

HOMOSEXUALITY IN AMERICA

EXPOSING THE

MYTHS



If we are to combat the destructive effects of homosexuality socially and personally, we must face the reality, understand the agenda and answer the arguments.

AMERICAN FAMILY ASSOCIATION

■ HOMOSEXUALITY IN AMERICA:
Exposing the Myths

INTRODUCTION

The reality of homosexuality

PART 1

What ever happened to
“live and let live?” 2
The definition of homosexuality 3
Identity or behavior? 3
Recent history and organization 3
Origin 4
Homosexual activist groups 4
Political/social agenda 5
No neutrality 5
The effects of homosexuality 6

PART 2

The myths about homosexuality 9
The response to homosexuality 15

SIDEBARS

Insight: homosexuality and evolution 6
Insight: What does the Bible say? 13
by Bob Davies
Ministries to homosexuals 4
Notes 22

■ THE HOMOSEXUAL MOVEMENT,
A Response by the Ramsey
Colloquium 16

■ HOMOSEXUALS AND THE CHURCH
by Bob Davies 20

■ THE EROSION OF HETEROSEXUALITY
by Charles W. Socarides 23

■ Additional copies of Homosexuality
in America: Exposing the myths:
\$2 for a single copy
\$1.50 each for 2-9 copies
\$1 each for 10-49 copies
\$.50 each, 50 or more copies.

Order from: AFA
P.O. Drawer 2440
Tupelo, MS 38803

© 1994 by The American Family Association
Homosexuality in America: Exposing the Myths

Published by:

The American Family Association
P.O. Drawer 2440
Tupelo, MS 38803

Homosexuality in America: Exposing the Myths

By RICHARD G. HOWE

INTRODUCTION

The reality of homosexuality

MY FIRST ENCOUNTER WITH HOMOSEXUALITY WAS NOT IN AN ADVERSARIAL CONTEXT. I hadn't thought much about homosexuality, so, for the most part, I hadn't developed a theory of what homosexuality was, what caused it, or what, if anything, should be done about it. I was simply repulsed by it and thought it was immoral.

Will (not his name) was a good friend. Though he seemed somewhat effeminate, it never crossed my mind that he might be homosexual. He never made a pass at me or gave any indication that he considered himself different. Our friendship revolved around our common interest and participation in music, and, more importantly, our relationship to Christ. You see, Will claimed to be a Christian.

After our friendship had developed to the point where Will trusted me, he confided that he had had homosexual “struggles” since his pre-teen years. Because of his Christian commitment, Will at first didn't try to justify his homosexuality to himself or to me. It wasn't long, however, before his struggles returned and he found himself vacillating among periods of control, periods of indulgence with its attendant guilt and periods of comfortably practicing his homosexuality.

I believed that homosexuality was wrong. I believed that it could not be justified from a Christian perspective, but I found myself inadequate to understand and help him. After a while, because of school commitments, Will and I went our separate ways, and I lost contact with him. Some years later he returned and we quickly began to catch up on each other's lives. We went for a walk one evening and he must have known that the question on my mind was how he finally had come to terms with his homosexuality. Up to this point in our reunion, Will had been excitedly filling me in on the wonderful ministry opportunities he had had with his music.

Will was also eager to tell me how he was doing regarding his homosexuality and I was eager to hear. To my delight, Will told me that his homosexuality was finally over. Gone were the days when he would try to justify what he knew all along was an abomination before God. He had finally learned that homosexuality was a violation of God's created order, and the love he thought he was experiencing was nothing but a sinful substitute for what God had intended.

Since that time, I have known several homosexuals. Some were professing Christians; some were not. Some struggled with their homosexuality; some did not. So I would be irresponsible if I allowed my conclusions about homosexuality to come solely from the few homosexuals I have known.

To truly understand homosexuality we must avail ourselves of the analysis of the issue afforded by those who have brought to bear the tools of research and examination politically, socially, scientifically, philosophically, and theologically.

This work is an attempt to synthesize the tremendous amount of information on the subject (with primary concern about homosexuality as a social phenomenon), critically analyze that information and advance the claim that homosexuality is not normal or benign, and should not be given preferential treatment by law. My critical analysis of homosexuality will be interspersed throughout this work, but will mainly be in the section “The myths about homosexuality.”

I make no pretense of being unbiased. I do not think that is possible. I am convinced that homosexuality is morally wrong and is personally and socially destructive. I am convinced that the Bible is clear on the subject, and that an empirical analysis of homosexuality will corroborate the biblical assessment that homosexuality is not what God intends for individuals or society.

However, that opinion – once held as a consensus in our country – has come under attack as the homosexual community in America has made major strides into public policy.¹ Today homosexuality is becoming increasingly more difficult to ignore. Homosexuality is being forced upon us through legislation, taught to our children in school and promoted in the powerful arts/entertainment complex.

If it is true that homosexuality has the destructive effects on the individual and society that many believe, then it behooves us to know our enemy and forestall any further advance of homosexuality by understanding what it is, what the homosexual community is up to, and how to answer their arguments in the open marketplace of ideas.

PART I

What ever happened to
“live and let live?”

Why all the bother? What ever happened to the old adage of “live and let live?” If someone wants to be homosexual, why is that anyone else’s business? If you’ve asked yourself questions like these, perhaps it would help to alert you to what homosexuality is all about.

Though it is true that individual homosexuals may differ in their opinions regarding public policy, there is a strong movement in our country whose agenda is specific and whose effect is spilling beyond the homosexual community. Its agenda is forcing homosexuality upon many who reject the notion that homosexuality is a legitimate lifestyle. Not forcing in the sense that people are being coerced to become homosexual themselves. Rather, the homosexual agenda is radically affecting public policy in ways that those who oppose homosexuality cannot ignore.

The issue of homosexuality is not simply a matter of what goes on between consenting adults in the privacy of the bedroom. Basic elements of society are targets of change. There are issues that defy neutrality. Consider these goals that the homosexual community seeks to achieve.²

- The implementation of homosexual, bisexual, and transgendered curriculum at all levels of education.
- The lowering of the age of consent for homosexual and heterosexual sex.
- The legalization of homosexual marriages.
- Custody, adoption and foster care rights for homosexuals, lesbians, and transgendered people.
- The redefinition of family to include the full diversity of all family structures.
- The access to all programs of the Boy Scouts of America.
- Affirmative action for homosexuals.
- The inclusion of sex-change operations under a universal health care plan.

Those who oppose homosexuality are fighting for the prevention of social sanctions, either concretely or in principle, for homosexual acts. We want to outlaw public homosexuality. We want the right not to have homosexuality imposed upon our sentiments by having it treated in public school curricula as if it were a normal alternative lifestyle. We want the right not to have homosexuality imposed upon our sentiments by being forced to hire someone because he is a homosexual. *We resist the effort of the homosexual community to establish their lifestyle as legitimate.*

We believe that homosexuality is immoral and leads ultimately to personal and social decay. We argue both from a Biblical prin-

ciple and a historical and empirical perspective.

The Biblical case against homosexuality will be discussed later. Regarding the historical perspective, it is beyond the scope of this work to fully advance the practical arguments to prove that homosexuality is socially destructive, though in an overall argument against the legitimacy of homosexuality, the historical perspective is important.³

However, we don’t have to look at the vast spans of history to know that the contemporary state of decay in America and the breakdown of the family is due, at least in part, to the presence of homosexuality. As Linda Chavez, former Executive Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, says:

Historically, virtually all societies have condemned incest, adultery, and homosexuality because such practices, in distinctive ways, threaten the family. ...[O]ver the last 25 years, we have become increasingly tolerant of sexually permissive behavior. But that tolerance has had consequences. We face epidemics in sexually transmitted diseases, teenage pregnancies, abortions, illegitimacy, rape, and sexual abuse. Marriage rates are on the decline, and divorce is on the increase, especially among younger couples. The American family may not yet be an endangered species, but it is far from thriving.⁴

**We resist the fact that
the homosexual commu-
nity is seeking to establish
their lifestyle as legitimate.**

The empirical arguments against homosexuality are discussed in the section “The myths about homosexuality.” Special consideration is given to the medical consequences of homosexuality.⁵

In addition, video tapes such as *The Gay Agenda* and the testimony of those who have come out of homosexuality, give clear testimony of the destructive effects of homosexuality on the individual.⁶

Again, not every individual homosexual necessarily favors each one of these social and political goals. But the movement is there and it is gaining inroads into the fabric of society. The information offered here is your weapon to fight the homosexual agenda.

The definition of homosexuality

Simply put, homosexuality is sexual relations between members of the same sex.⁷ Of-

ten the terms “homosexual” and “gay” refer specifically to homosexual males, while the term “lesbian” refers to homosexual females. The term “bi-sexual” or “bi” refers to males or females who have sexual relations with both sexes.

Sometimes the distinction is made between homosexuality and homosexual actions, i.e., between being a homosexual (having a homosexual orientation) and engaging in homosexual activity. While the distinction is relevant in theological and social contexts, for the most part the focus should remain on homosexuality as an action when we are discussing public policy.

Identity or behavior?

Today the homosexual community is casting the debate along the lines of *one’s identity as being a homosexual* rather than *one’s actions as engaging in homosexual activity*. This makes it easier for the debate to be construed as a civil rights debate, and consequently more difficult for those who oppose homosexual activities in the public arena to argue their case. It is easier for the homosexuals to preclude a debate when the focus is on the more abstract issue of one’s personal nature rather than the more concrete issue of one’s behavior.

Homosexual activists understand that the vast majority of Americans are repulsed by homosexual acts. As Congressman William Dannemeyer comments:

[H]omosexuals were...diverting attention from the one aspect of their cause that was most vulnerable: their sexual habits. Most people simply found the idea of homoerotic behavior disgusting...But the homosexuals were well aware of how ignorant the general public was concerning their practices, and their campaign to establish the predetermined nature of their “sexual orientation.”⁸

Our argument focuses on homosexual actions, i.e., whether there should be laws regulating them.⁹

Recent history and organization

Is it possible to talk about homosexuality as a social entity? Are homosexuals in America banded together in order to advance some social agenda? While not all homosexuals are part of one political movement, there is no doubt that there exist powerful, politically organized groups. As homosexual rights activist Dick Michaels said near the beginning of the homosexual movement:

Homosexuals could be a very potent economic and political force – *if united*. The time has come for new leadership to rise from the wreckage of the past.

About the author

Richard G. Howe is president of The Issachar Institute, Inc., an apologetics ministry in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Richard is a graduate of Mississippi College with a B.A. in Bible. He received his M.A. in Philosophy from the University of Mississippi. Richard has completed the course work for the Ph.D. in Philosophy at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

For information on cults, the occult, the New Age Movement and Christian apologetics, or to request a speaker for your Church or group write: The Issachar Institute, P.O. Box 221583, Charlotte, NC 28224, phone 704-527-5870.

MINISTRIES TO HOMOSEXUALS

Exodus International of North America

P. O. Box 2121
San Rafael, CA 94912 • 415-454-1017

Founded in 1976, Exodus is a Christian organization which seeks to equip and unify agencies and individuals to effectively communicate the message of liberation from homosexuality through repentance and faith in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.

Exodus provides resource lists for books and tapes. Publishes the magazine *The Exodus Standard*, available by subscription. Information about ministries to homosexuals was provided for this work by Exodus International. This is the place to start for information on ministry to homosexuals.

Transforming Congregation

724 Niles St.
Bakersfield, CA 93305 • 805-325-0785

Mainline churches with a pro-change stance (instead of pro-homosexual)

Courage

St. Michael's Rectory • 424 W. 34th St.
New York, NY 10001 • 212-421-0426

A Catholic network

Homosexuals Anonymous

P. O. Box 7881
Reading, PA 19603 • 215-376-1146

Uses a modified 12-step program

Pure Life Ministries

P. O. Box 410
Dry Creek, KY 41035 • 606-824-4444

Deals with sexual addiction

New Creation Ministries

1020 E. McKinley Avenue
Fresno, CA 93728 • 209-264-6125

Regeneration

P.O. Box 9830
Baltimore, MD 21284-9830 • 401-661-0284

Here and there are signs of a new movement – dedicated to achieving a place in the sun for all homosexuals.¹⁰

Because of this, it is imperative that those who oppose the homosexual agenda be informed about the main characters and their political strategies.

Origin

Though homosexuality has existed in the world throughout history, it has been only recently that society has tolerated homosexuality as a social movement. Many organizations have emerged in recent decades to advance the homosexual agenda and to provide information and services to the homosexual community, including legal, political, medical, and religious.

No doubt the turbulent 1960s laid the groundwork for the homosexual community to organize itself into a social movement by the 1970s. Dennis Altman says:

The '70s saw the beginning of the large-scale transition in the status of homosexuality from a deviance or perversion to an alternate lifestyle or minority. ...Along with this change, homosexuals were being cast increasingly in the role of the vanguard of social and sexual change, worthy of considerable media attention.¹¹

Some mark June, 1969, as the beginning of the homosexual movement. On the heels of the police raid at the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village in June (which was met immediately with a riot), groups of homosexuals gathered for what homosexual activist Leigh W. Rutledge called "the first 'Gay Power' meeting" on July 9, 1969.¹² Other meetings were soon to follow, and the sentiments which had been seething underground for perhaps decades began to find their way into public expression.

During the 1970s the movement spread into other areas of expression besides protest. Organized efforts were under way to change existing sodomy laws, magazines such as *The Advocate* were born, "gay" bookstores began to emerge, and indeed, an entire industry targeting the homosexual community began to flourish.¹³ Homosexuals were beginning to be viewed as a segment of society with its attendant interests in entertainment, fashion, and public policy.

Homosexual activist groups

A number of groups exist for the purpose of advancing the cause of homosexual special interests. These organization range from public relations and anti-defamation, to legal and political, to social and religious. Some seek to

improve the public image of homosexuality as a viable lifestyle and others seek to effect change in public policy.

NGLTF – The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF), formerly The National Gay Task Force, was founded in October, 1973, by former New York City health administrator Dr. Howard J. Brown.¹⁴ The current Executive Officer is Ms. Urvashi Vaid. The NGLTF is a political lobbying – or as homosexuals call it, civil rights – group and is one of the most influential in America. Membership is estimated at about 18,000 with an annual budget of over \$1 million.¹⁵

Some credit the effort of NGLTF with persuading the American Psychiatric Association to officially take homosexuality from its list of mental illnesses,¹⁶ making the White House accessible to the leadership of the homosexual community during the Carter administration with their meeting with White House aide Midge Constanza,¹⁷ and influencing the introduction of several pro-homosexual statutes in the U.S. Congress.¹⁸

NGLTF publications include the semi-annual *Campus Organizing Newsletter*, the quarterly *National Gay and Lesbian Task Force – Task Force Report*, and various brochures, fact sheets, and information packets including *Dealing with Violence: A Guide for Gay and Lesbian People*; *Anti-Gay Violence: Causes, Consequences, Responses*; and *Gay and Lesbian Rights Protections in the U.S.*¹⁹

Though the NGLTF is not as large as its opponents, it nevertheless is a formidable political organization. As Dannemeyer comments:

But you can't quarrel with success. Regardless of the relatively small size of the NGLTF, it has taken on the most well organized and powerful adversaries, including the federal government itself, and come out the winner. ... They have operated on the national stage with an effectiveness that few, if any, lobbying groups have surpassed over the past fifteen years.²⁰

Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc.

– The Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Inc. is "one of the oldest and largest gay legal organizations in the United States."²¹ Its self description says that "Lambda was founded in 1973 to advance the rights of gay people and lesbians. ...Lambda pursues test-case litigation in all parts of the country, and in all areas of concern to gay men and lesbians. Case by case, its efforts strip away any respectability afforded sexual orientation discrimination, bringing gay people closer to equal citizenship under the law."²²

Currently headed by Kevin M. Cathcart,

membership is around 22,000, with a budget of \$1.8 million.²³

ACT UP – The AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power is a “direct-action organization dedicated to confronting the issues of discrimination against people with HIV infection and access to experimental AIDS drugs.”²⁴ ACT UP was founded in 1987 by author and playwright Larry Kramer “to force the government, businesses, and the public to confront the AIDS crisis.” This civil disobedience organization, with more than a hundred chapters in the United States and abroad, has succeeded in pressuring the Food and Drug Administration to speed up the process of testing and releasing potentially useful AIDS drugs, and focused public and media attention on the worldwide health crisis.²⁵

Currently headed by Robert Rygr, ACT UP “conducts rallies and demonstrations aimed at public figures or institutions that the group feels should be doing more to combat AIDS.”²⁶ Its publications include the quarterly newsletter *ACT UP Reports*.²⁷

Queer Nation – Queer Nation was founded in 1990 in New York City by members of ACT UP. According to one of the group’s founders:

We wanted to do direct action, to get out on the streets, to scream and yell, to stage very visible protests against anti-gay violence and discrimination.²⁸

According to Eric Marcus, author of *Is It a Choice? Answers to 300 of the Most Frequently Asked Questions about Gays and Lesbians*, Queer Nation has many chapters across the country.

