

Christian Ethics:
Christian Ethics: Lesson 3
Homosexuality

I. Introduction:

For the duration of the 20th century society considered homosexuality an aberration. Yet, a turning point occurred early in the morning on June 28th, 1969 when the police raided the Stonewall Inn, a prominent gay bar located in Greenwich Village. Enraged at what they saw as police brutality and public marginalization, the crowd fought back and a riot ensued. In the aftermath, the gay rights movement began. In 1973, the gay rights movement achieved a major victory when the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. Homosexuality was now considered an acceptable mental condition. In the 1980s, the AIDS epidemic at first seemed to slow the progress of the gay rights movement. However it galvanized the homosexual community to take political action and at the same time challenged the heterosexual community to respond with compassion. Movies like *An Early Frost* (1985), *And the Band Played On* (1993), and *Philadelphia* (1993) generated sympathy for those dying with the disease.

In the last decade, more advances have transpired. In 2003 the Supreme Court struck down sodomy laws and in 2004 Gavin Newsome, the mayor of San Francisco, authorized same-sex marriage.

In 2010 President Barack Obama repealed the “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell” policy which allowed homosexuals to openly serve in the military.

In 2013 the Supreme Court struck down the Defense of Marriage Act as well as Proposition 8 which defined traditional marriage in California. And in 2015 Gay Marriage was mandated in all fifty states.

- As Christians how should we react to these advances?

- How would you respond to someone who says “Homosexuality is just another sin. Why make a big deal about it?”

Our culture’s acceptance of homosexuality has risen with stunning speed. Whereas the church used to hold the majority position, those who find homosexuality deviant are now in the minority and increasingly marginalized. With increased hostility and ridicule, scores in Christendom have given in the temptation to water down the clear biblical teaching on this issue. Many mainline denominations have made a break from the biblical teaching and their theological traditions. And some in the evangelical church have softened their opposition or dropped it altogether to make their message more palatable to the culture. Therefore, it is more important than ever for all Christians to firmly grasp a biblical view of the ethics of homosexuality.

II. Statistics:

A. Definition:

Although the definition of homosexuality varies on experience, attitude, frequency, and, disposition the American Psychiatric Association defines it as the following:

*As a sexual orientation, homosexuality refers to "an enduring pattern of or disposition to experience sexual, affectional, or romantic attractions primarily to" persons of the same sex; "it also refers to an individual's sense of personal and social identity based on those attractions, behaviors expressing them, and membership in a community of others who share them."*¹

B. Population:

It has long been believed that 10% of the male population and 5% of the female population are homosexuals. Yet, that number was inherited from the research of William Kinsey, who used a large number of prison inmates and male prostitutes in his study. A 1989 study at the University of Chicago revealed that less than 1% of

¹ Sexual Orientation and Homosexuality, *APAHelpCenter.org*, <<http://www.apahelpcenter.org/articles/article.php?id=31>>. Retrieved on 2007-09-07

the populace is “exclusively homosexual”.² Other estimates vary between 2 and 7% of the population³ depending on how the question is posed.⁴

Further, in the 2020 United States census, same-sex married couples accounted for 0.5% of all U.S. households and unmarried same-sex couples accounted for 0.4% of all U.S. households.⁵

C. Adoption:

In the 2000 U.S. Census, 33 percent of female same-sex couple households and 22 percent of male same-sex couple households reported at least one child under the age of 18 living in the home.⁶

D. Sexual Activity:

Dr. William Foege, the director of the Centers for Disease Control, in 1983 states “The average AIDS victim has had 60 different sexual partners in the past twelve months.” In contrast the, “the average heterosexual male has – throughout his life – from five to nine sex partners.”⁷ A 2014 representative study in Australia found that heterosexual men had a median of 8 female sexual partners in their lifetime, while gay men had a median of 19 partners.⁸

E. Disease:

As of 2017, most HIV transmission in the United States occurs among men who had sex with men. 70% of new cases come from this group.⁹

III. Biblical Teaching:

As with all Christian ethics, our understanding of the morality of homosexuality must be built around the Bible. While it is granted that the Bible does not extensively discuss homosexuality, the following verses demonstrate that when it does speak, it speaks clearly.

