

## Preface

The Department of Music remains committed to ensuring the health and safety of all active participants, including students, faculty, staff, and guests. To that end, we instituted a semiannual lecture series during which professionals present valuable insight into caring for ourselves, alternating topics between issues of physical health and those of spiritual and emotional health.

While all topics pertaining to health and safety are timely, some circumstances arise in our local context, in our discipline, in our culture, and in our calling that warrant special and immediate attention. I believe the recent US Supreme Court ruling concerning same-gender marriages has resulted in such a circumstance.

As professing Christians and professional musicians, we live and work in a remarkably diverse setting. We believe one God exists, has created all things for His glory, has revealed Himself to us, and has the full authority to reign supreme over every aspect of our living. We also believe that humanity is fallen, choosing rebellion over submission and resulting in the desperate need for a cure. That cure is found in Christ alone. Yet, not all whom we serve or all with or for whom we work share our convictions. Nonetheless, we live among them and are called by our Lord to remain holy and to love as He loves us.

How, then, shall we live? Do we apply only for jobs where our views are allowed, respected, even applauded? Does such a place exist and, if so, will it survive? When we find that our colleagues hold opposing views regarding sexual identity and marital relationships, can we share our convictions? Should we? When our students reveal to us their wrestling through their own understandings of gender and sexuality, how do we listen, empathize, and guide? How do we pursue our vocation and hold to our convictions in a world that seems increasingly complex and hostile? How do we live wisely in an age of unreason?

These questions, or some form of them, are occupying at least a part of all of our thinking and are, most likely, generating some measure of concern and, perhaps, even unhealthy stress. I am grateful to Dr. Justin Barnard, then, for preparing this lecture as part of our series on Health and Safety and helping us process through our concerns. While the content of his message is sound, it is, for obvious reasons, incomplete. Our purpose is not to address each circumstance or to convince you that there is a single, correct manner to engage the musical world as a Believer. Rather, we desire to provide a catalyst for your careful thinking and cordial conversations. The landscape has forever changed and we hope to walk wisely in it. To that end, the following material is offered with gratitude, thanksgiving, and optimism.

Chris Mathews, Chair  
Department of Music

## After *Obergefell*: Living Wisely in an Age of Unreason

Justin D. Barnard

*Ubi amor, ibi oculus* – Richard of St. Victor (d. 1173)

Wisdom is a difficult gift to impart in a single essay. This is because wisdom is necessarily embodied. Those who would seek wisdom must procure it through sustained, incarnate, personal encounters with those who are wise. This means more than following someone on Twitter. Wisdom is transmitted through the fabric of living. While the existence of wisdom literature signals the possibility of codifying wise counsel in written form, it is worth noting that proverbs or other pithy sayings only make sense in light of the interpretive resources of lived experience. The latter is necessarily narrational. It's a story. So, since my goal here is to say something about wise living in an age of unreason, I begin with a bit of personal storytelling in the hopes that it will provide context for the counsel that follows.

In the fall of 1996, I enrolled, as a graduate student, at Florida State University (FSU). Within my first year of entering the Ph.D. program in philosophy, I discovered that I had entered a world that was somewhat different, socially and politically, from the space that I had inhabited as an undergraduate at Palm Beach Atlantic College – a small, private, Christian institution with Southern Baptist roots. Sex and sexual politics were at the heart of that difference.

Please don't misunderstand me here. I'm not suggesting that my transition from undergrad to graduate school represented some kind of loss of sexual innocence. This is not the story of a country mouse who leaves the unspoiled, virginal landscape of a small, Christian liberal arts college for the hedonistic Babylon of large, secular state university. Students at Palm Beach Atlantic were not unacquainted with sex. We talked about it. Some students were having it. And a handful were known for pushing the boundaries of traditional sexual identities – either as a matter of artistic expression or personal struggle. So, for me, the shift I experienced socially and politically in matriculating to FSU was not a transition from naiveté to worldliness.

