatment to gender confused students, advocating instead the creation of student groups that affirm homosexual attractions and behaviors…. Regardless of an individual’s sexual orientation, sexual activity is conscious choice. Any sexual activity outside of a monogamous, heterosexual, married relationship is unhealthy and ill-advised.” (American College of Pediatricians,) 179

- How does the Church respond?
  - “In his most widely anticipated address since taking over the leadership of the Church, the Most Rev Justin Welby insisted that it was now “absurd and impossible” to ignore an “overwhelming” change in social attitudes... But he insisted that the Church could benefit and even begin to grow again if it was willing to “respond radically and imaginatively” to a changing world…. He is understood to have approached Stonewall, which led the campaign in favour of gay marriage, to invite it into church schools to teach up to a million children about homosexuality” in an effort to reduce ‘homophobic bullying’. (Report in The Telegraph) 180 We are therefore developing a programme for use in our schools, taking the best advice we can find anywhere, that specifically targets such bullying." (Justin Welby) 181 Paul Rondeau has a different take about those who marketing “sex to our children in our schools under the guise of sex education, anti-bullying, diversity, and tolerance.” The outcome? – “Children who become long-term customers looking for contraceptives, STD testing and abortion.” 182 (For a classroom presentation of the nature of Marriage from a traditionalist perspective, download A Brief History of Marriage – John de Waal, Family Education Trust, famyouth.org.uk, 2013)
f) Consequences of The Revolution – The New Intolerance

• Democracy Untethered from Its Judeo-Christian Roots Caves In to:
  o **Egalitarianism**: When democracy, in the sexual revolution against established moral values, became untethered from its Judeo-Christian roots of self-restraint and responsibility, it was open to domination by a philosophy of radical egalitarianism where the political drive towards ever-increasing equality was intolerant of traditional boundaries and constraints.
  o **Humanism**: “Where believers are in the minority, as they are in Britain today, traditional faiths have been replaced by liberal humanism, which is now established as the unthinking creed of conventional people.” (John Gray, Professor of European Thought) 183
  o **Relativism**: “The objectivity that once allowed us to be sure what we were and what we stood for has been all but eroded. Our culture has been upended by moral and cultural relativism, the doctrine that denies any hierarchy of values, but is doctrinaire in its enforcement.” (Melanie Phillips, author and broadcaster) 184
  o **Libertarianism: Freedom** has been an important value of a Christian society. But when faith diminishes in society as Christian teaching is forgotten or ignored, the moral responsibilities involved in the belief system also fade as materialism increases and meaning to life is sought in the pursuit of pleasur e; ‘freedom’ becomes libertarianism. Today society has become sexualised by exposure to television soap operas, advertising and the film industry, aided not least by a powerful and clever gay lobby who have not only emerged in the last two decades as a dominant influence in governmental, legal, educational and even some business institutions, but also as an agency to marginalise religion in society.

• Gay Liberation Failing Civilization:
  o “When society allows men to marry men and women to marry women, it perpetuates the alienation of the sexes and contributes to the ever-increasing crisis in the sex roles. Before Stonewall, gays and lesbians mixed socially and in the clubs with a pretty good understanding of and appreciation for one another. But as gay liberation took hold, gay males, feeling ebullient from their new-found freedom, descended into a bacchanalia of narcissism and promiscuity. Segregated bars, orgy rooms and bathhouses exploded in number and luxury. Strange parasitic diseases soon began appearing, and by 1981, a "gay cancer" was identified as AIDS. We must honestly admit that even gay men's attempt to create a world without women failed catastrophically. Unfortunately, most people’s sense of history begins the day they were born, which means all that precedes is outmoded and irrelevant and all that follows is enlightened and progressive. However, we cannot and must not ignore the lessons of history and natural law. Again and again, it has been shown that whenever humankind fails to protect time-honored political, moral and social institutions, whenever humankind attempts to embrace pride as a virtue and mainstream behavior that contravenes natural law, and whenever humankind becomes arrogant, autonomous, egalitarian, nihilistic and foolish, civilization fails - always and without exception. So, here we are repeating the cycle and getting ready to crash and burn one more time.” 185 (John McKellar)

• Increase in Political Correctness and Governmental Authoritarianism
  o “Gay and lesbian activists, and more importantly, the progressives urging them on, seek to redefine marriage in order to achieve an ideological agenda that ultimately seeks to un-deline families as nothing more than one of an array of equally desirable “social units,” and thus
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185 John McKellar, “There’s HOPE for the world”, *Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism*, August 2003, posted by Robert A. Jason in [http://www.theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/22SxSo/PnSx/HSx/McKellar%20HOPE02.htm](http://www.theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/22SxSo/PnSx/HSx/McKellar%20HOPE02.htm) (Accessed on 20th March 2014)
open the door to the increase of government's role in our lives.” (Doug Mainwaring) \(^{186}\) [See 1.E.c) - Potential Areas ofConflict]

- **Reversal Societal Approval in The Public Domain**
  - Changing Societal Norms: “Homosexuality violates societal norms; however, mental health organizations have taken the formal position that societal norms have to be changed toward accepting homosexuality as a normal sexual variant.” (Jones and Yarhouse) \(^{187}\) [See 1.D.b) – The Goal of The Gay Agenda]
  - Traditionalists now need protecting: Not long ago understanding marriage as between one man and one woman was not in the least bit controversial. Today we need a protection clause in legislation to protect from prosecution anyone who expresses publicly (or even privately on their Facebook site!) such a **biblical belief in marriage.** [See 1.D.g) - Society’s Slippery Slope]

- ‘Diversity’ Slogan Enforces Repression ofTraditionalist Teaching
  - “We live in a society with a lot of other people, many of whom have political opinions, backgrounds, holy books, and perspectives that differ significantly from our own. The only way to govern such a society—the only “social contract” that allows us to coexist in reasonable harmony—is by respecting those differences to the greatest extent possible. That requires *treating everyone equally within the public/civic sphere, while respecting the right of individuals to embrace different values and pursue different ends in their private lives... here’s the dictionary definition of the term ‘bigot’: ‘a person who hates or refuses to accept the members of a particular group.’*” (Sheila Kennedy, Prof. of Law and Policy, Indianapolis University) \(^{188}\) “The problem. I believe in diversity. I am a gay man who has benefited from our tradition of allowing a plurality of views and for the open discussion of what is good and right and what is bad and wrong. Were it not for **Britain’s tolerance of dissent** who would have been brave, or foolish, enough to argue that people like me ought not to be imprisoned for our sexual desires? Yet that very word, ‘diversity’, has now come to represent not plurality but homogeneity, not dissent but repression. Hiding behind it, secularists and the ayatollahs of social liberalism are able to strip public discourse of the bits they don’t like – faith, orthodoxy, skepticism about change. They have been able to use the frame of diversity as a weapon against its very purpose: to shut out and shut up those with whom they disagree.” (Max Wind-Cowie, political activist) \(^{189}\)

- **Hounding of Traditionalists**
  - Belittling traditionalists as old-fashioned and alarmist. The Equal Marriage bill passed despite “dinosaur opponents proclaiming the end of civilization as we know it.” (Nick Clegg, who also once referred to defenders of traditional marriage as ‘bigots’) \(^{190}\)
  - Hate Messages Sent to Traditionalists. Newly-weds Rhys and Esther Curnow, who became the public face of the Coalition for Marriage when they handed in the 600,000 petitions to Downing Street, were besieged with hate messages. E.g. “BRING ON THE HATE! I really hope that both you morons get all the hate and threats in the world. You deserve nothing but sadness.” (Max Wind-Cowie, political activist) \(^{191}\)
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186 ‘I’m Gay and I Oppose Same-Sex Marriage’ The Witherspoon Institute: Public Discourse, 8\(^{th}\) March 2013 (Accessed on 3\(^{rd}\) February 2014)


• **Police Role in creating subjective crime offense:** “Hate crime covers a wide range of behaviour, for example verbal abuse, racist or homophobic graffiti or physical assault. A crime can be classed as a hate crime if the victim or witness see it as being so.” City of London police. 192

• **Shutting down opposition in Britain.** “Dale McAlpine, a practicing Christian, was handing out leaflets in the English town of Workington and chit-chating with shoppers when he was arrested on a “public order” charge by Constable Adams, a gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community-outreach officer. Mr. McAlpine had been overheard by the officer to observe that homosexuality is a sin. “I’m gay,” said Constable Adams. Well, it’s still a sin, said Mr. McAlpine. So Constable Adams arrested him for causing distress to Constable Adams. In fairness, I should add that Mr. McAlpine was also arrested for causing distress to members of the public more generally, and not just to the aggrieved gay copper. No member of the public actually complained, but, as Constable Adams pointed out, Mr. McAlpine was talking “in a loud voice” that might theoretically have been “overheard by others.” And we can't have that, can we?” (Mark Steyn, Political commentator) 193

• **Censorship in Brazil of Any Objection to a Gay Lifestyle:** “There is a project for a law in Brazil (PLC122) that will criminalize any opinion contrary to the gay lifestyle, even if it is philosophically or religiously based. Even without the law, there is a self-censorship in the media, since most journalists are pro-gay. The question is: for how long will the elite allow us to have the internet? This week the web sensation in Brazil has been a video by a courageous doctor who exposes the dangers of anal sex. 100% of her gay patients had endocarditis, an infection of the heart valves caused by bacteria from feces. It leads to valve failure and even with a valve transplant, often leads to strokes. The numbers for prostate and rectal cancer are also triple the ones for the hetero population. 68% of chance of getting cancer is not something to tinker with.” (Marcos, Brazil) 194

• **The Supreme Court of Canada** has ruled that Biblical speech opposing homosexual behaviour, including in written form, is essentially a hate crime. [See I.D.a) – History of a Western Cultural Revolution]

  • **Supporters of traditional marriage ‘unfit for employment’:**

    o When Brendon Eich, the CEO of the widely used browser, Firefox, donated $1,000 to the Proposition 8 campaign (that seeks to amend the California Constitution to define marriage as the union of one man and one woman), “in classic Communist fashion, gay rights organizations demanded that Eich publicly recant. When Eich did not, gay rights and other leftist organizations called for a boycott of Firefox. Firefox immediately forced Eich out.” American broadcaster and writer Dennis Prager comments: “It is important to further note that gay employees at Firefox acknowledge that Eich never discriminated against gays, whether in employment, benefits or any other way. But that doesn’t matter to the left because a totalitarian streak is part of the left's DNA.” Prager concludes: “The belief that marriage should remain defined as the union of a man and woman is portrayed as so vile by the left that anyone who holds it is unfit for employment.” 195

  • **Pressure on traditionalists to moderate personal beliefs and conform**

    o **Disparaging Traditionalists.** Buying into the homosexual idea requires traditionalists to abandon their own beliefs, family teachings, or those taught by Christianity and other faiths for a position
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unsupported by facts, logic or proof. Paul Rondeau believes that gay activists, with the help of the media, "portray those who refuse to buy, and especially any who dare to publicly oppose…the gay rights idea as bigots, homophobes, heterosexists, ignorant, hateful, intolerant and so on. They position the accused in the same category as racists, sexists, elitists and other pejorative classes." Defense against such labeling "requires a particularly sophisticated and, hence, both rare and precariou form of argument." To avoid being a ‘racist’, etc, it is easier simply to moderate one’s personal beliefs. “Remember that people want to hold right opinions, beliefs, and attitudes. A conflict arises between their own beliefs and a continuous flood, a shower, of homosexual-positive messages that cannot be turned off." (Paul Rondeau, Political commentator) 196

- **Totalitarian Belligerence and hubris of political correctness.** Cf.:
  - Discrimination against Christians opposed to same-sex relationships.
  - Social libertarianism in the public square.
  - ‘Prejudice’ (cf. against homosexuals) redefined to include the expression of normative values. (e.g. “prejudiced stance” of public officials declining to officiate at gay weddings.)
  - Freedom of conscience swept aside in the cause of gay rights.
  - Partisan Government Promotion: “I look forward to one day seeing the rainbow flag fly over every government building, and above parliaments across the world - maybe Russia, Uganda or Yemen.” (Nick Clegg, Deputy Prime Minister) 197
  - Political leaders: Ed Miliband, responding to questions from readers of Gay Times magazine, said: "The most important thing to me is that my kids are happy and I don't care whether they're gay or straight. That's what matters to me."
  - Nick Clegg said: "I would have no issues at all if one of my boys told me that he liked another boy. It's not a choice, it's who you are and I would love my boys regardless of their sexuality. I just hope that some day coming out to your parents is not going to be something you dread but something you will remember fondly."
  - David Cameron used his open letter to say he was proud to lead a country judged “the best place to live in Europe if you are lesbian, gay, bisexual or trans(gender).” He spoke of the need to "break down barriers” in sport. "We need more role models, straight and gay, to encourage the best behaviour and clubs must tackle problems on the terraces."
  - UKIP leader Nigel Farage also contributed to the magazine and was asked if his party would pledge to expel members who were homophobes. He replied that UKIP was not "the thought police", saying: "It would sound great to say, 'yes, we would expel anybody who was a homophobe', but how would that be judged, or investigated or enforced?" 198


Reparative Therapy

“A content analysis of reparative therapy Web sites highlights differences between
Two types of reparative therapists:
1. Professional therapists who emphasize the client's right to pursue change and
2. Religious counselors who prioritize biblical teachings prohibiting homosexual acts.” 199

“What reparative therapy is
- It is about helping people with unwanted feelings of same sex attraction who want to change.
- It supports men and women with homosexual issues who voluntarily seek change in sexual preference and expression.
- It respects the rights of individuals who identify as 'gay' who do not seek change.

What it isn’t
- It is not about coercing people or forcing people to change against their will.
- Some misconceived objections; opponents of this kind of therapy say that:
  - The motivation behind the therapy is homophobic rather than scientific.
  - Practitioners promote discrimination.
  - Practitioners lack familiarity with current scientific research and professional developments.
  - Practitioners are not acting to advance the welfare of the individual.

A big false assumption behind these objections is that:
- Homosexuality is innate and immutable (like race) and is biological in nature.

Busting the myths
- There is no sound scientific evidence to demonstrate that homosexuality is inherited genetically.
- There are many studies which suggest the importance of childhood family experiences in the formation of sexual orientation.
- Homosexuality is a concept, not a biological phenomenon – there is no physical location for it in the brain.
- There are many accounts of people who have found reparative therapy to be successful in reducing feelings of same sex attraction.

Conversion a one-way street.
- The implication of some opponents of reparative therapy seems to be that "coming out* after a period of heterosexuality is a revelation of one's true sexual identity, while embracing heterosexual behavior after living in the gay lifestyle is a dubious change of behavior, hardly credible since sexual orientation is deemed innate and immutable

The effects of banning reparative therapy. Banning reparative therapy in the UK would:
- Force patients to accept a sexual identity that they choose to reject and are unhappy with.
- Deprive patients of a treatment choice and the ability to seek help.
- Deny patients a human right to treatment intended to help them shape their lives as they wish.” (The Christian Institute) 200

Note: The parallel with paedophilia is striking, and in fact paedophiles are given therapy

- Professional Pressure on Therapy Research
  - Since 1973, research in reorientation change therapy started to witness a decline, as practitioners were obliged to conform to the new official position that homosexuality was no longer a disorder. Such research has become “professionally threatening”, as “funding and other support for such research has evaporated.”

---

200 “A Short Guide To Reparative Therapy”, The Christian Institute, 2013
\* Campaign to Ban Practice of Reparative Therapy
   \* “Any therapist in the UK offering to help a client to reduce unwanted SSA can now expect to be struck off the register of their professional body… The primary reason is that all therapies geared to such a goal are now alleged to be ‘harmful’…” Yet, most thinking people will reject the suggestion that the risk of harm from such therapy is greater than the risks from having major surgery and hormone treatment to attempt to turn a man into a woman, or vice versa. If a man wishes to reduce unwanted SSAs, is it really plausible that this is more dangerous for him than to try to turn himself into a woman?” (Michael Davidson, 201)
   \* “Core Issues Trust is aware of the New Statesman’s decision not to publish the third agreed advert calling the major political parties to respect the rights of individuals who wish to move away from homosexuality…. If a married individual presents to a psychotherapist accredited to the UK Council for Psychotherapy, for example, such a therapist may not work with the client’s agenda to reduce, or even attempt to reduce homosexual feelings, without penalty from that professional body. Thus a married man, who wishes to stay with his wife and to protect his children and continue to love his wife in a viable marriage, may not be assisted to reduce homosexual feelings. In fact, he may only be helped to express his homosexual feelings. This is unjust, anti-marriage and anti-family showing no concern for children - and is a violation of the human rights of this minority population.” Core-issues.org 202
   \* “Now it may be impractical to ‘convert’ totally from homosexuality to heterosexuality, but if counselling can allow a gay man to respond sexually to women, it should be encouraged and applauded, not lambasted or lampooned. If a gay male wants to marry and sire children, he shouldn't be harassed by gay activists accusing him of ‘self-hatred’. Come on! Is gay identity so fragile that it cannot bear the thought that some people may not want to be gay? Or that a woman's power should not be ignored, especially in the context of raising children. The difficulties in changing sexual orientation do not spring from its genetic innateness. Sexuality is highly fluid, and reversals are theoretically possible. However habit is refractory, once the sensory paths have been blazed and deepened by repetition - something that is also evident in the struggle with obesity, smoking, alchoholism or drug addiction.” (John McKellar) 203

\* Children Raised by Gay Parents
   \* “Mark Regnerus’ recent study on children who are raised by gay parents… has since proven to be very controversial because it does not paint a positive picture of children of gay parents. Even though it’s based on scientific methodology, it suggests conclusions that cut against the prevailing gay rights narrative. As a result, folks on the left have been calling for Regnerus’ head on a platter… A gay blogger lodged a complaint with the President of the University of Texas, alleging that Regnerus had engaged in ‘scientific misconduct’. Other faculty from UT have piled on, and now the University has launched a formal investigation into the alleged ‘misconduct.’” (Denny Burk) 204

\* Society’s Slippery Slope

\* Non-traditionalists’ advantage of gravity! Once SSM is conceded politically, it is difficult to reverse. The Progression of the Social Status of Homosexuality: Crime (in law) & sin (immoral behaviour) (by the church) (from Christ to modern times) > illness / pathological / psychological condition (by the
 medical establishment) (1900s) > normal biological state (by social scientists) (1973) > alternative lifestyle (gay activists) (1980s) > social identity (by the gay community) (1990s)

- **Western Culture Shift**
  - “Tim Wildmon (President of the American Family Association, says that striking down the traditional definition of marriage as between a man and a woman delegitimizes the moral argument against polygamy. ‘It opens up Pandora’s Box in how you define marriage in this country,’ he says. ‘Why not have three men and two women marry if they love each other? Why limit it to two people?’… Anne Wilde, a Mormon fundamentalist and founder of the polygamist rights organization, Principle Rights Coalition, is hopeful that these decisions represent movement towards the decriminalization of polygamy.” (Report in USA Today) 205
  - Recognition of polygamy, temporary marriages, incest and even pedophilia. “Once the definition of marriage is changed to accommodate same sex unions on account of equality and human rights, Government will have no good reasons not to extend the definition of marriage to other combinations, such as three or more partner marriages.” (Archbp. Tartaglia) 206 “Former Australian Governor-General, Bishop Peter Hollingworth notoriously suggested on ABC TV’s Australian Story (2002) that the case of a 14 year old girl’s sexual relationship with a priest, later bishop, was mitigated as consensual.” 207

- **Incremental Steps:** from “the normalization of homosexual behavior to full parity with heterosexual behaviour” to “the suppression and eradication (demonization) of all who think, write or speak negatively about homosexual conduct and issues.” (Canon Phil Ashey) 208
  - “Originally they just wanted homosexuality removed from the list of mental disorders. ‘All we want is to no longer be told we’re crazy for having feelings we can’t control.’
  - Then they wanted to get rid of the ban on homosexuality in the military. ‘All we want is the right to serve our country without being forced to lie about who we are.’
  - Then homosexuality was added to the list of protected classes in anti-discrimination laws. ‘We just don’t want to lose our jobs because we’re gay.’
  - Then it was domestic partnerships with some of the rights and benefits of marriage. ‘All we want is the right to visit our loved ones in the hospital.’
  - Then domestic partnerships were expanded to have all the rights and benefits of marriage. ‘We don’t want to change marriage. all we want is the same rights and benefits of marriage. We’re tired of being treated like second class citizens.’
  - Then they decided they needed to redefine marriage after all. ‘All we want is to change civil marriage. We wouldn’t dream of interfering with a churches right to define marriage however it wants and act accordingly. We love religious freedom. Hey, I go to church too.’

• **False Assurances of A Soft Revolution.**
  
  o “The greatest obstacle to halting the advance of the secularist culture has been a failure to recognise the ambition and goal of its protagonists. In seven short years there has been a massive transformation in the understanding of family life… At each stage it has usually been the prevailing view in society that it is inconceivable that anyone would want to move beyond the proposals currently being examined and there has been a broad willingness to accept assurances that developments would go no further. It has been a soft revolution to which few have raised voices of protest.” (John Deighan, Parliamentary Officer for the (Catholic) Bishop’s Conference in Scotland)  

• **Schools forced to teach SSM.**
  
  o “Scottish Government ministers intend to legalise gay marriage and are demanding that the curriculum should reflect the change in the law. And they are about to issue guidelines for schools which could see Catholic schools forced to teach pupils about the issue…A spokesman for the Scottish Government said: ‘Denominational schools, like any other local authority schools, are subject to inspection by Education Scotland on the quality of their learning and teaching.’” (Scottish Express)  

• **Now Pedophiles Follow Gay Tactics**
  
  o Peter Tatchell, defending an academic book about 'boy-love' in The Guardian (1997), wrote: “The positive nature of some child-adult sexual relationships is not confined to non-Western cultures. Several of my friends – gay and straight, male and female – had sex with adults from the ages of nine to 13. None feel they were abused. All say it was their conscious choice and gave them great joy. While it may be impossible to condone paedophilia, it is time society acknowledged the truth that not all sex involving children is unwanted, abusive and harmful.”  

210 (But note Tatchell later took a different stance: “Note: My articles urging an age of consent of 14 are motivated solely by a desire to reduce the criminalisation of under-16s who have consenting relationships with other young people of similar ages... I do not support adults having sex with children. I do not advocate teenagers having sex before the age of 16.”)  

o B4U-Act provides workshops for mental health professionals (MHPs) and minor-attracted persons (MAPs). "Until you have experienced it yourself, you cannot possibly understand how powerful and healing it is to be in a room full of people who are filled with empathy and compassion and understanding." ("Daneel") Its website states its purpose is to "help mental health professionals learn more about attraction to minors and to consider the effects of stereotyping, stigma and fear."  

214 Will this be called ‘pedophobia’?  

• **UK Government’s association with the LBGT lobby.**
  
  o The Government’s launch of a consultation of LBGT people in the autumn for their next policy idea after redefining marriage. “Writing exclusively for PinkNews.co.uk to mark this weekend’s Pride in London event, Culture Secretary and Minister for Women and Equalities Maria Miller says she is ‘proud’ that equal marriage legislation is on track to becoming law. ‘Equal marriage is an extension of those that have argued for and created social change over the generations. People should not be excluded from marriage, simply because of who they love. The institution of marriage underpins our society and over the years, as society has evolved, so has marriage. [See 2.C.e) – Marriage ‘Evolving’?] That’s why I’m proud that the

---

211 Report in Scottish Express, 13th January 2014  
government’s equal marriage legislation is on track to become law. *Equal marriage isn’t just a question of fairness; it’s quite simply the right thing to do* [See 1.E.f] – The Morality of Homosexuality]….We have come a long way since the decriminalisation of homosexuality in 1967 – but the fact is there are still many people who feel ashamed, who have hidden or who are still hiding their sexuality. through fear of homophobia or transphobia. So this autumn, we are starting our LGB&T Call for Evidence, a consultation on what the next steps need to be. I invite the readers of PinkNews to write to me when the consultation opens, and tell me what they think are the biggest issues still facing LGB&T people in this country and where government needs to prioritise action to combat homophobia and discrimination.’ ” (Maria Miller, Equalities Minister)\(^{215}\) Their response: “The first step is to acknowledge that human rights come before beliefs. (If you did that no consultation would be needed.) They do not depend on a majority vote. LGBT rights are human rights regardless of whether homosexuality is a fixed, natural trait or not – every investigation tells us it is – but because the right to pursue happiness without interference from others demands protection.” (Andrian Tippetts, human rights campaigner)\(^{216}\)

h) Plausibility of Same Sex Behaviour

- “The rate of homosexuality as a stable life orientation in our culture is certainly not 10%. There is good evidence to suggest that less than 3%, and perhaps less than 2%, of males are homosexually active in a given year.” (Jones and Yarhouse)\(^{217}\) [See 1.A.b] – Great Sex Charade; 1.C.a] – Identity, Behaviour or Inclination] “Imagine if smokers were represented in films and TV programmes far in excess of their actual proportion in the real population, and moreover presented in a very positive light, and plots, dialogue and characterisation constructed in such a way as to invite our identification, or at least sympathy. There would be an uproar and a campaign to do something about it. What do these production companies mean by softening people up to the message that smoking is attractive, harmless, and fun, and enjoyed by some very interesting, charming and intelligent people? I submit that a homosexual lifestyle is even more dangerous than smoking, morally, physically and mentally, so the relentless over representation is nothing more than propaganda.” (Greenson)\(^{218}\) [See 2.D.) – Confusions and Inconsistencies]

- Arguments for homosexual practice
  - Anecdotal impression of lovely guys! Appearing to be a nice guy does not preclude a darker side! (e.g. recent revelations about celebrities’ sexual abuse) There are many ‘nice’ adulterers around!
  - “The world has moved on! Traditionalists old-fashioned with outdated sexual ethics!” “Whoever marries the spirit of this age will find himself a widower in the next.” (Dean Inge) Contemporary permissiveness (of all kinds) is damaging adults, children and families on a massive scale; homosexuality is no exception.
  - “We should distinguish ‘good sex’ from ‘bad sex’. ‘Good’ homosexual sex is not promiscuous or destructive.” Biblical criterion for ‘good sex’ is sex between a man and woman in faithful, committed marriage; all else is ‘bad sex’. Widening the goalposts does not make an immoral act moral. Nor does wrapping a vice (gay sex) in a virtue (fidelity) transform the vice into a virtue!
  - ‘If there is commitment, monogamy, fidelity and love, it’s OK!’ This is an inadequate assessment of what constitutes marriage. What is crucially missing from the divine design is gender complementarity. Christians believe mankind, made in the image of God, is not at liberty to decide the criteria of marriage as designed by the Creator. Otherwise polygamists would be allowed to omit monogamy, and many homosexuals wanting ‘open’ relationships would omit fidelity. [See 4.B.a] – Arguments for SSM: Virtue Ethics


\(^{217}\) Scientific Research on Homosexuality P. 5

\(^{218}\) Greenson, F Howard, Unpublished paper, *Same Sex ‘Marriage’*, 2012
E.
ISSUES RELATING TO THE GAY RIGHTS AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Approval of Homosexual Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arguments For and Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Natural instincts</em> (Psychological)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A so-called ‘gay gene’ (more recently, but not proven) (Biological)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Human rights’ (e.g. to pursue behaviour that does not harm others) (Humanist)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments against homosexuality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Unnatural behaviour’ (Philosophical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated health risks (Medical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted societal consequences (Sociological)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its ‘sinfulness’ (Theological)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equality and Discrimination (LBGT activists)

v.

Equivalence and Distinctions (Traditionalists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Liberties Threatened: Ensuring Justice in Governmental Decision-Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Shutting Down Opposition to The Gay Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o “People do fear to express their opinions about homosexual behaviour. Professionals fear dissenting from the prescribed ideological “wisdom” about homosexuality. Politicians fear to say anything in public that would irritate the gay community, etc. The ideology of militant gays is being imposed on the West. It implies that the search for the truth about homosexuality, its causes and changeability, has almost become a forbidden activity.” (Gerard van den Aardweg) [See 1.D.f) – Consequences of The Revolution – The New Intolerance]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil and Religious Liberties At Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Freedom of association (incl. choice of association / membership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Freedom of expression (incl. to disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Freedom of conscience (to not be involved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Freedom of parental nurture (to teach counter to State indoctrination / political correctness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safeguards (in conflicting values, where one ‘right’ / ‘liberty’ might trump another)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Potential Areas of Conflict: Rights v. Beliefs

| • Conflict may arise between |
| 1. A public secular university enforcing anti-discriminatory rules as part of its educational mission, and |
| 2. A student Christian organization within its campus maintaining its freedom to choose its members and to promote its particular Christian message about sexuality. |
| • While laws may not interfere with the religious beliefs and opinions of individuals, they can with their practices and their expressions of their beliefs! |
| o Can a man excuse his practices that contradict the law by reference his religious beliefs? No! To permit this would be to allow every citizen to become a law unto himself! |
| o Professed doctrines of religious beliefs cannot trump the law of the land. |

219 Commenting on the news that Dr Robert Spitzer had recanted his views on the possibility of changing a homosexual orientation, ‘Frail and aged, a giant apologizes’ Mercatornet Navigating modern complexities http://www.mercatornet.com/articles/view/frail_and_aged_a_giant_apologizes (Accessed on 8th February 2014)
• The belligerence of political correctness. Cf.:
  o ‘Prejudice’ (cf against homosexuals) redefined to include the expression of normative values.
    (e.g. “prejudiced stance” of public officials declining to officiate at gay weddings.) [See 1.D.f) –
    Consequences of the Revolution – The New Intolerance]
• Traditionalist repugnance of homosexual practice seen by others as ‘demonisation’.
  o “As Peter Ould recently noted: ‘The general public are simply not interested in this [negative]
    kind of approach. They see it as equating homosexuality with promiscuity and the most offensive
    sexual practices, and since they all have gay friends who are not involved in either of those
    things, they just see it as demonization’. This is a serious error on the part of these vocal
    Christians - it undermines their credibility as 'witnesses' and cheapens the very Gospel they claim
    to defend... If the only issue that causes conservative Christians to organise petitions or mount
    legal actions or media campaigns is homosexuality and matters related, then it is hardly
    surprising people grow tired (and deal) to such obsessions. The Gospel lays many obligations on
    its followers and until these can be evenly applied as opposed to the present schwarm
    conservatives have with something as inconsequential (in the lives of 97-99% of the population)
    as homosexuality, then really they deserve the ridicule and intolerance that they are fostering by
    their 'easy' righteousness. Preach the Gospel by all means, but if you are going to preach about
    the sanctity of marriage, then remember its failures in our present society are diverse and
    complex and have been existent long before SSM was mooted.” (Peter Denshaw, gay man in a
    civil partnership) 220

d) The Morality (or Otherwise) of Homosexual Practice

• Should We Be Concerned About MP’s Private Behaviour?
  o A row about “a senior party official accused of using dating app Grindr to invite gay MPs and
    activists to his suite at the Conservative Party conference” drew this response from a Spectator
    blogger: “Some homosexual men are alleged to have romped in a hotel bed at Tory party
    conference? Well, blow me. Mr S would be more shocked if the combination of alcohol and
    intrigue that dominate any party conference did not lead to rumours of some sort of orgy.
    Moreover, the taxpayer would have paid the bill for such an official to be at Tory conference,
    regardless of who did or did not drop their trousers. As long as they were all consenting adults,
    what exactly is the problem here?” 221
• Sexual Behaviour: A Matter of Morality or Pragmatism?
  o “A former soldier and prominent LGBT rights campaigner has called for the closure of gay
    saunas claiming they promote homophobia and threaten to undermine gains in equality made
    over same-sex marriage. ‘For me as a gay man, the notion that there exist... places that actively
    promote the convening of gay men for participation in sex of shades various and in groups of all
    sizes rather revolts me... I’m no prude, not even close, but the days when we gathered in
    clandestine fashion for the want of a network or a sexual outlet are surely long gone.’ ... [But]
    Matthew Hodson, chief executive of the gay men's health charity GMFA, said closing gay saunas
    would not reduce the number of some men’s partners or change attitudes. He said mobile apps –
    used by both gay and straight people – made it easy to hook up for casual encounters anywhere.
    ‘If someone says that they don’t like gays because we have sex with lots of partners, they're
    probably just searching for an excuse to justify their prejudice. Most people with homophilic
    attitudes will be uncomfortable with gay men in long-term monogamous relationships too,”
    said Mr Hodson... Gay rights campaigner Peter Tatchell said using a sauna was an individual’s choice
    – whether they were straight or gay. ‘It would be very wrong if the gay community became
    prescriptive and moralistic over consenting adult behaviour. Plenty of gay and bi-sexual men

220 Comment in Cranmer’s Curate blog, 22nd February 2012 http://cranmercurate.blogspot.co.uk/2012/02/churches-must-rally-for-marriage.html (Accessed 8th February 2014)
221 Steerpike, “What happens at conference stays at conference”, The Spectator, 5th April 2014,


use saunas without resorting to drugs or unsafe sex. A small minority may act recklessly and that should be challenged but it would be wrong to penalise the majority,” he said.”

