

# Winning the Homosexuality Debate -- in the Public Arena

The Rev. F. Earle Fox, D. Phil.

## I. Restoring Sexual Sanity

### A. Incompetence, Dishonesty, & a Fool's Errand

Does clarity matter in dialogue, debate, or discussion? If the key issue being debated has never been clearly defined, there can never be anything but confusion and a field tilted to favor darkness and manipulation.

Why, then, has there never been clarity on the specific matter for which homosexual advocates seek approval -- homosexual behavior?

Clarity always favors truth, and truth always supports love and compassion. We have neither truth nor love and compassion because we have no clarity, only evasion, on the behavior issue.

So the public has given itself a fool's errand by allowing discussion to be "managed" so no honest closure can happen.

### B. The "Pansexual" Path

America is thus treading the path of the Episcopal Church, the primrose path into pansexualism, with homosexual activists riding point. Pansexualism is the "Alfred Kinsey" belief that all forms of sexual behavior are morally equivalent -- adultery, incest, pederasty, etc. It is all a matter of personal choice, there are no moral distinctions between sexual practices.

Homosexuality is thus only one branch on the pansexual tree, a tree with branches for every possible sexual practice, a tree natural to the secular/pagan Godless world of the Fall. With no relation to the Living God, there is nothing in the world to tell anyone otherwise -- neither by moral standard nor by the Image of God in which we are made, male and female.

The quest to legitimize sexual promiscuity never had an ounce of intellectual integrity, yet it has been the underground engine driving western culture since the late 19th century. It hit the streets in the 1960's -- the so-called "sex revolution". And then the *homosexual* revolution in 1969 with the Stonewall riots in New York.

Today we face the astonishing situation that although few Americans support the homosexual agenda (polls tell us that nearly 70% of Americans oppose it), yet all sides assume that the legal mandating of homosexual marriage is inevitable. Homosexualists have created the illusion of an inevitable juggernaut.

How can homosexual activists, representing less than 3% of the population sway the whole nation? They can do so only with the help of the much larger pansexual group of persons who desire their sexual freedom -- whatever the brand, and by support from some of the most highly skilled psychologists and marketing experts in the world. America is being brainwashed.

### C. Behavior - the Achilles Heel

Some blame outlaw, runaway judges who legislate at will. But the primary fault is not with the courts, homosexual activists, or their pansexual sympathizers. Homosexual marriage is as "inevitable" only as the *timidity* of those who object -- who fail to confront the single vulnerable issue, the Achilles' heel of homosexuality, i.e., homosexual behavior.

Homosexual activists have successfully framed the debate as a matter of civil rights, privacy, and victimhood. The population has been so side-tracked and anesthetized that the people of America will rarely confront them with either the facts or the consequences of their behavior.

Homosexualists cannot afford public discussion of the behavior because it is so outlandish and self-destructive. And those who oppose them have been typically too prudish, timid, or ignorant to do so. In the over three decades since the Stonewall riots ignited the homosexual revolt, no political, religious, or educational leader has stood up to lead a sustained, honest public discussion of

homosexual behavior.

That is betrayal of the public, *and especially of homosexual persons themselves* -- who most of all need honest public discussion. Truth alone sets people free.

The homosexual activist effort to quell such discussion has been astonishingly successful -- with the result that conservatives are buying a "pig in a poke" -- an unexamined pig and a public policy time-bomb. That requires remarkable revisionist "salesmanship" (read "brainwashing"). And remarkable apathy, ignorance, and naiveté among their gullible conservative victims.

The Episcopal Church has fallen to homosexual forces because conservative leadership was either unwilling to address, or incapable of addressing, homosexual behavior. America need not go down the same path.

Their bizarre behavior is the only issue homosexual advocates cannot talk around. They can talk around Scripture, the law of God, undermining marriage, "traditional values", the constitution, or any other conservative issue. But they have to shut down discussion of behavior because the public would not consider their behavior moral, healthy, or mainstream America.

If the public knew what it was.

