Dear parishioners,

In a newspaper of recent edition, Archbishop Vigernon, bishop of Detroit, was fiercely criticized for requesting that advocates of gay marriage abstain from Holy Communion.

The archbishop’s request was decried as un-Christlike, insensitive, discriminatory, biased, heartless, hateful, hurtful, etc. Sadly, the most vehement criticism came from his very own flock of fellow Catholics.

The archbishop has now been labeled for life as homophobic. Unless he backtrack, reverse his decision and accept every sort of sexual orientation as normal and worthy of respect...and Holy Communion, he will always be open to attack and recrimination. That is the price of going against the political correctness.

It is astounding that a Catholic priest and bishop be required to explain to his flock why certain varieties of sexual behavior are unacceptable. It is more astounding still that the Catholic Church has to defend its teachings on these questions. Scripture and Tradition are, after all, pretty clear on the subject. Homosexuality has always been condemned as a very grievous sin, one that cries out to heaven for vengeance.

God does not change, nor do His teachings. Christ yesterday, today and forever, says St. Paul.

Yet, as this incident with the archbishop shows, today some Catholics advocate rights for homosexuals, in particular in regard to marriage and child adoption. We may ask, how do they manage to justify their opinions with the catechism they are supposed to profess?

The answer is manifold. Some advocates say they are catholic but have never set foot inside a church in many a day, still less inside a confessional. These used to be Catholics, but they are no longer. Other advocates are "à la carte" Catholics. They pick and choose those Gospel truths they feel comfortable with, such as "Love thy neighbor", and jettison the rest, such as "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife".

Others are simply ignorant of Catholic doctrine, reducing the Creed to a single commandment: Be nice to everybody, criticize no one.

Finally, there are those who have been unwittingly brainwashed by a new ideology into thinking that homosexual activity is natural and wholesome, an authentic form of love and therefore blessed by God. This new ideology is the Gender Theory, of which I will speak further on. It is a theory that explains the world in such a way as to justify of any sort of "life choice".

The Gender Theory and its consequences are suddenly rampant. It is taught in schools and advocated by trendy intellectuals. Three years ago I had barely heard of it. Now it is rampant. And it provides the intellectual framework behind the sudden lobbying for homosexual marriage and adoption worldwide.

I wish therefore to provide insight into these issues. In the work place or on campus we are caught up in discussions that are difficult to argue. This is the 21st century in the making. We have to know what is going on and what this Brave New World is about.

Fr John Brucciani, pastor
Gender Theory

The world has been standing on its head for quite a few years now. Several centuries after the emancipation of the Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation and the French Revolution, writers, politicians, free thinkers, philanthropists and business magnates have been more or less trying to make the world a "better place".

By books, insurrection and bloodshed, the old world has been freed from the shackles of a Christian and Catholic universe and ushered into a new era, one where man becomes the center of the world. Before we had the Ten Commandments. Now we have the Rights of Man.

Today, many wars and many genocides later, with (wage) slavery back in and rights to private property reserved only to those who can afford it, we are approaching a point of no return.

Mankind redefined itself with regards to its Maker. God and our duties to Him are no longer a necessity but a matter of personal choice. (If only our world leaders would allow us the same sort of choices in their regard!) Today mankind is redefining itself ... period!

Astounding though it may seem, ideas that were once thought simply ridiculous are becoming more and more main stream, in the media that is. And since the media and movie industry define politics, politicians worldwide are hurrying to follow suit.

In the old days it was quite easy to distinguish between a man and a woman. You only had to look. Restrooms were easier to navigate between. Today, it has become not only unfashionable but actually offensive to call a woman a woman, and a man a man. That is old school obscursantism, a vestige of that damning Judeo-Christian vision of the universe which dared defame and attribute specific roles to each sex.

We have since learned better. Man and woman are neutral categories call "genders". They are modes of being that either sex may choose. As the gender theorist Simone de Beavoir said: "One is not born a woman, one becomes a woman."

Manhood and womanhood are thus independent of any biological make-up. Differences of anatomy are accidental since we are fundamentally the same. Our right and our destiny is to be able to chose what we wish to be.

