

RECEIVED  
6 FEB 2020  
GENERAL SYNOD

R2

IN THE APPELLATE TRIBUNAL  
ANGLICAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA

IN THE MATTER OF questions referred by the Primate under section 63(1) of the Constitution  
AND IN THE MATTER OF the *Blessing of Persons Married According to the Marriage Act 1961 of the  
Synod of Wangaratta*

**RESPONSIVE SUBMISSIONS BY DR DAVID PHILLIPS**

Tea Tree Gully Anglican Church, Diocese of Adelaide

**Table of Contents**

Introduction.....1

Procedural concerns.....2

Fundamental Declarations.....2

The Ruling Principles.....4

The question of same-sex marriage .....5

Scripture and same-sex marriage .....9

Lived experience and same-sex marriage .....12

Theological defence of same-sex marriage .....14

Conclusion .....20

**Introduction**

1. These submissions respond to some of the primary submissions published by the General Synod Appellate Tribunal of the Anglican Church of Australia.
2. In particular, these submissions respond to the primary submissions of
  - 2.1. Mr Brian and Mrs Helen Gitsham (submission 8) and
  - 2.2. Rev'd Associate Professor Matthew Anstey (submission 29).
3. In my primary submissions (submission 12), I argued that the questions referred to the Appellate Tribunal are matters arising under the Constitution and should be determined by the Tribunal, if necessary with advice from the House of Bishops on doctrinal matters. Here it is assumed that the Tribunal decides it has jurisdiction in these matters and there are Constitutional questions that the Tribunal will address. These submissions address some substantive matters before the Tribunal.

## Procedural concerns

4. The Gitshams' submission at paragraph 1 states:

*We understand that Bishop John Parkes is a member of the Appellate Tribunal and given that the Tribunal is dealing with the matter of the Diocese of Wangaratta, he has recused himself. However, we also note that Justice Clyde Croft, Chancellor of the Diocese of Wangaratta, is a member of the Tribunal and has not yet recused himself.*

5. Furthermore, it is reported that in his Presidential Address to Synod on 30 August 2019, Bishop Parkes said, "Justice Croft has served me and the Diocese with great skill and devotion ...". Clearly, Justice Croft has a very close working relationship with Bishop Parkes. The Gitshams respond saying:

*considering the committed relationship Justice Croft has had with the Diocese for a number of years, and undoubtedly, advice given to the Bishop by Justice Croft in his role as Chancellor of the Diocese, we consider it is important that the integrity of the Tribunal is maintained.*

6. They also quote Rev David Ould saying (emphasis added):

***we think there is only one option for Justice Croft; he must recuse himself from the hearing.** The matter is of such great import for the national church and he has (as Parkes himself puts it) 'served me and the diocese with great skill and devotion' for 11 years. It is not a matter of whether Croft can be impartial; we don't know the man and can only assume he is of the utmost integrity. The Appellate Tribunal, however must be seen to be utterly without fear or favour on this most crucial of questions and we believe Justice Croft would understand that.*

7. I concur with the Gitshams and Rev David Ould that, for the impartiality and integrity of the Appellate Tribunal to be upheld and be seen to be upheld, Justice Croft must recuse himself from the hearing.

## Fundamental Declarations

8. Anstey argues at 3.5:

*The Fundamental Declarations, and the two Creeds referred to therein, make no statements asserting any moral or ethical absolutes, norms or precepts.*

While the Fundamental Declarations contain no *explicit* assertions of "moral or ethical absolutes, norms or precepts", such assertions are present *implicitly*. The Fundamental Declarations affirm "the Christian Faith as professed by the Church of Christ from primitive times", which certainly includes moral dimensions. The first century *Didache*, an important summary of teaching of the Church of Christ in primitive times, is replete with moral instruction.

The Fundamental Declarations affirm the "canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the ultimate rule and standard of faith" and they contain extensive moral teaching.

The Fundamental Declarations also commit the Anglican Church of Australia to “obey the commands of Christ” and “teach His doctrine”. Christ’s commands and doctrine include profound teaching on moral and ethical matters.

Anstey’s thesis here is flawed and should be rejected.

9. Anstey, at 3.7, draws a distinction between credal and moral statements.

*One can observe that credal statements are of the form, "The Church believes that God is creator of heaven and earth" ... and so forth. They are timeless, universal assertions about the nature of God and God's creation.... In contrast, moral doctrinal statements are of the form ...: "The Church believes that adultery is wrong"....*

The matters before the Tribunal go beyond moral questions and deal with ontological issues – the essential natures of God and humans. The Christian Faith includes not only ontological beliefs about God, such as “Jesus Christ is the Son of God”, but also about mankind, such as “men and women are made in God’s image” and “marriage is between a man and a woman”.

The latter is clear from Christ’s teaching on the nature of marriage in Matthew 19:4-5:

*Have you not read that he who created them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'?*

In God’s economy, “marriage” describes only a relationship between a man and a woman. Describing anything else as a “marriage” is a *category mistake*. There are multiple reports of relationships and ceremonies purportedly about “marriage” that are completely miscategorised:

- Melissa Denton purported to “marry” herself in 2018 but she misapplied the word to a bizarre narcissistic ceremony.<sup>1</sup>
- Elizabeth Hoad was reported as “marrying” her dog Logan earlier this year.<sup>2</sup> And she is not alone. Wilhelmina Morgan Callaghan, from Northern Ireland, supposedly “married” her dog Henry in 2009.<sup>3</sup> And Lilly Smartelli was reported in January 2019 as dreaming of “marrying” her dog Bernie.<sup>4</sup> And there are other reports of “marriages” to dogs, cats and frogs.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Melissa Denton, "I married myself and it was truly empowering", *The Telegraph*, UK, 29 April 2019, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/women/life/married-truly-empowering/>

<sup>2</sup> Elle Hunt, "Why would a woman marry her dog?", *The Guardian*, 1 August 2019, <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2019/jul/31/why-would-a-woman-marry-her-dog>

<sup>3</sup> Rachel Hosie, "Woman who married dog eight years ago says he's 'perfect' for her", *Independent*, 11 October 2017, <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/woman-married-dog-8-years-perfect-for-her-marriage-animal-wilhelmina-morgan-callaghan-northern-a7994626.html>

<sup>4</sup> Vincent M. Mallozzi, "A Woman, Her Best Friend, and a Quick Walk Down the Aisle?", *The New York Times*, 31 January 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/31/fashion/weddings/a-woman-her-best-friend-and-a-quick-walk-down-the-aisle.html>

<sup>5</sup> "Human–animal marriage", *Wikipedia*, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human–animal\\_marriage](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human–animal_marriage)

- British woman Sharon Tendler supposedly "married" the (male) dolphin Cindy at Dolphin Reef in the southern Israeli port of Eilat in 2005.<sup>6</sup>
- South Sudanese man Charles Tombe found copulating with a goat named Rose was forced to "marry" it.<sup>7</sup> Balinese teenager Ngurah Alit, 18, caught in the act of intercourse with a cow, was forced to "marry" the animal.<sup>8</sup> In these cases, the "marriages" were imposed as punishment.