### D. Clearing the "PR" Fog

The public intuitively knows something is terribly wrong. But Americans have allowed themselves to be kept sufficiently in a fog so that most persons (uncomfortably) believe that homosexual behavior is essentially benign and harmless -- just a little affectionate hugging and kissing.

The public has been kept in a fog of misinformation by an enormously successful "PR" program, picturing homosexual persons as victims, and anyone who disagrees as "homophobic", "mean spirited", and denying their civil rights.

So the public is pathologically hesitant to challenge homosexual behavior publicly.

But it can - must - and *will* be done. Despite the juggernaut illusion, the homosexual agenda is a very, very vulnerable "house of cards". Below is a logical, simple, commonsense strategy for getting homosexual behavior on the table, forcing a candid but graceful public discussion of behavior which will pull the house down.

It is to be hoped that you, dear reader, will pray for guidance as to whether you are called to get equipped to make a public statement -- via one-on-one discussion, letters to the editor, testimony at board of education meetings, at political rallies and committee meetings, or through other ways of your own creative devising. If we do not address the behavior issue both gracefully and candidly, with clinical, not street, language, we can plan on losing the sexuality war.

If we lose, pastors can plan on hate-crime laws shutting down their preaching on homosexuality -- leaving the choice of fighting in court, compliance, or jail. Pastors must train their people, **first** in their personal spiritual life, **secondly** in their understanding of being made in the image of God, male and female, and **thirdly**, how to make a difference in the public arena, especially with educators and legislators.

Time is short. We are passing on to our children and grandchildren a battle which will cost them far more to win than it will cost us to fight here and now.

The material below will provide a head start in forming a small group who can work together to support each other so that homosexual advocates will begin to understand that whenever they get up to speak, they will have to defend homosexual behavior in public.

## II. 5 Questions

The stage can be set by a gentle invitation to an honest, mutually respectful discussion using the following 2-liner:

*You and I are on opposite sides of this*

*issue, but if the evidence should show that God approves and that homosexual behavior is healthy, then I will stand with you.*

*On the other hand, if the evidence should show that God does not approve, or that homosexual behavior is not healthy, would you be willing to reconsider your position?*

You make yourself vulnerable to the evidence, which invites the other side to do likewise.

Reason and righteousness are fundamental to both Biblical religion and the American democratic republic. The Church is society's conscience, the State its referee. The following five questions will lead, with moral and intellectual integrity, to a reliable conclusion to the question:

*Should civil or ecclesiastical government approve the homosexual legislative agenda? Yes or No? And why?*

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).

**1. Homosexuality is a behavior. What behavior, precisely, are we being asked to approve? We do not want to buy a pig in a poke. What are the behaviors and approximate percentages of homosexual persons who engage in these behaviors?**

Advocates of homosexuality seldom volunteer to explain their sexual behavior. Rather, they deliberately hide their behavior from public discussion (see *After the Ball*, by Marshall Kirk & Hunter Madson, two primary homosexualist strategists, who recommend this deceit). Truthful policy-makers must learn on their own to explain the behavior -- publicly.

Studies from both sides focus on the same behaviors with reasonably similar figures on what percentages of homosexual persons engage in them. There is little debate about the general picture of the sadly misnamed "gay" lifestyle.

The following figures are taken from one of the largest (850 pp.) studies on this subject, "*The Gay Report*" (1979), by two homosexual researchers, Karla Jay and Allen Young. The pair are stunningly candid.

*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.*

The promiscuity is enormous. A *New England Journal of Medicine* study indicates that the average active homosexual male ingests the fecal material of 23 different men each year (largely from rimming), and that the sexual partners average nearly 100. Homosexual persons on average fellated 106 different men per year, swallowed 50 of their seminal ejaculations, and had 72 penile penetrations of the anus.