• A Moral Issue First
  o “The homosexuals don't have much to stand on when it comes to promoting their practice based on moral issues. Instead, they have used misdirection of the main issue, misrepresentation of the opposing viewpoints, and misapplication of civil rights to further their cause. We need to be aware of this and deal not only with the so-called legal rights issues, but also the moral ones when dialoguing with homosexuals and pro-homosexuals.” (Matt Slick)  
  o “Homosexual persons are not sub-human robots whose acts are predetermined-- they are moral agents who inherit tendencies from biology and environment, and who share in shaping their character by the responses they make to their life situations. (Jones and Yarhouse)

e) Discrimination
  • Supporters of the gay agenda present the issue as one of discrimination. Thus Hilary Clinton said in a video for the Human Right Campaign* that discriminating against "any of our daughters and sons solely on the basis of who they are and who they love is to deny them the chance to live up to their own God-given potential."  

Discrimination
can have a negative meaning or a positive meaning (depending on the context):

A. (Negative) The practice of unfairly treating a person or group of people differently from other people or groups of people. (Prejudice) 
B. (Positive) The ability to recognize the difference between things that are of good quality and those that are not. (Discernment). 

Note: Inclusiveness is not without limits, therefore it must involve some discrimination.

The Many Connotations of Discrimination:

i. Be biased against. 
ii. Make an unjust or prejudiced distinction in the treatment of different categories of people. 
iii. Victimize. 

Or, positively:
iv. Recognize a distinction, or a difference between things. 
v. Use good judgement in discerning the true value (or worthlessness) of things compared.

Pro-gay responders to traditionalist views as ‘discriminatory’ (senses 1 and 2) can themselves be guilty of discrimination (sense 3) in their demands to shut down traditionalist objections to their agenda, when in fact, by recognizing in their arguments category differences (sense 4) traditionalists may be showing good judgement (sense 5).

Note: People are equal - behaviours are not. 
There is a fundamental difference between (prejudiced) discrimination against persons and (discerning) discrimination against behaviours.

---

224 S. Jones and M. Yarhouse, Scientific Research on Homosexuality P. 29
Part 2
Same Sex Relationships and Marriage

A. Marriage and Society
   a. The Essential Raison D’Etre: Family or Love?
      • SSM: Not About Families but Romance
   b. The Essential Issue: Extension or Redefinition?
      • Redefinition: Making Words Mean What You Want (‘Humpty Dumpty’ Thinking
      • Category Changes: When Same Sex Relationships Are Equated With Marriage
      • Category Confusions: ‘Equality’ ‘Equivalence’
      • Slippery Slope: Redefinition has no logical stopping point.
   c. Understandings of Marriage
      • Same-sex ‘marriage’
      • Conjugal marriage
      • Its Unchangeable Nature
      • Marriage ‘The Seedbed of Society’
   d. The Family As The Stabilizing Factors of Marriage and Society
      • Marriage and Family’s Fixed Nature
        Purpose: Raise Children for Society
      • Culture Describes, not Defines, Marriage
      • Same-Sex Families Parasitic By Nature
      • Families ‘Society’s Building Blocks’
      • Distinguishing Private & Public Benefits of Marriage in Society
   e. Some Misconceptions
   f. The Goal of Gay Lobbyists: Elimination of The Institution of Marriage

B. A Christian View of Marriage
   a. The Purpose of Marriage
      • Companionship, Sexual bonding, Children
   b. Humanity Formed in The Image of God
      (Biblical View)
   c. The Nature and Strengths of Traditional Marriage (Biblical View)
   d. Marriage as a Covenant

C. Arguments For Same-Sex Marriage
   a. Arguments about Rights,
      • “Homosexuals have a universal right to marry.” (Humanist)
      • A Right To a Life-long, Faithful, Intimate Relationship with Another (Romantic)
   b. Arguments about Toleration
      • “Depriving gays the right to marry is as immoral as racism.” (Historical)
      • “Those who would exclude gays and lesbians are homophobic (Dogmatic)
   c. Arguments about Happiness
      • “If two people want to be happy in marriage, why stop them?” (Hedonistic)

D. Arguments Against Same-Sex Marriage
   a. An Empty Pretence: Not about Equal Rights but about Unequal Acts
   b. The Significance of Complementarity
   c. ‘Rights’ (Entitlements) distinct from ‘Right’ (As Opposed to ‘Wrong’)
      Distinguish:
      • Right and Wrong: what is true, honest and good.
      • Right and Proper: what is just and equitable.
      • Human Rights: moral or legal entitlements.
   d. Confusions and Inconsistencies
   e. The Good of Trad. Marriage Undermined
      Archbishop of Canterbury’s objections
   f. Against Nature and Revelation: A Roman Catholic Defense of Marriage

E. The Politics Involved
   a. Lord Framlingham’s Speech in H. of Lords
   b. Scotland

F. Consequences of Same-Sex Marriage
   a. Changes Nature of ‘Marriage’ for All
   b. Undermines Marital Responsibilities
   c. Undermines The Family and The Welfare of Children Adopted by SS Couples
   d. Makes Marriage Available to All.
      Polyamory The Next frontier?
      • Desires of Adults Trump Needs of Children?
   e. Leads To A Genderless Society
   f. Provides Poorer Models of Marriage
   g. For Those who Oppose It
      • Injustices and Inequalities
      • Objects of Totalitarian Intolerance
      • Some Employments Threatened
      • Forced to teach SSM in schools
      • State-sponsored Discrimination
   h. Effect on Society

G. Constitutional and Political Issues
   a. Pressure on The Monarchy
   b. Gay Awards in Westminster
   c. Trivialisation of an Important Issue
2.

SAME SEX RELATIONSHIPS AND MARRIAGE

This whole debate has, with some notable exceptions, been characterized by one side emotively ‘promoting’ the positives (as they see them) and by the other rationally ‘arguing’ against the negatives (as they see them).

"Gay marriage signifies the final triumph of the Sexual Revolution and the dethroning of Christianity because it denies the core concept of Christian anthropology." 226

- Rod Dreher,
Orthodox journalist on cultural matters

“The Issue of Same-Sex Marriage is difficult because in the past we have relied on a commonsense, intuitive understanding about marriage.

Everyone simply knew what marriage was and what it was for. Because of the nature of intuitions (un-derived concepts, not conclusions based on preceding reason) it can be difficult to defend their truth against those who assert something to the contrary.

On the issue of same-sex marriage, then, we must work extra hard to argue for the definition of marriage as that union between a man and a woman only.” 227

- Jason Dulle,
Oneness Pentecostal Theologian and Apologist

“Same-sex marriage rejects 228 the anthropological truth that men and women are different and complementary, the biological fact that reproduction depends on a man and a woman and the social reality that children need both a mother and a father.” 229

- Ryan T. Anderson
The Heritage Foundation Fellow

“One of the things that for me was important about coming out as gay was that we came into a community that accepted a whole range of different relationships, different possibilities, and the fact that lots of people are not in primary relationships or that they are in primary relationships which really are quite different to those of the heterosexual norm.

And the constant emphasis on same sex marriage as the goal, the language of this is the civil rights issue of our time, it seems to me further marginalises and sends very dangerous signals to people who are not in long-term relationships and who may not want to be.” 230

- Dennis Altman,
Director of the Institute for Human Security at La Trobe University

228 Overstated? Better ‘fails to give due weight to’.


“For decades, marriage has been weakened by our culture of convenience. This demotes marriage to little more than emotional intensity or legal privileges. We should all remember that marriage is about the needs of children rather than the desires of adults.”

- Family Research Council

“The irony of the gay marriage debate is that traditionalists are making arguments based on reason and nature, while secular culture is now largely irrational in spite of its trumpeting of reason, as the severing of faith and reason has led to a nihilism wherein the greatest good is the fulfillment of whatever desires among consenting adults.”

- Leroy Huizenga, Christian Leadership Centre, N. Dakota

A. MARRIAGE AND SOCIETY

a) The Essential Raison D’Etre: Starting a Family? Or Sharing a Love?

- Not About Families and Children, But About Romantic Relationships Between Couples
  - “Marriage is about the public union of two people who wish to affirm their love and commitment to one another in a public, official manner.” “Where does the idea of two come from? Why not three or four? And where do we get the idea that love is the foundation of marriage? Who decided that? Nowhere in the history of the world has love been the basis of marriage.” (Jason Dulle)
  - Radical advocates of same-sex marriage don’t think marriage should exist, at least not as a state-sponsored institution. They think marriage is simply an intense emotional union – whatever sort of interpersonal relationship consenting adults want it to be…Its logic leads to the effective elimination of marriage as a legal institution. This will harm women, children and society as a whole… If marriage has no form and serves no essential purpose, how would society protect the needs of children — the prime victims of our non-marital sexual culture — without government growing more intrusive and more expensive? (Ryan T. Anderson, William E. Simon Fellow at The Heritage Foundation.) The grounds of marriage is not love, but commitment to a union.
  - Regarding the relationship of love and marriage C.S. Lewis has said, "The idea that 'being in love' is the only reason for remaining married really leaves no room for marriage as a contract or promise at all. If love is the whole thing, then the promise can add nothing; and if it adds nothing, then it should not be made."  

b) The Essential Issue: (Inclusive) Extension? Or (Invalid) Redefinition?

- Extension not the real issue.
  - “It is not a demand for marriage to be extended to gay people – it is a demand for marriage to be redefined. The understanding of marriage as an institution that exists and is supported for

---
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the sake of strong families changes to an understanding of marriage as merely the end-point of romance." 236 (Richard Waghorn, prominent Irish homosexual and political commentator)

- **Redefinition: Making Words Mean What You Want: The Dumpty Fallacy**
  - “The question is... whether you can make words mean so many different things.”(Alice)
  - “The question is... which is to be master – that’s all.” (Humpty Dumpty) 237
  - “Truth is not the issue. The issue is power.” (Gene Edward Vieth, Professor of Literature, regarding the marketing of political correctness) 238 [See 1.D.b) – The Goal of The Gay Agenda]

- **SSA and other Attractions**
  - “I'm a man married to one woman. If I have inescapable feelings of attractions to other women, should I commit adultery? Should I define myself as an adulterer, and start an Adultery Liberation Group and an Adultery Pride Week?” 239 (Amazon customer)

### Category Confusions: ‘Equality’ and ‘Equivalence’.

- **Equivalence** (comparing like with like) distinct from **equality** (sharing equally).
- **Equal Rights?** All have the right to marry (incl. gays), but to whom? There are certain generally accepted restrictions on the universal right to marry: e.g. a father cannot marry his daughter.
- **Distinguishing equality from equivalence** is not discrimination. Sexual intimacy of same-sex couples is not equivalent to the coitus union of heterosexuals. To object, for example, to a definition of ‘motherhood’ that includes men is not discriminatory! To promote such a definition is irrational by the standards of both profound philosophy and common sense. Traditionalists claim to be out to save the world from such madness!

Note: **Secular assumptions** about justice and equality differ fundamentally from **Biblical concepts**.

- **Category Changes When Same Sex Relationships Are Equated With Marriage:**
  - Marriage itself redefined (as no longer between a man and a woman, but between two persons)
  - A total self-giving of male and female to become one flesh re-interpreted as a ‘partnership of persons’ providing mutual pleasure.
  - One flesh (union of male and female), stripped of Christian meaning, becomes an alliance of companions in a legal and socially-recognized unit.
  - **Gender irrelevance** abolishes male/female distinction producing a ‘container’ view of the human body inhabited by the ‘authentic individual’. [See 2.E.e) – A Genderless Society]
  - ‘Mum and Dad’ replaced either by ‘Dad/Mum 1 and Dad/Mum’ 2, or ‘1st & 2nd Parent’!

c) **Understandings of Marriage**

- **‘Gay Marriage’ or ‘Same-Sex Marriage’?**
  - “The law doesn't care about your sexual preference, but the sex of the person you want to marry. If they are of the same sex as you, you cannot marry [until very recently]. So the real issue is not gay marriage per se, but same-sex marriage.” 240 (Jason Dulle)

---

236 Quoted by David Burroughs, MP, in Commons debate [http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm130205/debtext/130205-0002.htm](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm130205/debtext/130205-0002.htm) (Accessed on 4th March 2014)


240 Jason Dulle, *Ibid*, Footnote 1
## Conjugal Marriage v. Same Sex Marriage

### Conjugal Marriage
- Has an inherent orientation to bearing and rearing *children*:
- Its distinctive *family structure* (mother, father and child) is designed for this.
- It thus contributes to a stable *society* (of which the family is a microcosm), developing norms of behaviour such as *permanence, monogamy and fidelity*.

### Same-sex ‘Marriage’ *(a construct of the State that can be defined in any manner the State chooses)*
- Essentially a *romantic union* between two *individuals*:
- A *union of hearts and minds* augmented by sexual *intimacy, companionship* and commitment to *mutual support* (sharing the burdens and benefits of domestic life) – like conjugal marriage.
- It lacks marital *comprehensiveness* and *complementarity, bodily union* (coitus), and any *normal potential for procreation* of children. *(Childless heterosexual couples are not the norm.)*

### Marriage – Its Unchangeable Nature:
- “Marriage is not an arbitrary convention and is not meant to change with the times. We're not talking about music, fashion or art. We're talking about an institution whose four prohibitions
  - You can only marry *one person at a time,*
  - Only someone of the *opposite sex,*
  - Never someone *beneath a certain age,* and
  - Not a *close blood relative* - have been *grounded in morality and in law for millennia.* Humankind yearns for these stabilizing factors in our kaleidoscopic world and if we abandon these standards, then everything becomes legal and everything becomes moral. If gay marriages are permitted (a prerogative of the most decadent Roman emperors), why not polygamy? Why not brother and sister or parent and child?” *(John McKellar)*

### The Slippery Slope: Redefinition Has No Logical Stopping Point.
- What about siblings? Polyamorists? Pedophiles even? *(Some influential advocates of equality have been associated previously with the pedophilic advocacy group PIE.)*
- Stanley Kurtz *(Fellow, Ethics and Public Policy Center)* observes that the “gradual transition from *gay marriage* to state-sanctioned *polyamory,* and the eventual *abolition of marriage* itself, is now the most influential paradigm within academic family law” in America.
- “There are two versions of the *slippery slope:* the *fallacious* version, [and] the proper version (referred to as a *logical* slippery slope). I am using the latter.
  1. The *fallacious* version is that which rejects a view based on what it may lead to, even when there is *no logical connection* between the view itself and its supposed implications.
  2. The *proper* use of the argument follows the *reductio ad absurdum* argument in isolating the *logical principles undergirding the view,* and following them to their logical conclusion. If the conclusion is unacceptable, we are forced to reconsider our *guiding principles.*

In this particular case the *principles undergirding the argument for same-sex marriage are applicable to other morally relevant situations.* The reasoning behind allowing same-sex marriage is that we *shouldn’t discriminate,* and [that] ‘they love each other.’ If these are the principles upon which we determine eligibility for marriage, they are *applicable to many other sorts of relationships* that even most same-sex advocates disapprove of. When we point out that

---


these principles are applicable to any sort of relationship that meets the same criteria, we are not employing a fallacious argument.” 245 (Jason Dulle)

• Marriage ‘The Seedbed of Society’ (Giovanni Vico)
  o Marriage creates the most important relationships in life and has more to do with people’s morals and civilization than any other institution. When marriage is honoured and works well, society also works well, but where marriage is relativised and replaced, society begins to disintegrate and its future stability is threatened. Of Jewish communities, David Randall notes, “There is much less divorce, less child abuse, less pregnancy outwith marriage, less incidence of homosexuality and a significantly greater marital and family stability among the more orthodox communities than can be found in our society, or even within the church.” 244

d) The Family as The Stabilizing Factor of Marriage and Society

• Marriage and Family’s Fixed Natural Purpose to Raise Children for Society.
  o “Why has civilization always characterized families as a union of men and women? Because men and women are the natural source of the children that allow civilized culture to persist. This is the only understanding that makes sense of the definition, structure, legitimacy, identity, and government entitlements of marriage. This alone answers our question, "What is marriage?" Marriage begins a family. Families are the building blocks of culture. [Societies are large groups of families.] Families - and therefore marriages – are logically prior to culture… Families may fail to produce children, either by choice or by accident, but they are about children, nonetheless. That’s why marriages have always been between men and women; they are the only ones, in the natural state, who have kids.” (Greg Koukl, Christian apologist) 245 “Marriage, then, is not a term that applies to any relationship between human beings, but only particular kinds of relationships: those that at least in principle can help form families, the foundation of society. That is why governments have gone out of their way to promote (not invent) marriage….” (Jason Dulle) 246

• Marriage is not defined by cultures, but described by them.
  o “The difference in terms is significant. If marriage is defined by culture, then it is merely a construction that culture is free to change when it desires. The definition may have been stable for millennia, yet it is still a convention and therefore subject to alteration. This is, in fact, the argument of those in favor of same-sex marriage…[But] since families are constituent of culture, cultures cannot define them. They merely observe their parts…and acknowledge what they have discovered. Society then enacts laws, not to create marriage and families according to arbitrary convention, but to protect that which already exists, being essential to the whole.” 247 (Greg Koukl)

• ‘Same-sex’ Families parasitic by nature and deficient in parenting.
  o “Homosexual ‘families’ of whatever type are always and necessarily parasitic on heterosexual ones” [since they require heterosexual coupling for their creation]. 248 (David Orland)

244 “Understanding Marriage” in Embracing Truth, (Haddington, Handsel Press, 2012) p. 112
246 Dulle, Ibid
Gay couples’ argument: “While same-sex couples cannot themselves create children (the first interest of the State) they can be responsible for nurturing them (the second interest of the State), and thus the State should offer them legal benefits for doing so - not for the sake of the same-sex couple, but for the sake of the child.” But what about other situations where people are raising children outside the confines of traditional marriage? “People are of course at liberty to raise their children in various family structures, as long as they are not literally harming their children by doing so. … That does not mean that the State is required to provide identical forms of encouragement, endorsement, and support to all of the infinite variety of household structures that a free society permits.” Nor can same-sex couples justifiably claim to be able to provide the optimal child-rearing that a mother and father together can provide.

Sperm Donor Heartache: In practice sperm donation can create problems for the donor and his family.

- Distinguishing Private and Public Benefits of Marriage in Society
  - “Marriage confers tremendous benefits on a couple in terms of companionship, friendship, emotional security and sexual delight and intimacy, but these are all private goods which do not merit the State’s involvement. But the State’s concern is with the public good that marriage brings of parenthood and children. Not every marriage produces children (either through choice or inability) though the overwhelming majority do (that is the main purpose of marriage), but every child has parents, and children fare better if those parents are married. The State’s main concerns are security (from external enemies), stability (from disruptive and criminal activity) and continuity (to ensure the goods of security and stability are handed down to the next generation)…. We all have a vested interest in the success and stability of each and every marriage (not just our own), because broken homes lead to damaged children who are more likely to break into our house, commit fraud, damage our property, or simply be a burden on public finances by being misfits and under achievers who live on benefits.” (Greenson)

e) Some Misconceptions

- The underlying message of normalizing Same Sex Marriage is that any sexual attraction that is too strong to deny should be embraced as a part of your identity. But it is behaviour, not desire, that identifies individuals. Thus a thief is one who steals, rather than a person with dishonest inclinations.

**Terminology**

‘Gays’ may celebrate their identity as a class of people with a certain sexual lifestyle, but ‘homosexuals’, strictly speaking, are those persons who feel attraction only to their own sex (SSA).

[See 1.A.d) - Origins, Pronunciation and Usage]

---

249 See Dulle, Ibid

250 Example: “The wife of a businessman who became a sperm donor for a lesbian couple has spoken of the heart-breaking consequences of conceiving a ‘baby to order’. The woman said she initially supported her husband’s decision to help the gay couple have a child through a surrogate mother. But when it later emerged that the lesbian couple were not legally the baby’s parents, she and her husband launched a court battle to help them formally adopt the child. At one stage, she and the husband of the surrogate mother were left holding the baby at the High Court while a judge ruled the lesbians could become its legal guardians. ‘To hold your husband’s child, that isn’t yours, in your arms, felt like a kick,’ said the 45-year-old. ‘It is not something you can ever recover from. ‘I knew my husband was a sperm donor and supported him in this but when I knew a child had been conceived my heart broke. It is like your husband having an affair. No one ever thinks of the wives.’ She said partners of sperm donors should receive consultation and counselling and criticised the determination of the middle-aged lesbian couple to have a baby. She added: ‘One thing I have learnt about couples who want to have children at any cost is that they are ultimately selfish and the only thing they think about is their need for a child.”” Report by Alasdair Glennie in MailOnline, 16th September 2012, [http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2204017/Rupert-Everett-spark-outrage-homosexual-community-ridiculing-idea-gay-parents.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2204017/Rupert-Everett-spark-outrage-homosexual-community-ridiculing-idea-gay-parents.html) (Accessed on 7th March 2014)

251 Greenson, Ibid
• “It is not, at heart, a faith issue; it is about the general social good.” \(^{252}\) (Archbp. Justin Welby, House of Lords debate) If SSM is not a faith issue (amongst other issues related to it), does this not downgrade the significance of the biblical evidence to that of purely cultural values that belong to the past? Further, it excludes faith from the public square as an irrelevancy in the matter, whereas Christian faith claims to access the profound reality behind all social issues of good and evil. (Note: to argue \textit{ad hominem} on a non-religious level for the benefit of a \textit{secularist} audience is one thing; to \textit{deny} that faith has no ultimate bearing on the issue is quite another.) Better to claim, “It is not so much a moral issue as a cosmological issue,” because what is at stake is the truth about humankind’s place in God’s creation of the universe.

• SSM is more than an \textit{ethical} issue. Orthodox journalist Rod Dreher writes: “A culture requires a \textit{cultus}—a sense of sacred order, a \textit{cosmology} that roots these moral demands within a metaphysical framework. You don’t behave this way and not that way because it’s good for you; you do so \textbf{because this moral vision is encoded in the nature of reality}… Gay marriage signifies the final triumph of the Sexual Revolution and the dethroning of Christianity because it \textit{denies the core concept of Christian anthropology}. In classical Christian teaching, the divinely sanctioned union of male and female is an \textbf{icon of the relationship of Christ to His church and ultimately of God to His creation}. This is why gay marriage negates Christian cosmology, from which we derive our modern concept of human rights and other fundamental goods of modernity…Too many…think that same-sex marriage is merely a question of sexual ethics. They fail to see that gay marriage, and the concomitant collapse of marriage among poor and working-class heterosexuals, makes perfect sense given the \textbf{autonomous individualism} sacralized by modernity and embraced by contemporary culture—indeed, by many who call themselves Christians.” \(^{253}\)

f) The Goal of Gay Lobbyists: Elimination of The Institution of Marriage and The Family

• “One of the last \textbf{obstacles to the complete normalization of homosexuality in our society} is the understanding that \textit{marriage is the union of a man and a woman.”} \(^{254}\) (Robert Bork, Former Solicitor General of the United States) [See 1.D.g) – Society’s Slippery Slope]

• The battle is not about \textbf{access} to the institution of marriage but about radically redefining and eventually \textbf{eliminating} it. “For quite some time, the defenders of natural marriage have attempted to point out that the \textbf{true agenda} behind the demands of homosexual organizations is not marriage equality; it is the \textbf{total unraveling of marriage and uprooting traditional values from society}. (This will ultimately include efforts to \textbf{silence and punish some churches} that openly adhere to their religious teachings about marriage and sexual morality.)” \(^{255}\) (Micah Clark)

• “\textbf{The oppression of gay people starts in the most basic unity of society, the family, consisting of the man in charge, a slave as his wife, and their children on whom they force themselves as the ideal models. The very form of the family works against homosexuality}. \textbf{We must aim at the abolition of the [natural] family}”. Manifesto of the Gay Liberation Front, 1979 \(^{256}\)

\(^{252}\) “Archbishop Justin’s speech to the Lords on the government’s gay marriage Bill”, \textit{Justin Welby} website, 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 2013 \url{http://www.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/5069/archbishop-justins-speech-to-the-lords-on-the-governments-gay-marriage-bill#} (Accessed 6\textsuperscript{th} June 2013)

\(^{253}\) Rod Dreher, “Sex After Christianity: Gay marriage is not just a social revolution but a cosmological one”, \textit{The American Conservative}, 11\textsuperscript{th} June 2013, \url{http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/sex-after-christianity/} (Accessed on 23\textsuperscript{rd} April 2014)

\(^{254}\) Robert H. Bork, in \textit{The Wall Street Journal}, 7\textsuperscript{th} August 2001

\(^{255}\) Micah Clark, “\textbf{Homosexual Activist Admits True Purpose of Battle is to Destroy Marriage}”, \textit{Illinois Family Institute}, 4\textsuperscript{th} June 2013, \url{http://illinoisfamily.org/homosexuality/homosexual-activist-admits-true-purpose-of-battle-is-to-destroy-marriage/} (Accessed on 5\textsuperscript{th} March 2014)

\(^{256}\) \textit{Gay Liberation Front: Manifesto} London, 1971, revised 1978, reprinted by Fordham University, NY. \url{http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/pwh/glf-london.asp} (Accessed 5\textsuperscript{th} March 2014)
B.
A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF MARRIAGE

a) The Purpose of Marriage

- The Bible states three purposes for marriage: companionship, sex and children. (Husband and wives are friends first, lovers second and parents third.)
  1. **Companionship**: "It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make him a helper suitable for him." (Gen. 2:18)
  2. **Sexual Bonding**: "The two shall become one flesh." (Mat. 19:5) No sexual activity outside marriage - whether adultery, polygamy, incest, homosexuality, pedophilia or bestiality - should have society’s approval.
  3. **Procreation**: "Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth." (Gen 1:28)

Note:
1. Regarding infidelity the track record of non-casual same-sex relationships is far worse than that of heterosexual married couples. [See 2.E. c) - Undermines The Family and The Welfare of Children Adopted by SS Couples]
2. The unhealthy life-style of gays generally, involving abnormal acts, suggests an abuse of the gift of sex. [See 1.C.f) - Grim Facts about Homosexual Practice]
3. Clearly impossible for two same-sex persons to procreate by themselves.

b) Humanity Formed in The Image of God (Biblical view)

- We understand humanity from our understanding of God, not the other way round (which involves a type of mythological approach to God that self-deifies). Hence the cruciality of divine revelation showing the image of God reflected in man as corporate, relational and gendered.

- Humankind was designed for relationship and encounter. It must be understood in profoundly relational terms. Humanity is not just male and female, experienced either as an isolated individual man or an isolated individual woman.

- Homosexual practice is a tampering with the image of God as imprinted on us - a relational disruption of the image of God – caused by suppressing the truth about God’s identity and re-imaging him according to the practitioner’s desire. God’s Fatherhood is a strong corrective to many homosexual’s dysfunctional childhood relationship to their father. [See 1.B.b) The Androgynous View of Sex] Ethicist Gordon Preece observes: “Instead of being a form of sexual solitaire and animalistic stimulation, sex is an expression of our personal, relational nature as men and women made in God’s relational, Trinitarian image… When the two become one there is a mysterious image of that Trinitarian oneness in difference, where there is a basic complementarity and completeness, unity and non-competitive equality (Gen 2:24, Mt 19:5, Eph:28-33).”
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c) The Nature and Strengths of Traditional Marriage (Biblical view)

- Part of God’s purpose for marriage – including its sexual consummation – is to help us understand something of God’s loving and intimate covenant union with His people. [See 2.B.d) – Marriage as a Covenant] Thus the commitment of a man and woman to each other in marriage reflects not only the inmost essence of the Creator but also his covenant commitment that characterizes all his dealings with us.

- The introduction of marriage in the context of the creation narrative indicates that it is an essential component of creation enabling it to run as intended, i.e. in a loving environment providing continuity from generation to generation.
• In marriage God has revealed his design for human relationships, his plan being for a man and a woman, in the marriage bond, to leave their own families to become a new family.

• Marriage, as the proven foundation for the good of individuals, the protection of children and societal wellbeing, has stood the test of time.

• Gen 2:24: This pivotal verse in Genesis is the point from which all the central New Testament treatments of the subject start. It is an authoritative statement about the Creator’s intention in making human beings in the sexual differentiation of male and female (not an historical account since Adam had no parents to leave!)

• The vocation of the woman is to provide for the man the mutually loving relationships that in himself he both lacks and longs for and that none of the animals that he names can satisfactorily offer. Man and woman long for each other and turn towards each other, to find their unrealised completeness.

d) Marriage as a Covenant

• God established marriage as a covenant, not a contract (Malachi 2:14; Proverbs 2:16-17). It is important to understand the difference between these two.

Covenant v. Contract

Three important differences exist:
1. A covenant is based on trust between parties. A contract is based on distrust.
2. A covenant is based on unlimited responsibility. A contract is based on limited liability.
3. A covenant cannot be broken if new circumstances occur. A contract can be voided by mutual consent.

• Therefore, the marriage covenant between a man and a woman is a comprehensive and permanent commitment. This type of marriage covenant was ordained by God to provide believers with a picture of Christ’s love and relationship to His church (Ephesians 5:22-33; Revelation 21:2, 9). God intends the marriage relationship to be the hallmark of the Christian home, the loving relationship between husband and wife providing the clearest picture of Christ's love. A marriage providing such a model to children, the church, and the world, will thus draw others to the love of Christ. Roman Catholics call Marriage a Sacrament, not only symbolising the divine union between Christ, the Bridegroom, and His Church, the Bride, but also at the same time being a vehicle of grace emanating from participation in the divine life of God Himself.

