

FREEDOM OF RELIGION —CAUGHT IN THE CULTURE WAR

There can be no doubt that the US and Canada are deeply involved in a culture war, with religious freedom the centre of the battle.

This has been going on in the background for the past several years, but erupted openly in April in the State of Indiana. The state had passed a law called the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), which was modelled after a federal law passed in 1993 under President Clinton. This law provided that the government could not interfere in anyone's right to religious freedom. There are 19 other states that already have a similar RFRA in place. Arkansas was in the process of passing a similar law, but withdrew it under political pressure. This is because mass hysteria and political posturing broke out over Indiana and Arkansas, engineered by homosexual activists who claimed that this legislation would permit discrimination against them by permitting businesses to withdraw services from them based on religious belief. That was not what the Act stated, since it related only to government interference, and did not relate to actions by individual businesses. No matter, the stage was set for a donnybrook over religious rights. Large US corporations were recruited by homosexual activists to bring about cultural change by way of harassment and bullying of those who resist their agenda. Apple's CEO,

Tim Cook, an acknowledged homosexual, turned to the pages of the Washington Post to declare that the Indiana law "would allow people to discriminate against their neighbours [LGBT's]". Wal Mart, whose head office is located in Arkansas, warned that it would move out of the state if it enacted the RFRA. Other corporations joined, resulting in Indiana and Arkansas backing down on the legislation. Both Apple and Wal Mart are selective and calculating in their outrage. Apple outsources the manufacture of its products to China, to the impoverished and underpaid workers there, and Wal Mart provides poverty wages to its employees everywhere. Moreover, if these and other corporations were genuinely concerned about discrimination, they would refuse to do business in countries where a person can be executed for being homosexual. But they don't.

It's far easier, with the media's support, to bully religions to conform to their dictates on the LGBT issue.

This is because religion is the last bulwark against the full acceptance of homosexuality. People of faith refuse to follow the script, determined by the state, media and now, the corporations. People of faith take their instructions from a higher authority—namely, the word of God. Thus, in view of their refusal to accept the script, religions must



Lisa Benson, Deseret News April 24, 2015

CONTENTS

FREEDOM OF RELIGION —CAUGHT IN THE CULTURE WAR	PAGE 1
GOOD NEWS ON THE ABORTION FRONT	PAGE 2
NO PRAYING: WE'RE CANADIAN	PAGE 3
BOOK REVIEW – THE STORY BEHIND INTERNATIONAL HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVISTS	PAGE 4
HOMOSEXUALS BLAME US FAMILY GROUPS FOR THEIR INTERNATIONAL FAILURES	PAGE 6

be stamped out or “adjusted” or revised, in light of the demands of the modern age.

An openly homosexual columnist in the New York Times, Frank Bruni, recently wrote that religions and religious people had to be freed from their prejudices and biases and that homosexuality should no longer be considered a sin. This capitulation exists in liberal churches following the denial of the truths of the Christian faith, such as the Virgin birth, the resurrection of Christ, the existence of miracles, life after death, etc. All must be re-thought and jettisoned according to Bruni “rightly bowing to the enlightenments of modernity.”

The result of such pressures is that some churches have ceased to uphold their religious values and have collapsed into social institutions rather than religious ones. For example, the United Church of Canada was a vibrant, influential church after its amalgamation in 1926 of the three Protestant Churches: Congregationalist, Presbyterian and Methodist. However, the United Church adapted to contemporary society with fatal results. In 1972 the General Council of the Church accepted the policy of abortion on demand, and has accepted other such secular views on prostitution, assisted suicide, same sex marriage, etc. In short, the United Church has abandoned the pillars of faith on which it was built. It must be difficult for members of the United Church today to sing with any enthusiasm the wonderful hymn “I know that my Redeemer Liveth ... and He at last will come for me” when one no longer is certain that He will come, after all. The United Church of Canada at one time had over one million adherents, but, according to recent surveys, has a membership of just under 300,000. Similarly, the Anglican Church is in disarray for the same reasons, with its membership collapsing. The pews of these re-organized, revisionist churches are quickly emptying while the resolute Catholic, Evangelical and Reformed Churches have continued to carry on, faithful to their Christian beliefs.