[These practices are being taught in Massachusetts and other public schools -- criminal sexual abuse of minors. See "Fistgate" at ]<http://www.parentsrightscoalition.org/>]

**2. What are the medical, psychological, and sociological consequences of homosexual behavior, and of defending such behavior? Put very briefly...**

**Medical consequences** are so devastating that the average 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.

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. Over 50% of American HIV/AIDS cases are contracted by practicing homosexual persons -- less than 3% of the population. The Red Cross will not accept blood from anyone who has had same-sex sex, even once, since 1977. Joel Beltz writes in *World Magazine*, "Here is a whole category of people in our culture today unable to perform a basic function of human society -- to share their blood with their fellow human beings."

Homosexual behavior is lethal. Nearly 1,000,000 Americans have been infected with HIV -- and 400,000 have died -- of a behavior-caused, and thus preventable, disease, because those in the medical watchtowers have remained silent as this enemy of social order entered the gates and seized the levers of power. There is no excuse for the abysmal ignorance of the public, nor for the cowardice of medical and spiritual professionals in sounding the warning.

**Psychologically**, evidence shows homosexuality to be compulsive and addictive. When warned that continuing such behavior would mean a high death rate, homosexual 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!*" Continued justification and practice of self-destructive behavior, even when warned, is evidence of a compulsive and addictive pattern.

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

Marriage between a man and a woman is the foundation of family. The family is the building block of society. God, not the State, created the family when He created the human race in His image, male and female. The State only recognizes, not creates, marriage. Where there is no legal proscription of homosexuality, there is then no legal barrier to same-sex marriage, nor, soon, to any of the other "pan-sexual" arrangements, all of which corrode social order.

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

Homosexual behavior makes no more sense than playing in the toilet.

### **3. Is homosexuality (1) a genuine inborn identity, (2) a choice, or (3) a compulsive, often lethal, addiction?**

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. It was difficult, but possible.

Not until the 1990's did 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.

There is no evidence to support the "identity" claim, there is only their subjective declaration. 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 the homosexual orientation is a compulsive and addictive condition -- with practitioners looking for self-justification in a pseudo-identity.*

### **4. Given the answers to #1-3 above: Would a loving person (God, or a**

### **compassionate legislator) approve homosexual behavior, or reject and forbid it? Would such behavior be consistent or inconsistent for persons made -- male and female -- in the image of a loving and reasonable God?**

"Agape" love is serving the good of another. "Eros" love is attraction-love, signifying need or dependency, (from a legitimate child's need-love of a parent -- to the illegitimate "love" of an addiction). Agape love is always based on truth. Love not based on objective truth is no love at all. It is betrayal. True love seeks the welfare of the beloved, not emotional bondage. Love speaks hard truth even when it causes pain, and will not allow a person caught in bondage to define the diagnosis. A loving response does not condemn persons, but candidly assesses 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.

The homosexual agenda is about public policy, i.e., the coercive force of law. All law, without exception, is based on someone's moral code, someone's understanding of right and wrong. American law is based on the Judeo-Christian revelation of the will of God, who designs laws for human benefit and prosperity. (Read *Original Intent*, by David Barton.) The highest law of God is agape love, that we serve God and one another.

Given the evidence above, *love* is precisely what would impel God, or any other legislator, to say "No" to homosexual behavior.

### **5. Given the answer to #4: What should the public do (personal action, law enforcement, in the Church) about this situation?**

How might Church and State go about implementing a "no" response to homosexual claims with both truth and compassion?

**Honest public policy** would conjoin truth, righteousness, and love. It would call an addiction an addiction, and then assist those seeking help. Honest policy would insist on candid discussion of health issues (i.e., honest science) with appropriate public health measures. It would stop the subversion of public health policy which betrays those very persons badly in need of honest discussion, trapped in an addiction.

**Civil government faithful to its constituents** will stop activists from subverting discussion of behavior or its impact on public health and welfare. Two issues must be considered.

**A. Non-Discrimination Laws:** The freedom of religious communities to conduct affairs, such as hiring, and of individuals to conduct their home life according to their own moral standards must be protected. Homosexual activists are aiming at coercing employment and housing policy to enforce their pseudo-nondiscrimination, a situation already true in Canada, Europe, and in parts of America. Churches and para-church organizations would be forced to hire persons who violate the spiritual and moral base of the group. Owners of homes and apartments would be forced to share their own space with persons of a contrary moral and/or spiritual view -- as has already happened in Madison, Wisconsin.