C. ARGUMENTS FOR SAME SEX MARRIAGE

a) Arguments about Rights

• “Homosexuals have a universal right to marry.” (Humanist)
  o “It seems to me a fundamental human right to be able to choose the person with whom you wish to spend your life and with whom you wish to have a real bond.” (Lord Alderdice)  

So what about polyamorist marriages now? [See 2.E.d) – Polyamory The Next Frontier?, 2.D. c) – ‘Rights’ (Entitlements) distinct from ‘Right’ (As Opposed to ‘Wrong’)] Not everybody has a right to marry whom they wish. (E.g. Siblings) Same sex unions are different in nature and purpose from marriage. Same sex marriage is therefore not an issue about equality or human rights. It is an issue about the nature and meaning of marriage in our society. Whether

personal rights should be prioritised over the common good is another debatable issue. [See 2.C.a) – Arguments About Rights]

- Why has only a small proportion of gay people taken up CP? Do all those in CP want gay Marriage? Only 12 percent of co-habitating homosexuals in the Netherlands marry compared to 86 percent of their heterosexual peers. Less than 20 percent of same-sex couples already living together in California married when given the chance in 2008. In contrast, 91 percent of heterosexual couples in California who are living together are married.

- A Right To a Life-long, Faithful, Intimate Relationship with Another (Romantic)
  “Making marriage available to everyone says so much about the society that we are and the society that we want to live in – one which respects individuals regardless of their sexuality. As Lord Alderdice put it when arguing for civil partnerships in 2004: ‘One of the most fundamental rights of all is the right to have close, confiding, lasting, intimate relationships. Without them, no place, no money, no property, no ambition – nothing – amounts to any value.. It seems to me a fundamental human right to be able to choose the person with whom you wish to spend your life and with whom you wish to have a real bond’. I couldn’t agree more.” (David Cameron, PM)
  “A wealth of research demonstrates the marriage of a man and a woman provides children with the best life outcomes, that children raised in marriages that stay together do best across a whole range of measures… This is why the demand for gay marriage goes doubly wrong… If gay couples are considered equally eligible for marriage, even though gay relationships do not tend towards child-raising and cannot by definition give a child a mother and a father, the crucial understanding of what marriage is actually mainly for has been discarded. What that amounts to is the kind of marriage that puts adults before children. That, in my opinion, is ultimately selfish, and far too high a price to pay simply for the token gesture of treating opposite-sex relationships and same-sex relationships identically.” (Richard Waghorn, prominent Irish homosexual and political commentator)

- Few same-sex relationships last nearly as long as heterosexual marriages. "Only 4% of gay men over 40 are in loving, committed, long term relationships" says Paul Angelo MHA, MBA, gay matchmaker and gay life coach. [See 1.C.f)– Grim Truths About Homosexual Practice]

b) Arguments about Toleration

- “Depriving gay people the right to marry is as immoral as racism.” (Historical)
  - “Discrimination based on sexual orientation, analogous to denying mixed race marriage status? [See 1.E.e) – Discrimination] “If opposition to same-sex marriage is as immoral as racism, why did no great moral thinker, in all of history, ever advocate male-male or female-female marriage? Opposition to racism was advocated by every great moral thinker. Moses, for example, married a black woman, the very definition of Catholic is "universal" and therefore diverse and has always included every race, and the equality of human beings of every race was a central tenet of Judaism, Christianity, Islam and other world religions. But no one - not Moses, Jesus, Buddha, Muhammad, Aquinas, Gandhi, not the Bible or the Koran or any other sacred text, nor even a single anti-religious secular thinker of the Enlightenment -- ever advocated redefining marriage to include members of the same sex… Same-sex marriage is the only social movement to break entirely with the past, to create a moral ideal never before conceived.” (Dennis Prager)

259 “David Cameron explains what equal marriage means to him”, Pink News, 18th July 2013
d) Arguments about Trends

- “The younger generation is all for accepting homosexuals.” (Sociological)
  
  - Rod Dreher, Orthodox cultural writer, notes that in America “poll after poll shows that for the young, homosexuality is normal and gay marriage is no big deal—except, of course, if one opposes it, in which case one has the approximate moral status of a segregationist in the late 1960s.” 265
  
  - “We know from all the polls that they [the next generation] will be much more liberal – and probably too taken up with the realities of climate change to bother much with the culture wars [about same-sex relationships].” 266
  
  - Significantly when President Obama made public his support for same sex marriage, he spoke of conversations with his daughters and about interactions with staff members and friends who are in same sex relationships. But since when has wisdom resided more in the young than the old? The young are more susceptible to novel wrong ideas, (e.g. Rehoboam’s young advisers, 1 Ks 12).

---

263 ‘Equal marriage survives ‘fatal motion’ in first House of Lords test’, Stonewall, 4th June 2013


• **Opposition Diminishing?** “In recent polls a majority approve of same sex marriage.” (Democrat)
  o Determining morality is not a popularity contest. We should not be influenced by “what most people think today”? Hitler was once popular in Germany. “There have been times in history when the majority in a society approved of cruel behaviour, as for example in Roman times when public entertainment consisted in watching gladiators killing each other. Did that make it right?” (Howard Taylor) 267 [See 1.A.a] – Recent History – Trend in Public Opinion

  | Government Policy and Public Opinion: |
  | Public ‘acceptance’ often indicates public tolerance rather than public priority or personal conviction. |
  | “I think that the vast majority of the public have a totally different set of priorities from what I would call the metropolitan elite and I think that they’ll be looking for those economic and social issues to be dealt with first.” 268 - Liam Fox, MP, (on Government plans to introduce gay civil marriage) |

  ❄️ **Arguments about The Institution of Marriage: ‘Evolving’?**

  • **“Love is the same; the institution should be the same.”** (-Nick Clegg) (Political)
    o It is certainly true that “same-sex relationships are, typically, based on entirely the same bonds of companionship and emotional / sexual connections that heterosexual relationships are,” and “couples up and down this country build dynamic bonds of companionship and mutual support, of affection that goes far beyond simply erotic attraction and instead is built on a much deeper longing simply to share life together, to be cared for and to care, to be loved and to love.” (Ould) 269 But while such love is “the same entity [reality] of human-kinship” that is shared by any married couple, this kinship of the two united is not the very essence of marriage which is a union of a man and a woman who make a permanent and exclusive commitment to each other of the type that is naturally (inherently) fulfilled through the marital act of coitus enabling the bearing and rearing of children together.

  • **“Marriage is always evolving, producing myriad changes within the institution.”** (Evolutionary)
    o “Marriage has always been an evolving institution, taking account of shifting societal attitudes and changing needs of families. Just as other recent changes, thought radical at the time, have done nothing to undermine marriage, acknowledging the right of committed gay and lesbian couples to marry would strengthen the institution.” (GLAD, Gay & Lesbian Advocates & Defenders) 270 This confuses the practice of marriage with its nature. E.g. Dropping arranged marriages for love marriages does not change marriage; equating same-sex partners with husband and wife does, because it posits a different answer to the question: what is marriage? Attitudes to marriage are undoubtedly evolving. “Just a cursory exploration of the history of marriage demonstrates how marriage has evolved over the centuries from polygamy, including polyandry as practiced in Britain in Julius Caesar’s time, the acceptance of concubines and more recently mistresses as part of the family, eras of no religious significance until 1000 AD in the Roman Catholic west, and, of course, common law marriages throughout time. So what makes marriage “immutable”? Certainly not society, or tradition, or religion which have shown themselves

270 “Marriage – A History of Change”, GLAD, 22nd December 2011 pdf website:glad.org
• “SSM will strengthen marriage.” (Naive)
  o Bp. Nicholas Holtam told peers that allowing gay couples to wed would be a 'very strong endorsement' of marriage. No evidence for this. In Spain marriage rates fell precipitously after the legalization of SSM. Infidelity in SS relationships a frequent issue. According to Government spokeswoman Baroness Stowell: “In terms of the law, marriage does not require the fidelity of couples. It is open to each couple to decide for themselves on the importance of fidelity within their own relationship.” To which Tory MP David Burrowes responded: “This goes against everything the PM has said about his desire to try and strengthen marriage by extending marriage to same sex couples.” It certainly contradicts a Christian view of marriage.
  o Anthropologist Stanley Kurtz writes, “When we look at Nordland and Nord-Troendelag — the Vermont and Massachusetts of Norway — we are peering as far as we can into the future of marriage in a world where gay marriage is almost totally accepted. What we see is a place where marriage itself has almost totally disappeared….Scandinavian gay marriage has driven home the message that marriage itself is outdated, and that virtually any family form, including out-of-wedlock parenthood, is acceptable.”
  o SSM Undermines Marriage Stability. Dr. Peter May believes that “changing the definition of marriage will not bring stability to the world of marriage. As Stanley Kurtz of the Hudson Institute, the American futurology think-tank, has said, ‘what gay marriage is to homosexuality, group marriage is to bisexuality.’ Bisexuality is more common among women. The aggregate pooling of all recent studies in April 2011 shows that bisexuality is now the largest sexual minority identity label.” “The next logical step therefore from the promotion and full acceptance of homosexuality is the promotion of bisexuality. Kurtz again: "It is easy to imagine that, in a world where gay marriage was common and fully accepted, a serious campaign to legalize polyamorous unions would succeed. We'll someday be endlessly told that not all marriages are monogamous." "

• “Why Should Homosexuality Affect Heterosexuals?” (Red Herring!)
  o "The possibility of 'gay marriage' does not detract from heterosexual marriage unless we think that homosexuality is a choice rather than the given identity of a minority of people. Indeed the development of marriage for same sex couples is a very strong endorsement of the institution of marriage," (Bishop of Salisbury) [See 1.C. a) - An Identity, A Behaviour or An Inclination?]
  o Popular argument: “It does me no injury for my neighbor to say there are 20 gods, or no god. If it neither breaks my leg nor picks my pocket what difference is it to me?” (Thomas Jefferson, American Founding Father.) Free speech is one thing; imposing totalitarian legislation on others is quite another. Alex Salmond, whose Government introduced Equal Marriage legislation,
claimed that “I don’t feel that my marriage will be diminished in any way if same-sex marriage is introduced.” Who said it would personally? “Individual marriages of course would not be damaged by the change [in the immediate future]; my marriage and your marriage will continue unchanged [because they are based on my traditional understanding of marriage]. But [in the long-term] the public perception and understanding of marriage will be irrevocably damaged by SSM, and that will have disastrous long-term consequences; anything that damages marriage will lead to more children born outside of marriage with all the social pathologies that that brings.”

Greenson

o What would be altered is the social understanding of what ‘marriage’ entails. That would be diminished fundamentally. Imagine a building where every carpenter defined his own standard of measurement! One cannot alter the definition of marriage without throwing society into confusion any more than one can change the definition of a yardstick to include two different measurements. SSM is as meaningful as a ‘square circle’!

o Note: Amongst gays are two very different visions of same-sex marriage:
  1. The ‘secular’ gay vision: promiscuous and focusing on personal intimacy and social equality.
  2. The ‘religious’ gay vision: clearly geared towards monogamy and fidelity.
“...and therefore creates an injustice?” “Whether a policy is fair to every individual can never be the only question society asks in establishing social policy…Wherever there are standards, there will be unfairness to individuals.” (Dennis Prager, radio chat-show host) 280

o Stigmatize them and invite public discrimination against them?” [See 1.D.e) – Gay Lobby Tactics]

D.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST SAME SEX MARRIAGE

a) An Empty Pretence: Same-Sex ‘Marriage’ About Unequal Acts, not Equal Rights

  • “Doesn’t singling out gay men and women as ineligible for marriage:
    o Deprive them of equality before law?”
    o Deprive them of the financial, physical and psychological well-being that marriage enhances?”
    Those who would enjoy the privileges of marriage must meet its qualifications and commit to its responsibilities.
    o And therefore creates an injustice?” “Whether a policy is fair to every individual can never be the only question society asks in establishing social policy…Wherever there are standards, there will be unfairness to individuals.” (Dennis Prager, radio chat-show host) 280

  • Fighting for gay marriage generally involves lying about what we are going to do with marriage when we get there — because we lie that the institution of marriage is not going to change.” (Masha Gessen, 289)

278 Greenson, F Howard, Unpublished paper, Same Sex ‘Marriage’, 2012
Gay activist)\textsuperscript{281} History has proved this true! [See I.D.e) Gay Lobby Tactics; 3.C.b) – Paul’s Teaching Romans]. “Homosexual marriage is an empty pretense that lacks the fundamental sexual complementariness of male and female. Like all counterfeits, it cheapens and degrades the real thing.”\textsuperscript{282} (Timothy J Dailey, Ph D) [See I.C.f) – Grim Truths about Homosexual Practice.]

b) The Significance of Complementarity

- **To State The Obvious:** It takes both ovum and sperm to make a baby and ideally a father and mother to bring up a child.

- “Sex was designed for procreation, and one of the intended consequences is of course, conception, though as we all know, that does not occur with every act of intercourse, even without contraception. Sex was also designed to give pleasure (it is notable that God makes the necessary things in life, such as eating and sex, pleasurable), but this also with a purpose, to strengthen the bond between husband and wife, and thus the bond between the father and mother of any children that result. Our very body chemistry is designed to promote male-female bonding. Sexual intimacy triggers the production in a woman of a hormone known as oxytocin which causes her to trust her partner and feel emotionally bonded to him. And there are substances in semen called immune-regulatory macromolecules that send signals which are only understood by the female body, which will then permit the ‘two in one flesh’ intimacy required for human reproduction. The human body then, both structurally and chemically, plus male-female psychology, is designed for bonding (monogamy) and for reproduction: marriage is a perfect fit with the way human beings are made, by God or by evolution (or both, for those who believe that evolution was the mechanism God used to create the world).”\textsuperscript{283} (Greenson)

- **Lack of complementarity affects same-sex unions**
  - Single gender input limits the couples’ relational development and stability.
  - Without reproductive connection only adoptive / surrogate (i.e. parasitical) family possible. A child’s experience of parental role modeling is limited by only one gender. Boys and girls need and tend to benefit from fathers and mothers in different ways. Intact biological families provide the gold standard for the well being of children.\textsuperscript{284} “The weight of evidence indicates that the traditional family based upon a married father and mother is still the best environment for raising children, and it forms the soundest basis for society” (Rebecca O’Neil, Author of Report: Experiments in Living: The Fatherless Family)\textsuperscript{285}


\textsuperscript{282} Dailey, \textit{Ibid}

\textsuperscript{283} Greenson, \textit{Ibid}

\textsuperscript{284} See L Marks, Same-sex Parenting and Children’s Outcomes - Soc. Sci. Res. 41, 2012

\textsuperscript{285} “It’s Official: The Experiment Has Failed,” \textit{Civitas}, 16th September 2002, \url{http://www.civitas.org.uk/hwu/prexp.php} (Accessed on 6th March 2014) David Green, the Director of Civitas, comments: “For the best part of thirty years we have been conducting a vast experiment with the family, and now the results are in: the decline of the two-parent, married-couple family has resulted in poverty, ill-health, educational failure, unhappiness, anti-social behaviour, isolation and social exclusion for thousands of women, men and children.” According to Green, “When the universal rule of human societies has been that parents must be made to care for their own children, by law, custom, or religion, and when this rule has been found to be well-supported by all of the best academic research, it becomes irrational for the government to pretend, as Tony Blair’s government insists on doing, that family structure is no business of policy makers, and that all family structures are equally to be applauded and supported. We need to see a change in government policy which favours and encourages the most responsible behaviour amongst parents, rather than the opposite, as is currently the case.”
c) ‘Rights’ (Entitlements) distinct from ‘Right’ (As Opposed to ‘Wrong’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Human Rights” and “Morally Right”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Right and Wrong</strong>: what is true, honest and good e.g. “the difference between right and wrong”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Right and Proper</strong>: what is just and equitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Human Rights</strong>: moral or legal entitlements to have or obtain something or to act in a certain way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Right and Wrong – The Ethical Issues**
  - What of the family ethics of deliberately denying children both a mother and a father? What of the medical ethics of encouraging a medically dangerous lifestyle? What about the societal ethics of destroying the family as we know it? What of the morality of homosexual behaviour itself?

- **Right and Proper**
  - Supporters of SSM take this meaning to claim the high moral ground. “*Equal marriage isn’t just a question of fairness; it’s quite simply the right thing to do.*”\(^{286}\) (Equity Minister, Maria Miller) But the *extension* of the right to marry to include SS parties either *denies* or *ignores* the (good) *boundaries* inherent in the traditional meaning of marriage. [See 2.A.c) – Understandings Of Marriage]
  - Justice (in a biblical sense) is based on absolute (divine) truth and goodness. But divorced from such absolutes, it becomes whatever seems ‘right’ to the (human) judge.

- **Human Rights**
  - “*We are all equally entitled to our human rights without discrimination.*” (OHCHR)\(^{287}\) This is the basis, upon one narrow interpretation, for the drive for SSM. But it is limited to restricted understandings of both ‘discrimination’ and ‘right’. [See 1.E.e) – Discrimination]
  - Gays and lesbians are free to live as they choose, and we live in a society which roundly applauds them doing so like never before in our history, but they do not have the *right to rewrite marriage for all of society*…”\(^{288}\) (Micah Clark)
  - The gay call to ‘right a wrong’, claiming the high moral ground.
    - The spotlight today is on ‘*rights* of a tiny minority [supposedly]’*wronged* by society by being excluded from marriage. But what about the ‘right’ of heterosexuals to a traditional public understanding of marriage? Why should they be wrong-footed?
    - Note: public *acceptance* of SSM does not imply a general eagerness to redefine marriage. [See 2.C.d) – Arguments About Trends] What about the ‘rights’ of the next generation to a healthy lifestyle?
  - Normalisation? While gay activists claim to be ‘normalising homosexual behaviour’, traditionalists are concerned to ‘*restore marriage to its normal significance*’.
  - “The key concepts of politics are familiar to all: freedom, equality, justice, rights, and so on. The *challenge of political philosophy is to discover what these terms really mean*, and how we can make them work together… Paramount among these in modern political philosophy is the *notion of freedom*.”\(^{289}\) (Stephen Law, editor of Think) From a Christian perspective, ‘freedom’ must always be defined in terms of justice and ‘justice’ in terms of what is ‘right’.

---


288 Clark, *Ibid*

d) Confusions and Inconsistencies

“Same-sex marriage rejects

- The anthropological truth that men and women are different and complementary,
- The biological fact that reproduction depends on a man and a woman and
- The social reality that children need both a mother and a father.”

- Ryan T Anderson, Researcher on Marriage and Religious Liberty

SSM obscures the difference between civil partnerships (legal rights) and marriage (moral responsibilities).

Note: Civil rights (as a citizen of a country) are distinct from human rights (universal).

Everyone has a potential human right to marry, but within restrictions of age, gender and affinity.

Confuses
- homosexual ‘unions’ with caring bonds of friendship
- sex with intimacy.

- Marriage involves far more than a monogamous coming together of two people in love. In SSM:
  - Benefits of the complementarity of man and woman lost.
  - Procreative purpose of marriage missing.
  - Where SS couples adopt the children lose the complementary benefits of having both a mum and dad.
- ‘Equal love’ leads to unequal marriage.
  - Consumption and adultery cannot apply equally to homosexual and heterosexual couples! So absent from marital law.
- A very small minority demand changing a majority’s culture
  - “Presently in Scotland, out of 1,000 households there are typically one or two which are headed by a same-sex couple (General Register Office for Scotland figures). It is estimated that only around 5 per cent of same-sex couples will avail themselves of a provision to marry. So in around one of 10,000 households there is likely to be a couple who wish for same-sex marriage. For the sake of this there will be a threat to basic civil rights in our country. The centuries-old understanding of marriage will be abolished with a subsequent loss of the understanding across society of the benefit of mothers and fathers for children. This truly puts the interests of a few ahead of the well-being of the many.”

- John Deighan

Political Change Demanded on False Premise

“Legitimate reasons for more liberal attitudes and policies regarding gays and lesbians still exist, such as freedom of association, the right to privacy, and respect for other people’s experiences. But those who demand social or political change because gays are born that way just don’t know much about history.”

- David Benkof

Jewish Historian of Gay and Lesbian past

e) The Good of Traditional Marriage Undermined: Archbishop of Canterbury’s objections to SSM

- Speaking in the House of Lords debate on Marriage (Same-Sex Couples) bill, Archbp. Justin Welby, maintained that gay marriage undermines the good of traditional marriage because


(a) the gay marriage bill effectively abolishes, redefines, and recreates marriage in ways that are unequal and different for different "gender" categories;
(b) gay marriage abolishes the concept of marriage as "a normative place for procreation;"
(c) gay marriage diminishes "the idea of marriage as covenant," and
(d) it weakens the family "in its normal sense" as our foundation for society. 293

f) Against Nature and Revelation: A Catholic Defense of Traditional Marriage (Cardinal George of Chicago) 294

- Since marriage existed before Church and state, “neither Church nor state invented marriage, and neither can change its nature.”
- Marriage concerns the physical complementarity of the sexes. “The sexual union of a man and woman is called the marital act because the two become physically one in a way that is impossible between two men or two women.”
- Even though marriage precedes the state, the state has an interest in regulating marriage, which is a public institution, to the end of “assuring stability in society and the proper protection and raising of the next generation of citizens.”
- The Church is also interested in regulating marriage, “because Jesus raised the marital union to the level of symbolizing his own union with his Body.”
- The State has a duty not to define marriage according to the passing fancies of the body politic at a given time but to protect marriage as a natural good preceding the State.
- The Church too has a double duty, as it is indebted not only to nature but also to revelation.

E. THE POLITICS INVOLVED

a) England: Lord Framlingham’s Speech in The House of Lords

Note Political U-turn Involved: Less than a decade ago, when civil partnerships were being introduced for same-sex couples, the minister for constitutional affairs, Lord Filkin, told the House of Lords: ‘The concept of homosexual marriage is a contradiction in terms, which is why our position is utterly clear: we are against it and do not intend to promote it or allow it to take place.’

b. ‘Today has the potential to be deeply sad for this House and for millions of people—children, parents, families, teachers, clergymen—indeed, anyone who believes in the traditional family unit and its fundamental role in the life and cohesion of our country…The questions that many are asking are: why now and why the haste? The simple truth is that the coalition Government have colluded with equal love campaigners and the European Court of Human Rights in bringing a case—an appeal—against our country’s long-established and settled position on marriage. There was a suggestion—some would call it a threat—that if legislation were not brought forward by June this year then changes would be forced on us. The House of Lords Library tells me that as legislation is proceeding the case in the European Court of Human Rights will probably not now be pursued. What outrageous, behind-the-scenes arm twisting! The result is that not one meaningful amendment has been accepted, not because none has been worthwhile but for the sake of entirely contrived deadlines, which suit campaigners in a hurry and a Government who want it off their plate well before the next general election. How cynical and how dangerous. Given the huge effect the Bill, if passed, will have on millions of people, what an abuse of the parliamentary system to put speed before truth. So many

293 Welby, Ibid
important issues causing great concern have been left unresolved and hanging in the air, such as the effect on teachers, faith schools, the issue of adultery, consummation, the effect on registrars, which has already been referred to, and the use of premises—issues touching the lives of thousands every day, not to mention the effect on marriage itself. Those of us who have sat through all the stages of the Bill and have watched the Government knock down amendment after amendment have despaired at their intransigence. This House prides itself on being a revising Chamber. On this Bill it has been a bulldozer. We are being used to bulldoze through an ill thought through Bill, the ramifications of which the people have not begun to understand. All great issues are essentially very simple. We make them complicated when we do not want to face them or when we are anxious to hide their true meaning and purpose.

This Bill is built entirely on pretence. It pretends that there is no difference between a man and a woman. From this deceit have sprung all the problems we have been wrestling with—problems [of which] we have failed to resolve any—which will bedevil generations to come.

How can we possibly give our blessing to legislation built on pretence?

b) Scotland

• “In commenting on the introduction of same-sex ‘marriage’, Mr Alex Neil, the Cabinet Secretary for Health & Wellbeing, has said that this decision ‘sends out a message about the new Scotland we are creating’. We fear that this assessment is tragically true. The decision does send out a message about the new Scotland that our parliament is trying to create and this ‘new Scotland’ is -
  • a country in which politicians think they have the power to change the meaning of words;
  • a country in which democracy is under threat. Parliament deliberately ignored the results of its own consultation (two of every three people who responded its own consultation were against this change) so that the public is left wondering what was the point of asking (and whether it will ever be worth responding to a consultation again). It can only be deeply disturbing to voters that parliament has acted in such a cavalier and undemocratic fashion;
  • a country in which many politicians have allowed a tiny minority of the tiny minority of people who are homosexually orientated to persuade them to defy common sense, elementary biology and the wisdom of the ages – even (in a tell-tale symbol) turning to applaud toward the gallery;
  • a country in which politicians (and a Health Secretary even) happily lead some people into situations that involve health risks (and support a concerted effort to sweep all such health issues under the carpet);
  • a country in which politicians have prepared the way for the persecution of decent law-abiding citizens. The promise of so-called “protections” will prove to be meaningless and this decision will lead to many legal cases, loss of employment, etc. Even before this legislation, a police chaplain in Strathclyde was sacked for privately expressing the view that marriage is the union of a man and a woman. Many jobs and professions will become out-of-bounds for conscientious Christians;
  • a country in which reasoned argument is ignored. Replies received from MSPs have simply stated a disagreement without engaging with the arguments put forward, answering points made, or taking seriously the consequences that will flow from this “historic” decision;
  • a country that thinks it knows better than the God who created the world and who instituted marriage for the good of human society.”


F. CONSEQUENCES OF SAME-SEX MARRIAGE

a) Changes The Nature of ‘Marriage’ for Everyone

- Consequences will continue long after SSM is legalised
  - “As the social and economic consequences of this fundamental change to the way our society is structured become increasingly clear, the debate about what marriage is and how society should be governed will continue.” 297 (David Robertson, Solas Centre For Public Christianity)

- The Removal of The Consummation Clause.
  - By removing from the law on marriage the clause requiring consummation by a newlyweds to make their marriage legally binding (otherwise the marriage can be declared void), the Government has shown the lie to its mantra that homosexual sex is no different from heterosexual sex, and has removed from the definition of marriage any reference to its procreative purpose.

b) Undermines Marital Responsibilities

- Emotional Ties Replace Bodily Bonds
  - Lessen marital stability by stressing emotional ties rather than bodily bonds. It is less able to exemplify the marital norms of permanence, monogamy and fidelity. (The track record of non-casual homosexual relationships is far worse than that of heterosexual married couples.)

- Confusion about Responsibilities
  - Induce public confusion about the responsibilities of marriage. Thus already there is a tendency to reduce marriage (formally a covenant union) to the level of a contract (‘covenant’ becoming a ‘promise’). [See 2.B.d] – Marriage as a Covenant

b) Undermines The Family and The Welfare of Children Adopted By SS Couples

- Moral Education Taken Away From Parents
  - “The sexual rights lobby have always known that the complete success of their agenda depends upon suppressing the right of parents to be primary educators of their children in moral matters.” 298

- Mothers and Fathers Irrelevant As Such
  - “To legalise marriage between two people of the same sex would enshrine in law the principle that mothers and fathers are interchangeable or irrelevant.” 299 (Abp. Salvatore Cordileone)

- Children’s Welfare at Stake
  - Deprive children of their normal right to the benefits of having both mother and father. Children have a human right to be nurtured by both their biological parents. (See Article 9, UN Convention of Children’s Rights 300) “By far, the scariest and most insidious corollary to same-sex marriage is same-sex adoption (already legal in some jurisdictions). This is blatant child abuse. Children need a biological mother and father. We know this is not always possible, even in the

---

297 Reported in The Scotsman, 9th December 2013
context of opposite-sex marriage, but we don't solve the problem or alleviate the inconsistency by augmenting it. Children are not meant to be guinea pigs for social engineering experiments.”\(^\text{301}\) (John McKellar) Ludovine de la Rochere, President of La Manif Pour Tous, maintains: “It's a scandal to deprive children of a father and a mother” by adopting them to same-sex couples, because in such a case “they will be deprived of either a father or a mother.”\(^\text{302}\) [See 2.2.c) – Undermines The Family; 1.D.b) – The Goal of the Gay Agenda]

- “My mother thinks children need a father and a mother and I agree with her. I can’t think of anything worse than being brought up by two dads.” Gay actor Rupert Everett’s stinging attack on homosexual parents sparks outrage. Angry gay rights campaigners say the 53-year-old actor 'should get out a bit more'. Remarks likely to offend couples such as Sir Elton John and David Furnish.”\(^\text{303}\) (Rupert Everett,.) Note: This actor has received hate mail and death threats for this comment.

- “A new study [by Mark Regnerus, a sociology professor at the University of Texas] which found that children of heterosexual parents fare better on numerous indicators of personal well-being than children of homosexual parents is being hailed by true marriage advocates as by far the most scientifically credible study to date on the subject… Regnerus’ findings conflict with studies widely touted by homosexual activists which have claimed that children raised by homosexual parents fare as well or even better than their peers. Many of these studies, Regnerus points out, have relied on small, self-selected samples, parent rather than child reported outcomes, and have exhibited evidence of political bias… In contrast, Regnerus drew his data from the New Family Structures Study, a data collection project that drew from a large, random sample of American young adults. Regnerus analysed responses from 3,000 young adults, 175 of whom reported having a lesbian mother and 73 of whom had a gay father. He compared their responses to their heterosexually-raised counterparts, to determine who had fared better on forty different social, emotional, and relational outcomes. Regnerus notes that his study is one of the few that measures outcomes as reported by the children of homosexuals, rather than relying on an assessment by the homosexual parent… Patrick Fagan, who directs the Marriage and Religion Institute of the Family Research Council, called the Study the ‘gold standard’ for research on children of homosexuals.”\(^\text{304}\) (Christine Dhanagom,)

- Robert Oscar Lopez who was brought up by his mother and her female lover, says, “Quite simply, growing up with gay parents was very difficult, and not because of prejudice from neighbours. When your home life is so drastically different from everyone around you, in a fundamental way striking at basic physical relations, you grow up weird. My peers learned all the unwritten rules of decorum and body language in their homes; they understood what was appropriate to say in certain settings and what wasn’t; they learned both traditionally masculine and traditionally feminine social mechanisms. I had no male figure at all to follow, and my mother and her partner were both unlike traditional fathers or traditional mothers. As a result, I had very few recognisable social cues to offer potential male or female friends, since I was neither confident nor sensitive to others. Thus I befriended people rarely and alienated others easily. Life is hard when you are strange.”\(^\text{305}\)

- All school children will be taught that as adults they can have marriage relationships with either men or women.