The Human Rights Campaign Fund – The Human Rights Campaign Fund is a homosexual political action committee, or PAC. The Executive Director is Tim McFeeley. Founded in 1980, HRCF currently has 62,000 members and an annual budget of \$4.5 million.²⁹ As a PAC, the HRCF is able to collect and distribute funds for the election of specific candidates for public office. Since 1987, it has maintained at least three lobbyists in Washington.³⁰ Under its former director, Vic Basile, in 1986 the HRCF was ranked the sixteenth largest independent PAC in the nation.³¹ By 1988 it was ranked ninth and had raised over \$1 million “for an election-year war chest.”³² According to the *Encyclopedia of Associations*, the HRCF seeks to:

“...advance the cause of lesbian and gay civil rights by lobbying Congress and political candidates who support gay and lesbian civil rights and increased funding for women’s health concerns and AIDS research and treatment.”³³

Its publications include *Annual Report*, the bimonthly newsletter *Capital Hill Update*, and the quarterly *Momentum*.³⁴

The Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation – The Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD) was founded in 1985, and has 10,000 members with 13 regional groups. GLAAD seeks to:

...oppose media and public defamation of gay and lesbian individuals through education [and] replace “bigoted and misinformed representations” of lesbians and gays with positive images of the gay community.³⁵

GLAAD’s publications include the bimonthly *GLAAD Bulletin*, and the weekly *GLAAD Tidings*.³⁶

The American Civil Liberties Union – The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) is not a homosexual organization, but is committed to homosexual “rights” legislation. According to one homosexual publication, the local ACLU “may, in fact, function as the gay rights organization in some cities.”³⁷

Others – *The Encyclopedia of Associations: National Organizations of the U.S.* lists a number of other national organizations dedicated to the special interests of homosexuals. Entries include the American Library Association/Social Responsibilities Round Table/Gay and Lesbian Task Force (a division of the American Library Association); the Association for Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues in Counseling; the Association of Gay and Lesbian Psychiatrists; the Center for Gay and Lesbian Studies; Custody Action for Lesbian Mothers; the Gay and Lesbian Parents Coalition International; the Gay Nurses Alliance; the Hetrick-Martin Institute; the Homosexual Information Center; the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission; the Lesbian Feminist Liberation; the National Center for Lesbian Rights; Affirmation/Gay and Lesbian Mormons; Affirmation/United Methodists for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Concerns; American Baptists Concerned; American Gay/Lesbian Atheists; Brethren/Mennonite Council for Lesbian and Gay Concerns; Conference for Catholic Lesbians; Presbyterians for Lesbian and Gay Concerns; Dignity, Inc.; and many more. Truly, the homosexual community is organized.

Political/social agenda

There is no doubt that the homosexual community is actively promoting a specific social and political agenda. In *The Nation*, a publication sympathetic to the homosexual

agenda, Andrew Kopkind comments:

Responding to the rigidity of the old order, younger gay men and “baby dykes” have created a queer culture that is rapidly reconfiguring American values, redesigning sensibilities and remodeling politics. The gay movement, broadly construed, is *the* movement.³⁸

Kopkind goes on to boast about the extent to which homosexuals have influenced entertainment, journalism and publishing, law, academia, medicine and psychiatry, and the arts and creative professions.

All of this, of course, is supposed to strike us as long overdue, since it is ostensibly nothing more than recognizing the minimal “human” or “civil” rights of a portion of the American population who have been denied these rights for too long.

However, understanding that the majority of people do not consider homosexuality a legitimate lifestyle and certainly not a civil right, homosexuals often understate their social goals. Thus, when the homosexual community’s agenda is cast in terms of “civil rights” or “rights to privacy” it not only makes it difficult to speak out against such an agenda without sounding bigoted, but it hides the covert agenda. Peter LaBarbera in *Human Events* comments:

Unfortunately, much of the real homosexual agenda – and the realities of “gay” life – remains buried in the homosexual subculture to which the average American is seldom exposed.

Prominent homosexual leaders and publications have voiced support for pedophilia, incest, sadomasochism, and even bestiality.³⁹

It is clear that “civil rights” are not the only things that the movement is seeking. Regarding the lifting of the ban on homosexuals in the military, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force said:

It is not just about dropping the military ban. Indeed, the issue is far greater. What is at stake is the hearts and minds of American people.⁴⁰

Civil rights or rights to privacy are far from the minds of homosexual activists. Clearly the movement seeks not only tolerance for their lifestyle, but endorsement.

No neutrality

In the face of the movement’s real goals, it is impossible to remain neutral. If a conflict arises because an employee wishes not to hire someone because he is gay, then the conflict will have to be resolved in one of two ways. Either the employee will maintain his right to reject homosexuality as a viable lifestyle and

by Richard Howe

INSIGHT

Homosexuality and evolution

I do not believe in the theory of evolution. Most evangelical Christians do not. I think it is safe to say that most non-evangelical Christians, however, do believe in the theory of evolution. Since it is the case that most people who are sympathetic to homosexuality are non-evangelical Christians, then it follows that most of the people who are sympathetic to homosexuality believe in the theory of evolution.

There are ultimately only two options concerning the origin of the world as we know it: creation and evolution. If one is to be reasonable, this means any given fact about our world must be compatible with the theory to which one is committed. Does it make sense for one who believes in evolution also to argue that homosexuality is genetically endowed or “natural?”

For the evolutionist, the word “natural” means “the result of an evolutionary process.” According to the theory of evolution the characteristics of species are genetically passed on because of their ability to lead to reproductive success. Evolutionists maintain that genes mutate over eons of time, and those mutations which enable the species to better survive are preserved and passed on to successive generations. This notion of reproductive success is the whole basis of the theory of evolution. But surely homosexuality, by definition, cannot promote reproductive success. Even if it were possible that certain genes mutated which endowed an organism with homosexuality, how could this possibly be passed on? By its very design, homosexuality, if it were genetic, would be eliminated from the gene pool.*

Creationism has an explanation for homosexuality. In Christianity, which embraces creationism, homosexuality is the result of the moral fall of the human race. Simply put, it is the willful sin of human beings which causes homosexuality. This means that it is not a natural occurrence, but rather a moral one. Since there are only two options for explaining the world as we know it, and neither can account for homosexuality as “natural,” then it follows that homosexuality cannot be natural.

*For a defense of homosexuality as compatible with the theory of evolution see, Edward O. Wilson, *On Human Nature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978): 142-147. To read Wilson's account is to see its flaws. His argument is hopelessly *ad hoc*.

make his hiring policy align with his convictions, or the homosexual will be given the entitlement of the job when the government forbids the employer the right to refuse to hire him. There is no middle ground. Thus, homosexuals are seeking more than a “live and let live” society. They are on the advance.

In May, 1993, hundred of thousands of homosexuals and those sympathetic to their cause marched in Washington during the “Lesbian, Gay, and Bi-Equal Rights and Liberation March.” If the behavior of the homosexuals during the march is representative of the whole movement, then it is alarming to see what the movement wants to achieve socially and politically.

LaBarbera notes several of the “goals” of the homosexual community taken from their own literature:⁴¹

1. Homosexuals “demand passage of a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender civil rights bill” and the “repeal of all sodomy laws and other laws that criminalize private sexual expression between consenting adults.”⁴²

It is important to identify the far-reaching implications of the repeal of such laws against certain sexual behaviors or the implementation of laws protecting such sexual behavior as a “civil right.” What would happen, for example, to a church that fired a minister because of homosexual activity? What would take precedence, the rights of the church to maintain that homosexuality, even between consenting adults, is morally wrong and that their ministers should be held to such a standard, or the “civil rights” of the minister to engage in such activity?

It is not enough for the homosexual community to claim that all they want is for the activity not to be criminalized. To treat homosexuality as a civil right is to enable the courts to allow the activity wherever civil rights are protected.

2. Homosexuals “demand legislation to prevent discrimination against Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transgendered people in the areas of family diversity, custody, adoption and foster care and that the definition of family includes the full diversity of all family structures.”⁴³

3. Homosexuals “demand full and equal inclusion of Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals, and Transgendered people in the educational system, and inclusion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender studies in multicultural curricula.”⁴⁴

4. Homosexuals seem to favor leniency regarding pedophilia. According to one of San Francisco's newspapers for homosexuals, “NAMBLA's [North American Man/Boy Love Association] position on sex is not unreasonable, just unpopular. The love between men and boys is at the foundation of homo-

sexuality.”⁴⁵

5. Homosexuals seek “institute training for all personnel on the acceptance of homosexual or bisexual personnel in the military.”⁴⁶

6. Homosexuals seek to undercut the social authority of churches. “We can undermine the moral authority of homophobic churches by portraying them as antiquated backwaters, badly out of step with the times and with the latest findings of psychology. ...Such an unholy alliance [science and public opinion] has worked before [against institutional religion] on such topics as divorce and abortion. With enough open talk about the prevalence and acceptability of homosexuality, that alliance can work again here.”⁴⁷

7. Homosexuals seek to make their homosexuality more accepted by society. “The first order of business is desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights. ...You can forget about trying to persuade the masses that homosexuality is a good thing. But if you can get them to think that it is just another thing with a shrug of their shoulders, then your battle for legal and social rights is virtually won.”⁴⁸

These examples illustrate that acceptance of the homosexual agenda would restructure America in fundamental areas including public policy regarding sexual behavior, family issues such as family structure, custody laws, adoption, foster care, educational issues, government policy, and military.

The effects of homosexuality

Over the past few decades numerous homosexual special interest groups have organized to address various areas of society ranging from public policy to education.

There is nothing wrong in principle with special interest groups seeking to affect society in the way it perceives to be in its own best interest. Our quarrel with the homosexual movement is not at that level. Our argument is that to the degree that the homosexual movement changes society in its favor, (1) it will inevitably lead to an improper violation of the moral and religious sentiments of millions of Americans who oppose homosexuality, and (2) it will contribute to the overall decay of society.

Of course the mere fact that a group violates the moral and religious sentiments of another group is not sufficient reason to disallow the group from making changes in public policy if they are able. For example, a person's atheism may very well violate someone else's religious sentiments. However, it is not merely the fact that our sentiments are violated that makes us claim that we have the right to prevent the homosexual movement from having its way. It is that our sentiments are

**Those who oppose homo-
sexuality should have the
right not to have homo-
sexuality forced upon their
sentiments.**

violated in such a way that homosexuality is forced upon us.

Those who oppose homosexuality should have the right not to have homosexuality forced upon their sentiments. Its imposition upon us constitutes an improper violation of our moral and religious sentiments.

This is a common principle in our society. For example, our society has laws preventing someone from uttering public profanities. Regardless if one believes uttering profanity is protected by the first amendment as “free speech,” there are laws preventing someone from indiscriminately uttering profanities anywhere he chooses. Others have the right not to have their sentiments violated by being forced to hear such utterances. Thus, even if a case could be given that homosexuality should be allowed among consenting adults in the privacy of their own homes, it does not follow that society must introduce information about homosexuality into the educational system.

The current rage over “political correctness” evidences the fact that some believe speech and behavior can have far reaching effects upon society as a whole. Why are we being told that certain words or phrases should not be used?⁴⁹ Because, as some believe, certain words or phrases can have a harmful effect on others. If we are expected to believe, for example, that the use of the masculine pronoun in gender inclusive contexts leads to the oppression of women, why are some surprised by our claim that the overhauling of societal mores regarding homosexuality could have a debilitating effect on society?

It is clear that there is nothing flawed in principle with our argument that the institutionalizing of homosexuality will cause societal decay. The debate is not about the principle of whether activities have effects on society, but rather the debate is about whether a particular activity has an *unwanted* effect on society. Thus, when we argue that laws allowing homosexual marriages will have a destructive effect on society, we are employing a principle which itself is not in dispute. The argument then becomes one not of philosophy, but of empirical analysis.

Here is a quick look at how the homosexual

agenda is impacting public education, politics, medicine and science, and religion.

Public education

Homosexual activists have pushed their agenda into many public schools under the auspices of sex education. Robert H. Knight, Director of Cultural Studies for the Family Research Council, says one of the goals of the homosexual agenda is to implement curricula that regards homosexuality on par with heterosexuality.⁵⁰

The “family-life curriculum” entitled *Values in Sexuality* has the students role play both sides of homosexual situations such as “You feel whatever anyone does sexually is their business, but you feel very sad that your friend has closed off lots of options,” and “You are a devout Fundamentalist Christian and feel homosexuality is a serious sin.” The students are then asked to come to a consensus about which attitudes are the most constructive.⁵¹ It is clear that the message that is supposed to come across, in the interest of “understanding” and “tolerance” is that homosexuality is a viable lifestyle, just as legitimate as heterosexuality.

Another effort within the public schools to promote homosexuality is Project 10, a counseling program developed at Fairfax High School in the Los Angeles Unified School District by Virginia Uribe. The target group “consists of students who self-identify as gay or lesbian or students who express conflicts over sexual orientation.”⁵² In a letter to supporters of Project 10, Uribe reported how far the organization had come in promoting homosexuality; including a library of “gay and lesbian literature” of over 500 books; the distribution of over 3,000 pamphlets offering information on “the special needs of gay and lesbian youth” to every junior and senior high school in the district; and an essay contest “entitled ‘Homophobia and Racism – A Common Thread.’”⁵³

One incident involving an encounter with Project 10 found Elizabeth Ramos, 16, subjected to a lecture on homosexuality. Her class was brought into the library. There, according to a number of students, they heard Virginia Uribe, a lesbian teacher, tell them she practices “safe sex,” that it is okay for them to have sexual feelings for other people of the same sex, and, based on research, that 10% of them probably are gay.⁵⁴

When some students voiced their disagreement, Uribe changed the subject. According to *Valley Magazine*, parental consent was not obtained for the students to attend the speech by Uribe. In addition to the offense of having to be subjected to such content, Project 10’s presence in the school, being a school-sponsored program, utilized taxpayer dollars to do its counseling.⁵⁵

A controversy in New York City over curriculum involved two pro-homosexual books, *Daddy’s Roommate* and *Heather Has Two Mommies* (part of a bibliography included in the “Children of the Rainbow” curriculum).⁵⁶ The dispute “ultimately resulted in the ouster of Joseph Fernandez from his position as School Chancellor.”⁵⁷

Recently, the Governor of Massachusetts, William Weld, signed into law a bill which ostensibly ends discrimination against homosexual students. Among other things, the bill would require the schools to allow homosexual student organizations. David LaFontaine, head of the Governors Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth and director of the state Coalition of Gay and Lesbian Civil Rights, hoped the bill’s passage would “signal a whole new frontier in the gay rights movement.”⁵⁸ What remains unanswered, according to Weld, is whether gay students could sue the school “upon alleging that the atmosphere at a school had become intolerable.”⁵⁹

One can only imagine the implications for such a law. If the courts decide that an atmosphere of intolerance is actionable, would this mean that the government could step in and begin to “desensitize” those who oppose homosexuality? What about those of us who oppose homosexuality on religious grounds; how would government seek to address our “intolerance?” The prospects are horrific.

It is not enough for homosexual activists to debate these issues among adults in the open marketplace of ideas. The homosexual community has engaged the power of government in what some regard as brainwashing our children. More and more Christians will find their values assaulted by the government through the public schools.

Politics

According to John Preston, there are a number of public officials who have openly acknowledged their homosexuality, offering sympathetic, if not active, support of the homosexual agenda. These officials include, Congressman Barney Frank from Massachusetts; Congressman Gerry Studds from Massachusetts; California Superior Court Judge Donna Hitchens; Maine State Senator Dale McCormick; Minnesota State Senator Alan Spear; New York State Assembly Member Deborah Glick; Oregon State Legislator Gail Shibley; Washington Representative Calvin Anderson; and numerous local officials around the country.⁶⁰

The current Clinton administration is clearly courting homosexual support. The November 13, 1993, issue of *World* finds a picture of President Clinton with a “roll call of all the openly homosexual members of the Clinton government.”⁶¹ According to *World*,

Clinton lauded the “tireless efforts” of the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund. In addition, one of the most volatile issues immediately after Clinton’s election revolved around the controversy of removing the ban on homosexuals in the military. The fact that this issue reached such a high level of public debate demonstrates the clout of the homosexual lobby.

Supervisors and managers at Roberta Achtenberg’s U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development have been told if they want career advancement, take every opportunity in and out of the workplace to promote homosexuality.

The mandate comes in the form of new guidelines for administrators to evaluate the performance of their managers and supervisors specifically in the area of promoting a “diversified work force.” Managers and supervisors are encouraged to be “proactive” in addressing issues of “cultural diversity” and giving special consideration to others of “diverse backgrounds” – common euphemisms which equate homosexuality with racial minorities, women and persons with disabilities.

In a letter to the principal staff, regional administrators and regional housing commissioners of HUD, Achtenberg, assistant secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, and Marilyn Davis, assistant secretary for Administration, wrote that it is the policy of the department “to increase the awareness and knowledge of all employees, and the clients it serves and supports, about the benefits of working harmoniously with persons of differ-

ent race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, physical and mental ability and other personal characteristics.”

