

Why Activists Act

N.E.Whitehead

Paper delivered at Reforming Alliance Conference July 2005

Jesus the Foundation

Jesus is the foundation of everything, so I would like to start with briefly looking at this foundation. The name Jesus, or perhaps Yeshua or Yashua or Jehoshua, means the Saviour, the one who rescues. "You shall call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins". It seems to be referring to something very like this in the passage in Phillipians 2. "He humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross. Therefore God also has highly exalted Him and given him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of those in heaven and of those on earth, and of those under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" He died for us, to rescue us, therefore he is Lord. This is all well known, but turns out to be very important when looking at activism.

Jesus is the name that is above every name. *Saviour* is the highest name in the universe. Note that *Love*, surprisingly, is not the highest name in the universe. The idea of *rescuing* is fundamental. In Revelation 5 the only one worthy to break the seals and open the list of judgments, is the Lamb, the one who is worthy because "You were slain, and have redeemed us to God by your blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation". So again, the name is *Saviour*.

Jesus is the one who rescues us, places our feet on the rock (Himself) and builds us into a temple. We are all in the process of being rescued, and the church is an association of such people. What is the Lord rescuing you from? For me some of the things I am being rescued from, are deep underlying impatience, pride, despair, and simultaneous laziness and perfectionism, which is an unfortunate mix! Briar, who will speak later in the conference is the outcome of struggling for a dozen years with an absolutely crippling stammer. Ask her what she thinks of Jesus.

Jesus rescues from everything even same-sex attraction. Part of the opposition to that message will be the crippling negation by activists "*No, he can't and doesn't.*" I'm surprised how important this negation is in activism, and this is a critical point to understand gay activism.

But we universally hear even from experts, the idea that change is not possible. How can that be?



So a little background and history on whether change is possible in same-sex attraction.

The notorious Dr Kinsey believed in changing one's sexual orientation to fit circumstances and devised a form of therapy in the late 1940's to help people change. He said it worked quite well, but failed in some cases. Why has this been ignored?

. Up until 1973 it was common knowledge and a rule of thumb in the therapeutic professions that given a few years of therapy about a third of people with SSA (same sex attraction) made large changes in their orientation, a third made small changes, and a third did not change. Even those who had changed small amounts were rather satisfied with their progress. There was also a rule of thumb that the earlier the same-sex experience, and the more intense it was, the longer it took to change the orientation. Amongst therapies thought legitimate then were some which were brutal, and rightly condemned.

A friend of ours, an ex-gay activist, and now married to a woman for about 15 years, in his gay days had aversion therapy in a New Zealand hospital (which did him no good). He was homosexually raped by two of the staff in the process. Today no therapist would condone the basic therapy idea let alone the abuse. Don't let anybody tell you this kind of brutal therapy happens any longer in the west or that modern therapy is harmful. Rather it follows normal therapeutic guidelines and the guiding principle is *First, do no harm*.

In the US in 1973 activists took over the APA (American Psychiatric Association and later its fellow organization the American Psychological Association) with very intimidatory activist tactics, including forging of credentials, physical threats and intense meeting disruption, and removed homosexuality from the list of mental disorders. Those who supported this, merely wanted to not be too tough on gays/lesbians, but later activists tried to pass measures saying actual therapeutic help was unethical. This was only stopped by threats by those therapists to sue the APA for "restraint of trade". Very American this! The publishing of anything academic against Gay/lesbian/bisexual is now almost impossible (at least in the American Psychological Association journals which are the most influential). This is a remarkable phenomenon. In thirty years as a scientist I have never seen such scientific censorship in the western world before. It is typical of a communist regime only.

I have to very reluctantly take into account while reading some scientific accounts written by gay activist scientists that they are partly biased. They are publishing what is called "advocacy science".

