

# I Can't Fight This Feeling Anymore: Discerning the Conflict Over Human Sexuality and Religious Liberty

**Andrew Walker**

*Director of Policy Studies*

*The Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission*

*Ph.D. Candidate in Christian Ethics*

*The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*

*Louisville, Kentucky*

## Introduction

This essay focuses on sexuality's role as a social organizing principle. In particular, it focuses on how the diversity of viewpoints around contraception, abortion, adoption, and same-sex marriage serves as an illustration of contemporary debates about religious liberty and sexuality. What this article highlights are practical examples in American public life in which divergent and competing conceptions about human sexuality are driving current debates about religious liberty. The article will also make the argument that restoring a robust understanding of religious liberty, particularly on controversial sexual issues, requires a clear, biblical sexual ethic as it relates to human flourishing.

## The Rights of Sexual Liberty

The fault lines of contemporary American life run through divergent views of sex and religion. These factors alone are often an accurate predictor of how individuals will vote.<sup>1</sup>

Present disputes over religious liberty in America, however, stem almost exclusively from deeply divergent cultural views about the design and purpose of human sexuality. How did we arrive at this current milieu? Many would argue that an evolving understanding of "rights" language is at

the center of current debates. If religious liberty is pitted against sexual liberty, and competing factions are both arguing on the grounds of "rights," whose side will prevail?

Natural rights, which were once the guarantor of liberty and which issued from a broadly theistic worldview are now challenged by a conception of rights that are derived from self-determination and self-will. It is a view of liberty issuing from autonomy. It is also a view of liberty in search of a "rights" language sufficient enough to secure it. And over time, coupled with cultural shifts and judicial rulings confirming this conception as a dominant legal reality, liberty is now conceived of less as an exercise in duty and responsibility, and more of an understanding of permissibility.

Political scientist Anthony Giddens has advanced the thesis that the "transformation of intimacy" that marks late modernity and our discussion about liberty is a creature resulting from the democratization of sexuality. In Giddens's view,

How do democratic norms bear upon sexual experience itself? This is the essence of the question of sexual emancipation . . . The democratization implied in the transformation of intimacy includes, but also transcends, 'radical pluralism.'

No limits are set upon sexual activity, save for those entailed by the generalizing of the principle of autonomy and by the negotiated norms of pure relationship. Sexual emancipation consists in integrating plastic sexuality with the reflexive project of self. Thus, for example, no prohibition is necessarily placed on episodic sexuality so long as the principle of self-autonomy, and other associated democratic norms, are sustained on all sides.<sup>2</sup>

How do *liberty as autonomy* and Giddens's thesis combine to shape present day? Starting in the 1960s, new and aberrant sexual moralities were introduced into American culture, which steadily recast traditional understandings of American morality, eventually making room for such moralities to lay claim to legal recognition.<sup>3</sup> Hence, historical debates about a right of access to contraception, abortion, and same-sex marriage come as judicial afterthoughts issuing from a morality unknown at our country's founding. These issues have become, and indeed are fast becoming, deeply embedded institutions in American life so that the reigning sexual ethic in America is "if it feels good, do it."<sup>4</sup>

Contemporary culture finds its axis in an ever-expanding understanding of sexual liberty marked by—at least in America—collision with a large conservative evangelical population whose sexual ethics remain traditional.<sup>5</sup> For example, if a gay rights organization asked a Christian-owned t-shirt company to print shirts advertising for a gay rights parade, and the t-shirt company declined—who is at fault? Is homosexuality a protected right? Can the t-shirt company exercise a religious belief that exempts it from lending its craft to causes it believes are sinful?<sup>6</sup> These types of scenarios and debates over human sexuality and religious liberty stem from larger questions about which sexual morality and which sexual worldview will dominate the American landscape for decades to come. Academics shun generalization, but in short form, the question of the day is whether religious liberty or sexual liberty will prevail.