Sexual difference, as the common man understands it, is seen by gender theorists to be merely a social and cultural fabrication inspired by the Judeo-Christian understanding of the universe. It is something artificial and man made. And what had been made, can be unmade, and made again, differently.

Thus, gender theorists do not define the individual by his or her sex (man or woman) but by his or her sexuality (homo-, hetero-, bi-). They efface the biological and anatomical dimension that separates the two sexes in order to see only multiple genders, dictated by culture and by history. Disparity between sexes is man made. In truth (say they) there is perfect equality between man and woman, for they are but two varieties of gender.

And here we have a New World, where the woman in particular is finally freed and liberated from a male dominated environment. The gender theory revolutionizes our understanding of man and woman. Sexual identity is not about the anatomical characteristics of individuals but about personal choices individuals make. The implications are frightening to behold.

With only gender differentiation to go by, sexual partnership takes on a new definition. Before, sexual activity was understood as "normal" when between a man and a woman, and "abnormal" when otherwise. Today, heterosexuality is but one of several choices open to mankind. Man and woman have no nature-determined forms of behavior. It is all a matter of choice. And today we must all respect that choice, by force of law.

Thus, sexual identity ("I am a man, I am a woman") is replaced by sexual orientation ("I prefer men, I prefer women"). Sex (man, woman) is out. Sexual behavior (hetero, homo) is in. One can now be physically masculine, but psychologically feminine, and vice versa. It follows that any sexual desires are legitimate and normal, independently of one’s biological make-up.

In today’s New World, we must strive to rid individuals from the Judeo-Christian "straitjacket-ideals" of manhood and womanhood in order to lead them to be true to themselves, to live according to what they are in reality: neutral genders that can swing any way they wish, and act accordingly. And since it is a "free society," everybody’s choices must be respected and protected by law, just as the old Judeo-Christian ideal and understanding used to be.

With all this in mind, we can now understand how our 21st century idealists can rewrite nature, in particular with regards to marriage and child adoption. Marriage provides the legal framework which protects and fosters the union of a man and a woman. With man and woman sexually redefined, a man can call himself a woman, and a woman a man, and thus be married as of old but this time to someone of identical biological makeup.

Continued on page 3
Gay right to marriage?

Homosexual marriage has only recently become a social issue. Unheard under previous legislatures, in the West it has suddenly become a matter of urgency, not only for the benefit of the "homosexual community" which has suffered discrimination for too long, but also for the benefit of "the people" who want equal rights for all. We are told that, thanks to "social evolution" and "relational maturity," homosexuals should be able to enter into unions (namely marriage) that are fully recognized and protected by state law. This in turn will allow them to adopt or produce children.

It is essential to understand that the artificially generated and ideologically motivated debate on homosexual marriage does not really have anything to do with the rights of homosexuals. It is not about honoring or respecting them. It is about redefining the institution of marriage that we have received from the Creator, and which the Creator destined to be the basic social unit into which children are born: "Male and female he created them, blessing them and saying: increase and multiply and fill the earth." (Genesis 1)

A proper understanding of marriage will help us understand why homosexuals are unable to claim rights equal to those who enter into heterosexual unions.

Marriage as nature intends

According to the vast majority of mankind, marriage is the institution that embodies and regulates the union between man and woman who come together to establish a family. When a man and woman love each other, they wish to commit to each other and to consummate their love in the foundation of a family. Children are thus born into an primary institution, the family, that serves as the basic unit of a greater institution called society. Through the carnal link with father and mother, the child becomes a member of society, and is able to identify himself with generations past, present and future. The child is thus able to construct his own identity. Family provides him with a biological root that is the foundation stone of what he will become. So understood, marriage is a fundamental act in the construction and the stability of individuals as well as of society. It can therefore only exist between couples made of man and woman.

Homosexuals incapable of marriage as nature intends.

Homosexual unions are something very different to heterosexual unions. They are incapable of achieving any form of love consummation and cannot serve to found a family that provides a child with a carnal link to a father and a mother and through these, to generations past, present and future. A child born into a homosexual union through third party services is a handicapped child. He has no proper biological relation to the society in which he is born because he only has one biological parent. Thus homosexual unions are of no service to society in general and to children in particular. They have no role to play in the structuring, development and perpetuation of society. Homosexual unions cannot therefore claim equal status to heterosexual unions. They are fundamentally different.

