

The Homosexual Thing

More than one officer of the state has let us know that if the people cannot accept "gay-rights" measures, then to hell with them. But if they were to speak for themselves, what might the people say? Perhaps something like this:

We are not intolerant. In fact, we are prepared to suspend our public, but not private moral judgement for a sometimes alarming range of behaviours. Neither are we "Homophobic," which is a silly term. We are not afraid of homosexuals. We are mostly disgusted by homosexual behaviour and the homosexual worldview.

We think the claim that homosexuals only want equal "civil rights" is offensive, because homosexuals cannot be distinguished from other human beings except by their behaviour, which is changeable, as is all behaviour.

No one knows what "causes" homosexuality, any more than they know what causes, say, alcoholism, or drug abuse, but we do not attempt to promote or normalize either of these. And the fact is that credible psychiatrists claim cure rates of about 70 per cent. University of Toronto Professor of Psychiatry Joseph Berger has said, "I have never come across anyone with 'innate homosexuality.' That notion [is a] gay-activist political position...It has zero scientific foundation..."

At any rate, we cannot wait upon "research" to tell us what is morally or socially good. Wise leaders know that only moral vision creates a moral society, and that ultimately we all must answer the question: What model shall we uphold for our young as the preferred social arrangement for the rearing and protection of future generations?

Clearly, this must be a procreational model that specifically favours the married mother and father and their dependent children. Others may choose, or even be forced by circumstances, to live in other ways. But this does not imply an obligation on society to favour or promote those ways as equally desirable objectives for society as a whole. After all, the mere idea of a society that encourages its young men to roam about attempting to convert the male anus into a vagina, is plainly insane.

As a free people, of course, we must argue that individuals have rights. But surely a society - which is not simply a collection of individuals, but has a being, a nature of its own - has higher rights, among them its ancient right to design and promote intentionally preferential policies and tax codes to protect its preferred model of social behaviour. To encourage good love, that is.

Homosexuals often claim they "love" their partners, therefore they have a claim to the same social privileges and benefits as heterosexual couples. But all societies distinguish between good and bad love. Self-love, or narcissism, is notoriously bad love. Sexual love of children (pedophilia) is bad love. Incest is universally declared bad love. So is sado-masochism, polygamy, necrophilia, bestiality, and so on. There are thousands of forms of bad love.

In contrast to these, our Judeo-Christian tradition teaches that good love ranges in quality and purity from its most basic forms, such as innocent affection for the animals and plants of the earth, upward to love of close friends, neighbours, and family, to love of our own children, to love of our spouse, to spiritual love of God. The mere claim to a feeling of "love," in other words, is no sanction for the behaviour it is used to justify.

We believe the heart of civil society is the sexual order, with its four classic, interconnected prohibitions relating to Number, Gender, Age, and Incest. The Number prohibition states that you can only marry one person at a time; Gender, that you can only marry someone of the opposite sex; Age, that you cannot marry someone below a certain age; and Incest, that you cannot have sex with immediate blood relations. These protect society against polygamy, homosexuality, pedophilia, and genetic disorder. We are aware that the homosexual movement is only a part of a much broader, pansexual movement dedicated to the destruction of this sexual order. Pansexualism argues that because we are all naturally

good, then all consenting sex must be good. Pansexualists say that guilt, shame, taboos, and prohibitions against polygamy, homosexuality, pedophilia, and incest (the sexual order), are products of a "sex-negative" society and must be eliminated by an aggressive attack on "hetero-normativity."

What pansexualists really want is to replace our Judeo-Christian sexual order, one based on self-restraint and procreation, with a new, merely sensual order, based on self-indulgence and recreation. They are sexual radicals, and their tactics are piecemeal. If they can persuade us to agree that gender doesn't matter, then soon the number of spouses, their age, or their blood relationship to us won't matter, either. Sexologist Alfred Kinsey's partner Wardell Pomeroy, for example, argues that sex with animals is fine, as long as you don't hurt the animal. Like Kinsey, he promotes "consensual," or "positive" incest, both for pleasure, and as a social bulwark against the spread of AIDS, STDs, and promiscuity. In other words, if young Johnny gets the urge, he should just whistle for the family dog, or jump in bed with his young sister, or maybe even his Mother.

They are welcome to their vision. But it should not be affirmed, protected, or promoted.