According to the left wing, the only faiths that deserve religious liberty are those that have capitulated theologically to the modern age. All others are despised. Ontarian NDP

Cheri DiNovo (who introduced the transgender bill in Ontario) stated that religious objection to homosexuality is a “cover for hatred”. Objections to gay straight alliances and trans access to bathrooms have “nothing to do with faith and everything to do with phobia”. She suggests that all opposition to LGBTQ rights and privileges are motivated by emotions and racism.

On April 8, 2015, former NDP staffer and regular political commentator on CBC News network “Power and Politics”, Ian Capstick, announced that he and others are going to work to remove the charitable status of any churches that do not support gay marriage.

In effect, homosexual activists, with their fellow enthusiasts are working on the long term secular humanist project of banning its chief rival, Christianity, from any role in public life. They believe religious freedom must be cut down by limiting freedom of worship to occur within only a church, temple, mosque or synagogue. It may only occur, that is, in the pews, homes and hearts, but not be an influence in public policy. That is, to secure their totalitarian rule, these activists believe religion must be obliterated from the public square.

A culture war is a war of values. This war will not be won tomorrow. Our task is to maintain our culture against these venomous attacks. To win, we must maintain our organic organization which consists of our families, our communities and our religious, cultural groups, our arts, and our skills to resist this unauthentic counter culture of the left. The latter is a clumsily slapped together assemblage, trying to dominate people by the fetishization of a minority. Homosexuals should have the same rights as others, but should not have special rights based on their destructive sexual practices and life-style, which are detrimental to their very lives. The left had nothing to keep them going except for their hatred of established religious beliefs. We must live out our lives as persons of faith which is the natural resistance to the pressures caused by this bullying. We will destroy their system by refusing to be controlled by it. Our task is to outlive their counter culture. †

GOOD NEWS ON THE ABORTION FRONT

The federal and provincial governments and the media have placed a cone of silence over the abortion issue. ... From time to time, however, this artificial calm is broken, revealing a boiling cauldron of dissent, which will not and cannot be silenced.

The federal and provincial governments and the media have placed a cone of silence over the abortion issue. They don't want this bitter and divisive issue to be resurrected. Better it remain undisturbed, buried in silence with a woman continuing to decide privately whether she wants her pregnancy to continue, or

not, at taxpayer's expense, for whatever reason—inconvenience, life-style choice, morning sickness, job or educational opportunities, lack of support, etc. Any reason is of little matter. No fuss, no bother, no debate on the ethical, moral, economic, or social implications of abortion. Just let the issue remain hidden, buried as only one of life's minor questions.

From time to time, however, this artificial calm is broken, revealing a boiling cauldron of dissent, which will not and cannot be silenced. These eruptions will continue until they are too insistent and demanding to be silenced any longer.

One such eruption occurred on April 20, 2015, when the pro-life organization, the Association for Reformed Political Action (ARPA) launched legal proceedings against the Ontario gov-

ernment for refusing to release information related to abortion.

ARPA was joined in this legal action by an Ottawa based pro-life blogger, Patricia Maloney, who had uncovered the sordid story behind Ontario's cover-up of abortion information.

In 2011, Ms. Maloney had requested, under the Freedom of Information Act, information from the Ontario Ministry of Health on abortion. She learned, at that time, that 44,000 abortions were performed in Ontario in 2010. That is about 45% more than reported by the Canadian Institute of Health Information. In 2012, Ms. Maloney then requested for further information on abortion. She was shocked to learn, however, that the government had secretly amended the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA) to prohibit release of any such information on abortion. There is no recorded debate on this amendment in Hansard, nor any committee hearings. It was slipped into the law with no explanation. This is appalling. Why the secrecy? What's going on?

Initially, requests by Ms. Maloney and other pro-life individuals across Canada to provincial governments, for information on abortion, received the same response—namely, that the information cannot be disclosed as the names of patients are private information. Who had asked for names? No one. It was a ludicrous response.