---


d) Makes Marriage Available to All

- **Polyamory** The Next Frontier?
  - **Polyamory** is the practice of having simultaneous intimate relationships with more than one person at a time, with the knowledge and consent of all partners. Perel sees polyamory as “the next frontier” – a way of avoiding having to choose between monotony and jealousy. “We don't have a choice. We're in love with each other.” “We have a generation of people coming up who are saying, we also want stability and committed relationships and safety and security, but we also want individual fulfillment. Let us see if we can negotiate monogamy or non-monogamy in a consensual way that prevents a lot of the destructions and pains of infidelity.” 306 (BBC documentary on polyamorous relationships) A case of ‘having your cake and eating it’?
  - Russian-American lesbian activist and author Masha Gessen, in a recent interview at a writers’ festival in Sydney, admitted that the suggestion that same-sex marriage would not significantly alter marriage was a lie…. “It's a no brainer that we should have the right to marry, but I also think equally that it’s a no brainer that the institution of marriage should not exist…” Her reason for her antagonism to the institution of marriage is her own family situation. As she describes it, she has three children, and there are five parents in the picture. She thinks all five should be recognised as the legal parents of the children…’I don't see why we should take two of those parents and make them into a sanctioned couple.” Ms Gessen goes on to spell out the complicated nature of her family structure: ‘I got married in Massachusetts to my partner, my ex-partner, and by that time we had two kids, one of whom was adopted and one of whom I gave birth to….We broke up a couple of years after that and a couple of years after that I met my new partner and she has just had a baby, and that baby's biological father is my brother and my daughter's biological father is a man who lives in Russia and my adopted son also considers him his father. So the five parents break down into two groups of three… And really, I would like to live in a legal system that is capable of reflecting that reality, and I don’t think that’s compatible with the institution of marriage.’ So Gessen wants them all made legal parents. And by her logic, why not? Her problem is that the institution of marriage currently sanctions recognising only two parents as the legal parents of a child… **Once marriage is relativised, we can make it anything whatsoever.** Gessen makes this perfectly clear. And if we can turn it into anything whatsoever, then it has no essence and why should we have it at all?” 307 (Tom O’Gorman)

- **Desires of Adults Trump Needs of Children?**
  - “Marriage has a **public and a private purpose.** The public purpose of marriage is to unite men to women and both to any children they produce. Governments recognize marriage because it is an institution that benefits society and children like no other relationship. Where marriage declines, government grows, intrudes and steps in to pick up the pieces. Throughout history, in diverse cultures on every part of the globe, governments have understood that marriage is not just any kind of love. It is the special union of a man and a woman….Marriage is about the established needs of children, not merely the desires of adults or the demands of activists. Changing the foundation of marriage from the set needs of society and children to the various desires of adults is a dangerous move. Less than 24 hours after the rulings, those with other desires claimed their agenda. The polygamists see their long awaited opportunity for multiple partner marriages. As Practical Polyamory spokeswoman Anita Wagner Illig said, ‘We polyamorists are grateful to our (LGBT) brothers and sisters for blazing the marriage equality trail.’ They know that once society walks away from the logical, time-tested boundary of one man and one woman there is no stopping point.” 308 (Micah Clark, Changing marriage needs into marriage wants. nwi.com) 2013 [See 2.A.c) – Understandings of Marriage]

---

306 “How Does a Polyamorous Relationship Between Four People Work?” BBC 4, 19th September 2013
e) Leads to A Genderless Society:

- Gender Confusion
  - “There is a fierce battle taking place to render meaningless the man-woman distinction, the most important distinction regarding human beings' personal identity. Nothing would accomplish this as much as same-sex marriage. The whole premise of same-sex marriage is that gender is insignificant: It doesn't matter whether you marry a man or a woman. Love, not gender, matters...This year Harvard University appointed its first permanent director of bisexual, gay, lesbian, transgender, and queer student life. The individual, Vanidy Bailey, has asked that he/she never be referred to as he or she, male or female. Harvard has agreed... Same-sex marriage will pass along the consequences of our good intentions to our children and grandchildren - gender confusion and the loss of motherhood and fatherhood as values, just to cite two obvious consequences.” 309 (Dennis Prager)

f) Provides Poorer Models of Marriage:

- Adopted Children of SS Couples Suffer Double Ill
  - Not only are children of homosexual couples without a father or mother, they are also presented with their parents’ modeling of aberrant and unhealthy sexuality. “Marriage does not require the fidelity of couples.” (Government spokesman). 310 [See 2.E.c) - Undermines The Family]

- The Removal of The Adultery Clause:
  - By removing also the clause on adultery it has weakened the moral character of marriage and in consequence its moral contribution to the stability of society in general. This weakening of the institution of marriage must adversely affect the perception of future generations regarding the nature and responsibilities of marriage.

- Intimate partner violence:
  - Homosexual and lesbian couples experience by far the highest levels of intimate partner violence compared with married couples as well as cohabiting heterosexual couples. Lesbians, for example, suffer a much higher level of violence than do married women. 311
  - Relationship duration. The vast majority of same-sex relationships are short-lived or intentionally transitory. (In the Netherlands average duration: 18 months)
  - Monogamy versus Promiscuity. While three quarters of heterosexual married couples remain faithful to each other (while married), homosexual couples typically engage in a shocking degree of promiscuity (average of 8 sexual partners outside of their ‘relationship’ per year!) Percentage reporting fidelity in a Dutch study: 85% married women, 75% married men, 4.5% homosexual men supposedly ‘in relationship’. 312

g) Consequences for Those Who Oppose SSM

- The danger is that, in pursuing something which does not and cannot exist out of a desire to accommodate the wishes of the few, the government will create a whole host of injustices and inequalities for the

---


many.’ (Norman Wells) 313

- **Totalitarian intolerance of dissent** about approval of same-sex marriage, including gagging / curtailment of freedom of speech.
- **Loss of employment** for those expressing traditionalist beliefs about marriage.
- “The redefinition of marriage to include same sex unions will bring with it State-sponsored discrimination and penalties in the courts and in the workplace against anyone who dares to question the rightness of same sex marriage, thereby riding roughshod over freedom of speech, freedom of religion and freedom of conscience.” (RC Archbishop Tartaglia) 314 But note that **discrimination can be positive**: Just as we rightly discriminate between trained doctors and quacks to ensure our health and safety, so by upholding traditional marriage and discriminating against a same-sex life-style, we believe we are preserving the **health and stability of society**. [See 1.E.e) – Discrimination]

h) Effect on Society

- **Cumulative Damage**
  - “The destructive effects may not be immediately apparent, but the cumulative damage is inescapable. The eminent Harvard sociologist, Pitirim Sorokin, analyzed cultures spanning several thousand years on several continents, and found that virtually no society has ceased to regulate sexuality within marriage as traditionally defined, and survived.” 315 (Timothy J. Dailey)

F. CONSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL ISSUES

a) Pressure on the Monarchy

- **Constitutional Conflict.**
  - Bishop Michael Nazir-Ali “said legalising gay marriage could put the Queen at odds with the ‘law of God and the settlement of the Church of England’, adding: ‘Ministers should not be putting her in a position contrary to what she has promised.’” 316

- **Personal Royal Involvement Implied?**
  - “Although the Queen could hardly not have given her assent to the Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Bill, David Cameron promised guests at a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender reception in Downing Street on Wednesday that he intended to thank her “personally” for signing it at his audience with her that evening.” 317 (Tim Walker)

- **The Problem For The Established Church**: How should the Church respond?
  - **The Pilling Report**: “The response of the bishops is based on upholding the current teaching. It is marked by continued distancing from and opposition to the state and the law in this area. This is never easy, particularly for an established church. When it is on a matter where church and state have previously been partners in basic agreement and the church retains a special legal responsibility and social function it is even more uncomfortable. If wider society generally comes to accept the state’s definition the stance will be yet more difficult to maintain…Two areas where the conversations need to focus their attention… were largely unaddressed by the Pilling Report:
    - (1) What doctrine of marriage should the Church have and how should it then bear

---

317 Tim Walker, reporting in *The Telegraph*, 25th July 2013
faithful witness to that in ordering its own life and in mission in a wider society which recognises same-sex marriage? And

- (2) What is to be done, what new church structures may be needed, so that those who find themselves unable to accept the conclusions on the doctrine of marriage and its practical implications can faithfully bear witness to their understanding of marriage without undermining the mind of the majority or condemning the Church of England to continuing destructive conflict over this issue?” 318 (Andrew Goddard)

b) Who’s Triumphant?

- Gay Awards in The Palace of Westminster
  - “I would like to congratulate all the winners of these inaugural awards held in the State Rooms at Speaker’s House in the Palace of Westminster yesterday evening. They are recognition of the hard work many have done in Parliament and across the country to support the LGBT community and bring about greater equality. PinkNews has been at the forefront of that work and it’s fantastic that they are recognising those who have fought so hard and for so long. I think few people expected a Conservative Prime Minister to introduce equal marriage, but I am proud to have done so. It was right that we had the debate. And the great thing about that debate was that we didn’t just win the vote, we won the argument.” 319 (David Cameron)
  - Did you really? Was it not a case of bulldozing? (Four minutes for each speaker allows for little argument beyond pithy sound-bites!)
  - Conservative Councillor, Mary Douglas pointed out there had been “no democratic mandate. Not in any manifesto, not in the Coalition Agreement, no Green Paper, no White Paper, not in any Queen’s Speech. And against a promise made by our Prime Minister, on national TV, three days before the last General Election, that he would never introduce ‘gay marriage’...And it is not only the party faithful who are bewildered and betrayed. Ordinary men and woman are at a loss to explain what their government is doing with an institution so dear to their hearts.” 320
  - “I have to say that it is astonishing that a bill for which there is absolutely no mandate, against which a majority of Conservatives voted against, has been bulldozed through both Houses and just two hours of debate tonight is an absolute parliamentary disgrace.” 321 (Gerald Howarth, MP)

- Trivialisation of an Important Issue
  - “Gay marriage is not as trivial a matter as some politicians (such as Nick Clegg – ‘What is all the fuss about?’) would have us believe... The Christian prayer book states words to this effect, ‘Those whom God has joined together, let no-one rend asunder’. I, and many others, would regard this as blasphemous in the context of same-sex marriage.” 322 (Trevor Baxter)

322 Letter, The Telegraph, 25th July 2014
Part 3
Homosexuality and The Bible

A. Biblical Authority
   a. God’s Authority and The Role of Scripture
   b. Shift from The Written Word of God to The Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ
   c. The Affect of Our attitude to God's Word upon Our View of Homosexuality

B. Biblical Interpretation
   a. Crucial Tenets of Hermeneutics
      • Understand The Literary Genre Employed
      • Note the Literal Context
      • Note the Cultural Context
      • View The Big Picture
   b. Skewed Hermeneutics:
      • OT
         o Old Interpretations Modified In The Light of Experience
         o Laws Adapt To Changing Times.
         o How Relevant Are Old Testament Texts?
         o “Anti-homosexual laws merely about national identity (being different)”
         o Aren’t Traditionalists Being Selective about OT Texts Anyway?
      • NT & Jesus
         o Privileging One Theme of Scripture
         o The ‘compass’ of Jesus and a ‘trajectory of Scripture’ that trumps ‘proof texts’.
         o Slavery: The Trajectory of Scripture Against It Encourages a Change of Attitude.
         o The Silence of Jesus
      • The Bible in General: How Relevant Is The Bible Evidence?
         • Loving, Committed, Long-term SS Relationships:
         • “The Bible is only against bad (promiscuous) sex, not good (committed) sex.”
         • “The Bible does not address the contemporary issue of cohabiting faithful gays.”
         • “David and Jonathan exhibited a ‘committed consensual homosexual relationship.’”
         • “Positive Biblical Values (love, justice, etc) trump more negative texts.”
   c. The Consequences of Different Interpretations
      • Does the Bible really say what we think it does?
         o Extreme exegesis justifying orgies!
      • Should we beg to differ?
         o The danger of not warning!

C. The Biblical Evidence
   a. The Key Texts
      • 1 Thessalonians 4:3-10 How should we behave today? (Genre: Exhortation)
      • Genesis 1 & 2 What did God create? (Genre: Creation Story)
      • Genesis 19 & Judges 19 What decadent behaviour resulted from godlessness? (Genre: Narrative)
      • Leviticus 18 & 20 What is the moral law on sexual practice? (Genre: Law)
      • Romans 1:24-27 Why did Paul condemn same sex acts? (Genre: Apologetic)
      • Matthew 19:3-8 What would Jesus say? (Genre: Gospel Narrative: Teaching)
      • John 8:3-11 What would Jesus do? (Genre: Gospel Narrative: Action)
      • 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 How serious is sexual immorality? (Genre: Letter: Teaching)
      • Galatians 5:19-21 What are the eternal consequences of sexual immorality (and other ‘fleshy behaviour’)? (Genre: Letter: Exhortation)
      • 1 Timothy 1:4b-11 What role does the Law play in the teaching associated in the Gospel? (Genre: Letter: Teaching)
      • 1 Thessalonians 4:3-10 How should we behave today? (Genre: Exhortation)
   b. Paul’s Teaching in Romans
      • His categories: Married and Unmarried (not homosexual and Heterosexual!)
      • Suppression of truth > idolatry > decadent behaviour
      • Idolatry involves role-reversal
      • We are all born with a tendency to sin
   c. The Seriousness of Homosexual Sin
   d. Conclusions Regarding Biblical Teaching
      • Human sexuality: a story of warped desires being disciplined and re-ordered.
      • The biblical proscription of same-sex intercourse is absolute, pervasive and severe.
3. HOMOSEXUALITY AND THE BIBLE

See also 1.B - A Christian View of Marriage

Idolatry and Salvation

“When culture displaces God, it puts itself in place as an idol.” (Anon)

“This controversy is not merely about sex, it is about salvation.” 323

- Albert Mohler

A. BIBLICAL AUTHORITY

a) God’s Authority and The Role of Scripture.

- “God has delegated his authority somehow to this book… Scripture brings God’s order to God’s world.” 324 (Prof. Tom Wright, former Bishop of Durham)

- The Extent of Biblical Inspiration: ‘The Word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments,’ implies a disjunction between the ‘Word of God’ and ‘the Scriptures.’ This actually constitutes a very recent attempt to re-interpret theological language to allow for the ignoring of ‘unacceptable’ passages. The expression ‘contained in’ (Westminster Confession) simply points to where God’s Word is to be found: in Scripture. The statement constitutes a delimitation of what is Scripture; i.e. only Scripture is the true depository of God’s Word. 325 Thus Paul states: “All Scripture is inspired by God and is useful to teach us what is true and to make us realize what is wrong in our lives. It corrects us when we are wrong and teaches us to do what is right. God uses it to prepare and equip his people to do every good work.” (2 Tim 3:16,17)

- “The Bible is flawed and fallible… We have recently abandoned the text’s tyranny over women, as we abandoned its justification of slavery, and soon we'll abandon its ignorant misunderstanding of homosexuality.” 326 (Richard Holloway, Bishop) The Bible describes fallen society, including male dominance and slavery. While it condones neither of these specific examples, it does specifically condemn homosexuality. Once denigrate Scripture as ‘flawed’ any text can be ‘abandoned’ at will as ‘ignorant misunderstanding.’ [See 3.B.b) – Skewed Hermeneutics]

b) Shift from The Written Word of God to The Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ.

- “It is thoughtful conformity to Christ - not unthinking conformity to either culture or textual prohibitions - that should be our unchanging reference point.” 327 (Steve Chalke, Baptist minister and social activist).


324 NT Wright, How Can The Bible Be Authoritative? Vox Evangelica, 1991 No 21, p. 7

325 For a rebuttal of attempts within the church of Scotland to reinterpret the Westminster Confession’s use of ‘contained in’, see David W. Torrance, “The Authority of Scripture”, in Embracing Truth, (Haddington, Handsel Press, 2012) p. 73-4


It is a specious distinction to suggest that conformity to ‘textual prohibitions’ is ‘unthinking’ [= traditionalist?] while ‘conformity to Christ’ involves more ‘thoughtful’ [= revisionist?] interpretation. It is only by reference to (Gospel) texts that we access Christ’s thoughts. Jesus himself, when tempted by the Devil at the start of his ministry, quoted Scripture to combat each temptation in turn. (Robert Gagnon’s 522 page The Bible and Homosexual Practice shows considerable thought given to textual prohibitions!)

- The Bible as "an account of the ancient conversation initiated, inspired and guided by God with and among humanity". (Chalke) What unambiguous authority can a conversation carry? The Bible is rather an authoritative and accurate record of God’s interventions by word and deed into particular historical circumstances, using many different genres, of which conversation is one sub-set.

c) The Affect of Our Attitude to God’s Word upon Our View of Homosexuality

- “We now know better than the Bible, so don’t have to read passages that are culturally conditioned as having authority over us.” (A commissioner to 2010 General Assembly of the Church of Scotland) The liberal position hotly rejected by conservatives. Note: The serpent deceived Eve by asking: “Hath God said?” Eve could know better! Albert Mohler observes that: “If the modern concept of sexual orientation is to be taken as a brute fact, then the Bible simply cannot be trusted to understand what it means to be human, to reveal what God intends for us sexually, or to define sin in any coherent manner.” Thus the modern concept of sexual orientation functions as a much higher authority in revisionist thinking than Scripture.

- “What else does the Bible not know about what it means to be human? If the Bible cannot be trusted to reveal the truth about us in every respect, how can we trust it to reveal our salvation?... To tell someone that what the Bible reveals as sin is not sin, we tell them that they do not need Christ for that. Is that not exactly what Paul was determined not to do when he wrote to the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians 6:9-11? Could the stakes be any higher than that? This controversy is not merely about sex, it is about salvation.”

- Appeals to what ‘science’ supposedly says are based on a completely materialist, anti-supernatural and deterministic understanding of science and psychology. Instead of beginning with the given-ness of the Word of God or of man-woman in the Image of God, such appeals commence their understanding with the supposed ‘given-ness’ of homosexuality – and then revise their approach to humanity, marriage, sexual ethics, Scripture, theology, even God Himself, on the basis of it. ‘Drinking from another well’, they re-image reality.

B. BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION

From where in Scripture should one construct, on the basis of accurate exegesis, an ethic of sexuality that relates to the contemporary issues surrounding same-sex relationships?

“While exegesis and historical research can more or less reliably recover [the historical meaning of particular passages of Scripture, the hermeneutics or principles of biblical interpretation we bring to the text determine] ‘what series of texts are deemed applicable and which are not.’”

(- Pim Pronk, author)

---

329 Chalke, Ibid
331 Ibid
a) Crucial Tenets of Hermeneutics

- **Understand The Literary Genre Employed**: creation story, historical narrative, legislation, gospel account, epistolary exhortation and exposition. The reader must interpret a text according to its genre.
  - *Narrative* material is to be taken as descriptive of events and incidents, not necessarily as normative for forming the reader’s consequent behaviour.
  - Passages concerning law must be seen as either prescriptive or proscriptive and must be applied according to the purpose for which they were promulgated and in the time frame for which their enforcement was intended.

- **Note the Literary Context**. This lessens the danger of proof-texting, “the use of individual scripture texts to produce apparent support for a doctrinal position without adequate regard for the contexts of the individual texts which may indicate differences and nuances.” 333 (Henry Neufeld)

- **Note the Cultural Context**: Take into consideration background context; avoid reading back into the text a modern situation or a personal bias (eisegesis). (E.g. Mat 19:12 read by apologists for homosexuality as a reference by Jesus to homosexual orientation.) [See 3.C.a) – The Key Texts]

- **View The Big Picture**: Crucially, we need to see the various biblical texts on the subject not only in their immediate literary and historical / cultural contexts but also in their canonical context, that is, the context of the grand biblical meta-narrative of salvation. Note: The degree of importance attached and consistency of stance is more significant than the number of references (or lack of frequency).

b) Skewed Hermeneutics

- **Old Testament**
  - *Old Interpretations Modified In The Light of Experience*
    - “Christian morality comes from the mix of Bible, Christian tradition and our reasoned experience… Sometimes Christians have had to rethink the priorities of the Gospel in the light of experience. No one now supports either slavery or apartheid. The Biblical texts have not changed: our interpretation [of them] has.” 334 Bishop of Salisbury, in support of SSM) “It ignores the plain reading of the Bible’s uniform witness to homosexual practice as intrinsically disordered, contrary to God’s creative will and sinful. It makes any interpretation of the Biblical texts valid, even where such interpretations ignore and even violate the plain reading and meaning of the text.” 335 (Canon Phil Ashley) Interpretations that conflict with the plain meanings of scriptures elsewhere deny Scripture’s consistent witness. Ultimately legitimate interpretation does not arise from a rational application of experience to select verses, but from an overall examination of the total canon of Scripture. [See 4.B.a) – Arguments from Observation and Experience]
  - *Laws Adapt To Changing Times.*
    - “Law is living and flexible: always growing, adapting, changing shape. Christ distilled the complex religious laws of his time to love of that same God and of neighbour as oneself. The spiritual liberty and simplicity that resulted from this new, unified vision led to the breaking down of the divisive barriers.” 336 (Stephen Hough) Prohibitive Biblical laws cannot morph mystically at the touch of Christ into a permissive ‘vision’ of

---

liberty to do exactly what these laws proscribed! Otherwise Jesus would be calling black white! Jesus said, “Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets, I have not come to abolish but to fulfill them.” (Mat 5:17) Thus, though ceremonial laws would cease because they were fulfilled by Christ’s death, by their very nature, no moral law could be abolished. (Civil laws were dropped once their historical purpose was finished.) [See Being Selective? below]

- **How Relevant Are Old Testament Texts?**
  - “Levitical rules no longer apply in the new covenant.” Some do, some don’t! [See below] Context plays a part in how we interpret the Scriptures.

- **Anti-SS Laws Merely about National Identity**
  - “Anti-homosexual laws were formulated as part of a Purity Code only to meet the challenges of being different from the surrounding nations, i.e. a matter of identity.”
    - God’s people should still be seen as distinct - ‘different’ in their moral behaviour - from their godless neighbours.

- **Aren’t Traditionalists Being Selective Anyway?**
  - “Why single out texts prohibiting homosexuality when other things are prohibited which we allow today?”

  In the New Testament Jesus’ statement about divorce (mark 10:111-12) is cited as an example of a text dismissed as not binding today. Are our conclusions determined by the method of interpretation we chose for a particular text? All texts should be universally interpreted according to their literary context – both immediate and canonical and that of the whole corpus of the speaker’s sayings / author’s writings in between. In this case, the immediate context concerns the Pharisees’ legalistic dependency on documents of divorce, challenged by Jesus by showing the root issue in such casuistry is the adulterous spirit behind it. Jesus’ wider teaching concerns forgiveness for those prepared to “sin no more”.

- **Polycotton shirts?** “There will come a time when evangelical Christians have to repent of their attitude to homosexuality; it is no more sinful than wearing polycotton shirts.” 338 (OT scholar quoted by Greg Downes) This is an allusion to the Levitical prohibition against the wearing of garments that are woven with two kinds of material. Its significance lies in that it forms part of the same so called ‘Holiness Code’ that also condemns “lying with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination.” “This [latter is associated with] idolatry and the Canaanite practice of cult prostitution... [not to] loving, responsible homosexual relationships. In addition to this, Christians should remember that the Levitical rules and rituals were given by God for the purpose of preserving the distinctive characteristics of Israel’s religion and culture. Consequently they are no longer bound by these Jewish laws.” Revisionists ask of Traditionalists: “how [can] these two Levitical verses, taken completely out of context, remain relevant today when the many surrounding verses are ignored? Verses regarding, for example, the eating of shellfish, wearing mixed fibres, planting two different crops in the same field, or failing to build a parapet around the roof of one’s house (all terribly displeasing to God, some being regarded as abomination, others calling for the death penalty).” 339 (Elaine Ambrose, South London Metropolitan Community Church, serving the GLBT community) The purpose of these instructions was indeed to order how God’s covenant people were to conduct themselves in distinction to the surrounding nations. The prohibition on homosexuality was never relaxed in the NT because, as Paul expounded in Romans, not only it was a serious sin, but because it was a moral law whose violation showed the idolatrous character of that sin.

---

338 OT scholar quoted by Greg Downes in “The Bible and Homosexuality”, Christianity, February 2013
New Testament and Jesus

`The Silence of Jesus`

- **Jesus never spoke against homosexuality (i.e. silent on the matter).** Nor incest either! There is no indication he wanted to change sexual mores or depart from accepted Jewish wisdom on sex and marriage. He would have shared his countrymen’s repugnance at homosexual practice of any stripe as being ‘contrary to nature’. “Silence on the subject could only have been understood by his disciples as acceptance of the basic position embraced by all Jews. If Jesus had wanted to communicate affirmation of same-sex unions he would have had to state such a view clearly since first-century Judaism, so far as we know, had no dissenting voices on the matter.” 341 (Gagnon)

- “It is sometimes said that Jesus said nothing about homosexuality (as if this cancels out all the other verses), but Jesus squarely condemned sexual immorality in general (Mark 7:20-23) and quotes the Genesis 2:24 verse in his teaching as an expression of his Father’s will in creation (Matthew 19:5; Mark 10:7).” 342 (Greg Downes)

`Privileging One Theme of Scripture`

- In contrast, the church’s ‘great tradition’ in its reading of Scripture is a certain way of reading biblical texts that has developed since apostolic times. (Cf. the value of continuity for orthodox faith and practice.)

- Privileging one theme of Scripture (e.g. ‘the love of God’), at the expense of passages deemed in conflict with a pre-determined understanding of what that theme implies. A very arbitrary and selective hermeneutic!

- Claims an interior and esoteric notion of ‘love’ as its justification for revising the more-obvious teaching of Scripture – yet this is an imported notion of love which is itself disconnected from how the Bible speaks about love.

- The ‘compass’ of Jesus and a ‘trajectory of Scripture’ that trumps ‘proof texts’.

- “The Bible aims to set us on an ethical trajectory that takes us from where the culture of Bible times was to where God wants us to be ultimately.” 343 Cf. A form of ‘trajectory’ hermeneutics where themes develop within scripture, and the task of readers is to

---


342 Downes, Ibid

continue to develop those trajectories. Steve Holmes asks how do you trace a trajectory in scripture on a topic scripture says nothing about? Christianity is not about a book, but about a person who is the Word of God made flesh. We do not know more of the works of God than when we saw God at work in the earthly ministry of Jesus Christ. Our understanding of the truth does not grow and develop and improve beyond the point in history when we once looked the Truth in the face – on the dusty roads of Galilee. “There is nothing in the ‘big picture’ of the Bible on sexual ethics that moves ‘in the direction of’ support for homosexual practice.” 344 (Robert Gagnon, NT Professor)

• Trajectory Hermeneutics involves: “a method of interpreting the Bible (hermeneutics) in which our final authority is not found in what is written in the Bible itself, but is (supposedly) to be found later, at the end of a ‘trajectory’ or path along which the New Testament was progressing when it was being written.” 345 (Wayne Grudem)

   ○ Slavery: The Trajectory of Scripture Against It Encourages a Change of Attitude

      “Rather than basing their approach on isolated proof texts, the [slavery] abolitionists built their case around the deeper resonance of the trajectory of scripture – the compass for which is Jesus, who was radically inclusive of women and other social outcasts of his day, challenging social norms and perceived orthodoxy.” 346 (Steve Chalke) “The question of slavery is much different from the question of men’s and women’s roles in the home and in the church. God created marriage and God created the church, but slavery was a human institution not created by God… Trajectory hermeneutic’ advocates… seem unaware of [the] entire history of biblical arguments against slavery, and they wrongly assume that the Bible actually supports slavery of the kind seen in the horrible abuses in America in the 18th and 19th centuries… Then these ‘trajectory hermeneutic’ advocates say that we have to go beyond the moral teachings of the New Testament to find an “ultimate ethic” that is superior to that found in the words of New Testament… That is so highly subjective. People can imagine all sorts of developments that might have come “after” the New Testament, and it means that our authority is no longer the words of Scripture but some scholar’s imagination about where Scripture might have lead if the authors had been allowed to ponder a bit longer. This is directly undermining the authority of Scripture and it leads directly to liberalism.” 347 (Wayne Grudem)

• The Bible in General

   ○ Loving, Committed, Long-term Relationships: How Relevant Is The Bible Evidence?

      “The Bible is only against bad (promiscuous & exploitive) sex, not good (committed) sex,” “The Bible does not address the contemporary issue of faithful gay and lesbian Christians living in committed long-term relationships.” 348 (Ron Ferguson). But it never commends homosexuality: Walter Wink, biblical scholar and revisionist theologian: “Simply put, the Bible is negative towards same sex behaviour, and there is no getting around it.” 349 The entire biblical witness puts practiced homosexuality,
without exception, among the kinds of behaviour which give particularly striking expression to humanity’s turning away from God.

- How does this issue relate to the historical practice of a married man “living in committed long-term relationship” with a mistress? Why does the deliberate long-term commitment to a single person make a practice condemned as in principle immoral any less immoral? Loyalty to another person is in itself no justification for disobedience to God’s plain command. [See 1.C.f] – Grim Truths About Homosexual Practice

- “David and Jonathan exhibited a ‘committed consensual homosexual relationship’” This is simply eisegesis (reading into the story, as also with Ruth and Naomi being supposedly “involved in a lesbian relationship.”) “Those who try to argue that the intimate relationship of David and Jonathan was homoerotic simply fail to understand the Jewish cultural context and retrospectively visit the assumptions of our own highly sexualized culture on the text, in an attempt to make the Bible say what it does not.” 350 (Greg Downes, Theologian in residence, Christianity.) “We impart so much of our culture into the way we read the Bible that it keeps us from hearing the text.” 351 (Michael Holmes, Bethel University) [See 1.C.e] – Human Desire For Intimacy

c) The Consequences of Radically Different Interpretations

- Different messages taken from the same text. “Does the Bible really say what we think it does? (so we can take a different message from its text).”
  - The danger of extreme eisegesis: One gay blogger claims sexual orgies are an image of human community! “What do orgies teach us about developing a queer theology? Well, as the Apostle Paul writes, "We who are many form one body." 352 (Vincent Cervantes) An extreme case of theological eisegesis, with no regard for Paul’s over-all teaching on the body of Christ or on sexual morality!

- “Biblical values such as love, liberation, justice and inclusion of the outsider support gay relationships. (i.e. love trumps more negative texts)”
  - Love doesn’t justify any sexual relationship; liberation can also be from SS attraction! Rights are derivative from what is right which in turn is based on what is real. Inclusion does not entail accepting every behaviour of the one to be included.

- Should we just to beg to differ on our interpretation?
  - The danger of not warning: “If the matter is genuinely unclear, then to protect the eternal souls of those within the church’s care, we must warn people to stay away from any activity that might deserve the stated, severe, condemnation of God.” (Kirsty Birkett)

350  Greg Downes, “The Bible and Homosexuality”, Christianity, February 2013
353  Kirsty Birkett, “What if scripture really is unclear?”, Oak Hill College, 19th December 2013, http://oakhill2.ablette.net/blog/entry/what_if_scripture_really_is_unclear/#sthash.lTqHggwb.dpuf (Accessed on 14th March 2014)
BIBLICAL EVIDENCE
[This section is indebted to Robert Gagnon’s The Bible and Homosexuality]

“The Bible does not speak of same-sex attraction, but wherever it deals with homosexual practice, it speaks of it as unnatural and sinful.”  
- David Randall, Minister

Note: Deuteronomy 23:17-18; 1 Kings 14:23-24, 15:12-15, 22:46; 2 Kings 23:6-8) refer to the practices of Cult prostitution and are not immediately relevant to the current debate.

a) Is Homosexuality Such A Big Issue In The Bible?

- Revisionist stance: “The issues about homosexuality are very complex and are not understood by most members of the Christian church,” according to Bernard Ramm of The American Baptist Seminary of the West. This evangelical authority on biblical interpretation says that, ‘to them, it is a vile form of sexual perversion condemned in both the Old and New Testaments.’ But as Calvin Theological Seminary Old Testament scholar Marten H. Woudstra says: ‘there is nothing in the Old Testament that corresponds to homosexuality as we understand it today’ and as SMU New Testament scholar Victor Paul Furnish says: ‘There is no text on homosexual orientation in the Bible.’ Says Robin Scroggs of Union Seminary: ‘Biblical judgments against homosexuality are not relevant to today’s debate. They should no longer be used … not because the Bible is not authoritative, but simply because it does not address the issues involved. … No single New Testament author considers [homosexuality] important enough to write his own sentence about it.’”  
  (Ralph Blair, psychotherapist)

- Few Mentions In scripture?
  - “The small number of Biblical texts that address the subject of homosexuality.”  
  (M. Warner)
  OT lecturer Lindsay Wilson argues: “However, once you realize the need for context, it is evident that the Bible speaks about sexuality – and therefore homosexuality – at length, even devoting whole books to the subject (Song of Songs)... Whenever the bible speaks about sexuality, this has implications for the issues of homosexuality, a point often overlooked by those who claim that Jesus says nothing on the topic of homosexuality.”

b) The Key Texts (and their Genres)

- ‘Clobber Passages’. “There are six main biblical passages that Christians typically use to condemn homosexuality... Genesis 1:26-28, Genesis 19:4-5, Leviticus 18:22, Romans 1, I Corinthians 6:9-10, and I Timothy 1:9-10.”  
  (Rev. Daniel Payne)

- Genesis 1 & 2 What did God create? (Genre: Creation Story)
  - Important because
    - They record the story of the origins of marriage.
    - They reveal the sexual lifestyle that God intended for humanity, (God’s design for sex).