The real reasons why gays want marriage.

Why do homosexuals demand marriage rights? Can they not simply live together?

Gay activists demand the right to marry in order to be able to have or adopt children. We are here at the heart of the lesbian-gay rights campaign. It is not about them. It is about the children who will be placed in their care. More fundamentally, it is about a change in society where marriage and family take on new meanings.

For the first time in world history, the notion of the child will be separated from that of the father and mother. Children will henceforth be referenced as having two fathers or two mothers. Laboratory science and surrogate mothers will provide homosexuals with the means of making children for themselves. Farmers breed cattle and we will breed fatherless and motherless embryos in like manner.

Welcome to Brave New World.
Gay right to adoption?

Homosexual couples do not need marriage to be able to live together. They do need it to pass off as "family" and in order to adopt, acquire or fabricate children. Whilst society may tolerate the private sexual preferences of some of its citizens, it should not allow children to fall into their care. Children are not commodities. They are human beings who develop and mature only in a very specific kind of environment, one where there is a mother and a father. To deny one or both of these to a child is to cause him irreparable harm. And not only to the child, but also to society in general.

It is therefore obvious that that homosexual couples cannot provide proper "parenting" (to use modern jargon). Hence Mother Nature built us in such a way as to make homosexual procreation impossible. Rather than explain the obvious, let us look at a few of the arguments gay lobbies put forward in favor of gay rights to adoption. These arguments and their replies are inspired from the essay: Homosexuality, Marriage, Parenting and Adoption, by Gilles Bernheim.

Homosexuals are victims of discrimination. Just like heterosexuals, they must have the right to have children.

The right to a child does not exist. The desire to have a child in no way establishes the right to have a child, neither for heterosexuals nor for homosexuals.

There is no question of denying the suffering experienced by infertile couples, whether heterosexual or homosexual. But to seek to remedy that suffering at the expense of a laboratory-bred child or an adopted child, is unacceptable, since it implies using what is weak and innocent for one's own benefit and satisfaction.

The child is not an object of rights but a subject of rights. To speak of a "right to a child" instrumentalizes and objectifies the child. Since children have a natural right to one father and one mother, it follows that homosexuals have no right to children since their very union violate children's rights which include giving the child a family in which he will have the best chance of a good life: a family with a mummy and a daddy.

What is most important is love. A homosexual couple can give much love to a child, sometimes even more than a heterosexual couple. It is therefore unjust to deny them the right to marriage and to children.

To love a child is one thing, to love a child with a love that provides it with structure and fulfillment is another.

Love alone does not provide a child with all it needs to grow into happy, healthy and responsible adulthood. A child is psychologically structured in such a way that he needs more than love. He needs, in particular, to know where he comes from, who are his parents.

A child establishes his identity (source of self esteem and social adeptness) only by means of differentiation. Now, in order to know who he is and where he is, he needs to know where he is from. We see this with adopted children, who most often feel the need of finding out their origins. Who was my father, my mother? What brought them together? If I am to know who I am, I must know who they were.

In philosophical language, father and mother represent a genealogy for the child. The child needs a clear and coherent genealogy in order to find his place as an individual in a society of which he is a member and in which he must play a role someday. Thus Moses, when he learned that he was not Egyptian but Jew, could no longer accept his privileged status as adopted son of Pharaoh. Eventually he reconciled with his people and became the man we know. In modern language, Moses found his "true self."

It is not love alone that structures a child. Carnal filiation and the ability to relate to one's own genealogy provide the child with temporal and spatial reference points absolutely necessary to the full development of his personality.

Homosexuals, for all their love, are unable to provide children with genealogy and ancestry. A child bred in a laboratory and matured in rented "womb accommodation" is born into the world without any genealogical reference to place or person. He therefore has nothing to build up his personality and identity. Coming from nowhere, made by a no one dressed in a lab coat, the child has no root in humanity. He is an existential freak.

It is important, therefore, to understand that homosexual marriage cannot provide a normal and wholesome family environment to a child. The Beatles may have sung that "All you need is love..." but the
Beatles were wrong. Along with love, a child needs filiation, genealogy and ancestry which allow him to relate to a world of which he is part and in which he must carve a life for himself.

