

Background Information on the John's High Court Case

[The BBC's Question Time held an interesting debate \(4th March 2011\)](#) , concerning the recent court ruling against foster carers Eunice and Owen Johns.

For those who are unaware of the case, The UK High Court recently ruled that the Johns would be unable to foster children, despite a long history of dozens of successful fosterings, because of their view that homosexuality is unnatural and immoral. *"Lord Justice Munby and Mr Justice Beatson ruled that laws protecting people from discrimination because of their sexual orientation "should take precedence" over the right not to be discriminated against on religious grounds.*

"They said that if children were placed with carers who objected to homosexuality and same-sex relationships, "there may well be a conflict with the local authority's duty to 'safeguard and promote the welfare' of looked-after children"." ([BBC News - 28th February 2011](#))

What we now have, stated plainly for the first time by the High Court, is that the rights of a perverse 1.5% of the population take precedence over anybody who opposes, and especially Christians.

There are two petitions where you can register your opposition to the way the courts have acted:

<http://www.christianconcern.com/equalities-and-conscience>

<http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/justice4johns/>

The Question Time Debate

The John's case was debated on the [BBC's Question Time on the 4th March 2011](#) .

Written by BTM

Wednesday, 16 March 2011 20:49

It was one of those occasions where I found myself arguing (audibly!) with the TV set, so I thought that instead of disturbing everyone else, I would write up my thoughts on the debate, in the form of this article.

The question asked by an audience member, and debated by the panel was: *“Is the rejection of prospective foster parents, on the grounds of their religious beliefs, a form of prejudice?”*

Margaret Beckett MP (Former Foreign Secretary, Labour politician, and claimant of some rather dubious MP expenses) kicked off the debate by rather apologetically stating that she believed the court’s decision was the right one. To back this up, she stated that the Johns (who were in line to foster a child between the ages of 5 and 8) may have been given a child who had already decided that they were homosexual: *“...a child may know at an earlier stage their own sexuality – others don’t - and they [the John’s] could’ve had children placed with them for whom their teaching could’ve been profoundly disturbing.”*

Beckett’s argument is fundamentally flawed because it precludes any notion that homosexuality is not good, healthy, or moral. No matter how much mischief is framed in law (Psalm 94), homosexuality will always be designated as abominable by God (Romans 1, Leviticus 18), and this judgment has never been rescinded. I wonder, if the Johns had a child placed with them who was, say, a thief, would their teaching that theft is wicked be pronounced *‘profoundly disturbing’* on the part of the child? What if the child just couldn’t help its compulsion to engage in theft? Homosexuality is wrong, like any other sin.

At 1:30 in the linked video, Beckett compares homosexual ‘discrimination’ to racial prejudice. This is an oft-used argument, but it is outrageous, and a massive insult to all who have suffered racism. Race is an innate, genetic characteristic in a human being. Homosexuality on the other hand, is not. It is a learned behaviour, and is condemned by God. Even the vehement gay-rights campaigner, Peter Tatchell, was honest enough to state that homosexuality is not innate: *“Much as I would love to go along with the fashionable “born gay” consensus (it would be very politically convenient), I can’t. The evidence does not support the idea that sexuality is a fixed biological given.”*

(
[Guardian UK -2006](#)

– warning, the link contains some profane language)

Written by BTM

Wednesday, 16 March 2011 20:49

Dr David Starkey is the second panelist to give his opinion on the topic (at around 1:40). Starkey is a historian, is openly gay, and is an atheist. Yet, he defended the Johns, and also the Bulls ([hoteliers who were sued for refusing to allow a homosexual couple to share a double bed](#)) stating that we are “*producing a tyrannous new morality*”.

