

The Homosexual Rights Agenda: Re-framing the Debate

Talking Points Questions & Answers

Part I. Clarifying the Homosexual Agenda -- pictures the clash of worldviews which is at the center of the homosexual rights debate, illustrating the chasm between the Judeo-Christian and the secular/pagan worldviews.

Part II. Five Questions for Getting Truth into the Homosexual Rights Discussion -- views the logical, scientific, and empirical evidence, showing that behavior is the primary issue no matter from which worldview one approaches the issue.

Part III. Resolution in Support of the Federal Constitutional Marriage Amendment

Part IV. Sexual Orientation Non-Discrimination Issues.

Part V. Hate Crimes Legislation.

Part VI. Retention of State Sodomy Statutes.

Homosexual advocates have consistently succeeded in framing the homosexual debate to avoid any possible discussion of homosexual behavior -- their Achilles heel. This material is intended to be used in discussions of homosexual rights proposals or legislation, and frames the debate to get to the heart of the matter—an understanding that homosexual behavior is *central* to each issue. We thus point to the behavior issue in each Part of the discussion. Footnotes reference resources for documentation and further study.

Prepared by: F. Earle Fox (703-765-7862) & Allan Dobras (793-455-9051) 28 January 2004

Allan Dobras is a graduate engineer, author, and freelance writer specializing in religious, cultural, and science and technology issues.

Earle Fox is an Episcopal priest, with clinical training in two mental hospitals, a prison, and a general hospital, a doctorate from Oxford on the relation between science and theology, and has worked with Exodus International since 1989 helping persons out of the homosexual lifestyle. He co-authored *Homosexuality: Good & Right in the Eyes of God? the Wedding of Truth to Compassion & Reason to Revelation*, and currently heads Emmaus Ministries, dedicated to Christian apologetics. (<http://theRoadtoEmmaus.org>)

I. Clarifying the Homosexual Agenda: the Judeo-Christian vs. Secular/Pagan Perspectives

Background

Homosexuality is not a "stand-alone" issue, it has descended upon us out of a very specific context.⁽¹⁾ The failure of Christian leadership to address these broader cultural and apologetics issues is a primary reason why we are looking at the end of Western (i.e., Judeo-Christian) civilization, including the attempted trashing of the only kind of constitution which can sustain freedom -- one mandating a government under God with the fundamental separation of powers.

Legislators, like many others, are very busy and want "sound-byte" answers to hard questions. The material in this document raises issues which must be addressed if we are to turn the cultural (i.e., spiritual) war around. They may take time to grasp, and do require thoughtful engagement.

But the constitutional ship is sinking. We had better find time to plug the holes and rebuild the hull, or it will make little difference how well the course is plotted or the rudder turned from the pilot house -- the direction will be down. A healthy undergirding in these background issues (plugging the holes) will greatly enhance the possibility of restoring in America a Biblical moral and constitutional consensus (the sinking ship).

Generally, people divide "religious" arguments from "secular". In the Biblical view, there is no such division. The world of space and time (and therefore of science) is the creation of God. God wrote two books, not just one. He wrote the book of Creation first. He wrote the second book, the Bible, because we creatures trashed the first. The second book was written to point us back to the first, to rescue us from our attempted, but disastrous, independent autonomy back into God's original plan for Creation. One reads the book of Creation by the methods of science -- accurate observation and careful reasoning from our observations.

The creation therefore reveals His nature and is subject to His sovereignty. So appeal to empirical evidence is part and parcel of the Biblical case for or against any issue. The empirical evidence shows how God makes His world work.

Christians, therefore, should be investigating and presenting the empirical and logical evidence regarding the homosexual issues, not limiting their arguments to Scripture and Tradition. To be victors in the culture war, Christians must learn to handle empirical and logical evidence, the realms of science and of philosophy. If Jesus is King of kings and Lord of lords, Christians ought to be holding the intellectual, as well as the spiritual and moral, high ground. It all belongs to God.

That can be done, not by avoiding "religious" issues in public, but rather by framing the issues in generic terms, asking questions that *everyone* has to ask just because they are alive, and giving the Biblical and Christian answers to those questions in order that they may be openly compared with the secular/pagan answers to them. Properly presented, the Biblical answers will always be capable of holding the spiritual, moral, and intellectual high ground. As Elijah showed on Mount Carmel some 900 years before Christ (I Kings 18:17 ff.), the Biblical way thrives on public contest. God is quite capable of proving His own case -- if we will boldly present it, and then know how to get out of His way.

¹ See *Homosexuality; Good & Right in the Eyes of God? the Wedding of Truth to Compassion & Reason to Revelation*, by Earle Fox and David Virtue. Chapter V, "The Hard Evidence" documents the empirical and Biblical evidence on homosexuality.

The book was written to provide politicians, educators, clergy, and others quickly available information on the numerous issues surrounding homosexuality, including a survey of how America has arrived at this bizarre state of affairs, the cultural and historical context out of which the homosexual movement arose. Chapter headings, subheadings, and an extended index greatly facilitate looking up specific issues and talking points.

Obtainable from Emmaus Ministries, 2605 Schooley Dr., Alexandria, VA 22306 703 765-7862
<http://theroadtoemmaus.org/WinSexWars.htm> Also at Amazon and other booksellers ISBN 0-945778-01-5

The secular/pagan picture is inherently lame, leaving out essentials for life. However, for the sake of communication, circumstances may dictate different manners of presentation. The presenter can choose his approach for the audience at hand, whether to emphasize those items which are more "secular-friendly", or to present the whole picture.

Talking Points

Worldview & Government:

- **The clash of two worldviews.** Rationality in public discussion on homosexuality requires clarity on the "worldview" and "religion" issues, a subject beclouded by erroneous notions of conflict between religion and civil government.⁽²⁾ Secularism is recognized by both the Humanist Manifesto⁽³⁾ and the Supreme Court as a "religion", i.e., a comprehensive worldview from which persons obtain their values. The deeper issue being engaged in the "homosexuality" discussion is the contest between the Judeo-Christian and the secular/pagan worldviews -- the two primary choices with which we are all faced.
- **Who is the Ultimate Decider? -- God or civil government?** The practical *political* choice we face is, as an 1850's Speaker of the House said, "We will be ruled by the Bible or by the bayonet."
- **The Church is society's conscience, the State society's referee.** Reason and righteousness are fundamental aspects of both Biblical religion and of the American democratic republic.
- **How do we know?** Even though we use the same language, persons arguing across worldview lines are arguing from radically different presuppositions and standards about two fundamentals: truth and righteousness. Using the same language to mean conflicting things creates confusion. So, we must adhere to reasonable standards (of fact and logic) for public discussion and debate -- precisely that for which the American Constitution was written, to produce truthful and righteous legislation.

