

HUMAN RIGHTS FOR THE GLBTQ COMMUNITY  
Interfaith Impact of New York State Backgrounder by Richard S. Gilbert

INTRODUCTION

*“In Germany they first came for the communists and I didn’t speak up because I wasn’t a communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I didn’t speak up because I wasn’t a Jew. Then they came for the Catholics and I didn’t speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me – and by that time no one was left to speak up.”*

- Pastor Martin Niemöller

What is homosexuality? The term is derived from the Greek "hom" – “the same” - rather than the Latin root "homo" - "man". It is romantic attraction to, or sexual behavior with, members of the same gender. The late James Baldwin provides an interesting perspective: that homosexual is really an *adjective* describing people who find their basic source of intimacy, including sexual intimacy, in members of the same sex. It is contrasted to heterosexuality and bi-sexuality (responding sexually to persons of either sex). Its causes are a combination of genetic, hormonal and environmental factors. Scientists generally believe it is not a matter of choice.

Below are excerpts from a summary of basic terms from Transgender Students Educational Resources.

Cisgender/cis: term for someone who exclusively identifies as their sex assigned at birth.

Transgender/Trans: An umbrella term for people whose gender identity differs from the sex they were assigned at birth.

Queer: A term for people of marginalized gender identities and sexual orientations who are not cisgender and/or heterosexual. This term has a complicated history as a reclaimed slur.

Gender Expression/Presentation: The physical manifestation of one’s gender identity through clothing, hairstyle, voice, body shape, etc. (typically referred to as masculine or feminine).

Gender Identity: One’s internal sense of being male, female, neither of these, both, or other gender(s).

Sexual Orientation: A person’s physical, romantic, emotional, aesthetic, and/or other form of attraction to others.

Transition: A person’s process of developing and assuming a gender expression to match their gender identity. Transition can include: coming out to one’s family, friends, and/or co-workers; changing one’s name and/or sex on legal documents; hormone therapy; and possibly (though not always) some form of surgery.

The use of the shorthand GLBTQ summarizes a community: Gay (usually refers to male homosexuals); Lesbian (“lesbian” refers to female homosexuals - lesbian from the Isle of Lesbos, where the poet Sappho wrote in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE); Bi-sexual (both homosexual and heterosexual); Transgender (persons who identify across sexual stereotypes) and Queer (self-ascription of the GLBT community). As noted above, there are many other designations, but for these purposes GLBTQ is utilized.

What is homophobia? A fear of people who are homosexual. Homophobia manifests itself not only in personal bias and discrimination, but also in public policy. Homophobia is at the moral fault line of our society. It is widespread in many religious communities, and thus it seems appropriate to address it from a theological/ethical/religious perspective. Homophobia is at root a human rights issue. People of faith must heed the prophetic warnings of Pastor Niemöller (above).

## A HISTORY OF HOMOPHOBIA

Marriage equality became the law of the land in 2015 by the Supreme Court *Obergefell v. Hodges* striking down the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA). This meant same sex couples could legally wed in all 50 states. That was the triumphant conclusion of a multi-year struggle. New York State preceded the Court by making marriage equality legal in the Empire State in 2014. However, the struggle for human rights for GLBTQ people is far from over. Interfaith Impact of New York State was part of the coalition that won in 2014 and will be part of the coalition that continues the pursuit of human rights.

While homosexuals in our time are still victims of virulent prejudice, it was not always so. Many human societies accepted homosexuality as normal. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* points out that (64%) 49 out of 76 ancient societies accepted homosexuality, including ancient Greece and Rome.

John Boswell, in his monumental *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*, quotes Edward Gibbon, author of *The Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire*: "Of the first fifteen emperors, Claudius was the only one whose taste in love was entirely correct," in that context meaning heterosexual. That would mean the Roman Empire was ruled for almost 200 consecutive years by "men whose homosexual interests, if not exclusive, were sufficiently noteworthy to be recorded for posterity."<sup>1</sup> This observation is indicative of the fundamental tolerance of the Romans.

In Greece, Socrates' relationship with Alcibiades was as well-known as his relationship with his wife and children. However, the idea that homosexuality is "unnatural" had its beginning in Greece, perhaps through a chance remark of Plato that it was "against nature." Students of his thought find this perplexing, since he wrote extensively of eroticism in homosexual terms. (Some even claim he was gay.) The careful translation of his words indicates he meant homosexuality was "against nature" in the sense no children came from such liaisons. That chance remark, however, has caused great mischief.

