

Dear Blackhawk Presbytery friends,

As a member of the Mission Strategies and Resources Board, I am writing in response to MSRB's decision to reject the application of Renewing Orthodoxy to have status as a recognized Network in our Presbytery (the signers for the network application are myself, Bill Ward, Bob Kopp, Doug Forsberg, and Kristine Meyer). Renewing Orthodoxy's purpose is two-fold: to call us as a denomination to consider our renewal in our roots in the historic, orthodox, reformed/confessional faith, and to provide/network around resources for renewing in evangelism, prayer, discipleship, and mission (among others). At its essence, this network would continue to pursue these visions as the historically orthodox part of our denomination always has.

Our proposal was originally sent to MSRB in October of 2015. Earlier this year, it was discussed, and voted down. The committee's concern, among others, focused as now upon the original application's reference to listing (among several other ministry groups) OneBy1 ministries; OneBy1, founded and sustained by PC(USA) elders and members, offers gracious support to individuals struggling with a wide variety of sexual conflicts, including but not limited to unwanted same-sex desire. I have been personally acquainted with a number of their leaders, and they, like myself, have nothing but deep love and respect for those individuals in conflict with their sexuality: and we live out this grace in real relationships — on a regular basis.

In their letter to our Session at Rochelle, MSRB stated that they would have approved the Network had we/I renounced supporting ministries/therapies that offer assistance to those (particularly minors) seeking relief from unwanted same-sex attractions. Since that was MSRB's stated reason for the negative vote, I will address that concern in particular.

OneBy1 stands squarely in a great and historic stream of ancient & modern, secular & spiritual, approaches that have successfully helped individuals find not only significant relief from these desires, but transformation into God's clearly stated and intended creation of us as men designed for women, and women designed for men (Matthew 19:4-6). I shall discuss this, and offer further documentation and resources, at greater length below.

After this initial rejection, I conferred with several signatories of the proposal for the network. Several suggested that perhaps we should first organize & meet as our own group, and then later consider what kinds of relationships we might want to have with other organizations that might want to "network with our network". Therefore, at their encouragement, in the my second application, I deleted all references to the other ministries, including OneBy1. Out of a desire to be

conciliatory, I even deleted several other paragraphs that the Board found objectionable.

Having sought to do all I could to meet the Board “halfway”, I fully anticipated that our application would be accepted. While I knew the majority of the Board would still disagree with some of the content, I also knew that the original rationale for the networks included a commitment to “diversity”. Certainly, I thought, a network whose intention is to keep us theologically accountable to the mission of our Presbytery (as defined by scripture and Presbyterian confessions) should have no problem being seen as supporting the mission of our Presbytery (the stated criteria for a network to be approved). Nonetheless, at our October meeting, the revised proposal was voted down.

As stated in our application, and described by me in numerous Board discussions, the Network has a wide variety of goals, visions, purposes, hopes, and resources. Making ex-gay ministries known and available as a resource was — and is — only one of many. While we certainly affirm ex-gay ministry (and in 27 years of being a very outspoken member of our Presbytery myself, my joyful and lovingly-intended affirmation of such ministries has hardly been any hidden secret!), this was never intended, by any stretch of the imagination, to be the main focus of our network. (In the first edition, I had commented in response to the question, “how does this Network address the vision and values of Blackhawk Presbytery”, that one of those values is supporting our mission statement, which opens by referring to “the biblical image for human community” — I stated that we sought to uphold the definition of that image as male and female in marriage. This comment was directed at the marriage debate, not specifically the ex-gay debate. Yet I sense it was taken that way by the Board). I will note, in passing, that promotion of pro-gay concerns — including gay-affirming therapy — was indeed the exclusive purpose of the Covenant Network (which, from what I recall, was approved easily and quickly). I will quietly note my concern with this double standard.

So while ex-gay ministry is not the central focus of my concern — or the Network — , it obviously was for the Board: by their explicit statements. Therefore I will address their concerns.

It is more than ironic to me that among the many terms that are employed to identify the various therapies and pastoral caring approaches that have existed for millennia to help people —often successfully — resolve/leave behind unwanted same-sex attractions and behaviors, that my board members chose the term “conversion”. Quite ironic!