Sexuality:

- **Homosexuality is only one segment of "pansexuality" -- the much larger so-called "sex-revolution", which in turn is the natural sexual pattern for secularism and paganism.** Pansexuality has been promoted by Alfred Kinsey, the Kinsey Institute, Planned Parenthood, and several other sexuality-oriented organizations.⁽⁴⁾ The "pansexual" position holds that all forms of sexual engagement are morally equivalent, that one cannot distinguish morally between different forms of sexual behavior (with the exception of coercion, manipulation, or deceit, which are generally, *but not always*, deemed wrong).

Homosexual advocates are riding point for the much larger pansexual group favoring total sexual license -- from cradle to grave, no matter the kind of behavior. Advocates of all other sexually deviant practices are already using the astonishingly successful homosexual strategy to support their own cases.⁽⁵⁾ They are accomplishing their goals largely through commandeering the public school system.
- **All secular and pagan societies tend toward pansexualism** -- precisely because they have no objective standard for morality by which any behavior, sexual, political, or otherwise, can be either

² See *Homosexuality...* *Op. Cit.* Chapter II, "Worldview Issues"

³ Go to <http://theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/21PbAr/Apl/HumMan1.htm> for the Humanist Manifesto.

⁴ See *Homosexuality...*, *op. cit.* Chapter I, Section A, "Truth, Homosexuality, and Pansexuality".

⁵ The primary strategy manual for homosexualists has been *After the Ball* by Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, a study in propaganda (their own word) and mind-control. It accurately describes what we see happening all about us today.

mandated or forbidden. But even in non-Biblical societies where sexual diversions are permitted, in practical fact, heterosexual marriage will always be the norm.

- **The Hebrew community was the first and only society in the ancient world, as Rabbi Dennis Prager expressed it, to put the sexual genie into the marital bottle.**⁽⁶⁾ The Judeo-Christian community alone carried that principle into the wider world. Heterosexual monogamy was, and is, based on the most stable and objective fact in existence, the Image of God -- in which we are made, male and female -- suggesting that the family unit is to reflect and participate in that stability of God, especially for child-raising.

Morality:

- **The pansexual position rests on the notion that truth and morality are relative**, and that therefore no one has the right to "impose" his morality, or his religion, on other people. Each person's beliefs are right for that person.

However, the notion of a "subjective" or "relative" morality is a contradiction in terms. The very meaning of morality is to impose standards of truth and righteousness on the behavior of all, not just some, persons. The very purpose of the American Constitution, to provide law, which is based on truth and righteousness, is scuttled, for in a "relative" world, there is neither truth nor righteousness.

- **We must identify the true morality.** If there is no "true", i.e., objective (it is there whether we like it or not), morality, then there is no morality at all, there are no obligations of any kind for any person. Government has no obligation to respect citizens, and citizens have no obligation to obey government. Government therefore reduces to coercive force ungoverned by either truth or righteousness, and citizenship is reduced to an opportunistic take-what-you-can-get-away-with.
- **Life without objective morality (no obligation to either truth or righteousness) is simply power struggle** -- the devil take the hindmost. Neither homosexual nor heterosexual persons have any obligation to respect each other -- and therefore no legal protection or safety. The protection of all persons—secular, pagan, Biblical, heterosexual or homosexual—thus requires a principle of obligation.

A free people under a free government cannot survive the loss of objective moral standards. When morality goes relative, it goes all the way. So there are no moral barriers to sexual coercion, manipulation, or deceit. The murder of Matthew Shepherd (or anyone else) was, then, not "wrong", just another meaningless event in a chaotic cosmos.

- **The Biblical worldview alone can supply a principle of obligation (and therefore meaning) because the only objective source for morality is the will of God.** It is a matter of simple logic that the Creator of existence alone can supply the purpose (and therefore meaning) for existence. And purpose-for-existence, logically, has the only possible claim on our freedom of will which can meet the standards for being a "morality".⁽⁷⁾ That is why secular and pagan worldviews (which deny the existence of a Creator God) consistently have trouble sustaining moral standards, so that life tends to drift into power struggle rather than rational moral consensus.
- **Without the law of God, civil law has no legitimizing principle.** As our founding fathers understood, apart from the law of God, civil law searches in vain for a legitimizing principle. There are many noble and morally upright people who are secular or pagan, but their worldview cannot explain the objective source of their own moral standards for judging ultimate truth or righteousness. (We sometimes live above our own belief systems.)

⁶ Dennis Prager, "Judaism, Homosexuality, and Civilization", *Ultimate Issues*, April-June 1990

⁷ See *Defining 'Oughtness' and 'Love'* by Earle Fox, which gives the logical case for saying that only the Biblical worldview, with a personal Creator God, can sustain a morality. Neither secularism nor paganism can do that. The article may be viewed at <http://theRoadtoEmmaus.org/RdLb/21PbAr/Eth/00Eth.htm>

Behavior:

- **Persons engaged in homosexual behavior already have the same legal protection against abuse as other citizens.** They are demanding the legitimizing of their behavior, not protection for their personhood or identity. Homosexuality is neither an identity nor a legitimate behavior, it is best described as a compulsive, lethal addiction (indicating that God has very good reasons for saying "no").
- **Homosexual advocates have sought to sell the public a "pig in a poke"** (Scottish for 'bag'), to gain rights for homosexual behavior with no public discussion of the behavior, seeking rather to focus attention on a specious "identity" supposedly based on genetics or biology. No scientific study alleging such has survived scientific peer review.

Any rational decision requires open discussion of the material in question. When questions are raised about the legitimacy of homosexuality, one must first clarify the behaviors "common to the homosexual lifestyle" (as we read in the Lawrence decision on sodomy).
- **The focus on behavior is not meant to be a judgement on homosexual persons, but a fair, helpful, and graceful assessment of their behavior,** approval for which is the object of their political advocacy. In the heat of discussion, we must recall that we are dealing with human beings, some of whom are broken and despairing, some of whom are hoping to hear a word of love and encouragement from the "straight" world. "Love the sinner and hate the sin" is good advice when done the way Jesus does it for all of us.