Achtenberg is an open lesbian and long time radical homosexual activist. She served as executive director of the National Center for Lesbian Rights, directing attorney of the Lesbian Rights Project of Equal Rights Advocates, Inc., and was a national co-chair of the Clinton for President Campaign. While in San Francisco she led the fight to force the Boy Scouts of America to appoint homosexual leaders.

Homosexual groups on the state level have also been successful in challenging longstanding laws which prohibit sodomy.

In addition, there have been examples where people have been forced to undergo “sensitivity training courses” for openly opposing homosexuals in various public spheres.⁶² The fact that an opposition against homosexuality within governmental arenas brings such a response again evidences the significant impact of the homosexual agenda in the public sphere.

Business

The homosexual influence in the corporate world merited a cover story by *Fortune* magazine. The article describes how homosexuals are rapidly forming employee groups like the one whose huge banner greeted all those on their way to the elevators at Levi Strauss’ San Francisco headquarters in June: **LESBIAN AND GAY EMPLOYEE ASSOCIATION**

CELEBRATES PRIDE WEEK.⁶³

The article reports that similar groups exist at companies such as AT & T and Xerox. Plant manager at Xerox, Al Lewis, who is active in his company’s homosexual employees’ organization says that “there’s a group in every large company in the U. S.”⁶⁴

Mainline companies such as AT&T, Continental Airlines, Miller Brewing and Walt Disney are also courting the lucrative homosexual consumer market through sponsorship of homosexual events or advertisements directed at homosexuals.

Medicine and science

Since AIDS and homosexuality are inseparably connected, homosexuals are active in promoting their cause in the world of medicine and science.

According to a recent report in the *Washington Times* scientists at the federally funded National Cancer Institute have put basic cancer research on the back burner in favor of hunting for a genetic link for homosexuality.⁶⁵ The research is being led by a homosexual scientist – a fact that has gone largely unreported.⁶⁶

Molecular biologist Dean H. Hamer is the research leader and an acknowledged homosexual. Hamer has been a speaker for several pro-homosexual groups. He also appeared as a key expert witness for the legal coalition fighting Colorado’s Amendment 2, the state initiative to deny protected minority class status on the basis of sexual orientation. The director of the lesbian side of the research project is Angela M. L. Pattatucci, herself an acknowledged homosexual.⁶⁷

The *Washington Times* reported that the genetic hunt involves four of the six researchers in the Institute’s Section on Gene Structure and Regulation in the Laboratory of Biochemistry.

The story also indicated that NCI rejected repeated requests from the newspaper for budget information. However, the newspaper did report \$419,000 in taxpayer money was spent on a controversial two-year study published in 1993. The research made a dubious genetic link for homosexuality. The report was enthusiastically embraced by homosexual activists.

Entertainment/arts

Movie reviewer Michael Medved comments:

AIDS gets big bucks in research

7.5 times more per patient than cancer this year

The table below shows selected Federal spending on research and prevention for 1992 (actual), 1993 (estimate) and 1994 (estimate). The spending figures represent the sum of Public Health Service (PHS) and National Institutes of Health (NIH) spending. For the complete report call your Congressman and ask for 93-631 SPR from the Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress.

	in millions			a. no. of new cases yearly	b. no. currently infected	c. no. of deaths annually	Average per patient spending – 1994 funding ÷ a+b+c
	1992	1993	1994				
AIDS	\$3010	\$3151	\$3963	47,106	81,558	29,763	\$3,421.02
HIV infection				na	1 million	na	
Cancer	\$4003	\$4071	\$4420	1.2million	8 million	526,000	\$454.45
Heart Disease	\$1460	\$1484	\$1460	na	20 million	720,000	\$70.46
Diabetes	\$576	\$599	\$592	650,000	13 million	160,000	\$42.87
Alzheimer’s	\$562	\$588	\$579	na	4 million	na	\$144.75

No one could deny that the formidable gay presence in the entertainment business encourages industry leaders to take a far more sympathetic view of homosexuality than does the public at large.⁶⁸

Beginning in the early 1980s the major television networks offered a steady progression of pro-homosexual characters and themes. The 1993-94 series which featured regular or recurring homosexual characters include **Melrose Place** (Fox), **Birdland** (ABC), **Roseanne** (ABC), **Roc** (Fox), **Northern Exposure** (CBS) and **Sisters** (NBC).

In non-commercial television the Public Broadcasting Network has a long history of promoting homosexuality through broadcasts such as **Tongues Untied**, **Tales of the City** and **One Nation Under God**.

The National Endowment for the Arts, a taxpayer-funded arts agency, has pumped millions of dollars into homosexual and homoerotic arts projects.

As already noted, the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation, or GLAAD, exists for the purpose of applying the muscle of the homosexual community to the media for its public relations image.

Religion

Although traditionally seen as an abomination to God and against the teaching of all divisions of Christianity and Judaism, homosexuality is finding growing acceptance in some mainline religious groups.

The Re-Imagining Conference, held in November, 1993, promoted lesbianism and feminism. The convocation was funded primarily by the Presbyterian Church USA. Participants included United Methodists, Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, Baptists, American Baptists, Quakers, Moravians, Mennonites and members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, United Church of Christ, Church of the Brethren, Church of God in Christ, United Church of Canada and the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

In addition, the *Encyclopedia of Associations* lists a number of "concern" groups within major denominations.⁶⁹

The central focus of the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches (UFMCC), founded by Troy Perry, is the legitimacy of homosexuality. According to Dannemeyer, UFMCC congregations number 267 worldwide, with a membership of approximately 35,000.⁷⁰ Perry himself boasts, "We're now the largest organization touching the lives of gays and lesbians in the world. Our membership is contributing approximately \$6 million a year now."⁷¹

Virtually every area of society has been

touched by the homosexual agenda: education, public policy, all levels of government, business, science, entertainment, media, and religion. Clearly, the homosexual community is making an impact on American society.

PART 2

The myths about homosexuality

THE ISSUE OF HOMOSEXUALITY has become a political, social, and theological rage in recent years. Gone are the times when extended arguments needed to be advanced to dissuade the practice of homosexuality. No doubt because of the presence of the Christian world view, homosexuality was generally regarded in society as an unacceptable lifestyle. Those who were homosexual were compelled either to seek help for their condition or practice it in secret.

Today the homosexual community is seeking not only the right to practice and celebrate their homosexuality openly, but is in many ways seeking the endorsement from the rest of society for its lifestyle. There is no way to remain neutral on this issue. To allow for homosexuality in public life is tacitly to concede its legitimacy. Those who oppose homosexuality and regard it as socially and personally destructive must prepare for ideological, political, sociological and theological battles.

The success of the homosexual community in advancing its cause is due to a number of myths about homosexuality. These untruths are making it easier for the homosexual community to gain ground in the ideological, political, social, and theological arenas.

We must face these claims head on and see if they can stand up under the scrutiny of scientific, theological, and philosophical analysis. We can only stop the advancement of homosexuality in our society to the extent to which we can dispel these myths. Hopefully it is not too late to rescue America from total moral collapse.

The following are the most important and common myths propagated by those promoting the homosexual agenda.

Myth #1 – 10% of the population is homosexual.

The issue of how many people in the United States are homosexual is again in the news. Ever since the famous Kinsey reports,⁷² the most popular statistic used about the prevalence of homosexuality is that around 10% of the population of the United States is homosexual. In the widely acclaimed pro-homosexual video *On Being Gay: A Conversation with Brian McNaught*,⁷³ McNaught cites the Kinsey report as evidence that 10% of the

What are we to do in the face of such a seemingly ominous threat? The first thing to do is to learn to dispel the myths by which the homosexual agenda survives.

population is gay. In the book *Is It a Choice?* Eric Marcus uses the Kinsey studies to suggest that *one in ten* people is gay.⁷⁴ Even the public school counseling curriculum Project 10 gets its name from the Kinsey 10% figure.

But Kinsey's findings, as inflated as they were, did not go so far as to claim that 10% of the population of the United States is homosexual. Kinsey said that 10% of white males are more or less exclusively homosexual (a 5 on a scale from 1 to 6; 6 being exclusively homosexual) for at least three years between the ages of 15 and 65, and 4% are exclusively homosexual throughout life after the onset of adolescence. Thus, it is inaccurate to use Kinsey as an authority in trying to make a "10%" argument.

Not only did Kinsey not have the figures that high, there is reason to believe that the real percentage is not even as high as he did have it. In their book *Kinsey, Sex, and Fraud*, Dr. Judith A. Reisman and Edward W. Eichel demonstrate why it is evident that the Kinsey report is inflated.

The test of any theory, perhaps especially of human sexuality, is how it stacks up in the real world. By this yardstick, Kinsey's data on the prevalence of homosexuality in society... now appears to be inaccurate.⁷⁵

Reisman and Eichel's argument that Kinsey's numbers are too high falls along three lines: First, the actual number of AIDS cases fell far below the projected number of AIDS cases calculated on the basis of these estimates of the number of homosexuals in the United States. Thus, if there had been as many homosexuals as Kinsey estimated, then, given the known percentage of homosexuals who have contracted AIDS, health care professionals should have been able to accurately project the number of AIDS cases that would erupt in a given community. This was not the case. The actual number of cases was far lower. The number of AIDS cases indicated that only 1% - 3% of the population is homosexual.

Second, the methods of research which lead Kinsey to his conclusions were faulty because his studies focused on a sample of men whose homosexual experience was certainly higher than normal. Kinsey's analysis was on a study group in which 20% to 25% had prison experience and 5% may have been male

prostitutes. This would be like trying to estimate the percentage of Americans who are religious and then taking a survey on the street in front of a church at noon on Sunday. The sampling would have an over representation of religious people. Statistics are hard to achieve. But if the statistics are to be accurate nationwide, then the sample must be as close to a cross section of the country as possible. Even the National Research Council acknowledges that his methods were flawed.⁷⁶

Third, there is reason to believe that Kinsey's interviewees, from whom he gathered additional information upon which he based his statistical analysis, were certainly biased. The chance that those who were interviewed were biased was even suggested to Kinsey at the time by the eminent psychologist Abraham Maslow.⁷⁷

In addition to the problems with the Kinsey report itself, there is counter evidence from other studies which suggests the percentage of homosexuals in the United States to be around 1% to 3%.⁷⁸ Researchers at the Battelle Human Affairs Research Centers in Seattle found that 2.3% of American men report having sex with another man and that 1.1% consider themselves exclusively homosexual.⁷⁹ The *Washington Post* reported that the Battelle-Temple "scores high marks with most sex researchers."⁸⁰ Even some pro-homosexual literature is starting to admit that the long standing Kinsey figures are exaggerated.⁸¹ Thus, it is time to lay the "10%" myth to rest.

Myth #2 – Homosexuality occurs in the animal kingdom and is therefore natural.

Simply put, if animals do it, it must be "natural." There are several problems with this argument.

First, this line of thinking assumes without further argument that animals are a proper model for conclusions regarding humans. Admittedly there are areas where animals and humans are sufficiently alike to warrant conclusions about one on the basis of an analysis of the other. We are all familiar with how medical research is conducted on "laboratory rats" and how conclusions are drawn about humans.

There are areas, however, where this type of cross argument certainly cannot hold. It is one thing to examine clear physiological aspects common between animals and humans. It is quite another thing to assume that behavioral aspects are equally as common between animals and humans.

The only way we can discover those common physiological aspects is that the data regarding those common physiological aspects submits itself to rigorous scientific (i.e., empirical or physical) analysis. Behavior, however, certainly does not submit itself to such

analysis. At least, we have no obligation to think that behavior can be physically explained unless we have reason to hold this.

Whether or not the behavior of human beings is the proper subject of scientific or empirical analysis is ultimately not a medical or scientific question, but, rather, is a philosophical and theological one. How one regards the nature of human behavior presupposes how one regards human nature itself. Are human beings strictly physical, or is there a spiritual aspect? If it is true that human beings are more than just their physical bodies, then by definition, human behavior is more than an empirical issue, and therefore science is inadequate to deal with the question. Thus, we have no obligation to allow this type of argument which assumes that animal behavior is a proper model for conclusions about human behavior.

But, let us assume, for the sake of argument, that animal behavior is a proper model for conclusions about human behavior. The problem becomes, second, that the argument proves too much. Cannibalism is found within the animal kingdom, but surely no one would want to argue that cannibalism is "natural" and therefore should be allowed among humans. So, even if it were the case that homosexuality was natural within the animal kingdom, one would be wise to be cautious in his conclusions about human behavior on the basis of this.

A third problem with this argument is that it is not proper to equate human homosexuality with the seemingly "homosexual" acts that occur among some animals. Brian McNaught, in his video *On Being Gay*, makes the outrageous statement that "In every species of mammal, from the sea horse to the baboon, there is homosexual behavior, whether in captivity or in the wild."⁸² This is clearly wrong. Human sexual activity is quite different, even physiologically speaking, and certainly emotionally and spiritually speaking, than that of animals. As Robert Knight comments:

Anthropologists and sexologists interested in promoting the sexual revolution often interpret the sexual behavior of animals as analogous to human behavior. Scholars of animal sexuality rarely make that mistake because they know that animals are aroused in entirely different ways than are humans.⁸³

A study done by the U. S. Department of Agriculture on the sexual behavior in sheep is sometimes cited as evidence of homosexual behavior in animals. According to interviews with the researcher, however, there was absolutely no relationship between the conduct of the sheep and human sexual conduct.⁸⁴ Thus, to argue for homosexuality by appealing to the

animal kingdom is futile.

Myth #3 – Homosexuality is genetically endowed, and therefore is not only natural, but one should not be "punished" or forbidden from expressing his homosexuality.

There has been much controversy recently surrounding the issue of the causes of homosexuality. It is not surprising that the secular world has sought to establish the notion that homosexuality is physically caused. Indeed, it is tacitly assumed by the secular or naturalist community that every aspect of human activity or experience can be explained along physical lines.⁸⁵

As long as any direct physical evidence was lacking in the debate, there would be room for the anti-homosexuals to challenge the notion that homosexuality is physically caused. Now, however, it is becoming increasingly more popular to explain virtually every human sin, including homosexuality, as the inevitable result of one's genetic endowment, brain chemistry, or any number of physical conditions. There are several problems, however, with the genetic cause theory.

First of all, there is no scientific evidence which demonstrates that homosexuality is genetically endowed. It is true that some studies have been construed in the popular press as lending credence to the genetic cause theory. A study from the National Cancer Institute conducted by Dr. Dean Hamer and others supposedly finds "a genetic link to homosexuality." The study reported that families of 76 gay men included a much higher proportion of homosexual male relatives than found in the general population, with the frequency appearing on the mother's side of the family tree.⁸⁶

The research team focused on an examination of the X chromosome and discovered that "33 out of 40 pairs of brothers who were both gay had a similar genetic structure in the Xq28 area of the X chromosome."⁸⁷ Thus, some have concluded that there is a biological orientation to homosexuality.⁸⁸

Several comments can be made regarding this conclusion. First, some researchers argue that to link specific behavior with a specific gene "is generally considered highly unlikely by geneticists."⁸⁹ Dr. Joseph Nicolosi, director of the Thomas Aquinas Psychological Clinic, comments:

Homosexuality is much more complex than mere behavior and includes many complex dimensions, including thoughts, feelings, fantasies, specific attractions and identity.⁹⁰

A second comment to be made regarding the Hamer conclusion is, since it is the case that psychologists and ministers are treating

homosexuality with success, then the genetic cause theory must be suspect. This is the argument of Dr. Charles W. Socarides, president of the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality.⁹¹

A third comment to be made regarding the Hamer conclusion is, there are criticisms to be made against the study itself. Robert H. Knight makes a number of criticisms of the study including:⁹²

The small sample size,...the researchers' bias that homosexuality is "a naturally occurring variation" of sexuality; the fact that no heterosexual control group was used; and the large number of exceptions that were recorded.⁹³

According to Knight, 14 of the 80 who allegedly were homosexual did not have the marker, and Hamer offers no explanation for the deviation. Additionally, there are a number of studies critical of biologic theories in general.⁹⁴ Thus, it is unwarranted to argue for a genetic theory of homosexuality based on any supposedly conclusive studies.

The second problem with the genetic cause theory is, even if it were the case that homosexuality is genetically endowed, it does not follow that therefore there should be no regulations regarding homosexual behavior. The most one could conclude is that one could not be held morally responsible for being a homosexual. But even this would not mean that one would not be *morally* responsible for homosexual actions. If we discovered that being a serial killer or a sociopath was genetic, though we might not blame the serial killer or sociopath for being so, we certainly would not allow him to act upon his serial killing or sociopathological disposition.

Similarly, the propensity to become an alcoholic is genetic, but no one suggests that there be no regulations regarding the actions of alcoholics. It wouldn't make sense for an alcoholic to say, "I should be allowed to drive while drunk since my alcoholism is genetically endowed. And not only that, but we should introduce into the public schools curricula informing the children of the lifestyle of alcoholism. After all, statistically, a number of them are alcoholics."

Thus, the genetic argument, even if it had some warrant, is useless in establishing that homosexual activity should not be regulated. Since no study establishes a genetic theory of homosexuality, and a genetic theory of homosexuality would not necessarily preclude regulations on homosexual behavior even if it was established, then arguments for the homosexual agenda based on a genetic theory are useless.

