

CHRISTIANITY

Pulling the Trigger

by David Mills

At the end of the Episcopal Church, U.S.A.'s General Convention last summer, an academic friend, not an Episcopalian, asked me, "What argument is advanced against blessing polyamorous unions by those Episcopalians who favor the blessing of same-sex sexual unions? Or do they pull the trigger and say that the blessing of same-sex unions is only the beginning?"

As almost everyone knows, the Episcopal Church having risen briefly to being newsworthy from her usual irrelevance, the Convention had, by a comfortable margin, confirmed the election of a man openly living with his boyfriend (what other word do you use?) to be the next Episcopal bishop of New Hampshire. Conservatives protested, appealed to Anglicans in more conservative countries, and promised to have a meeting in October.

Her two houses (the bishops and the deputies, which included four priests and four laymen from each diocese) had also voted by about the same margin to let individual parishes celebrate homosexual "marriages" if they wanted to do so. This was promoted by almost everyone as a compromise, and "moderates" (timid liberals) rushed to say that it did not give official approval to the "marriages" but only recognized the differences of opinion within the Church and allowed people to talk about them.

Bishop John Lipscomb of Southwest Florida, for example, pledged to "do everything possible to help my diocese turn to godly conversation about what will continue to be a difficult issue." Bishop Henry Parsley of Alabama declared that:

Our liturgy expresses what we believe. So we need to be particularly clear theologically before we move forward liturgically. This amendment helps us be a church together as we seek theological consensus more solid and sound than we have found.

You have, in these bishops' words, the reason the moral innovators in the Episcopal Church will not "pull the trigger" and admit that approving homosexual "marriages" is but the first step in expanding the range of sexual practices they will eventually approve—or "celebrate," in Episcopal jargon.

I wrote my friend to say that this is a trigger the homosexuals will not yet pull, because, though they hold so much political power in the Episcopal Church, getting the votes they need for such measures as homosexual "marriages" depends on keeping the "moderates" from seeing what is going on—or, more accurately, keeping the more conservative "moderates" from seeing what is going on and letting the more liberal "moderates" pretend that they don't see what is going on.

Both sort of moderate insists upon the myth of the homosexual couple who are in every respect, except for sexual difference, just like the ideal heterosexual couple. They believe in monogamy (of a sort, about which more later). They simply want Adam and Steve to join Adam and Eve at the altar, in the pews, and in the Sunday-school parents' meetings.

The leading sodomitical propagandists still speak as if monogamy were their present practice and future goal, which only needs to be given official sanction as a matter of justice and inclusivity and as the natural fruit of our evolving understanding of "the freedom we have in Christ." (They are very big on invoking the Lord.) Hearing them speak of their unions, you could imagine that you were listening to someone describe the world of Mayberry, North Carolina, or the Walton Family, or a picture from the Norman Rockwell collection.

They do not hide the problems, but they find in them more evidence that the Church should do as they demand. If some of their peers are promiscuous, and promote promiscuity, they claim that these men and women sleep around because they do not have the social supports heterosexual people have and because heterosexual people hate them and teach them to hate themselves. "Homophobia" drives the homosexual from bed to bed. Letting him marry in the Church would be a pastoral act, an act of kindness as well as justice.

And so, in public, the homosexuals

plead only for the Church's approval of homosexual marriages. One might be inclined to assume that they are sincere in this (though I, who reported on the Episcopal Church for 15 years, do not), but they give the game away in the way they speak of themselves.

Roughly 20 years ago, they began to speak of the "lesgay" movement, which, between five and ten years ago, became the "lesbigay" movement. Shortly after that, it became the "lesbigaytrans" or "lbg" movement when they added the "transgendered." The "transgendered" are those who, for whatever reasons, feel more comfortable living as if they were the opposite sex, even if they don't want to have themselves surgically remade.

The change from "lesgay" to "lesbigay" meant something more than merely adding another oppressed group to the movement. The homosexuals assume that you must obey your sexual desires if you are to be true to your "nature," or "the way God made me." That is the reason they identify themselves by their sexual tastes.

Thus, in calling their movement the "lesbigay" movement, they have added to the list of things they want approved a sexuality that does not follow the rules they currently approve in public. As bisexuals by definition cannot be monogamous if they are to be true to their nature, the propagandists have approved promiscuity without exactly admitting it. The bisexual being true to his nature has to sleep with at least two people, one man and one woman, without settling on one or the other.

The "moderates" ignore this evidence that their homosexualist allies intend more than lifelong unions. I think they ignore it for two reasons, as I suggested already: First, some of them are genuinely dim and really do think a reasonable line can be drawn at homosexual marriage; and, second, many of them are much more liberal in these matters than they want to be seen as being in public.

And they have a logical problem as well as a political problem. Both must know (at some level) that, if they object to bisexuality, they will have to object to homosexuality, as all the reasons for approving the second justify the first as well. We have the same reasons for thinking sex ought to be restricted to a partner of

the opposite sex that we have for thinking that it ought to be restricted to one partner.