Questions and Answers

Q1. Isn't true that ancient peoples, as cited in the Bible and elsewhere, had no real concept of homosexual behavior and orientation?

A1. *Persons defending homosexuality have a vested interest in saying that the ancients had no knowledge of contemporary "faithful" homosexuality in order to make the present practice appear something "new", implying that "science" has given us new and positive information. There is no such new scientific information (it is uniformly negative), homosexual behavior is not now and never has been remotely "faithful", and the ancient people did indeed understand that there are "orientations" in the sense of compulsive behaviors.*

Romans 1:18 ff. pictures how we fall from the freedom we have as creatures of God into the bondage (compulsion, addiction) of those who worship the creature rather than the Creator. Many ancient authors commented on the compulsive nature of homosexuality.⁽⁸⁾

Q2. We hear, "Love the sinner and hate the sin" from religious people. Is not that hypocritical?

A2. *It is hypocritical only if dishonestly said, i.e., if loving the sinner is not in fact done.*

Opposing homosexual behavior is not the same as demeaning homosexual persons. "What we do" is different from "who we are". We are *required* to judge behavior, whereas only God can judge persons. Loving the sinner *mandates* speaking the hard truth. Sentimental love is no love at all, it is "enabling" and betrayal.

⁸ For quotes from ancient authors, visit <http://theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/22Sx/PnSx/HSx/ChHistHsx.htm>

See also *Homosexuality...*, *op. cit.*, Chapter V, Section B-10, "Romans 1" for a Biblical description of "compulsive orientation".

Q3. Why are traditional Christians so hostile to homosexual persons?

A3. *Traditional Christians are seldom hostile to homosexual persons. But it is easy in heated discussion over behavior to appear hostile to persons rather than to behavior.*

Much of the hostility has been engendered by the brazen, in-your-face attack, physical intimidation (e.g., against the medical professions), by sexually obnoxious "gay rights" parades, and by refusal to discuss the behavioral evidence by homosexual activists from the 1970's right up to the present. And hostility is often wrongly attributed because homosexual persons tend to identify "what they do" with "who they are". It thus becomes impossible to criticize their behavior without it seeming to them to be an attack on their personhood. Becoming free of a behavioral addiction requires that one separate "what I do" from "who I am".

However, one evil does not excuse another, and Christians are required by the highest Authority, to be willing to lay down their lives even for their enemies. So it is proper to call Christians to account where they fail. As pastors teach their people to reach out to with the truthful love and compassion appropriate to Christian salvation, there will be many more same-sex attracted persons seeking help from the Church.

II. Seven Behavioral Questions for Getting Truth into the Homosexual Rights Discussion

Talking Points

- **Whatever else homosexuality might be, it is at least a behavior.** We are forbidden to judge persons (which God alone can do), but we are required to judge behavior (every law, divine or civil, is a commandment to judge behavior, our own first, and, when appropriate, that of others). So, whenever questions are raised about the legitimacy of homosexuality, one must first clarify the behaviors "common to the homosexual lifestyle" -- as noted by the Lawrence decision on sodomy. (See behaviors listed below in Q & A.)
- **Persons engaged in homosexual behavior are demanding the legitimizing of their *behavior*, not protection for their personhood.** Homosexuality, which is neither a personal identity nor a legitimate behavior, is best described as a compulsive, lethal addiction. They already have the same legal protection against abuse as other citizens.
- **Homosexual advocates seek to sell the public a "pig in a poke"** (Scottish for 'bag'). They wish to gain rights for homosexual behavior with (deliberately) no public discussion of the behavior. They seek to focus attention on a specious "identity" supposedly based on genetics or biology. No study alleging such has survived scientific peer review.⁽⁹⁾
- **If the behavior for which approval is being asked is kept the primary focus of the homosexuality discussion, and if we avoid all other rabbit trails until this area is clarified, the discussion will lead to true and righteous laws. But not otherwise.** When supporters of homosexuality learn that every time they get up to defend homosexuality, they will have to defend homosexual *behavior*, there will be far fewer of them getting up. And the public will catch on that they have been lied to and manipulated.

Questions & Answers:

Q1: What is this behavior -- which both sides are so reticent to discuss? The Supreme Court "Lawrence" decision rejecting some types of sodomy laws referred to "certain intimate conduct" and conduct "common" to the homosexual lifestyle. What is it?

A1: *Around 99% of homosexual males engage in oral sex; 91% engage in anal sex; 82% engage in "rimming", touching the anus of one's partner with one's tongue and inserting the tongue into the anus; 22% engage in "fisting", inserting one's fist into the rectum of the partner; 23% engage in "golden showers", urinating on each other; 4% engage in "scat", the eating of feces, and in "mud rolling", rolling on the floor where feces have been deposited.*⁽¹⁰⁾

One can discover many of the behaviors by visiting homosexual websites or reading their literature, but often there are code or slang names which the public does not understand. It is a *very* different world from "mainstream America".

Karla Jay and Allen Young, two homosexual researchers, published in 1979 *The Gay Report*, one of the largest studies on homosexual behavior ever done (850 pp.), documenting almost every conceivable issue and question on the nature and practice of -- the "gay" lifestyle. In general, their conclusions are supported by more recent studies, right into the 1990's. There is little debate about the practices in

⁹ See *Homosexuality... op. cit.* Chapter V, Section D, "The Biological Evidence".

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Chapter V, Section A, "Homosexual Behavior: a Profile" for in depth discussion of the issue.

which engage, or, in general, the relative frequency with which they engage in these practices. The figures above come from *The Gay Report*.

The list above should be memorized, or printed to hand out, so that whenever homosexuality is being discussed, one can ask, "Is this the behavior to which you are referring?"

Q2: What are the medical consequences of homosexual behavior?

A2: *The evidence shows the homosexual lifestyle to be rightly described as "lethal". The medical consequences are so devastating that the average actively practicing homosexual person loses from 30% to 40% of his/her lifespan, typically not living beyond 50 in a culture where we average well into our 70's.*⁽¹¹⁾

An estimated "30 percent of all 20-year-old gay men will be HIV-positive or dead of AIDS by the time they are 30."⁽¹²⁾

Nearly 1,000,000 Americans, mostly , have been infected with HIV -- of which some 400,000 have died -- from a behavior-caused, and thus preventable, disease. Sexually transmitted diseases (STD's) commonly gotten from homosexual behavior include gonorrhea, syphilis, hepatitis A and B, anal cancer, amoebic "gay" bowel disease, and herpes. Homosexual behavior almost always means contact with human waste. The homosexual lifestyle thus makes no more sense than playing in the toilet. These diseases do not come from sexual inclination, attraction, or orientation, they come from sexual behavior.