Myth #4 – *It has been discovered that the hypothalamus is different in homosexuals, which suggests that there is a physiological cause of homosexuality.*

Another theory claiming a physical basis of homosexuality is a theory based on the supposed differences in the brains of homosexuals and heterosexuals. In the August, 1991, issue of *Science*, Dr. Simon LeVay reported on the differences in the neuron group INAH3, which is next to the hypothalamus, between homosexuals and heterosexuals. He claimed that the neuron group was smaller in homosexuals. In his research, LeVay supposedly discovered from 41 autopsies that 19 subjects were homosexual (including one bisexual), having apparently died from complications of AIDS; 16 were presumed heterosexual men; and six were presumed heterosexual women.⁹⁵

Though this research was heralded in the popular press as collaborating other research claiming a physical cause of homosexuality, it can be shown to be faulty. Grant and Horne comment:

To say that this experiment is exceedingly dubious is a gross understatement. LeVay is attempting to tell us that he has found a difference between the brains of homosexuals and heterosexuals when he actually has no idea if there are really any heterosexuals in his group.⁹⁶

They also point out that even homosexuals were critical of LeVay's claims. *The Bay Area Reporter* accused LeVay of having "a sloppy control group" and of engaging in circular reasoning.⁹⁷ Scientists also criticized his research. Dr. Paul Cameron wrote:

Three out of the 19 homosexuals have a larger INAH3 than the mean size for "heterosexuals" (the second largest INAH3 belonged to a gay) and three of sixteen "heterosexuals" had a smaller INAH3 than the mean size for homosexuals...According to LeVay's theory, three of the "heterosexuals" *should* have been homosexual, and three of the "homosexuals" *should* have been heterosexual. When you completely misclassify six of 35, you don't have much of a theory.⁹⁸

Thus, there is no reason to believe that homosexuality has anything to do with the hypothalamus.

Myth #5 – *The American Psychiatric Association changed its designation of homosexuality to normal, therefore the medical community recognizes that homosexuality is normal.*

Appeals to authority can sometimes be in-

teresting. The homosexual community was likely not impressed when the American Psychiatric Association at one time designated that homosexuality was abnormal and a mental illness in their *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Psychiatric Disorders*. Are we now supposed to be impressed that they no longer consider it so? It is true that sometimes the "latest" scientific opinions are regarded as the most accurate. This is only the case, however, if there is reason to believe that the changes in the scientific opinion were due to new scientific evidence, and not due to irrelevant non-scientific factors.

It is clear that the change in the APA designation was not due to new findings, but had everything to do with the lobbying pressure and tactics of the homosexual community. When the change was made, "only one-quarter of the proposed members of the APA voted on the proposed change."⁹⁹ It came after intense pressure was brought on the group. Ronald Bayer comments:

There was a shift in the role of demonstrations from a form of expression to a tactic of disruption. In this regard gay activists mirrored the passage of a confrontation politics that had become the cutting edge of radical and antiwar student groups. The purpose of the protest was no longer to make public a point of view, but rather to halt unacceptable activities. With ideology seen as an instrument of domination, the traditional willingness to tolerate the views of one's opponents was discarded.¹⁰⁰

According to Richard Isay, M.D., Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Cornell Medical College and chair of APA's Committee on Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Issues, there is a "continuing conviction among most, although not all, dynamically oriented psychiatrists in general and psychotherapists in particular, that homosexuality can and should be changed to heterosexuality..."¹⁰¹ Thus, the change in the APA's classification cannot be construed to mean that there is anything close to a consensus among mental health professionals regarding the normalcy of homosexuality.

Myth #6 – *Homosexuals cannot change to being heterosexual.*

This is perhaps one of the most destructive myths about homosexuality, for it can lead to the abandonment of all hope for deliverance. The truth is that a tremendous number of homosexuals have changed.¹⁰²

Likely there are two major reasons why militant homosexuals propagate this myth. First, to admit that any homosexual would want to change is tacitly to admit that there are those in the homosexual community who, af-

ter careful thought, have concluded that it is wrong to be homosexual and that it does not lead to personal happiness and fulfillment. Focusing on those homosexuals who want to change continues to emphasize the immorality and personal destructiveness of homosexuality.

Second, to admit that homosexuals can change is to deny that homosexuality is physically caused. However, we all know that there are things about us that are physically determined and we are still able to change. Just because one can change his weight doesn't mean that his weight was not physically caused.

Why, then, would we claim that the homosexuals would want to deny that they could change as if change were incompatible with being physically caused? What is the difference between one's weight and homosexuality? Simply, that the causal factors affecting weight are easily manipulated, whereas the supposed causal factors of homosexuality (i.e., genes) are not. As far as the homosexual community is concerned, their homosexuality is so much a part of their identity that it is beyond the ability of anyone to change it.

The more the homosexual community can convince the general public that their homosexuality is beyond their or anyone else's control, the more tolerance or even preferential treatment they can gain in public policy.

Probably the most famous psychologist who holds to a pro-change position is Dr. Joseph Nicolosi.¹⁰³ Not only has Nicolosi published material on homosexual change and done extensive counseling with homosexuals, but he is also part of an organization of clinical psychologists who believe that homosexuality can be changed.

The National Association for Psychoanalytic Research and Therapy of Homosexuality [NARTH] "was founded in March, 1992, by psychoanalysts and psychoanalytically informed individuals who believe that obligatory homosexuality is a treatable developmental disorder."¹⁰⁴ The organization is headed by Charles W. Socarides, M.D., Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York City. It was formed to counter what NARTH called "disturbing recent movements within the psychiatric and psychological professions."¹⁰⁵

There are numerous other professionals who claim that homosexuals can change. In their article, Sy Rogers and Alan Medinger have gathered extensive research evidence of the reality of homosexual change.¹⁰⁶ For example, Dr. Reuben Fine, director for the New York Center for Psychoanalytic Training says:

It is paradoxical that even though politically active homosexual groups deny the possibility of change, all studies

from Schrenck-Notzing on have found positive effects, virtually regardless of the kind of treatment used...a considerable percentage of overt homosexuals became heterosexual.¹⁰⁷

Other professionals cited by Rogers and Medinger include Dr. John Money, Dr. Charles W. Socarides, Dr. Robert Kronemeyer, and Dr. Edmund Bergler.¹⁰⁸

Another major approach to homosexual change is spiritual. Many homosexuals who have changed from homosexuality to heterosexuality have done so through the work of Jesus Christ in their lives. Despite the seemingly unbreakable hold that homosexuality can have on someone, more and more homosexuals are finding that change is possible.

Here are excerpts from testimonies published in Exodus International's journal *The Exodus Standard*:

There is a...way, also difficult, that some of us have found – the way of change – to move from homosexuality towards heterosexuality.... From where many of us stand who have gone down that road, it was difficult, but it was worth it a hundred times over, because it has been the way to joy, freedom, and personal fulfillment.¹⁰⁹

They have discovered that Jesus Christ is sufficient to make that difference.

[T]he...road begins not with just giving up on the gay life, not with trying to relate with a woman, not with just

trying to relate to other men in a different way; it begins with coming into a relationship with God.... Jesus Christ...is the only means of access to the God in whose presence the long pursuit is fulfilled.¹¹⁰

Thus, whether one examines the issue from a medical psychiatric perspective or a spiritual perspective, there can be no question that homosexuals can and do change.

Myth #7 – More sexual crimes against children are committed by heterosexuals than homosexuals, therefore a heterosexual is more likely to be a pedophile than a homosexual is.

There are two problems with this myth. First, this "statistic" is misleading. Of course there are more sexual crimes against children committed by heterosexuals than homosexuals, just as there are more heterosexual Nobel Prize winners, more heterosexual Ph.D.'s, more heterosexual star athletes, more successful heterosexual businessmen, and just about more heterosexual anything. The reason is obvious: There are more heterosexuals than homosexuals. What is relevant is not whether there are more or less in absolute numbers, but whether there are more or less in proportion to the group.

Is it true that a greater percentage of heterosexuals commit sex crimes against children than homosexuals? No. The fact that some have successfully been able to promote this myth is another way in which the "10%" fallacy is utilized (although even given the

Average income among homosexuals				
	average household income	% college graduates	% prof. and mgmt. positions	% with overseas vacations
HOMOSEXUALS	\$55,430	60%	49%	66%
NATIONAL AVERAGE	\$32,286	18%	16%	14%

Records compiled by The Wall Street Journal show that homosexuals are one of the most affluent groups in America.

Freedom Heritage Forum

“10%” figure, the percentage is still less). The greater the number of homosexuals in America, the less of a percentage the number of homosexual pedophiles is of the total. Given the fact that only 1% to 3% of the population is homosexual, statistically speaking, a homosexual is more likely to be a pedophile than a heterosexual is. A study in 1985 concluded that “homosexual acts [sic] were involved in 25% to 40% of the cases of child molestation.”¹¹¹

Second, when making this argument the data is interpreted inconsistently. What is of concern are homosexual actions, not whether someone is a homosexual. Thus, it confuses the debate to argue, as some homosexuals have done, that simply because a male adult sexually assaults a male child doesn't mean that the male adult is a homosexual. In this way, according to the homosexuals, acts of pedophilia would never be interpreted as homosexual crimes.

This line of reasoning, however, is inconsistent with the line of reasoning used by homosexuals to establish the percentage of homosexuals in America based on the Kinsey data. Since Kinsey's research group contained a disproportionate number of prisoners, and prisoners have a disproportionate number of homosexual experiences, the Kinsey research yielded a disproportionate percentage of men who had had a homosexual experience. Here homosexuals argued that these men who had had these homosexual experiences are homosexuals. The inconsistency is this: They refuse to count the pedophilia as examples of homosexuals, though they are examples of sexual acts between members of the same sex, while counting the prison experiences as homosexuals, though they are examples of sexual acts between members of the same sex.

Myth #8 – *Homosexuals are an oppressed minority and should have the same civil rights extended to them regarding their homosexuality as other minorities.*

With this myth homosexuals seek not only to affect public policy, but also to determine the terms of the debate. The more the homosexual community is able to construe the issue of homosexuality and public policy along the lines of “civil rights,” the more success it will have in achieving its agenda. Early observers likened the homosexual movement to other social movements such as the anti-war movement. Now it is compared to the civil rights movement of racial minorities.

There are several things wrong with regarding homosexuality as a civil right. First, the law already protects the civil rights of citizens. Homosexuals now enjoy these civil rights as everyone else does. It is true that individual homosexuals have had certain

by Bob Davies

Insight

What does the Bible say? (reprinted from *Moody magazine*, 5/94)

Religious trends during the past few decades have made today's debate over homosexuality almost inevitable. In a growing number of denominations, the Bible's moral statements are increasingly seen as irrelevant to our culture. The latest findings of science and an individual's personal experiences are treated as higher authorities than the Scriptures.

Discussions about homosexuality frequently center around a few isolated Bible passages. Often overlooked is the foundational teaching on human sexuality found in Genesis 1: “So God created man in his own image...male and female he created them” (v. 27).

Jesus based His teachings against divorce on this passage (Matt. 19:4-6). God created man and woman for each other, and ordained sex only in the context of a lifetime commitment. The opening chapter of Genesis explains why fornication, adultery, and prostitution – as well as “homosexual marriage” – are all distortions of God's original plan for sex.

Some scholars have offered new interpretations for specific biblical passages that prohibit homosexual acts. In the story of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19), Lot's visitors demand to “know” the angelic visitors (v. 5, KJV). The explanation that they wanted merely “to get acquainted with” the strangers makes Lot's response most puzzling: “Don't do this wicked thing” (v.7). The context supports the traditional interpretation of homosexuality, and other biblical passages link Sodom with sexual immorality and perversion (2 Peter 2:7; Jude 7).

In Leviticus 18:22, God clearly commands, “Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable.” Pro-homosexual scholars argue that Christians are no longer under the Mosaic law. But we must carefully distinguish the dietary or ceremonial laws (abolished in the New Testament – Mark 7:19; Heb. 10:8-10) from the moral laws (reinforced in the New Testament and still applicable today – Mark 7:20-23; Matt. 5:27, 28).

Differentiating the two types of laws answers the question, “Why do Christians quote the Old Testament on homosexuality, then ignore the commands that prohibit eating shellfish or wearing clothing of mixed fibers?”

The important distinction between these laws is reflected in the Old Testament penalties for breaking them: Disobedience to the ceremonial laws resulted in uncleanness (Lev. 11:24, etc.), while breaching the moral law meant death (Lev. 20).

The first chapter of Romans is usually considered the most thorough and clear condemnation of homosexuality in the Bible. It also contains the only specific reference to lesbianism. But some people claim that Paul's statements are “culturally bound,” addressed to first-century believers and therefore not applicable today. But God declares that His moral laws do no change and that His Word “stands forever” (Isa. 40:8).

What did Paul mean when he stated that homosexual acts are “unnatural” (Rom. 1:26, 27)? Contrary to what a person feels is natural? Not necessarily. Many homosexuals say that they have always felt attracted to others of their own gender. But we live in a fallen world; sin has distorted our perception of truth (Rom. 1:18). So what someone feels is “natural” can still be wrong. Paul was referring to the natural order as God originally created it.

Those who practice homosexual acts receive “in themselves the due penalty for their perversion” (Rom. 1:27). Homosexuals reap a bitter harvest of emotional and physical suffering. Though AIDS is not necessarily a direct judgment from God, it certainly is a devastating consequence of sin.

First Corinthians 6:9 mentions “homosexual offenders” in a long list of people who will not inherit the kingdom of God. This passage seems clear – until the discussions begin about the exact meaning of the original Greek word.

Does *arsenokoitai* refer to lustful, uncommitted male prostitution or to a loving, permanent relationship? The literal meaning is “a male who lies with a male.” There are no qualifications. All homosexual behavior is forbidden, no matter what degree of love or lust is involved.

What about Jesus' silence on this issue? There are many sexual behaviors that He did not address (incest, rape, bestiality). That doesn't mean they are permissible. Jesus always upheld the Old Testament law (Matt. 5:17-19), which strictly condemned homosexual acts. And He affirmed celibacy as the only legitimate alternative to heterosexual marriage (Matt. 19:12).

rights deprived at times (just as anybody could), and it may be because of their homosexuality, but this is nothing that the law does not already address.

For example, it is already against the law to beat someone up. If a homosexual is beaten up by someone who hates homosexuals, the offending party is already culpable by law. To extend protection to a homosexual on the basis of his homosexuality is unnecessary and unfair. One's behavior should not be the subject of civil rights laws. If I believe that homosexuality is immoral, why should I not have the right to avoid homosexuals? (No one could ever argue that they have the right to beat up homosexuals.) If homosexuality is a civil right, does that mean that a church could not deny a job to a homosexual because of his homosexuality?

Second, homosexuality is not a benign factor like race. Everyone should condemn racism and any generalizations about a particular race of people. By definition, however, all homosexuals are alike in terms of the factors relevant to any debate about homosexuality. For example, no one is interested in the observation that blacks tend to have darker skin than whites. This trivial observation is irrelevant to any debate concerning race. However, the claim that all blacks are lazy is an irrational racist belief because there is no connection between a person's laziness and his race. When it comes to the behavior of homosexuals, it is exactly what makes them homosexuals that is relevant to the debate about homosexuality. Why would anyone oppose someone's homosexuality? Precisely because of their homosexuality. In this regard, by definition, all homosexuals behave alike.

Although it is irrational for one to hate a race, since the factors that one hates are not related to the race as a race, it is not irrational for one to oppose homosexuality, since the factor that one opposes is related to the homosexuals as homosexuals. Homosexuality cannot be treated in the same way as one's race.

Third, the criteria to judge whether or not a group is an oppressed minority do not apply to the homosexual community. Tony Marco, in his book *Special Class Protection for Gays: A Question of Behavior and Consequences*, notes the three criteria that the Supreme Court established in awarding special protected status:¹¹²

1) There must be a history of discrimination evidenced by a lack of ability to obtain economic mean income, adequate education or cultural opportunity. Friedeman observes that this certainly does not apply to homosexuals. Homosexuals have an average annual income of \$55,430, over \$20,000 more than the general population. In addition, Friedeman observes:

The homosexual lifestyle and sexual practices

- A 1972 study by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control revealed that 50% of male homosexuals have had over 500 different sexual partners. For AIDS victims the average is 1,100 different sexual partners.
- In one study, two homosexual researchers found that 73% of adult male homosexuals had had sex with boys age 19 or younger.
- 93% report anal sexual relations.
- 92% report oral/anal sexual activity.
- 17% report eating and/or rubbing themselves with the feces of their partners.
- 29% report urinating on or in their partners.
- 37% report sadomasochism.
- 42% report "handballing" or "fisting" where the hand or arm is inserted into the rectum of their partner.
- 32% report bondage.
- 12% report giving or receiving of enemas for sexual pleasure.
- 15% report sex with animals.

Published by The Berean League, June, 1991, 2875 Snelling Ave. N., St. Paul, MN 55113.

