

# HOT TOPIC

## THE CHURCH AND S377A

---

Frequently Asked Questions Put Together by a Young Professional

---

### **1. Why are Christians trying to keep a law that makes homosexuality a crime?**

First, to clarify, Section 377A targets homosexual sex, not homosexuals as individuals on account of their same-sex feelings or choice of dress or other related lifestyle choices. Just like the act of statutory rape targets the act of having sex with a minor. It does not target any particular individual or group, but forbids a specific act. If people, no matter who, do not commit the acts, they have not broken any law.

### **2. This is just a Christian thing. We should not impose our religious views on the rest of society who do not subscribe to our beliefs!**

We are not imposing our religious views on people who do not share our beliefs. We are not saying they must believe in Jesus or go to church.

We are stating our moral values and informing the Government that this is how we want the land we live in to be. Other people are equally entitled to share their vision of what kind of society they wish to live in. Ultimately, in our society, the majority view will prevail.

In this case, the majority view of morality is aligned to our view. Muslims, Buddhists, Taoists, Hindus, atheists and Christians may have differing views on religion and the spiritual world, but there are common moral positions. We all agree that murder is immoral. We all agree that theft and rape are immoral. Although all our moral convictions arise from the different religious worldviews and religious teachings to which we subscribe, the moral positions we take transcend religious lines and are often common across different faiths. The laws of our country are therefore to reflect and demarcate these positions. Similarly, homosexual sex is frowned upon by most Singaporeans, not just Christians; and this is a moral issue, not a religious teaching.

### **3. But homosexuals don't harm anyone like a murderer does or a molester or rapist. They are consenting adults. What is wrong with their behaviour?**

Harm is not measured merely by whether there is a victim or whether there is consent. Harm is done to society in general if what is considered morally wrong is allowed to persist. If consent were the only

determining factor, then the use of drugs should not be criminalized if the abuser is a willing participant. Suicide too, should be permitted, since nobody else is “harmed”. And we should allow people to walk around naked. We should allow Satanists and occultists cut themselves and drink the blood of live animals. This is clearly not sensible. Every suicide, every instance of drug abuse, every act that is morally wrong, harms the fabric of society. The law has a role to play in restraining people to some degree because their acts have effects on the wider populace.

#### **4. But their acts are private. Surely the law should not enter into the private space of individuals.**

There are circumstances when the law has to intrude into private spaces. This is the paternalistic facet of the law. We punish people for not wearing seat belts. We made it an offence for motorcyclists to ride without helmets. We do not allow the possession of obscene films. We do not allow incest, even if consensual. These are examples of the law having a role to play in governing private acts.

Homosexuality does affect the wider populace even if activists pretend it does not. Men are not allowed to enter female toilets and vice versa. Homosexuals already do enter the toilets of their own sex and there commit lewd acts, or start to proposition other men. In future, urinals will have to be removed to protect the modesty and decency of men who are not homosexuals—if such misbehaviour becomes rampant.

The protection for children also comes under attack immediately. Childcare services enter a nightmare scenario as it is not good enough to ensure that female teachers take care of young girls and bring them to the toilets, and male teachers the same for young boys, since a homosexual male teacher may have to be kept apart from boys and a lesbian teacher from girls. This poses serious problems as it becomes almost impossible to identify in advance who must be kept from close contact with boys or girls of a young age.

#### **5. In occultic rituals involving animal blood, the animals are harmed. In homosexual acts, no person or animal is harmed. So you can't use examples like that!**

The killing of the animal is not the reason for the banning of such behaviour, or else we would all have to become vegetarians and nobody may kill a pig or a cow for food. The reason for these being outlawed is the morally repugnant nature of the acts.

#### **6. The churches in Singapore are hypocrites. When Section 498 of the Penal Code, forbidding adultery, was repealed in 2007, no Christians objected. Surely adultery damages marriages too.**

This is a falsehood being spread by homosexual rights activists. Section 498 did not target adultery. There are no specific laws targeting adultery in our Penal Code. Section 498 was an old law dealing with the crime of enticement. For consenting couples committing adultery, Section 498

did not target them at all. It does not make sense to have such a law anymore as it is difficult to prove the elements of the crime, and in almost all cases of adultery, it is by mutual consent. Hence the repeal.

*Penal Code 498. Whoever takes or entices away any woman who is and whom he knows, or has reason to believe, to be the wife of any other man, from that man, or from any person having the care of her on behalf of that man, with intent that she may have illicit intercourse with any person, or conceals, or detains, with that intent any such woman, shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to 2 years, or with fine, or with both.*

**7. Ok, so Section 498 did not target adultery. But that just begs the question: why are Christians targeting homosexuality and not other immoral acts in the Bible like adultery? Other religions also believe adultery to be wrong. Why not criminalise that as well?**

Homosexuality is different from other immoral acts like adultery. Adulterers know that they have done wrong. There is shame and social stigma attached to the act. People who commit adultery do not go around brandishing it proudly and proclaiming that this is their “lifestyle”. Unlike homosexuality, there is no concerted effort to try to paint it as being “normal”.