The mere fact that people use the word "marriage" to describe a relationship does not make it a marriage in reality.

Anstey's conclusion at 3.10, that "a doctrine of same-sex marriage is not inconsistent with the Fundamental Declarations" is unsound. The Fundamental Declarations affirm the "Christian Faith as professed by the Church of Christ from primitive times", which includes the ontological assertion that *marriage is between a man and a woman*.

### The Ruling Principles

10. Anstey argues at 4.2 that the Book of Common Prayer (BCP) refers only to "heterosexual marriage":

*Given that homosexual marriage was not a legal option at the time of the writing of the BCP, and given it is reasonable to assume that the possibility of same-sex marriage was not countenanced by the authors, the BCP doctrine of marriage and the rationale provided to support it should be taken as pertaining only to heterosexual marriage.*

Here, Anstey makes the false assumption that *marriage* is capable of qualification, as either "heterosexual marriage" or "homosexual marriage" – or, for that matter, "self-marriage", "human-animal marriage" or perhaps other varieties of "marriage". This fallacy is concomitant with his earlier category mistake.

The BCP defines marriage clearly in the preface of The Form of Solemnization of Matrimony (**emphasis added**):

*Dearly beloved, we are gathered together here in the sight of God, and in the face of this Congregation, to join together this man and this woman in holy Matrimony; which is an honourable estate, **instituted of God in the time of man's innocency**, signifying unto us the **mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church**; which holy estate Christ adorned and beautified with his presence, and first miracle that he wrought, in Cana of Galilee; and is **commended of Saint Paul to be honourable among all men**: and therefore is not by any to*

<sup>6</sup> British woman weds dolphin, Sydney Morning Herald, 30 December 2005, <https://www.smh.com.au/world/british-woman-weds-dolphin-20051230-gdmpf8.html>

<sup>7</sup> "'Man marries goat' captivates millions", *The Telegraph*, 3 May 2007, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1550479/Man-marries-goat-captivates-millions.html>

<sup>8</sup> "Teenager passes out marrying cow he had sex with", *Jakarta Globe* (APSN), 11 June 2010, <https://www.asia-pacific-solidarity.net/news/2010-06-11/teenager-passes-out-marrying-cow-he-had-sex.html>

*be enterprised, nor taken in hand, unadvisedly, lightly, or wantonly, to satisfy men's carnal lusts and appetites, like brute beasts that have no understanding; but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God; duly considering the causes for which Matrimony was ordained. First, it was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name...*

This definition sets clear bounds on the meaning and nature of marriage, including that it is as instituted by God in the beginning: "a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh."<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, the BCP acknowledges the existence of "carnal lusts and appetites" that are incompatible with marriage, which would include sexual immorality, adultery and homosexual practice.<sup>10</sup> It would be more reasonable to assume that the writers of the BCP would be aware of such vices, not (as Anstey assumes) that they would have been ignorant of such things.

### The question of same-sex marriage

11. Anstey, at 5.1, says that "the central theological issue before the Tribunal is same-sex marriage, not the blessing of such". At 5.3 he makes the following assertion (**emphasis added**):

*Not only are proponents of same-sex marriage confident of the theological orthodoxy and Scriptural foundation of their position, they believe that the view that same-sex marriage is a moral good is in accord with leading **medical, psychological, and other relevant scientific research**, sources of knowledge and wisdom that have always been deeply influential in the Church's determination of its views on moral matters.*

This assertion about *medical, psychological, and other relevant scientific research* should not go unchallenged.

12. The **medical** source cited by Anstey is the *AMA Position Statement on Marriage Equality 2017*.<sup>11</sup> Firstly, it must be recognised that the AMA represents less than 30% of medical practitioners in Australia.<sup>12</sup> It is not necessarily representative of medical opinion in Australia. And it is more of a political statement than a medical one.

The central medical issue with men who have sex with men is that anal intercourse involves numerous medical risks:

*There are a number of health risks with anal sex, and anal intercourse is the riskiest form of sexual activity for several reasons, including the following:*

---

<sup>9</sup> Genesis 2:24.

<sup>10</sup> 1 Corinthians 6:9-10.

<sup>11</sup> *Position Statement on Marriage Equality 2017*, AMA, 2017, [https://ama.com.au/sites/default/files/documents/Marriage%20Equality%20-%202017%20-%20AMA%20position%20statement\\_0.pdf](https://ama.com.au/sites/default/files/documents/Marriage%20Equality%20-%202017%20-%20AMA%20position%20statement_0.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> "Recently The Australian newspaper made the surprising claim that only 30% of medical practitioners are AMA members", *Medical Republic*, (undated), <http://medicalrepublic.com.au/low-can-ama-go/14216>

- **The anus lacks the natural lubrication the vagina has.** Penetration can tear the tissue inside the anus, allowing bacteria and viruses to enter the bloodstream. This can result in the spread of sexually transmitted infections including HIV. Studies have suggested that anal exposure to HIV poses 30 times more risk for the receptive partner than vaginal exposure. Exposure to the human papillomavirus (HPV) may also lead to the development of anal warts and anal cancer. Using lubricants can help some, but doesn't completely prevent tearing.
- **The tissue inside the anus is not as well protected as the skin outside the anus.** Our external tissue has layers of dead cells that serve as a protective barrier against infection. The tissue inside the anus does not have this natural protection, which leaves it vulnerable to tearing and the spread of infection.
- **The anus was designed to hold in feces.** The anus is surrounded with a ring-like muscle, called the anal sphincter, which tightens after we defecate. When the muscle is tight, anal penetration can be painful and difficult. Repetitive anal sex may lead to weakening of the anal sphincter, making it difficult to hold in feces until you can get to the toilet. However, Kegel exercises to strengthen the sphincter may help prevent this problem or correct it.
- **The anus is full of bacteria.** Even if both partners do not have a sexually-transmitted infection or disease, bacteria normally in the anus can potentially infect the giving partner. Practicing vaginal sex after anal sex can also lead to vaginal and urinary tract infections.<sup>13</sup>