Had new scientific discoveries shown that therapy didn't work, or that it was indefensible? No. There were no new discoveries or significant papers. It was just a power grab. The objective facts are that the therapy worked as well as any other used at the time. But you will now hear the myth that it didn't work at all, and is completely discredited (a favourite gay activism word, and usually a sign there is something to it, in spite of what they say).

The rest of the world took about 20 years to follow the American lead and remove GLB from their international diagnostic manual. It is now very hard to find therapists prepared to work with those who want to change. The greatest concentrations are in the United States and particularly among the Mormons. Most, regardless of religious belief belong to a non-religious organization called NARTH (National Association for Research and Therapy on Homosexuals) which has 1500 members mostly in the USA, but many like myself are not trained counselors, but contribute in related scientific fields.

Parallel with the struggle these professionals had, amateur groups emerged. These followed the clues supplied by Dr Elizabeth Moberly of Oxford. At that time it was the usual opinion that homosexuality among men was the result of smothering mothers. Dr Moberly said that was more minor – more usually the problem either in men or women was a deficit in relationships with members of the same sex. This had a considerable impact on therapists, and was taken up by at least four major amateur groups, Evergreen among the Mormons, Exodus among (mostly) Protestants, Homosexuals Anonymous (parallel to Alcoholics Anonymous), Living Waters (Protestant, which dealt more generally with sexual problems) and to some extent Courage amongst Catholics.

In Australia and New Zealand, therapists are rare. There may not be one in even a major city. There are usually amateur groups, but sometimes not even then. Exodus, Living Waters and Courage exist.

Therapists still working in the field have volunteered rates of significant change (to a greater or lesser extent) from their work, of 50-80%, generally improved from earlier therapy.

Scientific research parallel with this proliferation of small groups, but mainly a few decades later, seemed to show that no one cause predominated. There were many routes to SSA. So virtually all who study the subject academically say that it has multiple causes. Today they would include relationships with peers as very important.

What is this we hear then, about constant discoveries that we are “born that way”? Every year there are a few such reports in the media. Virtually all this research is by gays, or very strong gay sympathizers. It has got published, so it has passed the high barrier of peer review and so the basic research is usually at least worth looking at.

First I must tell you that no-one in the academic world believes that everything is fixed unalterable at birth. They believe that what we are is a complex interaction of nature and nurture. It is not pure nature. In spite of this, some researchers and activists, try to give the impression that homosexuals are born this way and cannot change. Media people are much worse. This has remained a constant in the debate for about 15 years. I shall show in my later talk we already have the answer to the degree of how much we are “born that way” (not much) and the answer is not going to change *regardless of future discoveries*.

However the impression was and still is given by activists that very strong early influences made SSA unchangeable.

Alongside this is the parallel invoked to the civil rights movement in the United States. It is claimed (though statistics do not bear it out) that gays/lesbians are a hugely disadvantaged class who need special protection of their status in law. That appears also to apply to their status in the church. They should be allowed to “marry”, to lead the church. But there is an element in gay activism which goes way beyond civil rights activism. During the debate in 1993 in New Zealand about rights for homosexual people, MP Michael Cullen (now Minister of Finance) triumphantly said (I paraphrase) “Now your ability to voice a negative opinion about gay people stops at the end of your nose!” That is you can think about it, but you must not say a word. There is a kind of vengefulness in that attitude, often fuelled by hatred, and anger. An anger at heterosexual gender roles. An envy of heterosexuals. And very interestingly, an appeal to be given special protections, because they do not feel strong enough to stand up to negative opinions about them. “We can’t stand the nasty things people say against us. Please protect us”. So there is hate speech legislation which other groups don’t usually need or seek.

Churches

In churches and society a number of trends were operating.

First the liberal – conservative split from the mid 1800’s continued and deepened. The most radical non-traditional views on all subjects were advanced by liberals or radicals, and at base this centred on differing views of Scripture, but often about different views of Jesus Christ. If he really was God, then much followed which liberals did not accept. As a scientist, I have to confess that much of this was the fault of my fellow scientists who gave an impression of their work and results being much more sure and far reaching than it was. Christian folk were fooled into thinking that scientists’ methodology was all powerful, whereas all it really did was clarify the situation in an archipelago of islands in the middle of irreducible chaos. All of technology is that cluster of small islands in a Pacific Ocean of Chaos, which can be nudged, but not directly manipulated.