Adulterers do not lobby for acceptance. Adulterers do not try to pressure the Government into changing marriage laws to allow

them to do as they wish outside the boundaries of marriage. Adulterers do not publicly slander and attack people who come out to say that their actions are wrong. Adulterers do not accuse their critics of “hate crimes” and “discrimination”.

There is no danger of people who commit adultery or other immoral acts becoming bolder and pushing the boundaries further. Paedophiles, for example, or molesters, or wife-abusers, do not come together to form support groups to try to collectively change their public image.

**8. Should homosexuals be punished now for having sex in private because of the fear that other people in future may push the boundaries?**

The Government has said that it will not actively prosecute homosexuals. Nobody is being punished for having homosexual sex in Singapore.

**9. That doesn't seem to make sense. If we are not enforcing the law, why even have it on the books?**

The law on the books signals the moral position that society wants, even if some people are given space to live their lives a little further away from this moral position. This is a practical approach to dealing with the issue.

As long as Section 377A exists, there cannot be pressure on other areas of society such as education and marriage. The agencies and organisations in these areas can therefore concentrate on their work, rather than deal with lawsuits and protests.

Section 377A marks the point where the line is drawn. All debate and pressure about the matter will focus on this point. This allows the Government to devote the necessary resources to study the issue and answer the questions raised.

If Section 377A is repealed, everything down the line becomes the next target. Agencies that at present merely concentrate on teaching, solemnising, adoption, etc. will have to devote resources to dealing with protests and lawsuits as they get cajoled into giving “equal rights” to homosexuals.

**10. Why are we so sure that by just allowing homosexual sex, it will lead to all the doomsday scenarios painted by Christian groups? Why can't we just repeal this one law and let homosexuals live quietly in peace?**

A blatant lie by homosexual rights activists in Singapore is that what we see happening in other countries will not happen to Singapore once Section 377A is repealed. They all know full well that even when homosexual sex is legal, they will still not be content. Who would, if you were in their position? They have already openly said that they want “equal rights” with the heterosexuals.

This means that anyone who does not hire a person based on moral objection to homosexuality is guilty of a “hate crime” and can be sued or fired from his job. Schools must give

equal weight to teaching homosexual and heterosexual sex in schools.

Adoption agencies must allow same-sex couples to adopt children just like heterosexual couples, regardless of the moral convictions of the adoption agency.

Religious leaders must solemnise same-sex relationships even if their religious teachings forbid it.

These are not fictional scenarios. These can be seen all around the world. The reality is that nobody stops at just being content with “private consensual sex” while the rest of society proceeds unchanged—there will always be the next battle and the homosexual rights activist will always seek to steadily move the frontline.

**11. By leaving Section 377A on the books, even if they are not being actively prosecuted, we are singling them out and branding them as criminals!**

They are not being singled out for branding as criminals. This is a lie. A criminal and a person who has broken the law are not the same thing.

Firstly, Section 377A targets homosexual sex—not homosexual individuals. They are not forbidden from mixing in homosexual groups, dressing as they please (within the bounds of public decency), liking whomever they wish to like, and even displaying public acts of affection such as holding hands, etc.

Secondly, everyone is innocent until proven guilty in a court of law. Thus,

unless they are actually prosecuted and convicted of a homosexual sex act, they are not criminals.

The Government has said that it will give space to the homosexuals and not actively prosecute them. In that sense, they are no different from people who are breaking the law everywhere but whom the Government is not actively pursuing to prosecute. They are wrong to claim that they are being singled out.

We are all guilty of having broken the law at some point in time. We may have made illegal U-turns. We may have cheated on parking coupons. We may have crossed the street where we should not. We may have littered. We may have accessed and kept pornographic materials in our computers. We may have bought pirated goods and downloaded stuff illegally from the internet. We may have driven our cars recklessly.

Because of that, we are all equally law-breakers, like people who commit homosexual sex. But until we are convicted in Court, we are not criminals, and neither are those who commit homosexual acts.

**12. A parking offence is not the same as a homosexual sex offence! One is an administrative offence, the other is a crime!**

Not true. The two categories are merely degrees of severity with which Government views the act of breaking a particular law. A very serious breach is categorised as a crime. A minor breach is categorised as a regulatory or administrative offence.