Rather, the change was one of *emphasis* or *tone*. In college, sex and sexual politics were, for students and faculty alike, largely peripheral to our common life together as those engaged in pursuing learning. We did not ignore the realities of sex and sexual politics. (How could such things be ignored on a campus filled with hormonally-overcharged 18-22 year olds?) But they were not matters that consumed our attention, nor did a preoccupation with such things organize the very structure of our academic

inquiry. In short, as undergrads at Palm Beach Atlantic, we knew all about sex and sexual politics; but, we were generally liberated from taking such things too seriously.<sup>i</sup>

During my first year at FSU, I discovered that sex and sexual politics were *serious business*. To appreciate what a shock this was to me, you must know that I attended a large public high school in the late 1980s during the height of the “political correctness” movement about language. The champions of this cultural phenomenon were fueled by a cadre of “-isms” in historical and literary critical circles (e.g., feminism, Marxism, post-modernism, post-colonialism, etc.). Their goal was to expunge the English language of all of its racist, sexist, patriarchalist, and colonialist overtones. In its most radical forms, this involved, among many other things, alternate spellings of purportedly sexist terms: so, for example, the word “woman” would be spelled, “womyn” so as to disassociate the fairer sex from her rhetorical subjugation to men.

By the time I graduated from high school, political correctness about language was, for me, an intellectual fad that had come and gone. I was aware of (and I should add, not altogether insensitive to) the deep historic and philosophical impulses behind it. I knew that for a handful of my high school English teachers, stamping out male chauvinism was a matter of life and death. But I also knew better. I knew not to take all of this *too seriously*. After all, I was child of the culture of Saturday Night Live, the comedy of Eddie Murphy and Monty Python, and the great slapstick and farcical films of the 1980s and 90s. I had read, with some delight, all of James Finn Garner’s politically correct fairy tales and bedtime stories<sup>ii</sup> in which he satirizes this movement in his re-telling of classics. So, was I really supposed to take seriously the claim that all problems surrounding sex and sexual politics would go away if we simply spelled nicely?

Apparently, at Florida State University, I was. As a graduate teaching assistant, I was introduced to the “Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language” published by the American Philosophical Association.<sup>iii</sup> With great solemnity, our professor informed us that as we graded student papers, we, teaching assistants, should provide students with written correction in cases of problematic usage. She was not joking. I did not laugh. At FSU, I learned that sex and sexual politics were *serious business*. It was so serious that it organized the very structure of our shared academic inquiry.

Sex and sexual politics were also increasingly encroaching on the visible structure of our social life. One example of this was FSU’s initiative to create “Safe Zones” across campus. The effort to create Safe Zones was sponsored by the FSU Counseling Center. Those who opted to participate – faculty, staff, or graduate students – could attend an information session and subsequently display a small, relatively inconspicuous pink triangle magnet in their office. The magnet signaled to students who might identify as gay, lesbian, or bisexual that your office was a “safe zone” – a space in which a student might talk about personal matters of sexual identity in a supportive environment.

Many of my professors and colleagues attended the information sessions and displayed the Safe Zone insignias in their offices. After all, sex and sexual politics at FSU were *serious business*.

Nevertheless, as serious as things were, social and political navigation was fairly straightforward. At that time, to the extent that one felt discomfort about the seriousness of the sexual climate, at a place like FSU, one could, relatively easily, learn the socio-linguistic rules, keep “one’s head down” so to speak, and generally stay out of what might be perceived as harm’s way. After all, I wasn’t required to display a Safe Zone magnet, if I felt uncomfortable doing so. And since not everyone did, I could easily get away with opting out, without much fear of social reprisal.

Moreover, the “Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language” were fairly easy to master. This is because, at that time, you could count the categories for sexual identity on one hand. There were straights, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. That was about it. At least, one could satisfy the general cultural expectations by being aware of these four. And since I could count to five, I could handle the nuisance of navigating the imperial expectation that my language conform to the wishes of the gods of sex and sexual politics, provided that I kept one simple principle in mind: *straight males are losers*. As long as I followed the demands of this rule in how I wrote, what I said, and in my comportment, those at FSU who worshipped the gods of sex and sexual politics with utmost seriousness, generally left me alone.