² Joseph P. Gudel “Homosexuality: Fact and Fiction” CRI Volume 15: Number 1, 1992 pp. 1-2. Downloaded from <http://www.equip.org/site/c.mu1LaMNJrE/b.2548721/> downloaded on August 19, 2008.

³ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality> downloaded on August 19, 2008.

⁴ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT_demographics_of_the_United_States#:~:text=Studies%20from%20several%20nations%2C%20including,adult%20population%20identifying%20as%20LGBT. downloaded on February 15, 2024

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality> downloaded on August 19, 2008.

⁷ Gudel, p. 6.

⁸ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Promiscuity> downloaded on February 15, 2024.

⁹ <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HIV/AIDS> downloaded on February 15, 2024.

A. *Genesis 19:1-11: Now the two angels came to Sodom in the evening as Lot was sitting in the gate of Sodom. When Lot saw them, he rose to meet them and bowed down with his face to the ground. ² And he said, “Now behold, my lords, please turn aside into your servant’s house, and spend the night, and wash your feet; then you may rise early and go on your way.” They said however, “No, but we shall spend the night in the square.” ³ Yet he urged them strongly, so they turned aside to him and entered his house; and he prepared a feast for them, and baked unleavened bread, and they ate. ⁴ Before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people from every quarter; ⁵ and they called to Lot and said to him, “Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may have relations with them.” ⁶ But Lot went out to them at the doorway, and shut the door behind him, ⁷ and said, “Please, my brothers, do not act wickedly. ⁸ “Now behold, I have two daughters who have not had relations with man; please let me bring them out to you, and do to them whatever you like; only do nothing to these men, inasmuch as they have come under the shelter of my roof.” ⁹ But they said, “Stand aside.” Furthermore, they said, “This one came in as an alien, and already he is acting like a judge; now we will treat you worse than them.” So they pressed hard against Lot and came near to break the door. ¹⁰ But the men reached out their hands and brought Lot into the house with them, and shut the door. ¹¹ They struck the men who were at the doorway of the house with blindness, both small and great, so that they wearied themselves trying to find the doorway.*

1. Objection:

Ancient near eastern sexuality was defined by dominance and submission. Sex never occurred between equals. For instance, it is asserted that a conquering army would rape their captives to demonstrate their dominance.

This story is not a condemnation of homosexuality, but is a story about rape and inhospitality. In other biblical texts (*Ezekiel 16:49, Luke 17:28-29*) Sodom’s ‘sin’ is not identified as homosexuality, rather, their sins were pride, failure to help the poor, and lack of hospitality to foreigners.¹⁰

2. Response:

¹⁰ Mona West, *The Bible and Homosexuality*: downloaded on Aug. 18, 2008 from: <http://www.mcccchurch.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Resources&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=2074>

The biblical witness of *2 Peter 2:7* and *Jude 7* make it clear that the sin of Sodom was not related to a lack of hospitality, but to their lewd sexual conduct. In regards to rape, there is no reason to suggest that what Lot's neighbors wanted to do would be permissible if the strangers had consented.

B. Lev. 18:22; 20:13

Leviticus 18:22 'You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination.

Leviticus 20:13 'If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act; they shall surely be put to death. Their bloodguiltiness is upon them.

1. Objection:

This injunction was an attempt to preserve the internal harmony of Jewish male society by not allowing them to participate in anal intercourse as a form of expressing or gaining social and political dominance. These verses in no way prohibit, nor do they even speak, to loving, caring sexual relationships between people of the same gender.¹¹ Another position postulates that this passage condemns homosexuality not because it is inherently wrong but because of its connection with idolatrous pagan rights.¹²

2. Response:

Both of these views place a significant weight upon the historical background of the ancient near east. While there is strong evidence that homosexuality was practiced in idolatrous worship that does not necessarily limit the practice of homosexuality to that context. The Leviticus texts naturally assume that the practice of homosexuality is inherently wrong. In addition, the surrounding text in *Leviticus 18* condemns adultery, bestiality, and incest. Clearly those practices were not condemned because of its association with idolatry in Egyptian and Canaanite culture, nor because they were a threat to the internal harmony of the Jewish male society.