What was requested was information on the number of abortions performed, demographic statistics of women who had abortions: their age, how many times they have abortions and the gestational age of the unborn child, as well as complications resulting from this procedure. Since the public is paying for these so called medical procedures, why are citizens forbidden to have this basic information? The short answer is that provincial governments don't want the public to know about the callous and expensive destruction of our future generations. Instead, governments cover it all up because they don't

want the public to interfere in this politically correct policy, which costs taxpayers millions of dollars each year. If we don't know what's going on, how can we object?

There is a good possibility that this legal action in Ontario may take a couple of years, with the governments putting up resistance at every turn—but it has to be done.

100,000 PRO-LIFE FLAGS

At the same time the legal action was announced at a press conference at Ontario's legislature, Queen's Park, over 150 volunteers from the pro-life group "We Need A Law.ca" joined ARPA Canada to set up 100,000 blue and pink flags on the lawn surrounding Queen's Park. This immense display of flags represented the approximately 100,000 human lives destroyed by abortion every year in Canada.

According to ARPA "every flag is a testament to a little boy or girl who was denied a welcome into our nation". These dead pre-born human beings are an equivalent to about 5,000 classrooms across Canada, every single year. No wonder the government wants to keep this awful statistic secret from the public.

A similar demonstration of blue and pink flags was planted on Parliament Hill in Ottawa in October, 2014. They formed a colourful carpet on the grass, 400 meters long in front of the Parliament Buildings.

These demonstrations are hard to ignore. Expect other provincial capitals to have similar demonstrations, as Ontario is not alone in undemocratically denying information to the public on abortion. For example, British Columbia has a similar censorship provision.

These arrogant governments believe they know what is best for the public. Keeping the public in the dark on the abortion issue is their policy. This has to stop. †

NO PRAYING: WE'RE CANADIAN

The City Council of Saguenay, Quebec has been ordered by the Supreme Court of Canada to cease opening its council meetings with the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank You for the great blessings that You have given to Saguenay and its citizens, including freedom, opportunities for development and peace. Guide us in our deliberations as City Council members and help us to be aware of our duties and responsibilities. Grant us the wisdom, knowledge and understanding to allow us to preserve the benefits enjoyed by our city for all to enjoy and so that we may make wise decisions. Amen.

Saguenay's population is 94% Christian according to the 2011 General Household Survey: only 6% claim no religious affiliation.

However, one atheist, Alain Simoneau, claimed that the opening prayer at the Saguenay City Council was offensive to him, and took his case to the Supreme Court of Canada. On

April 15, 2015, the court obligingly held that Mr. Simoneau had suffered "isolation, exclusion and stigmatization" by Saguenay's City Council conducting its brief introductory prayer. The court awarded him \$30,000.00 for what was essentially his hurt feelings. One would think that the Supreme Court of Canada was another human rights tribunal with its enthusiasm for delving into such tender, sensitive matters as "hurt feelings".

The court declared in its judgment:

sponsorship of one religious tradition by the state in breach of its duty of neutrality amounts to discrimination against all other such traditions ...

A neutral public space free from coercion, pressure and judgment on the part of public authorities in matters of spirituality is intended to protect every person's freedom and dignity and it helps to preserve and promote the multicultural nature of Canadian society.

Come again? Coercion, pressure, and judgment? How did they find all this buried in the recitation of the prayer? One has to be a Supreme Court Judge, one supposes, to be able to read such reckless and tragic implications in the recitation of a benign prayer.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE COURT'S DECISION

As soon as the decision was handed down, some Canadian mayors announced they would no longer recite a prayer at the opening of council meetings. Some were the mayors of

Ottawa, Windsor, Regina and Edmonton. In one fell swoop, God has been removed from the nation's city councils.