I am all for conversion, and, infinitely more importantly than what I think, so is Jesus: and His written Word. As Reformed, biblical, confessional Christians we support conversion from all things that God defines as sin, things that block the rich, saving, life-giving, loving, truthful, precious and holy relationship we are offered with Him by His sheer kindness, goodness, and grace.

The question of conversion, and the gospel itself, begins indeed with God: His holiness, purity, love, truth, grace, goodness, kindness, omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence — and many other infinitely incredible attributes. God created us indeed to “glorify God and enjoy Him forever” in an incredible relationship filled with a goodness beyond what we could ever achieve or imagine.

However, as a race & as individuals, we turned our backs on our glorious God (Romans 1:18- 3:20), and by choosing our own way in rebellion to the truth, we sinned and destroyed this relationship: our only ultimate source of goodness, truth, and life.

But out of sheer grace and tender love for us, God did we could not do: He gave His only Son as an atonement for our sin! As we repent of our sins, we can be not only forgiven (I John 1: 8-9) and be reconciled eternally to God, but transformed to be more like Him (II Corinthians 3:18)! II Corinthians 6: 9-11 also uplifts the hope of repentance, forgiveness and transformation: “**9** Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, **10** nor thieves, nor *the* covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God. **11** Such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.” Indeed, here we see the first reference to ex-gays: “and such were some of you...”. (the Greek terms *malakoi* and *arsenokoitai*, here translated as “effeminate” and “homosexual”, refer to the passive and active partners in homosexual acts: Paul’s focus is that these acts themselves, regardless of whether or not they are related to idolatry, prostitution, rape, pederasty, etc, are wrong because they violate the prior standard of sexual expression as created for & limited to man and woman in marriage (see Dr. Robert Gagnon’s website below for one of the best outstanding scholarly, detailed discussions). All ministries, including ex-gay, are crucial: they can help reduce our temptations, and turn us from the sins that otherwise would have caused us to be excluded from the Kingdom of God. Such ministries, when conducted in grace and truth, are the ultimate act of love: certainly, given the stakes, not an act of “hate”. Indeed, the stakes couldn’t be higher.

This, dear friends, is “conversion”. Conversion from the sin of worshipping ourselves: our lusts, misbehaviors, self-justifications, and viewpoints, to worshipping the Living God in truth.

As Sam Allberry points out in his outstanding book ([Is God Anti-Gay?](#)), the central issue in all of life is that we follow Jesus: no matter what. This calls for repentance, denying ourselves, and taking up the cross being the road we must all follow, regardless of the particulars of what kind of sin or temptation we may have as our personal struggle. Moreover, he points out that if we are really serious about being Jesus’ followers, it is absolutely essential to define every aspect of our lives by Jesus and His written Word: including, but of course, not limited to, our sense of ourselves, our identity — and our sexuality and behavior. Scripture is crystal clear that marriage between man and woman is the only good and true context for sexual activity. The texts are clear, but just in case more echoes are needed, the unanimous witness of the Jewish and Christian faith communities for three millennia have seen this biblical standard as clearly and unambiguously taught in scripture as well. The only challenges have come simply in the last few decades in the Western world, where a pre-existing “need” (or political agenda) has demanded that the legitimacy of same-sex behavior be “found” in scripture. But it’s simply not there. Once again, I recommend Gagnon’s materials as the premier scholarly resource for these concerns.

Fortunately, God has been gloriously leading people out of sin — including same-sex behavior — for millennia. The truth (the rants of popular culture, and its emotional, agenda-driven pseudoscience notwithstanding) is that vast numbers of people have successfully become ex-gay, and many are happily married.

As Reformed Christians, the primary source for our worldview (including sexual ethics and behavior, sexual identity, and the questions regarding the transformation of our lives) is the scripture: God’s revealed truth. Secondly, in consideration of such issues as “are attempts to change ever successful?”, “Are they harmful?”, it is fair game to consider the input of the social sciences, including psychiatry/psychology. I am personally glad to do, since I am the holder of an earned Ph.D. in Clinical psychology from one of the most highly regarded clinical training programs in the nation, the Fuller Graduate School of Psychology. Beginning as an undergraduate major in psychology, I have studied the issues surrounding our topic beginning over 40 years ago.

But let’s go further back. Despite politically inspired and driven changes beginning in the early 70’s, psychiatry and psychology were agreed (since their origins, dating back over 100 years), that same-sex desires represented a disorder worth offering treatment to those who might wish it.