¹¹ Mona West, *The Bible and Homosexuality*: downloaded on Aug. 18, 2008 from: <http://www.mcccchurch.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Resources&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=2074>

¹²Feinberg, John S. ; Feinberg, Paul D. ; Huxley, Aldous: *Ethics for a Brave New World*. Wheaton, Ill. : Crossway Books, 1996, c1993, S. 193

For instance, it is most likely in Egypt that homosexuality was regarded with contempt since such practices were not common among them. Two Middle Assyrian laws which go back to the fifteenth century B.C. make a homosexual act indictable, and the high influential Hittites refer to homosexuality as an abomination.

C. 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 and 1 Tim. 1:9-11:

1 Corinthians 6:9-10 Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals,¹⁰ nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God.

1 Timothy 1:9-11 realizing the fact that law is not made for a righteous person, but for those who are lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers¹⁰ and immoral men and homosexuals and kidnappers and liars and perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound teaching,¹¹ according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, with which I have been entrusted.

1. Objection:

Pro-homosexual scholars believe that the rare usage of the words for homosexual and effeminate make an exact translation inconclusive. Therefore, we should be reticent to consider it a sin. Others teach that this alludes to the common practice of pederasty in which patrons socialized, educated, and often engaged in a sexual relationship with young boys. The words for homosexual (*arsenokoitēs*) and effeminate refer to an extremely specific instance of male patrons exploiting their boy protégés. This does not speak of a mutually loving and caring relationship between people of the same sex.¹³

2. Response:

While the word for homosexual is quite rare in the Greek, there may be good reason for it. Paul was not deeply familiar with the sexual lingo at the time, so he created the word for homosexual, by compounding male and bed. Both of these words are found in the Greek translation of the sexual mores established

¹³ Mona West, *The Bible and Homosexuality*: downloaded on Aug. 18, 2008 from: <http://www.mcccchurch.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Resources&Template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=2074>

in *Leviticus 18*. In addition, the general nature of other sins listed such as adultery and fornication suggest that the overly narrow scope postulated by pro-homosexual biblical scholars is unlikely.

D. Romans 1:26-27:

For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural,²⁷ and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.

1. Objection:

Paul is condemning certain homosexual *acts*, not homosexuality, or the homosexual, or the responsible practice of homosexual behavior. Whether he knew it or not, we now know that some people constitutionally prefer members of the same sex. They experience no attraction to members of the opposite sex. Therefore, we must distinguish between the *invert* and the *pervert*, between *inversion* and *perversion*. Perverts are not genuinely homosexual. They engage in homosexual practices although they are heterosexuals, or they commit heterosexual acts though they are homosexuals. Inverts, on the other hand, are constitutionally gay. Their sexual orientation is the inverse of heterosexuals, and for them, engaging in homosexual acts is normal. In *Romans 1* Paul condemns perversion, not inversion.

Support for this view is adduced by Paul's claim that those he discusses changed or left the natural use of their sexuality for that which was unnatural or against nature. Thus, Paul only condemns homosexual acts committed by apparently heterosexual persons.¹⁴

2. Response:

There is no proof that there is a constitutional homosexual for whom homosexual acts follow from a genetic condition, but this interpretation clearly requires that. Moreover, there is no reason to believe that even if such a condition exists, Paul knew of it and refers to it here.¹⁵ In a classic case of

¹⁴Feinberg, John S. ; Feinberg, Paul D. ; Huxley, Aldous: *Ethics for a Brave New World*. Wheaton, Ill. : Crossway Books, 1996, c1993, S. 197

¹⁵Ibid. S. 198

eisegesis pro-homosexual scholars are guilty of anachronism - imposing distinctly modern thoughts upon the theology of Paul. This would be equivalent to saying that “the poor in spirit” in the Beatitudes are those with low self-esteem. Such psychological concepts did not surface until the 20th century.