**Thousands of children are waiting for adoption.**

*It would be better for them to be adopted by a homosexual couple than to remain in an orphanage.*

A child would not be better off with a homosexual couple rather than in an orphanage. On the contrary. Due to his previous abandonment, the adopted child needs a father and a mother more than other children. An adopted family provides the child with the best biological alternative to his lost family, and it allows him to identify himself with regard to a new genealogy and ancestry, which is so important for the development of his personality and identity.

Homosexual adoption aggravates the child’s sense of abandonment. Not only has he been denied his biological father and mother, but he would also be denied an adopted mother or father.

Adopted children are fragile creatures. Those adopted by homosexual couples would feel doubly excluded from normal society. To be an adopted child is to feel different and sidelined, hence the difficulties in raising adopted children. To be an adopted child with two mothers or two fathers is to feel all the more different and sidelined, making normality and happiness inaccessible.

We should remember that no one has a right to a child, but children have a right to a family, complete with one father and one mother. Homosexual couples cannot provide this basic requirement.

**The meaning of parenting is evolving, particularly thanks to medically assisted procreation. The law must take account of such developments.**

Law that is no longer based on nature and common sense can evolve without limit, thus allowing for a veritable Pandora’s box. As an illustration of how far homosexual lobbies are prepared to go in order to be able to have or adopt children, lesbian and feminist associations have come up with different forms of homosexual parenting technics, that will be protected by law. They include partner swaps between lesbian and gay couples for insemination purposes with the sharing out of the resulting product 9 months later. Children engendered will either be taken in by one of the couples or shared and raised by both, in a two mothers, two fathers arrangement.

It is also suggested that lesbians should exchange eggs prior to insemination in order to make child production more of a joint venture. Each partner would carry the other’s child.

It is evident that in such circumstances a child will never be able to develop normally. He would have no one and nothing to identify with and distinguish himself from. He would become a psychological wreck.

To grant the right to parenting for homosexual couples opens up all sorts of child production possibilities. These would eventually serve to satiate the demands, in the name of equal rights, of incestuous couples and, given time, of pedophiles as well.

**Conclusion**

Equal rights for gay couples is not about ending discrimination against a tiny minority of individuals. It is not about helping society to evolve into social adulthood. It is not about offering abandoned children more homes. It is not about recognizing the normality or nobility of homosexual love.

**Equal rights for gay couples is about redefining nature.** It is about redefining sexual identity, marriage, society and family. It strikes at the very core of our human species. It results in the objectification of children and the denial of their fundamental need/right to a father and a mother.

The arguments against gay rights to marriage and child adoption are obvious enough. Why then, when so few support gay rights, have they become a social issue of global status similar to apartheid?

Political connivance, media support, tax funded lobby groups, political correctness: all these concur to create the impression that society has evolved and that this is what people want. Whether the people be for or against gay marriage and adoption, it is clear that they are misinformed. Politicians are handling a social time bomb with incredible alacrity. They are thus hurrying in the police state that will be necessary to maintain order in a disordered and disorientated society.

Just like in Brave New World.
Homophobia

Do opponents of homosexuality hate homosexuals?

There is such confusion on this politically-charged question of sexual choice. Lobbies thunder charges of cruelty and hatred against all those who think that unions between man and woman are normal and anything else abnormal. Liberal Catholic pressure groups say that they deplore what they call a basic lack of charity and understanding. The world brands us as homophobic.

Yet, homosexuals and homosexuality are two different things. We should not group them into a single category.

Saint Augustin of Hippo used to say: "Love the sinner, hate the sin." In the same way we can say: "Love the homosexual, hate homosexuality."

Against the charge of homophobia we reply that we are not against homosexuals as persons. God loves them and so do we. God died for them, as so must we, if called upon.

We are, however, against homosexuality. All the best and noblest intentions in the world cannot change it into anything other than what it is: a grave moral depravation. "Thou shalt not have commerce with a man as if it had been with a woman; such commerce is abominable." (Lev. 18.22)

Like it or not, homosexuality is wrong. Sincerity, so-called "biological leanings" and private choice make no difference. The thing remains a grave moral depravation.