Let's consider three questions: 1. What happened in the early 70's that caused the American Psychiatric Association to delete homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of psychiatric disorders? 2. Is there any evidence (from the perspective of psychological research and experience) that change is possible? 3. Is there any evidence that attempts to change same-sex inclinations are harmful?

1. What happened in the early 70's that caused the American Psychiatric Association to delete homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of psychiatric disorders?

The APA's decision to de-classify homosexuality in 1973 was not based on any new scientific evidence or studies — which by itself is quite unusual. A change in diagnostic nomenclature is normally the result of years of careful, well-ordered research. Rather, the change was driven by politics, not science. Even sympathizers acknowledge this. Ronald Bayer, a Fellow at the Hastings Institute in New York, reported how in 1970 the leadership of a pro-gay political faction within the APA planned a “systematic effort to disrupt the annual meetings of the American Psychiatric Association.” (from R. Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (New York: Basic Books, 1981, p. 102)). Presentations by eminent leaders in the field, such as Irving Bieber, were interrupted with derisive laughter and inappropriate comments. Political operatives from the Gay Liberation Front, and the National Gay Task Force, disrupted the normally reserved and reflective process of the APA. They “developed a detailed strategy for disruption, paying attention to the most intricate logistical details (Bayer, p. 104-105). Operatives from this group took over one of the meetings, grabbed the microphone, and made a “declaration of war” against the APA. Political pressure was intense; in response, an APA committee agreed to consider changing the nomenclature in 1973. But “the outcome had already been arranged behind closed doors. No new data was introduced, and objectors were given only fifteen minutes to present a rebuttal that summarized seventy years of psychiatric and psychoanalytic opinion. Regarding the decision to change the classification, Bayer remarked, “The result was not a conclusion based upon an approximation of the scientific truth as dictated by reason, but was instead an action demanded by the ideological temper of the times” (Bayer, p. 3-4).

In response to MSRB's letter to our Session, in which it is noted that “a number of health and psychological associations” support the ban on attempts to help minors, it needs to be noted that such organizations routinely and often automatically follow the lead of the APA. I also note that despite endlessly

repeated claims in the popular culture and the “politically correct” academic culture, no credible objective evidence exists that such therapies indeed create harm. More on that below.

Psychiatrist Jeffrey Satinover, formerly a Fellow in Psychiatry and Child Psychiatry at Yale University and former William James lecturer in Psychology and Religion at Harvard, notes “How much the 1973 APA decision was motivated by politics is only becoming clear even now. While attending a conference in England in 1994, I met a man who told me an account that he had told no one else. He had been in the gay life for years but had left the lifestyle. He recounted how after the 1973 APA decision he and his lover, along with a certain very highly placed officer of the APA Board of Trustees and his lover, all sat around the officer’s apartment celebrating their victory. For among the gay activists placed high in the APA who maneuvered to ensure a victory was this man — suborning from the top what was presented to the membership and the public as a disinterested search for truth.” (*Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*, Jeffrey Satinover, p. 35).

This pattern continues all the more today. In my 15 years experience in academia, first as an undergraduate major in psychology at Stanford University, and then 11 years as a clinical psychology doctoral student, I had a front row seat to observe the hyper-politicization of social science. While I respected many of my professors for their reasonable objectivity in many areas, it disturbed me greatly to see that objectivity fly out the window when issues of sexuality — particularly homosexuality — came in view. All too frequently I saw “conclusions” formed by personal passions — followed immediately by the attempt to manipulate science to “justify” conclusions borne not by objective research, but political agendas already long established before any consideration of facts, logic, and rational argument. Studies that purport to show the “harm” of therapies to help people release unwanted same-sex attraction are the “gold standard” of this kind of propaganda-driven pseudoscience. Bluntly put, if one tries hard enough, “studies” can be manipulated in a variety of ways to “show” the desired result. Such researchers are fervent to discover the “results” they desire: whether they exist or not.