- Why do you believe these pro gay scholars make it a priority to revise the Bible?
- Why do many of these scholars attempt to draw upon culture, modern sciences, background, etc. into their studies?
- With what kind of moral conviction can we declare that homosexuality is wrong?

IV. Objections:

A. What if Homosexuality is genetic?

The Bible clearly states that homosexuality is contrary to man’s basic nature. You could take it a step further and say that all sin is contrary to man’s basic nature as we were created “good.” Yet, the Fall has left its imprint on our souls. We now have a proclivity for sin. In addition, the Fall impacts our genetics as well. We no longer have the ability to live forever. We are subject to all sorts of maladies and diseases. Babies are born with birth defects. The problem with the view that homosexuality should be okay since “God made me that way” is that God did not make man that way. God made us good, but we have been corrupted. So how can God still hold us responsible? The answer is simple. God has given each homosexual and for that matter sinner a way out. Through the regenerating work of the Spirit God can cleanse you from all sin, even those with a genetic base. Now mind you, this answer grants that there might be a genetic basis. This contention is still under great dispute, but if there actually is a genetic basis it does not challenge the authority of the Bible or God’s justice.

- Why is it essential to the gay rights movement to establish that homosexuality is genetic?

- How does the following passage give the homosexual the hope of change, as well as assign full responsibility for their lifestyle?

1 Corinthians 6:9-11 Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals,¹⁰ nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God.¹¹ Such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.

Note: Establishing the genetic make-up of homosexuality is critical to the advancement of the homosexual rights movement. In title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, employers cannot discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Naturally, the LGBT¹⁶ lobby would like to see this expanded to include “sexual orientation.” Citizens are born gay, just like we are born into our race, religion, color, nationality, etc. For more information on the political advancement of LBGT see appendix 1.

B. Don't we see homosexuality in the animal world?

Homosexuals argue that homosexuality is natural since it occurs in the animal world. But this is problematic. It is true that this behavior occurs in the animal kingdom. But, it is also true that we see animals eating their prey alive. We see savagery, cruelty, and extreme brutality. Yet, we do not condone such behavior in our own society. Proponents of the natural order argument as a basis for homosexuality should not pick-and-choose the situations that best fit their agendas. They should be consistent and not compare us to animals. We are not animals. We are made in God's image. Logic says that if homosexuality is natural and acceptable because it exists in the animal world, then it must also be natural and acceptable to eat people alive.¹⁷

C. Why do you focus so much on homosexuality? Aren't there other sins to worry about?

There is not a widespread movement proclaiming the virtues of murder, the positive aspects of rape, or that thieves should be accepted as they are. Yet, there is a movement to call good what the Bible deems as evil. Repentance involved turning away from sin, and the repentance of a homosexual will fall short if he or she erroneously believe that God accepts his or her lifestyle.

¹⁶ Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender

¹⁷ <http://www.carm.org/issues/homosexuality.htm>

D. The Bible does not address a loving, monogamous homosexual relationship?

The Bible condemns homosexual activity as well as those whose lifestyle is defined by it. This blanket condemnation allows for no exception on account of the quality or fidelity of the relationship.

E. What's wrong with a celibate homosexual?

Lust can be defined as wanting something that is sexually forbidden. Jesus makes it very clear in *Matthew 5:27-30* that lust is the same thing as adultery. Why? Because lust reveals intent. A young man who looks but never touches does not go far enough. In the same way, a homosexual who is celibate does not go far enough. His or her thoughts regarding sex and the opposite sex fall outside of God's will and should be addressed. Now, it is possible that someone may struggle with homosexual thoughts, but it is important that they struggle against them. When someone accepts the label of homosexual, they acquiesce to the cultural lie that you can't change who you are.

