

- *The Homosexual Discussion* -

"COME, LET US REASON TOGETHER....?"

OR *Dialogue in Darkness?*

F. Earle Fox

[Come, Let Us Reason Together (see Isaiah 1:18) and the second article, *Dialogue in Darkness* (both by Earle Fox, president of Emmaus Ministries) are joined here to illustrate how radically differently orthodox Biblical folks deal with issues of truth from the manner in which homosexual activists deal with truth. The major issue facing the human race today is not sex or violence, it is whether we will join God in honest, open, candid, and loving discussion of the issues. Will we engage in an honest "reality check"?

The first article is an invitation to persons on both sides of the "homosexual fence" to "reason together". The second article was written in response to a program of pseudo-dialogue promoted by the Episcopal Church.]

COME, LET US REASON TOGETHER

1. Honest Dialogue

There is an intense discussion in America over whether the homosexual lifestyle is really "gay" (approved by God and a healthy way to live), or whether it is "SSAD" (Same Sex Attraction Disorder -- a compulsive, and often lethal sexual addiction, and sinful if deliberately pursued).

Christians faithful to their Lord stand on the opposite side of the fence from those who believe that "gay" really describes the homosexual lifestyle. Our fallen nature, rebellious and broken, conditions us into such behavior. But we can choose to change such seemingly intractable adversity.

However, the first business before us all is to establish mutually respectful, yes, even loving, dialogue and discussion based, as best we can, on the facts of the matter.

There are two primary issues being debated:

1. **homosexuality is good and right in the eyes of God - T or F?** and
2. **the homosexual lifestyle is a healthy way to live - T or F?**

Answers to nearly all other questions about homosexuality are going to depend on how we answer those two questions.

There is a truth to the matter, we cannot make up our own truth to suit our feelings. Getting the truth of those two issues is of paramount importance to resolving the social and moral and religious issues before America and western civilization.

Neither side of the debate is gifted with infallibility, and we are necessarily obligated on both sides to discipline ourselves to observing the facts accurately and reasoning logically from those facts to our conclusions. Love and respect for one another are absolutely meaningless apart from, and thus absolutely committed to, truth-seeking. Uneducated or deliberately ignorant love is no love at all.

So, on both sides, we must insist on *both* love and truth because not only are they mutually compatible, they are also mutually interdependent. Neither one will survive without the other. Love without truth is ignorant love, the tool of dangerous simpletons. Truth without love is equally dangerous and soon becomes the tool of tyrants. So if we do not wish to be ruled by simpletons or tyrants, we will insist on the unity of truth and love in all discussion of public policy, and discipline ourselves to both.

In a discussion ruled by truth and love, each side invites the other to state its case clearly, without being called nasty names merely for stating its case. There are honest truth-seekers on both sides of this discussion, persons who want to know the truth of the matter, whether or not it fits their present opinion.

So we (who have come out of homosexuality or work with those who do) offer the following:

If the evidence should show that God approves of homosexual behavior, and if the evidence should show that the homosexual

lifestyle is a healthy way to live, then we will stand boldly and publicly with those who affirm homosexuality.

But if the evidence were to show that God did not approve, or that the homosexual lifestyle is in fact a self-destructive way to live, then we would invite the supporters of homosexuality to reconsider their position, and perhaps even join us in bringing the freedom of truth to the world.

2. An Invitation...

Most Christians have concluded that God does not approve and that homosexual behavior is very self-destructive. Many, such as in the Exodus movement, have, by the grace of God, come out of homosexuality, or are on their way out. But all Christians are committed to speaking this truth in love, as St. Paul urges us to do. We are obligated to remain open to the kind of discussion described above and invite those who disagree to visit us.

Many have many stories to tell of personal victory over sexual addiction and bondage, from self-destructive behavior and lifestyle, and of regaining self-respect and identity as men and women made in the image of God, male and female. Both from personal experience and from research on the matter, many have come to the conclusion that the homosexual lifestyle is not at all "gay", but rather that it is indeed quite sad. Faithful Christians do not wish to coerce others who disagree, still less to be abusive toward them. But Christians do insist on the freedom to state our case, just as we insist on the freedom of those who disagree also to state theirs.

For those who conclude in open and free discussion that God does not approve, or that homosexuality is not healthy, for those who experience pain and frustration in their homosexuality and suspect that God might offer something better, and who would thus like to leave that lifestyle, Exodus ministries and others offer resources for doing so. There are testimonies of hundreds who have already been healed of what *honest* medical and psychological evidence shows (despite what the American Psychiatric & Psychological Assns. are telling us) to be a compulsive and lethal addiction.

