

# **Postal Plebiscite Debate – Have the People of Australia Over-Ruled God’s Abiding Will on Homosexuality?**

PLEASE NOTE.

THIS ARTICLE CONTAINS MATURE THEMES AND  
IS NOT SUITABLE FOR PRE-ADULT READING.

This article has been written for the express purpose to be used in conjunction with Faithchasers’ outreach to bring an awareness of challenges currently faced by the Christian faith and those that profess their belief in the Word of God and the salvation that has been wrought through Jesus our Lord and Saviour. Contextually this is not a document prepared for broad public distribution. It is an educational guide for Faithchasers to understanding Biblical scripture within the landscape of our current contemporary society.

This whole issue of whether the Australian public agrees to allow same gender couples to take advantage of an amended Federal Marriage Act to be able to access a formal marriage arrangement within the Federal jurisdiction, albeit after a change to the definition of a legitimate male and female couple, has far reaching implications well beyond anything that Mr and Mrs Average citizen could even dream about.

Certainly this is not a simple question, and just as certainly nor is there a simple answer. Australia has conflicting interests at play within our general society and also, not dissimilarly, conflicting interests within our Federal Parliament as an operating function of Australia's Constitution. So let's first look at the Australian Constitution first.

Australia became an independent nation on 1 January 1901 when the British Parliament passed legislation allowing the six Australian colonies to govern in their own right as part of the Commonwealth of Australia. The Commonwealth of Australia was established as a constitutional monarchy and through it our forefathers prescribed what jurisdictional matters the new Federal Government would have. One of these was marriage and hence the Marriage Act was created, and being a nation reflecting the norms of a society befitting a young and enthusiastic country where opportunity was on the doorstep for any citizen who wished to seek their fame and fortune within the lands of this great island in the Pacific, the formation of a Federated union of states was struck to give Australians these freedoms to pursue their lives in whatever their endeavours were.

So the basis of the new Constitution for a united states of Australia was laid down and we can look back on the wisdom of our forefathers through its crafting and we can see that they understood that it was a great and onerous responsibility to make and prosecute laws to govern mankind within their borders and hence for very good reasons carefully worded the preamble for that document to reflect the intrinsic essence that would undergird every aspect of our united Australia.

The main stay of the Constitution was clearly not of money, it was not of societal class, it was not of power or might – it was a declaration that the people of the united states of this new Federated Australia would humbly rely on the blessing of Almighty God that Federation would be workable and fair to every Australian within it.

The wording is:

*The preamble*

*Whereas the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania, humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God, have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth etc.*

Without overstating this undergirding confidence that Federation would work and be successful, Australia declared that it was a nation beholden to God for its success and for the well-being of those within it. And I might add, that preamble statement is still in force today and a great majority of Australian citizens still rely on our leaders and lawmakers to uphold its tenets.

This is saying that any challenge to our laws as they stand need to be measured against our Constitutional foundation that the citizens of Australia are, “*humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God*”. So what does it mean to, “rely on the blessing of Almighty God”?

Well there is a surprise here for us all. The Constitution has bound the office bearers of our Parliament and our law makers to the extent that if they depart from that which Almighty God will bless, they are in breach of the foundational premise of our Constitution. Remember it is the citizens of Federation who are humbly relying on the blessings from God for their united existence within the Federation. Some might scoff at this. However the Constitution is the founding document of our Federation and it dictates the bonds that our forefathers wrote into it to ensure future generations would not depart from its foundational premise. And very clearly, the concerns of our forefathers were that the fledgling nation would stray from that which they wished for Australia and consequently, through their wisdom, they enshrined the duty of our government to perform in a manner that would attract the blessing of God.

If we come up in time one hundred and seventeen years those bonds have not been severed nor dispensed with. The Parliament is still bound to not depart from doing that which falls into a reliance on the blessings of God. It is the essence of the reliance on God that is now under challenge by a Parliamentary push to change the Constitutional laws in relation to the Marriage Act. The change being sought is to re-word the Marriage Act to accommodate same gender relationships so that marriage no longer will be defined as being between gender specific males and females.

This brings us to the question where we wish to know what we should expect from our Parliamentarians in their duties to act in good faith toward governing the Federated States.

The pent up heat that this proposal to change the Marriage Act is generating has its roots back in the preamble of the Constitution; and to understand why, we need to explore if changing the Marriage Act is (in the first instance) contrary to the preamble statement. By definition, if God has deemed certain actions by mankind to be so heinous that it is considered to be an abomination before Him, then we can only conclude that if those actions not only become common place in our society, which also raises deep toleration issues, but are further enshrined into our laws in total disregard to the preamble statement, then clearly the Parliament is acting contrary to God and is breaching the trust of the people within the Federation who are relying on God for his blessings. God will not bless that which he considers an abomination – no matter what that may be. We could strongly suggest that changing the law in this case is unconstitutional because it transgresses against God’s abiding will for mankind. This leads us to identify what God’s abiding will is on this particular matter.