Q3: What are the psychological consequences of homosexual behavior?

A3: *Psychologically, the evidence shows homosexuality to be compulsive and addictive.*⁽¹³⁾

When warned that continuing their behavior will result in a high death rate, homosexually active persons typically respond that such a request is an attack on their identity and personhood, not on their behavior. "Homosexuality is who I am, not what I do!!" The continued justification and practice of self-destructive behavior, even when warned, is evidence of a compulsive and addictive pattern.

The American Psychiatric and Psychological Associations have systematically misinformed the American public, and especially themselves, with dishonest science and cowardly response to homosexual pressure. That is not compassion, that is betrayal.

Q4: What are the social consequences of homosexual behavior?

A4: *The social consequences of the homosexual agenda include the deconstruction of marriage and of sexual morality, and the criminalization of honest discussion through "hate-crime" laws.*⁽¹⁴⁾

God, not the State, created marriage and the family when He created the human race in His image, male and female. Legally, the State can only recognize, not create, marriage.

Anti-discrimination based on "sexual orientation" opens the pansexual door, permitting pedophilia, pederasty, adultery, bestiality, polygamy, and others. Pederasty and pedophilia are largely subsets of homosexuality. Supporters of the whole range of pansexuality are already bringing cases to court, based on the recent Supreme Court decision striking down sodomy laws in Texas.

¹¹ See *Homosexuality.... op. cit.* Chapter V, Section C, "Medical Evidence" See also *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth* by Jeffrey Satinover, one of the best books available on homosexual medical and psychological issues.

¹² Charles Socarides, MD, a psychiatrist who works therapeutically with persons coming out of homosexuality, in a letter to the *Wall Street Journal* (2/13/997) quotes the *Clinical Psychiatry News*.

¹³ See *Homosexuality.... op. cit.* Chapter V, Section E, "Psychological Evidence". See also Satinover, *op. cit.*

¹⁴ See *Ibid.*, Chapter V, Section G, "Social and Criminological Consequences"

Q5: Could homosexuality be an inborn identity?

A5: *Not until the 1990's did homosexual activists discover the "PR" value of getting people to believe that their condition was "genetic" or "biologically determined". Several studies during the early and middle '90's were alleged to prove such. The claim was false. Not one of those studies has survived scientific peer review, and few, if any, researchers today will support that claim.*⁽¹⁵⁾

Prior to the 1990's, no researchers on either side of the fence said either that homosexuality was genetic, inborn, or otherwise "hardwired", or that one could not change one's orientation. Alfred Kinsey, John Money, Masters and Johnson, all pansexual proponents, said that persons could change, and that it was their own business -- difficult, but possible. Even some homosexual groups are now admitting the "inborn" case to have failed.

The prodigious promiscuity in disease-causing behavior, coupled with denial of lethal dangers, provides incontestable evidence that homosexual orientation is a compulsive and addictive condition -- with practitioners looking for self-justification in a pseudo-identity.

Q6: Given the answers to the above five questions: Would a loving person (God, or other compassionate legislator) approve homosexual behavior, or reject and forbid it?

A6: *Love seeks the welfare of the beloved, not emotional bondage. Love speaks the hard truth even when it causes pain, and will not allow a person caught in bondage to define the diagnosis. A loving and compassionate person would say "no".*

Love not based on objective truth is no love at all. It is betrayal. A loving response does not condemn *persons*, but gives a candid assessment of *behavior*. A loving person condemns the sin precisely so that the sinner will *not* be condemned, neither by God nor by the behavior itself. Tough love just says "no".

Q7: Given the answer to #6,, what should the public, especially legislatures, do about the homosexual agenda?

A7: *Honest public policy would conjoin truth, righteousness, and compassion. It would call an addiction an addiction, and then assist those seeking help.*

Honest public policy would insist on candid discussion of health issues (i.e., honest science) with appropriate public health measures. It would stop the common subversion of public health policy which betrays those very persons in need of honest discussion, those trapped in homosexual addiction, and would bring an immediate end to promotion of homosexuality in government schools or by way of special "rights".

NOTE: These first seven Q & A's lead inexorably to one conclusion: homosexuality is compulsive, addictive, and lethal, so one would *expect* God (and other legislators) to simply say "no".

¹⁵ See *Homosexuality.... op. cit.*, Chapter V, Section D, "Biological Evidence"

Further supportive Q&A

Q8: We do not normally in public talk explicitly about *heterosexual* behavior, why should we talk about *homosexual* behavior in public? Is not that being rude and putting them in an embarrassing position?

A8: *Homosexual advocates are asking for us to legally enforce approval of their behavior, but have systematically prevented a candid, public discussion of precisely what that behavior is. Examining their stated request is morally mandatory, not rude or impolite.*

The public is being asked to buy a pig in a poke because homosexual advocates know that if the pig were exposed, the buyer would quickly put his wallet away. No sale. The buyer in this case is the American public. Reasonable discussion of any "sale" requires open knowledge of the terms of the sale.

Q9: Why talk about homosexual behavior when it is so repulsive?

A9: *The repulsiveness is precisely why we must talk about it. Repulsive and lethal behavior is what homosexual advocates are trying to sell the public as normal, benign, and mainstream America.*

They are winning their goal of justifying this repulsive behavior because *conservative* leadership has been unwilling to bring the pig into the light. Homosexual advocates cannot afford to do so, because it would scuttle their case before the public that what they are doing is all quite benign. And so-called conservatives have been too polite, too prudish, too apathetic, or too cowardly to do so.

This must change. Both sides must deal publicly with the facts of the matter, gracefully but directly, using clinical, not street, language, with a calm spirit which *cares* for the opposition.

Q10: Is this behavior actually being promoted anywhere in public?

A10: *Yes. Oral sex, anal sex, fisting, (and no doubt other behaviors) are currently being taught to students as young as fourteen in the Massachusetts public school system, with the aid of funds from the governor and the state department of education in collusion with GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network).⁽¹⁶⁾*

The homosexual program aims at total pan-sexualizing of education, and therefore of America, cradle to grave -- the Kinsey "gospel" of sexual liberation. Their target is every school system in America. The media, with the apathetic and cowed consent of most Americans (we do not turn off our TV's), promotes the same agenda.