## Sexual Cosmology

Sex defines our being. We enter this world endowed with a procreative capacity constituted by our sex as either male or female. So it is no coincidence that the first pages of Genesis begin with sex. Like a relational roadmap, God decrees that the relationship between a man and a woman is to be sexually unitive (Gen 2:7–24). Sexual identity and the sexual act itself are institutions that build civilizations. Between a man and a woman there is a microcosmic creation narrative such that the sexual arrangement of a man and woman lies at the heart of discerning what a properly ordered society looks like.<sup>7</sup> Sexual desire is primal and visceral to our human experience.<sup>8</sup> It powerfully foreshadows a future, heavenly mystery (Eph 5:31–32), but sex also encodes social patterns for human organization and societal ordering. While "cosmology" may be a grandiose term to describe sex's power over people, I agree with Rod Dreher who, in a provocative essay entitled "Sex after Christianity," argues that America's move away from traditional sexual morality really signals its move away from a sexual hegemony informed by a culture that was once predominantly Christian. He writes,

Is sex the linchpin of Christian cultural order? Is it really the case that to cast off Christian teaching on sex and sexuality is to remove the factor that gives—or gave—Christianity its power as a social force?<sup>9</sup>

According to Dreher, the ascendancy of same-sex marriage in America signals the "dethroning" of a Christian sexual cosmology in America's sexual heritage.<sup>10</sup> Drawing on the work of sociologist Philip Rieff, Dreher summarizes the ties of "cosmology" to religion and sex:

He [Rieff] understood that religion is the key to understanding any culture. For Rieff, the essence of any and every culture can be identified by what it forbids. Each imposes a series of moral demands on its members, for the sake of serving communal purposes, and helps them cope with these demands. A culture requires

a cultus—a sense of sacred order, a cosmology that roots these moral demands within a metaphysical framework.<sup>11</sup>

Sexual relations between a man and a woman constitute a crucial aspect to our being in that sexuality has a built-in organizing principle to it. According to Reiff, the sexual prohibitions that once issued from a shared cultural consensus about Christianity's demands for sexuality formed the fabric of our social order. According to Dreher, "Christianity did establish a way to harness the sexual instinct, embed it within a community, and direct it in positive ways."<sup>12</sup> The relationship between the sexes builds society and society in turn codifies sexual expectations for how men and women are to channel their sexual desire. According to a Christian sexual cosmology, Christianity's influence waxes or wanes to the extent that its sexual ethics are the standard community ethic that organizes a society. But as Dreher notes, that consensus about the design and purpose of sex is less recognizable with each passing generation, so that Christianity's cultural power is itself also less dominant. As Christianity is cast off, so is its sexual ethics and vice versa. But the hinge of the argument in determining how sexual morality leads to disputes over religious liberty is the following: *How a society orders itself sexually is consequential to what it values as a political community.* Sexual values shape political values. But according to the biblical narrative, what is sinful can never be ordered—teleologically—for human flourishing. The Bible and history reveal that disordered sexual relations make for corrupt, deteriorating societies.<sup>13</sup> According to John Piper, sexual relationships signify spiritual enlightenment.

God created us in his image, male and female, with personhood and sexual passions, so that when he comes to us in this world there would be these powerful words and images to describe the promises and the pleasures of our covenant relationship with him through Christ. God made us powerfully sexual so that he would be more deeply knowable. We

were given the power to know each other sexually so that we might have some hint of what it will be like to know Christ supremely. Therefore, all misuses of our sexuality (adultery, fornication, illicit fantasies, masturbation, pornography, homosexual behavior, rape, sexual child abuse, bestiality, exhibitionism, and so on) distort the true knowledge of God. God means for human sexual life to be a pointer and foretaste of our relationship with him.<sup>14</sup>

Piper's comments have stunning implications for the type of sexuality practiced on a national scale. When a society embraces sexual practices abhorrent to Scripture, society experiences a similar "giving over" to lawlessness, rebellion, and wrath echoed in Romans 1:24.