Boswell demonstrates that the terms "natural" and "unnatural" have a wide variety of meanings. For example, contrary to the conventional wisdom, homosexuality is quite *natural* in the animal kingdom. Thus, homosexuality is inherent in the *natural* order.

To say that homosexuality is "unnatural" appears to be neither scientifically nor morally cogent and probably represents a rhetorical attack on a violation of one's personal values. Human nature is not an abstract norm but is embodied in particular people, with particular traits. It is as natural for the homosexual to be homosexual as for the heterosexual to be heterosexual. Hence the term homosexual "preference" is not appropriate.

With today's resurgence of the religious right, we find much homophobia has its roots in the *Bible*. The term "sodomy" (unnatural sex) comes from Genesis (19:1-38). According to the legend, two angels visited the Canaanite city of Sodom to investigate outcries concerning violence.

Abraham's nephew Lot provided hospitality. The males of Sodom surrounded his house and demanded that the two guests be brought outside "that we may know them." Lot offered his two virgin daughters as substitutes. Through supernatural power, the angels brought temporary blindness on the Sodomites; the visitors and the young women were spared. Yahweh then destroyed Sodom by "fire and brimstone." The linkage of homosexuality with Sodom is of relatively recent origin.

Religious fundamentalists today point to this as punishment for homosexuality. But, according to the ancient commentary in the Jewish *Mishnah*, the original sin of Sodom had to do with selfishness, not sexuality. Later Biblical references to Sodom indicate that inhospitality toward strangers was its sin, which is the consensus of scholars today, *contra* the fundamentalist interpretation. Bible scholar Walter Wink said that "the sin of the Sodomites was homosexual rape, carried out by heterosexuals intent on humiliating them by treating them 'like women,' thus demasculinizing them."<sup>2</sup> H. Darrell Lance of Colgate Rochester Divinity School wrote, "there is no evidence that it regards homosexual acts *per se* as significant when defining the sin of Sodom."<sup>3</sup>

We read in the prophet Ezekiel: "As I live says the Lord God, your sister Sodom and her daughters had pride, too much, food, and prosperous ease, but they did not aid the poor and needy. They were arrogant and did abomination before me." (16:49-50) That sounds more like economic injustice than sexual immorality. As columnist Nicholas D. Kristof writes, "... Imagine if sodomy laws could be used to punish the stingy, unconcerned rich!"<sup>4</sup>

However, there remains much homophobia in the Bible. In the Book of *Leviticus* we read: "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination." Lev. 18:22. The death penalty is prescribed. Yet, such behavior is more to be understood as ritual impurity than as moral turpitude, since eating pork and misusing incense are in the same section. The Jews sought to distinguish themselves from the surrounding pagan societies which regarded homosexuality with basic indifference.

Among the ancient Hebrews, any sexual activity not aimed at reproduction was forbidden. In their pre-scientific mentality they believed semen contained the whole of nascent life; female eggs and ovulation were unknown. Thus, the spilling of semen for *any* non-procreative purpose was tantamount to murder. Scarcely populated, outnumbered by enemies, it was a matter of survival.

The word homosexual is never mentioned in the Bible - there was no word for it in its ancient languages. Actually, same-sex love relations are glorified at several biblical points: David and Jonathan, for example. David said his love for Jonathan "was wonderful, surpassing the love of women." Ruth and Naomi have a strong affectional relationship. "In other words," says one scholar, "there is no evidence that the Old Testament regards homosexual acts *per se* as significant when defining the sin of Sodom." And it is passing strange there is no condemnation of homosexuality as there is for adultery in the Ten Commandments.

We look in vain to Jesus for a definitive word about this alleged "abomination." A denominational booklet from the Unitarian Universalist Association illustrates. On the cover we read: "What Jesus Christ said about homosexuality." On the inside we find two blank pages. On the back page we read: "That's right, he said absolutely nothing about it." If indeed homosexuality is such a sin against God and humanity, it is curious that the Savior of Christianity never mentioned it.

What did the Apostle Paul have to say about homosexuality? In Romans 1:18-32 and First Corinthians 6:9 he refers only to homosexual acts which harm or disregard others. Paul condemns homosexual acts by heterosexuals who distort their sexuality and thus alienate themselves from God. This is the same Paul who commands women to "be silent in the

churches," orders slaves to be "obedient to their masters," and tells wives to be "subject to their husbands" and provides lukewarm support for marriage: "Let them marry; it is no sin."