The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners provides the following information in the medical risks:

*Men who have sex with men are at increased likelihood of acquiring a STI and/or HIV infection. Between 2000 and 2004, 86% of new HIV infections in Australia were attributed to male homosexual contact. In New South Wales in 2005, 92% of gonorrhoea cases were isolated from men and 38% were rectal or pharyngeal isolates. Syphilis rates increased more than 10 fold from 1999 to 2003 in NSW, with most of the increase occurring in homosexual men.<sup>14</sup>*

It has long been known that contact with faeces is a health risk. The development of public sewer systems in the late 1800s, eliminating faecal contamination of water supplies, was largely responsible for a major improvement in public health. As every child should know, washing one's hands after going to the toilet is important. Anal coitus ignores good hygiene.

<sup>13</sup> "Anal Sex Safety and Health Concerns", WebMD, (undated), <https://www.webmd.com/sex/anal-sex-health-concerns>

<sup>14</sup> James Baber, "Men who have sex with men: A management approach for GPs", *Australian Family Physician*, Vol. 35, No. 10, October 2006, <https://www.racgp.org.au/afpbackissues/2006/200610/20061004baber.pdf>

The apostle Paul knew well of the consequences when he wrote of “men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error.”<sup>15</sup>

13. The *psychological* source cited by Anstey is an unattributed comment on a website of the American Psychological Association that cites no evidence whatsoever.<sup>16</sup> As such it cannot be considered authoritative.

Furthermore, the American Psychological Association is a highly politicised and partisan body that is known for making controversial statements. For example, its statement on the treatment of men and boys was strongly criticised by multiple scholars.<sup>17</sup>

The comment quoted by Anstey (in footnote 11) includes the questionable assertion that “Research has found no inherent association between [lesbian, gay or bisexual orientations] and psychopathology”. Evidence is available that:

*Members of the non-heterosexual population are estimated to have about 1.5 times higher risk of experiencing anxiety disorders than members of the heterosexual population, as well as roughly double the risk of depression, 1.5 times the risk of substance abuse, and nearly 2.5 times the risk of suicide.*<sup>18</sup>

The quoted comment also includes the assertion that “both heterosexual behavior and homosexual behavior are normal aspects of human sexuality.” This begs the question of what is “normal”. The mere fact that homosexual behaviour has been observed “in many different cultures and historical eras”, is no different from observing that murder, adultery, bestiality and paedophilia occur across cultures and historical eras. The occurrence of a behaviour does not make it a *moral good*. Anstey’s assertion, that this comment supports his claim that “same-sex marriage is a *moral good*”, is a non sequitur.

14. The source on **other relevant scientific research** cited by Anstey includes the claim that “There is now an extensive body of research on the psychological well-being of children and adolescents reared in sexual minority parent families.”<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Romans 1:27.

<sup>16</sup> “Sexual Orientation & Homosexuality: Is homosexuality a mental disorder?”, American Psychological Association, <https://www.apa.org/topics/lgbt/orientation>

<sup>17</sup> “Twelve Scholars Respond to the APA’s Guidance for Treating Men and Boys”, *Quillette Magazine*, 4 February 2019, <https://quillette.com/2019/02/04/psychologists-respond-to-the-apas-guidance-for-treating-men-and-boys/>

<sup>18</sup> Lawrence S. Mayer and Paul R. McHugh, “Sexuality and Gender: Findings from the Biological, Psychological, and Social Sciences”, *The New Atlantis*, Fall 2016, <https://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/introduction-sexuality-and-gender>

<sup>19</sup> Nanette Gartrell, et al., “We Were Among the First Non-traditional Families!: Thematic Perceptions of Lesbian Parenting After 25 Years”, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 25 October 2019, <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02414/full>

The principal author of the paper cited by Anstey is Nanette Gartrell, who is described as an American psychiatrist, researcher and lesbian activist. She lives in San Francisco with her lesbian partner.<sup>20</sup> Her personal life immediately raises questions about objectivity.

The study involved 131 prospective lesbian mothers who had volunteered (between 1986 and 1992) to participate in the U.S. National Longitudinal Family Study (NLLFS).<sup>21</sup> The fact that the subjects *volunteered* to participate means that the study could be subject to *volunteer bias*, and render the results invalid.<sup>22</sup>

The methodology used in the study is seriously flawed for several reasons. Firstly, the study was based on participants in the study *self-reporting*, which is a known source of bias. Secondly, the questions asked were subjective: asking about the participant's experiences related to being a parent of a non-traditional family. Subjective questions are at greater risk than objective questions of suffering from *confirmation bias*, which "is the tendency to search for, interpret, favour, and recall information in a way that confirms or strengthens one's prior personal beliefs or hypotheses."<sup>23</sup>

Furthermore, the questions and the study relate only to the experiences of the parents. The children were not consulted, and their perspectives may be quite different. While the Gartrell refers in the introduction to "research on the psychological well-being of children", this study does not address that question.

In short, it would be unsafe to rely on the results of this study: it risks *volunteer bias*, *self-reporting bias* and *confirmation bias*, and it fails to consult the children raised in those contexts. The study provides no support for the claimed *moral good* of same-sex-parent families – another non sequitur from Anstey.

15. Evidence of how children raised by same-sex parents are affected in early adulthood is most likely to be reliable with well-designed research methodology. For example, studies with large, random samples of children assessed in early adulthood using objective measures. Fortunately, several such studies are available.

