

The Gay Revenge? Or: Once a persecuted Minority, Today a persecuting Power?

Tammy Bruce's Call

The lesbian radio presenter Tammy Bruce has addressed the gay and lesbian movement in a contribution for the Washington Post and on the television channel Fox as an avowed lesbian because the former homosexual minority is today paying its former enemies back in kind. She holds that no longer giving Christians the freedom to think differently overshoots the mark and turns the demand for tolerance into its opposite. She maintains that if someone knew how a minority pushed into a corner felt, it would be the gay community. Why cannot Christian forces, who advocate a moral monopoly with the ideal of lifelong monogamy between individuals of two different sexes, be given their right to freedom of opinion? (As an example from among numerous reports, see [here](#) and [here](#).)

Unfortunately, like many minorities in history who came to political power, there is political payback for everything to actual, but often also only to alleged, former persecutors by the LGTB lobby.

And, as always, in the process it is a matter of the topic of clan liability. This is due to taking the descendants of former opponents to make them liable today for what happened earlier. The result is that an entire population group is indiscriminately made liable, regardless of whether its individual members think at all as in former times or not! Also, they are often not even the biological descendants. Often the connection to groups of past times lies only in a single factor, which they – actually or allegedly – have in common.

Payback: an Example from History

Christian Hillgruber, professor of law in Bonn, has written the following:

“It is not uncommon for winners to not be satisfied with their victory alone but also to want to humiliate the defeated. Not only should they admit their defeat. They should also admit that they fought for the wrong cause and renounce their ‘error.’” (Christian Hillgruber, “Wo bleibt die Freiheit der anderen? ... Ein Plädoyer für den Schutz einer neuen Minderheit”(translation of the title: “[Where is Freedom for Others? ... A Plea for the Protection of a new Minority](#),” *Franfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, February 20, 2014.).

It is hoped that very different examples from the past and present hope will illustrate this:

Early in the 16th century, only a few years after the emergence of the Lutheran Church, Lutheran rulers began to persecute their former persecutors, the Catholics, just as thoroughly as the Catholics had persecuted them.

I do not want to denigrate the heroic shift in South Africa from apartheid to multi-ethnic democracy in general, but there are unfortunately enough signs that new rulers are discriminating against those who

previously held power, including discrimination against non-whites who were neutral under the racist regime, who cooperated with it for all sorts of reasons, or who did not fight racism within the framework of the Communist Party or the ANC.

Islamists in Egypt were oppressed for decades. They came to power under President Mursi because the people were tired of the violence and corruption of the dictatorial system. Hardly in power, President Mursi began to persecute his opponents just as badly – and became just as corrupt.

In Iraq, the Shiites, who had been severely persecuted under Saddam Hussein, took revenge after they had won the majority in parliament through a democratic election. This occurred under President Nuri al-Maliki, who gradually became more and more like Hussein. Thus hundreds of thousands of Sunnis were displaced from Baghdad, and civil war was waged by the Shiites against the Sunnis. This is an essential reason why today many Sunnis support the ‘Islamic State.’

Even victims of ethnic ‘cleansing’ can belong to a party (such as an ethnic or religious group) that has used or is using violence against minorities as a majority in other countries. Indeed, as a result of a planned population exchange, it has often happened that those who are perpetrators and victims in one region are, conversely, victims and perpetrators in the other region. Also, when power relations shift, perpetrators and victims might exchange roles out of revenge.

Minorities that have come to power often – of course not always – prove that they are just as intolerant in power as their opponents were when they had power.

For many years – despite all my efforts for religious minorities – I have presented the following idea, which also applies to the religion to which I myself belong: How a religious community or worldview stands on religious freedom really only becomes apparent when it comes to power or when it constitutes the majority religion in a country with access to the state. Talk is always cheap for a minority as long as it does not have access to power anyway. And it is not uncommon for a minority of one religion in one country to demand freedom, while as majority in another country the same religion does not grant the same freedoms to minorities.

Protection of the new Minority

Back to Tammy Bruce: Is it really not enough for the homosexual minority that they have reversed the political signs in their favor? Do they want to achieve a situation where dissenters are no longer allowed to *think* differently and are no longer allowed to express their opinions freely – but are instead punished by the state for their *thinking*?

