

Homosexuality

Supplement Contents

The Christian response to homosexuality	2
The Biblical Response to Pro-Gay Theology	2
Homosexuality as Genetic?	3
Homosexuality: An Oppressed Minority or a Powerful Special Interest	
Group?	6
Hate Crimes	6
Medical consequences of homosexuality	7
Homosexuality in the military	7
Homosexual marriage	9
Homosexuality and Child Sexual Abuse	10
<i>Exploring the Homosexual Myth</i> By Rev. John Smid	10
<i>The Root Causes: The Child Development Process</i> By Rev. John Smid	12
<i>Same-Sex “Marriage” is Not a Civil Right</i> by Peter Sprigg	20
Talking Points on Sexual Orientation Policies from Exodus International	22
Resources	24
Support Groups	25

Homosexuality

Resource Supplement

1. The Christian response to homosexuality (This material is from a handout provided by Dr. Gary Phillips)
 - A. Christians must publicly stand against the homosexual agenda. Chuck Colson says, ‘In the context of America’s muddled infatuation with tolerance, which demands we accept homosexual behavior as normative, we draw the line. Normalizing homosexual behavior as an ‘alternative lifestyle’ inevitably requires the recognition of homosexual marriage: the most direct assault on God’s created order, and the surest way to undermine a society, which demands on the family for its propagation” (“Neither Busybodies nor Bigots,” *Prison Fellowship Jubilee*, March 1993, p. 7).
 - B. Christians must promote changing sinful behaviors. Jo Ann Gasper says “Lifestyle diseases have been fought by telling people how to act. Anti-smoking campaigns tell smokers not to smoke. Children are taught in school to say no to tobacco. Pregnant women are told not to drink alcohol or smoke. The general population is told to reduce the quantity of fats and cholesterol consumed. All these *negative* campaigns are directed toward changing lifestyles. The message is usually very simple—‘don’t do it’” (*What You Need to Know about AIDS*, Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1989, p. xii).
 - C. Christians must express compassion and love. Glenn G. Wood and John E. Dietrich point out (in specific relation to homosexuality and AIDS) that “Life ‘under the sun’ is full of pain. Dying slowing of a debilitating disease, whether self-caused or not, is horrible. Salvation answers do not ring true to an unsaved man unless accompanied by the sacrificial compassion of Christ” (*The AIDS Epidemic: Balance Compassion & Justice*, Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1990, p. 224).
2. A Biblical Response to Pro-Gay Theology
 - A. The Bible clearly teaches that homosexuality is wrong. See Romans 1:25-27, I Corinthians 6:9-110, Leviticus 18:22, 20:13, Genesis 19:1-29.
 - B. Responding to the homosexual claim that Sodom’s sin was violent homosexual rape, not homosexuality
 1. This is not stated in the text
 2. The judgment was announced prior to the specific incident in Genesis 19.
 - C. Responding to the homosexual claim (about Genesis 19:1-11) that Sodom’s sin was not homosexuality, but a violation of the hospitality code, because the term used for ‘rape’ was *yada*, which means ‘get acquainted with.’
 1. *Yada* (Hebrew) is used with sexual connotations throughout the Bible (Gen 4:1, 17).
 2. The context makes this interpretation ridiculous (19:8).
 3. The use of *yada* is a euphemism (The Sodomites would hardly say, ‘bring out your guests that we may rape them’).
 4. II Peter 2:6-8 and Jude 7 make this interpretation impossible for those who believe in the inspiration of Scripture.
 5. It is rather hard to explain God’s destruction of two cities if the only/primary sin was breach of politeness.
 - D. Responding to the homosexual claim that Hebrew laws (Leviticus 18:22, 20:13) against homosexuality were part of the ceremonial law, which we no longer keep (such as not cutting one’s beard).
 1. As with nine of the Ten Commandments and much of the moral law, these prohibitions are repeated in the NT.
 2. Invoking the death penalty shows that the command was not rooted in ceremony but morality.

3. This reasoning would also permit other acts prohibited by the context, such as adultery (20:10), incest (18:6-18), as well as the immediate context of bestiality (18:23) and child sacrifice (18:21).
- E. Responding to the homosexual claim that the Leviticus 18:22 & 20:13 passages are really about religious prostitution common in Canaanite practices, and that aside from this homosexuality would have been considered amoral.
1. This reasoning would allow Israelites to engage in child sacrifice, once disinfected of Canaanite rites.
 2. This is not historical or logical. The Canaanite fertility rites were heterosexual; they were to entice the gods to copy human acts and thus make the land fertile.
- F. Responding to the homosexual claim about Romans 1:26-27, that Paul was referring only to homosexual perversion, which is committing homosexual behavior without having been 'born that way', and that inborn homosexuality (inversion) is perfectly natural.
1. The distinction (conveyed by the terms pervert/invert) is found nowhere in all the writings of antiquity.
 2. The 'biological orientation' argument is not assured.
 3. The word 'nature' argues that homosexuality is against God's pattern for sexuality found in nature.
- G. Responding to the homosexual claim about I Corinthians 6:9-11, that Paul is not referring to homosexuality in general but to being 'soft' and 'self-indulgent', engaging in homosexual prostitution or pederasty.
1. The meanings given these terms are not from the first century but from later.
 2. The Greek word for pederasty was not used.
 3. The Greek translation of the Old Testament, in reference to Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, with which Paul would have been familiar, clearly indicates that homosexuality was in general view.

3. **Homosexuality as genetic**

(For a recent collection of research data, see A. Dean Byrd, Shirley E. Cox, and Jeffrey W. Robinson, "The Innate-Immutable Argument Finds No Basis in Science," NARTH. Available online at <http://www.narth.com/docs/innate.html>).

- A. Simon LeVay and the Hypothalamus study. LeVay reported that the hypothalamus structure called the interstitial nuclei of the anterior hypothalamus (INAH3) was larger in heterosexual men than those engaged in homosexual lifestyles.
1. This argument is exaggerated and misleading. Three of the 19 men involved in homosexual lifestyles had larger INAH3's than the heterosexuals, and 3 of the heterosexuals had smaller INAH3's than the men involved in homosexual lifestyles. Thus 17% of the study group contradicted his own theory.
 2. LeVay measured the INAH3 by size. Scientists cannot agree on whether this is a correct measurement, or whether it should be measured by the number of neurons.
 3. The relationship between brain structure and behavior is unclear. Brain change occurs throughout life as a consequence of experience. Thus, it is logically uncertain whether the brain structure caused their homosexual behavior, or if their homosexual behavior caused their brain structure. One year after LeVay's study, Dr. Lewis Baxter of UCLA obtained evidence that behavior therapy produces change in brain circuitry.
 4. LeVay was not certain which of his subjects were involved in homosexual lifestyles and which were heterosexual.

5. LeVay is openly involved in a homosexual lifestyle and is on a crusade to find a genetic cause for homosexuality. He told *Newsweek* magazine that he would either find it or abandon science altogether. Such biased research should be rejected.
6. LeVay offered the following criticisms of his own research:
 - “It’s important to stress what I didn’t find. I did not prove that homosexuality is genetic, or find a genetic cause for being gay. I didn’t show that gay men are born that way, the most common mistake people make in interpreting my work. Nor did I locate a gay center in the brain.
 - “INAH3 is less likely to be the sole gay nucleus of the brain than part of a chain of nuclei engaged in men and women’s sexual behavior...Since I looked at adult brains, we don’t know if the difference I found were there at birth, or if they appeared later.”
 - (Quoted in A. Dean Byrd, Shirley E. Cox, and Jeffrey W. Robinson, “The Innate-Immutable Argument Finds No Basis in Science,” NARTH. Available online at <http://www.narth.com/docs/innate.html>.)

B. Twins studies. In 1991 psychologist Michael Bailey and psychiatrist Richard Pillard, a gay rights advocate who is openly involved in a homosexual lifestyle, respectively, compared sets of identical male twins to fraternal twins, and found that among identical twins, 52% were involved in homosexual lifestyles, as opposed to the fraternal twins, among whom only 22% were involved in homosexual lifestyles.

1. Pillard and Bailey’s findings actually indicate that something besides genes must account for homosexual behavior. If 48% of identical twins, who are closely linked genetically, do NOT share the same sexual desires, then genetics alone cannot account for homosexual behavior.
2. All of the twins studied were raised in the same household. The environment in which they were raised could have had a significant effect.
3. The researchers were biased; they were not doing objective scientific research.
4. Researchers trying to replicate the results have found completely different results.

C. Genetic studies.

1. Arguments are misleading and exaggerated. Attempts to replicate the studies have produced confusing and contradictory results.
2. Arguments are illogical. It cannot be assumed that just because something is inborn that it is therefore normal or morally acceptable. Many defects are inborn, but we do not call them normal. Furthermore, alcoholism, obesity, violent behavior and even infidelity may be in the genes, but we do not accept or condone them.
3. Professional opinion is not conclusive. Dr. William Byne of Columbia University compares the ‘inborn evidence’ to ‘trying to add up a hundred zeroes so you can get 1.’ Other highly respected researchers believe that the studies are not about biology, but about politics. Dr. Judd Marmor, past President of the American Psychiatric Association, said “No one has ever found a single, replicable genetic, hormonal or chemical difference between heterosexuals and homosexuals.”

4. Homosexuality has developmental roots. Much research indicates that homosexuality is not genetic, but is a developmental issue which results in part from social circumstances, and that sexual orientation shifts frequently and can be changed.

A. Homosexuality is a learned behavior. “There is no connection between sexual instinct and the choice of a sexual object. Such an object choice is learned, acquired behavior; there is no inevitable genetically inborn propensity toward the choice of a partner of either the same or opposite sex” (Socarides, C. W., “Homosexuality: Basic Concepts and Psychodynamics,” *International Journal of Psychiatry*, v. 10, March 1972, p. 118). Even Dr. Alfred Kinsey, the famed sex researcher, was convinced that there was absolutely no evidence that homosexuality was inherited (W. B. Pomeroy, *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research*, NY: Harper and Row, 1972, p. 247).

