Opinion

Gay inspiration in the interim report of the bishops' synod*

GERARD J. M. VAN DEN AARDWEG

Private Practice, The Netherlands

Homosexuals have gifts and qualities to offer to the Christian community: are we capable of welcoming these people, guaranteeing to them a fraternal space in our communities? Often they wish to encounter a Church that offers them a welcoming home. Are our communities capable of providing that, accepting and valuing their sexual orientation, without compromising Catholic doctrine on the family and matrimony?

The question of homosexuality leads to a serious reflection on how to elaborate realistic paths of affective growth and human and evangelical maturity integrating the sexual dimension: it appears therefore as an important educative challenge. The Church furthermore affirms that unions between people of the same sex cannot be considered on the same footing as matrimony between man and woman. Nor is it acceptable that pressure be brought to bear on pastors or that international bodies make financial aid dependent on the introduction of regulations inspired by gender ideology.

Without denying the moral problems connected to homosexual unions, it has to be noted that there are cases in which mutual aid to the point of sacrifice constitutes a precious support in the life of the partners. Furthermore, the Church pays special attention to the children who live with couples of the same sex, emphasizing that the needs and rights of the little ones must always be given priority.

From Part III of the Extraordinary General Assembly of the Synod of Bishops

By their statements on homosexuals and homosexuality, the composers of the interim report of the Synod on the Family distracted public attention from the main subject, the urgency to strengthen Catholic marriage and family life, toward the subordinate issue of homosexuality. The impact of the report should not have surprised the synod participants. The eagerness of the secular media to exploit every word and gesture of Catholic authorities in favor of an ideology, which normalizes homosexuality should be obvious to all.¹ The clear objective of the media is to put pressure on the Church to give up its resistance and accept homosexuality in the way they demand. The extremely unfortunate truth is that the portion of the report dealing with homosexuality did not disappoint them at all but wounded and confounded many ordinary Catholics and non-Catholics, *including genuinely Catholic people struggling with homosexual problems.*

Let us examine the contentions of numbers 50–52 of the interim report. Number 50 starts with: “Homosexuals have gifts and qualities to offer to the Christian community.”

*This article was previously published as “The gay inspiration underlying the Vatican synod’s interim report,” LifeSiteNews.com, December 16, 2014. Used by permission.

If this is to mean anything (which person lacks “gifts and qualities” to offer?), it suggests that people with same-sex desires have special “gifts” inherent to their “orientation.” They do not say what these gifts might be. This gratuitous statement recalls stereotypes popular in gay activist circles such as: homosexual men are peculiarly sensitive, artistic, and gentle; or that many important figures in history and in the arts are said to have been homosexuals, as if that were an argument for the value of homosexual desires. It is elitist thinking: the homosexual “nature” is something special, and homosexuality is superior to “ordinary” heterosexuality. (Similarly, homosexual pedophile Gide [1924] extolled the superior value of homosexual pedophilia.) There is no reason to glorify the superior talents and achievements of people with homosexual feelings. The fact that many of them are to be found in certain professions is more a question of interests than of gifts. In contrast to those who excelled or became famous (which is not the same) stand many who were thwarted by their emotional problems or irresponsible lifestyle in the development and deployment of their capacities and professional productivity. The disproportionate psychological and medical problems of many practicing homosexuals constitute a considerable and steadily increasing social burden. However, much more dubious is the socially and morally degrading influence exerted by practicing (“active”) homosexuals in the human sciences, literature, politics, education, and in Christian churches. In this regard, the Church cannot forget that it was for the most part homosexual priests who had something else to “offer to the Christian community” than their “gifts and qualities”; the great majority of the victims in the recent sex-abuse scandal were male adolescents. The vast majority of abusers were not pedophiles but adult homosexual men (Fitzgibbons and O’Leary 2011). We must be careful in indiscriminately trying to normalize homosexuality in the Christian community.

The very first word of number 50, “Homosexuals,” is an ambiguous and misleading term, which is subsequently used throughout these paragraphs. Who are these “homosexuals” the authors have in mind? Whom exactly are the faithful admonished to “provide ... a place of fellowship in our communities” because they would “oftentimes want to encounter a Church which offers them a welcoming home” (n. 50)? This is an implicit accusation that, until now, “homosexuals” were more or less rejected by “our communities” (thus by the parish, monastery, and seminary?), not given the “fellowship” and “home” they longed for. In other words, they were not welcome, treated in an un-Christian way. The implication is of “discrimination,” and this represents “homosexuals” as victims of cultural and religious condemnation, which has proven to be an immensely successful propaganda item in the gay rights movement. It is evident which category of homosexuals is referred to in this piece. Not those—the minority today—who try to live chastely and according to the voice of their conscience, who perceive the unnaturalness and immorality of same-sex behavior, who seek the help of God through prayer and the Sacraments in their psychological and spiritual combat (van den Aardweg 1997). These are not the ones who want this “place of fellowship” or “home”; the Church already *is* their home. Moreover, they do not want to manifest themselves and be seen as “homosexuals,” but as ordinary Christians. They have their personal inner struggle, which they may want to share with some understanding member of the family, a good friend, and a confessor, but which, for various reasons, is not meant to be publicly known (compare their situation with many other good Christians struggling with their sexuality: people with a tendency to womanize, who are preoccupied with pedophile attractions, and the like). One will not often hear