Unfortunately, these gods – like all gods – are jealous. By the end of the first decade of the new century, I began to realize that they would not leave those who did not wish to offer the appropriate sacrifices alone. One catalyst for this realization was a 2009 email exchange that I had with a former graduate school colleague named Charles. In trolling the blogosphere, I discovered that Charles was behind a movement within the American Philosophical Association (APA) that eventually resulted in a major petition within the organization.<sup>iv</sup> Charles was arguing that some colleges and universities were not in compliance with the APA’s guidelines for non-discrimination in employment. Specifically, Charles claimed that schools that would not hire practicing homosexuals were violating the APA’s guidelines for non-discrimination.<sup>v</sup>

Since hundreds of professional academic philosophers worship the gods of sex and sexual politics with utmost seriousness, this was regarded as an offense requiring some form of censure. At the time, one idea being discussed was the possibility of marking such institutions with a sign in APA publications – some sort of asterisk, in effect, a Scarlett letter – to signify that they were not in compliance with APA guidelines for non-discrimination in employment. It would be a way of publicly identifying, and thus, publicly denouncing, those colleges and universities whose employment practices did not follow what the gods of sex and sexual politics demanded in the form of right worship. As it turns out, today, such institutions are simply not allowed to place job ads with the APA.<sup>vi</sup>

In my 2009 email exchange with Charles, I did my best to argue against the effort that he was leading to publicly censure religiously-based institutions such as Union University (where I was teaching at the time). I offered carefully articulated reasons, and I added my signature to a counter-petition that was put together by a small, but courageous minority within the profession who were arguing for a genuinely pluralistic culture in the world of professional academic philosophy. But our arguments, however well-reasoned, were to little avail. The world was changing. And the space that once existed for those who did not wish to worship the gods of sex and sexual politics was closing rapidly.

Today, that space is effectively closed. The recent decision of the US Supreme Court in *Obergefell v. Hodges*<sup>vii</sup> signals the culmination of a massive cultural shift, one which those who hold traditional views about human sexuality<sup>viii</sup> will increasingly experience in two specific ways. Those who hold traditional views about human sexuality must recognize the fact that their cultural experience will increasingly be one of *complexity* and of *hostility*. Consequently, the task of learning how to navigate in a healthy, constructive way, in a world that is increasingly complex and hostile with respect to traditional sexual norms, is an urgent one.

First, consider complexity. Less than 20 years ago, the scope of public categorical concern, when it came to matters of sexual identity, was relatively limited. Males were males. Females were females. It was simply that some were straight, some gay, some lesbian, and some bisexual. Today, the alphabet of sexual identity continues to proliferate with no clear end in sight.

The Office of Residential Life at an elite liberal arts college recently advertised a new community called “Open House.” Open House was advertised as a safe space for “Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Transsexual Queer, Questioning, Flexual, Asexual, Polyamorous, Bondage/Disciple, Dominance/Submission, Sadism/Masochism.” In case you’re keeping count, that’s L,G,B,T,TQ,Q,F,A,P,BD,SM. They explain:

Open House works to be a welcoming space for non-normative sexuality and gender minorities, acknowledging this task is one of perpetual motion and action. The goals of Open House include generating interest in the celebration of queer life from the social to the political to the academic. Queer is a word with many meanings, and we embrace all and none of them. Open House works to create a Wesleyan community that appreciates the variety and the vivacity of gender, sex, and sexuality, and we work to be an anchor of the amorphous, chaotic, and beautiful queer community.<sup>ix</sup>

The point here is not to pass judgment on whether the presence of such communities on college and university campuses is a good sign or a bad one.<sup>x</sup> The point is that those who hold traditional views about human sexuality must quickly begin to recognize the simple fact that the world we now inhabit will, at least for the

near future, be characterized by increasing *complexity* when it comes to sex and sexual politics. This is simply a reality.

