

Is there Really a Gay Agenda?

Timothy Zebell
September 23, 2014

In a 1996 speech on behalf of same-sex marriages delivered to the House of Representatives, Iowa Republican Ed Fallon declared:¹

“

Heterosexual unions are and will continue to be predominant, regardless of what gay and lesbian couples do. To suggest that homosexual couples in any way, shape or form threaten to undermine the stability of heterosexual unions is patently absurd.

And I know, you'll say: "What about the gay agenda?" Well, just as there turned out to be no Bolsheviks in the bathroom back in the 1950s, there is no gay-agenda in the 1990s. There is, however, a strong, well-funded anti-gay agenda ...

Few things seem to rile homosexual activists more than an allusion to a gay agenda. Charles Bouley II has written a representative response on Advocate.com, which is a leading gay website, "Actually, let me flat out say it: There is no gay agenda. I hate to break it to all those antigay organizations out there that have made such a myth the bedrock of their bigotry campaigns, but really, it just doesn't exist."² Similarly, in 2006, the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation, commonly known as GLAAD, listed "gay agenda" and "homosexual agenda" among their list of offensive terminology to avoid. They wrote, "Notions of a 'homosexual agenda' are rhetorical inventions of anti-gay extremists seeking to portray as sinister the lesbian and gay civil rights movement." Not surprisingly, they recommended replacing the offensive "gay agenda" with the preferred title, "lesbian and gay civil rights movement."³

The question must be asked, "Why is there such an aversion to linking homosexuality with an agenda?" As is implied by GLAAD's comments, could it be that "agenda" indicates sinister intent, and it would be more accurate to speak of the gay civil rights movement? Setting aside for the moment the question of whether the requests of gay activists are, in fact, civil rights requests, surely history does not support the suggestion that "agenda" implies something sinister. Indeed, the civil rights movement frequently refers to their efforts as a "civil rights agenda." Articles can be found such as "The Unfinished Civil Rights Agenda" and "A New Civil Rights Agenda: A New Leadership is Making a Difference." Even the Citizen's Commission on Civil Rights refers to their efforts as an agenda on their website, saying that "Its work is grounded in the belief that the civil rights agenda

¹ Brown, *A Queer Thing Happened to America*, 26.

² Ibid, 27.

³ Ibid, 25-26.

benefits the entire country, not just particular interest groups.”⁴ Likewise, the feminist movement freely refers to the “feminist agenda.” On the National Organization for Women’s website, articles can be found such as “NOW’s Progressive Feminist Agenda for Peace,” and in Australia, the feminist movement even sports the website FeministAgenda.org.au.⁵ Clearly the use of the term “agenda” for a political movement is nothing new, and the term is not inherently sinister.

Make no mistake about it, the gay movement is a political movement. If there is any doubt, then consider just two prominent gay organizations. With an annual budget in 2014 of nearly \$45 million,⁶ The Human Rights Campaign once described itself on its website as “America’s largest gay and lesbian organization” which “[E]ffectively lobbies Congress; mobilizes grassroots action in diverse communities; invests strategically to elect a fair-minded Congress; and increases public understanding through innovative education and communication strategies.”⁷ Likewise, according to their website, the National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce “works to build the grassroots political power of the LGBT community to win complete equality. We do this through direct and grassroots lobbying to defeat anti-LGBT ballot initiatives and legislation and pass pro-LGBT legislation and other measures. We also analyze and report on the positions of candidates for public office on issues of importance to the LGBT community.”⁸ Certainly, a movement that includes multiple well-funded organizations that build grassroots political efforts and lobby Congress can be considered a political movement. And every political movement has an agenda. After all, it would be a waste of time to lobby Congress for an unknown benefit.

Yet even beyond this, there is another reason why people reference a gay agenda. In 1990 Harvard-trained gay authors Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen wrote the book *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 1990’s*, in which they presented a six-point comprehensive strategy for changing America’s attitude toward homosexuality. According to the authors, the purpose of this book was to expand and detail an already existing four-point agenda into what they called “a practical agenda” for homosexuals. Recounting the origins of this agenda, they wrote, “In February 1988 ... a ‘war conference’ of 175 leading gay activists, representing organizations from across the land, convened in Warrenton, Virginia, to establish a four-point agenda for the gay movement.”⁹ Certainly, when 175 leading gay activists representing organizations from across the country convene for a “war conference” to establish an “agenda for the gay movement,” it is fair to view the gay movement as an organized political movement that is following an agenda.