Our universal guide to knowing what God will bless and what He rejects in societal behaviour is clearly laid down in both the Old Testament (Tanakh) and also the Gospels from our Bible of the Common Era. In unambiguous terminology we read that any form of homosexual behaviour is an abomination to God. And we can’t argue this away with feigned social acceptance in our current contemporary society. An abomination to God a few thousand years ago is not going to suddenly become a blessing in later times, and this

we can see in several places of the canon scripture as we trace, for the sake of our discussion, other societies that allowed same gender relationships to flourish. There are several passages from canon scripture that go to our case in point and it is very productive to view them all.

### **Old Testament Law:**

Leviticus 18:22      *Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.*

Leviticus 20:13      *If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.*

### **New Testament Gospels**

Romans 1:24 - 32      *Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves:*

*Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:*

*And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet.*

*And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;*

*Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers,*

*Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents,*

*Without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful:*

*Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.*

1Corinthians 6:9 *Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind,*

1Titus 1:8 – 10 *But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully;*

*Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,*

*For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for men-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;*

We can further see in the canon scriptures that homosexuality was, in some regions, rampant in earlier times and clear examples of communities acting contrary to societal codes that were based upon the blessings of God were noted in those early Song Lines.

Genesis 19:5 - 8 *And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, Where are the men which came in to thee this night? bring them out unto us, that we may know them.*

*And Lot went out at the door unto them, and shut the door after him,*

*And said, I pray you, brethren, do not so wickedly.*

*Behold now, I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes: only unto these men do nothing; for therefore came they under the shadow of my roof.*

Judges 19:22 - 24 *Now as they were making their hearts merry, behold, the men of the city, certain sons of Belial, beset the house round about, and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, the old man, saying, Bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him.*

*And the man, the master of the house, went out unto them, and said unto them, Nay, my brethren, nay, I pray you, do not so wickedly; seeing that this man is come into mine house, do not this folly.*

*Behold, here is my daughter a maiden, and his concubine; them I will bring out now, and humble ye them, and do with them what seemeth good unto you: but unto this man do not so vile a thing.*

These were communities that had allowed diverse same-gender relationships (and behaviour) which permeated throughout their society. The outcome from those freedoms away from God's abiding will for human behaviour spoiled the entire community who were judged by God in a scenario that modern mankind risks today. What we are reading about is human behaviour driven by sexual gratification, and not a relationship issue. The two are mutually exclusive.

With respect to how appropriate the Constitution is for Australia in this twenty first century, there will never be a consensus as long we have free speech that often conflicts with a biblical view from which we do not formally teach to our citizenship about the principles of God. Added to this we have a form of democracy that allows minority groups to hold sway over elected members of our government – out of fear presumably of losing their seat in an election, and hence there exists a weak constitution of principle in many of our representatives. This is a classic example of our case in point where a minority group pushes for legislation to normalise a certain behaviour regardless of whether it is good, bad or indifferent to society as a whole. Our Constitution, if properly administered, should always take the view of the expected Christian basis of our Parliament as set forth by our founding forefathers in 1901.

Many of us will remember clearly back in 1999 the campaign to separate Australia away from all ties to the British Empire in favour of becoming the Republic of Australia. And driving that attempt to cut our ties with our reigning monarchy was no other person but our current Prime Minister who, as we will all know is driving this push to change the Constitution to legislatively normalise same gender marriage. I do not believe it is coincidental. I think that this is a longer term strategy to dispense with God and open the flood gates to something similar to what consumed Sodom and Gomorrah, or in simple terms, govern the masses down to the lowest possible common denominator where any behaviour is acceptable. Same gender marriage rights are but the beginning – and this warning should be loud and clear.

So you can ask if the current Constitution is appropriate for today. The answer, unequivocally is Yes! It is a bolt-hole to keep God's abiding will as an over-sight of our Government and the laws it is passing for running this country. Without God as the foundational rock we are lost to every perverse human practise that any minority group gets into its head to push onto all society. If this sounds fanatical, it is the opposite fanaticism of pushing very unseemly teachings and normalising behaviours that legalises all forms of perverse sexual behaviour. Welcome to your new Republic with a Bill of Rights that will incarcerate any person who speaks out against it and protects the very essence of everything that is evil in the eyes of God's word.

Traditionally Australia has seen itself as a monarchical nation with deep Christian veins pulsing through government and commerce and through society in general in various forms of adherence. Whether this be through the traditional Church of England or Church of Roman or the multiplicity of other persuasions that were spawned after Luther and the protestant rebellion out of Europe.

As a side comment, little has been recognised about the indigenous population of Australia and their religious beliefs from millenniums past. These communities are an important part of the nation's history, but their religious beliefs have had very little influence on those pro-Christian migrant settlers that arrived after the eighteenth century.