2. Is there any evidence (from the perspective of psychological research and experience) that change is possible?

Yes indeed, tons of it. Ministries such as OneBy1 build upon an excellent and vast foundation of psychological research and clinical experience beginning at least as far back as the beginning of the 20th century. In the eight years between 1966 and 1974 alone, just the Medline database — which does not include many psychotherapeutic journals — listed over a thousand articles on the

treatment of homosexuality. Dr. Reuben Fine, Director of the New York Center for Psychiatric Training, notes: "I have recently had occasion to review the results of psychotherapy with homosexuals, and been surprised by the findings. It is paradoxical that even though the politically active homosexual group denies the possibility of change, all studies from Schrenk-Notzing on have found positive effects, virtually regardless of the kind of treatment used... a considerable percentage of overt homosexuals became heterosexuals.. If the patients are motivated, whatever procedure is adopted, a large percentage will give up their homosexuality. In this connection, public information is of the greatest importance. The misinformation spread by certain circles that 'homosexuality is untreatable by psychotherapy' does incalculable harm to thousands of men and women" (Dr. Reuben Fine, "Psychoanalytic Theory," in *Male and Female Homosexuality: Psychological Approaches*, ed. Louis Diamant, 1987, pp. 84-6). Dr. Irving Bieber, former President of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, states that "We have followed some patients for as long as 20 years who have remained exclusively heterosexual. Reversal estimates now range from 30% to an optimistic 50%" (Irving Bieber and Toby B. Bieber, "Male Homosexuality," *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 24, No. 5, August 1979, p. 416). If to the lay reader a 30-50% success rate seems low, it is a common figure among psychotherapeutic outcomes studies for a wide variety of conditions: depression, anxiety, obesity, alcoholism, and more. These rates do not cause us to cease treating these aforementioned issues; they should not deter us from offering help for unwanted same-sex attraction either). Satinover conducted an extensive overview of scientific studies and concludes an overall success rate of 50%. Masters and Johnson discovered a five-year follow-up rate of 65%; another study by their institute established a six-year follow-up success rate of 71%.

[[75%]]

To the question at hand of the validity of spiritual ministries such as OneBy1 in helping persons overcome unwanted same-sex attractions: In 2009, Jones and Yarhouse conducted a rigorous study of a ministry similar to OneBy1. They sought to answer two questions: Were participants experiencing any change? And secondly, was there any basis for the charge that such ministries could indeed be harmful? (Our third question). The authors employed rigorous, state of the art research methodology, and vowed publicly to report their results: even if those results indicated no change — and personal harm. The results of their study mirrored the general trend found in secular research: about a third of the participants experienced dramatic change toward heterosexuality, another third moderate (but still appreciated) change, and the final third experienced no change. The first two groups' degree of change held up well longitudinally. Further, no evidence of harm was found (side note: all therapies for all issues have their share of angry clients. Sometimes this is warranted; in every field of

treatment, there can be found either incompetent or overtly abusive clinicians. Policy already exists to address this. Sometimes it is unwarranted, as some clients will take whatever their frustrations may be out on their therapist).

George A. Rekers, Ph.D, Fellow of the American Academy of Clinical Psychology; Professor of Neuropsychiatry and Behavioral Science Emeritus, University of South Carolina School of Medicine; Diplomate in Clinical Psychology, American Board of Professional Psychology, was among a number of positive professional reviewers of Jones and Yarhouse's research. He states he was impressed with its "convincing scientific evidence" and concluded that it "produced strong and clinically meaningful changes in homosexual orientation in a large percentage of individuals. Furthermore, this careful clinical research investigation of a significant number of individuals yielded no evidence to support the common assumption that attempts to change sexual orientation cause harm or distress". Rekers is quoted in the massive, 400-plus page book that describes the study: Ex-Gays? A Longitudinal Study of Religiously Mediated Change in Sexual Orientation. The citations could go on and on.

Many will ask, "if this is so, why haven't we heard more about it?". The answer is deeply disturbing. Since the advent of the Sexual Revolution in the 60's, unlimited sexual gratification and experimentation have become fiercely guarded emotional/spiritual idols. Over the decades, a fierce militancy has arisen on campuses across this nation against any scientific inquiry that might raise concerns about the validity — and the alleged harmlessness — of the same-sex lifestyle. Indeed, while such research as cited above flourished for decades, it began to dramatically taper off as the "chill" set in after the 1973 APA decision. Political passions — not scientific concern — quickly created a toxic climate in academic institutions wherein even seeking to research questions of treatment (and even the origins of same-sex desires) could mean a "death-toll" to one's career (this is why a number of the sources cited earlier are from previous decades. (That alone hardly makes them invalid). The National Association for the Research and Treatment of Homosexuality (NARTH) is a premier scientific organization that continues to brave the political storm. Their website (narth.com) is an outstanding resource for further research directly relevant to the challenge brought by MSRB.