After the Ball is filled with specific tactics for accomplishing this “practical agenda.” Regarding these, they willingly admit, “The campaign we outline in this book, though complex, depends centrally upon a program of unabashed propaganda, firmly grounded in long-established principles of psychology and advertising.”¹⁰ Most notable among these tactics are those of desensitization, jamming, and conversion. Regarding desensitization, the authors wrote, “[T]o desensitize straights to gays and gayness, inundate them in a continuous flood of gay-related advertising, presented in the

⁴ Ibid, 41.

⁵ Ibid, 41-42.

⁶ Brown, “Human Rights Campaign Accuses Christian Conservatives of Inciting Fear and Hate.”

⁷ Brown, *A Queer Thing*, 36.

⁸ “About Us.”

⁹ Brown, *A Queer Thing*, 32-33.

¹⁰ Kirk, *After the Ball*, xxvi.

least offensive fashion possible. If straights can't shut off the shower, they may at least eventually get used to being wet."¹¹ They also wrote:¹²

“

Gays must launch a large-scale campaign ... to reach straights through the mainstream media. We're talking about propaganda. ... [C]arefully crafted, repeatedly displayed mass-media images of gays could conceivably do even more to reverse negative stereotypes than could the incremental coming-out of one person to another. ... One of the special advantages of a media campaign is that it can—and should—portray only the most favorable sides of gays ... When this is done, the picture labeled “queer” is aggressively painted over; prior images of dirty old queens or coarsened dykes are overlaid with pleasing new images of all-American and Miss American types. (emphasis in the original)

Equally important as the strategy of desensitization is something they referred to as “jamming.” According to the authors of *After the Ball*, “Jamming makes use of the rules of Associative Conditioning (the psychological process whereby, when two things are repeatedly juxtaposed, one's feelings about one thing are transferred to the other) and Direct Emotional Modeling (the inborn tendency of human beings to feel what they perceive others to be feeling.)”¹³

One means of accomplishing this is to unfairly associate everyone who opposes homosexuality with the radical beliefs and actions of fringe extremists. They wrote:¹⁴

“

In TV and print, images of victimizers can be combined with those of their gay victims by a method propagandists call the “bracket technique.” For example, for several seconds an unctuous beady-eyed Southern preacher is shown pounding the pulpit in rage against “those perverted, abominable creatures.” While his tirade continues over the soundtrack, the picture switches to heart-rending photos of badly beaten persons, or of gays who look decent, harmless, and likeable; and then we cut back to the poisonous face of the preacher. The contrast speaks for itself. The effect is devastating.

The viewer will ordinarily recoil from these images of victimizers, thinking automatically: “I don't like those maniacs, don't want to be like them, and would be ashamed if others thought I was like them. Surely I'm more compassionate and sophisticated, because I don't share their irrational hatred of gays.” Every time a viewer runs through this

¹¹ Ibid, 149.

¹² Ibid, 161, 169.

¹³ Ibid, 151.

¹⁴ Ibid, 189–190.

comparative self-appraisal, he reinforces a self-definition that consciously rejects homohatred and validates sympathy for gay victims. Exactly what we want.

A particularly effective means of jamming has been to redefine the homosexual as a victim. The authors wrote, “In any campaign to win over the public, gays must be portrayed as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to adopt the role of protector. ... The purpose of victim imagery is to make straights feel very uncomfortable; that is, to jam with shame the self-righteous pride that would ordinarily accompany and reward their antigay belligerence, and to lay groundwork for the process of conversion by helping straights identify with gays and sympathize with their underdog status.”¹⁵

The final tactic presented in the book *After the Ball* for accomplishing this “practical agenda” for homosexuality is that of conversion. The authors wrote:¹⁶

“

Desensitization aims at lowering the intensity of antigay emotional reactions to a level approximating sheer indifference; Jamming attempts to blockade or counteract the rewarding “pride in prejudice” ... by attaching to homohatred a pre-existing, and punishing, sense of shame in being a bigot, a horse’s [expletive], and a beater and murderer. Both Desensitization and Jamming, though extremely useful, are mere preludes to our highest—though necessarily very long-range—goal, which is Conversion. It isn’t enough that antigay bigots should become confused about us, or even indifferent to us—we are safest, in the long run, if we can actually make them like us. Conversion aims at just this.