Once again Hillgruber:

“That seems to be how far it has come in the meantime in the dispute over the ‘normality’ of homosexuality. Although this is a small minority that should actually be weak in a democracy, homosexuals as a group in Germany, Western Europe, and North America have managed, thanks to impressive lobbying, to turn their agenda of complete equal rights and equality with the heterosexual majority into an agenda of the majority society. The political success is resounding and complete: Homosexuals enjoy full freedom and equality here, and where it is seen that the last remnants of ‘discriminatory’ inequality remain, they will disappear in no time at all, with or without constitutional help.

Even the relatively rapid change in public opinion could hardly be more obvious: In the West, homosexuality has long been regarded by most as ‘entirely normal.’ Only a small minority still sees things differently.”

“... what began as a legitimate fight against stigmatization and oppression and for free development according to self-determined sexual orientation now glaringly shows tendencies hostile to freedom at the expense of third parties. This has to send an alarm. A legitimate concern for freedom is threatening to become an attempt at re-education under state order and coercion. It is not enough for the homosexual lobby that it has fought for freedom of development for its clientele and opinion leadership; it now wants to deprive the minority, which still holds a dissenting opinion, of the freedom to continue to evaluate homosexuality negatively and to orient their behavior towards third parties with this evaluation.”

Hillgruber sees freedom of conscience to be in danger in the process:

“What is worse is the fact that courts are prepared to give in to authoritatively presented liberty-adverse demands under the flag of “anti-discrimination.” ... It is time to remember that people other than homosexuals also have freedom and dignity and therefore must not be forced against their religious or otherwise justified conscience to give room to practiced homosexuality in the literal as well as in the figurative sense. This freedom of conscience is also not just limited to the *forum internum* and the private realm. Rather, it also includes the external freedom to orient one’s entire behavior towards one’s own moral or religious conviction and to act according to this conviction in public. If it is true that the freedom of one individual ends where the freedom of the other begins, then no one can request the realization of his freedom by making a claim upon another person who is not prepared to do so because of his conscience. If such restrictions on free actions led by conscience ... were to prevail in the West, then the freedom of opinion of those who consider homosexual practice immoral and, *horribile dictu*, dare to say so would soon be imperiled. A preliminary step to an attack on the freedom of opinion is made by calling anyone a ‘homophobe’ who still views homosexuality negatively, which is intended to certify that they possess an irrational group-focused enmity based upon fear. It almost already goes without saying that freedom of opinion may not be claimed under such circumstances. However, it is precisely this freedom to express an opinion that differs from the prevailing opinion in matters of homosexuality that must be vigorously defended. This is due to the fact that freedom is always the freedom of those who think differently.”

Hillgruber concludes with the words:

“It is within the rights of homosexuals to live their homosexuality. But they cannot demand that all others also consider their way of life to be a good life and evaluate it positively or otherwise abstain completely from evaluation. No, they, like everyone else, have to put up with the fact that their lifestyle is judged differently by others, even in a negative moral sense. This does not prevent them from exercising their freedom, nor does it affect their human dignity, unless the negative assessment takes on the character of a personal insult.

Conversely, opponents of homosexuality must accept criticism – even sharp criticism – for their attitude. This is part of the intellectual conflict of opinion where there is a mutual imposition of contrary views.”

David and Goliath

While it is indeed still contrary to effective law, Green Members of Parliament in the Bundestag have demanded that certain Evangelical and Catholic organizations be deprived of any kind of financial support, charitable status, etc., and it does provide a deep insight. As far as I know, this has to do with two organizations with two employees each! At the same time, however, one does not find a word about Islamist theologians who – also in Germany – demand the death penalty for homosexuals.

In official hours of questions in the federal parliament, these opposition members of the Bundestag (2015) awaken the impression that Evangelicals and Catholics loyal to the Pope, as representatives of the establishment, persecute the minority of homosexuals. In doing so, they are distorting the facts. The fact is that Evangelicals and Catholics loyal to the Pope obviously not only represent a minority in Germany in purely numerical terms. The majority of the population and the media – indeed followers of their own religion in the broad sense – are also on the side of homosexuals in being negatively disposed towards Evangelicals and Catholics loyal to the pope. Moreover, they also have no or hardly any access to political or economic power. Additionally, the homosexual minority of yore has long since reached the corridors of power in countries in the West, for instance in the executive branch, the legislative branch, and the judiciary (judges) and increasingly in the economy. LGBT concerns are supported on all political levels with enormous amounts of tax revenue, while the Christian groups touched upon finance themselves almost completely from donations.