Q11: Can we legislate morality?

A11: *To say that "we cannot legislate morality" is disingenuous, illogical, and contrary to historical fact. All law is based on someone's moral code, someone's understanding of right and wrong. Except in cases of arbitrary power struggle, morality is the only thing we legislate.*

Easily available evidence shows that American law is based on the Bible, i.e., the Judeo-Christian revelation of the will of God, who designs laws specifically for human benefit and prosperity.⁽¹⁷⁾ Given

¹⁶ Go to the following website: <http://www.parentsrightscoalition.org/> and look for items on "fistgate". An actual tape of homosexual "teaching" sessions can be obtained from the website.

¹⁷ Read, for example, *Original Intent*, by David Barton, on the astonishing story of the Biblical foundations of America.

Chapter 11, "Establishing the American Philosophy of Government", discusses a 10-year study published by the Louisiana State University Press, *The Origins of American Constitutionalism*, by Donald Lutz. This secular study shows that in an extraordinary percentage of times, when the founding fathers quoted someone to justify their views on government, it was from the Bible. The Bible was, by a wide margin, the primary source for their *political* inspiration.

Available at www.wallbuilders.com

the evidence above, a loving person (whether God or any other legislator) would say "No" to homosexual behavior.

Strategy: The questions above are framed as though addressed to persons interested in public policy. Whenever questions about *any* homosexual issue are raised, the effective tactic would be to reply: *"Before I respond to your question, let us first come to a common understanding of the issue before us, namely the behavior which homosexual activists are asking us to approve."* Then list the behaviors named above (or show them a written list), and ask, *"Is this what we are talking about?"*

This will bestow reality on the discussion which for so long has gone in defensive circles. Persons of common sense must take the offensive and force honesty onto the table. When the behavior issues are made clear, answers to subsidiary issues (homosexual marriage, non-discrimination laws, hate-crime legislation, and retention of sodomy statues) become almost self-evident. And there will be far fewer persons rising to defend homosexuality in any form.

If the other side rejects the facts offered, it is better not to argue with them, but rather to ask for *their* specific information to the contrary, and for *their* studies supporting such information. *Insisting on fact and logic* soon reveals that the homosexual agenda has no case based on either, which will encourage anyone standing for truth and righteousness to press the attack.

III. Resolution in Support of the Marriage Amendment

Talking Points

- **In all of recorded history, marriage has been linked to a man and a woman** coming together in mutual love for the purpose of sharing in the establishment of the basic family unit, which is the bedrock of any civilized society. Since those who identify themselves as homosexual seek legitimization of their behavior, they have initiated a vigorous campaign to claim a right for same-sex couples to legally marry, which is the most sacred of public institutions and the ultimate prize in their quest for society's acceptance of homosexual behavior.
- **A stable marriage between a man and a woman is, by far, the best arrangement for raising children and offers the greatest possibility for the next generation to be productive, stable and well-adjusted.** Factors such as no-fault divorce and cultural influences that denigrate marriage and promote co-habitation have put a heavy strain on marital relationships, creating many dysfunctional households. The prospect of adding same-sex marriage partners—whose behavior is notoriously lascivious and promiscuous—to this mix, jeopardizes the very concept of the integral family unit.
- **Legal marriage between same-sex partners would inevitably lead to broad adoption rights of children and/or the increased use of artificial means of reproduction.** This would mean that children are deliberately being placed into the confusing and unnatural situation where he/she has either two "mothers" or two "fathers". Children would be raised to accept sodomy -- in all its bizarre sexual expressions -- to be healthy and normal.

Questions and Answers

Q1. How do you respond to complaints made by homosexual rights advocates that same-sex couples—because they cannot legally marry—are denied a number of significant benefits available to those who may legally marry, that is, opposite sex couples who fall within certain restrictions set by law, e.g., age, relationship, etc.

A1. *The complaints by homosexual rights advocates are true, but legally frivolous and irrelevant because are defined by their behavior, not by any identifiable state of being.*

Since no scientific, medical, or biological evidence exists that homosexuality is either inborn or unchangeable, no one can authenticate that he or she is homosexual—it is only declared. In their declaration, such persons only lay claim to being a practitioner of sodomy in one or more of its many forms--oral and anal sex, anilingus, multiple partners, "fisting", cross-dressing, bestiality, and other bizarre sexual expressions. Accordingly, any claim that same-sex couples are entitled to certain rights granted to a legally married husband and wife has no more legal merit than that of persons engaged in such similarly aberrant sexual behaviors as consensual adultery, incest, or polygamy.

Q2: Surely allowing homosexual partners to marry will not have any impact on traditional heterosexual marriage, so why not let them marry?

A2: Actually, the negative impact on society of "gay" marriage has already become evident in Scandinavia, where homosexual persons have been allowed to marry since 1993. In an article titled *The End of Marriage in Scandinavia*, by Stanley Kurtz in the February 2, 2004 issue of *The Weekly Standard*, he states, "*Marriage is slowly dying in Scandinavia. A majority of children in Sweden and Norway are born out of wedlock. Sixty percent of first-born children in Denmark have*

unmarried parents. Not coincidentally, these countries have had something close to full gay marriage for a decade or more. Same-sex marriage has locked in and reinforced an existing Scandinavian trend toward the separation of marriage and parenthood. The Nordic family pattern--including gay marriage--is spreading across Europe. And by looking closely at it we can answer the key empirical question underlying the gay marriage debate. Will same-sex marriage undermine the institution of marriage? It already has. More precisely, it has further undermined the institution." The full article can be found online at:

<http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/003/660zypwj.asp?pg=1>

Q3. Doesn't fairness require that the legal and financial benefits of marriage be granted to same-sex couples--perhaps through "civil unions" or "domestic partnerships?"

A3. *No. Society grants benefits to marriage because marriage between a man and a woman is the core of the basic family unit, which is the most important element of a civilized society.*

Without laws that protect the sanctity of a stable family unit, no culture can long survive. Persons who have established a same-sex relationship have the same rights available to them as that of close friends and acquaintances, and is commensurate to circumstances of the relationship. Specific issues such as hospital visits, property rights, and inheritances are adequately covered under current law regulating wills, powers of attorney, and medical caregivers.

Q4: Isn't homosexual marriage a basic issue of civil rights?