It is understood that many do not agree with that opinion, but that is reason to meet and discuss the matter and the relevant evidence, not for throwing bricks at each other.

The primary concern of Christians is healing the broken, not to be contentious other than to present what we believe to be the truth, as best we can on the basis of the publicly available evidence.

3. The Evidence

If it is true, as we believe the available evidence shows, that the APA has betrayed its trust as guardians of public health and safety, then the APA is no longer to be trusted in anything it says until it repents of having in 1973 caved in to pressure tactics from homosexual (or really pan-sexual - all forms of sex are morally equivalent) advocates.

The pansexual revolution has never had a teaspoon of objective evidence in support. The notions that all forms of sexual expression are on equal moral standing is not true. The companion notion that all are equally healthy is also not true.

Evidence easily available from the Centers for Disease Control, medical journals, and pro-homosexual, as well as Christian, sources, indicates that there are devastating medical risks in homosexual behavior, and that homosexual practitioners are (again, contrary to the APA) not typically as emotionally healthy as "mainstream America".

A healthy emotional life requires that we make a clear distinction between "who we are" and "what we do". Our "being" is different from our "doing". Our being is God's doing, not our own. Our being is something we *receive*, not something we *do*. We can

either cooperate with what He is doing, or we can take what He gives us and behave so as to hurt and destroy what He is doing.

Since what God is doing is nothing less than inviting us into that freewill covenant relationship which we call the Kingdom of Heaven and the Abundant Life, that is precisely what we threaten when we become rebellious.

So we must keep a clear distinction between what *God* is doing and what *we* do. We must not identify our sexual behavior with "who we are", when it is in fact "what we are doing". "I engage in homosexual behavior" vs. "I *am* a homosexual". When we think of our *activity* as a part of our *being*, that activity will become compulsive. We will not be able to stop it or control it because to do so will seem like suicide -- a threat to our very being.

So to regain control of our sexual lives, we must -- at any cost to ourselves -- make a clear distinction between our sexual behavior and our identity. We must find our identity in that place where God tells us to find it -- in His image, male and female.

The clear warning of common sense, of Scripture, and of careful scientific observation is that when we depart from God's plan for our lives, we become both self- and socially destructive.

4. The Deeper Issue...

While overcoming any unhealthy condition is of great importance, overcoming our alienation from God is the primary issue for all of us. Our sickness and brokenness (including sexual) comes from our ignorance of God and from our rebellion against Him.

God has mercifully leaned all the way down from heaven to draw us back to Himself -- though our behavior has given Him little or no reason to do so. In Jesus Christ, we are offered the way back to health, including sexual wholeness. Biblical revelation is the story of God drawing us back to His original intent, restoring us back to living on His provision for our lives and obeying His voice.

Salvation means the saving of the whole of our human nature as intended by God. Back to plan A -- the conditions prior to the Fall. Salvation means the restoration of our sexual and gender wholeness as well as our moral standing before God. God is redeeming the *whole* of His creation -- so that we can stand as sons and daughters, straight and tall before Him and before one another.

Jesus Christ is the Way, and the Truth, and the Life. Following Him, we come to that abundant life of which He spoke. On the way of the cross, we discover and can drink of that living water which will become in us a well springing up to eternal life.

So the deeper issue is: *Have I invited Jesus to sit on the throne of my heart?*

5. The Way of the Cross

If you believe God has better for you than you are currently experiencing, many Christians in the Exodus movement would appreciate the chance to share their stories with you. And if there is contrary information of which we are unaware, we wish to be informed by those who disagree with us. When God says to us (Isaiah 1:18): "*Come, let us reason together,*" He means, "*Let's have a reality check*". God calls us into that open encounter where we bring our needs and complaints, and where we allow Him to speak His word to us.

It is only as we allow ourselves to get into honest discussion with one another and with God, when the real I meets the real God, that truth can emerge. That is a scary road, the "road less traveled" as one book title has it, but it is the only road to life.

Following Jesus on the way of the cross thus includes that honest discussion and search for truth where I give up trying to be "the right one", where I want to know the truth, whatever it is, where I make myself vulnerable to the possibility that I might be wrong, where I have a teachable spirit, and allow the

truth and the Lord of truth to speak for themselves -- but when it is all over, I draw my conclusions, and stand for what I perceive to be the truth.

So again, we offer:

If the evidence should show that God approves of homosexual behavior, and if the evidence should show that the homosexual lifestyle is a healthy way to live, then we will stand boldly and publicly with those who affirm homosexuality.

But if the evidence were to show that God does not approve, or that the homosexual lifestyle is in fact a self-destructive way to live, then we would invite the supporters of homosexuality to reconsider their position, and perhaps even join us in bringing the freedom of truth to the world.