Professor Paul Sullins used data from a longitudinal study over 13 years of a random sample of over 15,000 Americans interviewed at average ages of 15, 22 and 28 years. The factors studied included depression, suicide ideation, anxiety and parental child abuse. Compared with opposite-sex parents, children who had been raised with same-sex parents had "higher

---

<sup>20</sup> "Nanette Gartrell", *Wikipedia*, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nanette\\_Gartrell](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nanette_Gartrell)

<sup>21</sup> Nanette Gartrell, "US National Longitudinal Lesbian Family Study: Psychological Adjustment of 17-Year-Old Adolescents", *Pediatrics*, 126(1):28-36, July 2010, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44655831\\_US\\_National\\_Longitudinal\\_Lesbian\\_Family\\_Study\\_Psychological\\_Adjustment\\_of\\_17-Year-Old\\_Adolescents](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44655831_US_National_Longitudinal_Lesbian_Family_Study_Psychological_Adjustment_of_17-Year-Old_Adolescents)

<sup>22</sup> "Volunteer bias", *Encyclopedia of Research Design*, 2010, <https://methods.sagepub.com/reference/encyc-of-research-design/n492.xml>

<sup>23</sup> "Confirmation bias", *Wikipedia*, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Confirmation\\_bias](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Confirmation_bias)



depression risk in early adulthood, coupled with a more frequent history of abuse victimization, parental distance, and obesity.”<sup>24</sup>

Professor Mark Regnerus, as lead investigator of the New Family Structures Study (NFSS), surveyed 2,988 young adults in 2011 in order to collect reliable, nationally representative data about children from various family origins. Adults raised at least in part by same-sex couples did worse on over half the 40 measures tested, including public welfare, lower levels of employment, poorer mental and physical health, poorer relationship quality with current partner, and higher levels of smoking and criminality.<sup>25</sup>

These (and other) well-designed studies of the outcomes in early adulthood for children raised in different contexts show clearly that those raised by same-sex parents have poorer outcomes than those raised opposite-sex parents.

16. The claim by Anstey that "proponents of same-sex marriage ... believe that the view that same-sex marriage is a moral good is in accord with leading medical, psychological, and other relevant scientific research" is unfounded, as shown above (paragraphs 11 to 15). The studies cited in support of that belief either do not address the question (and are therefore irrelevant) or are poor quality studies whose conclusions are dubious.

On the contrary, sound studies with well-designed methodology provide robust evidence that male-female marriages provide the best context for good physical and psychological health of the couple and their children, and the best outcomes for their children in early adulthood.

### Scripture and same-sex marriage

17. Anstey states at 6.15 that he follows:

*those scholars who argue that the Biblical texts (Genesis 19:1-11; Leviticus 18:22, 20:13; 1 Corinthians 6:9-10; 1 Timothy 1:10, Romans 1:26-27) on homosexual practice see it as morally wrong.*

But the scholars quoted then advocate views that explicitly contradict this biblical teaching. For example (**emphasis added**):

*it important to state clearly that we do [with regard to homosexuality], in fact, **reject the straightforward commands of Scripture**, and appeal instead to another authority when we declare that same-sex unions can be holy and good... We appeal explicitly to the weight of our own experience...*

---

<sup>24</sup> D Paul Sullins, "Invisible Victims-Delayed Onset Depression among Adults with Same-Sex Parents", *Hindawi*, volume 2016, <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/drt/2016/2410392/>

<sup>25</sup> Mark Regnerus, "How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships? Findings from the New Family Structures Study", *Social Science Research*, Vol 41, Issue 4, July 2012, pp 752-770, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0049089X12000610?via%3Dihub>

By implication, Anstey rejects the straightforward commands of Scripture in favour of personal experience.

This appears to be an explicit rejection of the Fundamental Declarations of the Anglican Church of Australia, specifically rejecting:

- *the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the ultimate rule and standard of faith given by inspiration of God and containing all things necessary for salvation.*

Anstey's proposed basis for determining the Anglican Church's position on same-sex marriage should be rejected as a flagrant repudiation of the Fundamental Declarations of the Anglican Church of Australia.

18. Anstey states at 6.20 that:

*the doctrinal moral argument ... with respect to same-sex marriage, is analogous to how abolitionists approached slavery, especially with respect to how the Scriptures in the case of slavery prima facie offer more support to the proslavery position than the antislavery one.*

The claim that Scripture is *prima facie* more proslavery than antislavery is a spurious. Biblical teaching on slavery could be more accurately summarised as being antislavery in principle but tolerant of limited humane slavery in practice. Scripture is nowhere proslavery.

A Jewish perspective on slavery in the Old Testament is provided by Rabbi Benjamin Scolnic:

*Leviticus says that there is no such thing as an Israelite slave. Deuteronomy understands that there will be slaves and they must be treated well until they will be released. Combining the laws of the Covenant Code with the antipathy for the enslavement of an Israelite in Leviticus, Deuteronomy forged a compromise that was workable for its time.*<sup>26</sup>

Peter Williams, Warden of Tyndale House, explains that:

*Often the Old Testament Law is a matter of permitting or regulating something, rather than saying that it is good...*

Regarding New Testament teaching on slavery, he adds:

*Christians could not change the legal system. A slave rebellion would have led to the execution of the rebels. There were also legal restrictions concerning the number of slaves who could be freed and freeing them early (before the age of 30) could bar them from becoming Roman citizens (Lex Fufia Caninia and Lex Aelia Sentia).*

*Commanding Christians to free their slaves would not therefore have been legal, nor would it have worked as, by state law, some of those slaves would still not have been free. But*

---

<sup>26</sup> Benjamin Scolnic, "Slavery in the Bible", *Conservative Judaism*, Volume 51:3, Spring 1999, <https://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/biblical-slavery/>

*Christians were commanded to love others as Christ loved us. That meant that people could no longer be treated as slaves...<sup>27</sup>*

Moral consideration of “same-sex marriage” is *not* analogous to that of slavery. Same-sex genital behaviour is not supported, or even tolerated, anywhere in Scripture – it is uniformly and consistently condemned as contrary to God’s will.