- B. Sexual orientation shifts. 84% of gays and 29% of heterosexuals shifted or changed their 'sexual orientation' at least once in a lifetime. 32% of gays and 4% of straights reported another shift. 13% of gays and 1% of heterosexuals claimed at least five changes in sexual orientation (Bell and Weinberg, *Homosexualities*; op. cit.; Hammersmith, S.K., *Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1981).
- C. Studies suggest that homosexual behavior can actually alter brain structure. "Indeed, in commenting on the brain and sexual behavior, Dr. Mark Breedlove, a researcher at the University of California at Berkeley, demonstrated that sexual behavior can actually change brain structure. Referring to his research, Breedlove states, 'These findings give us proof for what we theoretically know to be the case-that sexual experience can alter the structure of the brain, just as genes can alter it. [I]t is possible that differences in sexual behavior cause (rather than are caused by) differences in the brain.'" (Quoted in A. Dean Byrd, Shirley E. Cox, and Jeffrey W. Robinson, "The Innate- Immutable Argument Finds No Basis in Science," NARTH. Available online at <http://www.narth.com/docs/innate.html>.)
- D. Homosexuals can change. "Leaving homosexuality was the hardest thing I've ever had to do. I finally saw the patterns of my same-sex attraction and came to understand the underlying needs that had sparked my longings. As I grew in my relationship with God, I knew He had changed me forever. Gone was the hardness. Gone was the hurt. And gone was the shrill cry inside, replaced with God's still, small voice. In His gentle love I found forgiveness, and the acceptance I sought so hard on my own."
- "There is another way out. Please, if you, or someone you know or love, is struggling with homosexuality, show them this story. If you truly love someone, you'll tell them the truth. And the truth that God loves them could just be the truth that sets them free.
- "Thousands of ex-gays like these have walked away from their homosexual identities. While the paths each took into homosexuality may vary, their stories of hope and healing through the transforming love of Jesus Christ are the same.
- "Ex-gay ministries throughout the U.S. work daily with homosexuals seeking change, and many provide outreach programs to their families and loved ones. If you really love someone, you'll tell them the truth. For information on contacting an ex-gay ministry in your area, please call 888-264-0877."
Ann Paulk, former lesbian
- E. Therapy can significantly alter sexual orientation. "Joseph Nicolosi, psychologist and founder of the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality, insists that same-sex attraction is a disorder. He says he's treated more than 400 gay men over the course of his career, and that roughly a third of them have reversed their sexual orientation completely. Another third see 'significant improvement': they can control their behavior but they still have homosexual thoughts" (ABC News on-line).

5. **Homosexuality: an oppressed minority or a powerful special interest group?**

- A. Gays are not persecuted and oppressed. As an entire class, gays are perhaps America's most affluent self-identified sub-group. According to marketing surveys, gay household average income is up to \$15,000 more per year than heterosexual households, and up to 1200% more than disadvantaged African American households. Jonathan Rauch, a homosexual author, writes "As more and more homosexuals come out of hiding, the reality of gay economic and political and education achievement becomes more evident. And as that happens, gay people who insist they are oppressed will increasingly, and not always unfairly, come off as yuppie whiners, 'victims' with \$50,000 incomes and vacations in Europe. They may feel they are oppressed, but they will have a harder and harder time convincing the public ("Beyond Oppression," *The New Republic*, May 10, 1993, p. 23).

- B. Those in homosexual lifestyles are not in the same class as other minority groups. Andrew Sullivan, a gay author, says: “But this strategy [of viewing the homosexual struggle as a civil rights issue] is based on two assumptions: that sexuality is equivalent to race in terms of discrimination, and that the full equality of homosexuals can be accomplished by designating gay people as victims. Both are extremely dubious. Unlike blacks three decades ago, gay men and lesbians suffer no discernable communal economic deprivation and already operate at the highest levels of society: in boardrooms, governments, the media, the military, the law and industry” (“The Politics of Homosexuality,” *The New Republic*, May 10, 1993, p. 34).

6. Hate crimes

- A. Hate crimes against those practicing homosexuality are not epidemic (quotes are from Matt Kaufman, *Citizen*, Jan. 1999, p. 7).

“Since Congress passed the 1990 Hate Crimes Statistics Act, the FBI has collected statistics on what it defines as crimes ‘motivated by preformed negative bias ... based solely on race, religion, ethnicity/national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.’

“From the beginning, the media have greeted each year’s report with a barrage of sensational stories. Typical headlines include ‘A Cancer of hatred Afflicts America,’ ‘Rise in Hate Crimes Signals Alarming Resurgence of Bigotry,’ and ‘Combating Hate: Crimes Against Minorities are Increasing Across the Board’ (*Hate Crimes: Criminal Law & Identity Politics*, James Jacobs and Kimberly Potter, Oxford University Press, New York, p. 50).

“Yet the most recent FBI report (1996)—which gathered information from 11,354 law enforcement agencies, covering 223 million people—claims just 8,759 ‘bias-motivated criminal incidents’ (“Hate Crime Statistics: 1996,” *Uniform Crime Reports*, U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, pp. 2-5). That’s less than one per agency; in fact, 84 percent of participating agencies didn’t find a single hate crime in their jurisdiction. Only 1,016 incidents involved ‘sexual orientation’—well below other categories such as race (5,396) and religion (1,401) (FBI, p. 7).

“Moreover, most of the incidents were what criminologists call ‘low-level’ crimes. The largest single category of offense (accounting for fully 39 percent of those reported) was ‘intimidation’—essentially, speech deemed to be threatening, but with little or no physical contact’ (FBI, p. 9). Such events, while repellent, don’t constitute a major crime wave.

“As a percentage of overall crime in the U.S., hate crimes are almost nonexistent. Though [Matthew] Shepard’s brutal slaying drew plenty of attention in 1998, the FBI counted just eight hate-crime murders in 1996 (two of which were anti-gay) out of a total of nearly 20,000 killings. The number of aggravated assaults attributed to ‘bias’ in 1996 was roughly 1,000 (221 of them anti-gay) out of a total over one million (FBI, p. 10).”

- B. Labeling ‘hate crimes’ is virtually impossible (Matt Kaufman, *Citizen*, Jan. 1999, p. 7).

“In this politically charged atmosphere, police and other officials are also under intense pressure to label offenses as ‘hate crimes,’ even if the evidence doesn’t back up these charges. “‘I hate these cases because they become real mysteries,’ says New York Police Detective John Leslie. ‘Everybody jumps on the bandwagon but nobody has the facts.’ In theory, law-enforcement officials are supposed to follow a list of criteria to decide whether an offense is a hate crime. In practice, the criteria are often so loose that almost any offense counts.”

- C. Gay-gay crimes are the real concern (quotes are from Matt Kaufman, *Citizen*, Jan. 1999, p. 7).

“Indeed, many liberals and gay-rights groups know—though it’s rarely reported—that the greatest threat to homosexuals may not be anti-gay bigots, but rather other homosexuals. ‘Many of the crimes that concern anti-violence activists are in fact gay-on-gay crimes,’ *The Washington Post* has reported. ‘Into this category fall many ‘pickup murders,’ so called because they are committed by troubled men who pick up strangers in bars, go home with them for sex, and then rob and kill them.

“In 1997, the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Projects (NCVAP)—which collects data from 14 gay anti-violence groups—found 3,327 cases of domestic violence. This dwarfs the number of anti-gay aggravated assaults (221) reported by the FBI that same year (‘Study says gay abuse reports rise 67 percent, based in part on awareness,’ Associated Press, Oct. 7, 1998).

- D. Gay crimes against Christians are rarely covered (John Leo, *The Washington Times*, Wed. Mar. 27, 1991, p. G4).

“Savage mockery of Christianity is now a conventional part of the public homosexual culture. A ridiculous-looking Jesus figure carrying a cross is always featured in the homosexual Halloween parade in New York, along with the usual throng of hairy guys dressed as nuns. Some homosexual clubs and at least one homosexual movie featured a tableau of Jesus being sodomized. Homosexuals in Los Angeles have dressed as angels with coat-hanger halos when disrupting Masses, and homosexuals in Boston as silly-looking bishops in red miters. Producers of ‘The Cardinal Detoxes,’ a poisonously anti-Catholic monologue that ran off-Broadway, invited nightly mockery of the church by offering free admission to patrons dressed as nuns or priests. This ‘Rocky Horror’ side of homosexual culture is ever more virulently anti-Catholic. Somehow the press has not gotten around to telling this story straight.”

7. **Medical Consequences of Homosexuality**

- A. Those involved in homosexual lifestyles, on average, are far more promiscuous than heterosexuals. 70% of those in homosexual lifestyles estimated that they had sex only once with over half of their partners, and also average somewhere between 10 and 100 different partners per year (Corey & Holms, *New England Journal of Medicine* 1980, 302, pp. 435-438; Cameron et al, *Nebraska Medical Journal*, 1985, 70, pp. 292-299; Bell & Weinberg, *Homosexualities*, NY: Simon & Schuster, 1978; Beral V. et al, *Lancet*, 1992, vol. 339, pp. 632-635).
- B. The vast majority of those involved in homosexual lifestyles participate in sexual activities which put them at high risk for sexually transmitted diseases. About 90% of those involved in homosexual lifestyles have engaged in rectal intercourse, and about 2/3 do it regularly. In a 6-month long diary study where sex acts were recorded daily, those practicing homosexuality averaged 110 sex partners and 68 rectal encounters a year (Corey & Holms, *New England Journal of Medicine* 1980, 302, pp. 435-438). About 80% of gays admit to licking and/or inserting their tongues into the anus of partners and thus ingesting medically significant amounts of feces. In the diary study, 70% of those practicing homosexual lifestyles had engaged in this activity—half regularly—over 6 months (Corey & Holms, *New England Journal of Medicine* 1980, 302, pp. 435-438). As a result of these and other activities, 70% to 78% of those practicing homosexuality reported having had a sexually transmitted disease (Schechter M.T., et al, *Lancet*, 1984, 1, p. 1293; Jay & Young, *The Gay Report*, NY: Summit, 1979).