In some jurisdictions, the distinction results in “minor or summary” offences versus “serious, arrestable or indictable offences”. But in all cases they are still “offences”. All are cases of breaking the law; the difference lies in how severe the penalty is, whether it is a mere slap on the wrist or a fine or a jail sentence or caning or the death penalty. In fact, most offences attract penalties of a fine and/or a jail sentence, reflecting that there are degrees of severity even within the same offence.

In the parking offence example, under Section 16 of the Parking Places Act, technically a person who breaks the law by parking illegally can be convicted and sent to prison. However, Section 12 of the Act allows for the “composition” of these offences by paying a fine of up to \$400 to the Superintendent of Carparks. Hence, it is still a crime to park illegally but the practical enforcement on a day to day basis is done through composition fines handed out by enforcement officers.

In private housing estates, there are double yellow lines everywhere but the Government does not actively go around giving out summonses unless there are complaints from residents. The Government does not want to throw people in jail daily for parking illegally.

In the same way, the Government does not want to throw homosexuals in jail daily for having homosexual sex. Therefore, the world of difference lies in how the law is enforced, if at all.

To summarise, we are all law-breakers if we commit any offence, but we are not criminals until prosecuted and

convicted. We can go to jail for up to 3 months for parking on a double yellow line. Therefore the idea that homosexuals are “unfairly targeted” and “branded as criminals” is a distortion of the truth and a lie that has been perpetuated to try to win sympathy.

### **13. But doesn't Section 377A legitimize discrimination against homosexuals?**

Discrimination happens all the time and is regrettable. But Section 377A does not legitimize it any more than the repeal of the law will prevent it.

There are no laws forbidding foreigners from being in Singapore, or even locals of different ethnic groups, but people discriminate against foreigners and other ethnic or religious groups all the time.

This is unfortunate. It is wrong and we should not be silent about it. But it goes to show that it is not true that homosexuals are discriminated against and nobody else is. In some places, the elderly are discriminated against by the young. In other places, women are discriminated against. In many places, ex-convicts who are trying to turn over a new leaf are discriminated against.

Discrimination is never legitimate, regardless of the law. The problem of discrimination does not lie in the law but in individual persons. The solution lies in changing people's attitudes towards how they treat one another, how they speak to one another, and how they value a person despite the struggles or past

mistakes a person makes. It does not lie in allowing people to do whatever they want under the law.

In countries where the homosexual rights activists have taken things to the extreme, their concept of preventing discrimination is to attack religious teachings and institutions, ban free speech and freedom of religion, and punish people who do not agree with their views. They have created an environment of extreme oppression by disguising it as “anti-discrimination”.

For example, in some countries, people have been charged in court for merely saying that “homosexuality is immoral” or “I am not hiring this person because he is a homosexual”.

If we were serious in dealing with all discrimination, not just allowing the homosexual agenda to get preferential treatment, we must also charge people in court for saying “I think adultery is immoral” or “I am not hiring this person because I think a woman will not be able to do this particular job as well as a man”.

We can see that this outcome is not what we want, but the “anti-discrimination” efforts of the homosexual movement worldwide seek to do precisely that, for the one area of homosexual rights.

### **14. Does that mean homosexuals are doomed to live their lives not being happy?**

Many people have found happiness in life through various endeavours and life choices. To say that happiness can only be found in

allowing a person to have sex with whoever he wants to is nonsensical.

Otherwise, it follows that widows and singles and anyone who is not having sex must be living a miserable life. And as for paedophiles or people who struggle with bestiality, we should also allow them to have sex with whomever or whatever they want so that they can be happy. Or we should allow people who want to have sex with dead bodies to do what makes them happy.

This is clearly not the way. These people have to respect the moral standard of the society they live in. If they do not commit any offences, they are allowed to live in peace in this land. If they break the law, they may be charged and convicted.

For those who want to change their lifestyles and no longer struggle with the tendencies they have, there are avenues of help. Many church groups and counsellors have reported success in helping homosexuals turn away from their past life and enjoy fulfilling heterosexual relationships or singlehood.

These stories have naturally been condemned and branded as lies by homosexual rights activists in order to perpetuate their own lie that people are born homosexual and cannot change. It is extremely tragic that these selfish people would tear down the credibility of ex-homosexuals who have found happiness in coming out of homosexuality, in order to push lies that are useful for justifying their alternative lifestyles.

There are countless stories of very vicious and vile attacks on people who have tried to move out of the homosexual community and begin new lives with heterosexual partners. For those who recognise that what they are doing is immoral and want to be helped, there are many places that will provide it. It is not a hopeless situation for them.

Godliness  
makes a  
nation great,  
but sin is a  
disgrace to  
any people.

Proverbs 14:34