Dialogue in Darkness

Human Sexuality: A Christian Perspective, a program developed by the Episcopal Church Province VII in response to General Convention, was supposed to promote honest dialogue on sexuality, leading to the 1994 Convention in Indianapolis. But it was packaged with psychological techniques that subtly push one point of view (there is no Biblical truth, only equally valid feelings and experiences), and very effectively prevented any critique of that view. It is a classic example of homosexualist attempts to commandeer discussion of public policy. *Human Sexuality: A Christian Perspective* brings the moral deviousness of previous sexuality materials, such as the *Newark Report* and *Human Sexuality: A Divine Gift*, to a new level of psychological sophistication. Nothing has changed. The same issues are relevant today.

Biblically Based...?

In the dialogue program, the leader is told in the first session to "Acknowledge that 'This entire course is biblically based'":

An example of this is that we believe Jesus modeled the best possible method for adult learning. Our Lord's method was the opposite of Moses'. Moses first handed down the law, made a point or a pronouncement, usually occasioning resistance and deeply hostile questions from his hearers. Jesus first asked questions, and then offered a statement or a parable. We will use Jesus' method throughout this course.

This contrast between Moses and Jesus is not only absurdly slanted, but pictures objective truth-seeking and handing down the law as not Christ-like. To suggest that Jesus did not give commands, or did not occasion hostile responses is to suggest that the writer had not yet read the New Testament.

In session III, the material declares that the *Venite* and Eucharistic prayer C present "two differing worldviews": In the *Venite*, "The psalmist sees earth from the ground level, so to speak, and god [sic] as one among many deities, though for him the greatest," while, "The Eucharistic prayer sees earth from outer space and God as the one creator of all, a concept that would be inconceivable to the psalmist."

The psalmist (David?) is, of course, saying *precisely* what the writer denies him to be saying. Radical monotheism is *the* gift of the Old Testament, evident on every page. But not to worry: "We can rejoice in both views, because we have had both views in our experience."

The simple *experience* of a view is sufficient to make it so. One does not need to bother about whether it is either Biblical or true. We can all be friends and honor one another's "experience". That is, of course, nonsense, and so the assertion that *Human Sexuality* is "biblically based" is simply false.

Ground Rules and Goals

Even worse than *Human Sexuality's* misrepresentation of the Bible is its importing of legitimate therapeutic techniques into public discussion to undercut resistance and to control the outcome -- to create mind-control.

Three of the ground rules for enabling "caring dialogue" are:

1. These sessions are confidential.

3. Differing views are not to be argued, but honored as valid for that person.

5. We speak from our own experience, use "I" statements instead of making generalizations... [My emphasis.]

The rules are supposedly to prevent "putting people down", and to create an open atmosphere where participants can express viewpoints.

On page 3 of *Human Sexuality* we find a two column comparison, "Dialogue vs. Debate".

"Debate" is described negatively: "I listen for weaknesses so as to discount and devalue." "I speak based on assumptions made about others' positions." "I ask questions to trip up or confuse." These are contrasted with glowing descriptions of "dialogue" such as: "I listen with a view toward understanding."

The negative description is not of a debate but of a rude person. The prejudicial comparison prompts one to feel guilty for even suggesting to "debate" or discuss the issues -- have an open and honest comparison of the viewpoints with the evidence for each side. Clearly, a discussion which might conclude in favor of Biblical truth is the very thing being avoided.

"Therapeutic" Control

The reason for choosing "dialogue" over "debate" becomes clear when we find that what is meant by "dialogue" is the misuse of therapeutic techniques.

The techniques are (you guessed it): confidentiality; the forbidding of criticism of someone else's behavior, feelings, or experience; and, confinement to "I" statements.

Confidentiality is helpful in a therapeutic process because one is being encouraged to divulge personal, and perhaps painful, information. Forbidding criticism can be helpful because therapy must provide an arena in which the client will feel free to bring to the surface even those events of which he might be ashamed. And using "I" statements helps to minimize evasion of one's own problems and issues, so a therapist may tell the client: "talk about yourself, not your spouse (boss, kids, parents, etc.)."

The point of therapy is to investigate and heal what is psychologically "inside" a person. But when these techniques are applied to finding the outside public truth about matters of Church policy, they become unreasonable and destructive.

(1) Imposing confidentiality encourages the sharing of personal and intimate items by creating an atmosphere of "safe vulnerability". If then a homosexual person shares intimate experiences, the other participants are inhibited from dealing with the homosexual issue because they do not want to hurt the homosexual person. And so persons who *want* to skew the debate (*Is homosexuality right or wrong?*) can use the introduction of painful and intimate material to do just that.