When societies adopt and celebrate sexual relationships that the Bible condemns and moves away from norms that strengthen families, the deleterious effects on its people are empirically known. As Mary Eberstadt argues in her book, *How the West Really Lost God*, societal health is inextricably bound to religion's vitality and adherence within its people.<sup>15</sup> If Dreher is right (and I think he is) about America's descent into further glorifying a sinful sexual culture and sinful sexual structures, this only deepens the divide between the Christian population and the American political culture. As differences become starker, disagreement intensifies about how sexuality should be channeled. This difference in sexual worldview is the catalyst for disputes about the rights of Christians to exercise their liberty. Below are examples concerning contemporary events and their significance to understanding the controversy over religious liberty in America.<sup>16</sup>

## Contemporary Debates over Religious Liberty

### *Health & Human Services Mandate*

President Obama's 2010 signature domestic policy achievement, the Affordable Care Act, included a preventative services mandate issued from the Health and Human Services Department's Institute of Medicine. The law mandates

that employers provide, at no cost to female employees, access to contraception, sterilization, and abortion-inducing drugs.<sup>17</sup> While carving out narrow exceptions for church and some religious non-profits, the law has unsettled the conscience of business owners, notably the super-chain Hobby Lobby, whose owners desire to practice their business in accord with the principles of their faith. Many Christians—Catholic and Protestant—have a religious and moral objection to providing access to the aforementioned services.

Leaving aside the thornier issues about the constitutionality of the government's action, the immediate relevance to this article is the symbolic nature of government-mandated contraception services. The shift from *allowing* to *mandating* contraception signals a highly liberated view of sex, surely disconnected from the procreative emphasis, primacy, and function of human sexuality set forth in Scripture (Gen 2:24). Access to contraception has forever decoupled sex and childbearing. Moreover, once the consequence of sex, namely, children, could be cut-off from the act of sex, the relationship of a man and woman was forever transformed with the modern industrialization of contraception. While bracketing discussion about the morality of contraception, its impact on re-interpreting sex by licensing it for exclusively pleasurable purposes is a profound paradigm shift.<sup>18</sup>

Once considered taboo, access to contraception is now associated with any number of American ideals—self-liberation, self-empowerment, career mobility, and educational attainment among them. Further, any number of feminist interpretations about contraception would render the ability to control and overcome one's fertility as having acquired total independence from the burden of childbearing. In a telling admission, liberal advocates in favor of subsidized or free access to contraception have also cast their opposition to Christian concerns over infringements of religious liberty in a not-so-thinly-veiled appeal to liberty as well. Consider these words from an academic at the Center for American Progress, a liberal expositor of the sexual revolution:

Religious liberty means religious liberty for everyone. And that includes the freedom from having the theological doctrines of your boss or those of business owners in your community being forced upon you.<sup>19</sup>

Certainly, it should be admitted that the majority of Americans do exercise their right to use birth control under the rubric of personal liberty and family planning. But the shift from access to mandate is a step too far. It signals an overreaching government determined to enforce a rigid sexual worldview that contravenes Christian sexual ethics. In this instance, the government is putting a condition of marketplace entry on businesses by forcing business owners—private actors—to violate their conscience.

The HHS Mandate is an illustrative example of a government-mandated orthodoxy designed to communicate a truth about fertility and sexual freedom that conflicts with a large percentage of American Christians who have concerns about facilitating access to contraception, sterilization, or abortion-inducing drugs. American Christians persist in their opposition to the HHS Mandate, indicating that they will not be compliant with this particular government edict. While Catholics and evangelical Christians disagree on whether contraception can ever be used, both are co-belligerents against a “contraceptive mindset” that sees children as burdensome obstacles. In summary, diverse opinions on whether the sexual activity of persons should be subsidized via mandate is a clear illustration of the differences between Scripture's view of sex and our culture's view.

### *Adoption & Foster Services*

In Illinois, Massachusetts, and Washington D.C., Catholic adoption and foster agencies have ended their services after their respective states mandated that these institutions work with same-sex couples looking to adopt or foster children. Rather than lay down their conscience and their belief that children need to know the differentiated love of both a mother and father, they ceased operation.<sup>20</sup> The irony of *faux*-tolerance peddled by



sexual liberationists is on full display in this situation. Rather than allow a religious entity to operate according to its beliefs in a “live and let live” scenario, activists forced a long-standing social service agency to close its doors before they would allow them to openly defy the new definition of sexual tolerance. This episode demonstrates the denial of sexual complementarity to the parenting enterprise and the belief that the unique traits of a male and female are interchangeable. This ethic defies the biblical mandate that a mother and father unite not only to create children, but also to care for them.