But none-the-less our "white" heritage was in our beginnings wrought from British settlements and the penal colonies they administered. This encompassed Australian immigration policies toward the broad regions of Asia, the Africas, Eastern Europe and even the Americas, which in essence was that Australian immigration policy would only accept those who had similar cultural backgrounds to England. In later years it was dubbed the White Australia Policy because, and perhaps even inadvertently, it excluded persons because of their appearance. *It-was-what-it-was* and no doubt heavily influenced by the British oversight, but today nearly every Australian would shun such a divisive selection tool for its border control policy.

As we came up the years through the First and Second World Wars followed by the Korean Peninsula conflict, the Vietnam conflict, and more recently the Middle East conflicts of Iraq and Afghanistan and the conflicts within the Africas, we saw the White Australia policy finally dispensed with.

This heralded such large demographic movements of people from Europe and the Mediterranean region, ie dislocated Jewish, Italian and Turkish peoples and later we also saw population shifts from the regions where conflicts were driving their populations to seek safety in other countries. We have since seen shifts of large numbers of Vietnamese (and their neighbouring border countries) and from the Indian subcontinent, and at our current time we are receiving families from the Africas and the Middle East.

Why I have mentioned this is because with the dispensing of the "White Australia Policy" we have seen a multitude of different cultures coming to Australia bringing with them their diverse religions and societal belief codes. Their impact on the traditional Australian culture is dramatic and is best seen through how the population has grown. In 1945 Australia had a population of 7.4 million and since then some 7 million people have emigrated from the country of their fathers and settled here. There is also a secondary population impact by the children that have been born to these new Australian citizens who would have held similar cultural values to that of their parents. Currently the population of Australia is 24.5 million, and the point that I wish to emphasise is that we are very much so a cosmopolitan nation and whatever traditional values we held in 1945 have been diluted by the effects of this *cosmopolitanism*.

But in relation to all of these introduced cultures and customs, they do not bring a homosexual culture into the country. These cultures have their societal codes, and if I may be a little crass for the sake of making an important point, even cultures from regions of very basic communities still have codes of conduct (or laws) and they do not embrace homosexual relationships as a way of life. They may embrace polygamy or even arranged marriages, but homosexuality is a whole different behaviour they do not condone.

So whilst post eighteenth century Australia's traditional view of Christianity is being diluted by an influx of new citizens practising Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Sikhism (only to mention a few) their impact may be felt in relation to influencing other Government policies, for example the Republic debate, but I do not see any of them that we could single out as a culture supporting the debate on normalising same gender relationships within the country's Marriage Act.

This therefore leads us to think about why has there been a rise in the acceptance of homosexual behaviour within Australia's population. It certainly is a traditional moral issue, but once again may I say that there is confusion in the minds of society in general that they ignore the abnormal sexual behaviour and react only to the assertions of "but we love each other".

Don't be confused about what has always been mateship and going out and doing social activities with good friends of the same gender. Many people of both genders grew up with groups of really good friends and had a lot in common together – exploring the wilds of the world, learning societal limits on social behaviours, perhaps having fun nights out or just sharing in each other's activities and interests. The point I am making is, that for all those years of growing from youth to young adult and on to mature person there was no hint of any homosexual relationship or behaviour. I feel aggrieved that a minority of people have robbed society of innocently having mates to grow up with. So this relationship excuse to legitimise the behaviour of homosexual couples is a put up. It is just an excuse to make it sound acceptable. The real fact is "homosexual" behaviour is all about sexual gratification and not about trusting and loving relationships that all humans have with our friends, our colleagues, our family members and even our domestic pets and treasured inanimate items. As we have mentioned, the two are mutually exclusive.

One of the issues that arose during the debate period prior to the close of the postal plebiscite was that the pithy issues concerning homosexual behaviour were not permitted to be aired through the media. They were deemed too offensive for public broadcasting and whilst I hold the media ( pretty well across the board) guilty of endeavouring to swaying the vote outcome through their very biased reporting, their broadcasting of like-minded other programmes containing homosexual content cast into a "good and wholesome light", and their unwillingness to broadcast content that fully explained why homosexual behaviour was abnormal and an abomination before God, those who saw the evils of homosexual behaviour for what it really was were muffled.

The *debatees* that held the view for change to the Marriage Act knew that the media would not show or discuss what God deems to be the unseemly aspects of sexual activity nor permit any discussion on air about the real issues of male homosexual acts. And we all noticed that the advertising drive for those supporting homosexual couples to be allowed marriage under the Constitutional Act featured females more so than males. "Why was this?" you may be thinking; because we know from God's word that the real abomination of homosexual behaviour is with males.