---
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- Jesus refers to these texts as providing the principles that can be deduced regarding later issues, such as divorce (See Mat 19:4ff).
- Paul alludes to them as substantiating his claim that God created humankind male and female; God instituted marriage as a complementary heterosexual union.
  - “God’s pattern for humanity consists of one woman and one man living together exclusively as one flesh. This is the nature of marriage, and would rule out, among other possibilities, a same-sex marriage. The phrase ‘one flesh’ implies that such a relationship is the proper context for sexual intimacy, and this is later made explicit for both Israel (e.g. Lev. 18) and the Church (e.g. 1 Cor 7).” (Lindsay Wilson, Senior OT lecturer) 359
  - “In Genesis 1… the point of the sexual difference between man and woman is reproduction. Increasing in number will enable them to fill the earth and be present everywhere to rule over it. But in Genesis 2… the purpose of sex here is to express and deepen the unity between them.” “By himself [Adam] is unable to fulfill the purposes for which God created him.” So God creates the first woman who “in contrast to the various animals Adam has just named… perfectly corresponds to him… She is like him in the right way (made of the same stuff) and unlike him in the right way (‘woman’ rather than ‘man’).” It is this complementarity that leads to profound unity between them when they eventually come together in sexual union… Eve was created out of Adam; made from his body. Their one-flesh union is therefore something of a re-union; joining together what had originally been one… Their story is true for all mankind. It sets up a pattern that we see repeated in every generation. The writer pulls back from the immediate setting to make the general observation: ‘That is why a man leaves his father and mother and is united to his wife, and they become one flesh’… The binding effect of sex in a relationship is what makes the breakdown of a sexual relationship so profoundly painful. [Divorce] is not what we’re designed for.” 360 (Sam Allberry)

- Genesis 19 & Judges 19. What decadent behaviour resulted from godlessness? (Genre: Narrative)
  - Important because
    - They reveal the decadence of the lifestyle of unbelievers outside of the Law
    - Revisionists claim: “The sin of Sodom (and Gibeah) not homosexuality but a breach of hospitality.” (Derrick Sherwin Bailey) But note:
      - When ‘know’ (‘yada’) occurs in Genesis, 6 out of 10 times it refers to sexual intimacy.
      - The immediate context of Lot’s gratuitous offer of women was sexual.
      - Jude 7 interprets the incident as sexually immorality.
    - Genesis 19: “What happened at Sodom is clearly meant to be a cautionary tale. They are an example of facing God’s judgement… ‘an example of what is going to happen to the ungodly’ (2 Pet. 2 v 6).…” They were punished for sexual sin along with the other sins [oppression, lying, abetting criminals, arrogance, complacency and indifference to the poor] of which they were guilty. Their destruction serves as a warning: God takes sexual sin very seriously… A parallel episode in Judges 19 indicates it is not just pagan Sodom, but also the people of God who commit this kind of sin.” 362 (Allberry)

- Leviticus 18 & 20 What is the moral law on sexual practice? (Genre: Law)
  - Important because
    - They govern the lifestyle of believers under the Law.
    - “Do not have sexual relations with a man as one does with a woman; that is detestable” (Leviticus 18:22) has been seen as a classic verse clearly prohibiting homosexual activity. The Queen James Bible (“the world’s first gay Bible”, published “to resolve interpretive ambiguity in the Bible...in a way that makes homophobic interpretations impossible”)
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translates as “Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind in the temple of Molech: it is an abomination.” 363 But this conflates v.21 with the previous verse, a condemnation of the practice of child sacrifice in the temple of Molech.

- As part of the Torah (teaching with binding authority, referred to generally in the NT as the Law), this condemnation of same-sex relationships would have been accepted by Jesus unless he specifically had reason to revoke it.
  - “It is also important to see that the second of these two verses (Leviticus 20 v 13) prohibits both male parties equally. We can’t write it off as only prohibiting things like gay rape or a forced relationship. Leviticus prohibits even general, consensual homosexual activity... It is also important to see that homosexual behaviour is not the only sin to be described as ‘an abomination’ in the Bible. Leviticus refers to other sexual sins in exactly the same way, and Proverbs lists deceitful speech, pride and murder as equally abominable to God.” 364 (Allberry)

- Romans 1:24-27 Why did Paul condemn same sex acts? (Genre: Apologetic)
  - Important because
    - It categorically condemns a homosexual lifestyle. Yet Romans 1:25-27 is interpreted by Revisionists as referring to a condemnation of perversion rather than inversion. “Perversion is where a heterosexual chooses to experiment sexually with their own gender, but inversion is where a person has a homosexual orientation that he or she cannot help – that is innate to them. This interpretation is mistaken, as the Bible authors knew nothing of the modern distinction between homosexual orientation and practice.” Paul was concerned with behaviour, not orientation or identity, (a concept not existing before 1870 according to historian Michel Foucault). “So any mention of men ‘abandoning natural relations’ cannot refer to heterosexuals going against their natural orientation – but rather that the practice of homosexuality contravenes natural law; it is not how the creator intended us to live.” 365 (Greg Downes)
    - It provides us with Paul’s clear and authoritative denunciation of all same-sex behaviour as a particularly strong example of mankind’s idolatrous determination to ignore God and do his own thing.
    - It shows how idolatry leads to impurity including homosexual activity, its sinfulness so severe that those who indulge in it risk exclusion from God’s Kingdom (1 Cor 6:9)
  - “Paul describes both lesbian and male homosexual behaviour as ‘unnatural’. This is... a very hard thing for many people to hear... The words for ‘natural’ and ‘against nature’ do not describe our subjective experience of what feels natural [or comes naturally] to us, but instead refer to a fixed way of things in creation... This shows us why it is not true for those with SSA to say: ‘But God made me this way!’ Paul’s point in Romans 1 is that our ‘nature’ (as we experience it) is not natural (as God intended it). All of us have desires that are warped as a result of our fallen nature. Desires for things God has forbidden are a reflection of how sin has distorted me, not how God has made me... As we reject God, we find ourselves craving what we are not naturally designed to do. [c.f. v 24: “So God abandoned them to do whatever shameful things their hearts desired.”] This is true of a heterosexual person as of a homosexual person... It is important to recognize that Paul is talking in societal rather than individual terms. He is describing what happens to culture as a whole, rather than particular people. The presence of same-sex desire in some of us is not an indication that an individual has turned from God more than others, or that they have been given over by God to further sin more than others.” 366 (Alberry)

- Matthew 19:3-12 What would Jesus say? (Genre: Gospel Narrative: Teaching)
  - Important because
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• It answers the question regarding divorce: “What would Jesus say?” From this it is possible to extrapolate what would be Jesus’ attitude to same-sex behaviour had he been asked. When his disciples could not accept the total commitment that Jesus taught was involved in marriage, he continued: “Not everyone can accept this word, but only those to whom it has been given. For there are eunuchs who were born that way, and there are eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by others, - and there are those who choose to live like eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. The one who can accept this should accept it.” (v. 11-12) “Eunuchs were the celibates of the day, and Jesus indicates that their celibacy might be the result of birth, or human intervention, or a voluntary decision to forego marriage. Whatever the case, that Jesus goes there right after his disciples have baulked at the commitment and seriousness of marriage, shows that Jesus regards it as the only alternative. One marries [heterosexually], or remains single. There is no third possibility, whether of a homosexual partnership or a heterosexual unmarried partnership.”

  o Jesus denounced evil thoughts that make one spiritually unclean before God: “Sexual immorality, theft, murder, adultery, greed, malice, deceit, lewdness, envy, slander, arrogance and folly. All these evils come from inside and defile a person.” (Mark 7 v 20-23) “Sexual immorality’ translates a greek word, porneia (from which we get the word ‘pornography’), something of a catch-all term for any sexual activity outside of marriage... None of Jesus’ hearers would have doubted that his reference to porneia included homosexual behaviour.” (Allberry) That Jesus did not specify homosexuality in his list only points to the fact that this particular practice was not prevalent amongst his Jewish hearers (although common in the wider Greek society of his time). On another occasion his denouncing of lustful glances as equivalent to adultery, far from revealing an advocate of sexual tolerance, demonstrated his adherence to a strict ethical code. (Matthew 5:28)

  • John 8:3-11  What would Jesus do? (Genre: Gospel Narrative: Action)
    • Important because
      • It answers the question regarding adultery (punishable by stoning in Jesus’ day): “What would Jesus do?” Again, extrapolation is possible to discern Jesus’ view of same-sex practitioners.
    • Jesus, concerned for the woman’s eternal good, allows her time to repent. “Sin no more!” still shows a strict sexual ethic.

  • 1 Corinthians 6:9-11  How serious is sexual immorality? (Genre: Letter: Teaching)
    • Important because
      • It warns that sexual immorality has eternal consequences.
      • In 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 Paul includes those who practice the homosexual lifestyle among those who will not inherit the kingdom of God. “Malakoi’ (literally ‘soft to the touch’) refers to the passive partner in homosexual sex. Revisionists claim: “These verses refer to pederasty (the practice of keeping a catamite – a boy kept for sexual relations with a man), and therefore have nothing to say concerning the current debate as to whether consensual, monogamous gay relationships are an acceptable Christian option.” Whether or not this is so, what is clear is that what is being prohibited here are actions – homosexual behaviour not orientation.
      • Paul uses two words to describe homosexuals who are amongst those who will not be in heaven: malakoi, literally ‘soft’, hence ‘effeminate’, and arsenokoitai, literally ‘male-bed(ders)’. “These are the two words used in the Greek translation of Leviticus 18 v 22 and 20 v 13, suggesting that Paul is referring back to those two passages. Arsenokoitai, then is a general term for same-sex sex, and its pairing with malakoi indicates that Paul is addressing both the active and passive
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partners in homosexual sex.” 369 (Allberry)

- “Homosexuality sin is not inescapable...” (v. 11) These forms of behaviour are not appropriate for the Corinthian Christians precisely because it is not who they are any more. Some of them had been active homosexuals...But no more... However ingrained it may be in someone’s behaviour, homosexual conduct is not inescapable. It is possible for someone living a practicing gay lifestyle to be made new by God. Temptations and feelings may well linger. That Paul is warning his readers not to revert to their former way of life suggests there is still some desire to. But in Christ we are no longer who we were...What defined us then no longer defines us now.” 370 (Alberry)

**Galatians 5:19-21** What are the eternal consequences of sexual immorality (and other ‘fleshly behaviour’)? (Genre: Letter: Exhortation)

- Important because
  - It concerns the expected lifestyle of believers in Christ under grace (1 Timothy 1:8-10; 1 Corinthians 6:9-10; Romans 1:26-27)
  - It states the seriousness of sexual sin. “Now the works of the flesh are evident: sexual immorality, impurity, sensuality, idolatry, sorcery, enmity, strife, jealousy, fits of anger, rivalries, dissensions, divisions, envy, drunkenness, orgies, and things like these. I warn you, as I warned you before, that those who do such things will not inherit the kingdom of God.”

**1 Timothy 1:4b-11** What role does the Law play in the teaching about the Gospel? (Genre: Letter: Teaching)

- Important because
  - It shows that the Law’s condemnation of immorality supports the Gospel.
  - In 1 Timothy 1:8-10 ‘practising homosexuality’ is one example among many of the lifestyle of those who break the law of God. ‘arsenokoites’ (literally ‘male in a bed’) refers to a person who engages in homosexual sex – particularly the active partner.
  - “All these practices contradict ‘sound doctrine’ and the gospel. They go against the grain of the new identity we have in Christ.” 371 (Allberry)

**1 Thessalonians 4:3-10** How should we behave today? (Genre: Exhortation)

- Important because
  - It reminds us of our Christian duty to avoid all immorality. (Romans 12:9; Hebrews 12:1)

b) Paul’s Teaching in Romans

- “Paul has a category in which sex is rightfully exercised and enjoyed—in marriage between a man and a woman—and another category in which it’s not: for those outside such a marriage. His categories are not heterosexual and homosexual; they are married or unmarried. We impart so much of our culture into the way we read the Bible that it keeps us from hearing the text.” 372 (Michael Holmes, Bethel University)

- Paul’s thesis is that people have suppressed the truth about God, even after they had formerly known it, which had led to idolatry (a lie concerning who God is), which in turn had encouraged same-sex immorality (a lie about what God had created), which in turn had resulted in spiritual death in the form of various ‘pay-backs’ of decadent behaviours. By exchanging the truth for a lie at each turn, they had violated nature and become unnatural in their behaviour and stood condemned and thus liable ultimately to exclusion from the Kingdom of Heaven. Mutuality does not imply moral goodness for Paul.
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• **Idolatry** in the Bible always involves a strong element of **role-reversal**; the creature perverting nature by making the Creator in his own image. “According to Romans 1:20ff anarchic or **disordered**, anonymous or depersonalized **desire flows from idolatry**. Idolatry means worshipping the creature [creation?], including sex, not the Creator. It makes good things into gods,” e.g. Eros, the god of sex. 373 (Gordon Preece)

c) A Theological Basis for Marriage

• **Human marriage is meant to reflect something of God’s nature.** Deuteronomy 6:4, “The Lord is one”, “is an assertion about God’s nature. He is One. There is a unity to him. He is of a piece. We see in the Bible that this God is Trinity – he is Father, Son and Holy Spirit. **Three different persons.** But all that this [relational] triune God is, does, and says is **perfectly integrated. One.** This very same word is used in Genesis 2 v 24 to describe the union of the man and woman in marriage. They become one (‘ehad) flesh… **God’s oneness is not sameness**, as though the three persons of the Trinity were identical to one another. It is **unity in difference, not uniformity.** And the same is true of the union of a man sand a woman.” 374 (Sam Allberry) Not for nothing, then, is marriage celebrated as **Holy Matrimony**.

• **This one-flesh union is designated to be the way in which Adam and Eve fulfill God’s command to “be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth.”** From this union flows the possibility of new life – for children result from it… [Thus Malachi wrote] ‘Has not the Lord made them one? In flesh and spirit they are his. And why one? Because he was seeking godly offspring’ (Malachi 2 v 15). **Procreation** is not the sole purpose of marriage (those unable to have children are no less married because of that), but it is clear that procreation is intended to be **rooted in complementary (heterosexual) marriage**.

• **Marriage also reflects the grace that, in Christ, God shows to his people.** Paul, speaking of a man and his wife becoming one flesh, calls it “a profound mystery. But I am talking about Christ ad the church.” (Ephesians 5 v 32) “Human marriage is a reflection of this supreme, heavenly marriage between Christ and his people. It is one of the reasons why Christians are resistant to allowing marriage to be defined in such a way as to include gay couples. A man and man, or a woman and a woman, cannot reflect the union of Christ and the church…

• **The Bible’s teaching on sex and marriage is the foundation for how Christians think about the whole issue of sexuality today.**” 376

d) The Seriousness of Homosexual Sin

• **When God tells Israel, “You shall be Holy to me for I the Lord am Holy”, he is not simply calling for purity of living, or even separation from the pagan nations (Israel’s holiness as ‘separateness’ from the profane). He is calling for separateness to himself as Creator.** Katy Smith notes: “The purpose of separation within God’s handiwork is to provide order within creation as well as distinguishing between different parts, so that each part of creation has its role.” 377 Leviticus provides **rules against any behaviour that** obscures such separation or **confuses the distinctions** made by God in his order of creation.

• **Every text that treats the issue of homosexual practice in Scripture treats it as a high offence abhorrent to God.** Note: It is one of several sins described as ‘an abomination’ in God’s eyes. The others are: idolatry – thoughts and acts of the wicked – fortune telling – dishonest business practices (a false balance)
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– lying (being devious) – arrogance – adultery – remarrying a divorced wife – murder – sowing discord among brothers – condemning the righteous – anything which is exalted by men – sacrifices of the wicked – prayers of those deaf to God’s law – cross-dressing. If all these other behaviours are equally abhorrent to God according to Scripture, the Bible can hardly be described as ‘homophobic’ (Scottish police have declined Gideons Bibles because they ‘condemned homosexuality’; “Bibles are ‘homophobic, Scots Police told”378). See Galatian 5:19-21 above.

• The complementary otherness of creation ordinance is the foundation of sexual relations. Taking away the two gender basis for sexual union leaves no moral basis for limits to what kind of sexual unions are permissible. Anything goes! Note: the violation of foundational matters is thus worse than the violation of structures built on that foundation.

• Incest is wrong because it flouts the ‘otherness’ of sexual bonding because of the involvement of close relatives; even more does homosexual sex flout this ‘otherness’.

• Human sexual differentiation and pairing is uniquely integrated into the image that humankind shares with God. One cannot engage in any extra-marital sexual behaviour without doing harm to this divine imprint.

• Homosexual practice has eternal consequences.

e) Conclusions Regarding Biblical Teaching

• “The whole sweep of scripture is, without exception or deviation, a heterosexual narrative from the creation of Adam and Eve, through the poetic affirmation of heterosexual love in the Song of Songs, right up to the finale of the book, when Revelation concludes using a heterosexual metaphor to speak of the return of Christ (Revelation 22:17).” 379 (Greg Downes)

• “At the heart of a biblical theology of sexuality [is] a story of warped desires being disciplined and reordered. The breaking of the proper relationship of mutual love and companionship between husband and wife is explicitly cited as a result of the Fall (Genesis 3:16); after this, while the remnants of God's good gift of sexuality will occasionally be celebrated (as in the Song of Songs), the broader biblical witness is more about difficult and demanding sexual disciplines. When Jesus commends faithful monogamous marriage, his disciples are simply incredulous - this calling is impossible! (Matthew 19:10); when Paul gives advice about marriage and singleness, it is not about fulfillment, but about the disciplining of desires (1 Corinthians 7:1-9); ... In later Christian tradition, marriage was understood as an ascetic practice, a way of training oneself to be fit for heaven.” 380 (Steve Holmes, theological teacher)

• "Same-sex intercourse falls short of the Christian ethical ideal, because it is a deficient act in the wrong context." It is a deficient act because it "loses the symbolic dimension of two-becoming-one present in male-female sex." And it is in the wrong context because it "introduces into the friendship bond the language of exclusivity and permanence that properly belongs solely to marriage." 381 (Stanley Grenz, Evangelical theologian)

• Why is homosexual practice wrong? Condemned by Scripture primarily because it ignores the divine design in nature, accelerates immoral behaviour in society and places the homosexual’s own relationship with the Creator in jeopardy.
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• The biblical proscription of same-sex intercourse, like those against incest, adultery, and bestiality, is absolute (encompassing all cases), pervasive (by both Testaments and within each Testament) and severe (mandating exclusion from God’s kingdom). \(^{382}\) (Gagnon)

• Homosexual practice violates God’s purposes for human sexuality
  o Homosexual activity is neither the only nor indeed the typical form of our falling short in this area of sexuality (cf. Moses provision of divorce because of adultery), but it is a fundamental deviation from God’s purposes. Every text in Scripture treating sexual matters, whether narrative, law, proverb, poetry, moral exhortation, or metaphor, presupposes a male-female prerequisite for all sexual activity.
  o The Bible presents the anatomical, sexual, and procreative complementarity of male and female as clear proof of God’s will for sexual unions. In its unnatural use of human anatomy, same sex activity is not ‘fit for purpose’. “Essentially, the biblical argument is the natural law argument; what God wants for us is inscribed in our bodies and our natures.” (Julie Rubio, Catholic Moral Theology, Symposium on SSM: Evolution?)

---

Part 4
Homosexuality And The Church

A. The Issues At Stake
B. Church under attack from gay protest groups.
   a. What’s It All About?
      • A question of authority: “Where does authority lie in the church?”
      • Where is Our culture Heading?
      • Background: The Kirk’s ‘mixed economy’
      • “The Church decides what is and what is not the Word of God.”
   b. The Traditionalist Stance
      • Reason for Opposing Homosexual Behaviour
      • Who Wants The New Morality Anyway?
      • ‘Homophobic’ Charge?

B. Arguments For Same-Sex Practice
   a. Arguments From Observation and Experience
      • Negativism Alienates Youth and Undermines Mission
      • Inclusive Church: Stigma Makes Church Seem Unwelcoming to Homosexuals
      • Experience and ‘Good’ Gay Relationships
      • Revisionists Take Note! How Easy is Monogamy for Gay Men?
   b. Arguments From Theology
      • Jesus The Word and Primacy of Love” Jesus the Living Word (rather than an ancient book!)
        So what would Jesus say today?” “Jesus taught the primacy of love. Aren’t we too judgemental and not loving enough?”
      • A Gospel of (Cheap) Grace. “God accepts you just as you are!”
      • Our Presuppositions affect Our Interpretation of Scriptures.
      • Re-interpretations of Texts
      • Charges of Inconsistency against The Traditionalist Opposition to Homosexual Practice
      • The Church’s Change of Mind on Slavery and Other Issues
      • “The Spirit Leading Towards Acceptance of Same Sex Unions’”
      • ‘Committed to each other, therefore its OK!’
      • SSM Has Equal Covenantal Authority with Heterosexual Marriage.
   c. Arguments From Science
      • Scripture and Scientific Progress
      • A disease model of homosexuality is condescending to gays.

D. Same Sex Conundrum: Embracing Truth While Practicing Grace
   a. Balance Grace and Truth: Beware The Error of:
      • The Sadducees (grace without truth)
      • The Pharisees (truth without grace)
   b. Distinguish the different contexts in which homosexuality is experienced
      • Unwanted same-sex attraction
      • Tolerated same-sex practice of others – “all are welcome” (in an inclusive church)
      • Celebrated same-sex practice, but within ‘a loving faithful committed relationship’.
      • Vociferous campaigning of gay activists.
      • Promiscuous same-sex practice.
   c. Diverse Attitudes to Those with SS attraction (Ex-Gay Christian’s Testimony):
      • Affirming a false identity
      • Judging a sinful behaviour
      • Inviting to freedom in Jesus

D. Church Membership of Those in Same-Sex Relationships
   a. Accommodation or Compromise?
      • Accommodation Arguments: Even if we think homosexual practice is a sin,
        • “Is this really an issue worth dividing the church over?”
        • “There are more important things about which to be concerned.”
        • “Doesn’t love and commitment at least moderate the severity of homosexual practice”
      • ‘Compromise’: look faithful (“it’s a sin”) but tolerate practice (“no worse than other sins”).
   b. The Question of Homosexual Adherents
      • Welcome to attend only?
      • Pro-active effort to minister to those with SSA
   c. The Question of Homosexual Members
      • “The Church is as inclusive as other institutions in society”
      • “How can homosexuals cease to find church a dangerous place?”
      • Conditions of membership
      • Critique of Arguments for Granting Membership (Gagnon)
        • “Having a ‘stable relationship’ justifies homosexual practice.”
        • “The church is not a citadel of the perfect but a hospital for sinners”
        • “Homosexual intercourse is not as bad as some other sins.”
        • “Many practicing gay Christians exhibit the Spirit in their lives.”
        • “Excommunicating practising homosexual persons is impractical and unenforceable.”
4. HOMOSEXUALITY AND THE CHURCH

[See Biblical Authority: Understandings within The Church]

Note:

Italics: Gay/Revisionist assertions.  R: Traditionalist responses

‘Revisionists’ refers to those who claim not that the Bible is wrong (as old-fashioned liberals maintained) but that it needs to be ‘properly’ understood so as to ‘reveal what it really teaches’.

-------------------------

“Homosexuality may be the single most divisive issue in the western church today.”  383
- Barry Seagren

“We are living in the midst of a massive revolution in morality, and sexual morality is at the center of this revolution. But the question of same-sex relationships and sexuality is at the very center of the debate over sexual morality, and our answer to this question will both determine or reveal what we understand about everything the Bible reveals and everything the church teaches — even the gospel itself.”  384
- Albert Mohler

“Ralph McInerny once offered a brilliant definition of the gay rights movement: self-deception as a group effort. Nevertheless, deception of the general public is also vital to the success of the cause. And nowhere are the forms of deception more egregious, or more startlingly successful, than in the campaign to persuade Christians that, to paraphrase the title of a recent book, Jesus Was Queer, and churches should open their doors to same-sex lovers…”  385
- Ronald G Lee

“To expect that everyone will live in conformity to scriptural standards is biblical; to expect or claim that everyone will experience grace in exactly the same way is to infringe upon God’s sovereignty.”  386
- Michael Holmes

“Nowhere in either the Old or New Testament is homosexual practice considered something good… The churches [must] have the courage to resist the pressure by secular society to change… Christians [need] to resist secular pressures from with the church where some are motivated solely by emotion and sympathy for relatives and friends with homosexual desires, rather than listening to and obeying the Word of God.”  387
- David W. Torrance

Bp. Michael Nazir-Ali, well known for his traditionalist stance on marriage, was recently told by a revisionist at a C. of E. meeting:

‘There is no room for someone like you in an inclusive church.’  388

383 Barry Seagren, Address, (Sermon communicated privately to the compiler, 2013)
THE ISSUES AT STAKE

a) The Sexual Revolution

- Church under attack from gay protest groups.
  - Choice on offer to the Church by the secular media/political establishment: “Bow to our will and we’ll say how enlightened and nice you are; refuse and we’ll attack you as sinister bigots.”
  - Archbishop Carey’s 1998 Easter sermon disrupted by gay activists. Peter Tatchell (Outrage leader) climbed into Canterbury Cathedral’s pulpit alongside the Archbishop shouting: “Dr. Carey supports discrimination against lesbian and gay human rights. This is not Christian teaching. It is wrong for Dr. Carey to oppose an equal age of consent... Archbishop Carey’s opposition to gay civil rights is a perversion of Christ’s Gospel of love and compassion.”

- The Challenge of SSM Legislation to Traditional Christian Teaching. “The danger in this situation is that Christians respond primarily – or even solely – on the basis of their responses to these social changes.
  - Those who are more socially conservative can then appear bitter and reactionary,
  - Others can argue that God is teaching us new things which are part of his work of inclusion and welcoming the outcasts.
  - Perhaps the majority of Christians, aware of their own and the church’s past failings in relation to sexuality (particularly their treatment of those who are same sex attracted), simply become confused and lose the confidence they previously had in traditional Christian teaching once it becomes counter-cultural to express such views.” (Andrew Goddard)

a) What’s It All About? Today’s Moral Confusion Among Christians

- A Question of Authority
  - A question of authority: “Where does authority lie in the church? Is decision-making in the church to be controlled by the Word of God in Scripture, as has been believed through the ages – or is it to be controlled by our own wisdom, by contemporary mores or by social pressure?” (David Randall, Snr)

Welcome?

When discussing “welcoming and affirming the presence and ministry of gay people” (Church of England College of Bishops re the Pilling Report)

clear distinctions need to be made between:

- Welcoming someone’s presence within the church, (all should be agreed)
- An assumption of Christian fellowship,
- Endorsement of their lifestyle,
- Affirming their ministry.

---

• **Cultural shift:** “We live in an age where we see evidence of cultural decline, the erosion of values, the decline of civility, the denial of truth and the elevation of unreason. Many people are asking, ‘Where is our culture heading?’” 393 (Bill Muehlenberg, ethicist, author and media commentator)

• **The Cultural Philosophy:** “It is no surprise that the numbers are growing [of those moving away from the traditional view of the Bible’s teaching] as we live in times where there is a theological paradigm shift happening in the Church on the issue. It is more than a coincidence that this theological shift is mirroring a massive cultural shift in society at large, where in the space of one generation attitudes to homosexuality have gone from prohibition to tolerance, and now to celebration. What’s more, the relativist society in which we live ensures that there is an absolutism in this new sexual ethic, one in which there is very little tolerance for any dissenting voices. So how do we know what is true when there are conflicting voices from people who command our respect within the evangelical constituency?” 394 (Greg Downes)

---

**The Culture of Relativism**

“In those days Israel had no king; all the people did whatever seemed right in their own eyes.”

*Judges 21:25*

“Relativism is the philosophical position that all points of view are equally valid, and that all truth is relative to the individual… Under the umbrella of relativism, whole groups of perspectives are categorized:

- **cognitive relativism** (truth) - Cognitive relativism affirms that all truth is relative. This would mean that no system of truth is more valid than another one, and that there is no objective standard of truth. It would, naturally, deny that there is a God of absolute truth.

- **moral/ethical relativism** - All morals are relative to the social group within which they are constructed.

- **situational relativism** - Ethics (right and wrong) are dependent upon the situation…

It is becoming so pervasive that if you speak out against moral relativism [and any of its applications] and its "anything goes" philosophy, you're labeled as an intolerant bigot…

Society cannot flourish nor survive in an environment where everyone does what is right in his own eyes…

*Without a common foundation of truth and absolutes, our culture will become weak and fragmented.*” 393

---

• **Background: The Kirk’s ‘Mixed Economy’**

A generalised overview of the position in recent history:

- “[Conservatives] believe and submit to the authority of the Bible as the infallible written Word of God. This has a tendency to solidify doctrine and ethics as a fixed body of truth and right actions for all time.

- [Liberals] see the Bible as a record of the experiences of God’s people, bound by the times it was written in, and not necessarily infallible in the views it records. This has a tendency to keep doctrine and ethics more fluid, an evolving body of truth and right actions that can be changed over time in line with new insights, spiritual experiences and changes in society.

The acceptance of these broad views is the true mixed economy the Kirk has accepted for more than 100 years.” 396 (James Miller)

• **“The Church decides what is and what is not the Word of God.”** Consequences:

- Speaks with a divided voice, being uncertain about what is truly the Word of God.

- Loses authority to speak to the world.

- Simply echoes what the world is saying.

- Ceases to be ‘salt’, (no longer proclaiming to the world the mind of Christ).

---
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396 James Miller, letter to *The Herald*, 23/5/13
Three Clear Positions

1. For some tolerating homosexual lifestyles is being ‘Christian’, since such behaviour is because ‘that’s they way they are’, and the church should always be inclusive.

   Others believe “Tolerance for gays is not and cannot be enough;

2. Churches must either preach against the sin of homosexuality and help those caught in the bondage of that sin,

   or

3. They must fight for justice on behalf of the oppressed gay minority.

   There is no middle ground on this issue.”

   (Gene B. Chase, Professor of Mathematics)

• A More Nuanced Approach

  o “In today’s polarized climate it seems most of us either condemn homosexuals as evil corrupters of society or we fawn over them as noble victims and cultural heroes. We either accuse them of “choosing” to be “wicked sexual deviants,” or we claim – utterly without evidence – that “gayness” is an inborn, genetic trait. Reality, however, lies somewhere else. Deep down, people of conscience know homosexuality is neither an innocent, inborn “minority” characteristic like skin color, nor a conscious choice to become evil and to corrupt others. But without understanding what we’re really dealing with, we’re not only powerless to help others but easily confused and corrupted ourselves.”