In case there remains any doubt as to what is meant by “conversion,” the authors clarify, “We mean conversion of the average American’s emotions, mind, and will through a planned psychological attack, in the form of propaganda fed to the nation via the media. We mean “subverting” the mechanism of prejudice to our own ends—using the very processes that made America hate us to turn their hatred into warm regard—whether they like it or not.”¹⁷

Without question, these authors were absolutely correct when they defined their book as a “practical agenda.”¹⁸ These tactics offered in the book *After the Ball* have proven to be incredibly successful. Nevertheless, gay activists often seek to disassociate themselves from this landmark book and dismiss it as an obscure fringe work. Most likely, this is because the book is a raw and honest exposure of

¹⁵ Ibid, 183.

¹⁶ Ibid, 153.

¹⁷ Ibid, 153-154.

¹⁸ Ibid, *i*.

the gay movement's tactics, goals, and intentional deception. Regardless, nearly every suggested tactic in the book has been utilized by the gay movement.

Were this not enough, there remains still more reason to believe that a gay agenda exists. Even beyond the admission by these gay authors of a war conference and a gay agenda, and beyond their use of the term “agenda” to describe their own work, an organized gay agenda can be clearly seen as early as 1972 in the *Gay Rights Platform*. The *Gay Rights Platform*, which was formulated in Chicago, Illinois, demanded:¹⁹

- The repeal of all laws prohibiting private sexual acts involving consenting persons
- The repeal of all laws prohibiting prostitution, both male and female
- The repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent
- The repeal of all legislative provisions that restrict the sex or number of persons entering into a marriage unit; and the extension of legal benefits to all persons who cohabit, regardless of sex or numbers
- The enactment of legislation that child custody, adoption, visitation rights, foster parenting and the like shall not be denied because of sexual orientation or marital status
- The encouragement and support for sex education courses, prepared and taught by gay women and men, presenting homosexuality as a valid, healthy preference and a lifestyle that is a viable alternative to heterosexuality

Certainly, this qualifies as an agenda, and this agenda was carefully followed by gay activists. These demands were an important part of the literature distributed at the 1987 March on Washington as well as the 1993 March on Washington—except that by 1993, several of these demands had already been met. Still, a list of the remaining demands was presented to Congress. This list included demands for:²⁰

- The recognition of same-sex marriages and domestic partnerships
- Adoption of children by homosexual couples
- The implementation of homosexual, bisexual and transgendered curricula at all levels of education
- The repeal of all sodomy laws
- The passage and implementation of graduated age-of-consent laws for sexual relations

Today many of these 1993 demands have been met. In fact, as a nation, we are on the verge of consenting to every one of the *Gay Rights Platform*'s original list of demands. But this consent is not the result of a national epiphany. It is the result of persistent gay lobbying in the media, and everywhere between the halls of government and the halls of our local public schools.²¹ Surely it is both fair and accurate to refer to a “gay agenda.”

A considerable amount of time could be spent further detailing the goals and tactics of this gay agenda. Such a careful examination of this agenda would be an enlightening experience, but it would also risk encouraging us to view the homosexual as our adversary. Of course, on a political level, this

¹⁹ Muehlenberg, *Strained Relations*, 85.

²⁰ *Ibid*, 84.

²¹ “Who We Are.”

is true. On a political level, we must stand firmly opposed to legislation that would allow such immoral behavior to transform our society and needlessly expose our children to lifestyles that they have no ability to understand or evaluate. But for most of us, the political nature of this subject is secondary to its personal nature. There are some who are strong political activists, and we need such people. If truth be told, we could use far more activists, and we ought to encourage and champion the efforts of such individuals. But the vast majority of Christians are not politically active. Instead, for them this issue revolves around people—friends, relatives, neighbors, and co-workers; and people must be treated differently than political platforms and legislative proposals.