To get a sense of just how complex things are getting, consider the fact that in 2014, the historically female Mount Holyoke College announced that in addition to admitting women and transgendered men (i.e., female-to-male transgendered persons), it would now begin admitting transgendered women (i.e., male-to-female transgendered persons). So, according to the College's website:

The following academically qualified students can apply for admission consideration:

- Biologically born female; identifies as a woman
- Biologically born female; identifies as a man
- Biologically born female; identifies as other/they/ze
- Biologically born female; does not identify as either woman or man
- Biologically born male; identifies as woman
- Biologically born male; identifies as other/they/ze and when "other/they" identity includes woman
- Biologically born with both male and female anatomy (Intersex); identifies as a woman

The following academically qualified students cannot apply for admission consideration:

- Biologically born male; identifies as man<sup>xi</sup>

Again, the point here is not to indicate whether places like Mount Holyoke or the other elite women's colleges like Smith, Wellesley, Bryn Mawr, or Barnard who have followed suit have lost their collective minds.<sup>xii</sup> The point is that those who hold traditional views about human sexuality must begin to recognize that this is the sort of *complexity* that now characterizes our culture's view of sex and sexual politics.

Undoubtedly, the complexity itself will be challenging enough. However, the reality is that increasing complexity will be accompanied by the experience of increasing hostility toward those who hold traditional views about human sexuality. Obviously, some of this hostility may take the form of legal or governmental action, instances of which are already well-known. So, for example, small, independent, even family-owned businesses may increasingly find themselves marginalized, if not shut down, for their refusal to participate in public ceremonies that honor the cultural gods of sex and sexual politics.<sup>xiii</sup> Individuals may find themselves under enormous social or economic pressure within their spheres of employment to conform not merely to behavioral expectations but to fundamental convictions that are shaped by what these cultural gods demand.<sup>xiv</sup>

Among other signs, the evidence for this is a precipitous rise in attention being given to so-called acts of "microaggression."<sup>xv</sup> Microaggression purportedly occurs when one person uses subtle, intentional or even unintentional, verbal or non-verbal

cues to communicate in a negative, hostile, or derogatory way toward another. For example, my earlier use of the term “straight” in contrast with “gay, lesbian, or bisexual” would be regarded by some as an act of microaggression. This is because the term “straight” connotes something that is in good moral order, implying that those who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual are *not* in good moral order. In some contexts, my use of such language would be regarded as an act of hostility toward those who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered. In such contexts, those guilty of such microaggressions may find themselves on the receiving end of open, social scorn or worse.<sup>xvi</sup>

The point here is not to assess whether our present cultural obsession with rhetorical acts of microaggression is a welcome development or not.<sup>xvii</sup> The point is rather that those who hold traditional views about human sexuality must begin to recognize the depths of the increasing hostility and the open, social scorn they are likely to face. You will offend in ways you can’t now imagine, perhaps almost every time you open your mouth. And your offenses will be, at least for the near future, largely unforgivable in the eyes of our culture.

So, how are those who hold traditional views about human sexuality to navigate in a culture of both increasing complexity and increasing hostility?

The short answer is *wisely*. In fact, all that follows is really nothing more than a reflection on Jesus’s injunction to be “as wise as serpents and as gentle as doves.”<sup>xviii</sup> Still, merely telling someone to live wisely falls short of the sort of specific advice that people generally seek when they’re asking for direction in life. So, in what remains, I aim to say a bit more about what living wisely looks like in response to this particular set of challenges.

To begin, the one who is wise understands that increasing complexity often induces confusion. Specifically, complexity in matters of sexual politics and sexual identities will often engender confusion in two areas: first, in conversation, and second, in people’s lives. Knowing this, the fundamental posture of one who is wise – the first act, as it were, of every engagement with another human being – will be to *seek clarity*. Because we are living in a world where, in our social interactions, almost nothing can be taken for granted, the wise person simply won’t take anything for granted. The wise do not presume to understand; they seek to clarify. This requires the discipline of keeping one’s preferred metaphysical categories – i.e., the concepts through which one views the world – close to the vest, so to speak. In practical terms, it means that when you meet someone, you should not presume that they will think or believe like you do, or that they will understand the world in the same way that you do. If anything, you’re safer presuming that they don’t, until you discover otherwise. And the road to that discovery is asking questions that seek to clarify and patiently listening to responses in a way that withholds judgment.