   (David Kupelian, editor of Whistleblower magazine)

  o “Homosexual sin is incredibly serious, but it is not alone in being so. It is wicked, but so is greed. God will judge those who indulge in it. But he will also judge thieves… If we are to be faithful to Scripture, we must preach against theft, greed, drunkenness, reviling, and defrauding others, many of which are also trivialized in western society.”

   (Sam Allberry)

b) The Traditionalist Stance

People with SSA in Church

1. Statistically people with Same Sex Attraction can be expected to be present in most congregations.

   If 1.67% of UK’s population is gay, expect a ratio of 1:60 in an average congregation.

   Note:

   60 was the size when a Synagogue congregation (in earlier times) and Brethren Assembly (in modern times) used to split to form 2 groups.

   Traditionalists distinguish ‘welcome’ (of a person) from ‘affirmation’, ‘celebration’, and ‘advocacy’ (of a lifestyle)

• Sin Innate, Not Homosexuality!

  o Since the Fall, all have been born with sin in their nature. Nature itself has been affected by the entrance of sin into the world. Homosexual practice is just one example of sinful behaviour produced by inborn sinfulness – acting in a manner not in accordance with our Creator’s

---


declared design for human life. **Homosexual desire** may arise from some **same-sex attraction** developed in childhood; but it is not innate (no ‘gay gene’!) though, because all creation (including nature) is affected by the **Fall**, there may be biological factors that contribute to it.

- **Why Homosexual Behaviour is a Morally Serious Matter**
  - It is **offensive to God** and **forbidden by Him** and should therefore be **shunned by His people**.
  - “Paul is clear: **homosexual conduct leads people to destruction.** To teach otherwise (as a number of purportedly Christian leaders sadly do) is tantamount to sending people to hell. This is a **gospel issue.**” 400 (Allberry)

- ‘**Homophobic**' Charge?
  - Avoid any irrational fear of, **aversion to,** or **discrimination** against homosexuals per se.
  - Commitment to include active homosexuals in a community does not preclude the **call to them to transform their behaviour** within that community.

- **Homosexuality’s Shame: The Elephant In The Room**
  - “Archbishop Rowan Williams insists that Christians need to overcome their own feelings of embarrassment, shame and disgust about homosexuality. Does this include those of us who have practiced and lived out a full homosexual lifestyle and who, having heard the Gospel message and become Christians, have chosen to reject **homosexual practice and ideologies**? There are many shameful and disgusting aspects to homosexual practice which **our society fails to face head on and discuss**, as some learn too late to their own detriment. Christ’s message was to call people to the truth and in doing so to see people set free to live a fuller life, not a diminished one. At the risk of appearing bigoted, intolerant and even homophobic, maybe the Christian community in our nation, born out of a genuine compassion and Christ-centred love, needs rather to **reach out to homosexually attracted people by standing more firmly on the promises and truths of Scripture and, in so doing, see more same-sex attracted men and women come to live a fuller life based on their eternal identity rather than one that limits them to merely sexual attraction.” 401 (James Parker)

c) **Women’s Ordination and Gay Priests**

- **Is there a link with Feminism?** Bp. Gene Robinson’s life story is documented in the film “For The Bible Tells Me So” which makes a link between sexism and anti-gay prejudice, contending that, "at its root, the hatred of gays is driven by a hatred and second-class status of women," 402 (Robinson, who made a similar point at a secret retreat for gay RC priests: "I had said to them, 'It's too dangerous for you to come out as gay to your superiors, but I believe that if you work for the ordination of women in your church, you will go a long way toward opening the door for the acceptance of gay priests.'”) (About 75 Catholic clergy from around the U.S. participated without notifying their bishops or provincial leaders.) 403

### B. ARGUMENTS FOR SAME-SEX PRACTICE

**“Surely There Are More Serious Sins To Worry About?”**

“This **homosexuality is only a marginal issue** in the Bible, therefore no fuss should be made about it.” This **confuses frequency with importance.** [See 3.C.c) – The Seriousness of Homosexual Sin]

That the Bible “hardly ever” discusses homosexual behaviour must reflect the fact that **homosexuals constitute a small minority** of the population.

---

400 Allberry, *Idem*
401 James Parker, “Rowan Williams Is Wrong On Homosexuality”, *The Daily Telegraph*, 01/07/12
a) Arguments From Observation and Experience

- **Personal Acquaintance with Gays: such ‘Nice’ Guys!**
  - “How can you tell such a ‘nice guy’ as the gay next door who does so much good in the community that he’s living in sin?” “The simple truth of the matter is that Christians who are fruitful in many areas still sin and their fruitfulness in those other areas doesn’t suddenly validate their sin. I’m a pretty decent chap and you’ll find lots of people who will tell you how marvelously pastoral I am. At the same time speak to my family and they’ll tell you that I can be a selfish, angry, lazy person at the best of times. Does the fact that I’ve helped so many people and done so much for charity (don’t like to talk about it) mean that my selfish, lazy moments are actually OK and even good?”  

- **Negativism Alienates Youth and Undermines Mission**
  - “A negative traditionalist attitude towards homosexuals alienates youth and undermines the Church’s mission.” It is Liberal Christianity, rather than Evangelical Christianity, that is a small and rapidly declining section of the otherwise flourishing world-wide church. [See 2.C.d) – Arguments About Trends] The young are more susceptible to wrong ideas anyway, (e.g. Rehoboam’s young advisers, I Ks 12).
  - Social change is never a sufficient reason for theological change. It is the embracing of social movements as ‘the work of the Spirit’ that endangers the Church’s witness and discipleship. Those in thrall to a revisionist agenda will always perceive traditionalists as counter-cultural, fundamentalist or bigoted.

- **‘Queer’ Stigma Makes Church Seem Unwelcoming to Homosexuals**
  - “Too often, those who seek to enter an exclusive, same-sex relationship have found themselves stigmatized and excluded by the Church. I have come to believe this is an injustice and out of step with God’s character as seen through Christ.”  

- **Experience and ‘Good’ Gay Relationships**
  - “My experience of good same-sex relationships suggests the validity of same sex marriage.” Experience is neither normative nor insignificant. “As believers in the gift of revelation and the power of reason to discern “the truly human,” we are obligated to carefully consider our experience and test it against the weight of scripture, tradition, and the natural order.”  
  - “Experience is itself a kind of text, and texts need interpreters. How often have we thought that we understood our experiences, only to realize later that we had only the barest understanding of our own motives and impulses? We all know how flexible memory can be, how easy it is to give an overly gentle account of our own motivations, how hard it is to step outside our lifelong cultural training and see with the eyes of another time or place… To take personal experience as our best and sturdiest guide seems like a good way to replicate all of our personal preferences and cultural blind spots. It’s necessary to look at least as hard for alternative

---
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understandings of our experience as for alternative understandings of Scripture.”

“Virtue Ethics’ Finds Much Good in Homosexual Relationships

- “Shouldn’t faithfulness within a relationship be what determines its moral goodness rather than the gender of those involved? A promiscuous gay lifestyle with multiple partners and one-night stands might be wrong, but two people who love each other and are faithful to whatever promises they have made – surely that’s OK?”
- The Problem with ‘Virtue Ethics’: ”There are many relationships which embody some virtues, but could never be celebrated in church. An adulterous relationship may be permanent and have the potential for nurturing children – but it is not faithful. An incestuous one may be permanent, faithful and procreative – but it is not natural. Polygamous relationships may be permanent, faithful and procreative, but they are not exclusive.”

Revisionists Take Note! How Feasible is Monogamy for Gay Men?

- Testimony of a Gay Priest:
  “Just after we agreed to part I met Robert Wilson who had been at an Albany Trust lecture in the City University where he was studying engineering. The subject of the talk was homosexuality, and he thought the lecturer, Fr Fabian Cowper, very handsome, so next day he asked Doreen Cordell, the Trust’s counsellor, if he might see him. ‘He is Roman Catholic and you are an Anglican,’ he was told, ‘so you have to go and see Malcolm Johnson.’ Thank God he did, because we have now been together 43 years. This diary is not sexually explicit, but we soon had to work out what we thought about sexual faithfulness. After a bout of faithfulness we soon realised that most male gay couples need and want sex outside their relationship, and we came to an arrangement and agreement … … I realised that consensual sex between men is not sinful if it causes no pain or hurt to each other or other people. I would not presume to say if this applies to heterosexuals.”

Arguments From Theology

- Created gay? (But nobody is born that way!)
  “God made me this way.” This has been “the major argument gays and lesbians have made for religious affirmation…Thus, if it’s proven sexual orientations are not innate, much of the scaffolding upon which today’s LGBT movement has been built would begin to crumble. Given the stakes, most gays and lesbians are dismissive or hostile toward anyone who doesn’t think being gay is an essential, natural characteristic of some members of the human race.”
  But surprisingly, a group of “scholars of gay history and anthropology…almost all LGBT themselves…have decisively shown that gayness is a product of Western society originating about 150 years ago…Only our society believes people are oriented in just one direction.”


• **Jesus The Word and Love**
  o “*The Word of God is a living person, Jesus (rather than an ancient book, the Bible!) So what would Jesus say today?*” Jesus is the same today as yesterday and His words to us remain the same as recorded in Scripture, which He confirmed as God’s Word. There is no contradiction. [See 3.C. b) - The Key Texts (and their Genres)]
  o “*Jesus taught the primacy of love. Aren’t we too judgemental and not loving enough?*” “Archbishop Carey’s opposition to gay civil rights is a perversion of Christ’s Gospel of love and compassion.”
  
  (Peter Tatchell). Love must be married with passion for God’s holiness (e.g. Jesus in the Temple, and his injunction to his disciples to “*shake of the dust from your shoes*” where people rejected his message). The Christian is called to love everyone and seek the salvation of all people including homosexuals. But this ethic of love for the person has been confused with a notion of tolerance of any behaviour he or she may exhibit.

• **Inclusive Church:**
  o “*All are welcome! – regardless of race, class, or sexual orientation!*” This should be true of the church visible. But there are conditions concerning. “But the gateway to life,” according to Jesus, “is very narrow and the road is difficult, and only a few ever find it.” (Matthew 7 v. 14) Since the church invisible is made up only of those who have found life, it means not all are eligible for membership of Christ’s Body. All congregations should understand this crucial gospel distinction.

• **A Gospel of Grace.**
  o “*God accepts you just as you are!*” is a distortion of the Gospel of grace – it is cheap grace! God does not accept men and women as they are! There is a condition for inclusion in the Kingdom of God - the demand to acknowledge sin, repent and accept Jesus as Lord!

• **Our Presuppositions affect Our Interpretation of Scriptures.**
  o “*Once it is recognized that our views on homosexuality are more determined by what we bring to the Biblical text than what we find in that text, the way will be clear for the churches to formulate a positive position on homosexual intercourse.*”
  
  (See Pim Pronk) Eisegesis is a tendency both sides are prone to, but robust application of exegetical principles can greatly diminish it. [See 3.B.a) - Crucial Tenets of Hermeneutics]

• **Re-interpretations of Texts**
  o “*Weren’t the biblical injunctions aimed exclusively at exploitative practices?*” [See 3.B.b) – Skewed Hermeneutics]

• **Charges of Inconsistency against The Traditionalist Opposition to Homosexual Practice**
  o Scripture Texts: “*Other practices condemned which we don’t hesitate to follow today. So why get het up over rules forbidding homosexual acts?*” Other practices were prohibited in the Purity Code for reasons that do not apply today, chiefly because then they needed to reflect the need for God’s people to be seen as ‘different’ in their moral behaviour from their godless neighbours. [See 3.B.b) – Skewed Hermeneutics]

• **The Church’s Change of Mind on Slavery and Other Issues**
  o “*The Bible approves of slavery and the subjugation of women and the Church has moved on from these issues? If we have changed our minds about slavery, divorce, interest and women’s ministry, why can’t we change our minds on homosexuality? Surely it is consistent and logical to now champion gay rights.*” Each issue must be judged on its own merits. On the issues quoted the

412 Spoken at Peter Tatchell’s disruption of Archbishop Carey’s Easter sermon in 1998. Tatchell was subsequently fined £18.60 (a whimsical allusion to the ecclesiastical law of 1860 that forbids demonstrations in churches) plus costs.

Bible provides debatable evidence, but on same-sex intercourse it provides no dubiety: it is forbidden. The principle of semper reformanda does not support every ‘progressive’ change. While many changes on ‘debatable’ issues have some biblical support, even some gay lobbyists admit the entire Bible evidence is against such a change on homosexual practice. “While the Bible does not repudiate slavery directly, as the book of Philemon reveals, the biblical view of humanity inevitably leads Christians to abolish slavery and find other ways to deal with debtors and prisoners of war (Philemon 1:15-16). Likewise the Bible’s view of women, emerging from the misogyny of the prevailing cultural norms, culminates in the radical equality we see in the New Testament (Galatians 3:28). With homosexual practice, we see no such development, nor does the Bible allow for the possibility of one. The Bible is uniformly negative about it. What’s more, unlike the issues of slavery and gender, it does not relate to a person’s God-given worth but is a prohibition against a lifestyle that is chosen (even though same-sex attraction is clearly not).”  

414 (Gregg Downes) [See 3.B.b) – Skewed Hermeneutics]

• “The Spirit Leading Towards Acceptance of SS Unions”
  o “Opponents of change may be dismayed by the growing number of theologians, and congregations, who believe that some same-sex unions can be spiritually fruitful, or may dismiss this as a passing trend. Yet other people see the journey towards acceptance as an example of the way the Spirit of truth continues to guide followers of Christ (John 16.12-14).”  
  415 (Savitri Hensman, commentator working in Care and Equalities sector) That support for same-sex love can be found from theologians of every stripe may well indicate a shift in thinking of the theological guild. But the Spirit who guided the Biblical writers into truth does not contradict Himself in His leading today into all truth. The key issue remains: “What saith the Scriptures?” And as Peter wrote, “First of all you must understand this, that no prophecy of scripture is a matter of one’s own interpretation, because no prophecy ever came by human will, but men and women moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God.” (2 Peter 1:20)

• “Committed to each other, therefore OK”
  o This principle doesn’t apply to adultery! Why should it apply to homosexual intercourse? (In adulterous situations the moral issue of to whom the involved parties are ‘committed’ is crucial, but the adultery is morally inexcusable.)

• SSM Has Equal Covenantal Authority with Heterosexual Marriage.
  o “Monogamous, permanent same-sex relationships are of equal covenantal authority to heterosexual marriage.” But the template of covenantal marriage is being borrowed and overlain onto a relationship explicitly prohibited by Scripture. Covenanting with someone does not confer sanctity on the relationship, it only strengthens the bond – in this case an unholy bond!

c) Arguments From Science

• Scripture and Scientific Progress
  o “Science has shown homosexual orientation is natural and the Biblical authors mistaken. We don’t need the Bible now!” This is a gay myth. Militant lesbian Camille Paglia warned, “we should be aware of the potentially pernicious intermingling of gay activism with science, which produces more propaganda than truth.”  
  416 [See 1. C. c) – Causation: Nature v. Nurture]
  o “Even if the scientific findings were clear and unequivocal, their relevance to the moral debate would still be less than determinative. The prevalence of a particular behavior pattern has no clear

---
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relevance to the moral evaluation of that pattern; patterns which are common or uncommon may be immoral or moral... The Church's moral concern is not fundamentally with homosexual orientation, but with what one does with it. Only in the case of extreme biological determination at the level of individual acts would moral culpability be seen as obliterated, but homosexual persons are not sub-human robots whose acts are predetermined-- they are moral agents who inherit tendencies from biology and environment, and who share in shaping their character by the responses they make to their life situations. Like all persons, they must ask, "This is what I want to do, but is it what I should do?" The existence of proclivities or predispositions does not obviate the need for moral evaluation of those proclivities... Even if what some proponents of change regard as the most "optimistic" scientific scenario were realized-- that homosexuality was found to be common, utterly unassociated with psychological distress, and the orientation clearly and determinately caused by genetic factors, and the orientation itself utterly immutable-- the traditionalist vision of sexual morality would still have to be engaged on ethical and theological grounds, informed but not decided by science.” 417 (Jones and Yarhouse) Scientific Research on Homosexuality, p. 28-29

- A disease model of homosexuality is condescending to gays.
  - Homosexuality is not an illness: we should look for sexual transformation in those who want to conquer their unwanted feelings, rather than for physical healing.
  - Note: “Research on whether homosexuality is a pathological condition is not formally relevant to the moral debate in the church. Psychological abnormality and immorality are two different things, although sometimes they overlap.” 418 (Jones & Yarhouse)

C. THE SAME SEX CONUNDRUM
Embracing Truth while practicing Grace

“We are united in seeking to be faithful to the Scriptures and the tradition of the Church and in seeking to make a loving, compassionate and respectful response to gay men and women within Church and society.” 419

- College of Bishops, Church of England

  “Try your best to live in peace with everyone.
  Try to be holy. Without holiness no one will see the Lord.
  Be sure that no one misses God’s grace.
  See to it that a bitter plant doesn’t grow up.
  If it does, it will cause trouble. And it will pollute many people.
  See to it that no one commits sexual sins.”

- Heb 12:14-16

"Conduct yourselves with wisdom toward outsiders, the most of the opportunity.
Let your speech always be with grace, seasoned, as it were, with salt, so that you may know how you should respond to each person,”

- Col 4:5-6

---

418 Jones and Yarhouse, Ibid
a) Balance Grace with Truth:

- **Empathy** with the homosexual condition without compromise of truth: hearts must be involved as well as minds. W.P. Campbell, Presbyterian minister in California warns:
  - “Congregations and entire denominations have done a good job of condemning, affirming, or avoiding homosexuality, but how many have fully embraced both the truth and grace Jesus offered?”
  - Beware the error of:
    - The Sadducees (grace without truth)
    - The Pharisees (truth without grace)

Grace Emphasised

The issue for **revisionists**: the extension of God’s love, i.e. inclusiveness (people)
“The Church is trying to… answer the question, how big … is God’s love for all of God’s children.”
- Bp Gene Robinson

Evangelical revisionist Steve Chalke, who blesses civil partnerships, aims at “our churches becoming beacons of inclusion.”

Truth Emphasised

The issue for **traditionalists**: the purity of God’s love, i.e. exclusiveness (sin).

“God’s will is for you to be holy, so stay away from all sexual sin.” (1 Th 4 v. 3 NLT)
“You are not to associate with anyone who claims to be a believer yet indulges in sexual sin.” (1 Cor 5 v.10)

- **The homosexual search for love** – cf. some hymn themes that lend themselves to this application:
  - “O love that will not let me go…” (Pain, angst)
  - “O Jesus, I have promised…” (Commitment)
  - “Let there be love shared among us…” (Reality)

---

420 Empathy: The capacity to recognize human feelings that are being experienced by another (not simply understanding truths about a condition / behaviour)
422 *Ibid*, p. 50f
425 “O Love that will not let me go, I rest my weary soul in Thee;
I give Thee back the life I owe, that in Thine ocean depths its flow May richer, fuller be.…
O Joy that seekest me through pain, I cannot close my heart to Thee;
I trace the rainbow through the rain, and feel the promise is not vain That morn shall tearless be.”
- George Matheson (1842-1906)

426 “O Jesus, I have promised to serve Thee to the end; Be Thou for ever near me, my master and my friend;
I shall not fear the battle if Thou art by my side,
Nor wander from the pathway if Thou wilt be my guide.
O let me feel Thee near me; the world is ever near;
I see the sights that dazzle, the tempting sounds I hear;
My foes are ever near me, around me and within;
But, Jesus, draw Thou nearer, and shield my soul from sin…
O give me grace to follow my master and my friend.”
- J.E Bode (1816-74)

427 “Let there be love shared among us, let there be love in our eyes…
Give us a fresh understanding of brotherly love that is real.”
- D. Bilbrough
• Can we be civil? – Skyline Church’s ‘Conversation on Marriage’ (Bp. Jean Robinson v Robert Gagnon 2012)
  o “Too often disagreement is misconstrued as hate. That's entirely NOT TRUE. I was seeking a way to convey my love but still stand strong morally. It's much easier to just ‘live and let live’, but that's not love.” (nehifamily, amazon.com, 28/08/12)
  o “That book!” – the question of biblical authority: how crucial? Where is God’s voice heard today? Division in the Church: Those who deplore “God’s Word abandoned!” v. those who claim “God still speaking through His Spirit!”
  o The question of interpretation: how to handle context and share understandings graciously (rather than dogmatically)?
  o In study groups asking questions as well as sharing beliefs and experiences.

b) Distinguish the different contexts in which homosexuality is experienced:

• Distinguish homosexual orientation / preference from homosexual practice. “Sexual orientation is different from sexual behavior because it refers to feelings and self-concept. Persons may or may not express their sexual orientation in their behaviors.” (-American Psychological Association) [See I.C. – The Nature of Homosexuality]

The Homosexual Spectrum

1. Unwanted same-sex attraction – struggle against temptations – goal: change in sexual orientation, or celibacy through control of SSA.
2. Tolerated same-sex practice of others – motive: “all are welcome” (in an inclusive church) – seen as marginalized - goal: include in all church life ,
3. Celebrated same-sex practice, but within ‘a loving faithful committed relationship’ – goal: accept same-sex unions as equal with heterosexual unions.
4. Vociferous campaigning of gay activists promoting an agenda - goal: to change society.

Range of Appropriate Responses and Emphases

A. Pastoral (individuals with SSA) – grace
B. Evangelistic (sharing the Good News for those with SSA) – truth about grace
C. Educational (Christian understanding and responsibilities in this area) – truth
D. Apologetic (making the case for a Biblical view of human sexuality) – truth
E. Campaigning (lobbying for Christian codes of practice in legislation) - truth

428 “As a response to the toxicity that has been created by this searing social issue we wanted to create a civil dialogue where both sides could present their case for and against same-sex marriage. We brought prominent advocates on both sides emphasizing both religious and secular / philosophical arguments. 1,500 people witnessed a very civil and respectful yet ground-breaking dialogue on a very heated social topic.” For video of the complete debate see http://vimeo.com/47223269.
430 According to Robinson, “context means everything,” and when reading scripture, one should ask: “Is the context described there similar to our context and therefore is eternally binding?” The fallacy here lies in the fact that such ‘timeless’ bindings would only last until a new context arises when, according to Robinson’s logic, they would cease to be binding! Some other criteria is needed to determine the abiding application of any text, such as the nature of the original ‘binding’.
c) **Diverse Attitudes to Those with SS attraction** (Ex-Gay Christian’s Testimony):

1. **Affirming a false identity**
   “[Affirming church] believers can act like a false physician, telling people tempted by homosexuality that same-sex orientation is **part of their identity** and that they should accept it.

2. **Judging a sinful behaviour**
   Or, we can act as **judge, jury, and executioner**, driving them away from the Saviour who loves them. Either way, we risk the same result: **spiritual death**.

3. **Inviting to freedom in Jesus**
   Or we can **respond like Jesus would, with grace and truth**: ‘Come unto me, all who are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest.’ Those words called to me, weary and heavy-laden with sin...Shouldn’t all Christians bear that message of freedom and hope?... Contrary to what some churches teach, it is **homosexuality – and not its suppression – that enslaves** people like me”,
   “It is insufficient for **correct teaching** to be in place if those experiencing SSA are not **embraced and cared for pastorally**. The LGBT world will readily welcome such people and make them feel they belong. Indeed, the Christian gay movement is more than ready to bring into their fold, people who feel the church has let them down because, among other things, **it failed to love them**.”
   (Anon., “Cheated by the Affirming Church”, *Christianity Today*, 1st December 2004)

D. **CHURCH MEMBERSHIP OF THOSE IN SAME SEX RELATIONSHIPS**

   **Note:**
   In considering the question of **homosexuals in the Church**, what follows does not countenance any invasive enquiry about an individual’s lifestyle, which would be generally accepted as abhorrent.
   But the discussion does address the issue of how to relate to those with SSA who **openly espouse homosexual practices** or **declare a SS ‘relationship’**.

a) **Accommodation or Compromise?**

   - **Accommodation Arguments**: Even if we think homosexual practice is a sin,
     - “Is this really an issue worth **dividing the church over**?”
     - “Doesn’t the church have **more important things** about which to be concerned?”
     - “ Doesn’t **love and commitment** at least moderate the severity of homosexual practice?”
   
   **R:** Once one moral boundary is broken down (namely, sexual intimacy outside of **heterosexual marriage**), the question of **overall moral authority also breaks down**, for the standards of measuring moral permissibility are driven by human desires, even if said by some to be led by the Holy Spirit. Thus James: “For whoever keeps the whole law and yet stumbles at just one point is guilty of breaking all of it.” (James 2:10) This confirms that moral authority cannot be retained if we persistently stumble on one part of the law.

   - **‘Compromise’ / Third way: look faithful (“it’s a sin”) but tolerate homosexual practice in the church as “less than the perfect will of God” (“no worse than other sins!”). Encouraged by revisionists as moving an otherwise resistant church to **incremental and transitional steps to normalizing homosexual practice**, i.e. **A compromise provides the transitional bridge to its full acceptance in the church.**

---

432 Anon., “Cheated by the Affirming Church”, *Christianity Today*, 1st December 2004
433 The Church of Scotland requires for admission to the eldership that ‘no relevant objection regarding life or doctrine is made and substantiated’. 
• **Question:** Is the C of S General Assembly’s 2D motion (maintaining the church’s orthodox position on sexuality while allowing congregations to depart from it) 434 **‘the thin edge of the wedge’**, or simply an acknowledgement of the Kirk’s ‘mixed economy’ (broad church)? The Publication in 2012 of *Embracing Truth: Homosexuality and The Word of God*, a collection of traditionalist essays by ministers and laymen of the Church of Scotland and three other Churches, was hailed as “A tremendously helpful contribution to the debate from an orthodox perspective”. 435 yet was not allowed to be sold at the General Assembly of that year or be reviewed in *Life and Work* magazine. Since then, one contributor has left the Kirk; another, however, has become its Moderator Designate. 436

b) The Question of (Openly Practicing) Homosexual Adherents

• **Positive Approach:**
  - Welcome to attend worship and other church activities. As homosexual adherents made to feel ‘at home’, without signing up to a church’s beliefs and behavioural standards,
  - Pro-active effort made to minister to this small but significant section of society.

**Question:** Should they be considered more than just regular guests? When can they join the church and under what circumstances? When should they be considered as belonging to “the household of God”? 437

c) The Question of (Openly Practicing) Homosexual Members

• “*Shouldn’t the Church be as inclusive as other institutions in society?*” **R:** Jesus did teach radical inclusiveness as a core Kingdom value challenging his listeners to reach out to the disadvantaged and poor, etc, - but **not today’s politically correct inclusiveness**, where every minority group that it is fashionable to celebrate must be allowed unchallenged expression however contrary their ideas to Christian truth and morality as taught by Jesus and found in God’s Word. While the church welcomes all people, it cannot affirm all behaviors.

• **How can homosexuals cease to find church such a “dangerous place”?** **R:** We should:
  1. Welcome warmly and embrace any self-affirming homosexual who comes into the church.
  2. Involve homosexual persons appropriately in church life through pro-active outreach and support programmes.

• **Critique of Arguments for Granting Membership** to Practicing, Self-Affirming Homosexual Persons (Points taken from R. Gagnon’s ‘missing’ chapter from *The Bible and Homosexual Practice, deemed ‘too practical’ by the publishers for publication!*) 437 Gagnon is a Presbyterian Professor at Princeton Seminary)
  - “*Having a ‘stable relationship’ justifies homosexual practice.*” **R:** According to the Bible, what is offensive about same-sex intercourse is not that it usually occurs in the setting of unstable relationships but rather that it violates God’s will and nature’s design for the pairing of the sexes.
  - “*The church is not a citadel of the morally perfect; it is a hospital for sinners. Jesus died for gays.*”. **R:** The ‘hospital’ metaphor… does not fit the Jesus who… referred to adultery in one’s heart as an offense for which one could be thrown into hell. We are called to become saints (not ‘saved sinners’ continuing safely in our sins). If authors of the New Testament viewed

---


436 Dr. Angus Morris withdrew from the Moderatorship on health grounds in 2014.

repentance as a precondition for conversion and moral renewal as an essential mark of the Christian life, what justification does the contemporary church have for receiving people into the membership of the church without regard to overt immoral sexual behavior? James wrote to show that the credibility of a statement of faith hinges on behaviour. (James 2:14)

- “Homosexual intercourse is not as bad as some other sins for which people are not denied membership, e.g. violence and materialism.” R: To assert that violence and materialism are worse than sexual immorality is to confuse contemporary ethical valuations with biblical ones. Which causes more long-term pain to a spouse: a single act of domestic violence or a single act of marital infidelity? [Added to which many homosexuals in ‘committed’ relationships have previously deserted their wives on ‘coming out’.]

- “Many practicing homosexual Christians exhibit the presence of the Spirit in their lives. So it can’t be so bad!” R: Sin is sin whether sexual or otherwise and, repented of, can be forgiven. All of us (however spiritual!) are guilty of sin, and open un-repented sin causes harm to the body of Christ and must be brought to book. As fallen people we exhibit both good and bad traits until the day we die. The Spirit is given us to fight against the traits that fall short of God’s standard, ‘the glory of God’ (Rom3:23). (Though note: love must be shown and patience exercised with recent converts who clearly and lamentably ‘fall’ from their avowed intentions, as with other newcomers to church life.)

- “Excommunicating practising homosexual persons is impractical and unenforceable.” R: The church has to be interested in the moral conduct of its members if it is to be something other than just a club for socializing… It has a moral duty to confront in a loving and gentle manner such persons offend the biblically mandated moral standards it is responsible for maintaining.

Gagnon also observes:

- “Membership in the church is not a right. The church has a right to (a) define, on the basis of scripture, minimal standards of belief and conduct and (b) expel or refuse membership to any who cannot subscribe to such standards.” Healthy boundaries between the church (as the sphere of Christ’s dominion) and the world (the sphere of Satan’s rule, in Paul’s view) demand the expulsion of members who trample on the Spirit of holiness.”

- “Given an assessment of same-sex intercourse as sin, the church… has to respond not just to homosexual behaviour but to homosexual persons… out of… humble, compassionate, and self-sacrificial service aimed at effecting the deliverance and transformation of others.”

**Question:** How to balance discipline of behaviour with both compassionate outreach and acceptance of homosexuals (active or not) as persons?

- Alternative Conditions of Membership and Involvement:
  
  **A. Membership status should be granted only to those who commit to the church’s stance on homosexuality.**

  **B.** While all people are welcome as members, there are particular functional roles that carry a requirement to uphold the values of the church.

**Questions:** What are the obligations of ‘being a member of a church’? Are people with same-sex attractions any different from anybody else? How can casual attenders be helped to feel welcomed if they don’t ‘belong’ to a church?

**Note:**

It is unrealistic to expect a high degree of immediate reformation of homosexual persons who have recently renounced their practice.

---

438 John Calvin, The Institutes (Chapter XII, Section 5)
RECOMMENDED RESOURCES

Video: To hear both sides of the debate communicating with each other:
Conversation on Marriage (Skyline Church, Ca. USA) http://vimeo.com/47223269

Books: Short accessible and empathetic introduction to the whole subject by a SSA writer.
Emphasis on truth (without denying the need of grace):
Emphasis on grace (without denying the truth involved):
Encyclopedic study of what Scripture teaches about homosexual behaviour:
The Bible and Homosexual Practice, Robert Gasgon, Abingdon Press, 2001, 522pp
[Note: This very thorough and widely acknowledged study is conveniently summarised in a descriptive review by Paul Burgess in Embracing Truth - see above.]