At 3:55, Conservative MP Iain Duncan Smith (Secretary of State for Work and Pensions) wades in: “*...the point about the foster carer is their role isn't to push their views onto the child that's temporarily in their care...the judgment is not about them holding their views... the problem is this child is not theirs, the child is under the protection of the state, and whilst in the foster care, the foster care is about love care and nurture...I think the problem was them deciding this was somehow a principled issue, when in actual fact had they said 'look we hold the views we do, but we would not try and push those down onto the child, we would simply love and care for that child', then there would not have been an issue.*”

Duncan Smith's basic point is that foster parents should not be allowed to impose their views onto a child. But where do we draw the line here? Again, if the child was a compulsive thief, would they be able to tell the child that theft is morally wrong (never mind help him to overcome his compulsive urge to steal)? By whose moral standards? The fact is that one cannot passively raise a child. Children look to their parents as role models, and for guidance and care. Would foster parents be allowed to give a child guidance on a matter that the child raised?

At 6:05, the chair goes to Liam Halligan, an economist and columnist for the Sunday Telegraph. He seems to be the only panelist that really speaks any sense on the issue, and yet he is not a Christian. He begins by highlighting the good work that the Johns have done in fostering so many children, and saying that we should be praising, instead of penalising, them. He says (at 6:30) “*I'm a tolerant guy, but sometimes, if you absolutely push tolerant people, they become intolerant, because you go past the point of no return...*” This sentiment is echoed amongst many non-Christian people, with whom I have discussed this and similar issues.

A redheaded lady in the audience says (at 6:55) that she thinks the Court's decision was the right one, “*because, I think no matter what we think and feel in our private lives and in our minds, we have a duty to behave in a certain way when we're at work for instance. Now if its right that homophobia is bad, and I do agree that homophobia is bad, then yes it was the right decision*”

Written by BTM

Wednesday, 16 March 2011 20:49

If you cut to the core of her words, what she is really saying is: *“No matter what your personal convictions, you must submit to the state’s view of morality when in public life.”*

This is very, very dangerous ground indeed. Who made the state the sole arbiter of moral views? That is tyranny. Instead the only arbiter of genuine morality is the one true God, who unequivocally condemns homosexual behaviour. Even if sinful man wishes to disregard what God says, the results of homosexuality also condemn the practice.

At 9 minutes into the video, David Starkey makes the same point that I have made with regards to Iain Duncan Smith’s comments: *“How can you bring up a child even as a foster parent without transmitting your values to them, and what sort of an upbringing is that?”*

Again I repeat, one cannot passively raise, a child, no matter how long the custody of the child is.

Iain Duncan Smith replies by saying the council should’ve discussed the issue, but stops short of denouncing the judgment made by the Court. In so doing, he shines yet another light on the ‘Conservative’ party’s absolute refusal to say anything even mildly negative against homosexuality.

At 10:15, an audience member questions why a social worker should pose a question regarding homosexuality to the Johns, after so many years and dozens of successful cases of fostering. She noted “There’s something just not right there”. This is a significant point. In the recent case where Christian hoteliers, Peter and Hazelmary Bull, were sued for refusing to allow homosexuals to share a double bed, the gay lobby group Stonewall telephoned the B&B to quote the newly-implemented Equality Bill, and warn them that they could not turn away homosexuals. Then, a couple of weeks later the gay couple turned up, were refused the double bed, and legal action was successfully taken against the Bulls. All the signs are that it was a set-up.

It is therefore not unreasonable to suggest that the social worker posed this question specifically to corner the John’s, having learned that they held Christian beliefs. Although this is conjecture, it is very similar to how Stonewall targeted the Bull’s. It is interesting that the question merely resulted in an agitated, inaudible mutter from David Dimbleby, before the panel swiftly turned to another question from the audience. Perhaps the woman was a little too close to the truth for comfort?