19. At 6.20, Anstey also asserts that (**emphasis added**):

*The approach ... the Church has always taken with moral issues, namely, reasoning out a morally defensible position ... **shaped by the testimony of those on the “inside” of the question under discussion.***

But who are the people on the “inside” of the homosexuality issue? We should be listening to those whose experiences are like that reported by the apostle Paul in his letter the church in Corinth (**emphasis added**):

*Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor men who practice homosexuality ... will inherit the kingdom of God. **And such were some of you. But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.***<sup>28</sup>

Several recent cases are reported in my first submission at 57. These are cases of people who had previously engaged in homosexual behaviour but ceased – and some were washed, sanctified and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus.<sup>29</sup> For example:

*James Parker was adopted and grew up in northern England. There he was sexually abused by teachers and an older boy, became addicted to pornography and alcohol, and “came out” as homosexual to his parents at the age of 17. After moving to London to attend university, he lived a promiscuous gay lifestyle – until he met a man who became his steady partner.*

*After attending a Catholic prayer meeting, he experienced a profound spiritual awakening and ended his same-sex relationship. Through a painful journey he found for the first time a strong sense of masculinity. He knows people who have grown into a life of chastity but still experience levels of same-sex attraction.*

*James discovered an attraction to the opposite sex. After moving to Perth, he eventually married and became a father. “I’ve lived the committed homosexual and committed heterosexual partnerships – they’re radically different,” he says.<sup>30</sup>*

---

<sup>27</sup> Peter J. Williams, "Does the Bible Support Slavery?", *BeThinking*, <https://www.bethinking.org/bible/does-the-bible-support-slavery>

<sup>28</sup> 1 Corinthians 6:9-11.

<sup>29</sup> David Phillips, "Submission to the Appellate Tribunal of the Anglican Church of Australia re Primate’s References under Section 63 of the Constitution on Blessing of Persons Married According to the Marriage Act 1961 Regulations 2019 (Wangaratta)", 11 December 2019, paragraph 57.

<sup>30</sup> Ben Smith, "James Parker: ‘From Gay-Activist to Husband and Father’", *Catholic Outlook*, 19 May 2016.

## Lived experience and same-sex marriage

20. Anstey states at 7.1 and 7.2 that:

*The early Church's struggle with Gentile inclusion (Acts 10-15) was guided in the end by the undeniable reality of God's Spirit at work in the lives of the Gentiles.*

*Such recognition of God through the Spirit in our lived experience has throughout history always been the impetus for the re-evaluation of our doctrine.*

Anstey's argument is that the inclusion of Gentiles in the church involved a rejection (or re-interpretation) of Scripture and Christ's teaching in favour of lived human experience. However, the change in Christian practice is better understood as a rejection of human tradition in favour of a full understanding of Scripture and Christ's teaching.

The inclusion of Gentiles in God's plan for the world is clear throughout Scripture, as a few examples illustrate:

- **Abram** (Abraham) was told by the Lord: "I will bless those who bless you, and him who dishonours you I will curse, and in you all the families of the earth [including Gentiles] shall be blessed." (Genesis 12:3)
- **Isaiah** was told by the Lord: "I will make you as a light for the nations (Gentiles), that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth." (Isaiah 49:6)
- **A Roman centurion** (Gentile) who sought healing for his servant was commended by Jesus for his faith: "Truly, I tell you, with no one in Israel have I found such faith. I tell you, many will come from east and west and recline at table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven..." (Matthew 8:10-11)
- **A Canaanite** (Gentile) woman's daughter was healed by Jesus, who commended her for her faith: "O woman, great is your faith! Be it done for you as you desire." (Matthew 15:28)
- **Jesus**, shortly before his ascension, told the apostles: "You will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth [including Gentiles]." (Acts 1:8)

Gentile inclusion was foretold in the Old Testament and was both taught and practised by Jesus. The disciples, however, were slow to understand and accommodate God's vision for the Gentiles. Through conversion of Cornelius (Acts 10-15), the Holy Spirit guided Peter to embrace God's vision for the Gentiles.

Contrary to Anstey's thesis, the inclusion of the Gentiles in the church does not provide an example of reinterpreting Scripture; rather the conversion of Cornelius provoked the apostles to recognise what was already taught in Scripture and by Jesus.

21. The proper relationship between Scripture and human experience is best understood from the example and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ.

- During his temptation in the wilderness, Jesus consistently rebuked Satan by quoting Scripture. (Luke 4:1-13)
- During the sermon on the mount, Jesus emphasised the enduring significance of the Scriptures in the lives of his disciples. He says of the commandments therein: "Whoever does them and teaches them will be called great in the kingdom of heaven." (Matthew 5:19)
- In response to a question from the Sadducees, Jesus criticized them, saying: "You are wrong, because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God." (Matthew 22:29)

The model set and taught by Jesus Christ is that human experience should be judged by Scripture, not vice versa.

22. Anstey, at 7.4, says:

*It is the case that the majority of Christians who have moved from opposing to affirming same-sex marriage have been significantly influenced by the testimony of gay Christians.*

He then mentions some theologians who have been influenced by life experiences to change their interpretation of Scripture.

Making biblical interpretation subject to human life experiences can be dangerous and has led to some very undesirable outcomes. Perhaps the most prominent historical example is the Dutch Reformed Church's development of a theology supporting apartheid in South Africa.

The Dutch Reformed Church's theology was developed during British rule of the Cape Colony from 1806. Prior to that the Cape had been a Dutch settlement established in 1652 by the Dutch East India Company, most of whose employees were members of the Dutch Reformed Church. The new British rule was required by the 1806 Cape Articles of Capitulation to respect the previous Roman Dutch Law, which was quite separate from English Common Law.<sup>31</sup>

Over the following century or so, numerous laws were passed to control slaves, later indentured labourers, limiting their employment, location, movement, ownership of land, education and parliamentary representation. In 1948, the newly elected National Party responded to a large influx of black migrant workers by strengthening laws for racial separation that became known as apartheid (aparthood).<sup>32</sup>

A few years earlier, in 1944, Afrikaans poet and Bible translator Prof J D du Toit addressed the National People's Congress defending racial segregation on biblical grounds. He commended a pamphlet by Rev J G Strydom, copies of which were widely distributed in Dutch Reformed Churches. It concluded:

<sup>31</sup> "Apartheid: Precursors", *Wikipedia*, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apartheid#Precursors>

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

*that the white man's survival can only be guaranteed if he ... maintains the strict policy of the old folks of strict apartheid in social life, and not sink to the level of the barbarian, and if mixed marriages are prohibited and interracial intercourse is severely punished.*<sup>33</sup>

The lived experience of the Dutch Reformed Church was of more than a century of increasingly restrictive government laws enforcing racial separation, to manage the increasing numbers of black migrant workers. The Church's fear was existential: white man's survival. Their response was to reinterpret Scripture to support government policy.

As we now know, the policy of South African government's policy of apartheid was unjust and was overturned. And the Dutch Reformed Church has repudiated its former support for apartheid.

