

# **A Thoughtful Response To The Washington State Law Giving Homosexuals Special Rights**

May 29, 2006

*Note from Pastor Kevin Lea follows this handout.*

*The following is a letter written by a lady in our congregation to the editor of our local newspaper. It clearly communicates the concerns associated with our State's foolishness in legislating immorality.*

Dear Editor:

I support Referendum 65, to repeal Engrossed Substitute House Bill (ESHB) 2661 – which adds “sexual orientation” to the state’s law against discrimination in employment, housing, credit, insurance, and certain contracts – and place the issue on the ballot for the November elections.

Like all compassionate people, I abhor unjust discrimination against people seeking housing and jobs. However, this broad and vaguely-worded bill creates more problems than it solves.

Consider:

1. Civil Rights legislation is designed to protect classes of people that meet the following three criteria: (1) They are politically disadvantaged. (2) They are economically disadvantaged. (3) They have an immutable (unchangeable) condition, such as race, sex, or disability. The lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community does not meet these criteria. It is certainly *neither* politically nor economically disadvantaged. While the third criterion is hotly debated, there is in fact no uncontested medical or psychiatric or other evidence to support the “immutability” of sexual orientation. As Pastor Ken Hutcherson of Antioch Bible Church in Seattle stated during his televised debate with King County Executive Ron Sims, “I’ve never met an ex-black, but I have met plenty of ex-homosexuals.”
2. “Sexual orientation” under the bill encompasses “heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality, and *gender expression, identity, appearance, and behavior.*” Almost any behavior or dress, regardless of how bizarre, could (and no doubt will) be called “gender expression” or “gender behavior” that is protected under this law. Hiring organizations would be vulnerable to litigation if they elect to *not* hire someone who dresses like a man one day and a woman the next (regardless of the reason).
3. Discrimination is not always a bad thing. The word simply means selecting the best for the situation between two or more choices. Most would agree that it is appropriate to discriminate against convicted child molesters, for example, when hiring teacher aides for elementary school classrooms. ESHB 2661 eliminates the right of employers and landlords to *not* employ or rent to people who behave in a way that they consider immoral or offensive. The law also eliminates the ability of insurers to charge higher rates to a people

group with well-documented higher rates of illness and mortality. “Regarding physical health, there is increasing evidence that mortality and morbidity rates are substantially higher for those who engage in homosexual practices.” (“The American Journal of Public Health Highlights Risks of Homosexual Practices, by A. Dean Byrd, Ph.D., M.B.A., M.P.H., Vice President, National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH), <http://www.narth.com/docs/risks.html>.) Under this law, an insurance company would be able to charge risk-appropriate rates to a cigarette smoker, but not to a person living the high-risk homosexual lifestyle.

4. Public school curriculum designed to teach our children (beginning in *kindergarten*!) that the GLBT lifestyle is normal and acceptable is ready for immediate deployment once the law is enacted. Human sexual identity development is such a fragile process— talk about creating additional confusion in the minds of young children already prematurely bombarded on all sides with sexual images and messages! This also clearly infringes on the rights of parents to teach their children traditional faith-based values. For example, Christians who hold to the authority of Holy Scripture believe God clearly teaches that *all* sexual behavior between individuals outside the confines of the God-ordained institution of marriage between a man and a woman is immoral. Orthodox Judaism, orthodox Catholicism, Islam, and other religions hold the same view. You personally may not agree with this, but it is unreasonable to expect that a religious person can or should disengage their religious faith from their personal life and practices. (See for example, “Legislative Battle Looms over Pro-Homosexual School Curriculum,” <http://www.pacificjustice.org/resources/news/focusdetails.cfm?ID=PR060411a>.)
5. Also waiting in the wings is a Washington State Supreme Court ruling on same-sex marriage (“Foes, Friends of Gay Marriage Await Ruling,” Associated Press, by David Ammons, 5-14-06, [http://www.kitsapsun.com/bsun/op\\_columnists/article/0,2403,BSUN\\_19095\\_4696703,00.html](http://www.kitsapsun.com/bsun/op_columnists/article/0,2403,BSUN_19095_4696703,00.html)). Some surmise that the Court is waiting to see what will happen to Referendum 65 and in the November elections. Many folks of the “live and let live” variety believe that legalizing gay marriage will have no affect on society or on them personally. This is not true. Other states, including California and Massachusetts, are already transitioning (or trying to) to a genderless society – deleting all references to “Mom” and “Dad” from school books for example. In addition, legal scholars and advocates on both sides of the debate agree that legalizing same sex marriage opens up a whole gamut of conflicts between “sexual liberty” and “religious liberty.” For example, Catholic Charities of Boston, one of the nation’s oldest adoption agencies specializing in finding good homes for hard to place kids, has decided to get out of the adoption business. The reason? Placing children with same-sex couples violates Catholic teaching, but Massachusetts State Law says that policies that prohibit such placements are discriminatory. The agency had to choose between violating their faith and breaking the law. So they decided to get out of adoptions altogether. “It’s a shame because it is certainly going to mean that fewer children from foster care are going to find permanent homes,” Marylou Sudders, president of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, said simply. “This is a tragedy for kids.” (“Banned in Boston: The coming conflict between same-sex marriage and religious liberty,” by Maggie Gallagher, *The Weekly Standard*, 05/15/2006, Volume 011, Issue 33. <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/012/191kgwgh.asp>). It seems incredible to think that barely more than 200 short years ago our country was founded by men and women fleeing religious intolerance and seeking religious liberty –liberty that is

now being stripped away in the name of “tolerance.”

Washington citizens should be able to decide through voting whether to adopt legislation that would have such a widespread impact on our public schools, workplaces, churches, homes, and society at large. For a Referendum 65 petition, contact your church, call 425-493-8707, or visit [www.LetTheVotersDecide.net](http://www.LetTheVotersDecide.net).

Jane Simmons  
Port Orchard

***Note from Pastor Kevin Lea: If this law is not turned around, then we will be heading down the same road as Sodom and Gomorrah and the results will also be the same.***

Gen 13:12 Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan, and Lot dwelt in the cities of the plain and pitched his tent even as far as Sodom. 13 But the men of Sodom were exceedingly wicked and sinful against the LORD. (NKJ)

Gen 18:3 Then he (**Abram/Abraham**) said, "Let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak but once more: Suppose ten should be found there?" And He (**God**) said, "I will not destroy it for the sake of ten."

Gen 19:5 And they (**homosexual men of Sodom**) called to Lot and said to him, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may know them carnally (**homosexually rape them**)." -----

12 Then the men (**Angels who appeared as men to Lot warning him to leave the city before judgment falls**) said to Lot, "Have you anyone else here? Son-in-law, your sons, your daughters, and whomever you have in the city-- take them out of this place! 13 "For we will destroy this place, because the outcry against them has grown great before the face of the LORD, and the LORD has sent us to destroy it."

14 So Lot went out and spoke to his sons-in-law, who had married his daughters, and said, "Get up, get out of this place; for the LORD will destroy this city!" But to his sons-in-law he seemed to be joking (**just like Governor Chris Gregoire and all those who support this legislation would laugh at those who would say that this Bill will bring judgment to the State and affect their eternity when they stand before Almighty God.**)-----

23 The sun had risen upon the earth when Lot entered Zoar. 24 Then the LORD rained brimstone and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah, from the LORD out of the heavens. 25 So He overthrew those cities, all the plain, all the inhabitants of the cities, and what grew on the ground. ----- 27 And Abraham went early in the morning to the place where he had stood before the LORD. 28 Then he looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the plain; and he saw, and behold, the smoke of the land which went up like the smoke of a furnace.