More than three times as many homosexuals as average Americans are college graduates. Three times as many homosexuals as average Americans hold professional or managerial positions... some 65.8% of homosexuals are overseas travelers – four times the national average.¹¹³

2) Protected classes should exhibit obvious, immutable, or distinguishing characteristics, like race, color, gender, that define them as a discrete group. It should be clear that this does not apply to the homosexual community.

3) Protected classes should clearly demonstrate political powerlessness. Again, it should be clear from the impact the homosexual agenda is having on America, that the homosexual community is far from politically powerless. Thus, there is no reason to regard homosexuals as an oppressed minority.

Myth #9 – *Homosexuals are normal, healthy, everyday people.*

There can be no doubt that most Americans would be repulsed if they could see the decadence within the homosexuality community. The slick and somewhat successful public relations campaign hides the true face of the homosexual lifestyle. This can be demonstrated from two incontrovertible sources: former homosexuals who reveal what the typical homosexual lifestyle is like, and video tape of the homosexuals themselves in certain public gatherings.

Unfortunately for their public relations campaign, homosexuals characteristically don't behave themselves when they gather in public. One only has to view the video tape *The Gay Agenda* produced by The Report¹¹⁴ to see the disgusting truth.

Despite what homosexual advocates would like us to believe,¹¹⁵ testimony from

those who have come out of the homosexual lifestyle as well as video accounts of events such as gay rights parades¹¹⁶ evidence the fact that the homosexual lifestyle is characterized by anonymous sexual encounters and celebration of sexual obsession and perversion unparalleled in any other social group.¹¹⁷

Are homosexuals as healthy as everyone else?¹¹⁸ It is not uncommon to call such practices as smoking or drug abuse harmful. This is because the harmful effects of these practices have been demonstrated in the medical research, and the life span of those who smoke or abuse drugs is shorter on the average than that of non-smokers and non-drug abusers. What do we know about the average health and life span of homosexuals?¹¹⁹

Dr. Paul Cameron and colleagues conducted research on 6,714 obituaries from 16 United States homosexual journals from 1981-1993 as compared to a large sample of obituaries from regular newspapers.¹²⁰ The sampling from the newspapers matched the U.S. averages for longevity. The median age of death of married men was 75, 80% of whom died at 65 or older. The median age of death of unmarried or divorced men was 57, 32% of whom died at 65 or older.

The median age of death of married women was 79, 85% of whom died at 65 or older. The median age of death of unmarried or divorced women was 71, 60% of whom died at 65 or older.

A comparison of these statistics to the homosexual population is startling. According to Cameron, the median age of death of homosexuals was virtually the same nationwide. Less than 2% of homosexuals survived to 65. This statistic is so extreme, no doubt because of the disparate percentage of homosexuals with AIDS, as compared to the rest of society. For those homosexuals with AIDS, the me-

dian age of death was 39. For those homosexuals whose death was from other factors besides AIDS, the median age of death was 42, 9% died at 65 or older. The survey found that 140 lesbians had a median age of death of 45, 23% survived to 65.

Other factors about the homosexual community are alarming. Homosexuals were 116 times more likely to be murdered and 24 times more likely to commit suicide.¹²¹ The disgusting details of the homosexual lifestyle explain why so many diseases are present in the homosexual community.

There can be no doubt that the homosexual lifestyle is a dangerous one.

Myth #10 – The Bible doesn't condemn homosexuality, per se, only promiscuity.

It should come as no surprise that the Bible is unambiguous on the matter of homosexuality. In this respect, the Judeo-Christian tradition is not unlike practically every other religious tradition in the world in condemning homosexuality. Amazingly, there are those in the homosexual community who advance the notion that the Bible is either indifferent on the subject, or actually allows for the expression of homosexual love.¹²² Those who hold the view that the Bible does not condemn homosexuality advance illogical lines of argument: that the Bible as a whole has very little to say about the subject, and what it does seem to say is probably referring to something other than homosexuality.

Several comments can be made. First, it is irrelevant to argue that because the Bible has little to say about a topic, therefore the topic is unimportant from a biblical perspective or that the Bible is indifferent to the topic. A thorough search of the Bible will reveal that it has very little to say about cannibalism, but surely no one would argue that the practice of cannibalism is unimportant or that the Bible is indifferent about cannibalism.

Second, it is a mistake to suppose that one has analyzed all the Bible has to say about homosexuality simply because one has examined all the passages that deal directly with homosexuality. A biblical doctrine of homosexuality is subsumed under the broader biblical doctrine of sexuality. Thus, to discover what the Bible teaches about homosexuality, one must examine what the Bible teaches about sexuality as a whole, including heterosexuality. It is beyond the scope of this work to thoroughly examine the biblical doctrine of sexuality. But it is sufficient to say that any fair reading of the creation account, as well as the Scriptures dealing with marriage, proves that homosexuality is not allowed by a biblical doctrine of sexuality.

Third, it is clear that the sin of Sodom was homosexuality,¹²³ that homosexuality is con-

demned by the Law of Moses (Leviticus 18:22; 20:13), that the male and female relationship is the only sexual relationship allowed by Jesus (Matthew 19:4-6), and that homosexuality (as well as lesbianism) is condemned by Paul (Romans 1:24-27).

One may argue that homosexuality is not immoral and that the Bible is wrong. Indeed, this would be a more intellectually honest position, but it is clear that the Bible condemns homosexuality.

The response to homosexuality

When asking ourselves the question "What should we do?" there are at least two distinct issues before us that we shouldn't confuse. First, there is the concern about how we can forestall the further advance of the homosexual agenda. Second, there is the concern about what we can do for homosexuals themselves. The first concern is a social/political issue. The second concern is a theological/ministerial issue.

Social/political action

First, become informed about the homosexual movement. To the extent that we are ignorant of the homosexual agenda and unable to intelligently debate the issues, we will be unable to stop their advance. Hosea 4:6 says, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge."

Second, work to change as many minds to a proper understanding of this issue as we can. Homosexuality can no longer be an issue that we are too shy to confront publicly.

Third, become involved in the political process. God has given us a country where the process of government and the implementation of public policy is in our hands as citizens. Our involvement in the political process is a matter of stewardship before the Lord. Having become informed on the issues, while persuading those around us, write letters to public officials regarding public policy, vote our consciences, and/or run for public office. Proverbs 29:2 says "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; But when a wicked man rules, the people groan."

Helping the homosexual

Our responsibilities are not unlike our responsibilities concerning other areas of sin. Our plan of action in this area is similar to our plan in the public arena. First, we need to be informed about what the Bible, as our authority on matters spiritual, teaches on homosexuality. There has been a tremendous amount of work done in helping us understand what the Scriptures have to say about this issue.

Second, persuade others that God's word is unambiguous on the matter. Just as in the social/political sphere we confront this issue

in the open marketplace of ideas, in like manner within the church we also must take a stand for righteousness, and convince others by sound doctrine that homosexuality is not God's plan for human beings. Second Corinthians 5:10-11 says:

For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he has done, whether good or bad. Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men;

Third, we need to have a heart of love and compassion for those who profess Christ who are overtaken in such sin. Galatians 6:1-2 says:

Brethren, if a man is overtaken in any trespass, you who are spiritual restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness, considering yourself lest you also be tempted. Bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.

Fourth, offer the hope that is only in Jesus Christ. Nothing short of regeneration will solve the problem of homosexuality. Having offered the salvation that is in Christ, for those who trust in Him, we must be willing to help the recovering homosexual grow in his relationship with Christ.

NOTES

- 1For the most part, when I use the expression 'homosexual community' I am referring to that element of the American homosexual population which seeks to advance a particular agenda in the social sphere and public policy. Thus, it may be possible that one be a homosexual, and not consider himself a part of this activist population.
- 2These goals are taken from the 62 platform demands of the 1993 March on Washington for Lesbian, Gay, and Bi-Egal Rights and Liberation. The Platform can be found in its entirety of pages 17 and 18 of the Official 1993 March on Washington for Lesbian, Gay, and Bi-Egal Rights and Liberation Program Guide published by The Committee for the March on Washington, Inc., P. O. Box 34607, Washington, DC 20005-3406.
- 3For a brief discussion on the history of sexual ethics, see George Grant and Mark Horne, *Legislating Immorality* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1993): 23-47.
- 4Linda Chavez, "Homosexuality and the Moral Order," *First Things* (April 1993): 15.
- 5See Myth #9.
- 6See the section "Sources" for a listing of the video tapes.
- 7I try not to use the term gay because I consider gay to be a euphemism, i.e., a nice sounding substitute term designed to hide the true nature of something. I believe the term gay was introduced to prejudice the debate in favor of homosexuality. To call someone gay connotes notions of happiness. I avoid the term gay because I do not believe homosexuality is happy.
- 8William Dannemeyer, *Shadow in the Land: Homosexuality in America* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989): 140-141.
- 9The homosexual orientation issue is not without its public application, however, since it is certainly the case that one is more likely to engage in homosexual actions if one is a homosexual than if one is not. Thus, we would argue for the right to avoid those who are homosexuals. Should the law, for example, forbid one from renting to a tenant if the tenant is homosexual? Should a Church be allowed to refuse to hire someone if he is homosexual?
- 10Dick Michaels, June 1, 1969, as cited in Leigh W Rutledge, *The Gay Decades: From Stonewall to the Present: The People and Events that Shaped Gay Lives* (New York: A Plume Book, 1992): xiii, emphasis in original.
- 11Dennis Altman, *The Homosexualization of America* (New York: n.p., 1982): 2, as cited in Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 123.
- 12Rutledge, *The Gay Decades*, p. 3. Eric Marcus, however, specifically argues that the movement had its origin in the 1950's, though the Stonewall Riots were a significant turning point. (Eric Marcus, *Is It a Choice? Answers to 300 of the Most Frequently Asked Questions about Gays and Lesbians* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993): 180-181.)
- 13Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 124.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 19

THE RAMSEY COLLOQUIUM is sponsored by the Institute on Religion and Public Life. The Colloquium is a group of Jewish and Christian theologians, ethicists, philosophers and scholars who meet periodically to consider questions on morality, religion and public life. It is named after Paul Ramsey (1913-1988), the distinguished Methodist ethicist.

HADLEY ARKES, *Amherst College*

MATTHEW BERKE, *First Things*

GERARD BRADLEY, *Notre Dame Law School*

RABBI DAVID DANIN, *University of Hartford*

ERNEST FORTIN, *Boston College*

JORGE GARCIA, *Rutgers University*

RABBI MARC GILLMAN, *Hebrew Union College*

ROBERT GEORGE, *Princeton University*

THE REV. HUGH HAFFENREFFER, *Emanuel Lutheran*

Church, Hartford, Connecticut

JOHN HITTINGER, *College of Saint Francis*

RUSSELL HITTINGER, *Catholic University of America*

ROBERT JENSON, *St. Olaf College*

GILBERT MEILAENDER, *Oberlin College*

JERRY MULLER, *Catholic University of America*

FR. RICHARD JOHN NEUHAUS, *Institute on Religion*

and Public Life

RABBI DAVID NOVAK, *University of Virginia*

JAMES NUECHTERLEIN, *First Things*

MAX STACKHOUSE, *Princeton Theological Seminary*

PHILLIP TURNER, *Berkeley Divinity School (Yale University)*

GEORGE WEIGEL, *Ethics and Public Policy Center*

ROBERT WILKEN, *University of Virginia*

The Homosexual Movement

■ *A response by the Ramsey Colloquium*

The new thing

Homosexual behavior is a phenomenon with a long history, to which there have been various cultural and moral responses. But today in our public life there is something new, a *novum*, which demands our attention and deserves a careful moral response.

The new thing is a movement that variously presents itself as an appeal for compassion, as an extension of civil rights to minorities, and as a cultural revolution. The last of these seems to us the best description of the phenomenon; indeed, that is what its most assertive and passionate defenders say it is. *The Nation*, for example, asserts (May 3, 1993):

“All the crosscurrents of present-day liberation struggles are subsumed in the gay struggle. The gay movement is in some ways similar to the movement that other communities have experienced in the nation’s past, but it is also something more, because sexual identity is in crisis throughout the population, and gay people—at once the most conspicuous subjects and objects of the crisis—have been forced to invent a complete cosmology to grasp it. No one says the changes will come easily. But it’s just possible that a small and despised sexual minority will change America forever.”

Although some date “the movement” from the “Stonewall Riot” of June 1969, we have more recently witnessed a concerted and intense campaign, in the media and in leading cultural institutions, to advance the gay and lesbian cause. Despite the fact that the Jewish and Christian traditions have, in a clear and sustained manner, judged homosexual behavior to be morally wrong, this campaign has not left our religious communities unaffected. The great majority of Americans have been surprised, puzzled, shocked, and sometimes outraged by this movement for radical change. At the same time, the movement has attracted considerable support from heterosexual Americans who accept its claim to be the course of social justice and tolerance.

We share a measure of ambivalence and confusion regarding this remarkable insurgency in our common life. We do not present ourselves as experts on the subject of homosexuality. We are committed Christians and Jews and we try to be thoughtful citizens. In this statement, we do our best to respond to the claims made by the gay and lesbian movement and to form a moral judgment regarding this

new thing in our public life.

We are not a “representative group” of Americans, nor are we sure what such a group would look like. No group can encompass the maddening and heartening diversity of sex, race, class, cultural background, and ideological disposition that is to be found among the American people. We are who we are. As such, we offer this product of our study, reflection, and conversation in the hope that others may find it helpful.

Our aim is to present arguments that are public in character and accessible to all reasonable persons. In doing so, we draw readily on the religious and moral traditions that have shaped our civilization and our own lives. We are confident that arguments based, inter alia, on religious conviction and insight cannot legitimately be excluded from public discourse in a democratic society.

In discussing homosexuality, homosexuals, and the gay and lesbian movement, it is necessary to make certain distinctions. Homosexuality is sometimes considered a matter of sexual “orientation,” referring to those whose erotic desires are predominantly or exclusively directed to members of the same sex. Many such persons live lives of discipline and chastity. Others act upon their homosexual orientation through homogenital acts. Many in this second group are “in the closet,” although under the pressure of the current movement, they may be uneasy about that distinction between public and private. Still another sector of the homosexual population is public about its orientation and behavior and insists that a gay “lifestyle” be not simply tolerated but affirmed. These differences account for some of the tensions within the “movement.” Some aim at “main streaming” homosexuality, while others declare their aim to be a cultural, moral, and political revolution.

We confront, therefore, a movement of considerable complexity, and we must respect the diversity to be found among our homosexual fellow citizens and fellow believers. Some want no more than help and understanding in coping with what they view as their problem; others ask no more than that they be left alone.

The new thing, the *novum*, is a gay and lesbian movement that aggressively proposes radical changes in social behavior, religion, morality, and law. It is important to distinguish public policy considerations from the judgment of particular individuals. Our statement is directed chiefly to debates over public

policy and what should be socially normative. We share the uneasiness of most Americans with the proposals advanced by the gay and lesbian movement, and we seek to articulate reasons for the largely intuitive and pre-articulate anxiety of most Americans regarding homosexuality and its increasing impact on our public life.

New thing/old thing: The sexual revolution

While the gay and lesbian movement is indeed a new thing, its way was prepared by, and it is in large part a logical extension of, what has been called the “sexual revolution.” The understanding of marriage and family once considered normative is very commonly dishonored in our society and, too frequently in our communities of faith. Religious communities and leaderships have been, and in too many cases remain, deeply complicit in the demeaning of social norms essential to human flourishing.

Thus moral criticism of the homosexual world and movement is unbalanced, unfair, and implausible if it is not, at the same time, criticism of attitudes and behaviors that have debased heterosexual relations. The gay and lesbian insurgency has raised a sharp moral challenge to the hypocrisy and decadence of our culture. In the light of widespread changes in sexual mores, some homosexuals understandably protest that the sexual license extended to “straights” cannot be denied to them.

We believe that any understanding of sexuality, including heterosexuality, that makes it chiefly an arena for the satisfaction of personal desire is harmful to individuals and society. Any way of life that accepts or encourages sexual relations for pleasure or personal satisfaction alone turns away from the disciplined community that marriage is intended to engender and foster. Religious communities that have in recent decades winked at promiscuity (even among the clergy), that have solemnly repeated marriage vows that their own congregations do not take seriously, and that have failed to concern themselves with the devastating effects of divorce upon children cannot with integrity condemn homosexual behavior unless they are also willing to reassert the heterosexual norm more believably and effectively in their pastoral care. In other words, those determined to resist the gay and lesbian movement must be equally concerned for the renewal of integrity, in teaching and practice, regarding “traditional sexual ethics.”

It is a testimony to the perduring role of religion in American life that many within the gay and lesbian movement seek the blessing of religious institutions. The movement correctly perceives that attaining such formal approbation – through, for example, the con-

tent and style of seminary education and the ordination of practicing homosexuals – will give it an effective hold upon the primary institutions of moral legitimation in our popular culture. The movement also correctly perceives that our churches and synagogues have typically been inarticulate and unpersuasive in offering reasons for withholding the blessing that is sought.

One reason for the discomfort of religious leaders in the face of this new movement is the past and continuing failure to offer supportive and knowledgeable pastoral care to persons coping with the problems of their homosexuality. Without condoning homogenital acts, it is necessary to recognize that many such persons are, with fear and trembling, seeking as best they can to live lives pleasing to God and in service to others. Confronted by the vexing ambiguities of eros in human life, religious communities should be better equipped to support people in their struggle, recognizing that we all fall short of the vocation to holiness of life.

