

BIBLICAL WORLDVIEW

\$1.95

AN AMERICAN VISION PUBLICATION

**MANUFACTURING
RESPECTABILITY**
Doctoring the Evidence

ALSO:

The Reporting of Misguided Sentiment
Changing Society... The Right Way
Dr. Greg Bahnsen: Intellectual Stubbornness

MAY 1993



VOLUME 9 NUMBER 5

God is Anti-Homosexuality

James A. Michener, author of numerous historical novels, has ventured into the arena of social ethics and biblical interpretation by taking up the homosexual cause. He should have stayed with writing novels. In a *New York Times* article Michener offers a defense of the homosexual lifestyle where his ignorance shows and his logic is seriously flawed.

The title of the *Times* article is "God Is Not a Homophobe" (March 30, 1993). Of course God is not a "homophobe." Homophobia means "fear [Gr.: *phobia*] of homosexuals." If the prefix *homo* is taken from the Latin, then "homophobia" means "fear of man." God fears no one. God gives His law so man will fear Him (Ex. 20:20).

Those who oppose legitimizing the homosexual lifestyle are simply anti-homosexuality. We are not bigots. Is God anti-homosexuality? Yes. In fact, Michener never disputes the Bible's condemnation of homosexuality. He does attempt, however, to neutralize the Bible's condemnation of homosexuality by applying a *novel* form of logic to the issue.

First, Michener admits that homosexuality, adultery, bestiality, and striking one's parents were prohibited under Old Testament law and merited the death penalty. They were prohibited, Michener claims, because the Israelites "lived in a rude, brutal, almost uncivilized place where abominations abounded." We "moderns" must realize that "God had to be unusually strict with such an undisciplined mob." Michener unintentionally makes the case for anti-homosexual legislation. Adultery, homosexuality, bestiality, and children brutalizing parents are characteristics of "uncivilized" societies and "undisciplined" character. Why would a civilized society want to return to a world where brutality was the norm? God moved Israel to civility by *prohibiting* these vile practices.

Second, Michener zeros in on the death penalty for adultery as being severely anti-modern. He calls the law "perplexing," asking, "Can you imagine the holocaust that would ensue if that law were enforced today?" If people knew that the death penalty was the possible punishment for adultery, my guess is that we would have fewer cases of adultery.

Adultery is prevalent because it is no longer morally repugnant. Anyway, the penalty for adultery is not as brutish as Michener would have us believe (see Matt. 1:19). Most wives, for example, would rather have their philandering husbands

working and paying alimony and child support than lying six feet under. Adultery wrecks marriages, destroys trust, and ruins families. The social costs are enormous.

Third, Michener asserts that the "Old Testament condemnation of homosexuality must be seen as one law among many intended to bring order to human relationships. Because the Jewish community was in deplorable disarray, harsh measures were required." What?! According to Michener the "condemnation of homosexuality" equals "order." Logic would dictate that legalizing homosexuality equals disorder.

Fourth, for the sake of argument, let's remove the death penalty sanction from adultery, bestiality, homosexuality, and children brutalizing their parents. This does not make any of these practices moral. Since Michener wants to legalize homosexuality, is he telling us that he wants adultery, bestiality, and children abusing their parents to be legal as well? Will we have the Senate hearing advocates of bestiality calling for legalization based on Michener's logic? Will we find a young thug justifying the brutalization of his parents based on the Michener theory?

The James A. Michener of 1993 cannot be considered an ethical theorist either.

"I have thought a good deal about our society, but I am not a philosopher. I have written a good deal of history, but I am not an historian. In the past I taught sociology, but I am not a sociologist, and although I love politics, I cannot be considered a political theorist."

— James A. Michener, 1976

MANUFACTURING RESPECTABILITY

◆ “Gays” in the Military ◆

By Gary DeMar

Turning the case for homosexuality into a crusade for civil rights is a brilliant tactic. Large groups of once-disenfranchised Americans — racial minorities, women, and the physically impaired — are being called on to join what is being called the next phase in the cause for full civil rights. The homosexual lobby claims that to ignore their struggle for equal rights will stall the many advances made in behalf of minority groups who have fought long and hard to gain equality. In fact, the claim is made that the civil rights movement will be set back if opponents to homosexuals in the military get their way. Homosexuals remind us that Harry Truman faced similar opposition in 1948 when he mandated a desegregated army.

By adopting the tactic of comparing racial prejudice with sexual behavior, the homosexual lobby has captured the high ground by formulating a reasoning process that ignores several key differences between the two situations. The homo-logic is deceptively simple, as this example illustrates: “Substitute ‘gays’ for ‘blacks,’ and you’ve pretty much got the situation facing President

Clinton. The same chorus of protest, resistance to change, fear of the unknown.”¹ Sounds reasonable, doesn’t it? But is it?