F. How hard should we fight to oppose gay marriage?

While the issue of homosexual marriage does not have the same moral clarity as abortion (i.e. an innocent baby dies), it is still bad for our society. It leads our nation to call good what God deems as evil. The complete normalization of homosexuality will be a stumbling block to those entrapped in that lifestyle. In addition, there should be concern for the children who grow up in gay homes – gender confusion, life without a mother and a father will have its effect. Finally, it could be argued that if the fight over gay marriage is lost, the homosexual activists will form a new front preventing Christians from speaking out on the sinfulness of their lifestyle (see appendix 1). Such has happened in Canada, where Christians cannot use “hate speech” towards gays in newspapers or over the airwaves.

- Should we panic if the gay agenda triumphs in public policy? Why or why not?

V. How to Help a Homosexual

A. Be aware that as a born again Christian you are perceived as the “enemy.” Seek to build a loving friendship with the homosexual, and let them know that you want to help them out of homosexuality.

- B. Show sensitivity in how you talk about that sin, knowing that all have sinned and all stand condemned before a Holy God.
- C. Understand that the temptation they face is real and powerful. If it could be turned off with a switch more people would do so. Though the Bible speaks absolutely on this topic, guard against the temptation to glibly call them to get over it.
- D. Give them hope that God can deliver them from their bondage provided that they repent and believe in the gospel.
- E. Be clear, that the Bible does call it a sin, but that God will give them the resources to change.
- F. Seek to help them build strong same sex relationships which honor the Lord.

VI. Conclusion:

While the cultural mainstreaming of homosexuality may discourage many Christians there is a bright side. As the social stigma has waned, more young men and women have opened up about their struggles. Previously, when a Christian high school student struggled with homosexual temptation, they kept it to themselves. Once they got to college they found sympathetic ears in the gay advocacy groups on campus. They kept silent about the very thing they needed the most help with. Now it has been reported that more teenagers are willing to go to their pastors and counselors to share their struggles. Consequently, the church has been able to address, comfort, and counsel many young men and women out of this sin. As a church, we have been given a unique opportunity to minister to those who emerge from the homosexual lifestyle. May we do so with love, care, and compassion as we use the truth of God's Word to rescue them from the den of darkness.

Appendix 1

How Have Homosexual Activists Impacted Modern Culture throughout the World?¹⁸

There are various ways to demonstrate the impact of homosexuality on today's culture, here in the United States as well as the world. The following section provides just a small cross-section of the imprint left by homosexual activism in today's world. There are *numerous* other examples of the way homosexual activists have made and are making a powerful impact on public education and the political process in the United States as well as on political realities in the world.

1b. The Issue of Homophobia

1c. Basic definition—According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, homophobia signifies the “fear or hatred of homosexuals and homosexuality.”

2c. Broad definition

However, different meanings have been assigned to this word. Although there are legitimate cases of homophobia, the modern use of the term has been expanded to take on social and political meanings. Gay advocates use it widely to refer to those who are hostile toward gay people and even those who disagree with the pro-gay perspective. They consider homophobic those who want to resolve their homosexual problems as well as therapists who try to help them.

3c. Important clarification

It would be helpful to distinguish between prejudice or some kind of bias and homophobia. Those who disagree with the pro-homosexual agenda may also do it legitimately out of conviction, which is a strong belief. Those who object to homosexuality on religious or moral grounds do so out of conviction, not because of a phobia or prejudice.

This one word, homophobia, is used by different people in different settings with some very different meanings. It is rapidly becoming a “snarl” word like racism and sexism.