The sexual revolution is motored by presuppositions that can and ought to be effectively challenged. Perhaps the key presupposition of the revolution is that human health and flourishing require that sexual desire, understood as a “need,” be acted upon and satisfied. Any discipline of denial or restraint has been popularly depicted as unhealthy and dehumanizing. We insist, however, that it is dehumanizing to define ourselves, or our personhood as male and female, by our desires alone. Nor does it seem plausible to suggest that what millennia of human experience have taught us to regard as self-command should now be dismissed as mere repression.

At the same time that the place of sex has been grotesquely exaggerated by the sexual revolution, it has also been trivialized. The mysteries of human sexuality are commonly reduced to matters of recreation or taste, not unlike one’s preferences in diet, dress, or sport. This peculiar mix of the exaggerated and the trivialized makes it possible for the gay and lesbian movement to demand, simultaneously, a respect for what is claimed to be most importantly and constitutively true of homosexuals, and tolerance for what is, after all, simply a difference in “lifestyle.”

It is important to recognize the linkages among the component parts of the sexual revolution. Permissive abortion, widespread adultery, easy divorce, radical feminism, and the gay and lesbian movement have not by accident appeared at the same historical moment. They have in common a declared desire for liberation from constraint – especially constraints associated with an allegedly oppressive culture and religious tradition. They also have in common the presuppositions that the

body is little more than an instrument for the fulfillment of desire, and that the fulfillment of desire is the essence of the self. On biblical and philosophical grounds, we reject this radical dualism between the self and the body. Our bodies have their own dignity, bear their own truths, and are participant in our personhood in a fundamental way.

This constellation of movements, of which the gay movement is part, rests upon an anthropological doctrine of the autonomous self. With respect to abortion and the socialization of sexuality, this anthropology has gone a long way toward entrenching itself in the jurisprudence of our society as well as in popular habits of mind and behavior. We believe it is a false doctrine that leads neither to individual flourishing nor to social well-being.

The heterosexual norm

Marriage and the family – husband, wife, and children, joined by public recognition and legal bond – are the most effective institutions for the rearing of children, the directing of sexual passion, and human flourishing in community. Not all marriages and families “work,” but it is unwise to let pathology and failure, rather than a vision of what is normative and ideal, guide us in the development of social policy.

Of course many today doubt that we can speak of what is normatively human. The claim that all social institutions and patterns of behavior are social constructions that we may, if we wish, alter without harm to ourselves is a proposal even more radical in origin and implication than the sexual revolution.

That the institutions of marriage and family are culturally conditioned and subject to change and development no one should doubt, but such recognition should not undermine our ability to discern patterns of community that best serve human well-being. Judaism and Christianity did not invent the heterosexual norm, but these faith traditions affirm that norm and can open our eyes to see in it important truths about human life.

Fundamental to human life in society is the creation of humankind as male and female, which is typically and paradigmatically expressed in the marriage of a man and a woman who form a union of persons in which two become one flesh – a union which, in the Biblical tradition, is the foundation of all human community. In faithful marriage, three important elements of human life are made manifest and given support.

(1) Human society extends over time; it has a history. It does so because, through the mysterious participation of our procreative powers in God’s own creative work, we transmit life to those who will succeed us. We become a people with a shared history over time and

with a common stake in that history. Only the heterosexual norm gives full expression to the commitment to time and history evident in having and caring for children.

(2) Human society requires that we learn to value difference within community. In the complementarity of male and female we find the paradigmatic instance of this truth. Of course, persons may complement each other in many different ways, but the complementarity of male and female is grounded in, and fully embraces, our bodies and their structure. It does not sever the meaning of the person from bodily life, as if human beings were simply desire, reason, or will. The complementarity of male and female invites us to learn to accept and affirm the natural world from which we are too often alienated.

Moreover, in the creative complementarity of male and female we are directed toward community with those unlike us. In the community between male and female, we do not and cannot see in each other mere reflections of ourselves. In learning to appreciate this most basic difference, and in forming a marital bond, we take both difference and community seriously. (And ultimately, we begin to be prepared for communion with God, in Whom we never find simply a reflection of ourselves.)

(3) Human society requires the direction and restraint of many impulses. Few of those impulses are more powerful or unpredictable than sexual desire. Throughout history societies have taken particular care to socialize sexuality toward marriage and the family. Marriage is a place where, in a singular manner, our waywardness begins to be healed and our fear of commitment overcome, where we may learn to place another person's needs rather than our own desires at the center of life.

Thus, reflection on the heterosexual norm directs our attention to certain social necessities: the continuation of human life, the place of difference within community, the redirection of our tendency to place our own desires first. These necessities cannot be supported by rational calculations of self-interest alone; they require commitments that go well beyond the demands of personal satisfaction. Having and rearing children is among the most difficult of human projects. Men and women need all the support they can get to maintain stable marriages in which the next generation can flourish. Even marriages that do not give rise to children exist in accord with, rather than in opposition to, this heterosexual norm. To depict marriage as simply one of several alternative "lifestyles" is seriously to undermine the normative vision required for social well-being.

There are legitimate and honorable forms of love other than marriage. Indeed, one of the goods at stake in today's disputes is a long-

honored tradition of friendship between men and men, women and women, women and men. In the current climate of sexualizing and politicizing all intense interpersonal relationships, the place of sexually chaste friendship and of religiously motivated celibacy is gravely jeopardized. In our cultural moment of narrow-eyed prurience, the single life of chastity has come under the shadow of suspicion and is no longer credible to many people. Indeed, the non-satisfaction of sexual "needs" is widely viewed as a form of deviance.

In this context it becomes imperative to affirm the reality and beauty of sexually chaste relationships of deep affectional intensity. We do not accept the notion that self-command is an unhealthy form of repression on the part of single people, whether their inclination be heterosexual or homosexual. Put differently, the choice is not limited to heterosexual marriage on the one hand, or relationships involving homogenital sex on the other.

The claims of the movement

We turn our attention now to a few of the important public claims made by gay and lesbian advocates (even as we recognize that the movement is not monolithic). As we noted earlier, there is an important distinction between those who wish to "mainstream" homosexual life and those who aim at restructuring culture. This is roughly the distinction between those who seek integration and those who seek revolution. Although these different streams of the movement need to be distinguished, a few claims are so frequently encountered that they require attention.

Many gays argue that they have no choice, that they could not be otherwise than they are. Such an assertion can take a variety of forms – for example, that "being gay is natural for me" or even that "God made me this way."

We cannot settle the dispute about the roots – genetic or environmental – of homosexual orientation.

When some scientific evidence suggests a genetic predisposition for homosexual orientation, the case is not significantly different from evidence of predispositions toward other traits – for example, alcoholism or violence. In each instance we must still ask whether such a predisposition should be acted upon or whether it should be resisted. Whether or not a homosexual orientation can be changed – and it is important to recognize that there are responsible authorities on both sides of this question – we affirm the obligation of pastors and therapists to assist those who recognize the value of chaste living to resist the impulse to act on their desire for homogenital gratification.

The Kinsey data, which suggested that 10% of males is homosexual, have now been

convincingly discredited. Current research suggests that the percentage of males whose sexual desires and behavior are exclusively homosexual is as low as 1% or 2% in developed societies. In any case, the statistical frequency of an act or desire does not determine its moral status. Racial discrimination and child abuse occur frequently in society, but that does not make them "natural" in the moral sense. What is in accord with human nature is behavior appropriate to what we are meant to be – appropriate to what God created and calls *us* to be.

In a fallen creation, many quite common attitudes and behaviors must be straightforwardly designated as sin. Although we are equal before God, we are not born equal in terms of our strengths and weaknesses, our tendencies and dispositions, our nature and nurture. We cannot utterly change the hand we have been dealt by inheritance and family circumstances, but we are responsible for how we play that hand. Inclination and temptation are not sinful, although they surely result from humanity's fallen condition. Sin occurs in the joining of the will, freely and knowingly, to an act or way of life that is contrary to God's purpose. Religious communities in particular must lovingly support all the faithful in their struggle against temptation, while at the same time insisting that precisely for their sake we must describe as sinful the homogenital and extramarital heterosexual behavior to which some are drawn.

Many in our society – both straight and gay – also contend that what people do sexually is entirely a private matter and no one's business but their own. The form this claim takes is often puzzling to many people – and rightly so. For what were once considered private acts are now highly publicized, while, for the same acts, public privilege is claimed because they are private. What is confusedly at work here is an extreme individualism, a claim for autonomy so extreme that it must undercut the common good.

To be sure, there should in our society a wide zone for private behavior, including behavior that most Americans would deem wrong. Some of us oppose anti-sodomy statutes. In a society premised upon limited government there are realms of behavior that ought to be beyond the supervision of the state. In addition to the way sexual wrongdoing harms character, however, there are often other harms involved. We have in mind the alarming rates of sexual promiscuity, depression, and suicide and the ominous presence of AIDS within the homosexual subculture. No one can doubt that these are reasons for public concern. Another legitimate reason for public concern is the harm done to the social order when policies are advanced that would in-

crease the incidence of the gay lifestyle and undermine the normative character of marriage and family life.

Since there are good reasons to support the heterosexual norm, since it has been developed with great difficulty, and since it can be maintained only if it is cared for and supported, we cannot be indifferent to attacks upon it. The social norms by which sexual behavior is inculcated and controlled are of urgent importance for families and for the society as a whole. Advocates of the gay and lesbian movement have the responsibility to set forth publicly their alternative proposals. This must mean more than calling for liberation from established standards. They must clarify for all of us how sexual mores are to be inculcated in the young, who are particularly vulnerable to seduction and solicitation. Public anxiety about homosexuality is preeminently a concern about the vulnerabilities of the young. This, we are persuaded, is a legitimate and urgent public concern.

Gay and lesbian advocates sometimes claim that they are asking for no more than an end to discrimination, drawing an analogy with the earlier civil rights movement that sought justice for black Americans. The analogy is unconvincing and misleading. Differences of race are in accord with – not contrary to – our nature, and such differences do not provide justification for behavior otherwise unacceptable. It is sometimes claimed that homosexuals want only a recognition of their status, not necessarily of their behavior. But in this case the distinction between status and behavior does not hold. The public declaration of status (“coming out of the closet”) is a declaration of intended behavior.

Certain discriminations are necessary within society, it is not too much to say that civilization itself depends on the making of such distinctions (between, finally, right and wrong). In our public life, some discrimination is in order – when, for example, in education and programs involving young people the intent is to prevent predatory behavior that can take place under the guise of supporting young people in their anxieties about their “sexual identity.” It is necessary to discriminate between relationships. Gay and lesbian “domestic partnerships,” for example, should not be socially recognized as the moral equivalent of marriage. We note again that marriage and the family are institutions necessary for our continued social well-being and, in an individualistic society that tends to liberation from all constraint, they are fragile institutions in need of careful and continuing support.

Conclusion

We do not doubt that many gays and lesbians – perhaps especially those who seek the

blessing of our religious communities – believe that theirs is the only form of love, understood as affection and erotic satisfaction, of which they are capable. Nor do we doubt that they have found in such relationships something of great personal significance, since even a distorted love retains traces of love’s grandeur. Where there is love in morally disordered relationships we do not censure the love. We censure the form in which that love seeks expression. To those who say that this disordered behavior is so much at the core of their being that the person cannot be (and should not be) distinguished from the behavior, we can only respond that we earnestly hope they are wrong.

We are well aware that this declaration will be dismissed by some as a display of “homophobia,” but such dismissals have become unpersuasive and have ceased to intimidate. Indeed, we do not think it a bad thing that people should experience a reflexive recoil from what is wrong. To achieve such a recoil is precisely the point of moral education of the young. What we have tried to do here is to bring this reflexive and often pre-articulate recoil to reasonable expression.

Our society is, we fear, progressing precisely in the manner given poetic expression by Alexander Pope:

*Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.*

To endure (tolerance), to pity (compassion), to embrace (affirmation): that is the sequence of change in attitude and judgment that has been advanced by the gay and lesbian movement with notable success. We expect that this success will encounter certain limits and that what is truly natural will reassert itself, but this may not happen before more damage is done to innumerable individuals and to our common life.

Perhaps some of this damage can be prevented. For most people marriage and family is the most important project in their lives. For it they have made sacrifices beyond numbering; they want to be succeeded in an ongoing, shared history by children and grandchildren; they want to transmit to their children the beliefs that have claimed their hearts and minds. They should be supported in that attempt. To that end, we have tried to set forth our view and the reasons that inform it. Whatever the inadequacies of this declaration, we hope it will be useful to others. The gay and lesbian movement, and the dramatic changes in sexual attitudes and behavior of which that movement is part, have unloosed a great moral agitation in our culture. Our hope is that this statement will

contribute to turning that agitation into civil conversation about the kind of people we are and hope to be.

NOTES...FROM PAGE 15

14Rutledge, *The Gay Decades*, p. 60.
 15According to Dannemeyer (*Shadow*, p. 147), membership figures have fluctuated considerably over the years, being estimated by Rueda (see footnote below) around 10,000 in 1982, 5,000 in 1986, and then 10,000 again in 1987. According to the *Encyclopedia of Associations* 28th edition, 1994, the membership is 18,000 with a budget of \$1,039,350. (Peggy Kneffel Daniels and Carol A. Schwartz, eds., *Encyclopedia of Associations*, 28th ed. vol. 1: *National Organizations of the U.S.* (Detroit: Gale Research, 1993), s.v. “National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.”)
 16Enrique T. Rueda, *The Homosexual Network* (Old Greenwich, CT: n.p., 1982): 157, as cited in Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 143.
 17Rutledge, *The Gay Decades*, p. 101
 18Rueda, *The Homosexual Network*, p. 157 as cited in Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 143.
 19*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.”
 20Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 147.
 21John Preston, *The Big Gay Book: A Man’s Survival Guide for the 90’s* (New York: Plume Book, 1991): 36.
 22Preston, *The Big Gay Book*, p. 36.
 23*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund.”
 24Marcus, *Is It a Choice?* p. 183-184.
 25Marcus, *Is It a Choice?* p. 184.
 26*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “Act Up.”
 27*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “Act Up.”
 28Marcus, *Is It a Choice?* p. 184.
 29*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “Human Rights Campaign Fund.”
 30Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 148.
 31Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 148.
 32Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 148.
 33*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “Human Rights Campaign Fund.”
 34*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “Human Rights Campaign Fund.”
 35*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation/New York.”
 36*Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. “Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation/New York.”
 37Preston, *The Big Gay Book*, p. 42.
 38Andrew Kopkind, “The Gay Movement,” *The Nation* (May 3, 1993): 590, emphasis in original.
 39Peter LaBarbera, “In Their Own Words: What Gay Activists are Demanding,” *Human Events* 53 (May 1, 1993): 1.
 40Martina Navratilova, fund raising letter for the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, p. 2.
 41The following are taken from LaBarbera’s article.
 42The 1993 March on Washington Demand #1, as cited in LaBarbera, p. 1.
 43Demand #3, as cited in LaBarbera, p. 1.
 44Demand #4, as cited in LaBarbera, p. 7.
 45From the editorial “No Place for Homo-Homophobia,” *San Francisco Sentinel*, March 26, 1992, as cited in LaBarbera, p. 7.
 46Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual Military Freedom Project Recommendations for Accepting Homosexuals and Bisexuals into the U.S. Armed Forces, as cited in LaBarbera, p. 7.
 47Paul Gibson, “Gay Male and Lesbian Youth Suicide,” paper in the *Health and Human Services Task Force on Youth Suicide* (Jan. 1989): 3-135, as cited in LaBarbera, p. 7.
 48Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill, “The Overhauling of Straight Answers,” *Guide* (Oct.-Nov. 1987), as cited in LaBarbera, p. 7, emphasis in original.
 49I know of a major university where one department requires “gender neutral” language in the doctoral dissertation. I abhor this requirement, but it serves as an illustration of a principle our opponents tacitly endorse, i.e., that what people do can affect society as a whole. For a good discussion of the fallacies and dangers of “political correctness” see David Thibodaux, *Political Correctness: The Cloning of the American Mind* (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House, 1992).
 50Robert H. Knight, “The Homosexual Agenda in Schools,” *Insight* no. 11 (June 1993): 1.
 51Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, p. 71-72.
 52Project 10 literature, as cited in Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 182-183.
 53From a letter by Virginia Uribe sent to “Friends of Project 10”, as cited in Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 183.
 54Manley Witten, *Valley Magazine* (August 1988), as cited in Judith A. Reisman and Edward W. Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud* (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1990): 227.
 55Witten, *Valley Magazine*, as cited in Reisman and Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, p. 277.
 56According to *Lambda Report* (June/July 1993), p. 12, the publishing company which produces these books also produces material catering to pedophiles,

CONTINUED ON PAGE 22

■ *Will we offer hope?*

Homosexuals and the Church

By BOB DAVIES (originally published in *Moody magazine*, 5/5/94)

John Paulk will never forget the 1986 Gay Pride Parade in Columbus, Ohio. A well-known female impersonator, he was riding in the back of a red Mustang convertible dressed in a white linen suit and blond wig.