The practice I am describing may sound simple. But do not be deceived by the simplicity of the description. In practice, the task is enormous, almost impossibly difficult. In the history of the world, there are, arguably, only two people who embodied what I am describing in near perfect terms: Jesus of Nazareth and the ancient Greek philosopher, Socrates. Both mastered the art of asking clarifying questions – questions which sought to resolve rhetorical confusion without imposing a heavy-handed, contentious spirit on the conversation. The clarity achieved by their questions was breathtaking. Sometimes, they brought moral clarity to a legal or civil dispute. Sometimes, they brought political clarity to a conversation about authority. Sometimes, they brought logical clarity to a matter of conceptual confusion. Sometimes Socrates, in particular, would simply clarify that the person to whom he was speaking had no idea what he was talking about. But they always employed questions, questions with a view toward clarification. And the questions were asked with a patient, thoughtful, gracious, gentle, and winsome spirit.

Now, lest one get the wrong impression, let me make it clear that I am not naïve. I am *not* suggesting that if we just learn to ask questions and listen patiently, that complexity and hostility in matters of human sexuality will go away, and that we will all begin to live in perfect harmony. On the contrary, the better one becomes at asking questions that bring clarity in the midst of deep rhetorical confusion, the more likely that one will face deep hostility. Both Jesus and Socrates were so good at it, they were killed for it! Despite the winsomeness of their clarifying questions, they regularly angered those with whom they came into contact. And despite (or perhaps because of) your best efforts, you may find yourself in this situation as well.

Nevertheless, it's worth remembering a few important aspects of the public lives of these two luminous figures. First, both of them radically and permanently changed the course of human history. Yet, neither of them published a book, wrote a blog, had a Twitter or Facebook account, or held political office. In fact, they mostly just walked around and talked to a handful of people in a relatively small geographic region of the world. Second, despite the enemies they made, both Jesus and Socrates still touched the lives of a few people who crossed their paths in profound ways.<sup>xix</sup> And in some cases, that profound touch was directly attributable to the clarifying questions they asked. Think, for example, of Jesus's encounter with the Samaritan woman at the well or the woman caught in adultery.<sup>xx</sup>

In the midst of our present confusion over matters of sexual identity, the wise person will learn to ask questions that clarify. In conversations that are confused and confusing, this will always bring light. At times, that light may ultimately be unwelcome, and simply generate heat, just as it did for Socrates and Jesus. Though at other times, the clarity that good questions can bring may provide exactly the sort of balm that a hurting soul needs. So, my first bit of practical wisdom is this. *Stop telling and start learning how to ask.*



But what does one do in the face of hostility that does not seem to go away? Is there any response beyond listening patiently that may assuage or even defuse the increasing cultural hostility toward traditional views about human sexuality?

I hesitate to offer an unqualified “Yes” in response to this question. By its very nature, the hostility that arises out of the unreason of our age may not be the sort of animus that is susceptible to being quelled by cooler heads and calmer passions. Christ conducted Himself as a Lamb before His slaughterers. He was slaughtered nonetheless. Still, the consequences of His example are the grounds for cultural hope. So, we would do well to consider what possibilities exist for quelling the cultural tides of hostility.

This must begin with a sober assessment of the source of this hostility. Let us take stock. We are living in a culture that is committed to the maximization of self-realization, of self-definition and self-expression.<sup>xxi</sup> Our culture will not tolerate anything that appears to infringe on the maximization of self-realization, especially in the area of sexual identity and sexual expression. In cases of conflict between sexual freedom and other forms of self-realization, sex will always win.<sup>xxii</sup> This *is* the reality at the cultural level.

But on the personal level, not everyone with whom you interact will, in fact, make the sorts of demands that typically accompany the maximization of self-realization. That is, not every person will demand that you organize your life around the maximal realization of their own sexual identity and expression. In fact, some may express their sexual identity not in terms of hostility, but in terms of confusion. This should not surprise us. Someone shaped by the culture of *Glee*, whether he or she realizes it or not, has been formed to believe that matters of sexual identity and expression are of the utmost concern when it comes to self-realization. For some, this is a burden greater than they can bear. Thus, the very source of the cultural hostility becomes, for them, an occasion for personal confusion.