The other negative aspect of homosexuality is that there is no risk of accidental procreation. It offers risk-free sexual gratification to all and sundry which brings us to a very sensitive

issue, that again was not permitted to be part of the public debate, and that is, we have to shield our children from this knowledge. In fact this is so sensitive that it goes beyond what this article is prepared to mention – let alone discuss. Suffice that this whole homosexual issue being permitted as an accepted behaviour in our general society is going to impact our children in one form or another, and as we all know, any acceptability on a general scale will – without doubt, permeate down to our young. This is an absolute evil from the culture of Sodom noted in the Old Testament.

If we had a section here for FAQ's we would surely want to know about the notion if there is an argument that would show homosexual behaviour as a behavioural feeder for paedophilia? This is delicate and is polarising to the extremes of both arguments in the postal vote plebiscite so let's try and break it down into understandable chunks and yet stay within the bounds of the current anti-vilification speech laws.

All sexually driven behaviour has common threads back to the desires of our flesh. We can generalise here, even to be inclusive of procreation, that our sexual desires have been hard-wired into our human machinery. Chemical changes that occur in our bodies, and perhaps particularly in our neuro systems that are triggered from our sensory faculties, have a very powerful influence over our decision making processes and consequently our physical actions.

The hard wiring of the type we are discussing is a mechanism given to mankind for the purposes of attraction of the opposite gender to drive procreation. Very typically this human drive is accompanied by affection one for another under a God-given law that a man and woman will leave their parents to lead a life together as one and bear children. There is of course a spiritual element here also, but let's just stick to the earthy issues.

However there is a period in our development where the maturing process that occurs from pre-adolescence to manhood can be interrupted and interfered with. Raging hormonal changes in our bodies are able to alter behaviour through changes in our cognitive processes in these teenage years, and it is well recognised that this is a period of vulnerability for our brain development to be influenced away from a heterosexual mind set to other forms of pent up sexual relief. It is likely that what occurs in these years can have ramifications many years later in a latent behavioural change.

There are many unpleasant, sordid and criminal forms of behaviour that sexual gratification can exploit to gain satisfaction. It is my opinion that there are linkages between heterosexual intercourse and "all" other forms of sexual gratification, but in putting all forms of sex acts in one reference basket would only apply for those who do not have the capacity (through immaturity or cognitive impairment) to have a physical relationship in the manner of heterosexual couples who have a bonded affection for one another and thus procreative intercourse becomes an expression (or in modern parlance a celebration) of their love one for another with the expectation of bearing offspring. The object of the relationship is building a family.

Now I am not so uninformed as to suggest that heterosexual couples do not use modern means to thwart that procreative process and have a physical relationship from a

perspective of enjoyment. But this “trend” if I may call it so, did not widely exist in times past. Intercourse was not always so easily manipulated as to prevent pregnancy and it is an indicator of the hard wiring into our human form to drive population expansion. Neither am I suggesting that all heterosexual relationships are pure in the form as I have described. Even heterosexual couples can have psychological issues that drive them toward acts of sexual gratification beyond just themselves.

However the point I wished to make is that if we open the door to normalising homosexual behaviour in society, which is described biblically as pertaining to those who are given over to a reprobate mind set (The Book of Romans 1:27), that same mind set also embraces all forms of sexual gratification. One cannot be half evil, or half good or for that matter half pregnant. You are either one or the other and therefore my conclusion is that homosexual behaviour is an indicator of a contrary mind-set that also includes many contrary behaviours including paedophilia. But in direct answer to the question about linkages between one and the other, it cannot be said that there is any causation between same gender couples in relationships and paedophilia. This is a dangerous over-reach to the extreme.

Globally twenty five countries have legislated to change their Marriage Acts to be inclusive of homosexual couples. Mexico can be added to this list but they have not fully legislated across all of their jurisdictions. The first of these occurred in the year 2000 and up until 2009 eight governments (including Mexico) had changed their laws. But the surprising metric comes in the period following, from 2010 to 2017 where eighteen countries have allowed changes to their marriage legislature.

The experience from these overseas countries that have legislated to normalise homosexual relationships into formal marriage arrangements within their communities raises issues that have not been addressed here in Australia. In an article entitled, “Changing the Marriage Act Could Change the Country” published in The Australian (12:00AM August 14, 2017), recognised senior commentator Paul Kelly noted;

*“.....the passage of same-sex marriage could have a second and far more important consequence: “an assault on religious freedoms made possible by inadequate laws that will see a major shift in Australian society”. Without adequate protection, he pointed out, many avenues of intimidation would be open against individuals and schools, charities, businesses and adoption agencies that continue to believe in the traditional definition of marriage. Consumer boycotts against businesses who oppose same-sex marriage could be promoted via -social media.*

*In February, a Senate -select committee found “the evidence supports the need for current protections for religious freedom to be enhanced”. Little, if anything, has been done. But it must be, soon, if religious freedom is to be upheld in the event of a change to the Marriage Act.*