"Candi, we love you," a man yelled. "You're the most gorgeous drag queen in Columbus." John smiled and waved.

Suddenly, John heard chanting and screaming ahead and spotted a small crowd of people waving Bibles over their heads. Some held signs with such messages as "God hates fags" and "Turn or burn."

"Why don't you hateful people leave us alone? We're not hurting you," John thought, as an eerie sickness gripped his stomach. Then another thought struck him: "Who would want to follow a God like the one they're displaying?"

Six months later, a pastor who had befriended John at the print shop where he worked invited himself to John's apartment. Although John suspected the minister was coming to talk about God, he consented.

That night, they prayed together as John committed his life to Christ. He soon left his homosexual lifestyle as he became deeply involved in the church. Today, John and his wife, Anne (a former lesbian), live in Portland, Oregon, where he is preparing for a career in Christian counseling.

Though John still occasionally struggles with temptations and memories of the lifestyle he left, with the help of God and his Christian community he is well on his way to wholeness.

Thousands of other men and women – all of them previously involved in homosexuality – have experienced similar changes in their lives. And almost all of them say that it was a group of Christians, demonstrating genuine love and concern, who made the difference.

Half the Gospel

"The church of the 1990s must decide if it wants to meet the relevant needs of today's society," said Sy Rogers of Exodus International during a seminar at Park Avenue Baptist Church in Titusville, Florida, on ministering to homosexuals. "If your church is equipped to minister to the needs of your society, you will be relevant; if not, you will be irrelevant."

In Matthew 28:19, Jesus tells His disciples,

"Therefore go and make disciples of all nations." The word *nations* means "people groups." Today, the homosexual population is among the last of the unreached people groups. And this people group even includes some who are in our churches.

Stories of those struggling with homosexuality are rarely as sensational as John Paulk's. Often, those who struggle are sitting quietly in the pew on Sunday morning, not involved in the homosexual subculture or a homosexual relationship. They hurt alone as they experience the internal chaos of conflicting desires.

"Almost 100% of people who come into my office have a church background, but they couldn't find help for their same-sex attraction within the local church," says Rick Hughes, director of Eleutheros Ministry in Winter Park, Florida.

Hughes is attempting to reverse that trend. When he speaks at conferences on the subject, he is often met with indifference and intolerance. Once, he wanted to conduct a short seminar on homosexuality for a local congregation, but the pastor refused.

"We don't have that problem here," the pastor said. Unfortunately, he was unaware that three of his church members, as well as someone on his staff, were in counseling at Eleutheros for their homosexual tendencies.

Churches that do realize the need to address homosexuality are often confused about how to handle a problem that has become so emotionally and politically charged. Homosexuality is tearing apart many denominations across the country. A growing number of conservative denominations have pro-gay groups that attempt to promote a theology that affirms their homosexual activities. Even some conservative Christians are faltering in their convictions as they discover homosexuality among family members and church friends.

"Homosexuality is the divisive issue of the '90s," says author and speaker Joe Dallas, who directs Genesis Counseling Services in Orange, California. And, he believes, many congregations are presenting only a "partial gospel" to men and women who are involved in gay relationships.

"Homosexual behavior is pronounced unbiblical, but no one offers a solution," Dallas says. "We cannot preach against a particular sin without offering an alternative." Dallas compares this situation with the pro-life

movement, whose leaders have discovered the effectiveness of offering practical help – such as crisis counseling and emergency housing for pregnant women – in addition to saying, "Don't kill your unborn child."

Waging the battle

Some Christians have turned to politics to stem the growing international homosexual-rights movement. Mary Heathman has felt the tension throughout Colorado over Amendment 2, a state constitutional amendment designed to prevent homosexual-rights ordinances. As director of Where Grace Abounds, a redemptive ministry to homosexuals in Denver, Heathman has heard angry remarks from both church members and pro-gay leaders as they tangle over this amendment, which was passed by voters but later overturned in the courts.

"Church people get into politics for various reasons," Heathman says. "Some are very loving and don't lose sight of the individual, but others are fighting the battle with the world's mindset rather than remembering the spiritual warfare involved."

Heathman says one of the biggest problems with some legislation intended to combat homosexual rights is that it isolates one particular sin. "If we're going to be balanced, we need to be talking about sexual sin in general, not just homosexuality."

Joe Dallas remembers how the fight looked from the other side of the fence. Ten years ago, Dallas was a homosexual-rights activist and a student minister at a pro-gay Metropolitan Community Church in Southern California. "The gay churches are full of men and women who know better," Dallas says. "But they feel they have nowhere else to go. And nobody has ever shown them convincingly that there is a way out of this particular sin."

Few evangelical Christians, Dallas adds, are willing to "stop and listen for a moment to a homosexual's pain." The pro-gay church movement, which offers loving acceptance of both the person and his or her behavior, is an attractive alternative to some members of the homosexual community who perceive the evangelical church as judgmental and "homophobic."

Dallas says that too few conservative churches acknowledge the high price paid by many homosexuals who become evangelical believers. Suddenly these men and women are confronted with the reality of leaving close friends, long-term partners, a supportive community, and perhaps even a gay-related job or career to follow Christ. And too often they get no sympathy from church friends who think they should "just repent and be done with it."

Jeff Konrad still remembers the anguish of leaving his homosexual partner almost 10

years ago. "I ached physically from all the emotional turmoil. But several Christian heterosexual men made themselves available any time of the day or night. I'm alive today because those guys loved me."

After receiving Christ, a homosexual desperately needs church support to stay free from sin. A conversion experience doesn't immediately erase homosexual desires. As with any Christian who struggles with temptation and who bears the consequences of a troubled past, accepting Christ is only the first step in the journey toward wholeness.

Many who have been away from the homosexual lifestyle for years still struggle with temptation, though usually less frequently. Many get married and identify more with heterosexuals, but that doesn't guarantee complete freedom from occasional homosexual desires.

The majority, who remain single, have the added struggle of remaining celibate. That's why continued encouragement and accountability from the church is so important to keep them on the path toward wholeness.

Breaking the sound barrier

Churches can provide a supportive atmosphere by being willing to break the silence that surrounds this issue in many evangelical congregations. When Ken Korver, associate pastor of Emmanuel Reformed Church in Paramount, California, realized that several men in his singles group were dealing with homosexuality, he confronted the issue head-on from the pulpit.

Korver preached a sermon on 1 Corinthians 6:9-11, where the apostle Paul identifies homosexual behavior as sin, but a sin that can be forgiven. "This church is a place where broken people are welcome," Korver told his congregation. "But we are not to remain in brokenness; we must move forward into God's design." Then he requested anyone fighting homosexual temptations to talk to one of the pastoral staff.

"We let people know we'd walk with them through the process of healing," Korver recalls. Soon a group of ex-homosexual men were meeting weekly.

Then Korver took the healing process a step further: He set up a mentoring program in the church, holding three-hour training sessions for straight men who wanted to better understand homosexuality. The names of 50 "graduates" of these sessions were made available to the former homosexuals, who could request an accountability partner to befriend them.

"Forming this kind of mentoring relationship is essential to getting beyond an 'ex-gay' mind set," Korver explains. "When the men who are overcoming homosexuality are ac-

cepted by other men in the church, a huge amount of healing occurs."

Other congregations throughout the country have had similar success in ministering to homosexual men and women. During the past two decades, Church of the Open Door in San Rafael, California, has earned a widespread reputation as "the church where homosexuals find healing."

This fellowship of 100 adults located 20 miles north of San Francisco is a spiritual home base for Love In Action, one of the oldest ex-homosexual ministries (founded in 1973). LIA runs a two-year discipleship program that attracts participants from around the world. Many become permanent members of Open Door, having left churches where they felt no support for resolving their sexual identity issues.

One recent program graduate, an attorney and former bank vice-president from Virginia, stood in front of the congregation to extend his thanks for their support. "This is a church where you don't have to whisper the word *homosexual*," he said. "I know my life will never be the same because of the love I've experienced here."

At the beginning of each program, members are introduced to the congregation in a special evening service. Afterward, church members are encouraged to come forward and commit to pray for one or more ex-homosexuals. Program leaders recognize that many church members want to offer support, but don't know how. So prayer cards are distributed, giving specific suggestions: Send the program member a birthday card, invite him to your house for dinner, phone him periodically to offer encouragement, include him on a family outing, have him bring a potluck item to your house for a holiday meal.

At Discovery Church in Orlando, Florida, church members, elders, and church counselors are trained to minister to ex-homosexuals by praying for them and providing strict accountability. "We generally set [those struggling with homosexuality] in a same-sex ministry group with two or three trained people," says elder Barry Johnston. "The leaders offer encouragement, practical help, and friendship. This also affirms their gender identification in a non-threatening way.

"We require strict accountability, too. In a secure environment, we ask about their thought life, their reading materials, the movies they see." The leaders also ask them, "Are you staying free and moving in the direction God created for you?" Then they place them in the mainstream of the church by discreetly and wisely directing them into a place where they can minister.

Beyond formal ministries, churches can often minister to ex-homosexuals by chang-

ing attitudes and becoming aware of the sensitivities of those struggling with homosexuality. "I've been around people in the church who have made jokes about people who are gay," says Brad Grammer, who directs Face-to-Face, a ministry to homosexuals at First Evangelical Free Church on Chicago's North Side. "It really hurt, because they didn't know I have struggled with homosexuality."

Grammer says that another way churches can help is to offer discipleship relationships. He believes that if the church is functioning as it should by offering honest, encouraging relationships to those struggling with homosexuality or any other sin, there may be less of a need for formal groups. People also need more information about homosexuality to help them understand those who struggle with the issue, Grammer says.

Unwanted harvest

Mona Riley, wife of Open Door's senior pastor, says there is potential for a great spiritual harvest in the homosexual community, but "it's an unwanted harvest. We don't want to reap it. Christians aren't sure if they want to spend eternity with these people." Revival has to happen in the church first, she says, "before it's going to happen in the gay community."

Riley sees a "hardness in the heart of the American church" toward people who have been involved in homosexual behavior. "We need to be trained in compassion," she says. "We have judged this particular sin to be worse than every other, but I don't see that in the Scriptures."

Leaders of ex-gay ministries around the country recognize hidden barriers that prevent churches from embracing those struggling with homosexuality. The foremost one concerns AIDS, says Chuck Therrien, director of ReCreation Ministries in Manchester, New Hampshire. Church members fear contracting the disease by casual contact, such as touching an infected individual or sharing restroom facilities. Despite assurances from health experts, these fears persist.

Therrien says church members also fear that former homosexuals will molest their children or seduce young people into the homosexual lifestyle. "But why would they recruit someone into a lifestyle they despise and are desperately trying to overcome?" he reasons. Therrien also points out that most adult homosexuals are sexually drawn to other adults, not children. And though such abuse is unlikely, churches should already be equipped to prevent any kind of child sexual abuse, homosexual or heterosexual. Such precautions should ease the fears of church members and leave them free to minister to whoever walks through the church doors.

Church leaders who have taken the risk of

venturing into this type of ministry have seen their churches affected positively. "Our people are proud that we are a church that is true to the Bible, but living it out in progressive ways," says Ken Korver. "We are not compromising truth, but the congregation is thrilled that we are living out grace."

There is also widespread support at Church of the Open Door for the Love In Action program. "Our people are excited to be on the cutting edge of this issue," says senior pastor Michael Riley.

The staff of these churches and specialized ministries to homosexuals insist that they are not doing anything different or unusual from the ordinary discipleship offered in any evangelical church. "All you need to know is how to love and speak the truth," Joe Dallas says, "and you've got all the tools necessary for ministry to these people."

John Paulk, the former female impersonator, agrees. After becoming a Christian, John moved to California to be come part of LIA. He attended Church of the Open Door and found unconditional support, especially from the men in the church. "Heterosexual men befriended me, prayed for me, and invited me into their homes for fellowship. They treated me with genuine respect and affection. It's really that simple. They loved me into wholeness."

Bob Davies is executive director of Exodus International (San Rafael, California), a worldwide coalition of redemptive ministries to men and women overcoming homosexuality. He is also co-author, with Lori Rentzel, of *Coming Out of Homosexuality* (InterVarsity Press, 1994). Melody Schiaing, a free-lance writer from Titusville, Florida, and Karen Beattie, associate editor, also contributed to this article.

To contact Exodus International regarding homosexual ministries in your area, write P. O. Box 2121, San Rafael, CA 94912 or call (415) 454-1017.

NOTES...FROM PAGE 19

including the erotic fiction *Macho Stulze*, the nonfiction *The Age Taboo*, and the nonfiction *Gay Sex: A Manual for Men Who Love Men*.
 57 Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, p. 78-79.
 58 "Mass. First to Enact Gay Youth Rights Law," *Jackson (MS) Clarion-Ledger*, 11 December, 1993, sec. A, p. 14.
 59 "Mass. First to Enact Gay Youth Rights Law."
 60 Preston, *The Big Gay Book*, p. 34.
 61 "The Internal Philosophical War... and How to Go Down in History," *World 8* (Nov. 13, 1993): 8, ellipses in original.
 62 Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, p. 91.
 63 "Gay in Corporate America: What It's Like, and How Business Attitudes are Changing," *Fortune* (Dec. 16, 1991): 43.
 64 "Gay in Corporate America," p. 43.
 65 "Federal Cancer Lab Hunts for Gay Gene," *Washington (DC) Times*, 3 March, 1994, sec. A, p. 1.
 66 "Media Spike Gay Gene Researcher's Homosexuality," *Lambda Report*, Oct., 1993, p. 12.
 67 "Doctor Angela Patatucci, Not Your Typical Government Scientist," *Deneuve*, Nov./Dec., 1993, p. 44.
 68 Michael Medved, *Hollywood vs. America: Popular Culture and the War on*

Traditional Values (New York: HarperCollins, 1992): 312-313, as cited in Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, p. 54.
 69 *Encyclopedia of Associations*, s.v. "Religious Organizations."
 70 Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 101.
 71 Troy Perry, *Dallas Voice* (July 19, 1989): 24, as cited in Dannemeyer, *Shadow*, p. 102-103.
 72 Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1948), and Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, and Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1953).
 73 *On Being Gay: A Conversation with Brian McNaught* (TRB Productions, 1986).
 74 Marcus, *Is It a Choice?* p. 8. However, Marcus goes on to say, "While I suspect the 10 percent figure is high, there are nonetheless millions of gay and lesbian Americans." (p. 8, emphasis added).
 75 Reisman and Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, p. 177.
 76 Charles F. Turner, Heather G. Miller, and Lincoln E. Moses, eds. *AIDS: Sexual Behavior and Intravenous Drug Use* (n.c.: National Academy Press, n.d.), p. 86, as cited in Robert H. Knight, "Video 'On Being Gay' Twists the Facts," *Insights* 14 (July 1993): 2. According to Knight, the National Research Council was once a Kinsey supporter.
 77 For a full discussion of the details of these arguments see, Reisman and Eichel, pp. 177-196, as well as Appendix A which is an excerpt from a letter written by Maslow.
 78 Knight lists the following sources in support of the 1% - 3% figures: J. Gordon Muir, "Homosexuals and the 10% Fallacy," *Wall Street Journal*, March 31, 1993; Tom W. Smith, "Adult Sexual Behavior in 1989: Number of Partners, Frequency of Intercourse and Risk of AIDS," *Family Planning Perspectives* (May/June 1991): 102; John O. G. Billy, Koray Tanfer, William R. Grady, and Daniel H. Klepinger, "The Sexual Behavior of Men in the United States," *Family Planning Perspectives*, The Alan Guttmacher Institute, vol. 25, no. 2 (March/April 1993).
 79 "Dispelling the 10 Percent Myth," *The Exodus Standard* vol. 10 no. 2 (1993): 9.
 80 "Dispelling the 10 Percent Myth," p. 9.
 81 Gregory M. Herek of the University of California, Davis says, "Gays and lesbians have been playing right into the hands [of conservative Christians] by quoting Kinsey's numbers uncritically. They have been defending an indefensible position." *The Advocate* (June 1, 1993) as cited in "Dispelling the 10 Percent Myth," *The Exodus Standard* vol. 10 no. 2 (1993): 9.
 82 For evidence he cites a study done in 1951 by Ford and Beach.
 83 Knight, "Video 'On Being Gay' Twists the Facts," p. 4.
 84 "Homosexual Sheep?" *Parade* (March 8, 1992): 8, as cited in Knight, "Video 'On Being Gay' Twists the Facts," p. 4-5.
 85 What I mean here by "naturalist" is one who denies the reality of the supernatural, spiritual, or non physical realm. Most naturalists hold that all of reality is physical in essence. Thus, it is not surprising when naturalists suggest a physical cause for something. It is unavoidably the only option open to them.
 86 "New Gene Study: Homosexuality Inborn?" *The Exodus Standard* vol. 10 (Fall 1993): 9.
 87 "New Gene Study: Homosexuality Inborn?" p. 9.
 88 In the article "New Gene Study: Homosexuality Inborn?" Charles Krauthammer in the July 23 *Washington Post*, regarding the media reports on the study, is quoted as saying that they are "a triumph of hype, another vivid demonstration of what can come from that volatile combination of scientific ignorance and journalistic sensationalism."
 89 Joseph Nicolosi, interview in "New Gene Study: Homosexuality Inborn?" p. 9.
 90 Nicolosi, interview in "New Gene Study: Homosexuality Inborn?" p. 9.
 91 Charles W. Socarides, interview in "New Gene Study: Homosexuality Inborn?" p. 9.
 92 Robert H. Knight, "New Genetic Study Not What It's Cracked Up to Be," *In Focus* (Washington, DC: Family Research Council, n.d.).
 93 "New Gene Study: Homosexuality Inborn?" p. 9.
 94 Knight refers to William Byne and Bruce Parsons, "Human Sexual Orientation: The Biologic Theories Reappraised," *Archives of General Psychiatry* 50 (March 1993): 228-239.
 95 Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, p. 120.
 96 Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, p. 120.
 97 *Bay Area Reporter*, Sep. 5, 1991, as cited in Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, p. 120.
 98 Cameron's comments are from Tony Marco, *Gay Rights: A Public Health Disaster and Civil Wrong* (Ft. Lauderdale: Coral Ridge Ministries, 1992): 45, as cited in Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, pp. 120-121, emphasis in Grant.
 99 Charles Socarides, "The Sexual Deviations and the Diagnostic Manual," *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 32 (July 1978), as cited in Knight, "Video 'On Being Gay' Twists the Facts," p. 6.
 100 Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (New York: Praeger's, 1981): 36, as cited in Grant and Horne, *Legislating Immorality*, p. 117.
 101 Richard Isay "Homosexuality and Psychiatry," *Psychiatric News* (Feb. 7, 1992): 3, as cited in Knight, "Video 'On Being Gay' Twists the Facts," p. 7.
 102 Surprisingly, Eric Marcus says, "But no matter what anyone claims, you cannot change a person's sexual orientation. In other words, you cannot eliminate a person's feelings of attraction for the same sex." (Marcus, *Is It a Choice?* p. 12.) Marcus is clearly wrong. There are many homosexuals who testify to becoming heterosexual.

