

Gay Marriage: the Logical, Inevitable Result of the Denial of God

So, the chief argument for enshrining gay marriage into law is “equal rights” without “discrimination” for any “class” of citizens.

Is that so?

Proposing the right to gay marriage does logically stem from the proposition that the practice of homosexuality itself is a recognizable and protectable human right.

So we have to ask, is that so? Is the practice of homosexuality a human / civil right? And while we're at it, just what is a “right”?

Let's see, we have laws against nudity. But why? Don't nudists have “rights” too? If anybody has a case for equal rights, shouldn't it be nudists? I mean of all people, nudists were certainly “born a certain way and couldn't help it!” On what basis does society have authority now to “discriminate” against this “class” of citizens and deny them equal rights by forcing them to wear clothes? Please tell me.

And really then, what was so bad about the Janet Jackson exposure at the Super Bowl? I mean, why didn't she and Jason just take it all off? What a showstopper it could have been! In fact, while they were at it, why didn't they just “go all the way” up there on stage? (Hardly could any show have a greater climax.)

C'mon. Logically, don't Jason and Janet have the “right” to do this? Shouldn't they? They are consenting adults. On what basis does society have the authority to discriminate against *any* kind of sexual behavior, private *or* public, between two consenting adults? Please tell me.

Let's see, what else? We have laws against polygamy and incest. But why? Don't polygamists have rights? Surely if gay marriage is a right, so is polygamy. So is consensual incest between parents and adult children. Where does society get off illegalizing consensual incest and denying it as a basic human right?

And should we just be talking about adult children? What about “minors?” What rational basis exists to deny minors the right to practice any kind of sexual behavior, public or private, as long as all parties consent? If they're old enough to procreate, don't 12 and 13 year olds have the right to marry as much as gays and polygamists? On what authority can society discriminate against an age group by pontifically legislating a “legal age” and relegating all who fall under it to “second class citizens”? Please tell me.

In short, don't any two or more consenting people have the right to practice any kind of behavior, sexual or otherwise, public or private—without regard to race, origin, creed, gender, or age—and to form a permanent legally-recognized union around that practice should they choose to? What public body has a moral authority to discriminate against

such people and is not rather obligated to enshrine all such practice into public law as a basic human right? Please tell me!

If the above litany sounds even partially absurd to anyone who also advocates the right to gay marriage, please explain to me the logical basis for claiming that this right supersedes a claim to any of these other rights.

Doesn't the question really come down to: What is a human "right?" Where does it come from? Does it come from anywhere? Do rights have any transcendent objective basis for recognition? Or are rights simply society's award to any group that can clamor loud enough to pressure society to recognize them? Are rights then really derived from nothing more than societal consensus?

If human rights have no transcendent source but merely devolve from societal consensus ("vote"), then they are intrinsically unequal because they can only be awarded to those vocal and strong enough to assert them (Look how tough it is for the unborn.) They are nothing more than corporate stamps of approval on a group's self-determined purpose, no matter what the purpose. If this is so, then all claims to human rights are really imaginary. There really is no such thing as a transcendent right to anything. A right is little more than a veiled demand with a threat of extortion ("give us what we want or else....")

The truth however is that natural human rights (and in turn the civil rights derived from them) are by definition issues of inherency in transcendent value, ie, values that transcend human origin and authorship. Rights are essentially spiritual and admit of the existence of a Creative Lifegiving Power who alone has the power to bestow them.

Look hard and long. I'd wager you won't find a society anywhere on earth, past or present, rooted in transcendent value that would consider gay marriage a right.

If we take only a small purview of the last American generation with its sexual revolution, we'll see that the emergence of sexual "freedom," abortion, and the gay agenda have paralleled what can only be described as a mass campaign to erase the consciousness of a transcendent, life-giving Creator (God) from the public mind. Is this parallel merely coincidental? You decide. The atmosphere of the public schools—where public acknowledgement of God first became prohibited—makes a good case that it is not.

Why do humans the world over have the overwhelming consciousness that nakedness is a shame? Why do children naturally giggle at what they believe to be "dirty" jokes? And why is the concept of human morality in every society so tied to sexual mores? Evolution cannot account for this, as animals have no such concern. The evidence is clear that the concept of human morality is inextricably tied to an awareness of accountability to a Divine Creator. So therefore is the concept of human "rights" which is itself tied to that weighty sense of transcendent morality.

Abraham Lincoln said, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.” The key word is created. In asserting the concept of human rights, Lincoln related them to the concept of a Creator. This agrees with the American founders. All concept of natural rights was tied to a transcendent awareness of God and accountability to Him. Declaration of natural and constitutional rights did not exist in a moral vacuum.

But today, “rights” are asserted in targeted opposition to any such awareness. The word “rights” has been pirated under color of its original context in Divine awareness to contend for nothing more than corporate self-will against the public consciousness of God and the sexual mores naturally tied to it.

If rights are finally derived from a sense of morality rooted in inner human awareness of God, it also means that so-called “rights” asserted through the denial of God and the mores of human conscience implanted by the Creator are no rights at all. They are mere animalistic assertions of corporate self-will.

This provides the true explanation behind the emergence of the gay movement and it’s pressing now for the right of gay marriage. The gay mindset—together with the wholesale American abandonment of sexual mores—is simply the inevitable result of a corporate mind that has verbalized refusal to be bound any longer to any sense of moral accountability to a transcendent moral standard resident in a Divine Creator. And for whatever reason, it is the American court system that has served as the touchpoint for the expression of this.

So it is, the legislators which have determined to ban the worship of God from the public square are the same legislators which for three decades have had to pass law after law after law to harness what is now innately ungoverned human behavior, even to the point of having to legislate something so ridiculously fundamental to the human consciousness as the meaning of marriage! I mean, how far does this have to go? (When will we finally hear from all the nudists?)

You may not like the Bible. That’s too bad, because the Bible really does explain it best:

“Because they did not want to retain the knowledge of God, God gave them over to reprobate minds, to do those things which are unbecoming, even their men departing the natural use of women for one another.”

All of western society is really in the dock right now. To be consistent, if society is going to enshrine a “right” to gay marriage, it must enshrine the right to any group to practice any behavior—sexual or otherwise—that it wants as long as its members all consent.

But if enough remains of divine awareness in western society that this does not seem right, then there is only one other rational course. It’s for society to return to dedicated public acknowledgement of the existence of and human accountability to the Sovereign God, with the commitment to uphold His laws of nature already written into the human

heart, and from there seek Him for the most perfect revelation of Himself available to mankind (discussion for another time).

“Fear God and give Him glory. Worship Him who made the heavens and the earth. For the hour of His justice is come.”

Chris Anderson

First Undershepherd of Anglemar Fellowship AHS, ACS

New Meadow Neck, Rhode Island