8. **Homosexuals in the military**

- A. Those involved in homosexuality pose a health threat to the U.S. military. A large number of those in homosexual lifestyles continue to risk death from AIDS and Hepatitis. Each military AIDS case costs the taxpayer \$200,000 with 3 billion already spent. To counteract this, homosexual activists are calling for an end to the military’s HIV testing program. “Someone’s HIV status shouldn’t be a determining factor for a job, and the military is a job,” said Daniel T. Bross of the AIDS Action

Council (Washington Watch, Family Research Council, December 11, 1992, p. 1). This puts U.S. troops at significant danger in wartime situations in which servicemen and women commonly come into contact with the blood of their comrades.

- B. Serving in the U.S. Military has never been a right. It is a privilege extended to those who are qualified, and the sole basis for making decisions who should serve must be military necessity. Social experimentation in an organization responsible for national security is neither moral nor wise.
- C. When entering the military, individuals give up certain Constitutional rights such as freedom of association and rights to privacy. The promiscuous sexual behavior of those practicing homosexuality, which is a violation of the military's legal code, could make it difficult or impossible to maintain discipline and unit integrity.

Senator Dan Coats (R-IN), a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, says: "An open enlistment policy for homosexuals in the military will undermine the very *esprit de corps*, morale, discipline, and good order that is necessary to have an effective fighting unit. We enforce very intimate living situations in the military. It's not an eight-hour-a-day job—it's a twenty-four-hour-a-day, seven-days-a-week job. In many cases, when you are sent overseas, or in field training, people are living in very close intimate situations. We would not put men and women together in those kinds of situations and expect them to bunk together, dress and undress together, shower together, and live together. For the same reason, we don't want to put people together who have a sexual interest in people of their own sex. It's going to create problems. Whether you are talking to a seasoned sergeant, a long-term general, or anybody in between, they will tell you that it is an invitation for disaster" (Coral Ridge Ministries *Impact*, March 1993).

- D. Based on their professional judgment and experience, military leaders are virtually unanimous in concluding that unit cohesion and overall military effectiveness will be seriously degraded if those openly involved in homosexuality are permitted to serve in the military.

9. **Homosexual Marriage**

- A. Marriage was an institution ordained by God in order to replenish and cultivate the earth. Homosexual marriage produces no children; hence, it is a mockery of God to believe that homosexual marriage should be sanctioned in the sight of God.
- B. Marriage is necessary for a society's survival. "Other relationships have not been accorded the same status as marriage because they do not contribute in the same way to a community. To put it bluntly, societies can get along quite well—in fact, better—without same-sex sexual relationships, but no society can survive without marriages and families" (Robert Knight, *Family Policy*, Family Research Council, p. 5).
- C. Gay marriage would destroy the institution of marriage. Tom Stoddard, a homosexual activist, admits: "enlarging the concept to embrace same-sex couples would necessarily transform it into something new...Extending the right to marry to gay people—that is, abolishing the traditional gender requirements of marriage—can be one of the means, perhaps the principle one, through which the institution divests itself of the sexist trappings of the past."
- D. Definitions are important. "To place same-sex relationships on a par with marriage destroys the definition of marriage altogether. When the meaning of a word becomes nonspecific, the exclusivity that it previously defined is lost...If 'marriage' in Hawaii [this article was in response to Hawaii's law legalizing same-sex marriage] ceases to be the term used solely for the social, legal, economic and spiritual bonding of a man and a woman, the term 'marriage' becomes useless" (Robert Knight, *Family Policy*, Family Research Council, p. 5).

- E. Homosexual marriage does not necessarily lead to monogamy and healthy sexual relationships. “Former homosexual William Aaron explains why ‘monogamy’ has a different meaning among those practicing homosexual lifestyles: ‘In the gay life, fidelity is almost impossible. Since part of the compulsion of homosexuality seems to be a need on the part of the homophile to ‘absorb’ masculinity from his sexual partners, he must be constantly on the lookout for [new partners]. Consequently the most successful homophile ‘marriages’ are those where there is an arrangement between the two to have affairs on the side while maintaining the semblance of permanence in their living arrangement’” (Robert Knight, *Family Policy*, Family Research Council, p. 5).
- F. Homosexual marriage and child-rearing. "On February 14 [2002] the American Academy of Pediatrics announced its conclusion that gay and lesbian parents typically raise children as effectively as traditional families in which husbands and wives are committed to each other. The committee that released this report has no convincing data to back its claim and, in fact, admitted that there wasn't enough information upon which to base valid findings. And yet, almost every newspaper in the country reported the spurious ‘finding.’ The revolutionary concept was based not on science, but on politically correct propaganda.” (James Dobson, "Family News from Dr. James Dobson," May 2002, p. 3).
- The study itself stated "Accurate statistics regarding the number of parents who are gay or lesbian are impossible to obtain...hampering[ing] even basic epidemiological research.... The small and non-representative samples studied and the relative young age of most of the children suggest some reserve." (Ellen C. Perrin, MD, and the Committee on Psychosocial Aspects of Child and Family Health, "Technical Report: Co-parent or Second-Parent Adoption by Same-Sex Parents," American Academy of Pediatrics, *Pediatrics*, Vol. 109 No. 2, February 2002, p. 341.)
- G. Loosening sexual morality destroys society. “As the research of the late Harvard sociologist Pitirim Sorokin reveals, no society has loosened sexual morality outside of marriage and survived. Analyzing studies of cultures spanning several thousand years on several continents, Sorokin found that virtually all political revolutions that brought about societal collapse were preceded by sexual revolutions in which marriage and family were no longer accorded premiere status. To put it another way, as marriage and family ties disintegrated, the social restraints learned in families also disintegrated. Societal chaos ushers in tyrants who promise to restore order by any means. Self-governing people require a robust culture founded on marriage and family, which nurture the qualities that permit self-rule: deferred gratification, self-sacrifice, respect for kinship and law, and property rights. These qualities are founded upon sexual restraint, which permits people to pursue long-term interests, such as procreating and raising the next generation, and securing benefits for one’s children” (Robert Knight, *Family Policy*, Family Research Council, p. 5).
- H. Gay marriage laws could diminish religious freedom. “Same-sex ‘marriage’ threatens not only the integrity of the marital definition but also religious freedom. Although the majority report recommends that religious institutions not be forced to perform same-sex ceremonies, it offers no defense for the conscientious Christian Jew or Muslim (or Hindu or atheist, for that matter) who will not legally recognize same-sex ‘marriage.’ Law carries the potential use of force against those who will not abide by it. If a businessman declines to extend marital benefits to same-sex couples, the law would open him to lawsuits and state coercion. Schools would be forced to teach the acceptability of gay ‘marriage’ in family life courses” (Robert Knight, *Family Policy*, Family Research Council, p. 5).

10. **Homosexuality and Child Sexual Abuse**

“Scandals involving the sexual abuse of under-age boys by homosexual priests have rocked the Roman Catholic Church. At the same time, defenders of homosexuality argue that youth organizations such as the Boy Scouts should be forced to include homosexuals among their adult leaders. Similarly, the Gay Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), a homosexual activist organization that targets schools, has spearheaded the formation of "Gay-Straight Alliances" among students. GLSEN encourages homosexual

teachers—even in the youngest grades—to be open about their sexuality, as a way of providing role models to "gay" students. In addition, laws or policies banning employment discrimination based on "sexual orientation" usually make no exception for those who work with children or youth.

“Many parents have become concerned that children may be molested, encouraged to become sexually active, or even "recruited" into adopting a homosexual identity and lifestyle. Gay activists dismiss such concerns—in part, by strenuously insisting that there is no connection between homosexuality and the sexual abuse of children.

“However, despite efforts by homosexual activists to distance the gay lifestyle from pedophilia, there remains a disturbing connection between the two. This is because, by definition, male homosexuals are sexually attracted to other males. While many homosexuals may not seek young sexual partners, the evidence indicates that disproportionate numbers of gay men seek adolescent males or boys as sexual partners. In this paper we will consider the following evidence linking homosexuality to pedophilia:

- Pedophiles are invariably males: Almost all sex crimes against children are committed by men.
- Significant numbers of victims are males: Up to one-third of all sex crimes against children are committed against boys (as opposed to girls).
- The 10 percent fallacy: Studies indicate that, contrary to the inaccurate but widely accepted claims of sex researcher Alfred Kinsey, those embracing homosexual lifestyles comprise between 1 to 3 percent of the population.
- Those practicing homosexuality are overrepresented in child sex offenses: Individuals from the 1 to 3 percent of the population that is sexually attracted to the same sex are committing up to one-third of the sex crimes against children.
- Some homosexual activists defend the historic connection between homosexuality and pedophilia: Such activists consider the defense of "boy-lovers" to be a legitimate gay rights issue.
- Pedophile themes abound in homosexual literary culture: Gay fiction as well as serious academic treatises promote 'intergenerational intimacy'.”

(from Timothy J. Dailey, "Homosexuality and Child Sexual Abuse", Family Research Council. Full article available online at <http://www.frc.org/get/is02e3.cfm>.)

Exploring the Homosexual Myth

by Rev. John Smid

There is no such creation as a "gay" or "homosexual" person. There is only homosexual attraction and behavior; accordingly, there can be no change from a sexual identity that never existed in the first place.