A4: *Marriage is a civil right, but homosexual coupling is not, and cannot be, a marriage. Homosexuals already have privacy in their bedrooms, just like everyone else. Had they not forced their issue into public view, right or wrong, they could have gone on as before in private.*

Homosexual activists themselves have, with coercion, deceit, and strategy, forced homosexuality into the *public* realm precisely to force *public* acceptance. In some cases, they insist on the *right* to have sexual relations in *public* places. Their cry for privacy is nonsense. They want absolute moral approval.

Homosexual activists are asking to redefine marriage based on special rights sought by who make up less than 4 % of the population. Marriage has been defined by civil law, church law, and nature law as the union of one man and one woman.

Rights do not come out of the air, or from civil government, but, as our Declaration of Independence recognizes, from our Creator. Our first obligation is to follow the Creator's purpose for our existence, the ultimate basis of all rights, without which there are neither obligations nor rights.

Our basic rights are to pursue truth, righteousness, and love, not to "have our own way" -- which means moral chaos. All *rights* for me require *obligations* (to honor my rights) on other people. Rights cannot be separated from obligations.

Q5: Aren't you denying homosexual couples the legal benefits that marriage provides?

A5: *Yes, but marriage is not a goody basket of legal benefits.*

Marriage is more than a legal contract between two people; it is a basic foundation of society since the beginning of time. Thus this is not so much about same sex marriage as much as it is about the extreme revision of what has been the bedrock of our human existence.

The purpose of marriage is not to gain additional financial benefits and tax breaks. This argument shows the confusion and conflicting objectives of homosexual marriage proponents concerning the true meaning of matrimony, and reflects the conflict of worldviews.

In the Biblical world, marriage is a fundamental building block of society founded on the Image of God and governed by the purposes of God, which civil government protects, not invents.

In the secular/pagan world, marriage has no deeper foundation than any other arrangement. It is, at best, a pragmatic contractual arrangement invented and enforced by civil government to stabilize society. But it has no moral obligation about it, and thus can be changed as fickle opportunity suggests. Family, the foundation of society and of future generations, is thus always at risk, with no substantial protection -- the results of which we see in Western Civilization today (see comment on Scandinavia above in Q&A #2).

Q6: Should not homosexual persons be allowed to have the *stabilizing effects* of marriage??

A6: *The marriage issue is a red herring, part of their "noble victim" smokescreen to help justify homosexual behavior in the public eye. The quickest way to kill the "marriage" issue is to expose their types of behavior, their gargantuan promiscuity, and their open, almost universal, rejection of marital faithfulness.*⁽¹⁸⁾

Calling their relationships "marriage" may be a way to tap into government perks, but faithfulness has never been part of the homosexual lifestyle. By their own measure, fewer than 2% of even plan to be "monogamous", let alone succeed at it. And by their own measure, among those who attempt faithfulness, almost no homosexual pair remains faithful beyond five years. Faithfulness is not part of an addictive condition. They have to redefine faithfulness in absurd ways to apply the word to themselves.⁽¹⁹⁾

Marriage as a "social contract" is not what stabilizes. Neither is merely being "heterosexual" the stabilizing factor. Pansexual perversions are participated in to some degree by heterosexual as well as homosexual.

Stabilizing is brought about by conforming to one's purpose for existence. The opposite of homosexuality (or any pansexual expression) is not heterosexuality, it is holiness. Holiness means conforming to the Image of God in which we are made -- male and female.⁽²⁰⁾

Q7: Would not marriage help homosexual men stop "cruising" and thus help them with their health problems?

A7: *According to one researcher, those who appeared to have a steady relationship had lifespans averaging two years shorter, not longer, than those who cruised.*⁽²¹⁾

This may be because homosexual behavior is inherently, in and of itself, disease-producing. And with a consistent partner, one would engage in the lethal behavior more often. The last door seems to have slammed shut on the homosexual agenda.

¹⁸ See *Homosexuality...., op. cit.* See especially chapter V, section H, "Homosexual Marriage -- Faithful and Monogamous?" and compare with the following section I on Biblical marriage.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* Chapter V, Section H-1, "A Parody of Life"

²⁰ See *Ibid.* Chapter II, "Worldview Issues" on the Image of God and human sexuality.

²¹ Paul Cameron (Family Research Inst., <http://www.familyresearchinst.org/>) has as study, "Does Homosexual Behavior Shorten Lifespan?" which reports this aspect of homosexual "monogamy". This website has valuable health and other information.

See also, *Homosexuality.... op. cit.*, Chapter V, SubSection H-5, "'Married' Homosexual Persons".

IV. Sexual Orientation Non-Discrimination Laws

Talking Points

- **Special protection legislation has always been reserved for classes of people who display immutable characteristics, which they cannot change, such as race, gender, or national origin. The criteria is based on “being” not on “behavior.”** Homosexual persons are the first group to demand special laws because of their “behavior” -- i.e. having sex with partners of the same sex. “Behavior” is the only distinguishing characteristic which defines homosexual persons as a group.⁽²²⁾
- **The growing number of former, recovered homosexual persons clearly establishes the fact that homosexuality is not an immutable characteristic, such as race or gender.** Thus, there is no rational basis for setting aside centuries of legal precedent, religious teachings and good social order in order to give a preferential place in society to homosexual behavior.
- **Homosexual persons, whose primary identifying characteristic is their sexual behavior, have repeatedly been found by the courts not to be deserving of special legal protections,** because of the moral, health and social issues involved.
- **People** who engage in homosexual behavior have the same rights as other citizens, but **should not be given additional rights based on their willingness to perform peculiar--and medically dangerous--sex acts.**
- **“Sexual orientation” is an expansively inclusive term.** According to the therapeutic manual of the American Psychiatric Association, there are at least 20 distinctive variations of “sexual orientation,” and perhaps many more. The term includes pedophiles, pederasts, transsexuals, transvestites, sadists, masochists, and others. If the General Assembly adds "sexual orientation" to the non-discrimination section of the Code of Virginia, these classes of deviant behavior may be legally protected, and lawmakers will have provided instant special legal protection for any kind of sexual behavior, however aberrant or perverse. Litigation is already expanding in that direction.

Questions and Answers

Q1. How do you respond to claims made by homosexual rights advocates that discrimination on the basis of “sexual orientation” is no different than discrimination on the basis of any other minority group?

