

1. Why Special Rights Should Not Be Granted to Persons Engaged in Homosexual Behavior

Dear Legislator:

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 issues is the primary reason why we are looking at the end of Western (i.e., Judeo-Christian) civilization, including the trashing of the only kind of constitution which can sustain freedom.

The Background material below discuss 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.

Legislators, like many others, are very busy and tend to want "sound-byte" answers to hard questions. 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 in the pilot house -- the direction will be down.

The Background section below offers suggestions on some of these issues. A healthy undergirding in the Background issues (plugging the holes) will greatly enhance the possibility of restoring a Biblical moral and constitutional consensus in America (the fast-sinking ship). Following the Background material are the usual Talking Points and Q & A's.

Background:

A. The Worldview Issue:

Rationality in public discussion on homosexuality requires clarity on "worldview" and "religion" issues, a subject much beclouded by the current erroneous notions of conflict between religion and civil government. Secularism is recognized by both the Humanist Manifesto⁽²⁾ and the Supreme Court as a "religion", i.e., a comprehensive worldview from which persons obtain their values. There is no constitutional reason to keep any worldview, secular or religious, out of the legislative discussion. Our constitution was written precisely to provide freedom of participation in just such public-issue discussion.

The deeper issue behind sex in the "homosexuality" discussion is the contest between the Judeo-Christian worldview and the secular/pagan worldview -- the two primary choices with which we are all faced. The practical choice we face (as noted by an 1850's Speaker of the House) is that we will be ruled by the Bible or by the bayonet. Who is the Ultimate Decider? -- God or civil government? Christians must decide: Is Jesus King of kings and Lord of lords, or not?

Even though we use the same language, persons arguing across worldview lines are arguing from radically different presuppositions about the two most basic fundamentals of law: *truth* and *righteousness*. Same words -- different meanings, which creates endless confusion. So, we must firmly adhere to reasonable standards of clarity (fact and logic) for public discussion and debate.

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. The book was written to provide quickly available information on the numerous issues surrounding homosexuality, including a survey of the cultural and historical context out of which the homosexual movement arose.

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

² Go to <http://theroadtoemmaus.org/RdLb/21PbAr/Apl/HumMan1.htm> for the Humanist Manifesto.

The American Constitution was written to produce *truthful* and *righteous* legislation. Both sides of the homosexual contest have failed in providing such candid discussion.

B. Pansexuality and Homosexuality

Homosexuality is only one small segment of the "sex-revolution", the so-called *pan*-sexual lifestyle promoted by Alfred Kinsey, the Kinsey Institute, Planned Parenthood, and several other sexuality-oriented organizations.⁽³⁾ 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 group favoring total pansexual 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.⁽⁴⁾ They are accomplishing their goals largely through commandeering the public school system.

C. Relative Truth and Morality

The pansexual position rests, in almost every case, 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 equal standards of truth and righteousness on the behavior of all, not just some, persons. In a "relative" world, the very purpose of the American Constitution (to provide law based on objective truth and righteousness, the only alternative being power-struggle, and hence tyranny) is scuttled, for in a "relative" world, there is neither truth nor righteousness.

The need is to 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 then 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 take what you can get away with.

In life without objective morality (no obligation to either truth or righteousness), neither homosexual nor heterosexual persons have any obligation to respect each other -- and therefore no legal protection or safety. 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 was not "wrong" -- because, in such case, there is no right or wrong.

The protection of all persons, secular, pagan, hetero- or homo-sexual, thus requires a principle of obligation. A free people under a free government cannot survive the loss of objective moral standards.

The Biblical worldview alone can supply a principle of obligation because the only source for morality is the will of God. It is a matter of simple logic that the purpose of the Creator for the creation alone can supply a "purpose 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".⁽⁵⁾ That is why secular and pagan worldviews (which deny the existence of a

³ *Homosexuality: Good & Right in the Eyes of God?* Chapter I, Section A, "Truth, Homosexuality, and Pansexuality".

⁴ 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.

⁵ See *Defining 'Oughtness' and 'Love'* by Earle Fox, which gives the logical case for saying that only the Biblical worldview, with

Creator God) consistently have trouble sustaining moral standards, so that life tends to drift into power struggle rather than reasonable moral consensus.

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. All secular and pagan societies tend toward pansexualism -- precisely because they have no objective standard for morality by which *any behavior, sexual or otherwise*, can be either mandated or forbidden. 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 source of objective standards for judging ultimate truth or righteousness. (We sometimes live above our belief systems.)

Talking Points:

1. Behavior is the fundamental issue.
2. 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. Homosexuality, which is neither a personal identity nor a legitimate behavior, is best described as a compulsive, lethal addiction.
3. 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.⁽⁷⁾
4. Whenever questions are raised about the legitimacy of homosexuality, one must first clarify the behaviors "common to the homosexual lifestyle" (as referenced by the Lawrence decision on sodomy. See behaviors listed below in Q & A.)
5. If the homosexuality discussion is kept to its primary focus, the nature of the behavior for which approval is being asked, 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.

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>

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

⁷ Ibid. Chapter V, Section D, "The Biological Evidence".

Questions & Answers:

NOTE: The first seven Q & A's lead inexorably to one conclusion - that homosexuality is compulsive, addictive, and lethal, in which case one would *expect* God (and other legislators) to "simply say 'no'". The first part of the answer is a quick response. The second paragraph is a fuller explanation.

Q1: 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 this behavior -- which both sides are so reticent to discuss?

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.

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 homosexual persons -- 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 which homosexual persons 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 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 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.

Nearly 1,000,000 Americans, mostly homosexual persons, have been infected with HIV -- of which 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 disease 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.

When warned that continuing their behavior would result in a high death rate, homosexually active persons typically respond that such a request was 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 betrayed the American public, and especially homosexual persons themselves, with dishonest science and cowardly response to homosexual pressure.

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.

God, not the State, created 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.

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.

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 the 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 a 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 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 schools or by way of special "rights".

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 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. The repulsive 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. We must be willing to deal publicly with the facts of the matter, gracefully but directly, using clinical, not street, language. And with a calm spirit which genuinely *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).⁽⁸⁾

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.

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.⁽⁹⁾ Given the

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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. www.wallbuilders.com

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

Q12: Should not homosexual persons be allowed to have the stabilizing effects of marriage??

A12: The marriage issue is a red herring, part of their "victim image" smokescreen to help justify homosexual behavior in the public eye. The quickest way to kill the "marriage" issue is to expose their behavior.

Marriage (faithfulness) may be a way to tap into government perks, but it has never been part of the "homosexual lifestyle". By their own measure, fewer than 2% of homosexual persons 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.

Q13: Would not marriage, rather than "cruising", help them with their health problems?

A13: According to one researcher, those homosexual persons who appeared to have a steady relationship had lifespans averaging two years shorter than those who cruised.

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.⁽¹⁰⁾

Comment: The questions above are framed as though addressed to the legislator. Whenever questions about *any* homosexual issue is put to a legislator, 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?"* It will bestow reality to 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 statutes) become almost self-evident. And there will be far fewer persons rising to defend homosexuality in any form.

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.

¹⁰ 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, Fox and Virtue, *Homosexuality: Good & Right in the Eyes of God?*, Chapter V, Section H5, "Married' Homosexual Persons".