*Conflicts overseas show the issue is more complex than allowing florists and bakers to refuse to supply goods for same-sex weddings (the proposed bill does not allow them to say “no”). In the UK, adoption agencies unwilling to place children with same-sex couples have closed. In Canada, graduates of a Christian university were*

*refused teacher registration on the grounds they might discriminate against LGBTI students. In the US, major companies threatened to boycott Georgia over moves to expand religious exceptions in relation to same-sex marriage.*

*Sydney City councillor Christine Forster touched on the philosophical dilemma central to the issue yesterday when she said legislation was needed to “protect people’s freedom to express their religious beliefs”. But, she also said, “if same-sex marriage is legalised ... then people have to accept that it is in law, how our country works”. It is up to Malcolm Turnbull and Attorney-General George Brandis to explain how that contradiction would apply in practice. Dr Fisher has posed questions the government must answer: “Will teachers be free to teach church teaching on marriage? Will employers of church agencies be free to choose staff in sympathy with their church’s teachings? Will employees be bullied into supporting same-sex marriages in various ways? Will children in government schools be subjected to propaganda in favour of same-sex marriage? Will parents be free to take their children out of such classes?”*

So despite the claims of some that allowing same gender couples access to the Constitutional Marriage Act will have no negative impacts on society or the way of life for everyday Australians is just plain and simply wrong. And also claims that this whole debate is about equality is also plain and simply wrong. Despite everything that we have afore mentioned, the fact is that Australia is still tied to a Christian foundation and within that foundation God has set the standard that homosexual behaviour is an abomination. If we enquired about God’s judgement in all of this we would not have to look very far at all. The Parliament in general and certainly all those that do condone homosexual behaviour have either not enquired what God’s abiding will is on this issue or are choosing to ignore it.

Throughout the debate those condoning this behaviour did not raise the scripture verses that are plain and unambiguous about these practises. We have already canvassed the Old Testament law from God and found that He forced out the Sodomites from within the borders of his Hebrew peoples, and in relation to the actual behaviour, the law plainly said that such transgressors should be put to death.

In the New Testament Gospels from our Common Era, once again we read God’s word in plain and unambiguous language saying that those “*who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.*” In another passage in reference to this “*they shall not inherit the kingdom of God*”, and for our Federal and State Parliaments,

*“knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for men-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;”*

And this also brings us back to the preamble of the Constitution that our laws are made to control the disobedient and ungodly (et al) “*..... and for those that defile themselves with mankind.*” Once again very clearly the Bible Scriptures lead us to determine that

homosexual behaviour should be the outlawed under the principles that God has set forth for us.

The ramifications of Romans Chapter One are enormous for all professing Christians and also the rest of mankind, and in re-reading these passages the wisdom of God is striking; in that there is no argument that can be mounted against it. In essence, God is saying to us all if you disagree with these passages then you, yourself, are also of a reprobate mind. This is damning stuff for any of us who think we can play around with selectivity of what scripture we will live by and what we shall reject as “not relevant”. Clearly God is not to be trifled with here and there will be after-life ramifications for all who do.

Additionally there is a question over free speech that is now being throttled under a guise that says negative comment is “hate speech” and the anti-vilification laws are like a shot gun held to one’s head. Well then, let me ask the question, “Who is standing up for God’s point of view and representing Him and His word through the Bible?”

Very specifically the Anti-Vilification laws are aimed at not impeding upon minority groups or their members feeling. Quite legitimately they frame a means of controlling extremist hate speech that incites violence, however it can also muffle robust points of view of society in general in the public forum. In essence the law makers of Government are saying in this case that same gender couples and homosexual behaviour are protected from the general society being able to reject their behaviour as being unacceptable in “this” society. Taking this to a hypothetical extreme, is this what bestiality might also look like into the future – ie a totally unacceptable form of behaviour that is foisted upon an un-wanting public?

The few tools that the general public have to express their rejection of some types of behaviour, and I am reminded that the Violence Against Women lobby is a classic example of rejecting a behaviour, is the deployment of protest groups to march through the streets and rally in prominent places. But if such actions can be arbitrarily ruled unlawful then Government can be said to be deliberately ignoring the will of their constituents in favour of some ideological fantasy that is in their political heads. The function of the Constitution of Australia is to impose upon all governments of the day a duty to make laws and govern for the wholesome good of mankind – by a standard that we must measure by the abiding will of God – as our forefathers designed into it. Therefore we can legitimately question the ethics of governments and politicians that choose to reject God in their deliberations for what is good for mankind and what is unacceptable.

In this case of changing the Marriage Act and specifically including same gender couples in the anti-vilification laws, obviously Parliament does not want to know what God thinks and those engaging in homosexual behaviour don’t want to know either – or don’t care, and the general public is just left to its own devices.