Homosexuals and Christians bound to tradition are like David and Goliath. However, the power of Goliath in politics, finances and media is more on the side of the former.

There were and are confessing homosexuals as heads of federal states, as holders of party chairs, and as holders of many other political and social top positions, not to speak of the media and the entertainment industry. Homosexuals and their supporters overthrow candidates to become EU commissioners and other political officers. Virtually all media are open to homosexuals but not to conservative Christians. Conservative Christians are occasionally interviewed in a well-disposed manner by the media, but negative reporting predominates.

Homosexuals are no longer a minority, as they have long participated in power structures. A minority is not simply defined by the fact that it makes up less than half of the population. Rather, it has to do with having power or being at the mercy of the power of others, i.e., being dependent upon the protection of others.

Are the boards of German corporations a minority because they make up only a fraction of German society? Are the few members of the Bundestag and various Landtag (state parliament) bodies a minority? No, because both groups have more power, intervention, and access to funds than millions of others combined.

This is an awareness that even supporters of homosexuality clearly express. Christoph Hillgruber, professor of law in Bonn, who has already been quoted, also states the following:

“The protection of fundamental rights, it is said universally, is the protection of minorities. But whoever is a minority in need of protection is not determined once and for all. Rather, it changes with the development of a society. In Western societies, it is not so much homosexuals but rather those who regard homosexuality as morally questionable and homosexual practice as offensive whose freedom to think differently and to live in accordance with their inner convictions seems to be endangered. Yet, their freedom deserves no less respect and protection.”

Hubris

According to Wolfgang Büscher, the emancipation of same-sex minorities is now entering the third stage, one of “hubris”:

“It seems to follow a pattern. One could call it the ‘H pattern.’ It has three stages.

H1 – the period of hardship. Homosexuals see themselves banished to an agonizing double life full of lies and fears, blacks see themselves banished to separate quarters and separate seats in the bus. In some countries, disabled children are hidden or even killed.

H2 follows – the heroic period. The point is reached at which the plagued no longer want to live in lies and misery. This goes hand in hand with fierce battles that then create a liberation myth. Like the legendary refusal of the black woman Rosa Parks to stand up for a white passenger in a bus in Alabama in 1955. Or the 1969 street battles in New York’s Christopher Street, which is the beacon of homosexual escape from their secret parallel world. These days its memory is conjured up again with parades where being proud is central.

For a long time we have been in phase H3: the temptation of hubris.” (Wolfgang Büscher. “[Die grenzenlose Emanzipation einer Minderheit](#)” (translation of the title: “The boundless Emancipation of a Minority,” Die Welt, June 13, 2013.).

Homosexuals will therefore have to be measured by how they, as co-owners of power, deal with power. They will have to be judged by whether they concede the rights and grant the tolerance to all others that they have won for themselves, even to those who appear ‘strange’ and ‘different’ to them.

This also applies within the same faction. If one looks at the inflexibility with which advocates of marriage for same-sex couples in Germany have ‘ridden roughshod’ over their homosexual opponents who regard this as a ‘bourgeoisification’ of the gay movement, one is shocked.

In France, among the millions who demonstrated against ‘gay marriage,’ there have also been many homosexuals who are against ‘gay marriage.’ In our country such voices are silenced, both because they do not follow the official party line and because it is unthinkable, even forbidden, to join forces with conservative or religious forces of this kind: a decent homosexual simply does not do that!

“When the argument about gay marriage broke out so explosively and so massively on the streets of France, Germany peered speechlessly across the Rhine. The louder the outrage

from France, the more audible the silence became here. As if French and Germans lived in different worlds.” (Büscher)

In any case, the choice of words, the polemics, and the sharpness of the condemnation also found within the political streams of the homosexual movement speak for the fact that no punches are pulled at this point with respect to the freedom of others. (See as an example the dispute between the BVH (Bundesverband Homosexualität / Federal Homosexuality Association) and the LSVD (Lesben- und Schwulenverband in Deutschland / Lesbian and Gay Federation in Germany) according to Wikipedia, August 23, 2015).

Why can't One live with the few Dissenters?