My own view is that many homosexuals really do want monogamy, of a sort.—the serial monogamy now standard among even conservative congregations, where remarriage after divorce is not thought in any way a problem—even when a man leaves his wife and children for a much younger, shapelier woman. All they want is a series with more entries or episodes packed into a much shorter amount of time. They have the same idea of sex and commitment as do many conservatives, only they have changed the time-span and the limit.

On top of which, the homosexuals are only asking the Episcopal Church to do with Scripture and Tradition and the rest of the Anglican Communion what it did in 1976 in approving the ordination of women—which 85 percent of the conservatives approve wholeheartedly. They (the moral innovators) are genuinely surprised that the conservatives continue to condemn one and cheer the other. They are, after all, the theological products of the Church the conservatives helped to create, sustain, and nurture.

David Mills is the editor of Touchstone (www.touchstonemag.com).

THE MEDIA

Pink Elephants on Parade

by Marian Kester Coombs

More than ever before, homosexual characters and situations are being featured on television. Needless to say, the lay of TV Land is overwhelmingly favorable: cheery, cuddly, cute, and camp.

The first of such programming originated in the formerly Great Britain, either imported directly (*East Enders*, *Absolutely Fabulous*) or adapted to the American small screen (*All in the Family*). This, the French would note, is only to be expected.

Interestingly, a six-week series called *Metrosexuality* ran in the United Kingdom back in 2001, a good two years before Howard Dean stumbled across the term during his campaign for the Demo-

cratic presidential nomination.

Between 1961 and 1970, there existed exactly one American homosexual television character. Between 1971 and 1980, 58 materialized. Between 1981 and 1990, there were 89. Between 1991 and 2000, 306. Since 2000, the rate of unnatural increase has only accelerated.

Does this mean that there are 300 times more “gays” in our society than there were 40 years ago?

The answer to this question depends on one’s theory of homosexuality. In my view, becoming homosexual is primarily a function of flawed embryogenesis: Stress on the mother interrupts the vital action of testosterone upon the male fetus, leaving his brain insufficiently male. This theory explains why there are so many fewer “gay” women than men, why so many lesbians are discretionary or situational (*à la* Anne Heche), and why the homosexual orientation (inversion) is so deeply, intractably rooted in a person’s very being.

By the light of this theory, there are now probably no more—and very likely fewer—homosexuals *per capita* than heretofore, if only because so many of the neurotic women who would have unsexed their male infants in the womb now have abortions instead of children.

Homosexuals, like the poor, have always been with us, a fact of life neither to be celebrated nor hidden, but, in the past, they “passed,” like Cole Porter or like Tennessee Williams, who spun heroines out of his own psyche and its cravings.

The present abundance of homosexual material in the media results, in large part, from the quest to titillate, of course. The problem is that homosexuality, unlike other *outré* sexual situations, is a turn-off to the vast majority of viewers. So, while it may function briefly as a lure, forbidden fruit, to generate buzz for a show, in the long and even the short run, it does not deliver an audience like such truly prurient fare as *The O.C.* and *The Sopranos*.

An even greater part of the reason for the increased visibility of homosexuals in the media is politics, propaganda, and p.r.

In November 1987, the homosexual magazine *Guide* published an article by Marshall Kirk and Erastes Pill called “The Overhauling of Straight America.” A sort of *Protocol of the Elders of Queer* or *Mein Camp(f)*, this document preaches the creation of a cult of “gay” victimization and then

the desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights. To desensitize the public is to help it view homosexuality with indifference instead of with keen emotion. Ideally, we would have straights register differences in sexual preference the way they register different tastes for ice cream or sports games: she likes strawberry and I like vanilla; he follows baseball and I follow football. No big deal. . . .

In no time, a skillful and clever media campaign could have the gay community looking like the veritable fairy godmother to Western Civilization.

A charm offensive very much like that proposed by Kirk and Pill has, in fact, been conducted *via* TV (and movies to a lesser extent). Virtually the only negative portrayal of homosexual behavior has been on *Oz*, an HBO prison drama that depicts homosexual predators behind bars. The majority are straight out of the civil-rights movement’s victimological playbook.

One of the first sympathetic portrayals was in 1994, on *General Hospital*, where an actor playing a homosexual activist melodramatically perished of AIDS, both on screen and off. Such soaps as *All My Children* have provided bathetic story lines for homosexual characters since the 1980’s.

The long-running British soap opera *East Enders* (1985-present) is famed for introducing characters drawn from the margins of London life, such as Pakis and West Indians outspoken in their lack of gratitude for the blessings of the British social order. So the show’s pioneering use of multiple homosexual characters, male and female, is all in the game.

Armistead Maupin’s insipid *Tales of the City*, originally a San Francisco newspaper series, inspired a British-financed dramatization in 1993 that did not spread to the United States until later. In the course of three endless sets of tales, it provided employment for quite a few happy campers, including Lance Loud (the homosexual son of the family that pioneered reality TV) and Sir Ian McKellen.

The Clinton years were a bonanza for “gay” characterizations. *Northern Exposure* not only situated itself in an Alaskan town founded by two lesbians but, in 1994, staged one of TV’s first “gay weddings.”

Beverly Hills 90210 had several ho-