As we followed the debate it was striking that the religious convocations were reticent to enter the discussion. I saw non-committal statements from most of the main stream churches and from the others they were either ambivalent or silent. One, at least, has said through interviews that it supported Gay and Lesbian relationships in their congregations

and indicated that the church hierarchy had no issues with appointing homosexual ministers to preach.

The only two religious organisations to take up God's position were the Roman Church who watered down its statement – presumably because they are currently dealing with homosexuality issues within parts of their own hierarchy, and the Presbyterian Church who very clearly and openly upheld God's word. The Presbyterian church was the only religious organisation to do so without flinching before the media and should be applauded for their intestinal fortitude to call out God's judgement of homosexual behaviour.

Now let's discuss the raw truth of this whole matter.

How many Christian minded souls sought God's guidance on this matter and pleaded the Christian cause to have Him sway the plebiscite? Perhaps it might be an offence to God to number the believers that went before Him. Many would have struggled with if this was something God would intervene to take control of and therefore they would have sought understanding of the issues from a higher perspective. It is sometimes difficult to surrender to the will of God and be an observer on the side line of human frailty. Even knowing that God had already condemned homosexual behaviour we still do not know His mind on the matter concerning any possible divine interventions into this behavioural trend of our wilting society that is sliding backwards toward a very uncertain and sinful future.

We often tend to ignore the testaments emanating from the Tanakh and consign them to a history locker of little relevance to us today. But how wrong that attitude is and we are missing out on so many of life's lessons that God was very keen for us to grasp.

We need to re-think our attitude toward Israel from the time Noah and his family landed the Ark on the mountains of Ararat and how they lived through the extremes of good and bad times as the fledgling Hebrew nation grew. It is in the period of the Judges and the Kings that we can gain some very valuable hindsight with respect to whether God should have intervened to sway the postal vote plebiscite in consideration of his judgement against homosexuality generally. Well the surprise for us is that in general, the cases we could cite about Israel transgressing against God, and pretty badly at that I might say, that He did not "get into" people's heads and robotically forced them to repent and return to obedience and worship. "Oh no siree!" What we see in reading back through those turbulent times is God giving Israel choices – choices to repent and return to a lifestyle in obedience to His abiding will and receiving manifold rewards for doing so. Choices for continuing to disobey God's abiding will and go off and worship the strange gods of the earth resulting in times of great testing and refining to clear off the dross that stood to spoil the nation as a whole.

Recall that there was a split in Israel during the reign of Solomon and ten of the tribes seceded from the Commonwealth of Israel under Rehoboam. Those ten tribes were ultimately lost because of their continued disobedience and unwillingness to return to the ways of God and were eventually carried off captive under the oppression of the Assyrian Empire. This left just the familial tribes of Judah and Benjamin, but even they transgressed very badly and they too were eventually carried off as captives to Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar. Could God have intervened in some miraculous way somewhere prior to

this? Of course He could have – but He did not and gave us all in these modern times an example that if the will of the people is to kick against his laws and his abiding will, they will ultimately get their way. But here is the kicker (as they say), in doing so there are consequences of immense proportions that will occur. But also there is a lesson for our Governments. If the disobedience is not subdued through laws of the land, then the populations will not know they are transgressing into eternal hell-fire and damnation. This is the enormous responsibility of Government in the world today. The principles remain the same, God remains the same, and there are consequences for the population – one way toward blessing and goodness, the other toward very testing times and ultimate destruction of the community structure as it would have been.

Just re-think about what occurred above and consider such issues as the Nazi Regime, the terrorist regimes that are rampant in the Middle East and their spread across the world, the threats to global peace by rogue nations, the near collapse of the Western financial system, famine, pestilence, natural disasters and every conceivable evil that flows in when the flood gates of bad government are opened – and note – driven by choices of the people. Recovery from such disobedience is a very long and arduous road back to recovery – if indeed recovery is ever reached. There will always be consequences.

So now reconsider the postal vote outcome. The people of Australia who voted for changes to the Marriage Act, albeit transgressors against the word of God, have overridden His abiding will and He is allowing those evil fruits to ripen and as we can see from history these fruits eventually become rotten to the core. These actions are to prove us just as the actions of the twelve tribes of Israel were also. God is allowing the evil to rise and it is up to His obedient followers to set about a rescue for this great nation before it falls into an anti-God abyss of sin.

The debate has highlighted and identified that the extent of the issue runs deeply through the general societal view. It has shown us that Governments have failed, churches have failed, captains of industry have failed, the media has failed, many citizens of note have failed, companies and businesses have failed and if we apply Romans Chapter One to these sections of the Australian landscape they all have been given over (by God) to a reprobate mind set. There is a lot that Australians need to think about regarding our collective future.

This presents Christians with a challenge to take remedial action to address the disobediences of our society and our current ways of life. If we all thought, as I did, that Australia generally was “okay” as far as the saint and sinner balance in society was, then a re-think is necessary. It is plain to me that the general societal moral view is now skewed to the sinner, not to the saint. God is putting all of this up in lights and is saying something like, “Come on you Christians – do something about it!”