¹⁸ M. Grisanti, 2008 TMS Lecture Series, “Cultural and Medical Aspects of Homosexuality” (unpublished)

2b. Domestic Impact

1c. Hate Crime Legislation

1d. H.R. 1592

On May 3, 2007, the U.S. House of Representatives voted to expand the definition of hate-crimes to include violence motivated by perceived sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability.¹⁹ This bill has not yet been voted on by the U.S. Senate or signed by the President.²⁰

2d. The Problem

This bill seems to set up a two-tiered justice system with a first class and second class set of victims. The existing hate-crime bill only includes non-behavioral characteristics (race, color, and national origin). According to recent FBI figures, hate crimes only made up 3% of violent crime in 2005. It is also interesting to note that 16% of those victims were attacked because of their religion and only 14% were attacked because of their sexual orientation.²¹

Charles Haynes, senior scholar at the First Amendment Center, said that one could rightly interpret the bill as another step toward normalizing homosexuality.²²

2c. The “Philly 5”

1d. The problem—On Oct. 10, 2004, a group of 11 Christians was “preaching God’s Word” to a crowd of people attending the Philadelphia “OutFest” event and displaying banners with biblical messages. After a confrontation with a group called the Pink Angels, described by protesters as “a militant mob of homosexuals,” the Christians were arrested and spent a night in jail.

Eight charges were filed: criminal conspiracy, possession of instruments of crime, reckless endangerment of another person, ethnic intimidation, riot, failure to disperse, disorderly conduct and obstructing highways. None of the Pink Angels was cited or arrested.²³

¹⁹ <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2007/mayweb-only/118-52.0.html>.

²⁰ As part of the defense bill that was proposed in November 2007, the House Democrats sought to add the hate crimes measure as part of the package. Eventually, they dropped that extension of hate crimes protection from the defense bill that the President eventually signed in December 2007 (<http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2007/decemberweb-only/150-12.0.html>).

²¹ <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/hc2005/table1.htm>.

²² <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2007/mayweb-only/118-52.0.html>.

²³ http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=42492.

- 2d. The resolution—In mid-February, all the charges were dropped as well as the bail requirement that they stay at least 100 feet away from any homosexual gathering.
- 3c. Interesting reverse bias- Gay and Lesbian Alliance against Defamation (GLAAD) calls the state of Indiana’s efforts to institute a strict anti-gay marriage law as an “anti-marriage equality movement”.²⁴
- 4c. California’s SB 777
 - 1d. Basic summary—On October 12, 2007, Governor Schwarzenegger signed SB 777²⁵ into law.²⁶ This bill deals primarily with what constitutes discrimination against homosexuals.²⁷ It changes numerous sections in the Education Code (EC). A key part of this bill mandates that “. . . a charter school shall be nonsectarian in its programs, admission policies, employment practices, and all other operations, . . . and shall not discriminate against any pupil on the basis of the characteristics listed in Section 220.”

2d. The Pre-SB 777 Education Code

In the Education Code before SB 777, under the section titled “Prohibited instruction or activity” (Section 51500), the code stated the following: “No teacher shall give instruction nor shall a school district sponsor any activity which reflects adversely upon persons because of their race, sex, color, creed, handicap, national origin, or ancestry.”

3d. The Impact of SB 777

SB 777 changed existing Section 51500 of the EC by having it refer to amended EC Section 220. The resulting combination of Sections 51500 and 220 effectively imposes the following requirement on every public school: “No teacher shall give instruction nor shall a school district sponsor any activity that promotes a discriminatory bias because of [one of the following characteristics: disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, association with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics].” Notice the comparison of these sections of SB 777:

Old 200: It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools, regardless of their *sex, ethnic group identification, race, national origin, religion, mental or physical disability, or regardless of any actual or perceived* characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit acts which are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefore.

Old 51500: No teacher shall give instruction nor shall a school district sponsor any activity which reflects adversely upon persons because of *their*

New 200: It is the policy of the State of California to afford all persons in public schools, regardless of their *disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other* characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code, equal rights and opportunities in the educational institutions of the state. The purpose of this chapter is to prohibit acts which are contrary to that policy and to provide remedies therefore.