The conservatives, and here I must repent with you, were afraid to get into the 100 years war which would result if they insisted liberal thought was outlawed. So extreme views were tolerated, including the idea that homosexual relationships might not always be sin, and now, the idea that they are normal, and virtually never constitute sin. If you want to fight liberal views you are committing yourself to the 100 year war. It is a strong current in the west.

Do you realize that it is so strong that even non-Christian religions are divided that way also? Islam has fundamentalist, moderate and liberal streams. In Judaism they are known as orthodox, conservative and reform. An ideological battle is in progress which transcends even the major religions. What could cause this? I think the liberal movement tends to the *secular, the scientific and comfortable*.

Science is so value-neutral that in many cases any religion can use its results – an improved strain of wheat for example. So the technology of science has huge and deceptive prestige. Although science will be able to deal with only the 1% of non-chaotic reality, there is an illusion it is nearly all-powerful, and hence should be listened to very seriously. Since Science by its nature does not talk about God an “enlightened” or “informed” person will not much either. It does not talk about miracles – a liberal ideology will not either. It does not have much in the way of moral values about sex – a liberal person will not either. It takes the attitude *Let us allow any behaviour in society, provided society can support it and continue to expand economically and we can be comfortable.*

So homosexual behaviour became tolerated in liberal settings, and opinion in the church divided between those who wanted to lynch them and those who wanted to ordain them. That is probably an irreconcilable difference. Grounds for divorce?

The results of this are the current mess in the church in the west worldwide. In many denominations open same-sex behaviour is tolerated, or even sanctified by ordination, and the successes mean the activism will continue and intensify.

Speaking of the Anglican Communion, which by historical accident I seem to know most about, you will all be aware of the consecration of Bishop Gene Robinson in the Episcopal Church of the USA, who lives in a relationship with a male partner and divorced his wife to do so. Reactions from the third world particularly have been very strong, and the Kenyan church has recently severed links with its North American counterpart, but the worldwide communion has at least condemned the action as not having consensus. The proponents have been typical in their actions – they push every law or boundary that exists and transgress all norms in the name of justice. They will continue to do so, because they are seeing successes. Appeals to back off will have nil effect. In other words we are faced with an extreme activist activity so committed to change of this type that any effective response by us is going to be either extremely bloody or our response will be overwhelmed by the continued pressure.

Let us look quickly at the standards which have been adopted implicitly in the Episcopalian Church. A form of marriage between two gays is possible in the US in the State of Massachusetts, I am informed. Bishop Robinson has not taken this option up with his lover. Even if you accepted that such a “marriage” was OK, they would still be “living in sin”. Hence at a press conference after the ordination a journalist asked “So if I’m divorced, and living unmarried with a heterosexual partner, I can now be a bishop?” There was general laughter from the journalists. The clergy fumbled and said they would be rather unhappy with that. In the midst of more laughter the press conference was hastily closed. In other words there were now either grossly inconsistent double standards, or no standards. Allowing this, allows anything. Yes, it is a kind of line in the sand. *If you do not stand here, you will not stand at all.*

Types of Activists

There are three groups of people who are “gay activists”. Parents/relatives/friends of those with SSA, secondly theological liberals, thirdly gay people who have not seen any change in their own lives.

Relatives

When a parent or relative hears someone has SSA, he may be intensely shocked on several levels. In such a state he is very vulnerable, and the gay/lesbian person or others in the lifestyle often supply a lot of propaganda to convince him that Gay is Good. This is a kind of conversion process, which can work and transform a parent into a fervent advocate of gays and supporter of their lifestyle. Some of your opposition will come from such people. People can profoundly modify their theology in the light of what has happened to them personally. I have not had to personally encounter such people more than briefly, so will not comment further.