Adulterer? Fornicator? Swindler? Gossip? The apostle Paul clearly said people who habitually and impenitently behave in such a manner “will not inherit the kingdom of God” (1 Cor. 6:9-11). These are actions that we all can get caught up in at one time or another in our lives. Nevertheless, if we are living a life dominated by any one of these or even several of them, God says it is possible for us to be sanctified by the washing of the blood of Jesus Christ and a willingness to submit to the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit, which comes through a process of conviction, repentance and seeking forgiveness from God and others whom we have offended along the way. "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9).

If we know the truth about these matters, then why do we accept the cultural definition of homosexuality? When non-Christians and Christians use the term “homosexual,” they often think of a person who is innately different from other types of people. We wonder how someone might have become a "homosexual." Families and friends of those caught in homosexuality go deep into grief and despair because they cannot imagine how their loved ones got there, and they believe it is a lifelong prison from which there is no escape.

Think of it this way: Mr. and Mrs. Jones came into my office grieving over their son’s ongoing homosexuality. They cried as I attempted to help them understand the real issues surrounding their plight. I asked them about their other children. “Well, John, our other son, lives with his girlfriend,” they replied. In an attempt to bring some reality to them, I asked why they were not so concerned about John. The truth became evident; they knew that there was hope for this other son either to marry his girlfriend or to leave her and get back to a moral life.

Their son struggling with homosexuality, however, was in their minds and hearts destined to remain a "homosexual."

Three Decades of Living a Lie. For the past 30 years, the modern American culture has bought into a lie! We have been sold a bill-of-goods about the nature of homosexuality that is spiritually and practically untrue. The jury is still out on any form of biological or physiological causation of homosexual desires. The common belief among Christians and non-Christians is that homosexuality describes a person who has something innately different about him or her. For many people, the term "homosexual" has become a noun. Many believe this is a descriptive word to help sort a certain person into a different category, a different type of gender, we might say.

Why the past 30 years? In 1975, the gay rights movement began to market the words "gay" and "homosexual" to refer to an inborn character or to the identity of men and women with same-sex attractions and behaviors. Today, they have succeeded in redefining those words to suit their agenda in our culture. The body of Christ (even ministries seeking to help those caught in homosexuality) regularly buy into that deceptive definition, often without thinking about it. How many times have we used the term "gay," "orientation" or "ex-gay" to describe ourselves or someone else? Even in the church we talk about ministering to the "homosexual," immediately labeling an individual just as secular activists do.

What Difference Does This Make? If we define homosexuality as an identity, an inborn characteristic or a hormonal imbalance, there is no answer or hope. If, however, we call it what it really is - a struggle with sinful desires and behavior - then throughout Scripture we're given ways to handle it.

If we use the false definition, where does one draw the line? Are you a homosexual because you have a homosexual thought for one moment in time? If not for one moment, then how long? A season? A lifetime? Is a man or woman a homosexual who engages in one act of homosexual behavior or a series of encounters or relationships? Are those who engage in exclusive homosexual practice for a lifetime the only "true" homosexuals? Often we have stumbled in our efforts to share the truth of freedom in Christ because we were wrestling with opponents over what makes a person a homosexual. Since there is really no such thing as a "homosexual," then we are chasing a mirage, a cloud, something we will never be able to grasp.

As we battle with proponents of the idea that "homosexuality equals identity," we lose ground by using their terminology. We lose more ground as we seek to put forward a solution based on the terminology of their lie. The truth is there are no homosexuals.

There are over one hundred ministries in the United States devoted to helping people and their families practically and biblically process through the dilemma of homosexuality (Exodus International "www.exodus-international.org"). These ministries are commonly called "ex-gay" ministries. Even in this slang title there is a subtle message that people used to be "homosexual" and they aren't any longer. This message is clearly understood when we are talking about an adulterer or a thief because we know that we are speaking of a behavior, but when we are talking about leaving homosexuality, so many see it as a change in a more innate way than in behavior. Some Christians might be thinking of a miraculous change from one kind of person to another!

Over the many years I have worked with Love In Action I have heard of one common burden from many men and women: "John, I prayed all my life to be free from homosexuality, and God has not done anything to help me. I guess He either doesn't care about me, or He doesn't care about my homosexuality." This kind of thinking falls into deep theological error due to a great misunderstanding about the real issue of homosexual temptation, thought and behavior. God has never promised that He would take away the temptation (see 2 Cor. 12:7-10). It is often the case that we have a lifelong struggle in which God gives us the grace to live obediently according to His will and good purpose. Some people who have homosexually addictive thoughts or behaviors will pray that God would take them away. If He doesn't, they conclude there is no other option but to act on them.

What Does Happen When a Person Leaves Homosexuality? The early Christians never viewed people with homosexual struggles as being born with that particular disposition. Today, as believers, we would never say, "Johnny was born a thief or extortionist," and then add, "Let's pray that God changes his genetic structure or innate predisposition from thief to philanthropist." We do this regularly, however, when referring to those who struggle with the sin of homosexuality.

The Devil, working behind the scenes, has succeeded in redefining the meaning of key words, and therefore we only reinforce and strengthen a false identity by calling individuals by a name that does not apply. Homosexuality involves feelings, attractions and sexual behavior; it can be a mind set, and it can include cultural association. From these factors, one can embrace it as a personal identity. People investing their lives into this kind of identity can expend so much of themselves that to think of leaving that identity can be quite threatening and very difficult even to discuss.

Based on that false identity, many people we see at Love In Action who struggle with homosexuality can tell of the heart-wrenching pain of waiting for a "change" that never comes. They struggle with feelings of rage,

confusion, rejection, abandonment and hopelessness because their prayer for change was based on a lie. They are asking God to change them from something they never were in the first place.

The first step of the process is to move away from the subtle lies of the Enemy and take back the truth in our communication and thinking. God can and will bring progressive freedom from struggles with homosexual thoughts and practices as we begin to adjust our thinking and the thinking of those to whom we minister the truth. Jesus declared, "then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free" (John 8:32).

Foundational Truths. At Love In Action, our belief is based on three foundational truths.

- **Truth One:** There is no such creation as a "gay" or "homosexual" person. There is only homosexual attraction and behavior; accordingly, there can be no "change" from a sexual identity that never existed in the first place.
- **Truth Two:** The truth for most men and women who struggle with homosexual behavior is that they will, at times, continue to experience attractions in large and small ways for a lifetime. It is often misleading and harmful to speak vaguely of "total" deliverance without mentioning the normal, ongoing struggles with temptations all believers have.
- **Truth Three:** God sees homosexuality as sin like any other, and directs us to apply the same biblical model to it that we would to any other sin. His real solution for deliverance and healing is based on repentance and obedience.

Does this mean that people choose homosexuality? Not exactly. The feelings, the temptations or the desires are certainly not chosen. They culminate from what we might call a conspiracy of factors, and then as with any temptation, they just come about. We believe God holds us accountable for the ways we act upon those challenges that come to us. People are responsible for the choices they make when acting on wrong sexual desires or behaviors.

Biblical change from homosexuality requires that we respond correctly to the message God speaks of in 1 Corinthians 6. This message of repentance will bring forth the truth that will, in fact, set people free from this kind of bondage. When we begin to see homosexuality as a sin, a behavior and a wrong mind set, then and only then can we find forgiveness and freedom.

There is no such thing as a homosexual! There are many individuals, however, who struggle intensely with homosexual temptation and addictive behavior. Once we get the message right, then we will be effective in ministering to those caught in this kind of deceptive bondage.

© 2001 - Rev. John Smid is the Executive Director for Love In Action and has worked with this ministry since 1986. John left his homosexual life-style in 1984.

The Root Causes: The Child Development Process

by Rev. John Smid

Today there is intense debate on why men and women develop same-sex attractions. In this series, our director gives his perspective on this vital question.

Part One: Birth to Four Years

During the past few years, I've had many opportunities to speak with groups on the issue of homosexual development. It's been exciting to see Christians gain a much better understanding of how men and women end up in the gay lifestyle.

As these believers relate these factors to their own lives, they see that all of us have struggled with many of the same "root" issues. Homosexual strugglers are not really that different; they have just attempted to resolve their emotional and relational pain in a different way.

Understanding the causes of homosexuality takes away some of the mystery surrounding this issue. Hopefully, this series will be illuminating to you, whether or not you struggle with homosexual issues in your own life.

Different Opinions

There is a tremendous lack of agreement on what exactly causes homosexuality. The scientific community has intensively studied the physiological questions, but it has come to no solid conclusions. Some studies (seldom publicized) emphasize the importance of family and other relational factors in a child's life. Other studies

(accompanied by major media publicity) emphasize the possible role of inborn or other genetic factors, but when other researchers attempt to duplicate these findings, often these studies cannot be reproduced.

The homosexual community has no solid answers either. Many men and women claim they were “born gay,” although they have no evidence. Others feel that they grew into the orientation, nevertheless, now they have no choice on how they live out their sexuality. A few realize that they could make major changes in their lives, but the whole idea seems too difficult and fearful to attempt.

The religious community is not settled on the matter either. Many conservative Christians have concluded that homosexuality is a sinful and totally disgusting lifestyle from which no one can be saved. Other believers think there is no hope for change. Therefore they welcome people active in homosexual behavior into their churches, even promoting them to leadership positions.

Life Development

Understanding how homosexuality develops is vitally important because it helps us formulate an appropriate response. I believe that homosexuality develops out of a series of decisions in response to our life development process. Through the power of Jesus Christ, and as adults make new decisions, they can experience change in regard to their homosexual struggles. Based on this conclusion, I would like to discuss some of the basic elements that I see in childhood and adult developmental growth.

As we look at these elements, keep in mind that I will be looking at general principles. This is not the “final word” on homosexual development. It is wrong to draw up one pattern and then try to squeeze every person into that particular box, but after six years of working at Love In Action, I have found many similarities in the lives of the people I have counseled. I have also been able to look back at my own past to find answers to the questions surrounding homosexual development.