It is very difficult to truly love and reach out to people when they are seen as the enemy. It is very difficult to come alongside someone who is viewed as a threat. Yet for many of our friends and family members who come out of the closet, and for many of the homosexuals whom we may encounter in the workforce, this gay agenda is larger than their personal aspirations. For many of these people, all they care about is being loved and accepted for whom they believe themselves to be. Many of these homosexuals are not interested in eliminating age of sexual consent laws and securing homosexual adoption rights. They just want to have relationships and a lifestyle that are considered to be normal and acceptable by society. Just as not every one of us is fairly represented by our politicians and political party affiliations, so too not every homosexual is fairly represented by gay activists. Therefore, we will not pursue an extensive understanding of the gay agenda. It is important to recognize that it does exist, and it is greatly influencing our society, but for those of us who are not well informed regarding the homosexual community, it might be a better use of our time to remember that we too have an agenda.

As Christians, we serve as Christ's ambassadors according to [2 Corinthians 5:20](#), "*[W]e are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We implore you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.*" An ambassador is one who represents and speaks on behalf of another. When an ambassador of the United States of America speaks to the leadership of another country, he is speaking with full authority as if he were the President of the United States of America. Likewise, when we share the gospel of salvation with others, we speak with full authority as if we were Jesus Christ reaching out to that individual. Therefore, when we ignore, belittle, mock, and reject another—such as a person with same-sex attractions—to that individual, it is as if Jesus Christ Himself were ignoring, belittling, mocking, and rejecting him.

Jesus would never ignore or reject a person who was lost and separated from God simply because he was acting out his sinful nature. It should be expected that sinners will sin. Apart from the forgiveness of Jesus and the renewal of the Holy Spirit, every person is a slave to sin. In [John 8:34-36](#), we read, "*Jesus answered them, 'Truly, truly, I say to you, everyone who practices sin is a slave to sin. The slave does not remain in the house forever; the son remains forever. So if the Son sets you free, you will be free indeed.'*" Likewise, Jesus presented an analogy in [Matthew 7:17-18](#), saying, "*So, every healthy tree bears good fruit, but the diseased tree bears bad fruit. A healthy tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a diseased tree bear good fruit.*" In other words, a person's consistent behavior is the result of a spirit that has either been renewed by God and is healthy, or a spirit that is sick and is enslaved to sin.

When we read the Gospels, we do not find Jesus cloistered away with the righteous. Instead, Jesus actively sought out sinners and built relationships with them. [Mark 2:15-17](#) recalls, "*And as he reclined at table in his house, many tax collectors and sinners were reclining with Jesus and his*

disciples, for there were many who followed him. And the scribes of the Pharisees, when they saw that he was eating with sinners and tax collectors, said to his disciples, ‘Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?’ And when Jesus heard it, he said to them, ‘Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.’”

It is important to realize that the use of the term “sinners” in this passage is not a generic reference to the common people. Rather, it refers to those who through the habitual practice of unlawful behavior had been separated from God’s covenant with Israel. These were the “reprobate” who were destined for eternal damnation. As such, they were often ostracized by society, and certainly by the religious community. The parallels between these sinners and the homosexual community should be obvious. Through repeated sexually immoral behavior, homosexuals often find themselves ostracized by the religious community as reprobates who are destined for an eternity in Hell. And yet we discover that it was precisely these kinds of individuals to whom Jesus actively ministered.

Jesus did not minister to the rejected reprobates of society because He had nobody better to teach. Rather, Jesus had a heart for those whom society had rejected. Jesus reached out to those who were in the greatest danger of experiencing God’s judgment because they had chosen a lifestyle that had divorced them from exposure to the truth. Realizing this, Jesus brought the truth to them. But He did not do this by shouting at them from a distance. Rather, He entered their homes and fellowshiped with them. Jesus built relationships with them in order that He might have opportunity to share the truth.