Historical Writings:
Selling Homosexuality to America, Paul Rondeau, Regent University Law Review, 2002 (Exposé of the gay marketing strategy)

APPENDIX A

Testimony of A Homosexual
Ronald G. Lee

“When I first came out in the 1980s, it was common for gay rights apologists to blame the promiscuity among gay men on "internalized homophobia." Gay men, like African Americans, internalized and acted out the lies about themselves learned from mainstream American culture. Furthermore, homosexuals were forced to look for love in dimly lit bars, bathhouses, and public parks for fear of harassment at the hands of a homophobic mainstream. The solution to this problem, we were told, was permitting homosexuals to come out into the open, without fear of retribution. A variant of this argument is still put forward by activists such as Andrew Sullivan, in order to legitimate same-sex marriage. And it seemed reasonable enough twenty years ago. But thirty-five years have passed since the infamous Stonewall riots of 1969 in New York, the Lexington and Concord of the gay liberation movement. During that time, homosexuals have carved out for themselves public spaces in every major American city, and many of the minor ones as well. They have had the chance to create whatever they wanted in those spaces, and what have they created? New spaces for locating sexual partners.”

“Gay churches survive as places where worshippers can go to sleep it off and cleanse their soiled consciences after a Saturday night spent cruising for sex at the bars. And there is no danger of ever hearing a word from the pulpit suggesting that bar-hopping is inconsistent with believing in the Bible. When I lived in the United Kingdom, I was struck by the extent to which gay culture in London replicated gay culture in the U.S. The same was true in Paris, Amsterdam, and Berlin. Homosexuality is one of America's most successful cultural exports. And the focus on gay social spaces in Europe is identical to their focus in America: sex.”

“Male homosexuals are not promiscuous because of "internalized homophobia," or laws banning same-sex "marriage." Homosexuals are promiscuous because when given the choice, homosexuals overwhelmingly choose
to be promiscuous. And wrecking the fundamental social building block of our civilization, the family, is not going to change that.”

“But isn’t it theoretically possible that homosexuals could restrict themselves to something resembling the traditional Catholic sexual ethic, except for the part about procreation -- in other words, monogamous lifelong relationships? Of course it is theoretically possible. It was also theoretically possible in 1968 that the use of contraceptives could be restricted to married couples, that the revolving downward slide into moral anarchy we have lived through could have been avoided. It is theoretically possible, but it is practically impossible. It is impossible because the whole notion of stable sexual orientation on which the gay rights movement is founded has no basis in fact.”

“Over the years, I have attended various gay and gay-friendly church services. All of them shared one characteristic in common: a tacit agreement never to say a word from the pulpit -- or from any other location for that matter -- suggesting that there ought to be any restrictions on human sexual behavior. …When was the last time you heard a sermon on sexual ethics?”

“Here is the terrifying fact: If we as a nation and as a Church allow ourselves to be taken in by the scam of monogamous same-sex couples, we will be welcoming to our Communion rails (presuming that we still have Communion rails) not just the statistically insignificant number of same-sex couples who have lived together for more than a few years (most of whom purchased stability by jettisoning monogamy); we will also be legitimizing every kind of sexual taste, from old-fashioned adultery to the most outlandish forms of sexual fetishism. We will, in other words, be giving our blessing to the suicide of Western civilization.”

“So where am I now? I am attending a militantly orthodox parish in Houston that is one of God’s most spectacular gifts to me. My best friend Mark (not his real name) is, like me, a refugee from the homosexual insane asylum. He is also a devout believer, though a Presbyterian (no one is perfect). From Mark I have learned that two men can love each other profoundly while remaining clothed the entire time.

We are told that the Church opposes same-sex love. Not true. The Church opposes homogenital sex, which in my experience is not about love, but about obsession, addiction, and compensation for a compromised masculinity. [See 1.C.e) – The Human Desire For Intimacy: Confusing philia with eros.]

As to the homosexual cruising scene: “There is nothing compassionate about a gay bar. It represents a laisser faire free sexual market of the most Darwinian sort. There is no place in it for those who are not prepared to compete, and the rules of the game are ruthless and unforgiving. I remember once being in a gay pub in central London. Most of the men there were buff and toned and in their 20s or early 30s. An older gentleman walked in, who looked to be in his 70s. It was as if the Angel of Death himself had made an entrance. In that crowded bar, a space opened up around him that no one wanted to enter. “His shadow transmitted contagion. It was obvious that his presence made the other customers nervous. He stood quietly at the bar and ordered a drink. He spoke to no one and no one spoke to him. When he eventually finished his drink and left, the sigh of relief from all those buff, toned pub crawlers was almost audible. Now all of them could go back to pretending that gay men were all young and beautiful forever. Gentle reader, do you know what a ‘bug chaser’ is? A bug chaser is a young gay man who wants to contract HIV so that he will never grow old. And that is the world that Harry left his wife, and the other Harry his Church, to find happiness in.” He concludes: “The homosexual rights movement is rotten to the core. It has no future. There is no life in it. Sooner or later, those who are caught up in it are going to wake up from the dream of unbridled desire or else die. It is just a matter of time. The question is: how long? How many children are going to be sacrificed to this Moloch?” (Ronald G. Lee, Roman Catholic homosexual, quoted by Bill Meuhlenberg, Time To Stop Promoting This Deathstyle.)

Appendix B

Gay Millionaire’s Exposé: A Miserable Way To Live!
Ivan Massow

“Gay millionaire and prominent Tory supporter Ivan Massow says today’s gay scene seems ‘obsessed’ with ‘drugs’ and ‘sex’ resulting in an empty world of hedonism. Writing in the London Evening Standard ahead of this weekend’s Pride in London celebrations, the financial services entrepreneur said: ‘Don’t misunderstand me: I
enjoy apps like Grindr (gay dating apps that supply you with a photo and precise distance of your nearest shag) as much as the next man. I admit to recreational drugs use in my distant past. But am I the only one to notice that the gay scene today seems obsessed with drugs? Obsessed with sex. Unable to take responsibility for its part in the spread of HIV. Inhabiting a soulless and empty world of hedonism. In fact, as many thousands prepare to descend on central London this weekend, I am finding it difficult to be proud.'Mr Massow, who became involved with the capital’s Pride movement in the early90s, said: ‘Every week the number of kids who die while out clubbing in south London apartments from drug overdoses or choking on GHB goes up (GHB kills by causing cardio-respiratory arrest or choking when mixed with alcohol). The clubs in Vauxhall have such severe drug issues that they now pay a levy to St Thomas’ Hospital. Prosecutions are practically non-existent, as the gay scene hides behind its new anti-discrimination laws and calls any such policing ‘homophobic’. ’ Mr Massow said: ‘Yet it’s even becoming fashionable to inject, or as they’re calling it, ‘slam’. The comparatively innocent ecstasy pill of the early nineties has been replaced with ‘crystal’ and methadone at so-called chill-outs — a euphemism for sex parties now principally responsible for the spread of HIV.’ Mr Massow warned: ‘We, the gay community, are becoming a group of people who suddenly have everything and nothing, all at once. He added: ‘I’m making the point because it's a miserable way to live. Chemically induced highs and kids addicted to ‘chem-sex’ is all fake bollocks. Bollocks that leads to depression and, frequently, death. Bollocks that is just plain boring and ultimately empty.’ ” (Pink News, Europe’s largest gay news service, 28/06/13)

Appendix C

GAYS DON'T WANT SAME SEX MARRIAGE

John McKellar

Founder of Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism (HOPE)

The 'choice and diversity' crowd would do well to read the gay press, which has long been replete with articles, editorials and letters lambasting the whole idea of same-sex nuptials.

Clearly, a substantial majority of us neither need nor want gay marriage. Lesbian authors, Jane Rule and Camille Paglia, drag queen, Sky Gilbert and the late pioneer activist, Harry Hay are among the numerous prominent opponents of this forced parity.

We neither need nor want the state in our bedrooms. We neither need nor want to be shackled by rules, regulations or paperwork. We've already won the same-sex benefits battle, so there's no longer concern over matters of pensions or estates. Let the straights keep marriage. We need to be liberated from the mainstream, homogeneous, egalitarian mindset that is destroying what is left of gay culture.

Even the January 14, 2001 gay wedding spectacle at Toronto's Metropolitan Community Church, left, although treated as the social event of the season by a delirious media circus, was shunned and scoffed at by the gay community. Better to stay at home and clean out the fridge when your public image is so embarrassingly represented by such maudlin specimens of martyrdom, who fancy themselves as pioneers and revolutionaries, but who simply reinforce every prejudice against us.

As an openly gay male, I have no problem conceding that heterosexuality is and will always be the great human norm. But I have no time for the modern, feel-good, pop-culture mentality that facilely equates homosexuality with heterosexuality and asks no deep questions about human psychology beyond the superficial liberal-vs-conservative, freedom-vs-oppression dichotomy. And I have even less time for the insatiable demands and

infantile caterwauling of my radical brothers and sisters who want to make the whole world their closet.

So, I formed HOPE (Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism) in 1997 to a) expose the lies, myths, distortions and propaganda of modern gay activism, b) deconstruct the oppression and victimology politics, c) give a credible voice to happy, successful and independent gays and lesbians who don't wake up every day finding "hate, bigotry and discrimination" under the bed and who don't go running to the courts, the governments or the human rights commissions for a lifetime of therapeutic preferences.

A GAY VOICE OF SANITY

Most Canadians believe that gays and lesbians should be able to pursue any brand of consensual sex as we see fit and form whatever relationships that make us happy. But I'm sick and tired of the activist mantra that my dignity and my relationships are devalued because the state will not codify same-sex marriage. And I'm not so insecure and so selfish to demand that marriage be redefined for everyone else.

Marriage is not an arbitrary convention and is not meant to change with the times. We're not talking about music, fashion or art. We're talking about an institution whose four prohibitions - you can only marry one person at a time, only someone of the opposite sex, never someone beneath a certain age, and not a close blood relative - have been grounded in morality and in law for millennia (the highlighting etc is mine - R.J). Humankind yearns for these stabilizing factors in our kaleidoscopic world and if we abandon these standards, then everything becomes legal and everything becomes moral. If gay marriages are permitted (a prerogative of the most decadent Roman emperors), why not polygamy? Why not brother and sister or parent and child?

Gay activists and their ever-willing accomplices in the media, relentlessly drive through our skulls that homosexuality is "not a choice", because no one would choose to be gay in a homophobic society. Firstly, there is an element of choice in all behavior, sexual or otherwise. Secondly, despite public fanfare and trendy hypotheses, there is no conclusive scientific evidence as to the biological, genetic, psychological and sociological influences on sexual orientation. The modern change in opinion concerning homosexuality, though presented as a scientific advance, is contradicted rather than supported by science. It is a transformation of public morals consistent with widespread abandonment of the Judeo-Christian ethics upon which our civilization is based. Though hailed as "progress", it is really a reversion to ancient pagan practices supported by a counter-culture restatement of gnostic moral relativism.

It is well documented that long term relationships and fidelity are extremely rare in the gay world. From Hollywood Boy Parties to Fire Island, from Gay Pride to Gay Games, homosexual men are relentlessly searching for "Mecca" - even if it's just for a weekend. Even at the Annual Global Conference on AIDS, the nightlife is more noteworthy than the daytime activities. Every night the discos are packed with gay doctors, nurses, activists and researchers shamelessly cruising one another. Likewise, the bathhouses do land-office business. In spite of the solemnity and tragedy in dealing dealing with a wasteful and fatal disease, the hedonistic, promiscuous, sex-carnival atmosphere never lets up.

Recently, Xtra, Canada's gay and lesbian bi-weekly, ran a feature entitled "How to Stay Married and Still Be a Slut", which, at first glance, seems satirical, but which is actually a serious guideline on how to have one's cake and eat it too.

Gay activism has always been naive in its belligerent confidence that “homophobia will disappear with massive " and forced education of the benighted. But such relentless indoctrination cannot be achieved without fascist obliteration of all freedoms. And since freedom always trumps diversity and tolerance, you can rest assured that any perceived threat to freedom will result in a societal backlash which will guarantee oppression of all homosexuals. Gay males, especially, are forever on the edge of a precipice, because in a political cataclysm we are always the first to be purged.

No gay or lesbian, surrounded overwhelmingly by heterosexuals, will feel at home in his or her sexual and emotional world, even in the most tolerant of cultures. At a young age we learn the rituals of deceit,
impersonation and appearance, and anyone who believes political, social or even cultural revolution will change this fundamentally is denying reality. The unhappy truth is that male homosexuality will never be fully accepted by the heterosexual majority, who are obeying the dictates not of "bigoted" society or religion, but of procreative nature.

Yet **this desperation deepens our artistic insight** and allows us to create civilization. Undoubtedly, Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Tchaikovsky, Somerset Maugham, Gore Vidal, et al experienced hardship and alienation. But look what they gave to the world. Look how they advanced the cultural heritage. They were too cultivated, creative and cosmopolitan to be concerned with the trivialities of sexual pride, queer studies or diversity. One of them glorified God and Church by painting the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, despite the Vatican's unequivocal denunciation of homosexuality.

"GAY ADOPTION IS CHILD ABUSE "

By far, the scariest and most insidious corollary to same-sex marriage is same-sex adoption (already legal in some jurisdictions). **This is blatant child abuse.** Children need a biological mother and father. We know this is not always possible, even in the context of opposite-sex marriage, but we don't solve the problem or alleviate the inconsistency by augmenting it. Children are not meant to be guinea pigs for social engineering experiments. Self-interested partisans will manufacture statistics to support their specious claims that children of gay marriages fare as well as those of traditional families. But the phenomenon of same-sex parenting doesn't have the longevity needed for such conclusive evidence, whereas the experience of single-parent families has not always, but often shown detriment to the development of the offspring.

When society allows men to marry men and women to marry women, it perpetuates the alienation of the sexes and **contributes to the ever-increasing crisis in the sex roles**. Before Stonewall, gays and lesbians mixed socially and in the clubs with a pretty good understanding of and appreciation for one another. But as gay liberation took hold, gay males, feeling ebullient from their new-found freedom, descended into a bacchanalia of narcissism and promiscuity. Segregated bars, orgy rooms and bathhouses exploded in number and luxury. Strange parasitic diseases soon began appearing, and by 1981, a "gay cancer" was identified as AIDS. We must honestly admit that even gay men's attempt to create a world without women failed catastrophically.

Unfortunately, most people's sense of history begins the day they were born... Whenever humankind fails to protect time-honored political, moral and social institutions, whenever humankind attempts to embrace pride as a virtue and mainstream behavior that contravenes natural law, and whenever humankind becomes arrogant, autonomous, egalitarian, nihilistic and foolish, civilization fails - always and without exception. So, here we are repeating the cycle and getting ready to crash and burn one more time.

### Appendix D

**Queer as Pop: From Gay Scene to Mainstream**

Channel 4, Friday 27/12/13

Documentary charting the men, music and moments that have brought pop music out of the closet and changed the world along the way. Queer as Pop details how the gay clubs and scene have inspired and affected the music mainstream over the last 40 years. This fascinating documentary shows how music has been influenced by the political and social liberation of gay men, charting key events from the repealing of laws banning homosexuality, through to the emergence of the disco era and the David Bowie-inspired New Romantics.

**Pop Music: Origins In The Gay Underground**

- **The Pop World** is a colourfully package carnival of camp happily playing with homoerotic images and iconography... where the world’s biggest stars targeted the gay audience...There were gay icons like Marlene Dietrich and Judy Garland and Dick Van Dyke. [But because homosexuality was against the law, artist like Liberace hid their sexuality.]
- “Much of the musical mainstream actually began in the gay underground. The gay clubs was where the best music was played....From **disco** to **house** to good old **pop, music from the gay underground is also**
the sound track to the fight for gay liberation, the music that brought pop out of the closet and changed the world.”

1970s - The New Era of Gay Rights In America: Decadent Gay Discos

- “The old sexual revolution of the 60s gave way to the gay revolution with the Stonewall Inn riots (July 29th 1969) protesting against the police regularly raiding gay bars; it “happened on the same day as Judy Garland’s funeral… marked the start of the new era of gay anger and civil rights. [Soon afterwards] the laws against gays were repealed and a new scene began in the bath houses, health clubs / cabarets, like The Continental Baths. Later the stage [there] was removed to become America’s first gay disco. It was all about sex, drugs, dancing - and sex.”

- “By the 1970s gay music was filtering into the mainstream and becoming ever more spectacular… [The Village People video album, created in 1977, based on gay club clichés, aimed at the gay audience. The band's name refers to New York City's Greenwich Village, at the time known for its large gay population.] Ironically it was heterosexual Middle America that bought 65 million of their records. People didn’t even know they were gay at the time! [They didn’t realise the lyrics were about men] having sex in the showers!… [New York’s disco venue,] Stateside, Studio 54 was the pinnacle of disco decadence and hedonism.”

British Clubs Follow: A ‘Trojan Horse’ Gay Infiltration Into Mainstream

- In 1976 Britain’s first gay super-club opened, “based on the New York clubs; it had the same crazy energy. The next few years were about opulence, glamour and celebrity…and sex, drugs and VIPs. With increasing popularity] after years of being forced to hide their sexuality by law, the gay bands started to hide their sexuality to sell records to straight people. [With] Saturday Night Fever selling 30 million copies, disco was no longer ‘decadent’… it was middle-aged mums and dads in village halls. [SNF depicted the escapist pull of the queer discotheque, addressing, as one NY critic put it, “the need to move, to dance, and the need to be who you’d like to be… when the music stops, you return to being ordinary.”]

- As [gay] disco went mainstream…those [gay] people who were so revolutionary it was just like bringing the Trojan horse in there…[David Bowie, the supposedly bisexual singer, appeared in Top of The Pops, 1972] One performance in particular would change sexual politics forever… When Bowie did Starman … putting his arms round Mick Robinson… It was really revolutionary. Suddenly sex wasn’t this set thing you’d been told by your parents,…That [performance] was more significant in British Pop Culture than all the Gay Pride marches put together and Stonewall. [Because David Bowie had a wife and a child, it made his “queerness”] a little bit less upsetting for the general public.

- [In the 80s a new youth cult, influencing the music and fashion, scene began by the New Romantics in clubs like The Blitz.] “They regard their movement as a positive reaction to a difficult world. ‘We wanted a place which was open-minded where people could go and be…whoever you wanted.’ This was breaching the ideas of what a man should do and what a woman should do… It started from one small [Soho] club and went completely global…challenged Britain’s wrapped sense of sexuality and the status quo…[The media were] in a furore over what this gender-bending [music] was doing to our youth. Middle England was confused about why their son was wearing makeup… It pervaded our consciousness… Each thing is another moment of acceptance.”

1980s Backlash And Counter Reaction

- “In the 1980s British Pop Music was conquering the charts… [The popular band] Frankie Goes to Hollywood kicked the closet doors down… taking that gay sub-culture and ramming it in people’s faces…The video [Relax, set in a gay night club,] was banned… but a Rubicon had been crossed in pop music… ‘we didn’t want to annoy people, we just wanted to be who we were’…using pop music to raise debate about issues gay men faced every day across Britain… an expression of emotion and honesty, that’s a very powerful thing.”

- “If the 70s was the age of decadence and burgeoning gay rights, the 80s was the backlash [as a result of the scare over AIDS in 1981]… A new Conservative agenda forced gay culture back underground…”

- Britain’s first openly gay disco club, Heaven, opened in 1979, “while in Chicago, a new kind of music, House music, [black] the first legitimate form of music that has come along out of the gay community. It was Marshall Jefferson’s Move Your Body (The House Music Anthem) [embracing a Gay lifestyle with
integrated body-mind fitness] that gave that sound the name. That's The Way Love Is [in Top of the Pops was House music] .. People didn’t really get the culture at that time.”

• “1988 The summer of love…the youth of that time were rebellious [against Thatcher] and it all collided in a night club called Heaven. It exploded to change the music of the world… House music was gay no more… part of the mainstream [as straight people took it on board]. Straight and gay went to the same club. House music was [now] inclusive…. Lady Gaga gave queer culture its first pre-packaged for purpose super-star and an anthem specifically penned for anybody who wasn’t straight [singing I Was Born This Way, a gay anthem] A massive money maker… The DNA of all those music forms could absolutely be traced to back to disco and the disco movement.

Footnote:

On Sunday 26th January, during the 56th annual Grammy Awards, before 100 million TV viewers, 33 gay couples were married in the auditorium by a rapper-actress-talk show host sworn in as a commissioner for 24 hours by the state of California to perform the ceremony, while Madonaa sang the gay song, “Same Love”. Reported in the Huffington Post. 440

Appendix E

“Of Course, No One Is Really Gay!”

The Rev. Peter Ould shares his experience
I will tell you a bit of my story, and also tell you why I made the lifestyle choices that I did.

Now in my 30s, I grew up in Sheffield. My father was an international contract lawyer, and my mother was Austrian. I had meningitis when I was 15, went to university at 19, and moved to London at the age of 23.

It was at the time of the move to London that issues around my sexuality first emerged. Up till then I had thought that I was just waiting for the right girl to come along. But one evening I was in my flat, watching MTV, and I saw a man on the screen. ‘I could snog him’, I thought.

Sudden realisation

People talk about ‘feeling gay’. For me, it was a sudden realisation that this was my sexual attraction. I went to speak to people in my church, and ended up talking to a man from an ex-gay ministry. I remember being asked if I wanted to change. Here was I, aged 23, realising that I was attracted to my own sex. It was very real, and I was interested in simply coping with it, rather than thinking about whether I could change. I did, however, realise that there was a clear conflict between my feelings and my theology.

The stats don’t add up

Now in my 20s, and an evangelical Christian, two things made me acknowledge God’s plans for me. The first was my academic training as a statistician. At the time when I ‘came out’ to myself, there was a lot of scientific stuff about homosexuality in the media. I was reading all I could get. But one thing struck me: none of this stood up to hard analysis. Either the sample groups were too small, or the repeat studies refuted the claims. I was, therefore, convinced that there was no firm evidence that my same-sex attraction was hard-wired. It was this conviction that first made me move to where I am today — and where I now want to live everyday.

Christ and the Church

Secondly, I began to understand the power of signifiers and symbols as, coming from an evangelical background, I explored in greater depth the Catholic heritage of my faith. I was looking at Genesis 1 and also at Ephesians 5, which describes the relationship between Christ and the Church. Could I justify a same-sex relationship theologically? I used to hang discussions on the meaning of certain Greek words. And yet, I discovered that there was an overarching theme in the Bible about the Christian man being called to signify Christ in his marriage, and that this theme applied to me. In the same way, Ephesians 5 showed that a Christian wife in her marriage signifies

the Church. But if you have a husband and a husband, where is the Church? And if you have a wife and a wife, where is Christ?

My theology seemed to be right, but after 18 months of praying to God, and not changing, I heard God asking me, ‘If you take seriously the truth that your choices about sexual behaviour ultimately speak about Me, will you let me do with your life whatever I want? Will you be celibate if I call you to that?’ This was a real challenge to me. It suddenly seemed as if God wasn’t offering me what I wanted, namely change, but rather was calling me to let his will be done, whatever that was.

So one very tearful night I finally said to God, ‘If that’s how it’s going to be, I will remain celibate’.

My real identity

Four weeks later, I went on a prayer ministry team weekend with my church. We were in the garden of one of the members of the church, and a girl asked what we should do if someone came for prayer and said they were gay. The vicar replied, ‘Well, of course, no one is really gay’. It was as if someone had thrown a switch! Up to that point, even though I realised that the Bible never makes the distinction of gay or straight, and simply calls us to be the man or woman that God created us to be, I still felt identified internally as gay. It was what defined me, because I didn’t know anything else. But suddenly I thought, ‘That’s not my real identity! I’m called to be a man, not gay or straight. God doesn’t make that distinction, and therefore neither should I.’

It was as though a weight had lifted off me. By the time I had driven back to London and joined in the evening worship service at church, I suddenly realised I was no longer thinking of myself as homosexual. I realised I was the same as all the men next to me. There was nothing different about me, either in what I was capable of, or how God viewed me. God had begun the work of healing the wounds of my past.

As I was growing up, I failed to make close emotional ties, both with my same-sex peers and with adult role models. I was small, unsporty and annoyingly intelligent and precocious. I was a geek! I didn’t know how to relate to boys or men, and though I wanted to be a man, I had no idea how to do it. When you grow up not feeling like other guys, you can grow up feeling as though you do not belong. Being gay, however, finally told me who I actually was and where ‘I belonged’. Finally understanding who you are gives you some form of security and identity, so taking a step away from that is almost like stepping into nothingness. It was really scary.

Deep work of healing

Despite this, from the time of that prayer ministry weekend, God began to do an amazing thing in my life. As I brought to him the brokenness of my past, his Spirit began a deep work of healing those wounds. If you get measles, you don’t put calamine lotion on the skin to heal it, rather you tuck yourself up in bed and let your white blood cells fight deep within you to rid the body of the harmful presence. In the same way, God healed the wounds in my past. The wound of having no same-sex peers or adult role models, the symptoms of same-sex attraction and the need for affirmation from a man — these things disappeared. It was not that the ‘rash’ had been healed but that the ‘virus’ had been dealt with.

Today, I am a completely different man from the person I was in my teen years and early 20s. Far from being afraid of men who were different from me, I began to discover that I was the same as they were. I no longer think of myself as heterosexual or homosexual, I’m simply Peter, whom God created to glorify him in his creation. I’ve seen God heal my past and change the desires and emotions that were trapped by it. He’s called me not only to help others walk in freedom, but also to enable the Church to respond with compassion and care to those whose sexuality is broken, as mine was.

Extract from God, Gays and the Church: Human Sexuality and Experience in Christian Thinking, editors Lisa Nolland, Chris Sugden, Sarah Finch, Latimer Trust (Paternoster).
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Genesis 1 & 2: origins of marriage, God’s design for sex, providing principles for later issues (Jesus), supports marriage as a complementary heterosexual union, 87-88; sexual difference for reproduction,
sexual complementarity for expressing unity, one-flesh union a re-union, this binding relationship so painful to break, 88
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Genesis 19:4-5, Leviticus 18:22, Romans 1, I Corinthians 6:9-10, and I Timothy 1:9-10, 87; see Biblical teaching

Commitment, with love, as the basis of marriage, 55; does not confer sanctity, 104; as practically impossible, 112
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Complementarity, of man and woman in marriage, 11, 68
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Consensual behaviour, that does not harm others, 50

Conservatives, in the Church, 98

Consummation: impossible in SSM, 67

Continental, The. America’s first infamous bathhouse, 1968, all about sex, drugs and dancing, 116

Creativity, artistic: as engendered by alienation and frustration, 21, 115; homosexual ‘greats’, 21; the arts as providing a tolerant environment, 22; creative arts challenging traditional values, 28; homosexuals advanced the cultural heritage, 115

Critics of gay agenda, censored, 6

Cultural revolution, the result of a planned manipulation of popular philosophy, 4, 29; today’s cultural made an idol of sex, 13; sexualisation of culture leads to sex as recreation, 28; taking over institutions and information sources, 29; Marxist origins, 29; sweeping social change through conversion of emotions, mind, will, 32; culture of convenience ‘adult desire’ centred rather than ‘children need’ centred, 55; cultural decline, and shift, 98

David and Jonathan, ‘in homoerotic relationship’? 86

Death, pre-mature, through gay lifestyle, 24; death threats, 74; spiritual, danger of, 108

Deception, frequent repetition of a big lie makes it true, 4, 37, 113; hide from the public ‘how it’s done’! 35;
of the general public through subversion of the truth by propaganda, 37, 49, 96; lying about no intention to change marriage, 37, 67-68, 75; each incremental step ‘the last’ (not true), 37; feeding legal misinformation, by rewriting history of homosexuals, 37; skewing research, 37; gay rights movement ‘self-deception as a group effort’, 37; SSM built on pretenue there is no difference between a man and a woman, 72; self-deception, 96; see Evidence and Scientific Process

Definition of marriage: see Redefinition

Democracy: losing its Christian roots, caves in to egalitarianism, humanism, relativism, libertarianism, 41

Demonisation of homosexuality: equating homosexuality with promiscuity and most offensive practices, 51

Dialogue, between traditionalists and revisionists, 107

Disagreement, construed as hate, 107

Discipline, of warped desires, 93; training to be fit for heaven, 93; excommunication impractical, 110; the church’s loving duty to confront willful sin, 110; Calvin’s reasons for: God’s honour, corruption of the good, lead to repentance, 110

Discourse, public: stripped by ‘ayotollahs of social liberalism’ of bits they don’t like – faith, orthodoxy, skepticism about change, 42

Discrimination: gay pride events against, 28; racial, 38; anti-discrimination laws, 47, 67; negative and positive connotations of ‘discrimination’, 52; against persons, distinct from against behaviours, 52; between truth and error to preserve the health and stability of society, 76

Disorder, mental: removal from list of, 47; disease model condescending, 105

Diversity, insistence on, actually represses orthodox teaching, 42; come to represent not plurality but homogeneity, 42

Egalitarianism: diminished self-restraint and responsibility + drive towards ever-increasing equality leads to intolerance of traditional boundaries, 41

‘Elephant in the room’, negative aspects of homosexuality, 100

Emptiness of gay relationships, 25

Environmental factors in homosexuality, 15; psychosocial factors, family issues, 17

Equality: treating people equally while respecting individual’s right to embrace different values, 42; confused with equivalence, 56; distinguishing from equivalence not discrimination, 56; secular assumptions about, fundamentally different from Biblical concepts, 56; the challenge of political philosophy to discover the meaning of such terms, 69

Equal Marriage, see Same-Sex Marriage

Equivalence: homosexuality with heterosexuality, 14, 29; disparity in health outcomes, 28

Ethics, Judeo-Christian, abandoned in gay activists’ transformation of public morals, 2; supports the whole UK legal structure and the family, 6; various ethical issues involved in SSM, 68; see Moral issues

European Court Of Human Rights: role in forwarding SSM, 71

Evidence, what constitutes reliable, for evaluating issues: science, experience, revelation, 10-11; language / research methods used, e.g. questionable survey design / sampling, 10-11, 16-17

Exclusiveness and sin, traditionalists emphasise, 106

Experience, neither normative or insignificant, 101; conformed to teachings of Scripture, and tested against Christian tradition, 101; as requiring interpretation, 101

Faith, the place of: faith issue? or social good issue? Or a Christian cosmology issue? 60

Family, importance for transmission of culture, 4; as only equally desirable social units, 42; massive transformation in understanding of family life, 48; the building block of society, 58, 112; governments promote marriage to produce families, 58; gay families deficient in parenting, intentionally parasitic on heterosexuals, 58-59; traditional family best environment for raising children, 68

Filkin, Lord: U turn on SSM, 71

Framlingham, Lord: speech in the House of Lords, 71-72

 Freedoms at risk: association, expression, conscience, parental nurture, 50, 76; true notion of freedom paramount, 69; Christian freedom understood in terms of justice, justice in terms of what is right, 69; freedom as trumping diversity and tolerance, 114

Friendship, close, between men, confused with homosexuality, 4, 22; C.S. Lewis on, 22

Gagnon, Robert: The Bible and Homosexual Practice, 81

Garland, Judy: poster girl for homosexuality, 26

‘Gay’: defining, complex, 10, 13; a variety of sexual attractions, 9; socio-political identity + lifestyle, 13-14;
denoting a lifestyle as distinct from ‘homosexual’ denoting SS attraction, 59; gayness a product of Western society, 102

Gay activism: involving the judiciary, politicians and media, 6; supported by judicial elite, cowed politicians and liberal media, jeopardise tolerance through relentless pursuit of lifestyle affirmation, 29; deny Christian values, 30