This episode illustrates the pressure God's people have experienced throughout history to conform to the ways of the world. Long ago St Paul exhorted the church in Rome:

*Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that by testing you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect.*<sup>34</sup>

Allowing human experience to dominate the interpretation of Scripture exposes the church to the risk of being conformed to the world and thereby to syncretism and apostasy. This should not be allowed to happen. Instead, Scripture should be used to judge whether the values of the world are acceptable to God or not.

### **Theological defence of same-sex marriage**

23. At 8.1 Anstey asserts that:

*It is important to acknowledge there is no substantive moral objection to same-sex marriage. That is, there is no rational account of which particular sin is being committed in a same-sex marriage qua same-sex marriage.*

Contrary to Anstey's assertion, there are several moral objections to so called "same-sex marriage", including particular sins being committed.

23.1. Firstly, there is an *ontological* objection. As argued above at paragraph 9, in God's created order, marriage *essentially* (or ontologically) describes only a relationship between a man and a woman. So-called "same-sex marriage" is a sham. Honouring a sham is offensive to God.

Honouring "same-sex marriage" is analogous to honouring idols made of wood, metal or stone. In reality, they are nothing. Honouring them is offensive to God and contrary to his commandments in Exodus 20 (and elsewhere).

---

<sup>33</sup> Robert R Vosloo, "The Bible and the justification of apartheid in Reformed circles in the 1940's in South Africa: Some historical, hermeneutical and theological remarks", Stellenbosch Theological Journal, Vol 1, No 2, 2015, [http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S2413-94672015000200011](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2413-94672015000200011)

<sup>34</sup> Romans 12:2.

- 23.2. Secondly, there is a *teleological* objection. In God's created order, the primary purpose of marriage is procreational – as affirmed in the preface of The Form of Solemnization of Matrimony in the Book of Common Prayer (BCP):

*First, it was ordained for the procreation of children, to be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name...*

Here, the BCP is reflecting God's first command to humans:

*Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it... (Genesis 1:28)*

Since same-sex coital relations are incapable of reproduction, honouring such relations is an explicit rejection of a central purpose of God for mankind and, consequently, a sin that is offensive to him.

- 23.3. Thirdly, there is an *explicitly moral* objection. Anstey acknowledges this in his submission at paragraph 6.15:

*As we note above, we follow those scholars who argue that the Biblical texts (Genesis 19:1-11, Leviticus 18:22, 20:13; 1 Corinthians 6:9-10; 1 Timothy 1:10, Romans 1:26-27) on homosexual practice see it as morally wrong.*

While Anstey then proceeds to argue that, despite the clear biblical proscription of homosexual practice, such behaviour should not be regarded as sinful. The fallacy of his conclusion is set out above in paragraphs 17 to 19 above.

24. At 8.2 Anstey poses and answers a series of questions:

*What sin for instance is committed arising from their sexual union as gay people? When two people of the same gender give their lives to one another in lifelong, covenantal fidelity and love, what specific sin is enacted? What harm is being done? What evil is being propagated? The answer is that there is none.*

- 24.1. Anstey's first question ("What sin for instance is committed arising from their *sexual union* as gay people?") makes specific reference to "gay people", as if they are a different subspecies of *homo sapiens*. Such a view arises from the idea that homosexuals are "born that way", that there is a "gay gene" and that sexual orientation is immutable. This idea has become a modern myth, widely believed in academic and media circles. However, the evidence is otherwise and is set out in my primary submission at paragraphs 50 to 58 and briefly summarised here.

Researchers Bearman and Bruckner at Columbia and Yale Universities comment that:

*social scientists and geneticists alike stress the obvious point that neither genes, nor hormones, nor specific social situations determine sexual behaviour by themselves. Rather, the extent to which same-sex and opposite-sex desires are expressed in the*

*individual is seen to be a complex interplay of biological, social, and situational factors.*<sup>35</sup>

Human behaviour is complex. Humans are not robots. There is no single gene governing sexual preference or any other preference. There is no gene for smoking, dancing or making sarcastic remarks.<sup>36</sup>

One of the strongest arguments against homosexuality as an inborn, unalterable condition is *change* in sexual orientation. Scientific literature shows that sexual orientation is not fixed but fluid. People change between homosexual and heterosexual orientation to a surprising degree in both directions, but a far greater proportion of homosexuals become heterosexual than heterosexuals become homosexual. Some of the change is therapeutically assisted, but in most cases it appears to be circumstantial. Life itself can bring along the factors that make the difference.

Studies in US and New Zealand show that some 80% of same-sex attracted teenage boys and girls become opposite-sex attracted as adults a decade or so later. The common claim that sexual attraction is unchangeable is a myth.

Personal stories of some men and women who have left a homosexual lifestyle behind provide some insights into the fluidity of sexual attraction are reported in my primary submission at paragraph 57.

- 24.2. It follows that Anstey's first question ("What sin for instance is committed arising from their *sexual union* as gay people?") is wrongly framed. In God's sight, all people are made in his image. Some people are same-sex-attracted, but it is important to distinguish between same-sex *attraction, identity* and *activity* – as elaborated in my primary submission at 50.

The critical question regarding immoral sexual temptation, whether same-sex or opposite-sex, is how one responds to the temptation. We are called to reject temptation, as Jesus did in the wilderness, not to act on it through immoral sexual congress.

- 24.3. Anstey's second question ("When two people of the same gender give their lives to one another in lifelong, covenantal fidelity and love, what specific sin is enacted?") The question here is really whether engaging in immoral sexual activity becomes moral if the relationship is expressed "in lifelong, covenantal fidelity and love".

---

<sup>35</sup> P S Bearman and H Bruckner, 2002, "Opposite-sex twins and adolescent same-sex attraction", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol 107, pp 1179–1205.

<sup>36</sup> Neil E and Briar K Whitehead, 2010, *My Genes Made Me Do It! A Scientific Look at Sexual Orientation*, (Lower Hutt, NZ, Whitehead Associates), <http://www.mygenes.co.nz>



Consider instead the question of incest. If an incestuous sexual relationship is immoral and sinful, does it become moral and acceptable if expressed “in lifelong, covenantal fidelity and love”? The answer is clearly, no!

The answer to Anstey’s second question is that the specific sin is same-sex coitus, which is condemned in Scripture as a sin. The surrounding circumstances do not diminish the primary sin.