There really is no one sexual ethic in the Bible, full as it is of contradictory words and primitive ethical codes. If we took Biblical ethics literally we would have to forbid nudity and execute adulterers. It should be noted that in the Bible there are 12 prohibitions against homosexual sex behavior, mostly for ritualistic reasons, and 300 against heterosexual behavior.

The overall ethical stance of the Bible, however, is one of love and justice. God sides with the oppressed. In Isaiah we read: "Is not this the fast that I choose: to loose the bonds of injustice, to undo the thongs of the yoke, to let the oppressed go free?" (58:6). Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan and the Golden Rule speak as loudly for love of neighbor as his silence on the question of condemning homosexuality. Paul's letter on love to the Corinthians far transcends in ethical stature his more culturally conditioned utterances on the details of the law.

A simplistic reading of Jewish and Christian scriptures is little short of blasphemy itself. It renders God as a petty moral tyrant, a small cultic deity, a trivializer of justice. The larger historical view is not of a God who helps some people oppress others, but a God of justice who takes the side of the poor and the oppressed. It becomes increasingly clear that use of the Bible to condemn homosexuality reflects more contemporary interests with a political agenda to pursue than a serious endeavor to explore the interests of the biblical writers.

During the Roman Empire, homosexuality was both widely practiced and generally tolerated. Homosexual prostitution was taxed. Gay marriages were performed. Only gradually did Christian asceticism, with its negative attitude toward any eroticism, triumph.

In the early middle ages, the 3rd through the 6th century, the Empire was crumbling, and scapegoats were necessary. The Emperor Justinian, in response to the earthquakes of 525 CE and the plague in 543 CE, outlawed homosexual behavior "at this time, when in various ways we have provoked Him to anger on account of the multitude of our sins. For because of such crimes there are famines, earthquakes and pestilences."<sup>5</sup>

While the only persons punished for homosexual acts were prominent bishops, the gay community was intimidated. Still, enforcement was spotty and punishment light - less, for example, than for a priest going hunting.<sup>6</sup> There were protests that gay priests were receiving each other's confessions. Gay people flourished, however, in the cities of Spain, due to Islam's tolerance of the practice.

The urban revival of the 10th through the 14th centuries had the effect of expanding personal freedom. There was a virtual explosion of homo-erotic culture. The impassioned hedonism of the *Carmina Burana* is perhaps the most telling illustration of the mood of the times. One section relates an affectionate argument between two clerics who are lovers. One tries to dissuade the other from entering a monastery; he is persuasive and the other concludes: "I am already changing my mind," and evidently does.

This explosion created small coteries, both strongly opposed to and supportive of homo-erotic thought and behavior, while most seemed relatively indifferent. An example of the general tolerance was the installation of Archbishop Ralph of Tours, despite his widely known gay proclivities. But with the rise of absolute government came the rise of intolerance. Edward II of England, the last openly gay medieval monarch, was deposed and murdered in 1327 CE. There was an explosion of xenophobia, fear of strangers, and the coming of the Crusades. A sea-change was underway.

Homosexuals, with Jews and Muslims, were victims of Christian fanaticism. The association of gays and heretics became common. Any heretic could be labeled homosexual and thus subject to persecution. From 1250 to 1300 homosexual activity went from legality to capital crime; in two centuries it went from cultural celebration to sinful aberration; from celebrations of love to death at the stake by burning small bundles of branches called faggots, thus earning homosexuals that unfortunate epithet.

Also in the 13th century Thomas Aquinas codified teachings about human sexuality in the church. Elaborating a doctrine of "natural law," he found homosexuality "unnatural" because it was not aimed at procreation. That teaching has been decisive in Catholic thought ever since, as American Catholic theologian Charles Curran discovered when he challenged that medieval formulation in 1986.<sup>7</sup>

On this continent, the Spanish conquistadors noted with alarm the open homosexuality of native Americans. Citing their Bibles, the Puritans decreed the death penalty for sodomy and practiced it on several occasions. One Puritan cleric denounced sodomy as a violation of the marriage ordinance, an institution decreed by God to quench "boiling and burning lusts."