Liberals

Liberals have superb empathy. Very likely more than you have. They have often, because of their sympathetic personalities, encountered far more people with SSA than you have, and have really felt for the difficulties SSA people have. They tend to say “There can’t be anything wrong with SSA, always subject of course to the law of love.” They have heard the heartrending stories of those who have tried to change and failed, and they have become very righteously indignant about any attacks on such people, theologically, legally, or personally. There is in fact sometimes quite remarkable hatred against those who do not agree.

15 years ago, I was associated with a group in Lower Hutt, near Wellington, New Zealand, which was run by a man, Noel, who had changed immensely from being a political gay activist, to being married. Hate was shown in the group’s interaction with a local Anglican minister. They sent him (among many others) an introduction to the group, and the fact that change was possible for gays/lesbian. There was a phone call from the minister. Noel said almost nothing, but the minister poured into the ears of Noel an extraordinary and totally inappropriate tirade of amazingly bad language and abuse. This subject can arouse violent reactions.

Alongside this, many were convinced by the half-baked ideas that homosexuality was innate and immutable. It is a theological and ethical fallacy to think that this has anything to do with whether something is right or wrong, but the popular view became “They are born this way – surely God would not be so cruel? It must be ethically OK.” That fallacy is called the *naturalistic fallacy* – “what is, is right”. The fallacious nature of it may be seen in the following example – if Hitler had genes which unavoidably caused him to want to wipe out the Jews, would it have been right because he was born that way? Of course not. Sin is mainly determined by other things.

Alongside this, many were coming across acquaintances who had not succeeded in changing their SSA. They were quite often in the church, and their stories were often horrifying reading. What do you feel like when you are aware of very strong SSA feelings and they are condemned from the pulpit and you can't change? Dreadful at best, suicidal at worst. Many of these folk had tried with all their might to change for years, by any route they could find, quite often including therapy (though this option dried up). Their views would be summed up in the statement "If there was a way out of this thing, I would have found it – I've tried everything, taken the best advice, from Christian and therapeutic fields". Encountering this, many in the church are impressed by the struggle and sincerity, and lack of progress. They often have done a radical rethink, concluding that change is impossible, and that church attitude and tradition must be wrong, or at least unloving.

Alongside this is the falsely exalted status given to love, as an ethical norm. Note carefully that the Apostle Paul who promulgated this standard, uses it – but also uses alongside it, a variety of ways of determining what ought to be done. For example in I Corinthians he says that the reason a Christian ought not be joined to a prostitute is that it is the wrong pattern, the wrong image, quite inappropriate. When Paul talks about sexual problems other than in the context of marriage he never uses love as a standard. Isn't that curious? Whether he loves her is not the most important image. Love is not the only standard. Love is not enough!

SSA Activists

Hurt people hurt people.

I have seen several examples now of people involved in a group called Evangelicals Concerned. They seem to hold a conference in the US each year with several hundred present. In all but their sex life and sexual orientation they are traditional evangelicals. However they are often convinced that SSA is innate, and immutable. As a result they struggle mightily trying to reconcile the scriptures with their experience. A variety of outcomes occur. Some cannot believe the various versions of gay theology they hear, and remain puzzled and conflicted. Others embrace a version of gay theology and are convinced that fellow evangelicals need to understand how natural gay sex is.

This is usually driven by experience overriding scripture.

Noel placed an ad in a local newspaper which ran every Saturday night and read something like "Homosexual? Change is possible. Ring 5654444". This is a very simple ad and perhaps mildly irritating to some, you might think. But it triggered a campaign by the gay community to close down Noel and his group. They were subjected to a barrage of calls, all evening, every evening by gay activists, many very obscene, many extremely hate-filled, many trying to undermine his marriage. Quite a number of death threats among them. Quite illegal of course. This went on for *7 months*.