Definition

First, what exactly is homosexuality? Here’s a good definition from Dr. Lawrence J. Hatterer, author of the book, *Changing Homosexuality in the Male*: “One who is motivated, in adult life, by a definite preferential erotic attraction to members of the same sex and who usually, but not necessarily, engages in overt sexual relations with them.”

This definition clearly addresses both persons who are active in homosexuality and those who have experienced homosexual thoughts.

Hatterer’s definition shows that homosexuality is different than just looking at members of one’s own sex and admiring their abilities or physical characteristics. It involves an erotic attraction that God has designed us to experience for the opposite sex.

The Beginning

Homosexuality does not drop out of thin air at puberty or later. Many people feel as though their homosexuality began before their conscious memory, even at birth.

This does not surprise me. Many studies show that the first four years lay the foundation for how we respond to events over the course of our entire life. From conception to about the age of four is the time when we obtain our foundational security from those closest to us, primarily our parents. Only through rebirth in Jesus Christ can we change our lives to the extent that we overcome negative effects of those first years.

Our immediate family’s vocal tones and emotional atmosphere are often the only input we receive for several weeks after birth. Are they comforting and soothing, or absent and rough, causing a shocking awareness in our tiny spirit that we have entered a new and hostile environment? Our mother’s security with her own life is quickly communicated either positively or negatively to the new infant.

Although we have no conscious memory of these events, they have a profound impact on our future. Babies are incredibly sensitive to their environment, not only physically, but also emotionally. You can almost hear them saying, “How long will she let me cry? How long do I have to stay in this soiled diaper?” The baby is constantly reacting to its new home, which is quite different from the security and comfort of the womb.

Within a short time, the baby begins to receive restrictions. Sometimes food is not immediately forthcoming. Sometimes parents are slow to respond to a midnight crying session.

Later on, discipline must be administered. Is it consistent? Is it harsh? Is it there at all? By this point, most input is from the feminine representative of God, a mother or significant other. At a deep, unspoken level, the child is grappling with some basic questions about life: “Am I important to these people? Is this world safe? When I am hurt, does anyone care?”

This young baby is not really aware of sex or gender. For the most part, the adults around the baby aren’t really interested in gender either. It is a baby, cute and cuddly (when not screaming for food or attention of some kind).

When a child moves toward two years old, he or she will discover all kinds of new things while watching intently for the parent's response to the new discoveries. "Can I touch? Can I go? How far?" The baby is still assessing the world by testing the boundaries and responses.

By this time the baby is looking for a place. "Am I accepted unconditionally even though I make mistakes? Is my life secure?" Already the baby is looking for her own personhood, a sense of personal identity which comes very early in life.

My Experience

When I was just a little over two years old my parents experienced some major marital problems. In seeking the best for my siblings and me, they decided that we should be sent to live with several secure and qualified relatives in another state.

The home I went to (being separate but close to my siblings' home) was loving and safe, but my entire world, the only one I had known since birth, was totally disrupted. Who in the world were these strange new parents and siblings? At two-and-a-half years old, my foundation for security was shaken to the core.

My parents did the very best they could in a difficult situation. They wanted to see my needs being met in a good and loving environment, but I had no way of knowing that.

Less than one year later, I returned to my birth home, which was another big shaking of my environment and family. How was I to settle all this at three years old?

Other Factors

The "performance scale" is another factor that plays into these first few years. "Am I accepted with or without my performance being up to par? When I am good, I get attention and affirmation. But what happens when I am bad?"

Often when a child is disobedient, the relationship with parents is affected and he/she may perceive rejection based on performance. Another child may see a sibling gaining acceptance and approval through certain actions, and will begin to compare himself or herself with the sibling. He/she may even copy the behavior in an attempt to gain similar approval.

A very difficult factor which is growing increasingly common is sexual violation early in life. I have heard many stories of men and women who have been introduced to sexual feelings and experiences at a time in their life when they are not emotionally or physically capable of responding to such actions.

This type of molestation can lay a confused and damaged foundation that takes a lot of counsel and validation to overcome. The effects on the child can vary, depending on the degree of abuse, the relationship of child to abuser, and the reaction of others when the abuse is discovered. In many cases it is not the actual violation that causes the deepest damage. The emotional injury is multiplied when shame, disbelief and hostility are heaped upon children, leaving them with no support or resources to deal with the violation.

An Important Stage

It is vitally important that parents realize the crucial foundations of emotional security which are laid during this early stage of life. While one-year-olds give us a lot of googles and giggles mixed with "Dada" and "Mama," they are very much in tune with their surroundings. They are listening and responding more than we know.

The elements that I see necessary in developing healthy children during this stage are unconditional love and acceptance without comparison to performance. There must be security and protection from violation of personhood (such as trauma, sexual abuse, or abandonment). If violation occurs, there must be comfort and affirmation.

The young toddler also needs freedom to explore his or her own personhood and identity. Permission to do this must be granted by parents and other family members. For example, the child should be directed to good activities, rather than merely hearing a continual "no" to unproductive or harmful exploring.

Part Two: Two to Six Years—Gender Affirmation

In part one we spent time learning how to build a secure foundation in a baby's life. Unfortunately, we cannot hold our children at one stage of development until their emotional needs are fully met. Children quickly move into the next phase of growth whether or not they get all the love and emotional support that they need in any given season of their life. When parents give them this security and love, they have a better chance of becoming happy and secure adults. When these elements are missing, broken or violated the growth process becomes stunted.

Gender Identity

Now our topic involves providing a healthy gender identity to children. One important issue to remember throughout this series is that at times, the lack in a child's life is more perceived than actual. For example, a father flies to his parents' home to care for an emergency, leaving a young son behind. The boy may interpret Daddy's absence as rejection, even though the father deeply loves the child. As this example indicates, young children may not understand the reality of such a family situation, and base their response on a wrong perception.

Something new happens when a baby becomes a toddler. Suddenly, this child becomes a little boy or a little girl. This stage of development marks the beginning of an important process - gender affirmation. Failure to affirm a child's gender can cause life-long confusion in the sexual identity.

Power of Words

On a practical level, at this age words begin to make sense and their application is being learned. Much of the communication is gender-related: "Oh, Bryan, you are just like your daddy!"; "Susie, you don't want to play with that. Trucks are for little boys!"; "Jennifer, come with mommy. We are going out with the girls today."

It's amazing how often the words boy, girl, cute, handsome and many other gender-related expressions are used in this vital period of life. A young child is also acutely aware of emotions and their relationship to words, because he or she is learning how to express himself or herself with the new found language.

Little Boys

The nurturing of a boy's gender is quite different from the necessary ingredients for security in a little girl. The boy needs to transfer his identification with "mom" to a very new and different relationship with "dad." This transfer can be perceived as scary and unwelcome, or affirming and exciting, depending upon how the significant male figure invites this little boy into his world.

The baby boy comes out of the womb relating specifically to the mom. Typically, mom feeds, diapers and closely bonds to this boy. This constant relationship with female adults is typical in day-care situations as well. When the boy reaches the age of about two or three years, it is time for him to begin participating in the world of his father or another significant older male more.

The period of ages 2-6 is vital for a growing boy. He is experiencing his first knowledge of his male gender. Basically the boy needs to be affirmed into a secure identity. He needs his father to welcome him into the male world. "Darryl, let's go for a walk together" or "Johnny, all us guys are going to watch the ball game together today."

Father-Son Affection

It's also important for a father to be free (even lavish) with his physical affection toward his son. Hundreds of men who have come through our office have made statements like, "I can't remember my father ever hugging or kissing me" and "My father never told me, 'I love you.'"

Other fathers abruptly withdraw physical affection from sons at a certain age. "We're too old for that stuff anymore," they scoff, and their sons are emotionally devastated.

It's also important for a young boy to have physical contact with his father's body. Healthy activities might include wrestling, sitting on Dad's lap, and bathing or swimming together. These bonding times provide a strong emotional link between father and son, and help satisfy a young boy's curiosity about the male body.

As I grew up, my father's extreme modesty fueled an exaggerated curiosity in me about other boys and men, including their physical bodies. I feel strongly that this came from my natural curiosity not being satisfied early in life.

This curiosity was so great that it became one more factor which pulled me into the homosexual lifestyle. I had an insatiable desire to know what other men were really like—physically and emotionally—and how I measured up to them. This curiosity became eroticized, and sexual experiences with other men provided a counterfeit solution to the problem.

It is vitally important that the boy and the father engage in frequent activities together. A father and mother will greatly increase the solid identity in their son through their mutual encouragement of the father-son relationship. This will mean that the mother has to release her little boy to the father's care, allowing them to spend time together without her interference.

Every little boy has a strong desire to "grow up and be like daddy." At a young age, his hope is not broken; everything he sees in his father appears to be a positive example of manhood.

A boy's desire to copy his father is damaged by emotional pain from both parents, but mainly the father. This pain can come from abandonment or absence, harshness in language or behavior, or some other disappointment in the relationship.

Sexual Abuse

Another factor that can break the growth patterns into maturity is sexual violation of a young boy. Male sexual abuse is more common than some parents imagine; current studies estimate 1 in 3 girls will be abused by age 18—and 1 in 4 boys.

Some men in our support groups remember having sex-related fantasies from the age of four or five years old. Of course, these boys did not understand the implications of adult sex, but they were the victims of inappropriate touch or sexual fondling.

These early sexual experiences are not necessarily attached to “good” or “bad” feelings, but more likely produce confusion and fear. A boy’s response to abuse will depend greatly on the security he has found in relating to his parents.

If there is little affection between the boy and the father, sexual abuse will seemingly fill the natural needs for touch and affection. An adult abuser typically showers attention and “love” on the boy before attempting abuse; if a boy is hungry for such intimacy, he is vulnerable to the overtures of an abuser.