A1. *The claim by homosexual rights advocates for minority rights discrimination is legally frivolous and irrelevant because are defined by their behavior, not by any identifiable state of being.*

Since no scientific, medical, or biological evidence exists showing that homosexuality is either inborn or unchangeable, no one can authenticate that he or she is homosexual--it is only declared. In their declaration, such persons can lay claim only to being a practitioner of sodomy in one or more of its many forms--oral and anal sex, anilingus, multiple partners, "fisting", cross-dressing, bestiality, and other bizarre sexual expressions. Accordingly, any claim that those who engage in sodomy are entitled to minority status has no more legal merit than that of persons engaged in such similarly aberrant sexual behaviors as adultery, incest, or polygamy.

²² See *Homosexuality....., op. cit.* Chapter V-D, "Biological Evidence" on the failure of the "inborn" theory.

Q2. Should the General Assembly include sexual orientation as a protected category in employment non-discrimination laws?

A2. No. Because each job applicant's sexual orientation is not identifiable, it is only declared. No one is born homosexual—it is a declared and lascivious behavior which society has no conceivable interest in legitimizing.

To comply with the law, employers would have to investigate the private lives of potential employees, and even then a prospective employer would have no positive assurance of a potential employee's so-called "sexual orientation", and thereby run the risk of potential litigation. There are more than 20 sexual orientations included in the APA DSM manual, of which many are illegal. Additionally, requiring places of worship and para-church organizations to hire practicing would violate the First Amendment guarantees of religious freedom and conscience.

Q3. Should the General Assembly include sexual orientation as a protected category in housing non-discrimination laws?

A3. No. Because no housing applicant's sexual orientation is objectively identifiable, landlords would have to investigate the private lives of potential renters. And even then a prospective landlord would have no positive assurance of the renter's so-called "sexual orientation", thereby running the risk of potential litigation. The term sexual orientation covers more than 20 types of orientation many of which are classified by the APA as a mental disorder.

Q4. What harm is there in including sexual orientation as a protected category in the housing non-discrimination laws?

A4. With sexual orientation legislation, the state forces its own citizens to either violate their deeply held religious beliefs or suffer prosecution for violating the law, rendering our cherished First Amendment guarantees of freedom of religion irrelevant.

This has happened to persons having a room or apartment to rent whose religious beliefs prohibited renting to a homosexual or other unmarried couple. In the early 1990's, a Madison, Wisconsin, woman was fined and told to attend an "attitude remediation" class for refusing to rent a room in her own apartment to a lesbian. This abuse happens regularly in Canada.

Q5: Homosexuals are being discriminated against just as Blacks were in the past.

A5. To equate sexual preferences with skin color is demeaning to African-Americans and people of any color, including white, who certainly do not morally equate the practice of sodomy with the color of their skin. This is not a civil rights issue, skin color has no correlation to sexual behavior. Humans are heterosexual by inherent design regardless of how some individuals wish to express their sexuality. This simple truth cannot be legislated away.

Q6. Isn't prohibiting homosexual "marriage" just as discriminatory, for example, as prohibiting interracial marriage, like some states used to do?

A6. The analogy is not valid. Laws against interracial marriage served only to preserve a social system of racial segregation. This was an unworthy goal, irrelevant to the fundamental nature of marriage.

For a black woman to marry a white man does not change the definition of marriage, the basic requirement for which is one man and one woman. Allowing two men or two women to marry would change that fundamental definition. Banning the "marriage" of same-sex couples is therefore essential to preserve the nature and purpose of marriage itself.

V. Hate Crimes Legislation

Talking Points

- **Hate crimes legislation is fundamentally unfair to victims.** It deems some victims more important than others. It violates the fundamental constitutional principal of equal protection under the law.
- **Hate crimes legislation can, and indeed has been used, to criminalize thought.**⁽²³⁾ Hate crimes legislation can, and has been used, to criminalize religious belief. The Bible is already being targeted in Canada as a "hateful" book.
- **Hate crimes legislation as applied to “homosexual persons” is excessive on many fronts.** The following information was provided by the Family Research Council (FRC), who gathered the information from FBI crime statistics.”
 - Of every 20,000 murders, 4 were declared "hate crimes" against homosexuals (0.02%)
 - Of every 20,000 aggravated assaults, 4 are "hate crimes" against homosexuals (0.02%)⁽²⁴⁾
 - Of every 20,000 robberies, 2 are "hate crimes" against homosexuals (0.01%)
 - Of every 80,000 rapes, less than 1 is a "hate crime" against homosexuals (0.00123%)The evidence for an epidemic of crimes against homosexual persons is non-existent, a part of the "noble victim" image which has been so successfully used to soften American attitudes toward homosexual behavior.
- **Homosexual persons already have the same legal protections as all other Americans.** Physical assault, murder, etc. are already crimes.

Questions and Answers

Q1. Why shouldn't hate crimes legislation be expanded to include “homosexual persons?”

A1. *The aim of homosexual rights advocates to cover “homosexual persons” under “hate crimes” legislation is actually a “backdoor” attempt to legitimize their claim that they are an authentic minority group.*

It is legally frivolous and irrelevant because homosexual persons are defined by their behavior, not by any identifiable state of being. Since no scientific, medical, or biological evidence exists that homosexuality is either inborn or unchangeable, no one can authenticate he or she is a so-called homosexual -- it is only declared. In their declaration, such persons only lay claim to being a practitioner of sodomy in one or more of its many forms -- oral and anal sex, anilingus, multiple partners, "fisting", cross-dressing, bestiality, and other bizarre sexual expressions. Accordingly, any claim that those who engage in sodomy are entitled to minority status has no more legal merit than that of persons engaged in such similarly aberrant sexual behaviors as adultery, incest, or polygamy.

²³ See *Homosexuality... op. cit.* Chapter V-G, "Social and Criminological Consequences" on hate-crime laws.

²⁴ FBI 2000 Uniform Crime Report, Section II, p 59. www.fbi.gov. The latest FBI reports from 2002 show that racial discrimination is at 48.9%, which is followed by religion at 19.1%. These account for most hate crimes. Sexual orientation which also includes crimes against heterosexuals, accounts for 16.7%, and national origin 14.8%, with the disabled at 0.6%

Q2. What is wrong with Hate Crime laws?

A2. The proper object of law is behavior, not attitude or belief. The homosexual agenda is reversing this to legitimize wrong behavior and criminalize critique of that behavior. That is calling good evil, and evil good.