Indeed, such militancy has spread to the political sphere: such as with the stunningly invasive (and baseless) Illinois law recently passed banning state licensed practitioners from offering assistance to minors with unwanted same-sex attraction. (Even the 2009 APA Gay and Lesbian Task Force — a task force comprised entirely of gay activists, excluding dissenters from more historical perspectives such as NARTH — even their report indirectly supports the findings

published in the current Journal of Human Sexuality that reveal no significant ill-effects of such therapy).

The letter to our Session from MSRB cites this recent Illinois law as part of their opposition to our network (this despite the fact that the law pertains only to state licensed counselors: religious counselors are protected by our First Amendment rights. At least, so far. Indeed, some day a lawsuit against even us might gain traction. But under no conditions should we surrender our liberties out of fear and intimidation).

I will also note, parenthetically, the following. MSRB's letter to our Session notes not only the Illinois law, but also the recent GA decision that "rejects" such therapies. I will observe, in contrast, that PC(USA) pastors performed same-sex marriages — when such marriages were illegal, in both state, and Presbyterian, law... Yet no such pastor was ever "barred" from anything, "networks" included. Why do we focus so on law in this case, and not in the other? This is a blatant double standard. I also note that both in the letter, and in our conversations as a MSRB Board, the GA decision was passionately affirmed as definitive, on the order of, "GA said so, so we need to follow that". At our last meeting, I asked that if we are so passionate to follow GA decisions, then why was the GA decision in 1996 (mandating that all church officers needed to either be faithful in marriage between a man and a woman, or chaste in singleness: and I note that this went from a GA decision to an addition to our constitution, G 60106.b, approved overwhelmingly by our presbyteries) not followed with equal passion? I still await a satisfactory answer to this double standard. (I also note that this part of the constitution beginning in 1997 was casually ignored: and no one but some of us theologically orthodox folks seemed to care).

As regards the therapy ban, history repeats itself. In 1994, the APA attempted to bar any clinician from helping those with unwanted same-sex attraction: including adults. Fortunately, it was a vast crowd of ex-gays (and many of their therapists) this time that stormed the gathering. They accurately insisted that APA was intruding brutal politics into the time-honored core value of all psychotherapy: that the client choose the goals of treatment. Moreover, they insisted that if APA went ahead with this ban, they would sue, and demand to reopen the history as to how homosexuality was re-classified in the first place. Perhaps quietly realizing how this inquest would reveal the non-scientific nature of the change, APA backed down...

Ex-gays, despite the bombardment of senseless political pressure, continue to quietly proliferate. They are persecuted by the radical left, not because they don't exist (and I know several personally), but because their very existence threatens the linchpin of the pro-gay arguments — obviously they are not "born

that way” (a statement without any scientific grounding; even many pro-gay-sympathetic researchers no longer believe that), and so the entire argument for “special” civil rights for same-sex affirming persons falls to the ground. Moreover, the existence of ex-gays tweaks the moral conscience of many of the self-affirming folks — a number of whom have chosen to follow Jesus in the ex-gay path...

Jeffrey Satinover zeroes in to the core issue: “Regarding change and the right to treatment, lesbian activist Camille Paglia states the following, in terms considerably sharper than most of us feel comfortable with:

‘Is the gay identity so fragile that it cannot bear the thought that some people may not wish to be gay? Sexuality is highly fluid, and reversals are theoretically possible. However, habit is refractory, once the sensory pathways have been blazed and deepened by repetition - a phenomenon obvious in the struggle with obesity, smoking, alcoholism or drug addiction...helping gays to learn how to function heterosexually, if they wish, is a perfectly worthy aim.’

It is indeed, Camille. Perfectly worthy, and perfectly Godly.

In conclusion, I post here the statement made by NARTH in response to President Obama’s recent statement on offering help to minors. While it repeats some of the ground I have covered, it is worth reading in its entirety (particularly the section on “coercion”:

“The Alliance responds to the President's call for ending therapeutic choice for adolescents and their families.