A similar, though admittedly new episode, involves the ACLU suing the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops over its health directive that prevents Catholic hospitals from performing abortion.<sup>21</sup> Not content to honor the religious beliefs of one of America’s largest health-care providers, the plaintiff, under direction of the ACLU, is suing on the grounds that in emergency situations like the one presented in the case referenced, abortions should be mandated regardless of the conscience or religious beliefs of the treating institution—despite an abortion facility’s location two blocks from the Catholic hospital where the desired service could have been performed.

In the case of abortion, what’s at stake is whether the sexual ethics of a Catholic institution can withstand scrutiny brought on by the abortion industry’s insistence that abortion become institutionalized, despite prevailing objections. Arguments for life and personhood ignored, what this case typifies is the sacramentalizing of a sexual worldview that treats human sexuality as a libertine escape into sexual fulfillment, against the narrative of a Christian sexual ethic that reserves sex for marital relationships and the belief that all of life is sacred.

### ***Homosexuality and Same-Sex Marriage***

The examples involving same-sex marriage conflicting with religious liberty grow more numerous by the month.<sup>22</sup> On this topic, I’d like to address two particular episodes. The first is from a debate in Colorado over its legislature passing a same-sex civil unions bill. This example is particu-

larly troublesome given the viciousness and hostility communicated towards Christians who hold orthodox beliefs about biblical sexuality. It demonstrates the rising tensions and atmospherics in the debate over advancing gay rights amidst concerns made by the Christian community.

Patrick Steadman is a Colorado State Senator who, in 2013, introduced a same-sex civil unions bill. During floor debate, Steadman offered a fiery floor speech denouncing those who disagree with his own purported homosexuality. According to Steadman,

Don’t claim religion as a reason the law should discriminate. We have laws against discrimination. Discrimination is banned in employment, and housing, and public accommodations, and so bakeries that serve the public aren’t supposed to look down their noses at one particular class of persons and say ‘we don’t sell cakes to you.’ It’s troubling, this discrimination. And it’s already illegal. So, what to say to those who claim that religion requires them to discriminate? I’ll tell you what I’d say: ‘Get thee to a nunnery!’ And live there then. Go live a monastic life away from modern society, away from people you can’t see as equals to yourself. Away from the stream of commerce where you may have to serve them or employ them or rent banquet halls to them. Go some place and be as judgmental as you like. Go inside your church, establish separate water fountains in there if you want, but don’t claim that free exercise of religion requires the state of Colorado to establish separate water fountains for her citizens. That’s not what we’re doing here.<sup>23</sup>

Steadman’s language of outright marginalization and contempt for Colorado’s Christian population is a stunning admission of how intense debates can be about the role and purpose of sexuality. Advocates for homosexuality will no doubt cast this episode in terms of civil liberties, but for Christians, liberty unto itself is not a first-tier moral principle when evaluating whether a bill should be

made legal. Steadman's suggestion that Christians remove themselves from society shows just how stark debates over sexuality can be. In this case, a Colorado state senator makes moral compromise a condition of participation in the civil sphere.

A second example is found in the case of pastor Louie Giglio. In the run-up to President Obama's second inauguration, the White House invited Giglio to offer the closing benediction at the inauguration ceremony. As an articulate, evangelical pastor, Giglio has devoted much of his ministry to extinguishing sex trafficking and fueling evangelical passion for social justice. After his invitation was announced, liberal activists discovered an online sermon he preached. His offense? Preaching a message expounding a view of sexuality from the Bible and upheld by the Christian church for over two thousand years.<sup>24</sup> He was called "vehemently anti-gay" by the liberal think tank Think Progress.<sup>25</sup> Liberal critic Jonathan Capehart, also gay, dismissed Giglio, saying, "It is our right not to have an unrepentant bigot be given such a high honor on Inauguration Day."<sup>26</sup> Giglio voluntarily removed himself from inaugural festivities, but his withdrawal prompted several responses from notable Christian thinkers.<sup>27</sup>