Curiously, the prayer recited in the Saguenay City Council is the same prayer recited by the Speaker of the House of Commons before each Parliamentary sitting. Fortunately, the court may not be able to insert its sticky fingers into that particular pie, due to Parliamentary Privilege. The latter also applies to provincial legislatures, which apparently, are also uttering such unacceptable words before their legislative sessions commence. †

BOOK REVIEW—THE STORY BEHIND INTERNATIONAL HOMOSEXUAL ACTIVISTS



Transnational LGBT Activism
by Ryan R. Thoreson,
Published by:
University of Minnesota Press,
288 pages
Cost: \$29.88 CDN,
\$16.00 Kindle edition

Ryan Thoreson, who self-identifies as “queer”, studied the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) movement while working in the offices of the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission (IGLHRC), an American based international advocacy group. This book is based on the doctoral dissertation in anthropology that Thoreson wrote while studying at Oxford University in the UK. Mr. Thoreson later obtained a law degree from Yale.

According to Thoreson, IGLHRC was founded in 1990 in San Francisco by radical feminist, bisexual activist Julie Dorf and it operated within the feminist movement, gaining notoriety as an extremist group at the UN Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, 1995.

Dorf describes the early IGLHRC as “a bunch of ragtag street activists and immigrants who really came out of that era in the late 80’s and 90’s of ACT-UP and Queer Nation...”. Working from homes at first, the organization gained traction and offices in New York City when it started receiving generous funding from extremist anti-life foundations, like the Ford Foundation, George Soros Open Society, and Swedish government and several US GLBT donor groups. Dorf is now senior officer, consultant and advisor to several major feminist and GLBT groups promoting and funding GLBTQ. IGLHRC now has offices in New York, Cape Town and Buenos Aires.

Some of the employees and consultants of IGLHRC have taken prominent roles internationally. One consultant was founder of the Soros Foundation’s International Women’s Program; a coordinator had worked at the anti-life, pro-homosexual International Commission of Jurists; another interned for a group of anti-life lawyers at the European Parliament, and one of its directors has worked for the Planned

Parenthood Margaret Sanger Center International.

In fact, what this IGLHRC organization has become is an international centre for gay imperialism, with the same few funders generously supporting it. Understandably, its international advocacy is deeply resented by Middle East, African and European countries, who object to its agenda, since it is contrary to their cultures and religions. These countries also regard IGLHRC as an exporter of American extremist sexual politics. To counteract the activists of IGLHRC, many of these countries have passed legislation specifically opposing homosexuality.

AIDS FUNDING FUELS GAY ACTIVISM

Using tactics learned from the feminist movement and employing human rights language, GLBT advocacy has found common ground with abortion activists, international feminists who lobby the United Nations, HIV/AIDS fundraising teams, drug harm reduction promoters and prostitution rights groups. All are left of centre, working together on extremist initiatives in order to implement their agenda world-wide.

The book reveals that: “Groups working with MSM (men who have sex with men) in particular are able to take advantage of considerable amounts of money devoted to combating HIV/AIDS. IGLHRC’s work in Africa has benefited greatly from this increased funding...” IHRFG (International Human Rights Funders Group) claims: “the majority of funding for the LGBT rights sector comes from HIV/AIDS sources....”

Despite the obstacles IGLHRC faces working in Eastern Europe, African countries, and in South America and Asia, it is relentless in its efforts. In 2004, it organized training in India, Uganda, Canada (during the same-sex marriage debates), Paraguay, Macedonia, the Netherlands, and other countries.

NEW LGBTQ RIGHTS CONFLICT WITH THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS

IGLHRC describes its mission as threefold:

1. the construction of human rights,
2. their promotion, and
3. their institutionalization within nations and the United Nations.

They claim to be creating a “norm”, homosexuality, admitting that the new human rights they are promoting are an affront to present norms or standards of behaviour. They claim to defend the rights of LGBTQ sex workers and all those who they consider to be outside the “charmed circle” of what is understood in our society to be “good”, “normal” and “natural”. The author notes that IGLHRC employees ignore and dismiss the accusations that “the human rights of LGBT people are an affront and an attack on wider community concerns”. Balancing rights is of no interest to them.