Procreation was informed by an agricultural metaphor: sperm was "seed;" women were "ripe" or "unripe" vessels; procreative activity was a kind of "planting;" children were the "valuable crop." For a man to "spill," "spend," or "waste" his seed was, in this frugal economy, to destroy the crops of survival.

Gradually, religiously-inspired law gave way to secular acts based on the Enlightenment; homosexuality became a "crime against nature." Though they had ceased to be enforced long since, only after the Revolution were most, but not all sodomy laws repealed. Some exist to this day.

In the post-Victorian period of the late 19th century, sexual activity came to be seen as pleasurable for its own sake, not merely procreative. But with this medical model, prejudice against gays was given a different rationale. The "normal" came to be not so much moral as quantitative - majority behavior was "normal," minority behavior "abnormal." This has been called "the dictatorship of the normal." Hitler made this public policy.

As Jews were compelled to wear a yellow Star of David by the Nazis, homosexuals were forced to wear an inverted pink triangle. Over 200,000 homosexuals were victims of the Nazi pogrom. Originally intended as a mark of degradation, it is now worn as both a memorial and as a reflection of personal pride and identity.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the nature of homosexuality became an issue in the psychological community. In a letter to Mrs. X, April 19, 1935, Sigmund Freud wrote: "Dear Mrs. X: "I gather from your letter that your son is a homosexual. I am most impressed by the fact that you do not mention this term yourself in your information about him. May I question you, why do you avoid it? Homosexuality is assuredly no advantage, but it is nothing to be ashamed of; no vice, no degradation; it cannot be classified as an illness; we consider it to be a variation of the sexual function produced by a certain arrest of sexual development."<sup>8</sup>

Sexologist Alfred Kinsey said it well in his oft-quoted remark: "The world is not divided into sheep and goats. Only the human mind invents categories and tries to force facts into separated pigeon-holes. The living world is a continuum the sooner we learn this concerning human sexual (identity and) behavior the sooner we shall reach a sound understanding of the realities of sex."<sup>9</sup>

The term "homosexual" made its first known appearance in print in 1869 by the Austrian-born novelist Karl-Maria Kertbeny, published anonymously as he argued against a Prussian anti-sodomy law. In 1886 psychiatrist Richard von Krafft-Ebing used the terms homosexual and heterosexual in his popular book *Psychopathia Sexualis*. The term "gay" evidently came from the French "gai" meaning "courtly love." Later, it became a secret password of the gay community. Finally, in 1969, as a result of resistance to a police raid on a Greenwich Village bar, the gay community became a civil rights community. The ensuing "Stonewall Riots" became the rallying cry of a liberation movement.

Our archaic laws on this matter stem directly from inhuman elements in our religious tradition. Homosexuality was a crime punishable by death in England until 1861, when a life-term was substituted. Then came the Wolfenden Report, and the 1957 law which stated that "homosexual behavior between consenting adults in private can be no longer a criminal offense."

The medical model moved beyond moral condemnation: it defined homosexuality as a sickness from which people did not want to be cured. But in 1973 the American Psychiatric Association removed it from its list of psychiatric disorders.

Even the Supreme Court moved from permitting states to criminalize private homosexual and some heterosexual acts to legalization. In its 1986 ruling on Georgia's sodomy law, the court upheld a perceived public opposition to homosexuality. However, in its 2003 ruling in *Lawrence v. Texas*, the Supreme Court struck down a ban on gay sex, ruling 6-3 that the law was an unconstitutional violation of privacy.

Then in its historic 2015 decision, *Obergefell v. Hodges*, Justice Anthony Kennedy authored the landmark opinion which legalized same-sex marriage. He wrote that "no union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family."

Now, the Court is considering the issue of religious freedom with GLBTQ implications. A Colorado baker refused to make a wedding cake for two gay men. They claim this is a violation of the state's anti-discrimination law, while the baker claims to be compelled to make this cake is a violation of his religious freedom. As of this writing, no decision has been rendered. It is, however, the view of Interfaith Impact that religious beliefs ought not be used to deny basic human rights. One wonders if the baker would not bake a cake for an adulterer, since Jesus condemned adultery.<sup>10</sup>

The history of homophobia is a fascinating one, full of dramatic twists and unexpected turns. We discover that early peoples were not greatly concerned about it; that the Biblical record is a distorted one; that there were long centuries of relative toleration; that today's anti-gay feelings are a result of basic prejudice read back into an errant Biblical record. The history of homophobia can be thus summarized: from moral neutrality to immorality; from immorality to crime; from crime to disease; from disease to life-style; from life-style to simply a way of being in the world.

