

Don't let the Gay Marriage Campaign Fool You ...

Gay Marriage: the Reality

Perhaps the most difficult issue facing Christians, and society, today is same-sex-marriage, or homosexual or gay marriage. Though I have no personal experience of homosexuality, I have read extensively about the subject, and particularly from the non-mainstream media, or samizdat media. Several things emerge from this:

Firstly, a much different account of the whole subject is given once one gets away from government, MSM, or pro-gay-activist sources, leading to the inescapable view that the Establishment line – as it must surely be called – produces a very sanitized account of homosexuality, both in terms of sexual practices and “lifestyle”; this Establishment understanding is one which seems, also, to dominate thinking and policy among some of the leadership of certain areas of the Christian Church (in clear defiance of scripture and tradition).

Secondly, I think it is false to consider (as many assume, or as the Establishment view has it) that it's good and kind and helpful and considerate – “liberal” – thing to encourage or facilitate anyone doing what their immediate inclination tells them to do; would the gay-promoting politicians encourage their own children to put their hands into a fire? For a “fire” it is, as independent research (ie. independent of the Establishment, and its promotion) shows that such practises as anal intercourse, rimming and fisting, etc., cause serious physical damage, and can lead to disease, pain, and death. To encourage, or facilitate, such actions, is in no way kind, “enlightened”, tolerant or “liberal”.

Thirdly, much is heard of the obviously-impending homosexual “marriage”. Politicians of all persuasions and colours plan and urge the implementation of this soon – but none of them goes so far as to explain his exact understanding of homosexual marriage, or tell us precisely what they mean. Careful reading of non-MSM accounts strongly suggest an inescapable reality: that “homosexual marriage” is not at all the same as marriage as traditionally understood, as most people think of it, and as known in the Judeo-Christian definition, which produced principles and practices for the whole of Western civilisation, and beyond. But it is clear that homosexual marriage is to be *presented* to the people as a whole as something just like “normal” marriage, but merely involving same-sex couples; it seeks to gain general acceptance under the guise of something which it is not. The fundamental difference, it seems certain, is that gay culture, lifestyle, and practice, in almost all cases, requires the principle of sexual freedom, in which “loose association” replaces the idea, or ideal, of sexual fidelity or exclusivity; there may be commitment and fidelity, but they are ultimately not related to sexual practice, only to that which is personal and concerned with living arrangements; they may involve genuine love, but not – if many accounts are to be believed – sexual fidelity/exclusivity. Further, it is said that many gay activist leaders and organisations openly admit, or even advocate, all of this, and that even gay Christian organisations are in broad agreement.

Fourthly – because of the real nature of homosexual marriage – it seems to me that the campaign to legalise and establish it is not something being done on behalf of, or directly to affect, *gay* people (many of whom are, understandably, not interested in “marriage”, traditional or otherwise). Rather, its purpose lies beyond, and aims more at re-structuring the whole idea of marriage – heterosexual marriage, that is, not gay marriage – towards the normalising of “open” arrangements of free-association, such as, apparently, dominate the “gay scene”. The destruction of the traditional idea of marriage, it is suggested, is the real purpose of the pro-homosexual marriage campaign.

Fifthly, many people, on all sides of the issue, naively assume that the legalisation of gay marriage is in some sense the objective and end-point of the whole gay sex and marriage issue; they are clearly wrong. Gay marriage is the beginning of a process, not the end. Waiting in the wings – or, rather, rapidly approaching centre stage – are the promoters of polyamory, zoophilia, man-boy love and consensual family sexuality. Court cases or legislative proceedings, currently in progress in north America and Europe, concern the legalisation or legal recognition of *ménages* comprising several people of varying sexualities, and discussions and decisions on the permissibility of consensual sex within families. Meanwhile, pressure groups argue for the acceptability of marriage-like *ménages* involving humans and animals, and consensual sex between men and adolescent boys. The fact that these groups use the very arguments that were used by “gay liberationists” (as they really were, once) twenty or thirty years ago, seems to arouse little interest, but it makes certain that, as with gay liberation and that which followed it, these campaigns will succeed before long, *if* society in the West continues along the same path as it has long been on. Ironically, many in the gay-promoting movement, and organisations, very much oppose polyamory, since the existence of its lobby, and its use of the same arguments, serves to unmask their own position, and reveal it to be just as dubious as is very generally thought, concerning polys and zoos.

We may choose to discount people who claim the right to be married to several people or animals, but if, in 1950, you had claimed that before long the government and media would be actively promoting homosexual marriage, you would probably not have been thought of as particularly dangerous - but clearly very insane.

March 2011