These cases indicate the growing chasm between a biblical sexual ethic and the gay lobby in America. While Christians affirm the complementarity of the sexes oriented towards the marital union, the homosexual lobby in America is unyielding in its quest to redefine and disempower the Christian sexual metanarrative. For the homosexual lobby to continue its ascendancy to cultural prominence, it will need to displace Christian sexual ethics, redefine Christianity, and marginalize and punish Christians, culturally, for holding firm to biblical Christianity.

### **Biblical Morality or Human Morality?**

As the above examples intend to demonstrate, America is in the throes of a great conflict about human sexuality and religious liberty. Christians are being routinely told to bury their views for the sake of cultural and marketplace participation. Secular and liberal conceptions of personal sexual lib-

erty seem to be growing increasingly irreconcilable against a normative biblical sexual ethic—not just in theory, but in application seen in present disputes.

But that brings us to a closing consideration: Biblical sexual ethics, if they are to be Christian, are to be normative not just for Christians, but for all of humanity.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, Jesus Christ is Lord over sex, for he established sex and ordered its purpose. As Creator, Christ revealed the teleology of sex in Genesis 1–2 and reaffirmed it in his teaching (Matt 19:3–9). In this way, sexual ethics are Christotelic (John 1:3; Col 1:15–20).<sup>29</sup> Sexual ethics, properly ordered, are an earthly shadow (Gen 2:24) of a unitive bond fulfilled in the gospel (Eph 5:22–33). Therefore, a properly ordered sexuality is a witness to the watching world about the brokenness of human sexuality, the depths of sexual sin, and its restoration in Christ by its proper use toward its proper end—the glory of God (1 Cor 6:18–20; 10:31). I find myself in agreement with John Piper, who offers a telling insight about sexuality's connection to our knowledge of Christ.

Not only do all the misuses of our sexuality serve to conceal or distort the true knowledge of God in Christ, but it also works powerfully the other way around: the true knowledge of God in Christ serves to prevent the misuses of our sexuality. So, on the one hand, sexuality is designed by God as a way to know Christ more fully. And, on the other hand, knowing Christ more fully is designed as a way of guarding and guiding our sexuality.<sup>30</sup>

But these realities and the gospel's hope in sexual brokenness will be challenged in the coming days. No one right now has the foresight to see what legal troubles Christians will find themselves in for maintaining a biblical sexual ethic. But I see no reason in offering Pollyannaish tales unmoored from reality. The times are dark. Chai Feldblum, an Obama appointee to Commissioner of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, is emblematic of the legal future facing Christians. In a now infamous remark discussing conflicts over

religious liberty, she made the following observation discussing how sexual liberty and religious liberty interact with one another:

Sexual liberty should win in most cases. There can be a conflict between religious liberty and sexual liberty, but in almost all cases the sexual liberty should win because that's the only way that the dignity of gay people can be affirmed in any realistic manner.<sup>31</sup>

This may be our future: Legal loss and cultural marginalization. In a very real way that is becoming increasingly known through experience; the tipping point of Christian influence and Christian identity in society may be the political and cultural witness we offer when we recognize and gladly submit to the authority and Lordship of Jesus Christ over sex. Christ and sexuality are never in tension when lived out according to his purposes. When aligned together, the teleology of Christian sexuality results in the glorifying of Christ and the sanctification of one's desires (2 Cor 4:4–6). Yet, where sexuality is divorced from its purposes found in Christ, the corrupting influence of sexual disorder remains unrivaled in breeding enemies of the cross (Phil 3:17–21). The reality of these stark differences is intensified when evaluated from the vantage point of which code of sexual ethics a culture adopts—God-glorifying sexual ethics or God-denying sexual ethics. But let us be clear: When God's glory is robbed, a nation's future is robbed, as well.