New 51500: No teacher shall give instruction nor shall a school district sponsor any activity *that* reflects adversely upon persons because of *a*

4d. What does this mean?

Here is what seems to be the punchline: Under SB 777, public school teachers are prohibited from giving any instruction, for example, that would make it look like same-sex marriages or a homosexual lifestyle was wrong. This means that any instruction, which supports marriage between a man and a woman as the only legitimate or best arrangement for a family or for raising children, could be considered an illegal discriminatory bias against homosexuals or bisexuals.²⁸

This Section 220 does not apply to any private school that “...is controlled by a religious organization if the application would not be consistent with the religious tenets of that organization”²⁹ or to home schools.

3b. Church Involvement or Non-Involvement in the issue

1c. Emerging Church—Notice the statements of Brian McLaren on his blog for Christianity Today:

“Frankly, many of us don’t know what we should think about homosexuality. We’ve heard all sides but no position has yet won our confidence so that we can say ‘it seems good to the Holy Spirit and us.’ That alienates us from both the liberals and conservatives who seem to know exactly what we should think.

If we think that there may actually be a legitimate context for some homosexual relationships, we know that the biblical arguments are nuanced and multilayered, and the pastoral ramifications are staggeringly complex. We aren’t sure if or where lines are to be drawn, nor do we know how to enforce with fairness whatever lines are drawn.

²⁸ <http://www.pheofca.org/SB777080124.pdf>.

²⁹ <http://www.pheofca.org/SB777071017.pdf>.

Perhaps we need a five-year moratorium on making pronouncements. In the meantime, we'll practice prayerful Christian dialogue, listening respectfully, disagreeing agreeably.

When decisions need to be made, they'll be admittedly provisional. We'll keep our ears attuned to scholars in biblical studies, theology, ethics, psychology, genetics, sociology, and related fields."³⁰

2c. Will We Risk Arrest If Needed or Not?

In one of his blog entries in September 2006, Mohler referred to Joel Osteen, pastor of Houston's Lakewood Church, concerning his statements concerning homosexuality. When asked what he thought of gay marriage (during his visit to Massachusetts, the first state to make them legal), Osteen responded: "I don't think it's God's best . . . "I never feel like homosexuality is God's best." When pressed on the issue, Osteen said, "I don't feel like that's my thrust . . . you know, some of the issues that divide us, and I'm here to let people know that God is for them and he's on their side."³¹

Mohler contrasted Osteen's evasive non-answer to that fact that Stephen Green was recently arrested in Great Britain for passing out pamphlets that included Bible verses clearly declaring homosexuality to be a sin.³² Christians in many parts of the world now risk arrest for declaring openly what the Bible clearly teaches. Mohler makes the point that Osteen's answer "will put him at very little risk for arrest. But then, pandering prophets are rarely at much of a risk from the public anyway."³³

3c. Helpful Resource—Daniel Heimbach provides a listing of religious statements on sexual morality from various mainline denominations.³⁴

4b. International Impact

1c. Canada's Bill C-250 (May 2004)

In Canada, "homophobia" is already illegal. Homosexual activist Member of Parliament Svend Robinson worked for 10 years to get Bill C-250, a private members bill (which almost never get passed into law) through parliament (equivalent to the US House of Representatives). The bill added "sexual orientation" to the pre-existing hate crimes and genocide bills. Opponents of the bill argued that sexual orientation was not fully defined, and existing legislation already offered legal protection. Their protests fell on deaf ears.

³⁰ http://blog.christianitytoday.com/outofur/archives/2006/01/brian_mclaren_o.html.

³¹ http://www.albertmohler.com/blog_read.php?id=766.

³² http://www.albertmohler.com/blog_read.php?id=768.

³³ http://www.albertmohler.com/blog_read.php?id=766.

³⁴ Daniel R. Heimbach, *True Sexual Morality: Recovering Biblical Standards for a Culture in Crisis* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2004), 375-449.