Iain Duncan Smith then tries to argue that the legislation is bad, and that as a consequence, the

Written by BTM

Wednesday, 16 March 2011 20:49

case has been allowed to be taken to the courts, instead of being settled on a lower level. Liam Halligan immediately retorts that Iain Duncan Smith has supported the case on national television, and states that the *“logic of this position is that if people are Christian - which I’m not - then do we disapprove of them having or raising children at all? That’s the logic of this position.”*

Of course, Duncan Smith immediately recoils at this notion, but Mr Halligan’s point is a good one, and it is one that BTM has raised in the past. I firmly believe that this **is** where things are heading. Indeed, it is already happening: A Christian family was recently investigated because their child mentioned heaven and hell at school, putting huge stress on the family. The children are now under child protection plans, despite all psychological and medical assessments proving that such a plan is unnecessary (

[Heaven and Hell in Colchester - Christian Voice](#)

).

Unless Christians come out in force against the evils that have been continually pushed onto society over the past 50 years, this kind of inquisition will become all the more commonplace.

At 12:40, Margaret Beckett says *“Is it just possible that the issue is something slightly different, that we have seen far too many times of late, which is people making a big standing principle, and taking things to court?”*

Dimbleby notes that they took the issue to court because they were prevented from fostering. The point is really quite bizarre, and I think an attempt to sidestep the evil and corruption that the court judgment has highlighted – did she expect the couple to just lay down and take the judgment against them by the council?

David Cameron: Anti-God

This is certainly what David Cameron believes they should have done. During a visit to Derby, The Prime Minister supported the court judgment, and said *“Christians should be tolerant and welcoming and broad-minded”* ([Tel](#)

[egraph UK](#)). This is perhaps the most overtly anti-Christian statement made by a Prime Minister in relation to the gay issue. Cameron has claimed to be a Christian, but every action he makes negates the claim. Indeed, he acts unjustly, and abuses his office. His actions show that he hates God, and that he does not wish for Christians to be free to be true to God. Instead, he will bend over backwards for a sinful minority of 1.5%. Yet, how many Christians voted for this man at the last general election?

The Johns Case is a Small Sign of Things to Come

Written by BTM

Wednesday, 16 March 2011 20:49

Christians must wake up to what is going on. The John's case is only part of the beginning: In the future you can expect real persecution, if you dare to stand for Christ. Do not blindly believe that your job will always be secure, no matter how competent you are, or how long you have held the role. Do not take for granted that your family are, at present, relatively safe. Do not believe that you will always be able to speak the truth without consequence. Indeed, we already cannot: we *"should be tolerant [to sin] and welcoming [to unrepentant gross sinners]"*.

The situation is far more advanced than many Christians in the UK realise. In Germany, Christian parents are frequently jailed for homeschooling their children in order to protect them from the perversions that are taught to them by the state ([One News Now](#)). One German couple were jailed for removing their children from mandatory state school sex education classes, which featured an 'interactive play' entitled

Mein Körper Gehört Mir

(My Body Is Mine) (

[Christian Concern](#)

). The play was performed by 9-10 year olds. The title is evil, because it rejects that it is God Who made us, and therefore rejects His laws for our lives. It also reflects the modern hedonistic ideas that abound today, and with which governments are attempting to pervert your children (see BTM article:

["Do What You Want": Really?](#)

).

In the US, a Quaker school leads by example in subverting (grooming) the minds of children to homosexual sin and turning their backs on the God and Bible they claim to believe in. See this video of a favourite documentary of homosexual activists called "It's Elementary", made over a decade ago:

At about 1:50 into the video, a woman (at what looks like a Parent-Teacher Association meeting) says that the school is actively seeking to override the authority of any parents that believe homosexual behaviour is wrong. Just like the National Socialists of Germany, the school is using "education" as a method of gross brainwashing. Clearly, it is having a great effect, since the children in the video are well versed in the kind of PC-speak that I had no idea about when I was their age. There is a part 2 to the video here:

Written by BTM

Wednesday, 16 March 2011 20:49

I could write another article on both videos, but will refrain! The propaganda is obvious and astounding, and it is coming to a school near you. Indeed, it is already there, to a greater or lesser degree.

© March 2011

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}