The homosexual lobby has skillfully maneuvered the debate to its



advantage, constantly putting those opposed to “gay rights” on the defensive. Recent history attests to their ability to force acceptance of their rhetoric.

Silencing the Opposition

Those who speak out against special rights for homosexuals are forcefully denounced as bigots. Martin Luther King III was forced to apologize to “Gay-rights leaders” for remarks he made while speaking in Poughkeepsie, New York, in 1990. King had stated that “something must be wrong” with homosexuals, certainly an understatement and an accepted evaluation just a few short years ago. Soon after the wrath of the homosexual “leadership” unleashed their wrath upon him, King retracted his remarks, calling them “uninformed and insensitive.”

Andy Rooney, a syndicated columnist and commentator on CBS’s *60 Minutes*, also learned the hard way what it means to anger the homosexual machine. In a December 1989 CBS Special, *The Year with Andy Rooney*, Rooney stated that “There was some recognition in 1989 of the fact that many of the ills which kill us are self-induced. Too much alcohol, too much food, drugs, homosexual unions, cigarettes. They’re all known to lead quite often to premature death.”² The militant homosex-

ual lobby leaped into action and Rooney was suspended for three months. His

comments on *60 Minutes* and an allegedly racist remark published in a "gay" magazine precipitated the suspension. He was

later reinstated after just 32 days through a great deal of support from irate viewers who believed CBS had caved in to the pro-homosexual lobby. Rooney later was pressured by the "gay lobby" to say that he "learned a lot" about how hurtful his uninformed comments on homosexuality had been.³

The Image Makers

"Gays on prime-time TV! Lesbians in *Redbook!* Comic book supermen bursting out of the closet! From the halls of Congress to the halls of ivy, gays and gay issues, once mentioned in whispers if at all, are being discussed, out loud and often."⁴ The homosexual lobby has targeted every sacred institution with the goal to remake the homosexual way of life into a normal and acceptable lifestyle.

Since the early '80s the homosexual lobby has pushed for a more



sympathetic treatment of the homosexual lifestyle on television and in



film. Scripts are often changed by writers to accommodate the sensibilities of the Los Angeles-based Gay Media Task Force. Homosexuals are now depicted as caring individuals who simply happen to like people of the same sex.⁵ Anything that would show the perverse nature of the homosexual lifestyle is censored. Homosexuals are the most effective and well-organized of the special-interest organizations lobbying the television industry. Gary Dontzig, co-executive producer of *Murphy Brown* and co-writer of an episode with a gay

character, is aware that the realities of the homosexual lifestyle must be masked in order to gain acceptance from the public:

In terms of what's been happening in this country with homophobia, we felt it was important to show a healthy, well-adjusted, wonderful and openly gay character. . . . When [people] see a gay-pride parade on the news, it's the guys who are overt. Why not

put somebody on who the audience could see and say, "Hey, this is a person."⁶

Television deals in myth and fantasy. The television portrayal of homosexuality is a deliberate attempt to mislead the public about what homosexuals actually do that makes them homosexual. What goes on at a "gay-pride" parade and in a "gay bar" is reality.

One of the best ways to manufacture respectability is to indoctrinate children. A steady stream of propaganda is aimed at children to

overcome their instinctive aversion to homosexual practices. This is being accomplished by writing stories for children in comics and comic strips. DC comics, publisher of *Batman* and *Superman*, introduced a homosexual character — the Pied Piper — and AIDS-related themes in their *Flash* series (August 1991). “Future issues [of *Flash*] will have the Pied Piper bring a male date to a wedding, and discuss the importance of protecting yourself from exposure to AIDS.”⁷

In the March 1992 issue of Marvel’s *Alpha Flight* comic book series, Northstar, a former (fictional) Canadian Olympic athlete, decides to come out

of the closet after seeing the ravaging effects that AIDS has had on an abandoned baby. Northstar declares, “I’m gay.” The media were ecstatic. Marvel’s *Silver Sable* has a team member who is a lesbian.

Now comic strips are working the indoctrination angle. *For Better or Worse* has announced that seventeen-year-old Lawrence Poirier, a character in the strip, is a homosexual. The creator of the strip wants to let teenagers know that it’s OK to be “gay.”⁸

New York City now gives unmarried and homosexual couples some of the rights enjoyed by married couples. Those living together can register as unmarried “domestic partners.”⁹ Those who register will be entitled to the same unpaid leave that in the past has only been available to married city workers. Housing will also be opened to “do-

mestic partners.” Again, normalcy and legitimacy are the goals.