Valid inclusiveness does not validate immoral behavior. It requires valid discrimination to make sense. Every law discriminates -- that is the purpose of laws. The proper basis for discrimination is the moral judgement of the people under God, through elected legislators.

**B. Hate-Crime Laws:** The proper object of law is behavior, not attitude or belief. Hate-crime laws regulate feelings and attitudes to gain subversively an end they cannot attain in open discussion. They are used to shut down the very public discussion of homosexual behavior necessary to rational public policy, and thus violate the proper inclusiveness and pluralism necessary to a democratic republic. Honest inclusiveness or pluralism does not say that every view is right, but rather that every view is welcome in the public discussion to be tested *to find out whether* it is the right one for the circumstances. Views are plural, truth is singular.

A loving church would offer the gifts of salvation: repentance, forgiveness, with restoration of innocence and reason for existence. It would hold persons accountable for good behavior, offer prayer, help in finding resources for overcoming self-destructive patterns, and provide companionship along the way. The church would offer resources for spiritual and emotional healing, and for discipleship into mature man- and womanhood.

And finally, the church would stand firmly for rational public policy which would assist in these compassionate aims.

**Erqo, the Question:** Should either civil or ecclesiastical government approve the homosexual legislative agenda?

## **III. Strategy**

How do we discuss the truth gracefully?

1. Always remain calm and caring toward the persons you talk with. We fight not against flesh and blood, but against principalities....
2. Effective resistance at public hearings requires at least a small group, not soloists (who are too easily diverted). When the first speaker is shut down or sidetracked, a second, third, and fourth speaker should be ready to bring the diverted subject (homosexual behavior and its consequences) back into focus, picking up where the previous speaker left off.
3. One-on-one, ask questions first, do not directly challenge with the list of behaviors unless necessary. Ask the other side to explain homosexual behavior. If they cannot or will not, politely hand them the list of behaviors printed out, or read it, and ask whether this is what they understand to be typical homosexual behavior. Draw them out. Keep asking for clarity of their position. Clarity always favors truth. With a group, at a microphone, one has to be more directive.
4. Ask calmly and seriously, "Which of these homosexual behaviors do you think God (or the State) ought to bless?"
5. They will try to divert from the behavior issue to "love". Always return to questions 1 and 2 until the "pig" is clearly out of the poke (Scottish for bag). Use the phrase, "pig in a poke" a lot. It will catch the public imagination.)
6. Note that love is *not* an issue between us. The issue is the *meaning* of love, and whether homosexual behavior is indeed loving behavior.
7. If they disagree with the behavior list, ask them to provide more accurate information. Be gentle but firm about their producing specific, documented evidence. Note that the above list comes from researchers on "their side".
8. Ask, "*If what I am saying were to turn out to be the case, would that make any difference to you?*" Or, "*If your view was shown to be wrong, would you want to know?*" (i.e., test to see if you are in an honest conversation.) Repeat the 2-liner above.
9. Affirm your concern for him as a *person*, and that it is *public policy related to behavior* which concerns you.
10. Agree, if possible, to meet again. Shake hands. Keep friendly.
11. We will have lost if they can shut us down or motivate us to ill will. We will have won if we speak the truth in love. We do not need to change anyone's mind. That is the task of the Holy Spirit. So relax. The point is not whether they believe what you say, but whether you do.

[For examples on using this strategy, visit <http://theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/22Sx/PnSx/HSx/00HoSx.htm>

Permission is given to copy this article in toto. A \*.pdf or \*.htm version can be found at <http://theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/22Sx/PnSx/HSx/Strtgy1pg.htm>

## **Emmaus Ministries**

**A School of Christian Apologetics**

**791 Valley Crest Dr., Vista, CA 92084**

**760 295-8061 emmfox@juno.com**

**<http://theroadtoemmaus.org>**

Copyright 8/2/2005, F. Earle Fox Strtgy1Pg.lwp