The phone company would do nothing, even on intervention from a member of parliament, until threat of media exposure of their failure to respond triggered a 24 hour response, which resulted in netting one student who just escaped criminal conviction because of his age.

Why this violent response to such an innocuous ad? Because it is fundamental. If choice of change is possible, it is one of the most threatening things you can say to a gay. And I believe that it is so basic to the Christian message that the very foundations are being tested.

Why is this activism so insistent and transgressive? At base it is fuelled by a profound insistence on the part of those with same-sex attraction – I will follow my same-sex attraction regardless. This is the idolatry described by Paul in Romans chapter 1. Jesus calls us to something horrifyingly lethal – if your eye causes you to sin, pluck it out. He would go further – if your mind or genes push you towards sin, fight it.

What we are partly encountering in gay activism is an addiction. They strenuously deny this, but it is common in many. What else can we call it when HIV transmission routes are universally known but many gay people neglect precautions? In New Zealand we are seeing AIDS at a higher level than ever, after several years where sense prevailed and the cases diminished. Same sex attraction is so important that life is not so important. Can this be called anything else than an addiction? Many in the mental health profession call anything which seriously interferes with normal life as a mental illness. By this definition, death from AIDS results from a mental illness. By the slightly strange standards of the mental health profession, however, it is only technically a mental illness if it worries the client.

I have observed the greatest hatred for traditional standards does not come from those who have formed a theological opinion about the rights and wrongs of acting on same sex attraction, but from those who have tried to change and failed. They are vehement that change cannot happen for anyone else and that people who claim change are faking or lying. They cross-question anyone who claims they have changed, to an inordinate and invasive degree. They demand a degree of change and of proof which is unreasonable and would not be asked in any other field. For myself I have talked to dozens who have made all sorts of degrees of change, and it is certainly real even if often partial. It is certainly not, in most cases, white-knuckle heterosexuality. But this means that anyone claiming to have changed will be subjected to an intense attack in a way a reforming alcoholic never is. It is not fair to expose those who are trying to change, to this type of hostility. It would be just as unfair to expose a somewhat fragile AA member to a prolonged and hostile interrogation by a strong sceptic of AA methods. Only those who have been out of the scene a long time and are stable, should be exposed to such vehement hostility. That will often mean 5-10 years of stability before public testimony.

Part of the reason this occurs is that activists rarely encounter anyone who has changed, or has controlled same-sex attraction. And yet the statistical surveys show that even in this room there are half a dozen who were once convinced they were gay, (probably as teenagers) but totally changed their mind. They never talk about it. And that is very natural. No-one on the path of Christ wants to admit they wandered off it. So there is a huge closet of ex-gays, I estimate from surveys that is maybe half the size of the gay closet.

What change is possible?

Is there anything Jesus cannot change? We would often say “Many, Many things.” I assert that is *a reflection of our failure to seek the answers in Him, rather than in His failure.*

80 years ago, the standard medical opinion about alcoholism was that it is impossible to treat. That may really surprise you. We all know of many people who have stopped exploiting the bottle, rather, have stopped letting the bottle exploit them. The reason is the rise of Alcoholics Anonymous, which ultimately arose out of the Oxford Group and its strong emphasis on Jesus. Many church folk look at AA today and think it isn't Christian enough. Well, look how amazingly well it does with what it does! Why aren't you doing better?

Pedophilia is one of the most intractable problems of a sexual nature, but I am convinced by the glimmers I see in a few places, that there are solutions for that too, and ultimately in Jesus.

Sometimes the advances will be medical. I have a nephew, who has many mental problems, and the drugs are not yet good enough to fine-control his symptoms. Perhaps Jesus will inspire some researcher to devote his working life to this problem.

Perhaps there will be some spiritual healing of some type.

Unless the church has many within it who testify to how they have changed, with the help of Christ, few will try to do so. The process must be modeled. How often do the church meetings you attend involve Testimony? Probably rarely. But is a fundamental activity in Christian services. Even change in some other area can be a model, as the Alcoholics Anonymous pattern formed the basis of the Homosexual Anonymous pattern. If you can say “Jesus rescued me” about anything in your life that is a very fundamental Christian witness, a basic building block. What can you say?