(2) Imposing a stop card on debate, on the spurious grounds that it is inherently hostile, gives an illusion of kindness while subverting the goal for which reasonable people would enter the dialogue in the first place, to discover the truth of the matter. It means that the *goal* of that dialogue is not to discover the truth of the issue, which requires putting the various options on the table and assessing the evidence for them -- the basis of scientific method. The goal is to subvert truth and control the outcome. This procedure allows the facilitator to insert his own viewpoint, now protected from challenge -- precisely what happens in *Human Sexuality*.

(3) Imposing "I" statements prevents *moral* discussion, because moral discussion is by its very nature about general principles which include all people, not just myself -- just as natural science searches for general principles about how all of nature works.

(4) Another misused technique is employing imagination to encourage the introduction of private and personal material. Participants are asked to imagine emotionally charged scenes (p. 75-6), and to use private visualization to explore feelings about alternative life-styles (p. 35-6). Therapeutic techniques are used to open the door to the "possibility" of the homosexual life style in the *deliberately planned absence* of any objective critique of the issues.

Guilt is the underlying tool which makes the techniques work. One who objects to the program or

raises relevant inquiries is likely to be told that he is homophobic, sexist, uncompassionate, engaged in "black/white, either/or thinking", rigid, fundamentalist, etc. He will be portrayed as one who discounts and devalues the other, asks questions to trip up or confuse, etc., or as a "Moses" and not a "Jesus".

The Effect

The effect of using the *Human Sexuality* ground rules was, very predictably, to create a pseudo-wave of pro-homosexual sentimentality washing into the Episcopal General Convention, as though it were a legitimate expression from the "man in the pew".

Any report founded on the Province VII material must be rejected as either incompetent, dishonest, or both, and unworthy of presentation to the spiritual leaders of the Episcopal Church.

Conclusions

Christians must be open to talking with anyone about any issue. But Christians come to a discussion with honest rules for discussion and *with a position*. Thus, the issue is not whether some people *experience* their homosexuality as compatible with the Christian position, but whether homosexuality and faithfulness to Christ really are compatible. But this is precisely the question *Human Sexuality* stifles.

Who, one asks, was responsible for producing material that violates both intellectual integrity and Christian sexuality, and functions as a mind-control program? How has it come about that we, presumably intelligent Christians, are willing to tolerate such abuse of ourselves, and the erosion of the spiritual, moral, and intellectual integrity of the Church by persons who have either no capacity or no desire for truth-seeking?

The dialogue results were sent to the House of Bishops -- who had themselves admitted to their own dysfunctional state, and embarked on their own mutual dialogue. But the same people, or at least the same mindset was managing the bishops' dialogue. The bishops were in fact unable to come to substantive discussion about the nature and mission of the Gospel, and got stuck in another endless "feel good" maze of smoke, mirrors, and relative truth. Therapy and healing of relations is necessary. But an honest therapeutic process is rooted in *prior truth commitments*, and that requires an understanding of and commitment to Gospel truth, including the Gospel of freedom from sexual bondage.

[Endnote: The reader is urged to memorize the principles of honest debate, and also of dialogue in darkness, so that he will be able publicly to stand firm for truth when challenged.

This article was written for a Christian magazine in 1994. Since then we have seen these manipulative ground rules increasingly control Church discussion on sexuality issues. Contrary to all reliable scientific and Biblical evidence, contrary to all common sense, the homosexual/pansexual agenda continues to capture the American imagination, including the imagination of many Christian leaders. That is collusion with the father of lies.

For an explicit description of these dark principles, defended openly as "propaganda" by two of the premiere homosexualist strategists, read *After the Ball* by Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen.

If people of honest intent on both sides of the sexuality issues fail to demand a return to intellectual, moral, and spiritual integrity, and fail to be witnesses to truth at any cost to ourselves, we will continue our downhill slide back into paganism, Baal worship, and their terribly self-destructive sexual behavior. The battle for truth is winnable. In the end, it is the only winnable battle.]

[*Dialogue in Darkness* is adapted from a 50 page booklet, *Dialogue in Darkness or Scientific Debate?* available from Emmaus Ministries, 2605 Schooley Dr., Alexandria, VA 22306 \$5 postpaid.]

Emmaus Ministries

A School of Christian Apologetics

2605 Schooley Dr., Alexandria, VA 22306

Tel: 703 765-7862

E-Mail: emmfox@juno.com

ROAD to EMMAUS==>>> WEBSITE:

<http://theRoadtoEmmaus.org>

Copyright 10/20/03, F. Earle Fox ReasonTogether2.LWP