Why can it not be accepted that there is a minority of devout people in Germany – Evangelical, Catholic, and Orthodox (fellow Jewish and Muslim citizens should also be mentioned, although they never become a target – one thinks, for instance, of the Jewish organization [JONAH](#)) – for whom all sexuality outside marriage is wrong? Why must the state's monopoly on the use of force be called upon against them?

The fact is: Although a large part of churches and Christians consider all sexuality outside marriage to be outside the will of God and only approve of sexuality in marriage that occurs consensually, there are no hateful reactions against such Christians by teenagers, porn users, brothel visitors, individuals who have affairs, or those who broker infidelity.

Millions of people live in 'common law marriages' without stigmatizing conservative Christians and without demanding intervention by the federal government in the Bundestag. Millions of people get divorced without violently demonstrating against Christian events that include pastoral warnings against divorce and offer help to victims of divorce. The porn industry grants the devout their way, even though they are among its sharpest critics. Why cannot representatives of other demands in the area of sexuality do the same?

Finally, so that no one misunderstands me: *What I am saying here applies to Germany, Great Britain, the USA, and many other Western countries. It does not apply to regions where homosexuals are still not safe or otherwise persecuted, as in large parts of Africa or the Islamic world.* It does not apply, for example, to countries in which homosexuals are still a persecuted minority and all churches (not only Evangelicals – as it is often one-sidedly described in Germany – but unfortunately also including some) are involved.

“What a contrast. A minority's power and powerlessness at the same time – there persecution, here a privileged boost.” (Büscher)

Sex in Marriage and only Marriage?

The Catholic Church, the Orthodox and ancient Eastern Churches, the Evangelical and most non-Western Protestant churches, that is, the vast majority of the world's 2.5 billion Christians, consider homosexuality, as well as any sexuality outside marriage and any involuntary sexuality in marriage, to be incompatible with the will of God. The fact that many Christians live in a society that sees the area of

sexuality completely differently is something they share with almost all Christians in many generations and cultures since New Testament times.

In a democracy, Christians are to abide by the laws in this regard, even where they seek to change them democratically and without violence. However, in a democratic constitutional state, they have a right to think or live as they do and not be forced by advocates of marriage without a marriage certificate or by advocates of same-sex marriage. This is due to the fact that freedom of religion, freedom of opinion, and the right to a self-determined life also apply to them.

It should also be pointed out that, unlike political groups, religious bodies and movements do not adapt their programs every year and change moral positions casually or according to opinion polls. It has also been demonstrated time and again that religious communities live from setting moral standards and not abandoning moral standards to arbitrariness.

The churches in many countries are currently having to adapt to a completely new situation in which society and the state no longer condemn homosexuality but protect it. It makes more sense to give them time to deal with this than to criminalize them. For example, all churches in Western countries, including Evangelical churches, have completely abandoned the idea of punishing homosexuality in any form or even seeing it condemned by the state.

All these Christians are of the opinion that God created sexuality as the crown of creation for the permanent relationship between man and woman. They believe that fulfilling sexuality belongs in marriage. They also help many people who do not live this way. They speak out against the sexual abuse of children, against rape in marriage, indeed, they see it self-critically and suffer from the fact that all this also exists in their midst. They offer help and forgiveness. They care for millions afflicted by HIV and AIDS in Africa and Asia, regardless of whether their sexual practices were partly responsible for them or not. However, in principle, it remains the case that they peacefully and pastorally work to ensure that sexuality belongs in a harmonious and dependable heterosexual long-term relationship.

Incidentally, the German Evangelical Alliance (Evangelische Allianz in Deutschland, or EAD) has made it clear that, in its view, there is no discrimination against homosexuals to be inferred. In its political manifesto "Suchet der Stadt Bestes" (English translation of the title: "Seek the Best for the City,"), the following is stated:

"We also oppose discrimination based on gender and gender orientation, also in view of the disastrous oppression of homosexuals in the Third Reich. We confront representatives of a different gender orientation with respect and dignity, but see practiced homosexuality – like other forms of extramarital sexuality – as fundamentally incompatible with biblical ethics that are decisive for the Christian faith. We also oppose attempts to equate same-sex civil partnerships with classical marriage, which stands out in Germany's Basic Law, even though we respect the fact that the understanding of gender roles changes time and again over the course of history" (German Evangelical Alliance, "Suchet der Stadt Bestes"; English translation of the title: "[Seek the Best for the City](#)." Bad Blankenburg, 2010).