someone in this category complain about being unwelcome or rejected. Obviously, people of another category, the greater one, want to lead a homosexual lifestyle and be accepted on that condition. These paragraphs hint at the agenda of those who promote a homosexual lifestyle, although not candidly but by insinuations and suggestions. For example, they state: “Are our communities capable of... accepting and valuing their sexual orientation?” This implies those who dramatize/tragedize themselves, because their desires are not “valued.” This is a clear echo of the usual dialogue of those who promote the “gay” lifestyle, but now in a high-level document of the Catholic Church! Besides, the “orientation” is presented as an intrinsic, fixed part of one’s personality or “nature,” not as the personality or behavioral disorder it undeniably is (as the scientific evidence clearly shows²). This suggestion reinforces the false opinion that “it’s in your genes,” or in your physiology, or in your brain, and that homosexuality represents a normal variant of human sexuality.³

The report takes a moralizing tone against “our communities.” This is typical of the gay activist rhetoric, because the teaching on the goodness—value—of the “homosexual orientation” combined with the moral duty to accept and value those openly living a gay lifestyle in their midst is imposed on the 98 percent of the faithful without any sign of understanding of their natural and normal aversion to such valuing (the authors of the report would likely brand this aversion “homophobia”). They fail to observe that this forced acceptance will strain normal relationships within a community and will certainly discourage many who follow the insight and natural feelings of their common sense from belonging to their religious clubs, orders, seminaries, and churches. This points to the characteristic blindness of the gay activists and their self-centeredness with its concomitant lack of interest in and comprehension of the feelings of men and women who have a normal sexual orientation.

Of course, preaching the “value” of same-sex proclivities is incompatible with preaching the duty to live chastely. Indirectly, the report justifies some form of homosexual behavior, perhaps in the quite unrealistic belief that certain same-sex relations can mirror normal marriage and genuine enduring mutual love. This is implied as a strict prohibition against acting on a sexual orientation that the report calls our communities (parish, seminary, etc.) to accept and value would be absurd. Also the following affirmation testifies to the suspect thinking of the report: “serious reflection [is required] on how to devise ... approaches to affective growth [of people with this penchant] ... and maturation in the Gospel, while integrating the sexual aspect” (n. 51). “Integrating the sexual aspect” usually stands for “making it a component of” and in this case that would mean “a component of maturation in the Gospel.” It should go without saying that the way to holiness, as well as to affective maturation, requires a battle against anything homosexual within the person. Any attempt to integrate homosexual behavior, emotionality, or “love” with the striving for holiness is a Gnostic invention. The opposite should have been written instead: in particular, persons with sexual temptations must be encouraged to exercise the virtue of chastity. A word of recommendation and support should have been addressed to the exemplary Catholic organization *Courage* and to those who make efforts to live in harmony with Catholic moral doctrine. Statements in the report such as that “Catholic doctrine on the family and matrimony” should not be compromised (n. 50), or that “The Church furthermore affirms that unions between people of the same sex cannot be considered on the same footing as matrimony between man and woman” (n. 51) have a pious ring. However, they are anything but pious. It is shameful that the

authors insinuate that the Mystical Body of Christ should be open to considering same-sex relationships (e.g., gay cohabitation and gay “marriage”). The subsequent statement on the higher status of true marriage does nothing to lessen this shame. Unholy gay intercourse is a perversion of holy marriage, biologically, psychologically, and morally. It is a *folie à deux*, i.e., a psycho-spiritual pathology shared by two persons. Psychologically normal gay partnerships do not exist. This includes the exceptional cases where these relationships last longer than a couple of years in the case of men and some years more in the case of women. Promiscuity in gay relationships is excessive, as is the occurrence of pathological jealousy, feuds, fights, and domestic violence.⁴ Any similarity with holy matrimony is a fantasy in the minds of those who do not know or do not want to know reality.⁵

Still the report persists: “Without denying the moral problems associated with homosexual unions, there are instances where mutual assistance to the point of sacrifice is a valuable support in the life of these persons” (n. 52). Thus although a gay affair or liaison may not claim equal value to holy matrimony, it nevertheless may sometimes be a noble, self-sacrificing “union.” Would not that provide a convincing argument for sanctioning same-sex partnerships in such instances? This would amount to creating a breach in the rule by permitting the exception (under strict conditions, after conscientious consideration, and all that, of course). It is well-known that once there is a hole in the levee, it will give way sooner or later.