## HOMOSEXUALITY: AN ETHICAL PERSPECTIVE

Interfaith Impact affirms the need to move beyond an often-condescending tolerance for a variant life-style to true acceptance of a way of being in the world; to move beyond talk of "the healthy homosexual" as if gay were sick; beyond the slogan "gay is good" as if gay were wrong; beyond gender, beyond gender preference to that deep human region where such differences are recognized but are not essential for our being and becoming. The historic descriptor of

homosexuality as “the love which dares not state its name” has been mothballed and gay pride has become the norm.

But prejudice is persistent. As one observer says: "We can easily reduce our detractors to absurdity and show them their hostility is groundless. But what does this prove? That their hatred is real. When every slander has been rebutted, every misconception cleared up, every false opinion about us overcome, intolerance itself will remain finally irrefutable."

One obvious point is to note the contributions of known homosexuals to world history in politics and religion, using the Great Man and Woman defense. Among an impressive list of persons known to have homosexual tendencies are: Socrates, Sappho, Sophocles, Aristotle, Julius Caesar, Nero, Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, John Milton, King James I of England, Horatio Alger, Tchaikovsky, Walt Whitman, Emily Dickinson, Hans Christian Andersen, Dag Hammarskjold, Willa Cather, Gertrude Stein, Virginia Woolf, Tennessee Williams, Elton John, James Baldwin - a veritable "Who's Who."

However, that limited focus gives way to a more theological argument: the inherent worth and dignity of all people – in more traditional language that all are the children of God. We are sensuous creatures; we are sexual beings. We experience that sensuousness in varied ways; we express our sexuality in different modes. What mostly marks us is that the highest common denominator is our common humanity, our spiritual sensitivity, our need for relationship, our love for one another.

Right and wrong have nothing to do with sexual orientation. Right and wrong have to do with whether our sexuality is expressed in ways that are caring, mutual, without exploitation. It is the nature of the loving relationship, not the combination of genders that is decisive. As there are many ways of being religious and expressing religion, so too there are many ways of being sexual and expressing sexuality.

All of us have an intense need for human intimacy, and that need we will seek to satisfy or we are psychically and spiritually dead. Who are we to say that two men or two women have not found that human intimacy with each other? Who are we to make so bold a judgment that this love is inferior to the love heterosexual couples celebrate in marriage? It smacks of a theological and ethical arrogance.

The irony of homophobia is found in a graffiti from a San Francisco washroom: “I won a medal for killing four men and got a dishonorable discharge for loving one. Vietnam Vet.”

## MARRIAGE EQUALITY

IINYS supports marriage equality because it is morally right; it is legally required by our constitution; it is socially healthy to provide loving couples their appropriate rights. No religious group is compelled to recognize same-sex marriage. We need each other – gay and straight – male and female. We must learn to celebrate our common humanity in full recognition of our differences.

There are, of course, many arguments against same-sex marriage. It is said that it will dilute the meaning of marriage. But it is difficult to argue how recognizing same-sex love legally will affect those who choose heterosexual marriage. It may even be helpful, helping us appreciate where love is all the more because same-sex love must confront both the personal and the institutionalized prejudice of society.

Some will say that legalizing same-sex marriage will only institutionalize sexual perversity. Well, what is sexual perversity? It is a relationship where love is not - where one person exploits or abuses another - where the other becomes a means to an end rather than an end in him or herself. That is sexual perversity.

But marriage is designed for procreation, it is argued. But what of all those couples who do not procreate, some by choice and some by chance? Are they not married? And what about all those gay, lesbian and bi-sexual people who are parents by a previous heterosexual relationship, or have adopted, or have had children through *in vitro* fertilization or other means? Where love is - there is a family worth supporting.

But marriage will not work for homosexuals, some will say - there is little loyalty there - only serial partners! Those who argue in this way have perhaps not observed the loving and committed same sex relationships. And in our time heterosexual marriage is often serial monogamy. If same-sex unions are troubled, can we not understand the pressure applied upon them by a doubting and disbelieving culture?

But what of the tradition of heterosexual marriage? Will this not distort it? The late John Boswell, a Yale historian, has discovered that the Church sanctioned same sex marriage in pre-modern Europe. Long before marriage laws were devised, the very first European church marriages were conducted between men.