The future

If this pattern of activism in society or the church is allowed to continue, so that it becomes coercive, the result ultimately can be judgment on that society or church. We are not in that position yet but moving amazingly fast towards it. I would point you to two passages in Scripture – those in Genesis about Sodom and those in Judges about Gibeah in Benjamin. In both, same sex activity had progressed to the point where it was coercive, justifying and enforcing homosexual gang-rape. In the latter case it manifested itself in the end as heterosexual (bisexual?) gang-rape. In both cases judgment resulted. Sodom is now an interesting heap of crystalline salt pillars. Benjamin was nearly wiped out as a tribe. There is a fearful biblical pattern here. Why should God be so concerned? Because all sorts of evils accompany same-sex activity, or are dragged in along with it, and because it is so profoundly the wrong pattern of the realities in the heavens, (the marriage of God's Son) which is what heterosexual activity is supposed to mirror.

We are beginning to see this coercive pattern in some countries. You will be aware of the notorious Victorian hate-law problems, which are inevitable in spite of assurances of politicians to the contrary. You will be aware of the legal ruling in Canada that at least parts of the Bible talking about homosexuality are technically “hate literature” and the conviction of the ex-gay in Canada in May, who distributed a virulently anti-homosexual tract giving the facts from his own experience. They fined him \$17,500 Canadian, which latest information said he refused to pay, preferring prison. You will be aware of the Pastor in Sweden on trial for a sermon against homosexuality. He won his case, but the government is appealing it. This is oppression. It leads to silencing of Christians. We are not yet in this position in most places, but with present trends it could be only five years. One ray of hope is that it is often at this stage that God will not accept it and intervenes.

I believe this is much more of a defining issue for our generation than most of us are aware of. It is not the only activity which can bring judgment, but it is an important one.

But perhaps there are three responses – those who join another church, those who join the great crowd of those who are actively Christian but not aligning with any institution, and those who like Jeremiah elect to stay (or against their will have that calling) and see it out to the bitter end, and I cannot hide that the latter may be apparently bitter, but carries an everlasting renown.

Within the extremely liberal Methodist church in New Zealand I remember advising an old man horrified at the open ordination of homosexuals (now official policy) who wanted to protest in an open church meeting discussing it. I believe he was given a fair hearing, and treated as a curious antique not even worth collecting or destroying as a menace, but simply to be ignored because of his age. That could be the fate of many who remain in the Uniting Church.

But a church which models personal change – that can do amazing things, even if it does not know what it is doing. Uniting Church people – testimony of change *must* be a regular part of your church life. If it can't be, doesn't that show you have castrated Jesus? Not allowed him to change you enough to talk about?

Back about 40 years ago, in the days when causes of same-sex attraction were not so well known, by some series of accidents, a Pentecostal church in the US attracted a significant group of gay men, who began to attend. The church was obviously and overtly traditional in its views and did not espouse gay theology. It had no idea how to counsel such people. It had a strong emphasis on prayer, personal testimony of change, discipling and small groups and simply treated the gay group the same as everyone else. Over some years lots of changes were seen, same-sex attraction diminishing in many to the point where a significant fraction of the group got married (and these days I have to specify *heterosexually*). This shows that good enough interactions amongst church members can have huge effects if done the right way.

Two recent surveys, one in the US and one here in Australia by Peter Lane of Exodus in Brisbane, found that the most effective help was actually mentoring. Briar will speak more about that. But therapy, support groups, general church life can be quite effective.