103 Joseph Nicolosi, *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc., 1991).
 104 "Psychoanalysis Say Change is Possible," *The Exodus Standard* vol. 9 no. 2 (1992): 4.
 105 "Psychoanalysts Say Change is Possible," p. 4.
 106 Sy Rogers and Alan Medinger, *Homosexuality and the Truth: Can Homosexuals Change? A Surprising Number of Leading Psychiatrists and Researchers Say 'Yes'* (San Rafael, CA: Exodus International, 1991).
 107 Reuben Fine, *Psychoanalytic Theory, Male and Female Homosexuality: Psychological Approaches* (n.c.: n.p., 1987): 84, as cited in Rogers and Medinger, *Homosexuality and the Truth*, pp. 1-2.
 108 Rogers' and Medinger's bibliographic references include: John W. Money, "Sexual Dimorphism and Homosexual Gender Identity," *Perspectives in Human Sexuality* ed. Nathaniel W. Wagner (New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974); Charles W. Socarides, "Homosexuality: Basic Concepts and Psychodynamics," *International Journal of Psychiatry*, 1972; Edmund Bergler, *Homosexuality: Disease or Way of Life?* (n.c.: Collier Books, 1962); Elizabeth Moberly, *Homosexuality: A New Christian Ethic* (n.c. Attic Press, 1983).
 109 *No Easy Way*, brochure by Regeneration (Baltimore: Regeneration, Inc., 1991). "Regeneration is a non-profit, interdenominational Christian ministry for men and women seeking a way out of homosexuality." (from the brochure) For information on contacting Regeneration and other ministries and services for help for homosexuals, see sidebar "Ministries Homosexuals" on page 4.
 110 *No Easy Way*, brochure by Regeneration.
 111 Paul Cameron, W. Coburn, Jr. et. al, "Child Molestation and Homosexuality," *Psychological Reports* 58 (1986): 327-337, as cited in Knight, "Video 'On Being Gay' Twists the Facts," p. 6.
 112 These criteria from Marco's book are discussed in Matt Friedeman, "Homosexuals Steal National Interest at the Expense of Black America," *Jackson (MS) Clarion-Ledger*, Wed. May 12, 1993, sec. A, p. 11.
 113 Friedeman, "Homosexuals Steal National Interest at the Expense of Black America."
 114 The Report was founded by Ty & Jeannette Beeson. Their video tape "The Gay Agenda: The March on Washington" can be ordered by calling 1-800-462-4700.
 115 The video *On Being Gay: A Conversation with Brian McNaught* is a polished attempt to portray the "typical" homosexual as a clean cut, well mannered, articulate, intelligent, sensitive individual.
 116 See, for example *The Gay Agenda: The Report*, Lancaster, CA., 1992; and *The Gay Agenda: The March on Washington*. The Report, Lancaster, CA, 1993 for uncut, uncensored video footage of certain gay rights parades. The imagery speak for itself. Viewer discretion is strongly advised. These videos are not for children.
 117 Even Brian McNaught admits in the video that homosexuals have more sex than heterosexuals.
 118 The following material summarizes data from Paul Cameron, *Medical Consequences of What Homosexuals Do*, a Family Research Institute educational pamphlet (Washington, DC: Family Research Institute, 1993).
 119 One has to be careful when making conclusions based upon statistical correlations. The fact that X and Y are statistically correlated in their relative frequency might suggest a causal connection between X and Y, or it might suggest a causal connection of X and Y to a third factor. The fact that people more often wear raincoats when carrying umbrellas does not suggest that somehow carrying an umbrella causes one to wear a raincoat. Rather, the presence of rain causes one to both wear a raincoat and carry an umbrella. When making causal conclusions, one has to base his conclusions upon a reasonable reading of the evidence by sufficiently eliminating other factors as possible causes. When it comes to these statistical correlations between the homosexual lifestyle and longevity, it seems reasonable to conclude a causal connection between homosexuality and premature death. This conclusion seems all the more justified when the statistical evidence of the disparate amount of disease present within the homosexual community is considered.
 120 Cameron: Playfair; and Wellum, "The Lifespan of Homosexuals," a paper presented at the Eastern psychological Association Convention, April 17, 1993, as cited in Cameron, *Medical Consequences*.
 121 Though it may be the case that some of the dangers for homosexuals (e.g., murder rates) stem from the fact that the overwhelming majority of homosexuals are concentrated in large metropolitan areas with its attendant hazards, it remains that these medical dangers have everything to do with the homosexual lifestyle and not with where homosexuals happen to live.
 122 Eric Marcus betrays his lack of biblical knowledge when he says, "The Bible really doesn't say all that much about sex between men and says absolutely nothing about sex between women." (Marcus, *Is It a Choice?* p. 131, emphasis added). The Bible most certainly says something about sex between women in Romans 1:26.
 123 The argument that the sin was inhospitability is clearly wrong. The men of Sodom wanted to "know" Lot's friends. Though the term "know" (Hebrew yadha) is mostly used in a non sexual way, it is clearly the meaning here, as evinced by Lot's response. First, he cried "Please, my brethren, do not do so wickedly!" and then offered his daughters, who are described as having not known (yadha, clearly a sexual use of the term) a man, in place of his friends, exclaiming "do to them as you wish, only do nothing to these men." (Genesis 19:7-8) The meaning clearly is sexual.

■ *Psychiatry falters, America sleeps*

The erosion of heterosexuality

By CHARLES W. SOCARIDES, M.D. (originally published in *The Washington Times*)

The author is a clinical professor of psychiatry at Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center in New York. He is president of the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality.

A significant portion of society today holds the belief that homosexuality is a normal form of sexual behavior different from, but equal to, that of heterosexuality. Many religious leaders, public officials, educators, social and mental health agencies – including those at the highest level of government, departments of psychiatry and psychology, and mental health clinics – have been taken in by a wide spread sexual egalitarianism and by accusations of being undemocratic or prejudiced if they do not accept certain assertions that are thrust upon them, as if they were deprived of all intellectual capacity to judge and reason.

This revolutionary change in our sexual mores and customs has been ushered in by a single act of considerable consequence: The removal of homosexuality from the category of aberrancy by the American Psychiatric Association in 1973. It is, furthermore, a fateful consequence of our disregard for established psychoanalytic knowledge of human sexual behavior.

This act was naively perceived by many psychiatrists as the “simple” elimination of a scientific diagnosis in order to correct injustices. In reality, it created injustices for the homosexual and his family, as it belied the truth and prevented the homosexual from seeking and receiving help. At the social, group, and community level, it proved to be the opening phase of a two-phase sexual radicalization; the second phase being the raising of homosexuality to the level of an alternative lifestyle – an acceptable psychosexual institution – alongside heterosexuality as a prevailing norm of behavior. The motivating force behind this movement was the wish to protect the homosexual against injustices and persecution. This could have been legitimately effected by the demand for equal rights for the homosexual, a demand arising from the humanitarian philosophy so deeply embedded in our humanistic science. Instead, the false step of removing homosexuality from our manual was substituted. This amounted to a full approval of homosexuality and an encouragement to aberrancy by those who should have known better, both in the scientific sense and in the sense of the social consequences of such removal. To many American psychiatrists, this action remains a chilling reminder that if scientific principles are not fought for

they can be lost – a disillusioning warning that unless we make no exceptions to science, we are subject to the snares of political factionalism and to the propagation of untruths to an unsuspecting and uninformed public, to the rest of the medical profession, and to the behavioral sciences.

The devastating clinical fallout from this decision was yet to follow. Those who would prefer to retain homosexuality as a valid diagnosis have been essentially silenced in lectures, meetings, and publications; a silencing that originates both within our association and from other sources as well. Political parties and religious leaders have been utilized to reinforce this silence. The press has been influenced in addition to the electronic media. Television and movies promote homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle and censor movies that might show homosexuality as a disorder. Homosexual sex education has entered our schools and colleges; pro-gay activists – homosexual or otherwise – portray their way of life as normal and as “American as apple pie,” while intimidating those with different views. In essence, this movement has accomplished what every other society, with rare exceptions, would have trembled to tamper with: a revision of the basic code and concept of life and biology, that men and women normally mate with those of the opposite sex and not with each other.

This psychiatric nonsense and social recklessness bring with it many individual tragedies, as men and women who no longer appreciate their own appropriate sexual roles create confusion in the very young for generations to come. Gender identity disturbance is bound to increase, and more true homosexual deviations result as parents distort the maleness or femaleness of their infants and children.

Currently, homosexuals who are in therapy have developed tremendous resistance, which retards their progress, while others are dissuaded even from seeking appropriate help. Other medical specialists, such as pediatricians and internists, are baffled by psychiatry’s folly. Residents in psychiatry have very little interest in going into an area of psychiatric research where they will be attacked, belittled, demeaned, and where their knowledge of sexual development will cease

The Advocate Survey – 1994

This information on homosexual activity is taken from *The Advocate*, a national magazine for homosexuals. The study included 2500 homosexual men. Results were published in the August 23, 1994, issue.

Sex acts men say they love	
Insertive oral intercourse	72%
Receptive oral intercourse	71%
Insertive anal intercourse	46%
Receptive anal intercourse	43%
Receptive anilingus (tongue in the anus)	45%
Insertive anilingus	29%
Sex acts (last five years)	
Three-way sex	48%
Group sex (four or more)	24%
Bondage & discipline sex	20%
Use of nipple clamps	19%
Sadomasochism	10%
Where partners met (last five years)	
Bar/disco	65%
Bathhouse, sex club	29%
Adult bookstore	27%
Park, bathroom	26%
Roadside rest area	15%

■ Most (57%) report having had more than 30 partners over their lifetime, and about a third (35%) report more than 100 partners.

■ About one quarter (26%) of HIV-positive men who have had insertive oral intercourse have ejaculated in another man’s mouth, most typically with someone they have just met.

■ Among men who have had insertive anal intercourse in the past year, 44% ejaculated in a partner without a condom. Among those who had receptive anal intercourse in the past year, 58% had a partner ejaculate without a condom.

■ Among HIV-infected men who have had insertive anal intercourse in the past year, 19% ejaculated without wearing a condom. They most typically did this with long-term partners or with men with whom they had a purely sexual encounter rather than within the context of a relationship.

■ Anilingus (tongue on or in the anus) is fairly common: 41% have performed it in the past year, and 47% have received it. When engaging in insertive and receptive anilingus, only 4% to 5%, respectively, have used dental dams to prevent the spread of sexually transmitted diseases.

■ Among men who had had a positive result from an HIV antibody test, 11% have said or implied that they were HIV-negative in order to have sex.

to grow. Above all, however, it is the individual homosexual wishing to change who suffers the most.

Young men and women with relatively minor sexual fears are led with equanimity by some psychiatrists and non-medical counselors into a self despising pattern and lifestyle. Adolescents, nearly all of whom experience some degree of uncertainty as to sexual identity, are discouraged from assuming that one form of gender identity is preferable to another. Those persons who already have a homosexual problem are discouraged from finding their way out of self destructive fantasy – discouraged from learning to accept themselves as male or female, discouraged from following those often painful but necessary courses that allow people to function as reasonable and participating individuals in a co-operating society.

After all, homosexuality cannot create a society or keep one going for very long. It operates against the cohesive elements of society. The sexes are driven in opposite directions, and no society can long endure when either the child is neglected or the sexes war with each other. Those who reinforce the dis-integrating elements in our society will get no thanks from future generations.

Individuals who adamantly insist that homosexuality is an alternative lifestyle have not been stopped by appeals to tradition, enlightened self-interest, or even the established findings of psychoanalysis. Threats about what would happen to society do not have much effect – no one considers himself society's guardian. Average citizens say they don't quite know what these social interests are, and after all, aren't personal decisions about sex a private matter? The answer to that question, contrary to popular opinion, is no.

Psychoanalysis reveals that sexual behavior is not an arbitrary set of rules set down by no-one-knows who, for purposes which no one understands. Our sexual patterns are a product of our biological past, a result of humanity's collective experience in its long biological and social development. They make possible the cooperative coexistence of human beings with one another. At the individual level, these patterns create a balance between the demands of sexual instinct and the external realities surrounding each of us. Not all cultures survive – the majority have not – and anthropologists tell us that serious flaws in sexual codes and institutions have undoubtedly played a significant role in many a culture's demise. When masses of people think similarly about long-standing customs, their collective behavior will, in the last analysis, have a profound impact on the whole of society.

Scientists, psychologists, psychiatrists,

AMERICAN FAMILY ASSOCIATION
JOURNAL

P.O. Drawer 2440
 Tupelo, Mississippi 38803

political leaders, public officials, and others with vested interests, ransack literature for bits of fact and theory that can be pieced together into a pro-homosexual or bisexual concept of nature, humanity, and society. Some individuals say that homosexuals are healthy, society is sick, and that science should cure society. Others raise false or outdated scientific issues to do battle with traditional values.

Many of our values could use some change, but polemical pseudoscience and genetics without corroboration is not the way. No society has accepted preferential homosexuality. Nowhere is homosexuality, or so called "bisexuality," a desired end in itself. Nowhere do parents say, "It's all the same to me if my child is heterosexual or homosexual." Nowhere are homosexuals more than a small minority at the present time. Nowhere does homosexuality per se place one in an enviable position.

Some pro-homosexual proponents within the behavioral sciences state that mental illness is simply a product of social definition, and that sexual behavior considered normal in one society may be deviant in another. Examination of the facts shows that this is not true of all illness and all behavior. Some behaviors are universally deviant and every society considers them destructive. Incest, rape, and psychopathic (apparently unmotivated) violence are considered taboo in all societies. So is predominant or exclusive homosexuality or even bisexuality. While homosexuals can and should be protected by all the laws of society, homosexuality should not be encouraged.

The forces allied against heterosexuality are formidable and unrelenting. Charges of being "undemocratic," "cruel and inhuman,"

or "irresponsible, homophobic, and prejudiced," are leveled at those who would question the normality of homosexuality. These accusations are then reinforced by the media and motion pictures, and render the ordinary citizen who disapproves of such practices (as well as faint-hearted members of the psychiatric and psychological professions) mute before their onslaught.

The counteraction for such forces is the knowledge that heterosexuality has self-evident, adaptive value. Man is not only a sexual animal, but a care-bonding, group-bonding, and child-rearing animal. The male female design is taught to the child from birth and culturally ingrained through the marital order. The male female design is thus perpetually maintained and it is only overwhelming fear or man's false pride and misdirected individual enterprise that can disturb or divert it.

All of this is enough "to make the angels weep." I borrow the phrase from one of William Shakespeare's bitter comedies, *Measure for Measure*. One of my patients brought the quote to my attention some time ago, as he himself mused about his condition. (He is a homosexual and a distinguished scholar, but he is learning about the dynamic forces behind his homosexuality and how to gain control of them.) Here's the entire quote:

*But man, proud man
 Dress'd in a little brief authority,
 Most ignorant of what he's
 most assur'd,
 His glassy essence like an angry ape
 Plays such fantastic tricks before high
 heaven
 As makes the angels weep.*