- 24.4. Anstey’s third and fourth questions (“What harm is being done? What evil is being propagated?”) are partly answered in paragraphs 12-15 above. Some significant medical risks of anal coitus are listed at 12. Psychological problems prevalent among homosexuals are given at 13. The developmental risks for children raised by same-sex couples are documented at 14 and 15. Some additional harms are identified below.

Homosexual men account for the majority of new cases of sexually transmitted diseases in developed countries.<sup>37</sup> Homosexual men are at increased risk of contracting HIV, syphilis,<sup>38</sup> human papillomavirus,<sup>39</sup> hepatitis A, B and C,<sup>40</sup> gonorrhoea<sup>41</sup> and other sexually transmitted infections.

Lesbians are twice as likely as heterosexual women to be obese,<sup>42</sup> making them at higher risk of heart disease.<sup>43</sup> Homosexual men are twice as likely to develop cancer as heterosexual men and are 1.9 times more likely to have it diagnosed ten years earlier.<sup>44</sup> Lesbians also have the highest number of risk factors for many of the gynaecological cancers.<sup>45</sup> Older homosexual and bisexual men aged 50 to 70 years reported higher rates of high blood pressure, diabetes and physical disability than their heterosexual counterparts.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Maron, DJ, “*Sexually Transmitted Diseases*, American Society of Colon & Rectal Surgeons, 2012.

<sup>38</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Syphilis – CDC Fact Sheet*, 16 Sep 2012.

<sup>39</sup> Zmuda, RA, *Rising Rates of Anal Cancer for Gay Men*, Cancer Page, 2009: [www.cancerpage.com](http://www.cancerpage.com)

<sup>40</sup> Winn, RJ, *Ten things gay men should discuss with their healthcare providers*, Gay & Lesbian Medical Association (GLMA), 2012: <http://glma.org>

<sup>41</sup> “Mortality and Morbidity Weekly Report: Increases in unsafe sex and rectal gonorrhoea among men who have sex with men – San Francisco, California, 1994- 1997”, *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*, 48(03), 29 Jan 1999, pp 45-48.

<sup>42</sup> Boehmer, U, *et al.*, “Overweight and obesity in sexual-minority women: Evidence from population-based data”, *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(6), Jun 2007, pp 1134-1140.

<sup>43</sup> Poteat, T, *Ten things lesbians should discuss with their healthcare providers*, Gay & Lesbian Medical Association (GLMA), 2012: <http://glma.org>

<sup>44</sup> AFP, “Gay men report higher cancer rates: US study”, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 May 2011, Breaking News World.

<sup>45</sup> Poteat, T, 2012, *op. cit.*

<sup>46</sup> Rabin, RC, “Disparities: illness more prevalent among older gay adults”, *New York Times*, 5 Apr 2011, p D7.

Many of these health problems are linked with behaviour characteristic of the homosexual lifestyle, such as increased drug, alcohol and tobacco use.<sup>47</sup> A 1997 Canadian study found that life expectancy at age 20 for homosexual and bisexual men was eight to 20 years less than the average life expectancy for other men.<sup>48</sup>

Same-sex attracted people tend to use tobacco, alcohol and drugs as a coping mechanism for mental health problems, which are significantly greater in their community. Domestic violence is also rife.<sup>49</sup> Domestic violence among homosexual men is nearly double that in the heterosexual population,<sup>50</sup> while verbal, emotional or physical abuse within lesbian relationships is estimated to range from 11% to more than 75%.<sup>51</sup>

Homosexual men are at an increased risk of developing eating disorders such as anorexia and bulimia,<sup>52</sup> possibly because of the strong emphasis the homosexual community places on physical appearance. Depression and anxiety affect homosexual and bisexual men and lesbians more than the general population.<sup>53</sup> Older homosexual and bisexual men were 45% more likely to report psychological distress than equivalent heterosexual men.<sup>54</sup>

Other studies have shown that there are more suicides and attempted suicides among homosexual individuals than heterosexual. A Denmark study found that completed suicides are nearly eight times more likely among homosexual men in registered domestic partnerships than for married men, and nearly two times more likely than men who had never married.<sup>55</sup>

It is sometimes argued that homosexual mental ill-health including suicide is caused by discrimination and stigma, but the facts do not support this conjecture. In countries like the Netherlands and New Zealand where there is high acceptance of sexual diversity, the rates of homosexual mental ill-health are as high as in countries where the stigma is strong.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> "Higher use of drugs, alcohol and tobacco in gay, lesbian and bisexual population", *Massey News*, Massey University, Palmerston North, 1 July 2007.

<sup>48</sup> Hogg, R, *et al.*, "Modelling the impact of HIV disease on mortality in gay and bisexual men", *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 26(2), 1997, pp 657-661.

<sup>49</sup> Greenwood GL, *et al.*, "Battering Victimization among a probability-based sample of men who have sex with men", *American Journal of Public Health*, 92(12), Dec 2002, pp 1964-1969.

<sup>50</sup> Island, D & Letellier, P, *Men Who Beat the Men Who Love Them: Battered Gay Men and Domestic Violence*, Haworth Press, New York, 1991, p 14.

<sup>51</sup> Cited in CM Renzetti, "Violence and Abuse in Lesbian Relationships", in RK Burgen (ed.), *Issues in Intimate Violence*, Sage Publications, Michigan, 1998, pp 117-127.

<sup>52</sup> Columbia University's Mailman School of Public Health, *Gay men have higher prevalence of eating disorders, says Mailman School of Public Health study*, 13 Apr 2007: [www.eurekalert.org](http://www.eurekalert.org)

<sup>53</sup> Meyer, IH, "Prejudice, Social Stress and Mental Health in Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Populations: Conceptual Issues and Research Evidence", *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), Sep 2003, pp 674-697.

<sup>54</sup> Rabin, RC, 2011, *op. cit.*

<sup>55</sup> Mathy, RM, *et al.*, "The association between relationship markers of sexual orientation and suicide: Denmark, 1990-2001", *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 46(2), 2011, pp 111-117.

<sup>56</sup> Whitehead, Neil, "Homosexuality and Co-Morbidities: Research and Therapeutic Implications", *Journal of Human Sexuality*, Vol 2, 2010, pp 124-175.