Instead, the author reports that IGLHRC downplays the fact that GLBT rights are in conflict with the charters and constitutions of many countries. For example, it tries to interpret the wording of the African Charter that provides that rights be exercised “with due regard to the rights of others, collective security, morality, and common interest” to include homosexual rights. Other examples of constitutions that IGLHRC is trying to use for its own purposes include the Ugandan constitution that “protects the right to culture, tradition, and religion”. The IGLHRC pretends that the UN human rights treaty, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which recognizes limits to freedom of expression for the purposes of “national security, public order, public health or morals or the rights and freedoms of others”, includes homosexual rights. Their wish that this be so, however, does not make it a fact.

LGBTQ IN ACADEMIA

It is clear from the book’s 50 pages of footnotes and index, that activists are ensconced in universities around the world, using millions of tax dollars to study every sexual orientation imaginable and developing the wordsmithing necessary to normalize the homosexual agenda. Thousands of post-graduate degrees are handed out as GLBTQ aficionados quote one another, micro-analyse their political movements and promote their publications. Canadian Universities are a party to this duplicity, aided and abetted by Industry Canada’s agency, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. The latter’s database lists 261 post graduate projects with the word “queer” in the title, 176 with “lesbian”, and 168 with “gay”. That is, Canadian taxpayers’ money is being used by these phony, self-serving, ideologically based studies to promote the homosexual agenda both here and abroad.

The same groups and individuals, involved in lobbying to redefine marriage worldwide were also engaged in formulating the extremist Yogyakarta Principles, now being used to try to impose, by legislation, homosexual, transgender, transsexual and cross-dressing normativity. This effort has met, to date, with effective opposition at the United Nations, especially from Middle East and African countries, which, unlike Canada and the US, do not accept that SOGI (sexual orientation and gender identity) exist as concepts in their culture.

As different sexual orientations come into play and “human rights are perpetually being thoughtfully reconfigured, and redeployed”, one cannot help but conclude that “the new human rights framework” being promoted is far from solid. The book quotes activists themselves who see the GLBT movement as combative, territorial and polarized with major schisms. E.g. the transgendered, cross-dressing and gender-confused, in the movement, are far from welcome, except perhaps in media circles.

Activists now claim that “gender is not static, it is changeable over time and across contexts”. The possibilities for “gender trouble” are endless as long as the money keeps flowing to homosexual activists. Ontario’s Trillium Foundation funds Canada’s major LGBTQ group, EGALE, to infiltrate schools to promote the GLBTQ agenda. EGALE, operating in Canada as a “charitable” organization, has a \$1.8 million annual budget, similar to that of the international IGLHRC, at \$2.3 million in 2011. The Human Rights Campaign, the major US homosexual rights group, had a \$38.5 million budget in 2013, with plans to expand internationally.

GLBTQ FAKING IT

The GLBT movement, admittedly, runs on bluff and public shaming of timid legislators, businesses and corporations, with the help of the media. One of their tactics is to “fake it ‘till you make it”. One IGLHRC director laughingly confirmed: “You keep saying something until everyone really does believe it’s true. If I tell people enough times that a [UN] Security Council resolution is international law that is binding, eventually it will be...”

Although the author, Thoreson, openly addresses GLBTQ problems, he shows no sign of openness to points of view outside the GLBTQ human rights doctrine. Any resistance to the homosexual/feminist attacks on heteronormativity, i.e., the natural family as norm, is dismissed as homophobia. Those with religious sensitivities are viewed as “religious hardliners”. While he claims to be open and scientific as an anthropologist, he writes with the thinking and language bias of an activist.

He does, however, candidly list the three major troubles facing the GLBT movement:

1. the specter of pedophilia;
2. accusations that the movement has an elitist agenda from the privileged West; and
3. the concern that GLBT rights will ride roughshod over all other rights.

The book, Transnational LGBT Activism, is not an easy read, but for those engaged in defending life and family, it contains insights into many events and personalities, as well as familiar tactics that homosexual activists undertake to eradicate the natural family in order to replace it with crude, open, unrestrained sexual activity. †

HOMOSEXUALS BLAME US FAMILY GROUPS FOR THEIR INTERNATIONAL FAILURES

The activism led by the international homosexual group IGLHRC, in its attempt to force an agenda on foreign countries, contrary to their culture and religion, has been a failure. Its activities have resulted, instead, in increased legislative resistance to its demands.