Times may be darkening in America as a Christian sexual ethic is treated with open hostility, but there is no reason for despair. The Christian Church does her best work when tested. While Feldblum's quote is disconcerting, I'm reminded of an even better quote offered by a Catholic Cardinal, Francis George:

I expect to die in bed, my successor will die in prison and his successor will die a martyr in the public square. His successor will pick up the shards of a ruined society and slowly help rebuild civilization, as the church has done so often in human history.<sup>32</sup>

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Joseph Liu, "How the Faithful Voted: 2012 Preliminary Analysis," *Pew Research Center's Religion & Public Life Project*, November 7, 2012, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://www.pewforum.org/2012/11/07/how-the-faithful-voted-2012-preliminary-exit-poll-analysis/>.

<sup>2</sup>Anthony Giddens, *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love, and Eroticism in Modern Societies* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1992), 194.

<sup>3</sup>*Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965) secured access to contraception for the general population. *Roe v. Wade* (1973) guaranteed access to abortion. And while a constitutional right to same-sex marriage has not yet been granted, legal proceedings in the states suggest that the Supreme Court will soon hear a state-level case asking whether the Constitution guarantees a right to same-sex marriage, an issue that Court avoided during its 2013 cases involving Proposition 8 and *Windsor*.

<sup>4</sup>Robert P. George, "What Is Religious Freedom?," *Public Discourse*, July 24, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2013/07/10622/>.

<sup>5</sup>I use "traditional" only in a descriptive sense to discuss how America's sexual ethics were once animated by a civil religion sexuality drawn from Christianity. America still is animated by a biblical sexual ethic, but as the argument in the paper will make clear, this is becoming less of a fact in contemporary America.

<sup>6</sup>This is not hypothetical. A case identical to what has been described is currently being litigated in Lexington, Kentucky.

<sup>7</sup>Excluding popular caricatures such as "God made Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve," the Genesis narrative offers an authoritative narrative about God's intention for human sexuality. Hermeneutically, the biblical account of human relationships indicates that the pattern of the marriage union is to be biologically complementary, institutionally permanent, sexually exclusive, and monogamous. For a defense of a natural law explanation of marriage, see Sherif Girgis, Ryan T. Anderson, and Robert P. George, *What Is Marriage? Man and Woman: A Defense* (New York: Encounter Books, 2012). For a discussion about the authority of Christ in re-affirming the creational institution of marriage, see Andrew Walker, "Jesus And The Same-Sex Marriage Debate," *The Federalist*, November 22, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://thefederalist.com/2013/11/22/jesus-sex-marriage-debate/>.

<sup>8</sup>"God created us with sexual passion so that there would be language to describe what it means to cleave to him in love and what it means to turn away from him to others." John Piper, *Sex and the Supremacy of Christ* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2005), 28.

<sup>9</sup>Rod Dreher, "Sex After Christianity," *The American Conservative*, April 11, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/sex-after-christianity/>.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.* As Dreher notes, "Same-sex marriage strikes the decisive blow against the old order."

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup>J.D. Unwin, *Sex and Culture* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934).

<sup>14</sup>Piper, *Sex and the Supremacy of Christ*, 29–30.

<sup>15</sup>Mary Eberstadt, *How the West Really Lost God: A New Theory of Secularization* (West Conshohocken: Templeton Press, 2013).

<sup>16</sup>Space prevents me from offering an extended discussion about the nature of religious liberty, but the following are representative volumes that offer classical rendering of religious liberty: Robert P. George, *Conscience and Its Enemies: Confronting the Dogmas of*

*Liberal Secularism* (Delaware: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2013), 106–25; Timothy Samuel Shah, et al., *Religious Freedom: Why Now?: Defending an Embattled Human Right* (Princeton, NJ: Witherspoon Institute, 2012).

<sup>17</sup>For more information related to litigation and the Health and Human Services Mandate, see <http://www.becketfund.org/hhs-informationcentral/>. At this writing, the Supreme Court will hear oral arguments on the constitutionality of the HHS Mandate in late March and will issue its decision in late June.

