

## Can you be actively gay and a good Catholic?

Heresy is parasitic on orthodoxy. It is Christian belief that a lie is parasitic on the truth. That means x is true and you have to recognise to a reasonable degree that x is true in order to distort it with a lie and to maintain the lie. Every religion has a doctrinal standard and is to be committed to helping people reach that standard. People in bad faith who are in say the true religion and who distort it are heretics. Their distortions and heresies in a way are in fact a promotion of the religion in its orthodox form. The idea is that as evil is fake and manipulates good it cannot stand forever so the heresy will tend to further and further self-destruction.

Truth must be served for it is simply right meaning it is right to serve it. Plus it is in our self interest to serve it for it does not care what we think so we may as well try to line up to it.

In a nutshell, if the Catholic faith is wrong about homosexuality then leave.

Archbishop Chaput explains Catholic doctrine in 2018, "There is no such thing as an "LGBTQ Catholic" or a "transgender Catholic" or a "heterosexual Catholic", as if our sexual appetites defined who we are; as if these designations described discrete communities of differing but equal integrity within the real ecclesial community, the body of Jesus Christ. This has never been true in the life of the Church, and is not true now. It follows that "LGBTQ" and similar language should not be used in Church documents, because using it suggests that these are real, autonomous groups, and the Church simply doesn't categorize people that way."

This is not just a Catholic doctrine - it is reasonable based on the assumption that Catholicism is a collection of truth and not just a religion.

The Church is homophobic but allows falling in love though love makes a person biased and leads to fulfilment that is the real reason for being good to the other person rather than being good for the other person's sake. Few things are as egoistic or egotistic and exploitive as falling in love. Would the man or woman be as keen if the person was a paralytic and became really grumpy not through their own fault but because of a genetic inability to cope? The Church is homophobic but not alcohol phobic.

A man called Matt one time wrote in a gay magazine in response to a call to LGBT unbelievers not to tick the Roman Catholic membership box in a census form.

He wrote, "I checked the Catholic box on the census because I identify as a Catholic. I also identify as a gay man. The two are not mutually exclusive." Here is a parallel that shows its stupidity. "I checked the Martian box on the census because I identify as a Martian. I also identify as a earth man. The two are not mutually exclusive." Matt does not have the honesty to admit that he just cares about not what he should believe but about what he wants to believe.

Where are the Bible verses and the papal statements - from the Pope who all real Catholics recognise as teacher of the Church in the place of Jesus Christ and who speaks with the authority of Jesus - to show that being a practicing homosexual and a Catholic fit together? All gay "Christians" do is give us distorted and far-fetched interpretations of Bible verses that condemn homosexuality to make it look like they don't condemn it. And the lie that Jesus said nothing about homosexuality is refuted by his clear teaching that sex should only happen between a man and woman for marriage is about the union of one man and one woman for life. It is insane to suppose that a man who banned divorce and said it was making the spouse commit adultery would bless gay sex.

The main question about the Catholic Church is, "Is the religion really true and revealed by God?" The gay person who is alarmed at Catholic teaching, instead of trying to change the Church in its official teaching, should investigate it and look at the evidence for Catholicism. If it is wanting then he or she should do the

right thing and quit. Revelation necessarily implies that you cannot fuggier out the truth on your own. It will collide with your intellect and experience. But that collision does not mean that it is necessarily wrong. Revelation necessarily excludes private judgement ie, I judge that part of God's word true and that other part false. If you want to exercise private judgment and pretend that being a good Catholic means you can be gay as well then you are in the wrong religion. Protestantism is the religion of private judgment. And Protestant is what you are.

If belief or at least refusing to accept beliefs contrary to the religion is not needed to be a true member then there is no real criteria to make one a real member of any religion and religion becomes must a pretence and a label. To deny one doctrine that The religion says God has revealed is to say the others may be denied or doubted as well. Why should we believe your statement? Would we believe somebody who said "I checked the Catholic box on the census because I identify as a Catholic. I also identify as an atheist"? Or "I checked the Catholic box on the census because I identify as a Catholic. I also identify as a Muslim"? Just admit it you are a hypocrite. If as you seem to think, one can believe it is right to be gay despite the official teaching of the Church and be a true Catholic, then there is no criteria for telling who is a hypocrite or not. If you can be a Catholic, then surely the embezzler who believes he has to steal for his children can justly appropriate and take the good Catholic label if he wants it? I am not saying that embezzlers and gay people are to be compared by the way.