The Boy Scouts have been pressured to allow homosexual Scoutmasters to be troop leaders. The Boy Scouts have refused. The homosexual community, showing its own brand of bigotry and heterophobia, has responded by pressuring long-time donors to cease supporting the Boy Scouts. The mean-spirited attitude of homosexual activists goes beyond the denial of financial support. Yale University’s student-run community service organization has denied membership to a Boy Scout troop and a Cub Scout pack because of the national

homosexuality right, it does make it legal.

The New Bigots

Bigotry used to be directed against those who viewed various racial and ethnic groups as being inferior by nature, a preposterous notion. Blacks, Hispanics, Caucasians, Orientals, and Indians, for example, are what they are by birth. There is no changing one’s race, and there are no ethical implications associated with any racial or national identity. A black man, for example, is no less a human being than a white man. The Bible asks it

this way:

“Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?” (Jeremiah 13:23). The answer is no. An Ethiopian does not

have to change his skin since race has nothing to do with his status as a human being created in God’s image. The Bible does not divide people by race, contrary to what some people might think. Men and women, no matter what their race or nationality, are evaluated by what they believe and how they act.

On the other hand, a homosexual is what he is by choice. Unlike the Ethiopian who cannot change the color of his skin, the homosexual can change his behavior if he so chooses. The homosexual community is the only minority group seeking special rights in terms of sexual practices. They encourage one another “to cultivate and celebrate their sexuality.”¹¹ A homosexual’s sexual *practice* is his identify-

FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE



Boy Scout organization’s policy of barring homosexuals from membership.¹⁰

The goal is simple: Homosexuals have to convince the American public that homosexuality is a legitimate lifestyle that should be tolerated in a modern, pluralistic society. In fact, toleration is not the ultimate goal. The stigma of depravity must be removed. Changing the law regarding gays in the military is one more step in the process of manufacturing respectability for the homosexual lifestyle. Saying that it’s OK to sodomize a willing neighbor, however, does not make it right. Getting your non-homosexual neighbor to agree with your lifestyle does not make it right either. And although forcing the hand of Congress does not make

ing trait. Art Positive, a homosexual protest group, "stands for militant eroticism." William Dobbs, founder of Art Positive, states that his group will "put our images and our culture out there for everyone to see." Simply put, homosexuality is nothing more than a deviant "pro-sex movement."¹²

In the Bible the sin of homosexuality is listed along with the sins of fornication, adultery, theft, covetousness, and drunkenness, acts which can be forgiven in Christ. In order to receive forgiveness for these sins, how-

ever, God requires a change in heart and behavior from those who once engaged in such sins (1 Corinthians 6:9-10). "And such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God" (v. 11).

Comparing Apples and Oranges

Anti-discrimination laws which protect racial minorities, women, and the disabled are in a different category from laws protecting those who practice sodomy. Homosexuality is an action, an admitted lifestyle. A homosexual is defined in terms of what he or she *does*. Anti-discrimination laws are not designed to protect lifestyles. Human rights laws protect what a person is, not what a person does. The homosexual community is beginning to realize this, so they are reformulating the debate to include biological

or genetic data to support their contention that their behavior is equal in kind to heterosexual behavior. But this will prove very little. The act of sodomy is perverse whether or not it is genetically determined. Finding a genetic cause for homosexuality does not mean that the act is normal or moral. Scientists

"At a General Court Marshall whereof Colo. Tupper was President (10th March 1778) Lieutt. Enslin of Colo. Malcom's Regiment tried for attempting to commit sodomy, with John Monhort a soldier; Secondly, For Perjury in swearing to false Accounts, found guilty of the charges exhibited against him, being breaches of 5th. Article 18th. Section of the Articles of War and do sentence him to be dismiss'd the service with Infamy. His Excellency the Commander in Chief [George Washington] approves the sentence and with Abhorrence and Detestation of such Infamous Crimes orders Lieutt. Enslin to be drummed out of Camp tomorrow morning by all the Drummers and Fifers in the Army never to return; The Drummers and Fifers to attend on the Grand parade at Guard mounting for that Purpose."¹⁴

are trying to link many behavior patterns to genetic causes — from crime to addiction to alcohol.¹⁵ Even if biological links are found, this should not mean that homosexuals are fit to serve in the military. Any number of physical disorders can keep someone out of the military. When it is learned that a certain disease is caused by a genetic flaw, millions of dollars are raised to search for a remedy.