US homosexual organizations, such as the affluent and influential US Human Rights Campaign (HRC), are blaming US pro-family groups for this disaster. For example, the HRC published two documents in 2014 highlighting the so-called “bigoted” work of US pro-family groups in foreign countries. One publication entitled “The Export of Hate” includes sketches of pro-family leaders resembling criminal “wanted” posters. HRC examined the funding and work of these pro-life family groups, condemning their behaviour of daring to oppose its agenda in the US and abroad. HRC claims there are 80 nations around the world which refuse to accept homosexuality because of the impact of US pro-family groups operating in these countries.

In another 2014 publication, HRC zeros in specifically on the World Congress of Families, in a document entitled “Exposed: The World Congress of Families — An American Organization Exporting Hate”. The publication states, that due to WCF’s connections, its rhetoric and its willingness to associate with and encourage radically homophobic and transphobic activists, it has an outsize influence on anti-LGBT sentiment and legislation in many foreign countries.

Interestingly, HRC seems genuinely puzzled that the WCF has not backed down in its efforts anywhere, despite persistent pressure by homosexual activists to do so.

It is significant that the designation of US pro-family

groups as “hate groups” is determined by the extreme left wing Southern Poverty Law Center situated in Montgomery, Alabama. However, its listings of hate are without merit since the Southern Poverty Law Center lists all groups that do not support the homosexual agenda, as “hate” groups.

The problem, however, is that some homosexual activists take the organization’s designation seriously. For example: in August 2012, an extremist entered the offices of the Washington headquarters of the pro-family organization, Family Research Council, and shot a security guard before the wounded guard wrestled him to the floor and subdued him until police arrived. The offender was not a misguided, erratic individual. He was a homosexual activist who had a masters degree from George Mason University — College of Education and Human Development. According to the FBI, in his rampage, this individual wanted to kill as many pro-family individuals as possible. In his pocket, the FBI found a handwritten list of groups which opposed same-sex marriage. This man had been given a license to perpetrate his act of violence by the Southern Poverty Law Centre which has systematically and recklessly labeled every organization with which it disagreed, as a hate group.

It is only reasonable to question which side of this controversy is consumed with hate. It is not the pro-family groups who, at least, are willing to enter into civilized debate with their opponents. Not so, the homosexual side which is consumed with vile hatred for all individuals and institutions which object to their agenda. They want to stamp out and utterly destroy this resistance. They are tyrants, incapable of reasoning or honest behaviour toward those who disagree with them. They are the bigots and fascists of the 21st century. †

MESSAGE BOARD

- The Federal Election in October 2015 is fast-approaching. Join your local riding associations to be involved in the nomination process for pro-life, pro-family candidates. Recall that in this election, all Liberals and NDP candidates will be pro-abortion as required by their leaders, Justin Trudeau and Thomas Mulcair, respectively.
- **Action Item:** Write to [Attorney General Peter Mackay](#) to thank him for backing the rights of Trinity Western University which has been involved in a legal dispute with the Law Society of Upper Canada. Mackay stated that it is against the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms for the LSUC to ban law graduates from TWU from practising law just because as students, they are required to sign a community covenant, agreeing to live according to Christian moral teachings, including abstaining from sexual intimacy outside of heterosexual marriage. Copy your [MP](#) and [Prime Minister Harper](#) in your correspondence. †

SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

PLEASE MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO JOIN OUR WORK
TO DEFEND & PROTECT LIFE & THE FAMILY

Membership \$30/year • Groups \$50/year • Donation _____

Contributions, unfortunately, are not tax deductible.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

Province _____ Postal Code _____

Tel _____ Email _____

Send online at www.realwomenofcanada.ca or by mail. Thank you.

REALity is a publication of **REAL Women of Canada**

PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 • Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203

www.realwomenofcanada.ca • info@realwomenofcanada.ca