Anybody can call themselves a Christian or Muslim if picking and choosing out of a faith is acceptable. There is no place to draw the line at where a picker and chooser can stop before he or she loses the right to claim to be a member of her or his religion. For example, would you consider a priest to be a real Catholic who stood for the notion that the Mass was barbaric idolatry and the Pope was not the head teacher appointed by Christ to be his voice in the world? If Matt wishes to disagree with the official Catholic teaching that sex must only happen in a valid heterosexual marriage, then he must not object if somebody starts to believe its a duty as a Catholic to kill gay people or if somebody decides they had a vision in which the people was declared invalid and he or she can be the new pope. Matt claims the Church belongs to him. How can it?

I see no evidence Matt that you even understand Catholic doctrine. Identifying as Catholic means obligation yourself to obey the leadership. They claim to be infallible under conditions and to stand in the place of Jesus and the apostles to rule the Church. It is up to the Church leaders to decide the rules of membership and if you break them you are only lying to yourself by identifying as a Roman Catholic. That is what leaders are for. A religion is a set of rules and standards. If it is not then Catholics may go to Mecca instead of Lourdes on pilgrimage and Shirley Temple Bar can say mass for us and there is no problem with electing Richard Dawkins as pope. Laws do not make something real. If a mad dictator makes a law that people who are LGBT are not human or not real people but machines made of flesh that law cannot make it true. Those who repudiate any part of the Catholic faith are not Catholics even if Church law says they are. In fairness to the Church those who do so are under automatic excommunication and cut off from membership and need to confess this to be restored to membership. The Church also holds that the baptised Catholics in Hell are not part of the Church any more. Catholic teaching says the Church exists only on earth, Heaven and Purgatory. The souls in Hell supposedly stay there because they stubbornly believe they are right and God wrong - their rejection of the authority of the faith makes them no longer Catholics.

I have no problem agreeing that an LGBT person can be a Catholic but only as long as they see themselves as sinners for having sex. A religion can't be a religion without rules. Religion comes from a word meaning to bind, it binds people together in a philosophy or system of doctrine. Your statement that I said that there is conflict between a homosexual orientation and Catholicism is a blatant lie. Homosexual usually refers to an orientation while gay refers to acting on the orientation. I never mentioned people with LGBT orientations but people who live out their orientations. There is no such conflict. It is the acting out and allowing sexual thoughts that the church has a serious problem with.

The Church's official teaching says they are. It is not your business to speak for the Church like that. You are misrepresenting. Why stop there? Why can't somebody say, ""I checked the Spiritualist box on the census

because I identify as a Spiritualist. I also identify as an unbeliever in the possibility of communication between the living and the dead. The two are not mutually exclusive". You are just a hypocrite. What would you say to somebody who said, "The Blessed Virgin is God like Jesus is. This is Catholic doctrine." It is not. The person is deluding themselves or lying which amounts to the same thing.

Religion thrives on irrational thinking and is based on feelings and has no real regard for plausibility - the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus is appalling. Matt you have that trait too. So you can't complain then if irrational Catholics keep trying to wreck LGBT rights. If you want to be irrational then why condemn others who do the same just because you don't like their irrationality?

Declaring yourself a member of the Catholic Church is giving the minimum of support for the Church as the Church can't exist without members. Financial support of the Church is giving more support to its anti-LGBT ethos than mere membership is. Paying the Peter's Pence to the pope every year is directly financing a ministry that does all it can to halt and reverse LGBT rights. Moreover it is financing a platform from which the pope speaks to the poor and the poorly educated woman and urges her to do nothing to protect herself from AIDS should she be forced to have sex. Matt if you won't divorce the Church at least do not give it money.

You are not your beliefs. A religion is a system of doctrine and morals and worship. You are not your religion. To say "I identify as a Catholic" is denying that. The Church itself correctly observes that it is wrong for people to identify themselves as gay people as if being gay is all they are about. The implication is that you are a human being and that is what you must identify as.

And is ticking No Religion in the census not embracing your true self at all?

