

Secularism and accommodation for gay/lesbian or unmarried couples when the proprietor thinks giving them a bed is a grave sin

Secularism makes it illegal for owners of bed and breakfasts and hotels etc from discriminating against say gay couples or secularist politicians to give two examples. The Christians are seeking the right to ban gay couples who wish to sleep together from their hotels and bed and breakfasts etc. The Bed and Breakfasts and hotels etc provide a public service. As long as somebody will not do serious harm on their premises, they have no right to ban them. If the state allows them to ban gay people then the state should also allow Christian doctors to refuse to treat Islamic missionaries on the grounds that the missionaries are dragging people into eternal damnation by propounding the wrong religion to them. Those Christians who believe that the Pope is the Antichrist cannot be allowed to discriminate against Catholic priests and bishops looking for accommodation.

Moreover, it is said that to force Christian hotel owners to admit gay couples into their double rooms denies that Christians have rights. This view implies that gay rights do not come before religious rights. But the Christians have rights as people but that does not mean they have rights as religionists or Christians! A religion cannot have rights as such. A religion is only made up of people but it is not people. It's a system. And Christians are inconsistent. They know fine well that they must not have the right to discriminate against gay people.

Sexual freedom is more important than religious freedom. That is because the sex instinct is part of our humanity. We are sexual beings. We have sexual needs. They are intrinsic to our nature. A person may be happily irreligious. Being religious is not intrinsic to our nature. Suppose it was. It does not follow that any particular faith should get preferential treatment. Being religious is one thing but being part of a religious faith is another.

The right of Bed and Breakfast owners to stop people doing things such as taking a little drink or having sex without being married in ones home is superseded by the fact that they opened their premises up to people for money - its about money not morals.

Should Christian Bed and Breakfast owners be sued for discrimination for refusing a room to gay couples?

THE BIBLE SAYS: The Bible, which was written by God as much as man according to the Church, says regarding those who alter the Christian faith:

If anyone comes to you and does not bring this teaching, do not receive him into your house, and do not give him a greeting; for the one who gives him a greeting participates in his evil deeds - see 2 John verses 10,11

Christians say that the custom when the text was written was that teachers stayed in the house where the Church was held. The house they are not to be received into can be understood as house church. So the text is not banning hospitality to a false teacher but banning anything that abets and encourages his ministry. The term "greeting" is said by some to refer to welcoming the false teacher into the congregation and encouraging him.

The scholar F.F. Bruce wrote: "The injunction not to receive any one who does not bring 'the teaching of Christ' means that no such person must be accepted as a Christian teacher or as one entitled to the fellowship of the church. It does not mean that (say) one of Jehovah's Witnesses should not be invited into the house for a cup of tea in order to be shown the way of God more perfectly in the sitting-room than would be convenient on the doorstep."

So Christians cannot let gay couples stay in their houses unless staying will somehow make them decide to split up and obey the gospel. But that would not be letting a gay couple stay but a pair who have parted stay. Such a situation would be so rare that it would be virtually impossible.

The Bible forbids greeting false teachers in the sense of implying, "I hope your ministry goes well". Christians are forbidden to wish happiness to a gay couple.

THE CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH SAYS

The Catechism of the Catholic Church (1756) says,

It is ... an error to judge the morality of human acts by considering only the intention that inspires them or the circumstances (environment, social pressure, duress or emergency, etc.) which supply their context. There are acts which, in

and of themselves, independently of circumstances and intentions, are always gravely illicit by reason of their object; such as blasphemy and perjury, murder and adultery. One may not do evil so that good may result from it.

THE POPE SAYS:

In the case of an intrinsically unjust law... it is therefore never licit to obey it, or to "take part in a propaganda campaign in favour of such a law, or vote for it"

Pope John Paul II, *Evangelium Vitae*, 73

It is forbidden then to defend the discrimination suit.

THE REASONABLE PERSON SAYS:

The Christians are committing discrimination because if they refused to let unmarried couples have a room they would have to close up. They presumably allow straight couples to have a bed.

They have no business assuming the gay couple will have sex in the room.

They could have asked them not to have sex and left it up to them. Would be better than turning them away.

It is their house but they offer it to the public. They have the right to decide who enters their home but they have given it up to provide their home to all those who are not coming into their homes to break the law or harm them.

It would be considered discrimination if they refused an inter-racial couple on the grounds that they thought each race should stick to its own. If they are given the right to discriminate against gay people, then there is nowhere to draw the line. They are tacitly declaring that people who believe that other races are inferior and who say their religion urges them to believe this should have the right to discriminate.

If you run a bed and breakfast, it is part of your job to believe that if people are doing wrong in your rooms up to a point, it is none of your affair. For example, if somebody was caught having a vodka that would not justify asking that person to leave.

Conclusion

Yes!

A thought: If Christians argue that they cannot be refused, the view that same-sex sexual activity is acceptable is not to be considered a reason. They let them in for separate reasons. They feel, "Its a pity that those other reasons exist. Ideally we would exclude them."

A COMMENT I POSTED ON A WEBSITE

RE: Gay Couple refused accommodation in bed and breakfast by its Christian owners on religious grounds

The owners are arguing that they had to refuse to let the gay couple stay for they felt they would be facilitating sex that would be a sin according to Christianity. But if they let the couple stay on the condition that they would not have sex they could not feel they were facilitating sin. They didn't even want to ask the couple to respect their wishes. Their refusal to let the couple stay is simply bigotry. No getting away from that. Their conscience is not an excuse. The court was right to fine them for discrimination. Think of Mormons who do not believe that marriages are valid or binding when performed outside the Mormon faith. If Mormon hotels discriminated against Christian married couples what would we say then?

Christian bigots Peter and Hazelmary Bull's have lost their Supreme Court appeal in gay snub case

The Bulls say gay sex is a sin. We need to remember that the Christians believe that God is king and has his own form of civil law. Sin is a crime against that law. You cannot prove that sin exists. Or that wrong is sin. Incredibly, Christians regard it as acceptable to accuse people of sin while they would say that if somebody was accused of breaking the law of the land without proof that person was the victim of sanctimonious slandering bigots. It is hate speech to say that two men having an innocent harmless fumble are guilty of a sin so terrible that it will put them in Hell forever.

The Bulls are using Christianity as an excuse. They could have asked the gay couple to refrain from sex as it is a grave sin

in their view but they did not. If the Bulls had, they couldn't say that letting the couple stay would be a violation of conscience. Yet they had the effrontery to go to the Supreme Court on the grounds of freedom of conscience!

Re: Christian B & B owners going to European Court seeking the right to ban unmarried couples from using their services.

They want to discriminate against people who love each other but who happen not to be married. How low is that! And how can they be sure that sex will actually take place anyway? They are wasting money on this issue instead of helping the poor with it. They are no better than the Catholic Church which has made it a commandment of the Church to give money to the pastors and has given no commandment to help the poor. The poor are helped as an afterthought regardless of the hypocritical performances of the current pope.