Well I suppose many Christians will be somewhat shell-shocked about this whole uncomfortable matter and most would have expected a divine intervention. I can imagine many will feel let down because of the result. But there are a number of positives we can look at to take away from all of this. As we have mentioned, now we know the state of the nation. Now we know who we cannot rely on unless their collective attitudes and beliefs change. Now we know from where error has crept into the universities of theological

training, so if this was going to happen, better we know whom we are up against and what the size of the problem is that needs fixing. Now we can start thinking about strategies to bring the societal view back from its precarious position of a break down in relationship with God. We need to save souls now like never before.

We may also need to think about what might be the likely fall out from these matters. Will we see an escalation in overt homosexual behaviour in public places? Will there be a push by the homosexual community to force churches to accommodate them – not only in marriage ceremonies but in worship and communion, and Lord knows how they will reconcile this before the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob who brought this whole universe into being and who redeems the faithful and obedient to heaven on their passing. Sinners are not saved. They **are** not – and **cannot** be within the Kingdom of God. We have already covered the scripture passages earlier that explain this.

Without being an alarmist we do need to protect our children from the stain of all sin in our life's activities. Remember it is always the children who suffer from the bad decisions of their parents that may have been made decades before. Take a glance at events occurring around world. The great tragedy is always the children; their indoctrination into a way of disobedience and complete forsaking of anything to do with God. This is a spiralling downward trend as we have seen often in those having emigrated from conflict zones where many displaced youth have difficulty in adjusting to Western lifestyles within a peaceful accord in community living. Yes, it's a long road ahead.

The decision to mount any redemption for the general society away from this spiralling downward moral trend is up to God fearing individuals by raising the bar and addressing the issues that have dealt our current church organisations a serious blow to their efficacy. It is a decision to enter Parliamentary service and stand up for the moral high-ground and allow God's word to be heard. It's about striving to be an influential leader in your place of employment, it is being a shining example of a business owner who brings God into his workplace through Christian principles, and it is every day "you and me" people who are the royal priesthood of believers to bring trust in God and His truths back into the general societal thought.

But there is always a "but" somewhere in all grand plans. For Christians going forward it is my opinion there will be rough times ahead. I see a downward spiralling general society pumped up on its low moral win over this Marriage Act debate emboldened to perk up in conversations and group discussions; to use devices of sarcasm seeking to embarrass and hinder those with a Christian view. It will likely become a passive conflict where the saints must abide by rules, principles and laws and the sinners without any code of restraint encouraging derision and enmity.

So Christians need to support one another in their everyday lives; establishing home groups for learning and encouragement, school car-park chats, coffee time get-togethers, recreational activities, forming interest groups and being more inclusive and open with one another. All of these things will build a network of support and I am sure there are countless other ways that this otherwise may be achieved. Our Christian church organisations are an issue at this time. The respective elders of the religious convocations

must address the dearth of good solid teaching about “all” of the Bible and sort out (or walk out from) those religious organisations that condone practises that are an abomination before God.

Is the rise of a renewed ground-swell congregation of God’s faithful believers warranted where the worship and praise of God is honest and earnest; where teaching of the scriptures is paramount and truth and understanding is sought at every corner; where our Lord is lifted up to be our High Priest in reality over his royal priesthood of believers; where the Kingdom of God really does come forth and the faithful walk in their salvation and where we can truly live day-by-day in the tenets of the faith that was delivered to us by the Saints of old?

Now what about this word *Homophobic* that is spat at Christians and all those who voice opposition to same gender marriage like it is a weapon to do harm? Perhaps our perceptions about its use might be clarified to a point where it becomes almost a laughable incident if it weren’t so such a serious indictment back onto the mouthpiece from whence it was voiced.

Obviously it is a word derived from “Homosexual” and “Phobia” but unfortunately its makeup and use is incorrect in meaning and execution. The Merriam Webster Dictionary defines the word “Phobia” as:

*An exaggerated usually inexplicable and illogical fear of a particular object, class of objects, or situation*

So let’s clear this up for a start. Those of whom God has given over to have a reprobate mind cannot grasp nor actually comprehend what actually the issues are. They think it is about themselves personally, whereas the truth is, in Christian terms, it is only the continuing practise of homosexual behaviour that is at issue. So if the behaviour ceases and therefore desists from the abominable act, ie same gender sex, then a relationship with another of the same gender can be enjoyed.