Little Girls

A little girl does not have quite as difficult a transition to make, but she will be very interested in just how her daddy responds to her. Is he interested? Is he caring and affirming? Does Daddy pay any attention to me at all? How much attention does he pay to others around me? Children are assessing their world in very specific ways at this age.

A young girl will experience nurturing by her mother and will judge her gender identity very quickly by comparing herself to that significant female figure in her life. The girl will desire affirmation and will search for her identity just like the boy, but the channels of that affirmation will come from a little different direction.

This little girl wants to know who she is in the eyes of her father. She will look to her mother for role modeling, but to her father for how well she is doing. The responses from her father produce the score card of passing or failing as a little girl.

Since this male affirmation is so important to a daughter, the breakdown of the father-daughter relationship has a dramatic effect on her. Great damage can come from negative remarks and derogatory comments about her character and girlish qualities.

“My father never affirmed my femininity,” recalls Carol, a former lesbian. “In fact, he made fun of my attempts to be pretty. I’ll never forget the first time I tried to apply eye shadow. He glanced at me and snarled, ‘You look just like a prostitute!’ I was so humiliated that I wanted to die. I didn’t wear make-up again for over a decade.” Carol’s self-esteem as a woman was shredded by her father’s negative attitude.

A father can greatly secure his girl’s feminine identity by building her up as she grows into her appropriate feminine identity. Dad must be careful to affirm both sons and daughters. A girl can suffer from seeing her brother receiving exaggerated affirmation of his maleness. She may begin to feel like she would be more loved if she were a boy. In their quest for parental affirmation some girls will place energy in copying the masculine behaviors that they see affirmed and idolized in their brothers.

One former lesbian remembers begging her parents for a cowboy outfit. This clothing made her look more like her brother who got a lot of attention from their father. This girl also spent a lot of time working in the garden, helping Daddy in order to gain his approval and affection.

Sexual Trauma

The violation of a little girl’s emotions or physical body through abuse is devastating. Sexual violation can cause a girl to shut down in traumatic fear to any relationship involving a man. Healing requires recognition of the trauma, validation of the feelings and fears stemming from it, and the resolution of those feelings. Although the violation is extremely traumatic, the resolution always requires validation of feelings and giving comfort, regardless of the child’s age or circumstances.

Summary

In summary, this time in children between ages 2 and 6 is vitally important in regard to their gender development. This period lays the groundwork as the child faces one of the most difficult seasons ahead, the harsh reality of peer relationships at grade school.

Part Three: Six to Twelve Years—Same-Sex Relating

For some children, starting kindergarten or first grade can be the most traumatic day of their young lives. Who are all these kids? they wonder. Where are my mom and dad? I’ve never been away from them like this before.

Grade school can be a very rewarding time of life if children are prepared for it. When not prepared, this time can provide wounds and hurts that act like the final nails in the coffin of their already-confused identity.

The “Safe” Years

After the earlier stages of forming gender identity, a young child gets some time to learn how to walk into their gender role. The years from six to twelve are designed by God as the “safe” years to explore same-sex relationships. These years are safe because they are not impacted by sexual hormones.

Little boys and girls will probably discover emotional relationships with their same-sex friends. They will most likely form some relationships because they idolize another friend. But these relationships will not be driven

by adult hormones into sexual immorality unless the foundation has already been broken down (such as by sexual abuse).

The Haven of Home

During grade school comes the discovery that other children are different. One boy may tease another boy about his big ears. A girl will get persecuted because she has red hair. This teasing happens a lot during these years. The effect can vary from little impact to deep emotional wounding.

Negative effects can be minimized by a supportive home. Think about the little red-haired girl who gets teased three times in one day about her hair. She goes home crying. Her father takes her in his arms and tells her, "Janice, God made your red hair. I think it's very special. I love your hair!"

The comfort and affirmation she receives from her dad allows her to walk back into the mockery of classmates, feeling a little more secure because of her father's support.

This safe haven of a secure home with loving parents is so crucial to a child's well-being during these years. This secure place can provide a lot of resolution to the natural traumas that come into a child's life from the first days of kindergarten until the early days of puberty. Often it is not so much the wounds from peers that cause long-term identity problems. Rather, the wounds have impact due to a lack of validation and comfort from parents.

In the bigger picture, no matter what the emotional wounds are and how they come about, the child needs someone to acknowledge the hurts and to offer arms of loving comfort. This is true even in the severe case of sexual violation. A child's most important need after being abused is to have someone acknowledge the pain and give the child a safe place to release it. Of course, God is the ultimate source of validation and comfort, but He often uses us to be His ears and arms.

Kids don't purposely tear each other down just because they want to inflict pain. They are discovering the differences between themselves and others. Some kids are short, some skinny, some blonde and some have big ears. Everyone is different. These children don't know how to respond to the differences they see.

Homosexuality

How do these facts affect the development of homosexuality? Little boys or girls may not have the opportunity to identify with a same-sex parent and be drawn into his or her world.

If a father figure is absent, a little boy will look to other boys for validation. If these boys are full of rejection and ridicule, this closes another door to entering the world of men. Out of fear and insecurity, the little boy stays in the kitchen with mom.

I remember during grade school when there was a gathering of people in our home. I was more comfortable hanging around the aunts and female cousins. Although I knew that I really belonged in the other room with the men and boys, I felt so unable to relate that I stayed out of that room and looked on from afar.

I was so torn during those times that I hated holidays. These days were full of fears and uncertainty as to who I actually was and where I belonged.

For the little girl, the role modeling of her mother is vitally important. An example of healthy interaction might be the mother and daughter sitting in front of a mirror while the mother is putting on make-up. "Jennie," the mother says playfully, "let's put a little lipstick on you, too. Then you can be just like Mommy!"

The father also plays a vital role in his daughter's development as he affirms her femininity and reinforces her identification with the mother. "My, what a beautiful dress!" he exclaims before church. "You're sure my pretty girl. I'm proud of you!" Little comments from Daddy can make a huge difference in a little girl's view of herself.

The grade school years are also the season when name-calling becomes a favorite pastime for kids. Names like "sissy," "fag," "tom-boy" and "butch" bring much confusion regarding role identity. These words will probably not deeply hurt the little boy or girl who are secure, but for those who are struggling, they will often assume that they fit these names.

Labels can play a big part in moving a child with a weak identity into the actual behavior that fits the label. "If they are calling me that name all the time, that must be who I am." The ugly names cause deep wounds, and they begin to take root in the tender places of a child's growing identity.

Sexual Violation

If sexual abuse takes place during these formative years, other factors begin to distort the growth process.

For a boy, violation can cause him to completely distrust men. He may reject or question his maleness. Why would another boy or man find me attractive? He wonders. Am I really a girl? A boy may have another unconscious response; Maybe this is the way to receive the attention from men that I've always wanted.

For a girl, sexual molestation may cause a complete detachment from boys or men due to fear of further abuse. This detachment may even cause her to take on the masculine role as a protection. She fears becoming a "woman," which means being weak and vulnerable.

She thinks, if women always become victims, then I don't want to be one. Eventually this girl may begin to hang around with the guys with an attitude of, If you can't beat 'em, then join 'em.

Summary

In summary, it's very important that children get the opportunity during elementary school to become comfortable with other children of their own age and sex.

In most adult homosexual men coming to Love In Action, we find a lack of significant and trusting relationships during grade school. They often felt alienated and distant from other boys and felt more comfortable with a few trusting girls.

In the women we see, violation at the hands of older boys or men often occurred during these years. Little girls need to be protected during this stage of life. If they already see themselves as feminine, this awareness needs to be nurtured and guarded.

Part Four: Puberty to Adulthood

The onset of puberty brings a new discovery about our identity. We have already known that we are a boy or a girl (our gender identity). Now, in our early teens we begin to wrestle with our sexual identity and what it means to be an adult male or female in our culture.

Sexual identity describes how we identify with relationships and activities which reflect our maleness or femaleness. A young woman, for example, may reject her femininity by dressing in men's clothing and pursuing only "male" activities.

Process of Growth

God has designed an interesting sexual development process. The earliest stage involves accepting our gender identity at a very young age. We test that identity through relating to kids like us. Then comes puberty, and we move into a new and insecure time of beginning to relate to the opposite sex.

Changes in Young Men

I have my own theory about how God gives men the appropriate "push" to get them interested in women. If a teenage boy has accepted his male gender, has found acceptance in the world of men, and feels comfortable with a few buddies, he would be quite content to stay in the company of men. But then something new enters his world - hormones! His sexuality awakens, but he has no desire to carry out his sexual desires with his buddies. A healthy sexuality searches for the "other," the opposite gender which complements and completes one's own gender.

The young man looks around and finds that women have a mystery about them that is curious and attractive. He may focus on a particular young woman at school. Who is she? He wonders. How does she think? Why does she act that way?

Changes in Young Women

Adolescent girls, on the other hand, respond differently to the hormonal input that comes at this clumsy age. Young women begin to hunger for someone to seek them out, someone to affirm them in their new-found femininity. They can begin to romanticize their relationships. Crushes become a prevalent part of their relationship experiences. Flirting can send a message that they are available for a young man's pursuit.

Ideal Scenario

Let's look at an example. Jerry is a 15-year-old freshman in high school who is venturing into the heterosexual realm. He begins paying attention to Diane, a fellow student in his math class. It begins with a little talking here, a little touch there, maybe even a little poking in jest or an offer to help her carry her books.

All during this time, Jerry is wondering how Diane will respond. Perhaps they even begin dating, the next step of finding out which kind of female he likes to be around. Does he like a girl who is talkative or quiet, is self-sufficient or seemingly helpless, is smart or resourceful, is energetic or passive?