Passages of the Bible condemning homosexuality, in Leviticus and Romans, have been declared akin to “hate literature” by a judge in Saskatchewan.³⁵

2c. The arrest of a Swedish pastor for preaching against homosexuality (2005)

Åke Green is a Pentecostal Christian pastor who was sentenced to one month in prison under Sweden's law against hate speech. On February 11, 2005 an appeals court, overturned the decision and acquitted him. However, on March 9, the Prosecutor-General appealed this decision to the Supreme Court, which on November 29 also acquitted him. In their opinion, while Green had violated Swedish law as it currently stands, a conviction would most likely be overturned by the European Court of Human Rights, based on their previous rulings regarding Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights.³⁶

In 2002, the Swedish parliament included references to sexual orientation in a list of groups protected against persecution in the form of threats and expressions of disdain. The list appears in a section of Swedish criminal law (*Brottsbalken*) known as The Act on Persecution of Minority Groups (*Lagen om hets mot folkgrupp*).³⁷

3c. The Expansion of Gay Rights in the European Union (February 2006)

Leaders in the European Union (EU) have passed a resolution stating that “homophobia” is a social evil and an irrational fear of homosexuals. The “Homophobia In Europe” resolution compares homophobia to racism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and sexism” and calls for its criminalization. The leader of this effort is Franco Frattini, the justice minister of the EU. He stated: “Homophobia is a violation of human rights and we are watching member states on this issue and reporting on cases in which our efforts have been unsuccessful.” The resolution warns that any refusal to grant homosexuals same-sex marriage status will be considered a crime of homophobia.³⁸

4c. The Decision of the UN Economic and Social Council (December 28, 2006)

In the end of 2006, the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) has granted official status to three European homosexual organizations as well as the International Lesbian and Gay Federation (ILGA).³⁹ After previously voting against this coveted status for such groups, the Bush administration’s representative has now voted for it. As reported by the UN watchdog organization, Catholic Family & Human Rights Institute (C-FAM), the U.S. vote to approve accreditation for the three groups prompted an unnamed UN representative

³⁵ <http://www.narth.com/docs/criminalize.html>.

³⁶ <http://www.thelocal.se/article.php?ID=2590&print=true>.

³⁷ <http://www.answers.com/topic/ke-green>.

³⁸ <http://www.narth.com/docs/criminalize.html>.

³⁹ ILGA has a history of association with the world’s leading organizational advocate of pedophilia, the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA). The relationship between ILGA and NAMBLA had led to UN rejection of the group in the past. Now claiming to have broken its ties to NAMBLA, ILGA nevertheless refuses to condemn man-child sex.

from another nation to comment: “While the Bush administration has been solid on life issues, it seems irrational to me that they insist on favoring gay groups that clearly seek to undermine marriage and the family.”⁴⁰

5c. The decision of various European cities (October 30, 2007)

The government of Catalonia, Spain, joined ILGA (joining the European cities of Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and Venice). The Catalonian organization called “E-Christians” wrote that “the ILGA is a pressure group, an international political lobby, that has as its objective the construction of a homosexual society...their political agenda has the intention of eliminating the natural differentiation of humanity between men and women for another based on the differentiation of heterosexuals, homosexuals, bisexuals, transsexuals, transgenders, etc.”⁴¹

The primary agenda of the ILGA is to establish homosexual sex acts as a “human right”, something no binding UN document has ever done. To this end, it is a promoter of the “Yogyakarta Principles”, a gay-rights declaration drafted in Yogyakarta, Indonesia earlier this year by several members and ex-members of United Nations “human rights” bodies and other international organizations.⁴²

6c. Potential Government Control of Private and Home Schools over “Homophobia”

Gay activist groups in Ontario are urging the provincial ministry of education to exert more control over private and home schools to fight against the alleged effects of homophobia.⁴³

⁴⁰<http://www.jbs.org/node/2304>.

⁴¹<http://www.lifesite.net/ldn/2007/oct/07103009.html>.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ <http://www.narth.com/docs/morecontrol.html>.