As an organization, the Alliance for Therapeutic Choice and Scientific Integrity and our members in the NARTH Institute are generally reluctant to become involved in political debates or in directly addressing pronouncements by elected officials. The popular media that airs these statements is seldom able to offer the depth and breadth of analysis necessary to appreciate the complexity of human emotional distress and suffering, or deeply held personal concerns, that lead someone to seek help from a licensed professional counselor or therapist. The “bumper sticker slogan” approach which so often characterizes media stories rarely improves the public’s understanding of important psychological issues.

Consequently, the Alliance feels compelled to respond to the misleading information contained in media reports generated by the President’s

comments on the advisability of “banning” clinical assistance for adolescents who may be experiencing confusing or unwanted homosexual attractions or behaviors.

We believe it is dishonorable and pernicious for politicians or policy organizations to use the personal and intimate conversations that take place in the confidential setting of a licensed professional counselor’s office as a basis or an excuse to push their way into the private lives of individual Americans so they can grandstand or promote their political objectives at the expense of the happiness and mental health of individuals who freely seek therapeutic assistance.

We ask policy makers and all citizens to consider these facts:

- No ethical licensed professional would agree to counsel with an adolescent client who was being forced into therapy. The counseling would be ineffective, the clinical setting coercive, and the potential for harm great. The Alliance and its clinical members would never support any kind of compulsory therapy, and any therapist who participates in such counseling should lose his or her license to practice. Further, all forms of physical or otherwise abusive therapy violate #6 of the Alliance's Practice Guidelines for Unwanted Same-sex Attraction.**
- Any society that grants the right to an adolescent to decide to terminate a pregnancy, or that often pushes graphic sexual material into school classes, cannot rationally suggest that this same adolescent should not have the right to freely participate in conversational counseling to discuss sexuality. If an adolescent is experiencing confusion or ambivalence about his or her sexual attractions, that individual should have the opportunity and the right to talk with a counselor of his or her choice.**
- No one is asking or expecting contented gay citizens to change anything. The freedom of a gay teen to choose a therapist that honors his or her goals and values is unchallenged. All citizens should expect equal treatment and protection from the law and lawmakers.**
- Research clearly demonstrates that sexual attractions, behavior, and orientation or preference change for some people over their lifetime. There is no evidence that support of sexual self-determination by licensed mental health professionals causes**

disproportionate harm to minors or adults who freely pursue this goal in therapy.

- **If a poorly trained or unethical licensed therapist harms a client, the the law already provides avenues to discipline the therapist or remove the therapist’s license to practice. These “therapy ban” bills rob innocent teens of their freedom while adding no new protection for anyone.”**

Love and Truth in Christ, Jim Tilley

p.s. I encourage my readers to research the following websites:

Websites Relating to issues of Same Sex Attraction

1. National Association for the Research and Treatment of Homosexuality
www.nARTH.com

NARTH is the premier scientific community for research and treatment of homosexuality. Excellent articles demonstrating how children fare much more poorly when raised by same sex parents, versus a mother and a father. Also excellent material demonstrating the fact the homosexuality is not genetic, and is, in fact, fairly fluid.

2. Desert Stream www.desertstream.org

A Christian oriented resource that equips churches to minister to the sexually and relationally broken, including same sex attraction.

3. Homosexuals Anonymous www.ha-fs.org

A Christian fellowship of men and women seeking to live free from homosexuality through a 14 step process based on biblical values

4. OneByOne www.oneby1.org

Presbyterian (PCUSA) renewal organization offering to equip the church to minister the transforming grace of Jesus Christ to those in conflict with their sexuality.

5. Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays www.pfox.org

Network of support for those with loved ones struggling with homosexuality. Support for ex-gays.

6. Robert Gagnon, New Testament Scholar robagnon.net

Rob is a deeply gifted biblical scholar; he makes an exhaustively researched case that the Bible indeed teaches that sexual activity is to be limited exclusively to one man and one woman within marriage.

7. Illinois Family Institute illinoisfamily.org

The pro-marriage website in Illinois.

8. National Organization For Marriage nationformarriage.org

This website & the Illinois site also contain resources documenting the assault on religious liberty that — virtually always — ensues wherever same sex marriage becomes legalized.

9. Voice of the Voiceless www.voiceofthevoiceless.info

An organization defending the rights and freedoms of Ex-gays.