Diane begins to feel affirmed as a woman, because of Jerry's pursuit of her. She thinks, I must be special to him. He thinks I'm attractive. If she is interested in Jerry, Diane will probably let him know in some way, whether it is through flirting or just outright telling him.

After a few years of dating and casual friendships, Jerry and Diane are able to make knowledgeable and thoughtful selections as to the characteristics they'd like to find in a marriage partner.

These teen years are full of clumsy failures and perceived rejection. Most of us would rather not repeat the years of puberty and young adulthood, but God's intent is that we grow separate from the security of our family and discover our place in the adult world of mature heterosexual relationships.

Negative Scenarios

Now you have seen a basic healthy plan for living through puberty with a positive outcome. Men like Jerry and women like Diane grow up with the necessary ingredients for making wise relationship choices.

Tom

Unfortunately this ideal scenario doesn't always occur. Tom lost out on the rites of passage into manhood. His father deserted the family when Tom was two, marking his young life with a same-sex deficit.

After a grueling season of rejection and confusion during grade school, Tom now moves into his teen years with more questions than answers concerning his manhood and gender identity. He questions his identity and begins to wonder if he is really like the other boys. Then he notices that the other boys are growing physically and their facial hair is darkening. What about me? He wonders. I'm still short and undeveloped. Why am I not like the other boys?

Tom begins to find other men sexually attractive. This is not surprising. Tom really never understood other boys, so they are the object of his curiosity and as I said previously, the object of our curiosity often becomes the object of our sexual desires.

Sarah

A girl who has missed the appropriate affirmation of her femininity or who has been the victim of emotional or physical abuse may be blocked from embracing her God-given sexual identity. The natural desire to respond to a man's interest will be blocked by fear of again becoming the victim of abuse.

Sarah is one example. Her father was an alcoholic who was verbally abusive and made sexual advances when he was drunk. She struggled with her value as a woman and felt very inadequate to respond to the boys around her.

Sarah had such feelings of inferiority that she began dressing in baggy clothes that hid her developing figure. Her deep fears of womanhood caused her to begin identifying herself with men through her mannerisms and dress.

Because of her victimization, Sarah had grown to feel that being feminine meant being weak and vulnerable to abuse. I will never put myself in that position, she decided. Besides, I don't need men. I can get along just fine without them!

Cindy

Cindy is another example. Recently we were discussing her teen years. Cindy, a former lesbian, told me that she experienced the romantic desires and sexual fantasies that come with the hormones of puberty, but her desires were for other girls.

Looking back, Cindy sees that she was longing for the nurturing of her mother and thought that maybe she could get this from another girl. Also, people had told Cindy all her life that she looked and acted like a boy. When Cindy became attracted to another girl who was obviously interested in boys she began adopting a more masculine dress and hair style. Maybe if I become more like a boy, she will also like me, Cindy thought.

Among healthy adults, I've noticed that differences tend to attract. I've seen young women marry men who are so much like themselves that, later in the marriage, the couple is fighting over their similarities. Their feelings are so similar that the relationship tends to be dull and routine. Sadly, some of these marriages do not last. One party escapes the marriage to find someone else who is more "exciting" (and different) from their spouse.

My Search

During my early years, I was not able to find the affirmation of my gender that I needed. In my late teens, I thought that my loneliness and internal struggles would end if I got married.

What a mistake! Even in marriage I could not find security or a deeper sense of my masculinity. At the age of 24, I discovered the world of homosexual relationships and left my marriage in a further attempt to find affirmation of my male identity.

Homosexuality seemed like the only place I could find other people who understood me. I thought that the acceptance of these gay men would give me a sense of security and belonging. But the gay life-style failed to deliver the wholeness for which I was seeking.

There is a significant difference between the heterosexually-oriented person and the homosexually-oriented person (besides the difference in direction of sexual drive). Heterosexually-oriented people have found their gender and sexual identity, and act in ways that show their security. But the homosexual strugglers are doing things to try to find something they never received.

To use a computer analogy, a heterosexually oriented woman has a floppy disc that is titled "woman," so each experience that relates to her femaleness can be stored in that file. The homosexually-oriented woman receives information relating to femininity, but she has no file to put it in. The "information" and experiences that should affirm her get lost.

Growing Throughout Life

The developmental cycle does not stop with young adulthood. God allows us to continue growing and developing all through our lives.

Look around you at older couples who have security in themselves and in their walk with the Lord. Often you will find that the man has begun to swap traditional "roles" with his wife. He becomes more nurturing and she takes on more leadership and responsibility. The husband is doing more dish-washing and cleaning; the wife is handling finances and taking the car in for repairs.

This diversity of roles can be excellent preparation for the future. In old age, a marriage will be disrupted by the death of one spouse. This huge adjustment will be less traumatic if both husband and wife can learn each other's duties and responsibilities.

A Final Word

This four-part series has given you basic principles that I have observed and studied. I have just scratched the surface; there is so much more that could be discussed. I hope you will use these principles as a starting place and as you think about them, you will be able to come up with additional insights on your own.

Rev. John Smid is the director of Love in Action and has been involved in this ministry since 1987.
Copyright ©1993 by Love in Action.

Same-Sex "Marriage" Is Not a Civil Right

by: Mr. Peter Sprigg

Mr. Sprigg delivered the following remarks at a "Defend Maryland Marriage" rally at the State House in Annapolis, Maryland, on January 27, 2005.

Good afternoon. My name is Peter Sprigg and I serve as the senior director of policy studies at the Family Research Council in Washington, D.C. I am also a proud resident of Montgomery County, Maryland.

In addition, I am the author of *Outrage: How Gay Activists and Liberal Judges Are Trashing Democracy to Redefine Marriage*, a book published last year. Today I'd like to share with you just a few points that I made in my book.

The first point is that same-sex marriage is not a civil rights issue. Without exception, every adult in Maryland already has a right to marry. But everyone also has restrictions on whom they may marry--again, without exception. No one is permitted to marry a child, a close blood relative, a person who is already married, or a person of the same sex. These restrictions apply equally to everyone--there is no discrimination involved.

Nevertheless, homosexual activists continue to hitch their caboose to the civil rights train--something which is offensive to a majority of African Americans. We ban discrimination based on race in this country for the specific reason that race is a characteristic which is inborn, involuntary (you can't choose it), immutable (you can't change it), and innocuous (it harms no one). Plus, race appears in the Constitution. The choice to engage in homosexual behavior is none of the above. The laws which once limited one's marriage partner on the basis of race were designed to build walls and to keep blacks and whites apart. But restricting one's choice of a marriage partner by gender preserves marriage as an institution that builds bridges to bring men and women together to create future generations and serve the health of society.

But even if same-sex marriage is not a legal right, some people ask, what harm would be done by letting same-sex couples marry? I sometimes find it hard to believe people can ask that question in light of the devastation we've seen from other changes in family structure in the last 35 years. The research we've done at the Family Research Council shows several things: homosexuals are much less likely than heterosexuals to enter into long-term relations in the first place; if they do have a partner, they are less likely to remain sexually faithful; and they are much less likely to remain committed for a lifetime. These problems—an unwillingness to commit to marriage, a lack of fidelity, and a lack of permanence—exist among heterosexuals as well. But the experience of the Scandinavian countries shows that opening marriage to same-sex couples would make these problems worse, not better, throughout the population.

I know that many people here have come with your pastors and in church groups, and are motivated in part by your religious convictions. This leads some people to charge that we are trying to impose a religious definition of marriage on civil society. But defining marriage as the union of male and female is not something unique to Christian theology, biblical teaching, or even a Judeo-Christian worldview. In fact, until the last blink of an eye in

human history, there has never been any civilization, any religion, or any culture that has treated homosexual relationships as the full equivalent of heterosexual marriage. Marriage is not simply a religious institution, nor is it merely a civil institution. Instead, marriage is a natural institution, whose definition as the union of a man and a woman is rooted in the order of nature itself.

Individuals may choose to marry for all kinds of private reasons, but the reason marriage is a *public* institution is because it brings together men and women for the purpose of reproducing the human race and keeping a mother and father together to cooperate in raising to maturity the children they produce. The public interest in such behavior is great, because thousands of years of human experience and a vast body of contemporary social science research both demonstrate that married husbands and wives, and the children they conceive and raise, are happier, healthier, and more prosperous than people in any other living situation.

In fact, I would suggest that the argument in favor of same-sex marriage can only be logically sustained if one argues that there is no difference between men and women--that is, if one argues not merely that men and women are equal in value and dignity, a proposition with which I'm sure we all agree, but that males and females are identical and thus able to serve as entirely interchangeable parts in the structure of marriage. The contention is absurd on its face. Thus, "same-sex marriage" is a contradiction in terms.

Finally, let's be clear about one thing. This debate has not arisen because there's been a large groundswell of public support for same-sex marriage, for no such groundswell exists. We are sometimes accused of being "divisive" for opposing same-sex marriage, but nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, there are few political issues on which Americans are so united as they are in believing that marriage is the union of one man and one woman. The only reason this debate is taking place at all is because small groups of homosexual activists have gone to court in an attempt to gain from a small band of judges what they know they could never win through the democratic process. They did it in Vermont and succeeded; they did it in Massachusetts and succeeded; and they are trying to do it in Maryland as we speak. Will they succeed? Not if we can help it!

During the civil rights movement—the real civil rights movement--people like Thurgood Marshall, whose statue is before us, went to court to fulfill the principles of liberty that were enshrined in our Constitution from the beginning of our nation. But today's homosexual activists are seeking not to fulfill, but to overturn, the principles of family that were enshrined in nature from the beginning of the human race. They will not succeed as long as government of the people, by the people, and for the people is alive in the state of Maryland.

Peter Sprigg is the author of *Outrage: How Gay Activists and Liberal Judges Are Trashing Democracy to Redefine Marriage* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, 2004).