In summary, male homosexual practice, usually involving anal intercourse, is inherently unhygienic due to contact with bacteria-laden faeces. It is associated with serious health risks including sexually transmitted infections and anal cancer. Condom use lowers these risks but does not eliminate them. Many lesbians also engage in unhygienic practices and suffer negative health outcomes.

Anstey's own answer to his question about harm – "There is none." – is ill-informed and clearly false.

25. At 8.4, Anstey makes the following appeal:

*For same-sex marriage, if it is indeed sinful, there needs to be a compelling, coherent theological account for what constitutes its sinfulness. Christian ethical judgments cannot be determined simply by divine fiat, so the "argument" – we use the term reservedly – that same-sex marriage is wrong simply because God says it is wrong ... fails to meet any "standards of excellence" in its theological formulation.*

A compelling, coherent theological account of the sinfulness of same-sex marriage must be accompanied by clarification of the nature and purpose of marriage in God's plan for the world. Those experiencing same-sex attraction should be encouraged to see that is not immutable but fluid. Such people may find encouragement from personal stories of men and women who have left the homosexual lifestyle, such as those quoted in my primary submission at paragraph 57. A brief summary follows:

- **Michael Glatze**, founder of Young Gay America and editor of its magazine, said: "Coming out' from under the influence of the homosexual mindset was the most liberating, beautiful and astonishing thing I've ever experienced in my entire life," Glatze said. "Homosexual sex is entirely 'lust-based' and can never fully satisfy. It's a neurotic process rather than a natural, normal one."<sup>57</sup>
- **Charlene Cothran** had been a lesbian activist for three decades. After she became a Christian and turned her back on lesbianism, Charlene gave her magazine a new mission "to encourage, educate and assist those who desire to leave a life of homosexuality."<sup>58</sup>
- **Luca di Tolve** was once a young homosexual man but is now a happily married father. Luca came to understand that his emotionally detached father and obsessive mother had unintentionally created confusion about his sexual identity.<sup>59</sup>
- **James Parker** lived a promiscuous gay lifestyle – until he met a man who became his steady partner. James discovered an attraction to the opposite sex, married and became a father. "I've lived the committed homosexual and committed heterosexual partnerships – they're radically different," he says.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Art Moore, "'Gay'-rights leader quits homosexuality", *WND*, 3 July 2007.

<sup>58</sup> Amy Tracy, "The Rebirth of Venus", *Christianity Today*, 23 March 2007.

<sup>59</sup> Michael Cook, "Luca era gay", *Mercatornet*, 11 October 2012.

<sup>60</sup> Ben Smith, "James Parker: 'From Gay-Activist to Husband and Father'", *Catholic Outlook*, 19 May 2016.

- **Rosaria Butterfield** was a tenured English professor at Syracuse University, specialising in Queer Theory, a postmodern form of gay and lesbian studies. Slowly but steadily, her feelings about herself as a woman and her sexuality started to change. Over time, she fell in love with a pastor. She married him and is now a home-schooling mother of four adopted children.<sup>61</sup>

26. At 8.6, Anstey observes that:

*On both sides of the debate about same-sex marriage, there is agreement that same-sex attraction desires are not sinful. Given that such desires pertain to the wellbeing and flourishing of another person, they therefore must be good desires.*

There is general agreement that sexual attraction, whether same-sex or opposite-sex, can be a form of temptation but is not in itself sinful. If the attraction is embraced and becomes a desire or lust for a sinful action – such as adultery, fornication, homosexual activity or paedophilia – then it becomes sinful.

Desires do *not* become good merely because they “pertain to the wellbeing and flourishing of another person”. Adultery, incest or paedophilia cannot somehow become “good” if they seek the wellbeing of another. Desires become good if the desired action is itself good. Since homosexual activity is sinful, the desire for such activity is also sinful.

## Conclusion

27. Contrary to Anstey, marriage was ordained by God from the beginning as the exclusive enduring union of a man and a woman, for their mutual benefit, for the procreation and raising of children and for the development of a stable and productive society. Same-sex unions are condemned in Scripture as contrary to the intention and purpose of God. They are prone to medical and psychological problems and provide a poor context for raising children.
28. Homosexual orientation is not determined genetically and is not immutable but fluid. There are many personal examples of people who have left a homosexual lifestyle and embraced either celibacy or marriage and family life.
29. The conclusion reached by Anstey that “enactment of ... same-sex love must necessarily be deemed to be good, wholesome, and, indeed, Christ-like” is completely unsupportable. It is based on false assumptions, faulty reasoning, irrelevant references and rejection of Scripture. His conclusions should be rejected as contrary to the Fundamental Declarations and Ruling Principles of the Anglican Church of Australia.

---

<sup>61</sup> Rosaria C. Butterfield, *The Secret Thoughts of an Unlikely Convert: An English Professor's Journey into Christian Faith*, Crown & Covenant Publications, 2012; see also Tony Reinke, "From Radical Lesbian to Redeemed Christian", *DesiringGod.org*, 19 February 2013.

30. The 1998 Lambeth Resolution 1.10 (reproduced below) provides helpful guidance on biblical teaching about marriage and the pastoral care of those who experience same-sex attraction.

The 1998 Lambeth Conference:

- *Commends to the Church the subsection report on human sexuality;*
- *In view of the teaching of Scripture, upholds faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believes that abstinence is right for those who are not called to marriage;*
- *recognises that there are among us persons who experience themselves as having a homosexual orientation. Many of these are members of the Church and are seeking the pastoral care, moral direction of the Church, and God's transforming power for the living of their lives and the ordering of relationships. We commit ourselves to listen to the experience of homosexual persons and we wish to assure them that they are loved by God and that all baptised, believing and faithful persons, regardless of sexual orientation, are full members of the Body of Christ;*
- *While rejecting homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture, calls on all our people to minister pastorally and sensitively to all irrespective of sexual orientation and to condemn irrational fear of homosexuals, violence within marriage and any trivialisation and commercialisation of sex;*
- *Cannot advise the legitimising or blessing of same sex unions nor ordaining those involved in same gender unions;*
- *Requests the Primates and the ACC to establish a means of monitoring the work done on the subject of human sexuality in the Communion and to share statements and resources among us;*
- *Notes the significance of the Kuala Lumpur Statement on Human Sexuality and the concerns expressed in resolutions IV.26, V.1, V.10, V.23 and V.35 on the authority of Scripture in matters of marriage and sexuality and asks the Primates and the ACC to include them in their monitoring process.*