<sup>18</sup>For an excellent discussion about Christian ethics and the morality of contraception, see Denny Burk, *What Is the Meaning of Sex?* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2013), 139–55.

<sup>19</sup>Joshua Dorner, “Religious Liberty for Some or Religious Liberty for All?,” *Center for American Progress*, December 12, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/civil-liberties/report/2013/12/12/80968/religious-liberty-for-some-or-religious-liberty-for-all/>.

<sup>20</sup>U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, “Religious Liberty Under Attack,” *U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops*, <http://www.usccb.org/issues-and-action/religious-liberty/fortnight-for-freedom/upload/Catholic-Adoption-Services.pdf>.

<sup>21</sup>“Tamesha Means v. United States Conference of Catholic Bishops,” *American Civil Liberties Union*, December 2, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, <https://www.aclu.org/reproductive-freedom-womens-rights/tamesha-means-v-united-states-conference-catholic-bishops>.

<sup>22</sup>There are currently disputes over homosexual rights and/or same-sex marriage and religious liberty in Kentucky, Washington, Colorado, and New Mexico. For an up-to-date reading of these cases, see [alliancefendingfreedom.org](http://alliancefendingfreedom.org). ADF is litigating these cases on behalf of Christian business owners.

<sup>23</sup>Eric Dolan, “Colorado Lawmaker Tells Anti-Gay Christians: ‘Get Thee to a Nunnery,’” *The Raw Story*, February 21, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://www.rawstory.com/rs/2013/02/21/colorado-lawmaker-tells-anti-gay-christians-get-thee-to-a-nunnery/>.

<sup>24</sup>Melissa Steffan, “Louie Giglio Withdraws from Inauguration over Past Sermon on Homosexuality,” *ChristianityToday.com*, January 21, 2013, accessed February 10, 2014, <http://www.christianitytoday.com/gleanings/2013/january/louie-giglio-withdraws-from-inauguration-over-past-sermon.html>.

<sup>25</sup>Josh Israel, “Inaugural Benediction To Be Delivered By Pastor Who Gave Vehemently Anti-Gay Sermon,” *Think Progress*, January 9, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://thinkprogress.org/lgbt/2013/01/09/1422021/inaugural-benediction-to-be-delivered-by-anti-gay-pastor/>.

<sup>26</sup>Jonathan Capehart, “Louie Giglio out from Inaugural: Good,” *Washington Post*, January 20, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2013/01/10/louie-giglio-out-from-inaugural-good/>.

<sup>27</sup>“When it is now impossible for one who holds to the catholic Christian view of marriage and the gospel to pray at a public event, we now have a de facto established state church. Just as the pre-constitutional Anglican and congregational churches required a license to preach in order to exclude Baptists, the new state church requires a “license” of embracing sexual liberation in all its forms.” Russell Moore, “Louie Giglio and the New State Church,” *Russell-Moore.com*, January 10, 2013, accessed April 30, 2014, [www.russell-moore.com/2013/01/10/louie-giglio-and-the-new-state-church/](http://www.russell-moore.com/2013/01/10/louie-giglio-and-the-new-state-church/).

<sup>28</sup>When we speak of sexuality as *only* a theological construct, we do a disservice to its public significance. There aren’t two kinds of

sexuality—one secular, one sacred. There is only one sexuality with one purpose.

<sup>29</sup>Consider that marriage’s creational purpose in Genesis 2 is fulfilled in the picture of the Christ-Church union in Ephesians 5.

<sup>30</sup>Piper, *Sex and the Supremacy of Christ*, 30.

<sup>31</sup>Maggie Gallagher, “Banned in Boston,” *The Weekly Standard*, May 15, 2006, accessed February 10, 2014, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/012/191kgwgh.asp%3Fpage%3D2>.

<sup>32</sup>Tim Drake, “The Myth and the Reality of ‘I’ll Die in My Bed,’” *National Catholic Register*, October 24, 2012, accessed April 30, 2014, <http://www.ncregister.com/blog/tim-drake/the-myth-and-the-reality-of-ill-die-in-my-bed>.