Hate-crime laws attempt to regulate feelings and attitudes to subversively gain an end unattainable in open discussion. They are often used to shut down the very public discussion of homosexual behavior necessary to rational public policy, and thus they violate the proper inclusiveness and pluralism necessary to a democratic republic.

Honest inclusiveness does not say that every view is right, but rather that every view is allowed into the debate (as in a legislature) *to find out in open public discussion whether* it is the right one for the circumstances.

Homosexual activists themselves verbally attack ex-homosexual persons because ex-homosexual persons prove change is possible. They want to use hate crimes to force churches to accept their chosen behavior. Hate-crime laws are a bad form of legislation, but nevertheless, *if* there should be anti-discrimination and hate-crime laws, they should protect ex-homosexual persons as well. However, homosexual activists fight against such equal treatment.

Q3. What's so wrong with legislation that protects homosexual persons from attack and abuse?

A3. Homosexual persons already have the same protection as every other American citizen. One group should not be singled out for special protection.

That is especially true when in reality we cannot tell by looking at a person what their sexual preference might be. There is no objective standard for distinguishing whether a person is homosexual. And, it might be said, every violent crime is a hate crime.

Q4. But we have hate laws that protect people based on their religious faith. Are you saying that we shouldn't?

A4. Religious liberty is a specific right protected under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

There is no *right* to do what is *wrong*. It has never been shown that homosexual behavior is either approved by God or a healthy way to live. The evidence shows homosexuality, as an orientation to be compulsive and addictive, and as a behavior to be lethal. The Constitution confers no special rights to either immoral or unhealthy behaviors.

In any event, no victim of violent crime should be made to feel less valuable than any other, and the judicial process is meant to assure equal protection in all cases.

VI. Retention of the Sodomy Statute

Talking Points

- The Virginia Crime Commission reviewed the effect of the Supreme Court ruling in *Lawrence v. Texas* on Virginia laws and **recommends that the “crimes against nature” statute remain in the Virginia Code.**
- *Lawrence v. Texas* may render one portion of the Virginia sodomy statute unenforceable; however, **the other portions of the statute remain in force.**

Questions and Answers

Q1: Why should the Sodomy Statute be retained?

A1: *The aim of homosexual rights advocates to delete the state’s sodomy statute is tied to their pursuit of legitimizing homosexual behavior commensurate to the level of heterosexuality.*

Since homosexual persons are defined by their behavior and not by any identifiable state of being, removal of the sodomy statute would add a level of legitimization—not to persons—but to the behaviors associated with their lifestyle: oral and anal sex, anilingus, multiple partners, "fisting", cross-dressing, bestiality, and other bizarre sexual expressions. Therefore, there is no conceivable merit to the people of this state in removing the sodomy statute from the legal code, but there is clear merit in its retention.

Laws which reflect legitimate morality, even when not strongly enforced, have a powerful teaching function in society.

"Homosexuality is not a victimless crime. It is compulsive, aggressive, and causes terrible damage, not only to those who participate, but to the larger society as well. The damage is not lessened by being consensual. No one has a right to spread death in the community, no matter how good it feels."⁽²⁵⁾

"Homosexuality is not a civil right, but an exploiting, victimizing crime just as much as rape and molestation."⁽²⁶⁾

Q2: Why should sodomy be illegal?

A2: *Virginia law defines sodomy as a crime against nature, i.e.,: "If any person carnally knows in any manner any brute animal, or carnally knows any male or female person by the anus or with the mouth, or voluntarily submits to such carnal knowledge, he or she shall be guilty of a Class 6 felony."*

The purpose of laws is to protect individuals and for the general welfare of society. The aim of homosexual rights advocates to delete all of the state’s sodomy statute is tied to their pursuit of legitimizing homosexual behavior commensurate to the level of heterosexuality. Since homosexual persons are defined by their behavior and not by any identifiable state of being, removal of the sodomy statute would add a level of legitimization—not to persons—but to the behaviors associated with their lifestyle. There are harmful effects to individuals and society that result from these acts. We have seat belt laws to protect individuals. The risks of physical harm from deviate sexual acts are much greater than riding a car without a seat belt. Statistically a person is more likely to suffer the health consequences including death from a deviate sexual behavior, than the chances of having an injurious car accident.

Ultimately, the reason anything should be illegal is because that is directly commanded by the law of God, or can be inferred from it. Since according to God, *the law is for the sake of persons, not*

²⁵ See *Homosexuality... op. cit.* See Chapter V, Section G-3, "Criminalize Sodomy?"

²⁶ *Ibid.*

persons for the sake of the law, we can conclude that all laws of God are for our benefit and prosperity. Violating any law of God can therefore lead only to our ruin, not our welfare.

Q3: Doesn't Virginia Law have to be changed to comply with *Lawrence v. Texas*?

A3: *No.* The case dealt with two men who practice sodomy and the fact that Texas considered sodomy only by homosexual persons illegal. The court decided sodomy was legal in the privacy of ones home regardless of gender.

The court left in place the rights of the state to enforce other statutes with regard to sodomy. The General Assembly proposes/wants to add language clarifying that public acts of sodomy and sodomy performed in public places is illegal. The *Lawrence* decision makes clear that public sexual acts, even if consensual between adults, are not protected.

Q4: Didn't *Lawrence v. Texas* make all sodomy laws invalid?

A4: *No.* *Virginia's laws define deviate sex acts without respect to whether they occur between two people of the same or opposite sex.*

The issue in the *Lawrence* Decision was that the Texas law made the deviate sexual act illegal only if performed between two people of the same sex. It thus, in the mind of the Court, made an unconstitutional discrimination between hetero- and homosexual persons.

Q5: Didn't *Lawrence v. Texas* strike down Virginia's sodomy law?

A5: *Virginia is doing exactly what it is supposed to do. The Supreme Court Decision does not "strike" state laws from the code of law.*

It is left to the state legislature to decide what action to take in response. The state legislature could, in appropriate cases, conclude that the Court had overstepped its jurisdiction.

* * *

Afterword

It is hoped that the materials above will help enable decisions which are truthful, righteous, and loving toward all persons. Those most hurt by bad public policy are persons disabled from self-help in a self-destructive condition. So, the primary issue before us is not sexuality, but honest, graceful public discussion. When truth wins, everybody wins.

This document is also available at
<http://theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/22Sx/PnSx/HSx/RefrmHsxDbat.htm>
in both *.pdf and *.html format