That is the first point. Secondly the word “phobia” is totally the wrong word and proves the point above that a reprobate mind lacks comprehension of the issue. Christians do not have an *inexplicable and illogical fear* of homosexual couples – they do however reflect that God has said that homosexual behaviour is an abomination before Him. So there is absolutely no fear at all. Frankly, fear? I don’t think so. And it again demonstrates just how far out of touch a reprobate mind can be twisted and warped. Could we say that God’s word is exaggerated? Well what is exaggerated about homosexual behaviour? God’s word tells us it is an abominable act and it is sinful. It’s like murder; a criminal act and it is sin. It’s like:

*“Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents. Without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful”.*

It is all disobedience, ie it is sin, and there is one thing that is sure and true – sin is sin whether it be murder or some other contrary human behaviour as we read in the scriptures.

So, are Christians phobic about homosexual behaviour? Not at all! They recognise it is a serious sin condoned and practised by sinners who frankly don't realise if they don't change their ways, they are Hell bound on a Number Ten Bus, and this bus does not stop at the Pearly Gates - it goes express to eternal damnation.

Spitting out hate against those who hold the moral line of God is an indicator of the nature of those that are given over to a reprobate mind. This is worthy to keep in your mind when confronted by such aggression. We have to be like the consummate psychologist – hear the words, analyse the content, box it all up and move on. Christians should rightly have pity on the sinners of the world. In truth all mankind across the world has sin in his nature. But the perspective of how we view all of this is that God selects those He wishes to redeem out from the pool of disobedient mankind and calls them to service. We all were once there, but God lifts faithful believers up, so in recognising our blessing from God, we should pray for the souls of those that are at high risk of never seeing redemption because of their disobedient behaviour.

I have considered introducing new terminology to better describe those of the homosexual community. Biblically they were referred to as Sodomites which is a very descriptive word and I would imagine its use would be offensive to some. But trading insults and accusations in a verbal fracas is not the way of a Christian, and this is the inequity of saints dealing with sinners – God has rules for discipleship ,and the scripture Verse: Matthew 5:9 gives us our lead on how we are expected to conduct ourselves.

It is an angry voice that rails against God's judgment and these have swept up large numbers of the population by intimidation and threats. There is work to be done to sway back those who were confused and caught up in the moment. Whilst we can work on the outside of a person, the Spirit of God will work on the inside. Our hope should be for the two to meet and bring forth the joy and thanksgiving for another soul saved from destruction.

Now with the Marriage Act debate sitting squarely in the jurisdiction of the Federal Government they have placed themselves at odds with God and we have already discussed this in the issue of the Constitution's preamble. We have also said that one of the positives out of this whole matter is that we now know that Australia's moral base is being eroded and that a number of members from our Parliament have forsaken God's judgement on the matter.

As this article is being written the Federal Government has suspended Parliament for its next sitting to give it time to deal with this specific matter of whether they should press on to make changes to the Marriage Act, or should they come to the realisation that it is a poison chalice and there will likely be ramifications for whatever they decide. I have no doubt that God will be extremely displeased with all of the Federal Parliamentarians who are driving the campaign to change the Marriage Act in favour of same gender couples.

But we have also seen other events in Canberra that we have to view with some interest. The dual citizenship crisis that has engulfed Federal Parliament in all of its quarters has, as we currently stand, removed the current Government's majority in both Houses and it is now in serious jeopardy of losing the right to govern. If I were the Prime Minister I would join the dots here and recant my position on same gender marriage rights and make serious supplications to God to restore the right to rule. Unfortunately the Opposition and select Cross-Benchers have also signalled their support for changes to the Marriage Act to occur so the dilemma for Australia is that to lose the current government they also lose to another incoming government with the same agenda. It is likely God will not intervene in the decision making process and will allow the Government to make its mind up. In similar circumstances to the twelve tribes of Israel under their Kings, God will allow these events to prove us as a Christian (or not) nation.

This is an extraordinary opportunity for God fearing Christians to strengthen their relationship with God through our faith in our Lord and Saviour

We now can see clearly those that have been given over to reprobate minds and it has exposed our rebellious Parliamentarians and all of those captains of industry that actively pushed the line to raise the profile of homosexual couples in our community. This in essence translates to any person who, from those things listed in Romans 1:24 to 32, in any way tries to justify or argue their acceptance of these behaviours must be deemed as having been "given over" to a reprobate mind in opposition to God's abiding will for mankind. For professing Christians who are caught up in supporting changes to the Marriage Act it is a very serious concern for us all in that they have placed their redemption by God at very high risk with eternal consequences.

If the shepherds have gone astray, what is to become of the flock? Has God got in reserve His rested shepherds that can repair the injured and care for the flock according to His abiding will?

It is time for a new congregation of believers to stand up and be counted who will worship God in honesty and truth, who will know the truths and have understanding of His ways if all is lost to the world, who will refuse to serve the gods of the earth and refuse to sacrifice their souls for the pleasures of the day, who will carry the truth of the Christian message to the highest places in the nation so that all souls will have a clear and uncompromised view of what is right before God and what is not.

It is time to redeem this great land of Australia back from the brink of eternal damnation?

Geoff Rooke