This is the point at which meaningful engagement, against the cultural hostility, is possible. It is here, at the level of personal relationships, that we encounter a window of opportunity to act so as to defuse hostility. Very simply, in our personal interaction with others, we must seek to love them in ways that deeply affirms their value as human beings made in the image of God, *while simultaneously downplaying* the significance they may attach to the role that their professed sexual identity has in conferring that value.

Let us be clear. I am not suggesting that this proposed downplaying take the form of direct, verbal assaults on a professed sexual identity. When someone you meet self-identifies as gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered, or any other future permutation of the ever-proliferating sexual alphabet, you should never respond with something like: “Well, that doesn’t really matter,” or “That’s not really important to me.” Rather, downplaying is *indirect*. It results from actively highlighting those aspects of a person’s

humanity that are not tied to whatever they may be willfully asserting or quietly struggling with regarding their sexual identity.

Because human beings are made in the image of God, our social interaction with others ought to be a source of endless delight. Those who are wise know how to rejoice in those aspects of another person's humanity that are the good gifts of a loving Creator. Quite often, attentiveness to these gifts results in the discovery of shared interests. And it is those shared interests that can become the basis for affirming the value of another human being made in the image of God in way that does not call attention to a professed sexual identity as the source of that value. I firmly believe that this space of loving personal engagement is the window of opportunity for the de-escalation of cultural hostility.

One of the greatest gifts that can form the basis of a shared interest is the gift of music and the beauty toward which it lifts the hearts of those pierced by its witness. Many of you here today either have or will organize a significant portion of your life around the gift of music. For this reason, many of you are or will be situated so as to embody the kind of wisdom I have been describing in the face of increasing cultural complexity and hostility. Such wisdom will, of course, seek clarity through questions that take a genuine interest in seeking the truth. But even more, such wisdom will delight in the manifold ways in which a gracious Creator distributes His musical gifts to the creatures He has made in His image.

In an age of unreason, gifts of artistic expression – which bear witness to a Beauty beyond themselves – may hold the greatest promise when it comes to piercing hearts that have been clouded by darkened minds. By loving those who love music, and more importantly, by loving the love that they have for music, you direct the heart of another toward something beyond the self. And in so doing, you bear witness to the form of life by which the gods of sex and sexual politics will ultimately be cast down. Specifically, the way to life is to die to self. And for some, dying to self might just well begin with the realization that the beauty of music is a gift for which the only appropriate response is gratitude toward the Giver. Those who live wisely in an age of unreason will help move others toward this end.

It is likely that this essay has raised more questions than it has answered. Moreover, there are a host of important questions that this essay has not addressed at all. For example, I have not in any way addressed how matters of sexual identity should play themselves out in church life. I have not dealt with how to make practical judgments about forming professional alliances or partnerships and whether/when to break them. I have not provided guidance for thinking through such things as terms of employment or the conditions under which one who holds a traditional perspective on human sexuality ought to disassociate from some business or professional organization. These are all important matters to consider when it comes to living wisely in an age of unreason. For there will surely be occasions when, despite our best efforts to bring

clarity while loving graciously, we may find ourselves in a position of having to say: “I am sorry, as much as I care for you personally, I cannot participate in *that* . . .” And we will need all the wisdom we can muster to know when and where this must be said and how to say it well.

In the meantime, I hope that what has been said here provides a gesture towards a faithful trajectory. The complexity and hostility of this age of unreason is producing a culture of ugliness. But we should remain hopeful that the ugliness can be shattered when it is pierced by the beauty of luminous witness. Aspire to possess an intellect flooded with the Light of piercing clarity, a heart overflowing with a love for piercing Beauty, and life animated with a passion for the Pierced One. Piercing beauty will save the world<sup>xxiii</sup> – even in an age of unreason.

