

Letters to Lynne Featherstone MP about Homosexual 'Marriage'

Written by BTM

Tuesday, 22 February 2011 23:45

Below are two letters by BTM readers, reproduced here with permission. They were sent to Lynne Featherstone, the Coalition Government's Equality Minister and Liberal Democrat MP, concerning the government's plans to redefine the age-old definition of marriage as between a man and a woman. The letters also protest against the decision to allow gay civil partnerships to take place within religious buildings, including churches. The Liberal Democrats in particular are very proud of [their pro LGBT stance](#) .

BTM believes that all Christians must make a stand against this evil movement.

Do YOU adhere to what God says about marriage? If so, will you do something about it, or grumble ineffectually from your armchair? (We have all been guilty of this at some stage!)

For more information, see this press release from Christian Concern: [Government plans to transform Marriage a social engineering experiment with profound consequences for society warns Christian Concern \(Feb 17th 2011\)](#)

Letter 1:

Rt Hon Lynne Featherstone MP
Equalities Minister
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA

Dear Ms Featherstone

Equalities Act Proposals for Civil Partnerships etc.

As Equalities Minister I am writing to express my opposition to plans to allow civil partnerships and homosexual unions in churches. I am opposed to government legislation that would restrict the free exercise of religion and the godly conscience of religious people to the detriment of a civilised and caring society.

Letters to Lynne Featherstone MP about Homosexual 'Marriage'

Written by BTM

Tuesday, 22 February 2011 23:45

The Government wants to promote a 'big society', but what does that mean? Surely traditional marriage would be high on the list to protect and nurture children? Or is it the continued systematic undermining of marriage and family life with even more permissive legislation and sexual rights - an agenda that has had a catastrophic effect in undermining the very fabric of society? From recent press reports it would seem that the latter is the case.

Yes, the agenda is 'equality"! But how can opposing values be equal? How can living in sin be equal to godly marriage? How is right and wrong equal to the belief that there are no rights and wrongs or absolutes? That is the problem with competing worldviews, where one worldview changes laws to ride roughshod over the other.

Such is the homosexual rights agenda with the redefinition of marriage. The media has reported that through the Equality Act (2010) plans are in hand which could include 'same-sex marriage'. Same-sex marriage is an oxymoron. God created two genders, male and female. He did not create L, G, B or T genders. The Bible is clear - marriage is union between one man and one woman for sexual expression and raising of children; the basic building block for a stable and prosperous society. We tamper with that at our peril.

Pope Benedict said last year that gay marriage and civil partnerships were among the "most insidious and dangerous challenges that today confront the common good." Only marriage is celebrated within a church. If civil partnership were allowed, sooner or later the law could be used to criminalise ministers and force churches to accept same-sex unions and further discriminate against Christians and those of other faiths.

Can you please assure me that these considerations will be taken into account? Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Reader 1

Letters to Lynne Featherstone MP about Homosexual 'Marriage'

Written by BTM

Tuesday, 22 February 2011 23:45

Letter 2:

Lynne Featherstone MP
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

Dear Lynne Featherstone MP,

I am writing in opposition to government plans to allow homosexual unions to take place in places of worship, and also against the introduction of homosexual 'marriage'.

The term 'marriage' has, for all history, and in virtually every single culture referred to the union of a man and a woman. It is the most fundamental social institution, and changing its definition to include homosexuals would be an unprecedented experiment in social engineering which will, along with all other gay legislation, have awful consequences (here I point towards the homosexual experiment performed by the Bolsheviks in 1920s Russia).

The government has stressed that it will be up to individual places of worship to decide whether they wish to conduct homosexual unions on their premises. I am rather sceptical as to how long this provision for freedom of expression will last, given the past moves of both the present and former government, along with the orchestrated vehemence the gay lobby shows to its opposition. However, the point is that even this provision does not go far enough. Ordinary people should not be forced by law to change the expression of their views in having to refer to homosexuals as 'married', when an elementary understanding of human anatomy shows that 'same-sex marriage' is impossible (this is one evidence of many!).

For time immemorial, the union of marriage has begun with a service in which the coupling of a man and a woman is made known to the wider community. This is often accompanied by a

Letters to Lynne Featherstone MP about Homosexual 'Marriage'

Written by BTM

Tuesday, 22 February 2011 23:45

religious blessing. Then, once the union is made legally binding, the couple consummate (make complete) their marriage. The consummation is the sealing of the marriage - it is what cements the vows that have already been made, and it is when the two become one. This is by way of sexual intercourse, which has always been defined as between the male and female genitalia, as the only means to procreate.

How on earth then, can a homosexual pair consummate a marriage? It is patently impossible since they are incapable of intercourse. Men and women are designed to complement one another on every level: Physically, as well as emotionally.

As homosexual civil partnerships already have the same legal status as marriages, I wonder why the government feels the need to redefine marriage in favour of a very vocal minority that accounts for less than 1.5% of the population? Could it be part of what seems to be a pervading quest by the successive governments of the past 50 years to implement a godless, liberal dystopia, where moral absolutes are abandoned in favour of relativism and the marginalisation of Christianity?

The redefinition of the most fundamental societal institution is a very dangerous concept indeed. It devalues the institution of marriage, and will bring dire consequences upon society. I therefore urge the government to keep the current definition of marriage as between a man and a woman.

Yours sincerely,

Reader 2

© February 2011

---oOo---

Letters to Lynne Featherstone MP about Homosexual 'Marriage'

Written by BTM

Tuesday, 22 February 2011 23:45

{loadposition btm_address}