The article only asked for LGBT's who haven't realised they shouldn't be identifying as Catholics on the form to click no religion. There is nothing stopping them from attending Mass. Some people like attending any kind of religious service, Mass, Protestant Service and Hindu Puja for the sense of transcendence. The polarisation need not happen. Do you really think the Catholic next door will hate you if you tick the No Religion box and attend Mass occasionally?

If a Church lets you believe what you want and be a full member the result is not a Church but a social club. The Church claims to be a voluntary organisation built on faith and held together by faith. That is why anybody that disagrees with the Church on an official teaching is automatically excommunicated.

Matt says "Gormley's proposal seems too pessimistic. No one should have to give up their faith in order to hold on to being gay."

Matt stop distorting. My article was addressed to LGBT people who do not believe in the Church or attend its worship who need to think if they can identify as Catholic. How dare you imply that people who tick the no religion box who no longer identify as Catholic are not embracing their true selves.

Also, you have already given up the Roman Catholic faith to hold on to being gay. You cherry-pick and have created a Roman Catholicism of your own. Your intellectual dishonesty is absurd.

I did not encourage the polarisation of religion and sexuality when I called on gay people who are not truly Catholic any more to stop ticking Roman Catholic on the census form. If I had surely it would be a matter of polarising not religion but one specific religion the Catholic religion.

Being gay and a good Catholic is impossible but you would still be a true Catholic as far as membership goes. Being gay and being a true Catholic is possible. Being a believer that it is not a sin for two men to go to bed and being a Catholic is not possible. You pretend there is no contradiction between being a gay man and a Catholic. To reject a religious teaching on homosexuality when it is that religions official teaching and when the religion claims that it is authorised to speak for God is to separate from that religion.

You have already given up your faith if you think that being gay is not a sin. The Church says the true Church has four marks - one, holy, Catholic and apostolic. It is one in faith - all members agree that the Catholic faith with its doctrines and ethics is true and that the Church cannot contradict its teaching but may grow in understanding it. It is holy which refers primarily to the doctrine and ethics of the Church. Even if Catholics are all bad, the principles at least are holy and the Church is called to be holy. Holy means to be separate and different. A Church that is a close match for the values of the secular world is not holy in any sense. The Church claims to be a church of sinners so the holiness refers principally to the teaching and the sacraments the Church provides. It is Catholic - Catholic means universal or meant for all people. A Catholic Church that accepted gay rights would not be Catholic any more for it would excuse the vast majority of sincere Catholics who oppose such rights. It is apostolic - meaning it accepts the teaching of the apostles and cannot change it for it was given once for all in the past. The Church may increase in understanding the faith but it cannot change it or contradict it. It is insanity to imagine the twelve apostles ever allowing homosexuality or ordaining practicing gay bishops. St Paul wrote in Romans 1 that those who burn with lust for the same sex have been abandoned by God because they are so sinful they are not worth bothering with and that is why they now suffer this lust. He also wrote that those who commit the sin of same sex intimacies are without excuse for God has planted his law in the heart. Thus it is denied that any person can sincerely believe that same-sex sexual activity is acceptable. You are not Catholic for none of the marks apply to you.

Your faith requires people to marry the once and if the marriage breaks up to remain faithful to one another. Dating and remarrying is only allowed if the spouse is dead. The Church says this is terribly hard but says Jesus' power gets people through it. You obviously think that because it can be hard to be a celibate, the gay person may engage in gay relationships and be a good Catholic. That doesn't look like faith to me. Jesus who stressed that the Church is to be one as intimately as he and God are one would frown on LGBT people for being at the centre of controversy and division in the Church.

Nobody should have to give up their faith to remain gay some say. It's not their faith but the Church's faith. If your faith has to be yours then you are your own religion. You pretend to support the Church and then you see it not as a Church but a collection of individuals. Some say nobody should have to give up their Catholic membership to be atheist!

NOTE: Helfaer's *The Psychology of Religious Doubt* asserts, "Generally, homosexual feelings and fantasies and feminine submissive longings, can be channeled into the relationship with God....The man's intensive love for Jesus may be a homosexual, narcissistic object choice, sometimes overriding any other object choice in the individual's life". See page 132. Jesus was a hypocrite for he demanded that he indeed be the only object choice and so he produced gays despite saying sex was between a man and his woman only in wedlock.