Our culture has come a long way in the past few decades. In 1981 the term "domestic partnerships" was coined. Now those words have become company policy in many of our most progressive companies. The 1996 federal Defense of Marriage Act defined marriage as the union of one man and one woman and enabled states to refuse to recognize same-sex marriages. Finally in *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015) the Court struck down DOMA's provisions disallowing same-sex marriages to be performed under federal jurisdiction. The marriage equality decision meant same sex couples could legally wed in all 50 states.

#### GENDA (Gender Expression Non-Discrimination Act)

In 2014 IINYS congratulated Governor Cuomo, his staff, the Division of Human Rights and the advocacy community for administrative action that clarifies how the Human Rights Law protects people based on their gender identity, gender expression, transgender status, and gender dysphoria diagnosis. We applaud the Governor's regulatory action. (See details at <https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/governor-cuomo-introduces-regulations-protect-transgender-new-yorkers-unlawful-discrimination>).

The state has the responsibility to act to assure that every New Yorker is afforded an equal opportunity to enjoy a full and productive life, providing them the opportunity to make their own choices, follow their own beliefs and conduct their lives as they choose. Too often, a transgender person experiences discrimination in employment, housing, medical services, restaurant service and other areas of daily living.

Nonetheless, we continue to support the Gender Expression Non-Discrimination Act (GENDA), a bill that codifies into law important protections to New Yorkers with gender variant identity and expression. This act will help ensure that every New Yorker is treated fairly and is accorded their full rights as citizens.

GENDA will by law prohibit discrimination based on gender identity or expression and will include offenses regarding gender identity or expression within the list of offenses subject to treatment as hate crimes. GENDA will add "gender identity and expression" to the already existing New York State Human Rights Law, which makes it illegal to discriminate on the basis of age, race, creed,

national origin, sexual orientation, gender, gender dysphoria and other categories in the areas of employment, housing, public accommodation, education and credit.

There is ample precedent for passage of GENDA. Fifteen states have enacted comprehensive non-discrimination legislation that includes gender identity and expression. New York prohibits discrimination only on the basis of sexual orientation, not gender identity. In New York there are 11 localities that have non-discrimination ordinances that include gender identity and/or expression: Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, Ithaca, New York City, Rochester, Syracuse, Suffolk County, Tompkins County, and Westchester County.

We also note that, according to testimony by chiefs of police, these local laws are not only protecting individuals with gender variant identity and expression but also enhancing law enforcement and helping to lower crime rates. It is time that everyone in New York is protected by transgender rights legislation.

As a group representing congregations, clergy and activists in the Unitarian Universalist, Reform Jewish, mainline Protestant and other faith traditions, we affirm that the transcendent love identified in scripture and philosophy extends to all. The State has an obligation to defend the worth and dignity of every individual, including those with gender variant identity and expression. We strongly support legislation to outlaw discrimination against transgender people. It is imperative that we include gender identity and expression in the state's civil rights law alongside race, religion and disability.

As a group representing people in several faith traditions, we believe this is a moral issue. We urge our legislators to pass GENDA.

#### CONCLUSION – HUMAN RIGHTS FOR THE GLBTQ COMMUNITY

The struggle for full human rights for gays, lesbians, bi-sexuals and transgendered people is far from over. While there will be fundamentalists who will say this violates the will and word of God, there will also be those of us who read our bibles quite differently. IINYS supports inclusion of the GLBTQ community as a human rights issue, believing all people have worth, are children of God and merit society's protection. In the last analysis we are all more human than otherwise.

---

<sup>1</sup> Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Wink, Walter. "Biblical Perspectives on Homosexuality." *The Christian Century*, November 27, 1979.

<sup>3</sup> Lance, Darrell. Quoted by Richard S. Gilbert in *The Bible and Sexuality: Three Perspectives*. The First Unitarian Church of Rochester, NY, July 1995.

<sup>4</sup> Kristof, Nicholas. "Learning from the Sin of Sodom," *The New York Times*, February 28, 2010.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 180.

<sup>7</sup> "The Charles Curran Case," *America*. March 29, 1986.

<sup>8</sup> *Historical Notes: A Letter from Freud* in: *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, April, 1951, 107, No. 10, pp. 786 and 787.

<sup>9</sup> Kinsey, Alfred. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, 1948.

<sup>10</sup> See "Even the Benini of Buttercream Has to Serve Gay Couples," *The New York Times*, December 2, 2017.