Gay adoption, children raised by gay parents disadvantaged, view contradicts gay rights narrative, 46, 73-74; analogy to heterosexual adoptions – inconsistency not alleviated by augmenting it! 74; study by Mark Regnerus ‘gold standard’ for research on children of gay couples, 74; modeling unhealthy lifestyle, 76; as child abuse, 115; lack biological mother and/or father, 115

Gay agenda aims: abolish the family, 30, 60; abolish cultural gender distinctions, 30; change society’s values and norms, 30, 41; uprooting traditional values, 60

Gay churches, as salving consciences, 111; no mention of ‘bar-hopping as inconsistent with believing the Bible’, 111; no sermons on sexual ethics, 112

Gay discos, all about sex, drugs and dancing, fueling the Gay revolution, 116

‘Gay genes’: see Homosexuality: Innateness

Gay goal: transform ‘the fabric of society’, 6; push the parameters of sex and family, 6; change public attitudes, 29; blueprint for revolution, 31-33; sweeping social change, 32; gay lifestyle affirmation, and normalization, 29, 35, 60; persuade ‘straight’ America that ‘the gay alternative’ is legitimate, acceptable and good, 32;

Gay ideology: goodness of homosexual practice, innateness of being homosexual, 29-30; imposed on the West, 50; gayness a product of Western society originating 150 years ago, 102

Gay lobby: dominant influence in governmental, legal, educational and some business institutions, 41; an agency to marginalize religion in society, 41; success dependent on suppressing the right of parents to be primary educators of their children in moral matters, 73

Gay Liberation Movement, founded on promiscuity, 6; in the permissive society, 8; launched by Stonewall riots, 26; ‘self-deception as a group effort’, 96; built on innate theory, 102; founded on (false) notion of stable sexual orientation, 112, ‘rotten to the core’, 112

Gay lifestyle, stereotype of a, 10; many different types of, 10; portrayed as normal and healthy, equivalent to heterosexual behaviour, 14-15; higher levels of violence experienced, 24, 76; ‘an empty world of hedonism’, 112-113

Gay marriage: See Same-Sex Marriage

Gay ministers / priests, as linked with ordination of women, 100

Gay Pride events, celebrating LBGT culture, 28; against discrimination and social stigma, promoting self-affirmation and visibility, 28; Glasgow City Council’s U Turn, 29; Glasgay as a catalyst for change, 28-29, 38-39; objection to ‘indecency’ of Glasgay treated as ‘hate crime’ by police, 29

Gay propaganda, stress victimization rather than proudly promoting a deviant lifestyle, 31, ‘victimology politics’; claim ‘born gay’, and so no choice, and no moral blame! 31, 99; carefully planned public relations, 31-32, 37; desensitize the public about gays, downplay imagery of sex to a matter of indifference, 31, 36; fed by the media, TV and films, 12, 32-33, 49; grounded in psychological and advertising principles, 32; conflict of continuous flood of propaganda conflicting with own beliefs and truth, 44, 101, 110; ‘good’ homosexual sex as not destructive, 49; only a small proportion of gays want SSM, 61; ‘pernicious intermingling of gay activism with science’, 104; ‘lies, myths, distortions’, 2113

Gay rights: more about power (control over public discourse) than truth or justice, 30; a fundamental human right to SSM, 61, self-deception, 96

Gay strategy: hitch their cause to accepted standards of law and justice, 32; solicit funds, 32; promote ‘live and let live’ tolerance, indifference, 33, 35;

Aggressive tactics: gays victimized by hateful bigots who must be silenced by legislation, 29; ‘victimology politics’, 113

Appeal: to ‘ambivalent sceptics, or ‘muddles middle’, 33;

Media use: make gays prominent on TV and in films; 31, 49;

Opposition: portray ‘homophobic’ churches as antiquated, out of touch with science and public opinion, 31; vilify opponents, 32; psychological terrorism / scare tactics: exact a price for not buying into the gay rights agenda, 33; laugh to scorn the sacred Scriptures, 33, 104;

Positive view of homosexuality: emphasize prevalence and acceptability of homosexuality, 31; disassociate from fringe gay groups like man-boy love associations, 31; portray homosexuals as
Everyman, ‘nice guy’ next door, or even as ‘superior pillars of society’, 32, 49; ‘good’ homosexual sex as not destructive, 49; 
Spin: muddy the moral waters by publicizing revisionist church support for gays, 31; misdirection of the main issue, misrepresentation of opposing views, and misapplication of civil rights, 51

George, Cardinal, of Chicago: defense of traditional marriage, 71

Gender confusion / differences, interchangeable? do they matter? 11; an arbitrary social convention defined by each person, 11; variety of relationships ‘develops’ people, 30; confusion for our children, 76

Gender engineering, in Sweden, wrong, 21

Gender Recognition Act, introduced to allow choice of gender, 28

Generation gap, homosexuality ‘no big deal’, 64

Genetics, See Innateness

Gospel, issue, 100; transforms behaviour, 100; reach out by standing by Scriptural truth regarding homosexual practice, 100; negativity as undermining the Church’s mission, 101; of compassion, 102, 105; rejected, crucial Gospel distinction between visible and invisible church, 103

Government, links with LBGT lobby, 48; 2013 consultation on ‘next steps’ for those ‘hiding their sexuality’, 49; combating homophobia and discrimination, 49; proud of its role, 78

Grace, God’s, balance, with truth, Pharisees and Sadducees, 106, 107, 108

Happiness, the right to pursue, without interference, 49; no criterion of morality, even if some people’s ultimate goal in life, 64

Hate Crime: Police say can be classed as such if the victim or witness see it as being so, 43; hate messages sent to traditionalist newly-weds, 42; in Canada biblical speech opposing homosexual behaviour a hate crime, 43; disagreement construed as hate, 107

Health, homosexual: medical statistics, 14, 15; health risks, 23-25; dangerous to, 23; human body not designed for male homosexual acts, 23; premature ageing, 24; mental health: intrinsically insecure and depressed, not due to societal prejudice, 25; claim that homosexuals are as emotionally healthy as heterosexuals, 37

Hermeneutics, see Biblical interpretation

Heterosexual majority, obeying dictates not of ‘bigoted’ society / religion, but of procreative nature, 115

History, lessons of, consequences of ignoring, 41; sense of history beginning the day we are born, all that precedes outmoded, 41

HIV: See AIDS

Hooker, Evelyn: her report on homosexuals leading to their removal from the APA’s list of disorders, 23n; different interpretation of her findings: not all homosexuals disturbed, 37

‘Homophobia’, and bigotry, should not be equated with opposing a gay agenda, 10, 30, 63-64, 100; societal prejudice not the cause of homosexual distress, 25; as a denial of human rights, 35; defending homosexuals from homophobic bullying in schools a means of promoting a gay agenda of achieving universal approval, 40; naïve to think it will disappear with enforced education of the benighted, 114

‘Homosexual’: origins, pronunciation and usage, 9; ‘homosexual’ or ‘gay’? 10; pre-Stonewall homosexuals a despised minority, 26, 111; moral agents with choice how they respond to life situations, 52; St Paul’s categories: ‘married’ and ‘unmarried’ (not ‘homosexual’ and ‘heterosexual’), 91; heterosexuality the human norm, 113

Homosexuality, is it normal? 14-15; parallels with the natural world not relevant, 22; normalization of, 60; progression of social status of, from crime to identity, 67; controversy not just about sex, but about salvation, 81, 108; ‘one of America’s most successful cultural exports’, 111; ‘about obsession, addiction, and compensation for a compromised masculinity’, 112

Acts, not predetermined (‘as sub-human robots’), but product of moral agents, 105

Boundaries, of what constitutes homosexuality, 19; fluidity: homosexuality as a passing phase, 14;

Cause: familial, cultural and other environmental factors, 14-19; four explanations of cause: nature – nurture – notion (choice) - combination, 16; complexity, 19

Condemned, as breading a culture of sexual irresponsibility, 23; a ‘vile form of sexual perversion condemned in both the Old and New testaments’, 87; fundamental deviation from God’s purposes, 94; an unnatural use of human anatomy, 94; evil corrupters of society, 99

Disease model: condescending and wrong, 105; ‘time to stop promoting this deathstyle’, 122

Innateness: homosexual predispositions as innate, 15-17; ‘biologically determined at birth’, 16; ‘No
gay gene, 16-17; a predisposition, not a pre-determination, 17; genetic assertions dismissed, 21; gay gene determining gender? 21; without innateness LBGT 'scaffolding would begin to crumble,' 102
Nature: a behaviour, not an identity? 12; something one ‘has’, not ‘is’, 13; as an addiction, 14; as an identity, 14; as equivalent to heterosexuality, 14-15, 23; many ‘homosexualities’, 20;
Pretext, that gay men were all young and beautiful forever, 112
Responses, range of: pastoral, evangelistic, educational, apologetic, campaigning, 107
Serious issue, offensive to God, leads to destruction, 92, 94, 100; not a marginal issue in the Bible, 100; affirmation and spiritual death, 108
Spectrum: a range of views on, 14; unwanted SSA, tolerated practice, celebrated relationship, gay campaigning, promiscuous lifestyle, 107
Homosexual relationships, effects of, happiness and security, 22; transient, 25, 114; whole range of, 54; at the centre of today’s social revolution, 96; lacking fidelity, 114
Homosexuals, should be welcomed and embraced, without affirming gay practices, 40, 108
Abandoning wife and family, for happiness in a gay lifestyle, 112
Love, search for, 106, 111; church failed to love them, 108
Pastoral care, need of, besides correct teaching, 108
Victims: 15; noble victims and cultural heroes, 99
Homosexuals Opposed to Pride Extremism, founded 1997 by gay writer John McKeller to expose distortions of the gay lobby, 112-113
Humanism: replacing traditional faiths as ‘the unthinking creed of conventional people, 41; human rights trump beliefs, 49
Humanity: formed in the image of God, corporate, relational and gendered, 61; homosexual practice a relational disruption of God’s image in humankind, 61
Human Rights Campaign: founded 2080 to work for LGBT equality, 52
Identity, personal, constituted around sexual orientation? 13; homosexuality as an identity, 13-14; a social construct, not a biblical concept, 13, 108; ‘of course, no-one is really gay’, 118
Idolatry, involves role-reversal, disordered desire flows from, 92; makes good things into gods, 92
Illness, homosexuality as a sexual, proved wrong, 12
Image: church leaders need to be seen as caring and enlightened, 33
Image of homosexuals: mainstream ‘normal’ replacing drag-queens, 32, 35; curtail gay ‘self-expression, 33; bishops of good reputation coming out as gay, 33
Inclusive Church: see Church, the: Inclusive
Indoctrination, relentless, impossible without fascist obliteration of all freedoms, 114
Influence of homosexuality: need to respond with biblical and rational defenses for the Christian position, and examination of accompanying problems, 1; need to prepare the ground of society for the gospel, to reaffirm the ordered reality of human nature, 12
Influences in forming an opinion: gay lobby, 41; sons, daughters and friends, 64
Innateness: see Homosexuality: Innateness
Instability, relational, high among homosexuals, 24
Intimacy, as largely indicated by sex, 11; with God, spiritual intimacy between Christians, 12; physical connection: affectionate between two females, aggressive between two men, 14; an outlet for, in the arts, 22; not always about sex, 22; SS intimacy not coitus union, 56
Intolerance: shown to opponents, 35; Firefox fire boss for supporting traditional marriage, 43; death threats, 74
Injustice: ‘witch hunt’ of gays an unbelievable injustice, 36; of homosexuals debarred from marriage, 67; Christian concern for an oppressed gay minority, 99
Jesus Christ, distilled the religious laws to love, breaking down divisive barriers, 82; silence on subject of homosexuality, 84, 90; and Jewish repugnance, 84; Jesus condemned sexual immorality in general, Mark 7:20-23, 84; denounced lustful glances as equivalent to adultery, Matthew 5:28, 90; what would Jesus say?, 90, 103; the primacy of love, 103; responding with grace and truth, 108; inclusivism as a core Kingdom value? 109; died for gays as well, 109
Jonathan and David, no suggestion of a sexual relationship, 23
Kinsey Report, the: 1948, claimed 1 in 10 homosexual, 26; effect: 10% = normal = natural = acceptable, 26
Kirk, the, see Church of Scotland
Landmarks in recent history of homosexuality, 26-28; Kinsey Report, 26; trial of Lord Montagu for
homosexual activity, 26; decriminalization of homosexuality in UK, 26; Stonewall riots, 26, 116

Language, control of, controls the debate, 4, 34; intemperate, in advocacy, 11

LGBT: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender culture / social movement, 28

Liberals, social: using diversity as a weapon against its very purpose, 42; in pursuit of their lifestyle affirmation, 42; in the church, 98

Libertarianism, leads into a growing barbarism, 6; finds meaning to life in the pursuit of pleasure, 41

Life expectancy, reduced, 24

Life style, fast-lane, of many in the gay community: ‘the pits’ – self-destruction, pathological lying, narcissism, rejection of morality, transience of relationships, drugs and drink, self-destructive, 23-25

Lord Montegu, trial of, tipping point into slow change of public attitudes, 26

Love, without truth leads astray, 2; promotion of deeply flawed vision of human love, 2; ‘Philia’ and ‘Eros’, 23; romantic notion of marriage, 48, 55

‘Made me this way, God’: desires for forbidden things God reflect how sin has distorted me, not how God has made me, 89

Marketing strategy, gay: selling an issue: acceptance and approval of gay lifestyle, 35; 4

‘P’s, 35-36; packaged through education and positive media coverage, 36; crucially do not let the public know how the propaganda is done, 36;

Language control: manipulation of language, 34; relabeling of terms for homosexuality: ‘sexual disorder’ > ‘affectional orientation’, 34; challenge historic understanding of words, 34;

Positive spin: use of spin, 34-36; rebranding of homosexuality, respectability and appearance of normalcy, 34-35; sanitization of gay life, 36; casting harmful and objectionable behaviour in a favourable light, 34-35; hide from the public ‘how it’s done’! 35; ‘homosexuals ‘hold sacred seeds – a ‘gift from God’ – with ‘an enormous amount to teach’ the nation, 36; good’ homosexual sex as not destructive, 49

Opponents neutralised: ‘gay rights’ puts opponents on back foot, 35; presenting opponents in a bad light, 36; churchmen portrayed discriminating, sinister bigots, 97

Marriage, as the only permitted condition for sex challenged, 6; abolition predicted, 47; extending the definition of, 47; as ‘evolved’, 48; monogamy not seen as essential, 66; not meant to change with the times, 114

Biblical purposes of, companionship, bonding and procreation, 60; marriage is about covenant commitment as seen in God’s covenant with his people, 61; an essential component of creation, revealing God’s design for human relationships, 61; sexual differentiation essential for human’s completeness, 61; as covenant, not contract, 61; reflecting God’s own nature of diversity in oneness, 92

Boundaries of, seen as an intolerant constraint, 41; necessity for, 69;

Children and marriage: about needs of children rather desires of adults, 55; for the protection of children, 61; broken homes lead to damaged children and problems for society, 59; procreation rooted in marriage, 92

Consummation, the potential ability to have, essence of marriage, 67; connects with procreation purpose, 73

Fidelity: necessity in marriage questioned by Government minister, 66; adultery clause removal weakens the moral character of marriage and the perception of future generations regarding marital responsibilities, 76

Public purpose: bond parents to their future children, 74; meeting needs of children, not desires of adults, 74

Restoration of: to its normal significance, 69

State’s role in: the state’s concern for stability, security and continuity in marriage, 59;

Symbolic of Christ and his Church, a picture of Christ’s love for, and union with, His church, 61, 92, 117

Traditional: four stabilizing prohibitions, if abandoned, makes everything legal /moral, 57; conjugal marriage brings family and social stability, 58; provides various private goods and the public good of parenthood, 59; a perfect fit with the way human beings are made, 68

Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Bill: sends out a message about the new Scotland being created, 72; allowing a tiny minority to defy common sense, elementary biology, and the wisdom of the ages, 72; ignores health risks, and potential penalization of objectors, 72; performing to the gallery! 72; removal of consummation reference gives the lie ‘no difference with heterosexual marriage’ and disconnects marriage from procreation, 73
Marriage (Same Sex Couples) Bill, (England and Wales): behind the scenes arm twisting, 71; putting speed before truth, ignoring ramifications for teachers, faith schools, registrars, marriage itself; the issue of consummation and adultery, 71; Government intransigence, bulldozing through an ill thought through bill, 72, 78; built on the pretence there is no difference between a man and a woman, 72; raising problems that will bedevil generations to come, 72
McKellen, Sir Ian, gay opponent of former GCC’s ‘values rotten to the core’, 29
Media, influencing public opinion through the: Andrew Marr accuses BBC of gay bias, 38
Mental Health: gays intrinsically insecure, 24
Minor attracted persons (MAPs), targeting mental health professionals, 48
‘Mixed Economy’, Church of Scotland’s, 98
Monogamy, as not seen as essential, 66; the human body, structurally and chemically, plus male-female psychology, designed for bonding, 68
Moral authority, breaks down once one law is broken with impunity, 108
Moral crusades: equating homosexuality with promiscuity and offensive practices as ‘a serious error’, 51
Moral education: right of parents suppressed, to be primary educators of their children in moral matters, 73
Moral renewal, see Sanctification
Moral agents, homosexuals as, who inherit tendencies, not sub-human robots, 105
Moral relativism, 98; follows recreational sex, 11, 18; SSM delegitimizes the moral argument against polygamy, 47; equal marriage as ‘the right thing to do!’ 49, 68; private behaviour with consenting adults OK, only a small minority’s use of drugs and un-safe sex reprehensible, 51-52; other sins worse: violence and materialism, 110; ‘spiritual’ homosexuals, 110; present trend on homosexuality a counter-cultural restatement of Gnostic moral relativism, 114
Virtue ethics, loyalty does not make moral, 86, 101
Morals, public: transformation and abandonment of Judeo-Christian ethics, 18, 114; heterosexuals’ track record on marriage sanctity not good either, 51
Motivation, sympathy for homosexual friends and relatives, 96
‘Natural relations’, abandoned, means contravening natural law, 89
Nazir-Ali, Bishop Michael: the constitutional issue with the Queen (State clashing with Church), 76
‘Nice guy’ doesn’t mean his gayness is OK, 101
Normal, homosexuality as, 14, 35; accepted by youth today, 64
‘Open-mindedness’, ‘being who you want to be’, pervading our consciousness, 116
Opponents to gay practice, moral status of a segregationist, 64; see also Totalitarianism
Orientation, sexual, influences on, 18; complex factors, 19; as term coined by the APA, 1973, 26
Paedophilia: ‘can’t help it’ no argument, 15; reparative therapy for, 45; acceptance of, 47; follow gay tactics, 48
Pastoral care, essential for SSA people, besides correct teaching, 108; show patience with recent converts, 110
Pederasty, in ancient Greece, 10
Perversion, what Biblical revisionists claim biblical texts condemn, as distinct from inversion, where homosexuality is innate, a modern distinction between practice and orientation, 88

Pilling Report, uncomfortable position of the Church of England, 76-77; dealing with continuing internal destructive conflict, 76

Polarized climate, either condemn or fawn, 99

Police: creating subjective crime offense (hate crime if a witness see it as being so), 43; Scottish police refuse Gideon Bibles as ‘homophobic’, 93

Political correctness: heterosexual and homosexual relationships as equivalent, 14-15; erases differences between relationships between two women and relationships between two men, 15; historical understandings of words challenged to conform to a ‘pc’ philosophical agenda, 34; and Governmental authoritarianism, 41; inclusiveness, 109

Politics, and the scientific process, 19; removal of homosexuality from the APA’s list of disorders ‘anything but science’, 26; gay politicians in scandals, 51; government policy and public opinion, 65

Polyamory: part of a trend towards abolition of marriage, 47; combines individual liberty with consensual partnership, 74; made more acceptable by acceptance of SSM, 75

Pop music, as ‘Trojan Horse’ gay infiltration into mainstream, pervading our consciousness, 115-117; ‘ramming the gay culture in people’s faces’, 116; using pop music to raise debate about issues gay men face, 116; Lady Gaga’s gay anthem I Was Born This Way, 117

Prevalence, of homosexuality, 12, 31; less than 1% totally gay, 12; 1 in 10 myth perpetuated, even when propaganda is admitted, 36, 49; in congregations, 99, small minority in Jesus’s Palestine, 100

Progress, fast: ‘sodomy’ (act) to ‘homosexuality’ (condition) to ‘gay’ (identity), 1

Promiscuity, a sexual brotherhood of, founded the gay liberation movement, 6, 37; issue: the degree and extent amongst gays and non-gays compared, 23-24

Propaganda, see Gay propaganda

Protection, needed for traditionalists, 42

Queen, position of the: placed in an impossible position as Governor of the Church of England, 76

‘Queer’, as a predicament, 12; pushing the parameters of sex, sexuality and family, 30; Jesus Was Queer claimed, so churches should welcome gays, 37; stigma makes churches seem unwelcoming, 101

Racial discrimination comparison, phony, 38, 63

Reaction: many bewildered by government’s role, 78; ‘an absolute parliamentary disgrace’, 78

Reason and faith, severed, 55

Rebel against God, leads to being abandoned to craving for the unnatural, 89

Recreational sex: individual moral relativism follows –‘if you enjoy it, it’s OK’, 11; consequence of interchangeable / equivalent genders, 11

Redefinition: demand to redefine marriage, 55; the Humpty Dumpty fallacy, 56; no logical stopping point, 57; results in two different standards under the one label, 67

Reparative therapy, helpful, 20; and the right to choose, 20-21; professional therapists and religious counselors, 45; misconceived objections, false assumptions and myths, 45; pressure to ban, 44-46; conversion one-way, 45; effects of banning, 45

Relationships, category changes when SS relationships equated with marriage, 56; see also Homosexual relationships

Relativism: denies any hierarchy of values, doctrinaire in its enforcement, 41; 98; leads to intolerance, 98

Repentance, mark of a Christian, 110

Responsibility, for our sexual behaviour, 18, 44

Revolution, social: 1960s values dominating the evolution of family structures, 29; personal fulfillment trumps duty and responsibility, 29; radical reinterpretation of gender, marriage, family and sexual morality, 29; a soft creeping revolution, 48; in morality, sexual morality, SS relationships, at the centre, 96; relates to the gospel, 96; targeting the Church; 97

Rights, homosexual, awkward to discuss because we know decent homosexual friends, 4; homosexuality not about rights, but redefining truth and censoring criticism, 6; right to change, 20-21; no right to rewrite marriage for all of society, 69

Romantic notion of marriage, 48; the promise adds nothing, 55

Salisbury, Bishop of: ‘SSM endorses institution of marriage’, 66

Salmon, Alex: ‘my marriage not diminished by SSM’, 66

Same-Sex Attraction (SSA): understood as feelings, behaviour or identity, or a combination of all three, 9;
evidence for SSA as a passing phase, 14; options for those with, 20; seen as signaling a mental illness, 24-25; attempts to reduce, seen as ‘harmful’, 44; compared with adulterous feelings of attraction, 56; presence of, not an indication that an individual has turned from God more than others, (Romans1), 89; requires welcome and pastoral care, besides correct teaching, 108

Same-Sex Marriage (SSM): marriage redefined, 56; unbalanced view of certain realities, 54; a construct of the state, therefore elastic, 57; marriage always evolving? So SSM will strengthen the institution? 65-66; attitudes evolve, but not the essential nature, 65; as meaningful as ‘a square circle’, 67; trivialised, 78; controversial in gay circles: gay press (lambasting the whole idea) versus ‘choice and diversity’ activists promoting ‘this forced parity’, 113

About: not a sentimental idea about inclusivity, but about access to children, 30; not just about fairness, but simply ‘the right thing to do!’ 48; extension not the real issue, rather changing the public understanding of marriage, 55-56; truth not the issue, rather power, 56; the real issue not gay, but same sex marriage, 56; not about access to marriage but elimination of marriage, 60; a right to have an intimate with a partner for life, 62; about unequal acts, not rights, 67

Acceptance: swing in polls towards acceptance, 8; evolving attitudes towards, distinct from notion of an institution evolving, 8, 48; commitment, monogamy, fidelity and love make it OK, 49; proportion of gays wanting SSM small, 62; totally accepted in Norwegian regions, 66

Changes: category changes involved in, 56; characteristics, 57; fallacy of compelling desire, rather than behaviour, as one’s identity, 59;

Consequences: as leading to elimination of marriage itself, 55, 74; as resulting in more governmental interference with families, 55; marriage itself outdated in Scandinavia, 66; bisexuality and group marriages, 66; damage to public understanding of marriage, and more children out of wedlock, 66-67; changing a majority’s culture, 70; a fundamental change to the way our society is structured, 73; stresses emotional ties rather than bodily bonds, 73; open the way for polyamory, 75; gender confusion for children, 76; creates host of injustices and inequalities for objectors, 76; cumulative damage over time, even if destructive effects not immediately apparent, 76; contributes to crisis in sex-roles – before Stonewall gays and lesbians mixed socially, 115

Corollaries: SS couples adoption ‘blatant child abuse’ – children need both biological parents, 73

Criticisms: puts adults before children, 63; don’t last as long as heterosexual marriages, 63; lacks marital act of coitus that enables child bearing, 65; puts the interests of a few ahead of the well-being of the many, 70; consummation and adultery removed from marital law, 70

Denial of evident truths: anthropological truth (complementarity), biological fact (reproduction) and social reality (children need mum and dad), 70

Lack of complementarity: limits couple’s relational development and stability, 68; only adoptive / surrogate (i.e. parasitical) family possible; 68; limits child’s experience of parental role modeling; 68

Monogamy, churches taken in by ‘the scam of monogamous same-sex couples’, 112

Promiscuity: shocking degree of, in comparison with heterosexual couples, 76; purchase stability by jettisoning monogamy, 112

Premise: gender is insignificant, 76

Religious gay vision: clearly geared towards monogamy and fidelity, 67

Secular gay vision: promiscuous, focusing on personal intimacy and social equality, 67

Stability, purchased by jettisoning monogamy, 112

Transitoriness: intentional, or short-lived partnerships, 76

Violence, higher level of intimate partner, 76

Sanctification, mark of the Christian life, 110; not an immediate consequence of conversion, 110

Saturday Night Fever, 1977 gay dance film/DVD, presented in a ‘straight’-friendly way, ‘Trojan Horse’ for promoting gay acceptance, 116

Schools, indoctrination in: introducing kindergarten to ‘alternative’ behaviours, 39; HIV awareness in schools through ‘sensitivity training’ course, 39-40; marketing ‘sex to our children in our schools under the guise of sex education, anti-bullying, diversity, and tolerance’, 40; promoting homosexuality as normal, immutable trait, 40; forced to teach SSM, 48, 74

Science, as one of ‘God’s two books’ (Bacon), 11; as the arbiter of what is positive, 18; ‘pernicious intermingling of gay activism with science’, producing propaganda, 104; informs, not decides, sexual morality, 105

Scientific findings: ‘wrong on the facts?’ - some distortions and misrepresentations about sexual health,
biology, change, equivalence and identity, 11-12; See Evidence

**Scientific process:** as corrupted by politics, 19; samples, how representative? 19

**Section 28,** of the local Government Act, prevented promotion of homosexuality by local authorities, 27; abolition paved way for massive funding for ‘anti-bullying’ material and sexual health services, 28-29

**Secularist culture,** advance of, 48; failure to recognize the ambition of, 48

**Self-expression,** primacy of, over restraint, 21

**Sex,** an expression of humanity’s personal relational nature as made in God’s image, 61

**Sexuality,** no natural character to sexuality, 11; pushing the parameters of, 30; mending a broken, 118

**Sexual Health Strategy,** and equivalence of heterosexual and homosexual behaviours, 28; sexual health services for children without parental knowledge, 28

**Sin,** moral choice and, 15, 16, 50; love the sinner, hate the sin, 35, 103; God takes sexual sin seriously, 49, 105; distorts personality, 89; not inescapable, 90; practice one of many sins, 99; innate, 99; and the Fall, 100; avoid sexual, 106; repentance, mark of the Christian life, 110; affects even ‘spiritual’ people, 110

**Slippery slope:** redefinition of marriage has no limit, 57, 114; from polyamory to abolition of marriage, 57; Distinguishing fallacious from logical slippery slope, 57; discrimination and love applicable to other relationships, 57-58; bisexuality and group marriages follow, 66, 75; legitimizing every kind of sexual taste, 112

**Society,** transformed by ‘queers’ pushing the parameters of sex and family, 6; blind to serious issues, 100

**Spin,** about what works, not absolute truth, 36; the doctors of, artists of persuasion, 36; See Marketing Strategy

**Spirit, Holy,** social movements embraced as ‘the work of the Spirit’, 101; speaks through Scripture, not the theological guild, 104; God still speaking through his, 107

**Stable relationships,** justify homosexual practice, 109

**Stages in history:** incremental steps from ‘normalisation’ to demonization of opposition, 47;

**State, the:** duty to regulate, not define, marriage, for the common good, 71

**Stonewall** as an organization, 1989, to lobby against Section 28, 27

**Stonewall Inn riots,** 1969, birth of the gay liberation movement, 26

**Suppression of evidence,** books and articles, 109

**Tatchell, Peter:** anti-Christian values, 6, 30; gay identity and gay rights, 14; rejects genetic causation, 16; indoctrination in schools, 39; disrupts church service, 44, 97; ambivalent stance on pedophilia, 48; consenting adult behaviour beyond criticism, 51

**Therapy, reparative, for unwanted SSA, controversy over,** 20, 37; professional therapists and religious counselors, 45; pressure to ban research and practice, 45-46; misconceived objections, false assumptions and myths, 45; Conversion one-way, 45; effects of banning, 45; gays harassed by activists when they want to reduce SSA, 46; change in behaviour (as opposed to inclination) always possible, according to St. Paul, 90-91

**Totalitarianism:** ‘totalitarian streak a part of the left’s DNA’, 43; instances of totalitarianism belligerence, 44; government promotion, 44; Nigel Farage’s UKIP ‘not the thought police!’, 44; totalitarian intolerance of dissent, and loss of employment, 76; curtailment of freedoms of speech, religion and conscience, 76

**Tolerance,** jeopardized by gays’ relentless pursuit of their lifestyle affirmation, 6; live and let live, 33; love the sinner, hate the sin, 35; because ‘that’s the way they are’, 99

**Traditional marriage:** see Marriage

**Traditionalists,** pro-gay responders to, and discrimination, 52

**Trend:** SSM to polyamory to abolition of marriage, 47

**Trivialisation of the SSM issue,** by Nick Clegg, 78; note merely about sex, about salvation, 80

**Truth,** with love sets free, 2; being redefined by militant gays, 6; balanced with grace, 106, 107, 108

**Union, physical:** SS intimacy not equivalent to heterosexual one flesh coitus, 56

**Unnatural, homosexuality as,** gut reaction, 14

**Urbanisation,** homosexuality flourishing with, tending towards decadence, 25

**Victimisation:** gays as victims of circumstances, 15; victim’s pain precludes moral scrutiny, 36; ‘witch hunt’ against gays an ‘unbelievable injustice’, 36, 99; oppression of gays starting in the family, 60

**Welby, Justin,** response to ‘overwhelming’ change in social attitudes: invite Stonewall’s co-operation in church schools’ teaching programme on bullying, 40; criticisms of SSM, 70

**Wisdom,** where to be found? 64

**Youth,** and beauty, idealized by gays, 25, 112; as alienated by negativity, 101; more susceptible to error, 101
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