Finally: what to think of this communication (n. 52): “the Church pays special attention to ... children who live with same-sex couples and stresses that the needs and rights of the little ones must always be given priority”? Priority over what? There is only one acceptable answer consistent with human compassion, common sense, and Christian morality: priority must not be given to the egoistic demands of gay adults who live together (for the time being) and violate the needs and rights of the child (ren) to be raised by a father and mother. This applies to children who live with their own mother or father and her (his) gay partner and even more so for adoptive children with gay “parents.” The authors leave the impression that in principle they accept these pseudo-families and the practice of gay parenting. They lamentably fail to unambiguously denounce this modern form of barbarism: sacrificing innocent and defenseless children and teenagers on the altar of gay ideology. These children are emotionally, characterologically, and morally damaged for life.⁶ Sugary words stating that the Church pays attention to the needs of the little ones does not substitute for the *duty* to speak out against this terrible injustice. The urgency of the matter is illustrated by, among other things, the explosive increase in adoptions by gays and lesbians in the USA; between 2001 and 2011, the number nearly tripled, and in the latter year amounted to more than 32,000 (Los Angeles Times 2011). We must remember that many of these children and teenagers (who also belong to the category of the abused “little ones”) are already traumatized by their parents’ divorce or other hurtful experiences before they are placed in the custody of a gay couple and exposed to their distressing, deforming influences.

This report has incited much doubt and discouragement. Perhaps the most scandalized are good-intentioned persons with same-sex attractions; and the parents, marriage partners, and family members of “active” homosexuals. They feel abandoned, as if the rug has been pulled from under them. One illustration: a man, a convert to

Catholicism who had overcome his same-sex attraction for the most part, felt upset and disillusioned:

I had always realized that gay was not the right thing but felt depressed and alone because every day the whole world around me sang the praise of gay life. Only the Catholic Church was a beacon of hope to me, but now... it seems that I can only have recourse to Putin!

An important step toward restoring confidence in Catholic moral doctrine, and in the unmistakable and universal perception of the human moral sense about the unnaturalness and impurity of homosexual and pedophile behavior, seems a realistic orientation about what is going on in the Church. How is it possible that gay inspiration was given free rein in a high-level paper on the family where not long ago, “sodomy” was officially one of the four singularly grave sins, which “cried to Heaven for vengeance”? We cannot, must not, gloss over the reality that lies openly before all of our eyes: it is still a (small?) minority of Catholics who try to live in accordance with the divine law on sexuality and marriage. Since Catholics joined the secular world in adopting the contraceptive mentality and practices (in the sixties), this has resulted in an increasingly dulled sensitivity to the sanctity of sexuality and marriage and fostered an unwillingness to inquire about the Will of God in this matter. One effect of this is an increasing acceptance of homosexual relationships and gay “marriage,” as recent research has confirmed for US Catholics (Sullins 2010). At the same time, many priests and prelates have become more or less infected by the same attitude; in this climate, the “gay lobby” within the Church has been able to deploy its activities.

But the profoundest understanding of the situation, as well as solid guidance toward setting it in order, comes from the pope who was exalted at the end of this particular synod—not by accident, as we may trust. Already forty years ago Blessed Pope Paul VI drew attention to “the smoke of Satan,” which had entered the Church; and at about the same time he assured his listeners during a general audience that he was not being “superstitious or unreal” when he said that

one of the greatest needs of the Church today is defense from that evil which is called the Devil... Today people ... let themselves be caught up into ideological seductions of fashionable errors, which are cracks through which the Devil can easily penetrate and work upon the human mind.

Diabolical action manifests itself, in part, “where hypocritical and blatant lies assert themselves”; he emphasized that Satan is “an effective agent, a living, spiritual being, perverted and perverting” (Paul VI 1972). It is not hard to recognize the demonic footprint in the gay ideology, to understand that it is grist to Satan’s mill. In homosex (including pedophile homosex), God’s design of marriage and procreation is turned upside down, “perverted.” The basic assertions of gay ideology are “blatant lies” aimed at “perverting” the afflicted individual, society, and Christians alike: one is born that way, one’s core identity is gay, it is immutable, gay “unions” are nice and harmless, and gay parenting is beneficial for children ... Furthermore, as regards the synod report’s pro-gay “homily” to the faithful (the exhortation in the report to somehow value the “homosexual identity” etc.), its sugary wordings and woolly sentimentalism certainly betray a measure of hypocrisy. Blessed Pope Paul’s remedy, in contrast, consists in the resolute rejection of compromises with the demon’s pro-gay inspirations, a firm “vade Satanas,” so to speak, hand in hand with the teaching of

Humanae vitae in the manner he urged: “with humble firmness” and without fear of making Catholicism “a sign of contradiction” (n. 18).

