

DIVERSITY OR PERVERSITY?

by

Dr. Michael L. Brown

In any debate over “gay rights,” the word “diversity” is sure to occur, and over the last decade, the word has been used brilliantly by gay activists and educators. After all, who would oppose diversity?

The strategy has been simple: Rather than advocating special rights for gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgenders, there has been a concerted effort to promote and embrace “diversity.” In keeping with this, major corporations require their employees to attend courses in diversity training, while university students are taught to respect diversity – in both cases, with specific reference to homosexuality. Embracing diversity is the key!

Thus, when British soldiers marched in a gay pride parade for the first time (on August 27, 2005, in Manchester), it demonstrated “that the Army accepts change and is very progressive, open-minded, embracing diversity, showing a higher degree of tolerance” (as quoted by BBC News). Similarly, gay pride events worldwide are often billed as celebrations of diversity, and when objections have been raised to the lewd public displays often associated with these very public events – which have included drag queens simulating sex acts, topless, motorcycle-riding lesbians (“Dikes on Bikes”) celebrating nipple freedom, men parading down the streets wearing nothing but shoes, and large floats with massive, protruding phalluses – those objecting have been scolded for their failure to embrace diversity.

Diversity? Isn’t this perversity rather than diversity?

Recent developments in the Netherlands confirm the semantic association between diversity and perversity, suggesting that diversity doublespeak may be losing its effectiveness. I’m referring to the new political party launched in Holland at the end of May called “Neighborly Love (or, Charity), Freedom, and Diversity” (abbreviated NVD), and having as a key component of its platform “the maximizing of diversity and liberty.”

Specifically, the NVD wants to allow “individuals, from the age of 12, to vote, have sex, gamble, choose their place of residence, and use soft drugs. . . . They also intend to eliminate marriage in the law, permit public nudity anywhere . . . and to legalize private use of child pornography and allow non-violent pornography to be screened on daytime television” (as cited in Wikipedia). They also want to encourage bestiality, as long as it does not result in the “sexual mistreatment” of animals. All this in the name of maximizing diversity! One must ask again: Isn’t this perversity rather than diversity?

Reuters reported that, “The Netherlands, which already has liberal policies on soft drugs, prostitution and gay marriage, was shocked by the plan.” But why should the nation be

shocked? Isn't it inevitable that the same nation which was among the first to legalize soft drug use, prostitution, and gay marriage would be among the first to entertain the possibility of legalizing consensual sex with minors and to encourage the social acceptance of bestiality – and in the name of diversity at that?

To ask a pointed question, On what basis should pedophilia and bestiality not be included under the rubric of “diversity”? And if the public perversion often paraded at gay pride events is protected under the heading of diversity, why shouldn't pedophilia – especially, “consensual” sex between a minor and his “lover” – be protected under that same heading? And why not even bestiality? On what concrete, moral basis?

Perhaps the greatest shock in the recent developments in the Netherlands is that a poll published in Holland on May 30th indicated that 67 percent of the population said that promoting pedophilia should be illegal. Only 67 percent! Perhaps, over time, the NVD will actually succeed in promoting its agenda. Perhaps this too is a logical development in the concept of “diversity.” To ask once more: Why not?

Let us learn a lesson from the Netherlands: Once “diversity” is associated with sexual behavior the sky – or, more accurately – the gutter is the limit. Now would be a good time to redefine our terms, and the sooner we desexualize “diversity,” the better. This is now a term behind which homosexual activism can no longer hide.

Michael L. Brown, Ph.D., is the President of FIRE School of Ministry in Concord, North Carolina and the Director of the Coalition of Conscience, a network of Christian leaders and believers in the greater Charlotte area who are working together for moral and cultural change through the gospel.