At one reunion of a Christian group among students at a New Zealand university, Briar mentioned briefly as part of the public proceedings that she had written a book saying change from homosexuality was possible. She was approached by one student who had become a clergyman who said "Are you aware that there are quite a few people here who were offended by what you said?" He meant that those who had got into the gay lifestyle now didn't like to hear that alternatives were possible, therefore she should not say so. I think this is another example of the type of pressure which will come on Christians as a result of gay activism. "Don't say change is possible. You offend us. This is therefore hate speech and not allowed." By accepting these comments we are giving veto rights to anyone who claims to be offended.

Probably those the clergyman referred to were those who had tried extremely hard to change and could not. But he was saying that essentially they had veto rights on a good news which could benefit many. A cancer patient on whom therapy has failed denying other patients the right even to listen to advice about the possibility of therapy. This will increasingly happen. Those from within our own ranks will increasingly prohibit the message of freedom. But this is against our essential foundation – Jesus is the one who saves. This is the essence of the offense of the Gospel. I must continue to say it.

Do you remember the example of Poland? More than 100 years ago, politically all MP's had veto rights. If one said "I object" the entire years legislation of their parliament was wiped and they had to start again. You can't run a country that way.

I want to challenge you all on a personal level. During the Homosexual Law Reform Bill in NZ in the late '80s, the most articulate spokespeople for traditional Christian views were two members of the Reformed church. They had excellent arguments including the

classic statement “We do not admit that any government has the right to tell the Christian Church how to worship”. However it came to light later that one was having an affair with his secretary and the other was also immorally involved in some way. Recently the Spokesman for the Christian Heritage party in NZ was convicted of child sexual abuse and more charges are being evaluated. So often I have found those taking a strong moral stance are themselves hiding problems. Are you? You *must* get help on this. Go to older people in the faith whom you trust.

What do we say to those who are so long in SSA that change seems impossible? If you will excuse the pun, it is like the woman bent double whom Jesus healed – although like that for 18 years, she became straight. Never give up, that is despair, ultimate lack of trust. If you are following Jesus you are called to radically do what he says even if you struggle your whole life. I think many of us do in various ways.

“I have tried all my life to change, and can’t”, says someone with SSA.

“I understand, I am still struggling with some things in my life. But also, it is partly my fault you are the way you are. I don’t know enough answers yet to help you radically the way you would like. If you commit yourself to continue to fight all your life, I’ll commit myself all my life to continue to search for ways to fight with you.” This is the true love, this is eternal life.

Activists act because (1) there is a worldwide –transcultural river flowing that way (2) They have tried to change and can’t. (3) they have been deceived by the stories of those who have tried and failed.

So what are you up against – a worldwide current, one of the strongest in history. Have you the strength to stand? Have you the testimony to Jesus? Have you the courage to boycott? Have you the commitment to stand with those who are struggling? Have you the courage to be more open about these things? Who are the real heroes, deserving to lead us? Those who have stood against even natural inclinations, with great pain and sacrifice, or those who have given way to them for many years until the behaviour is thoroughly engrained?

Is Jesus the foundation or is comfort?

Perhaps the following word from Jeremiah 15 is for you in the Affirming Alliance.

O Lord, You know;
Remember me and visit me,
And take vengeance for me on my persecutors
In Your enduring patience, do not take me away
Know that for Your sake I have suffered rebuke
Your words were found and I ate them,
And Your word was to me the joy and rejoicing of my heart:
For I am called by Your name, O Lord God of hosts.
I did not sit in the assembly of the mockers
Nor did I rejoice:
I sat alone because of Your hand,
For you have filled me with indignation.
Why is my pain perpetual
And my wound incurable,
Which refuses to be healed?
Will You surely be to me like an unreliable stream
As waters that fail?
Therefore thus says the Lord:
“If you return
Then I will bring you back;
You shall stand before Me;
If you take out the precious from the vile,
You shall be as My mouth.
Let them return to you,
But you must not return to them.
And I will make you to this people a fortified bronze wall;
And they shall fight against you
But they shall not prevail against you;
For I am with you to save you
And deliver you” says the Lord.
“I will deliver you from the hand of the wicked,
And I will redeem you from the grip of the terrible.”