Likewise, we have been commissioned by Jesus in [Matthew 28:19–20](#) to follow Jesus’ example and to seek out the lost in order that we might share with them the truth of God’s Word, *“Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you always, to the end of the age.”* This requires that we not allow ourselves to construct a wall of separation between ourselves and those whose practices are different, sinful, destructive, or even disgusting to us. Rather, if we are to follow Jesus’ example, then these are precisely the individuals whom we should most love and reach out to.

So, the first part of our Christian agenda is to identify the sinners—those who through the habitual practice of sinful behavior have been ostracized and rejected by society and by the religious community—such as homosexuals. Second, we are called to reach out to these individuals in love. This involves building relationships with them in order that we might have opportunity to share the truth of God’s Word. Third, we must speak the truth to them.

Jesus did not build relationships with sinners just to make them feel loved. Jesus was not afraid to offend sinners with the truth after first demonstrating to them his genuine concern for their wellbeing. There was never a question regarding whether Jesus condoned or affirmed the lifestyle of these sinners. Once again, in [Mark 2:15–17](#), Jesus referred to these people as being spiritually sick sinners in need of a cure in order that they might live in righteousness, *“And as he reclined at table in his house, many tax collectors and sinners were reclining with Jesus and his disciples, for there were many who followed him. And the scribes of the Pharisees, when they saw that he was eating with sinners and tax collectors, said to his disciples, ‘Why does he eat with tax collectors and sinners?’”*

And when Jesus heard it, he said to them, ‘Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.’”

All too often, Christians develop relationships with unbelievers only to discover that they do not have the strength to speak the truth when given the opportunity. Sometimes this is because they fear offending the individual, and sometimes it is because they begin to question what they believe to be true. Being ambassadors for Christ, it is as if Jesus Christ were communicating to these unbelievers that it is more important that they feel affirmed, supported, and loved than it is that they know the truth and fix their relationship with God. In so doing, the Christian offends Jesus Christ rather than offend his new friend. Jesus never placed an individual’s feelings above his need for salvation, but Jesus also did not minister to such individuals before first developing a firm personal conviction and understanding of the truth. [Luke 2:52](#) teaches that Jesus first grew in His understanding before ministering to those who would challenge the foundations of His belief. In other words, Jesus equipped Himself for this kind of ministry.

So, we might add another element in our agenda which really ought to be the first step. First, we grow in our understanding of the truth of God’s Word and in wisdom. Second, we identify those who through the habitual practice of sinful behavior have been ostracized and rejected by society and by the religious community—such as homosexuals. Third, we reach out to these individuals in love. This involves building relationships with them in order that we might have opportunity to share the truth of God’s Word. And fourth, we speak the truth to them. This should be the agenda of every Christian in order that we, like the Apostle Paul in [1 Corinthians 6:9-11](#), can say to our friends, *“Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor men who practice homosexuality, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God. And such **were** some of you. **But** you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.”* (emphasis added)

Every group has an agenda, but not every agenda is equally as effective. Despite the incredible influence of the homosexual agenda over the past few decades, the Christian agenda, when properly followed, has an unchallenged history of being the most influential agenda known to man. Unlike the gay agenda, we have no need to deny the existence of our agenda. Moreover, we have no reason to fear the gay agenda and its influence if we as the church would simply be faithful to execute our own divinely mandated agenda.

Works Cited

- “About Us.” National LGBTQ Task Force. Accessed September 23, 2014.
http://www.thetaskforce.org/about_us/mission_statements.
- Brown, Michael. *A Queer Thing Happened to America*. Concord: EqualTime Books, 2011.
- Brown, Michael. “Human Rights Campaign Accuses Christian Conservatives of Inciting Fear and Hate.” *The Christian Post*, September 22, 2014. Accessed September 23, 2014.
<http://www.christianpost.com/news/human-rights-campaign-accuses-christian-conservatives-of-inciting-fear-and-hate-126801/>.
- Kirk, Marshall and Hunter Madsen. *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90s*. New York: Doubleday, 1989.
- Muehlenberg, Bill. *Strained Relations: The Challenge of Homosexuality*. Melbourne: Culture Watch Books, 2014.

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are taken from *The Holy Bible, English Standard Version*, copyright ©2001 by Crossway Bibles, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.