As any therapist will tell, homosexuals themselves labour and suffer because of their condition. Homosexuality leads to promiscuity, and promiscuity leads to disappointment, depression and disease.

We do no favors to homosexuals when we refrain from condemning homosexuality. There may be powerful lobbies and proud practitioners, but there is also a multitude of beings with homosexual tendencies who know that these tendencies are wrong and who are begging for help. It would be homophobic not to come to their aid by clear statements, a loving heart and a helping hand.

Homosexuality

A genetic condition or a consequence of moral disturbance?

Psychologist Joseph Nicolosi argues that homosexual behavior is a search for the lost masculine/feminine self. He explains that it is a self-protective stance that develops in children who have suffered from neglect (in whatever form: general neglect, abuse, violence, abandonment) from their parent of the same sex. The boy then develops an aversion to men in general, and girls to women. And yet the child still needs same-sex love and will later go out and seek it in an effort to make up for missing love.

This happens at the onset of puberty. Sexual instinct drives us to the "other than me", to the "unapproachable." But because of the innate difficulties that have developed due to neglect, the boy will seek what was denied to him, namely masculinity and male love. Girls, often victims of abuse from men, will develop an inveterate aversion to them.

There are other scenarios that can affect a child's sexual attractions. They amount to various forms of family malfunction: weak fathers and over-bearing mothers, drugs and alcoholism leading to emotional neglect, parental divorce, unhappy, violent homes, teenage sex, etc. In such cases, children can develop an aversion to heterosexual relationships (their parents’ or their own which they are too young to handle) that have caused them such suffering as a child or teenager.

Homosexuality is thus not a genetic condition, but the result of some form of moral disturbance engendering suffering and loss. There is much of this around today, hence the rising number of people with difficulties to hold stable and normal sexual relationships. It is a condition that is open to various therapies that help victims of maltreatment, neglect and society-promoted promiscuity to reconstruct personality, self acceptance and assurance.

In short, society needs stable and loving homes if it wishes to deal adequately with the problems of "sexual orientation."

What is "Brave New World"?

*Brave New World* is a novel by Aldous Huxley, published in 1932. Set in London of AD 2540, the novel anticipates developments in reproductive technology, sleep-learning, psychosocial manipulation and operant conditioning that combine to profoundly change society.

World Controllers have finally created the ideal society. In laboratories worldwide, genetic science has brought the human race to perfection. From the Alpha-Plus mandarin class to the Epsilon-Minus Semi-Morons, designed to perform menial tasks, man no longer comes from the union of men and women but is bred in laboratories and educated to be blissfully content with his pre-destined role.

But, in the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre, Bernard Marx is unhappy. Harboring an unnatural desire for solitude, feeling only distaste for the endless pleasures of compulsory promiscuity, Bernard has an ill-defined longing to break free. A visit to one of the few remaining Savage Reservations where the old, imperfect life still continues, may be the cure for his distress. There he discovers reality.

A fantasy of the future that sheds a blazing critical light on the present evolutions of our modern society. This book is considered to be Aldous Huxley’s masterpiece.
Is Homosexuality natural?

Popular reasoning to justify homosexuality as natural.

Some readers of a debating website put forward a host of interesting reasons why they think homosexuality is indeed natural. I quote:

Of course homosexuality is natural, it occurs within nature and there are countless scientific studies supporting this... Not only has homosexuality been observed within dolphin groups but scientists have also observed dolphins expressing sexual acts towards humans.... - Love is love no matter who you are. - There are confirmed reports of homosexuality existing in hundreds of species. It is particularly common in dolphins, sheep, and bonobos. - It is found in every animal on the planet. - Heterosexual monogamy did not become the world norm until the expansion of Christianity.

These reasons are interesting because of the way supporters of homosexuality answer the question. They speak of "countless scientific studies," but cite none. They declare that "love is love", yet forget that this would serve to justify incest as well. They compare mankind to dolphins, sheep and bonobo chimpanzees and declare that if they do it (countless scientific studies say they do) then it is natural for us too. As if we were comparable to dolphins, sheep and bonobos!