The homosexual community's strategy is evident: To soften the public to adopt the homosexual lifestyle as morally acceptable and constitutionally legitimate. Pushing for acceptance of "gays" in the military is simply one more step in the public relations ploy. The homosexual community will claim that homosexuals have always served in the military. Some have even served with distinction. This begs the question. If the behavior is deviant and criminal, it does not matter how well a homosexual has soldiered. My guess is that rapists,

thieves, and wife beaters have also served in the military. Some may have also served with distinction.

End Notes

1. Lucian K. Truscott IV, "Truman's Legacy to Clinton," *The New York Times* (February 1, 1993), p. A13.
2. Quoted by Joseph Farah in "How Homosexual Thought Police Muzzled Rooney," *AFA Journal* (March 1990), p. 20.
3. Matt Roush, "Rooney Returns, But Credibility May Take Time," *USA Today* (March 5, 1990), p. 1D.
4. Anita Manning, "Exposure brings air of acceptance," *USA Today* (June 2, 1992), p. 1D.
5. Richard M. Levine, "How the Gay Lobby Has Changed Television," *T. V. Guide* (May 30, 1981), pp. 3-6.
6. Manning, "Exposure brings air of acceptance," p. 2D.
7. "Comic Book Hero Says He's Gay," *The Winnett Daily News* (January 17, 1992), p. 4A.
8. "Gay teen to come out in For Better Comic," *The Atlanta Constitution* (March 23, 1993), p. C3.
9. Alan Finder, "Orders by Dinkins to Broaden Rights of 'Domestic Partners,'" *The New York Times* (January 8, 1993), p. B12.
10. "Service Group at Yale Ousts Boy Scouts," *The New York Times* (February 24, 1993), p. B6.
11. "The Younger Generation Says Yes to Sex," *Newsweek* (March 12, 1990), p. 22.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
13. See Fox Butterfield, "Studies Find a Family Link to Criminality," *The New York Times* (January 31, 1992), p. A1.
14. *The Writings of George Washington, Bicentennial Edition* (March 1 through May 31, 1778), 11:83-84, published by the U.S. Government Printing Office, 1934. Quoted in *The Howard Phillips Issues and Strategy Bulletin* (March 31, 1993), Vienna, Virginia 22182.

ARM YOURSELF

with the facts about an issue of immediate concern

A CAVEAT COLLECTION

GAYS IN THE MILITARY

The
Moral and Strategic
Crisis

CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. D. James Kennedy

★
Howard Phillips

★
Mark Horn

★
Lt. Col. John A. Eldsmoe

★
Cal Thomas

★
Marlin Maddoux

★
Dr. Paul Cameron

★
Gary DeMar

★
Don Feder

★
Dr. George Grant

★
Lt. Cmdr. Gerry Carroll

★
Peter LaBarbera

★
Brig. Gen. Richard Abel

To order by phone call:

1-800-628-9460

Millions of calls flooded the White House on the heels of President Clinton's inauguration, creating a nationwide furor as the new Commander-In-Chief attempted to fulfill his campaign promise to void the military's ban on homosexuals. *Gays in the Military* explores the nature of the homosexual movement and makes a compelling legal, medical, military and moral case for retaining the historic ban.

Featuring essays by Gary DeMar, George Grant, Marlin Maddoux, Cal Thomas and other leading writers and thinkers, *Gays in the Military* is designed to give every American — as well as military leaders and policy makers — the information necessary to make wise decisions and to take appropriate actions regarding:

- ★ The public health risks of homosexual behavior
- ★ The weight of legal and military precedents
- ★ The relentless "gay rights" strategy
- ★ The long-term consequences for American life and culture

"Yes, Uncle Sam is looking for more 'proud, brave, loyal and good Americans' who are willing to serve our nation and honestly put its interests first. America has many needs for truly selfless, tireless servants. Those who answer the call but who also have chosen an open homosexual lifestyle can, and clearly would, serve our nation best outside the military services."

Brig. Gen. Richard Abel

"I believe that we have the moral will to restore traditional American morality. But, I also think we have the capacity to make the wrong choice and plunge the entire West into a dark night of the soul."

Congressman William Dannemeyer

Please send _____ copies of *Gays in the Military* (\$6.00 each. Price includes shipping & handling).

- Check or money order enclosed
 Charge to my VISA/MasterCard

Account # _____ Expires ____/____/____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Mail to **AMERICAN VISION**

10 Perimeter Way, B-175 Atlanta, Georgia 30339



AMERICAN VISION

P.O. Box 724088

Atlanta, Georgia 31139-1088



Address Correction Requested

ton, Geoffrey
S. 4th St. Apt. 39
ville KY 40203

NON-PROFIT
U.S. Postage
Paid
Marietta, GA
Permit No. 76