This article is from <http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=PD05B01&f=WU05D04&t=e>, the website of the Family Research Council, 801 G Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20001. Online at www.frc.org, or call 1-800/225-4008.



EXODUS

TALKING POINTS ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION POLICIES (Prepared by Liberty Counsel)

I. HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVITY DOES NOT WARRANT CIVIL RIGHT STATUS.

A. **Homosexuality Is Far Different From Other Historical Categories Of Protection.**

1. Generally, civil rights classification is based on:
 - a. Immutable (unchanging) characteristics, and
 - b. Discrete and insular minority that is politically powerless.
2. Homosexual activity is not immutable like race or gender.
 - a. Note that Anne Heche proclaimed she was a lesbian while having an "affair" with Ellen deGeneres. However, after the two broke off the relationship, Ms. Heche married a man. If she was "born" a lesbian, then how did she change her sexuality to heterosexual?
 - b. Other than religion (which is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution), no other civil right classification is based on a practice or an activity. Race, gender, age, national origin, and even disability are states of being - conditions which all will acknowledge are unchangeable.
3. Homosexuals are neither insular minorities nor politically powerless.
 - a. Homosexuals are politically powerful and need no special protection as compared to other minorities.
 - b. Homosexuals have higher incomes and more education than the national average.
 - 1) Annual household income: \$55,430 versus \$32,144.
 - 2) College degrees: 59.6% versus 18.0%.
 - 3) Professional/Managerial Positions: 49.0% versus 15.9%.
 - 4) Oversees Travel: 65.8% versus 14.0%.
 - 5) Frequent Flyers: 26.5% versus 1.9%.
4. Adding "sexual orientation" opens the proverbial Pandora's box.
 - a. Adds protection for a sexual practice.
 - b. Protecting one form of sexual practice (homosexuality) opens the door to any form of sexual practice.
 - c. Once one type of sexual practice is granted protection, there is no legal basis for denying protection to other forms of sexual practice.

B. **Adding Sexual Orientation Trivializes Historically Protected Classes.**

1. There are legitimate reasons for protecting certain classes of person from discrimination.
2. Sexual orientation is so different than historically protected classes that adding it to a protected class trivializes the historically protected classes.
3. Adding sexual orientation opens the door for adding other forms of protection that are based on mere preferences as opposed to categories based on a person's state of being.

4. While many people may have a desire to engage in a certain activity, that is no cause for affording such desire civil right protection (a bigamist desires to have more than one spouse, yet such activity is not protected).

II. SEXUAL ORIENTATION PROVISIONS ARE UNNECESSARY AND WILL FOSTER LITIGATION.

A. Adding Sexual Orientation To A Protected Category Is Unnecessary

1. Historically, listing certain categories of protection has been for the purpose of stopping ongoing, documented and rampant wide-spread discrimination
2. There is no ongoing, documented and rampant wide-spread discrimination against homosexuals.

B. Adding Sexual Orientation Will Result In Lawsuits Based On Free Speech And Religious Free Exercise Claims.

C. Adding sexual orientation will collide with the First Amendment right to Free Speech and Free Exercise of Religion.

1. Those who express their conscience that homosexuality is immoral have a constitutional right to do so under the First Amendment.
2. Those who violate the sexual orientation provision will have the option of bring suit in federal court for violations of the First Amendment. Claims based on the civil rights protections provided under the United States Constitution require that the government body compensate the prevailing plaintiff for attorney's fees and costs.

D. Adding sexual orientation will result in frivolous complaints

1. In areas around the country where sexual orientation has been added to policies, the statistics show the following
 - a. Frivolous complaints using sexual orientation as a pretext have been filed to mask complaints that have nothing to do with sexual orientation.
 - b. Statistics show that almost no real sexual orientation violations have occurred. This finding is consistent with the above observation that there is no ongoing, documented and rampant wide-spread discrimination.

E. Adding Sexual Orientation Will Result In Homosexual Indoctrination.

1. If a classification is added to a non-discrimination category, then it is generally assumed that would mean the government should takes steps to discuss the class.
2. Sexual orientation classification will result in a form of affirmative action wherein there will be indoctrination into homosexuality.
3. Indoctrination will expose children to the risk of engaging in homosexual activity.

TALKING POINTS REGARDING SEXUAL ORIENTATION IN EMPLOYMENT

- Federal law known as The Civil Rights Act of 1964 or "Title VII" governs discrimination in the workplace.
- Title VII applies to an employer which employs 15 or more employees for the period of 26 weeks prior to the alleged discrimination.
- Title VII prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex and national origin.
- The term "sex" does not include "sexual orientation."
- In order to file a Title VII claim, an employee must first exhaust administrative remedies by filing a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
- EEOC investigates the claim and issues either a (1) Show cause letter to the employer to show cause why it should not be found to have violated Title VII, or (2) a no cause letter stating there is no cause to find discrimination, or (3) a right to sue letter which allows the employee to file suit.
- Most complaints never develop into suit because the administrative process weeds out most frivolous claims or the employer and employee resolve the matter.

- States also have human rights laws similar to Title VII. In most cases, the only difference is the number of employees required for the application of the law.
 - No state or federal law prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.
 - The categories listed in Title VII have several points in common: (1) documented history of discrimination, (2) discrimination has caused economic hardship to the class of people, (3) the class is immutable, meaning the class did not choose and cannot change its status. Only religion does not meet each of these three categories, but religion is specifically protected under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
 - Sexual orientation includes "homosexuality, bisexuality and heterosexuality."
 - By definition, the term "sexual orientation" is a choice because it constitutes a continuum from heterosexuality to bisexuality to homosexuality.
 - Other than religion, which receives extra protection because of the Constitution, none of the Title VII categories are choices of the people within the class.
 - There is no documented history of discrimination because of someone's sexuality, particularly of homosexuality.
 - Homosexuals do not face economic hardship -indeed, the fact is that the average annual income of homosexuals exceeds that of non-homosexuals.
 - Homosexual organizations intend to advance their agenda through the adoption of sexual orientation policies in order to present homosexuality as "normal" and equivalent to a "civil right". The first two steps of the process to normalize homosexuality are adopting sexual orientation policies and then domestic partnership policies.
 - Another strategy is the passage of sexual orientation policies which prohibit the municipalities from contracting with any private company (even those outside the state) which does not have a sexual orientation and domestic partnership policy.
 - Although there has been no successful court case in the Southeastern United States claiming sexual orientation discrimination based on a local policy, a California trial court awarded a former employee of Shell Oil over \$5.3 million in actual and punitive damages after Shell filed the male homosexual for inadvertently leaving in the copy room sexually explicit materials detailing the "house rules" for "safe sex" practices at a gay party he hosted that weekend. See *Collins v. Shell Oil Company*, 1991 Cal. App. LEXIS 783 (1991).
 - Under Minnesota's sexual orientation law, a transgendered person filed suit after West Publishing, a large publisher of legal materials, requested the man stop using the women's restroom after female employees complained that the man, who dressed like a woman, used the women's bathroom. After several years of litigation, the employer "won" the legal case, but in the end had to pay significant amounts of money to defend this against this claim.
-

Resources

(Check Focus on the Family –www.family.org- for books and articles as well.)

Marlin Maddoux & Christopher Corbett, *Answers to the Gay Deception* (International Christian Media).

Mike Mazzalongo, *Gay Rights Or Wrongs* (College Press).

Jeffery Satinover, *Homosexuality And The Politics Of Truth* (Baker Book House).

Donald J. Wold, *Out of Order* (Baker Book House).

Mike Haley, *101 Frequently Asked Questions About Homosexuality* (Harvest House, 2004)

Jeff Konrad, *You Don't Have to Be Gay* (Pacific Publishing).

Support Groups

Harvest USA- P.O. Box 11469, Philadelphia, PA 19111, (215) 342-7114, John Freeman, Executive Director Mid-South office (Chattanooga: 423-266-0434) Harvest exists to partner with and equip the Church in bringing the power of the gospel to transform the lives of those affected by homosexuality, pornography, and other forms of sexual sin and provides a wide range support groups, informative materials, and educational presentations.

Desert Stream Ministries PO Box 17635 Anaheim, CA 92817-7635 Phone: 714.779.6899 info@desertstream.org., Andy Comiskey, Director. We aim to educate and equip the Body of Christ to administer healing to the sexually and relationally broken, and to those with life-defining illnesses. Desert Stream offers a newsletter and a wide range of support groups, conferences and seminars as well as an outreach to AIDS victims.

Exodus International phone 888-264-0877, info@exodusinternational.org, P.O. Box 540119, Orlando, FL 32854 , Exodus is the largest Christian referral and information ministry dealing with homosexual issues in our world today. They offer monthly newsletters, annual conferences, speaking engagements and web services.

Love in Action, John Smid, P.O. Box 753307, Memphis, TN 38175, (901) 542-0250, Love In Action exists to be a Christ-centered ministry for the prevention or treatment of unhealthy and destructive behaviors facing families, adults, and adolescents and provides residential recovery, support groups, conferences, and informative literature. They offer a two-week non-residential, 28-day and 3-month residential programs to help men and women live sexually and relationally pure lives through Jesus Christ and with sessions for wives and families that are struggling with relational and spiritual hardship.

NARTH, Dr. Joseph Nicolosi, 16542 Ventura Blvd. Suite 416, Encino, CA 91436, (818) 789-4440, The National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality. NARTH's primary goal is to make effective psychological therapy available to all homosexual men and women who seek change. Furthermore, they wish to open for public discussion all issues relating to homosexuality.

Websites: See Above For Descriptions

www.exodus-international.org.

www.harvestusa.org.

www.narth.com

www.lovinaction.org

www.desertstream.org

www.livehope.org. This site features a collection of articles and links to other sites that offer biblical answers to homosexuality, counseling to those desiring to leave the homosexual lifestyle, and help for friends and family members of gays and lesbians.