The weakness of popular argument in favor of homosexuality is evident. It proves nothing except, perhaps, that proponents adhere to the Darwinian hypothesis: we are overly evolved dolphins, sheep and bonobos, mere animals.

One argument does stick out: heterosexual monogamy is a "Christian invention." I do not think the pre-Christian world would agree with that one.

Homosexuality is not natural. It is very difficult to prove that it is, unless you redefine mankind. Hence the Gender Theory. ♡

Chesterton and self-evidence

When man begins to redefine nature

"Suppose we are all standing round a field and looking at a tree in the middle of it. It is perfectly true that we all see it in infinitely different aspects: that is not the point; the point is that we all say it is a tree.

Suppose we are all poets... a conservative poet may wish to clip the tree; a revolutionary poet may wish to burn it. An optimist poet may want to make it a Christmas tree and hang candles on it. A pessimist poet may want to hang himself on it. None of these are mad, because they are all talking about the same thing.

But there is another man who is talking horribly about something else. There is a monstrous exception to mankind. Why he is so we know not; a new theory says it is heredity; an older theory says it is devils. But in any case, the spirit of it is the spirit that denies, the spirit that really denies realities.

This is the man who looks at the tree and...says it is a lamp-post...the difference between us and the maniac is not about how things look or how things ought to look, but about what they self-evidently are."

G.K Chesterton, Eugenics and Other Evils.

The Roman Catholic Church's official teaching:

2357 Homosexuality refers to relations between men or between women who experience an exclusive or predominant sexual attraction toward persons of the same sex. It has taken a great variety of forms through the centuries and in different cultures. Its psychological genesis remains largely unexplained. Basing itself on Sacred Scripture, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity [Cf. Gen 19:1-29; Rom 1:24-27; 1 Cor 6:10; 1 Tim 1:10], tradition has always declared that "homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered." They are contrary to the natural law. They close the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved.

2358 The number of men and women who have deep-seated homosexual tendencies is not negligible. They do not choose their homosexual condition; for most of them it is a trial. They must be accepted with respect, compassion, and sensitivity. Every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided. These persons are called to fulfill God's will in their lives and, if they are Christians, to unite to the sacrifice of the Lord's Cross the difficulties they may encounter from their condition.

2359 Homosexual persons are called to chastity. By the virtues of self-mastery that teach them inner freedom, at times by the support of disinterested friendship, by prayer and sacramental grace, they can and should gradually and resolutely approach Christian perfection.

Excerpted from the Catechism of the Catholic Church
Marriage = one father + one mother = family

The family is the basic building block of society. Healthy and happy families make for a healthy and happy society. When families become dysfunctional, society suffers. No amount of government funding can make up for the value and efficiency of functional families. Families are a government's best ally in making society safe for tomorrow.

Family begins with the love of one man and one woman and transforms them both into father and mother.

The children thus born have both a father and mother. These provide the love, protection and education children need to grow into responsible adulthood.

Nature has programmed children to thirst for the love of their mothers and fathers. Happy children are those that know and feel they are loved. Unhappy children are those who know or feel they are not loved.

Every boy needs a dad... and a mom. Every girl needs a mom... and a dad.

A second dad does not make up for the mother that never was. A second mom does not replace a dad that never was.

The child who loses father or mother is devastated and distraught. It is every child's nightmare.

Yet our Brave New World is breeding a new generation of children who will never have either a mom or a dad. Imagine, dear reader, that your mother never was. You did not lose her when you were young. No, she simply never existed. You were motherless from the beginning. Even the womb that bore you was not hers, but belonged to an expensively paid surrogate-mother. You were born of no one.

Opposition to same-sex marriage is not about discriminating against a minority. It is about defending a child's right to a family. And family means one mother and one father.

Same-sex marriage and adoption rights for homosexual couples destroys the traditional idea of family. It is not a problem of "equal rights" but rather of future generations and ultimately of mankind.

How ironic that a small minority be allowed to impose its own definition of human nature on the entire Western world.

So much for democracy.

Conclusion: Homosexuality and homosexual marriage are wrong. It is not a case of "equal rights." It is a case of redefining marriage and family, thus paving the way for a Brave New World.
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