ENDNOTES

1. I warmly recommend the thorough, informative book by Reilly (2014).
2. Survey of evidence on homosexuality as a psychological disorder: van den Aardweg (2011).
3. Survey of the “biological evidence” on homosexuality: Whitehead and Whitehead (2010).
4. As regards male homosexual promiscuity, see, e.g., McWhirter and Mattison (1984); Dannecker (1990); Deenen, Gijs, and van Naerssen (1994); Xiridou et al. (2003); Grant et al. (2010). As regards lesbian promiscuity, e.g., Blumstein and Schwartz (1983); Schumm (2010). Review studies on homosexual partner violence: Cameron (2003); Finneran and Stephenson (2012); Buller et al. (2014).
5. See endnote 2.
6. The most comprehensive study on the long-term effects of gay parenting: Regnerus (2012). Very illustrative is the autobiography by Stefanowicz (2007), the daughter of a practicing homosexual father.

REFERENCES

- Blumstein, P., and P. Schwartz. 1983. *American couples*. New York: Morrow.
- Buller, A.M., K.M. Devries, L.M. Howard, and L.J. Bacchus 2014. Associations between intimate partner violence and health among men who have sex with men: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS Medicine* 11.
- Cameron, P. 2003. Domestic violence among homosexual partners. *Psychological Reports* 93: 410–16.
- Dannecker, M. 1990. *Homosexuelle Männer und AIDS*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Deenen, A.A., L. Gijs, and A.X. van Naerssen. 1994. Intimacy and sexuality in gay male couples. *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 23: 421–31.
- Finneran, C. and R. Stephenson. 2012. Intimate partner violence among men who have sex with men. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse* 14: 168–85.
- Fitzgibbons, R. and D. O’Leary. 2011. Sexual abuse of minors by Catholic clergy. *The Linacre Quarterly* 78: 252–73.
- Gide, A. 1924. *Corydon*. Paris: NRF Gallimard.
- Grant, R.M., J.R. Lama, P.L. Anderson, V. McMahan, A.Y. Liu, L. Vargas, P. Goicochea, M. Casapía, J.V. Guanira-Carranza, M.E. Ramirez-Cardich, O. Montoya-Herrera, T. Fernández, V.G. Veloso, S.P. Buchbinder, S. Chariyalertsak, M. Schechter, L.-G. Bekker, K.H. Mayer, E.G. Kallás, K.R. Amico, K. Mulligan, L.R. Bushman, R. J. Hance, C. Ganoza, P. Defechereux, B. Postle, F. Wang, J. McConnell, J.-H. Zheng, J. Lee, J.F. Rooney, H.S. Jaffe, A.I. Martinez, D.N. Burns, and D.V. Glidden. 2010. Preexposure chemoprophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men. *New England Journal of Medicine* 363: 2587–99.
- Los Angeles Times. 2011. Census data analysis by the Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. *Los Angeles Times*, October 21.
- McWhirter, D.P. and A.M. Mattison. 1984. *The male couple*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Paul VI, Pope. General audience. November 15, 1972. *L’Osservatore Romano*.
- Regnerus, M. 2012. How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships? Findings from the new family structure study. *Social Science Research* 41: 752–70.
- Reilly, R.R. 2014. *Making gay okay: How rationalizing homosexual behavior is changing everything*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.

- Schumm, W. 2010. Comparative relationship stability of lesbian mother and heterosexual mother families: A review of evidence. *Marriage and Family Review* 46: 499–509.
- Stefanowicz, D. 2007. *Out from under: The impact of homosexual parenting*. Enumclaw, WA: Annotation Press.
- Sullins, D.P. 2010. American Catholics and same-sex “marriage.” *Catholic Social Science Review* 15: 97–123.
- van den Aardweg, G.J.M. 1997. *The battle for normality: A guide for (self-)therapy of homosexuality*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- van den Aardweg, G.J.M. 2011. On the psychogenesis of homosexuality. *The Linacre Quarterly* 78: 330–54.
- Whitehead, N.E. and B.K. Whitehead. 2010. *My genes made me do it!: Homosexuality and the scientific evidence*. New Zealand: Whitehead Associates.
- Xiridou, M., R. Giskus, J. De Wit, R. Coutinho, and M. Kretzschmar. 2003. The contribution of steady and casual partnerships to the incidence of HIV infection among homosexual men in Amsterdam. *AIDS* 17: 1009–38.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Gerard J.M. van den Aardweg, Ph.D. received a Ph.D. in psychology at the University of Amsterdam, and he is currently a psychotherapist in private practice. His research and therapy expertise is in the field of homosexuality. He has published many articles on homosexuality and several books (translated in many languages), three of them in the USA.