*Soli Deo gloria*

### **Biographical Note**

Justin D. Barnard is Associate Dean in the Institute for Intellectual Discipleship and Associate Professor of Philosophy in the Honors Community at Union University in Jackson, Tennessee. His wide-ranging academic interests include such areas as ethics and culture, philosophical issues in science, religion, and technology, and the work of C.S. Lewis. In addition to his extensive teaching experience in ethics and moral philosophy, Dr. Barnard has spoken to academic and lay audiences, on such topics as the nature of marriage, human sexuality, and the philosophical origins and cultural consequences of the sexual revolution. Recently, he was an invited participant in a forum on human sexuality sponsored by *The Colossian Forum*, a Michigan-based organization dedicated to helping churches address divisive cultural issues in Christ-honoring ways. Dr. Barnard holds an M.A. and Ph.D. in philosophy from The Florida State University. He and his wife, Tracie, have two sons. They are active participants in the life and ministry of First Baptist Church in Jackson, Tennessee.

---

<sup>i</sup> In his chapter on Eros in *The Four Loves*, C.S. Lewis reflects: “We must not be totally serious about Venus [Lewis’s image for sexual desire]. Indeed we can’t be totally serious without doing violence to our humanity.” See C.S. Lewis, *The Four Loves* (New York: Harcourt, 1988), especially pages 96-106.

<sup>ii</sup> See James Finn Garner, *Politically Correct Bedtime Stories: Modern Tales for Our Life & Times*, New York: Macmillan, 1994.

<sup>iii</sup> See Virginia L. Warren, “Guidelines for Non-Sexist Use of Language,” *American Philosophical Association*, <<http://www.apaonline.org/?page=nonsexist>> (17 August 2015).

<sup>iv</sup> See Brian Leiter, “Philosophy Departments That Advertise Through the APA But Violate Its Anti-discrimination Policies,” *Leiter Reports: A Philosophy Blog*, 8 May 2007, <[http://leiterreports.typepad.com/blog/2007/05/philosophy\\_depa.html](http://leiterreports.typepad.com/blog/2007/05/philosophy_depa.html)> (19 August 2015).

<sup>v</sup> See Brian Leiter, “The APA and Discrimination Against Homosexuals . . . Again,” *Leiter Reports: A Philosophy Blog*, 12 February 2009, <<http://leiterreports.typepad.com/blog/2009/02/the-apa-and-discrimination-against-homosexualsagain.html>> (19 August 2015).

<sup>vi</sup> The American Philosophical Association jobs page now includes the following statement in bold: “Job seekers should be aware that ads for institutions and positions that do not comply with the APA’s non-discrimination statement are not posted on PhilJobs: Jobs for Philosophers.” See “PhilJobs: Jobs for Philosophers,” *American Philosophical Association*, <[http://www.apaonline.org/?page=pj\\_jfp](http://www.apaonline.org/?page=pj_jfp)> (17 August 2015).

<sup>vii</sup> For a helpful synopsis of the key issues in this US Supreme Court decision, see Joe Carter, “Explainer: What You Should Know About the Supreme Court Same-Sex Marriage Ruling,” *Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 26 June 2015, <<https://erlc.com/article/explainer-what-you-should-know-about-the-supreme-court-same-sex-marriage-ru>> (17 August 2015).

<sup>viii</sup> By “traditional views about human sexuality” I mean those who believe that, for human beings, made in the image of God, the complementary genders, male and female, are normatively ordered toward each other (“the two shall become one flesh”) for the sake of (where individuals are so called) marital union and the raising of any children that may result therefrom. Since marriage is defined by this complementarity, those who hold traditional views about human sexuality regard other gender or marital expressions as falling outside of this normative order.

<sup>ix</sup> See “Open House,” *Program Housing: Office of Residential Life*, <[http://www.wesleyan.edu/reslife/housing/program/open\\_house.htm](http://www.wesleyan.edu/reslife/housing/program/open_house.htm)> (17 August 2015). Interestingly, Wesleyan University initially advertised “Open House” using the litany of sexual identities cited above. However, it appears that in the wake of public criticism, the specific list of various gender possibilities has been removed from the website. For a trenchant critique of Wesleyan’s embrace of proliferating sexual identities, see Carl Trueman, “Congratulating Wesleyan,” *First Things*, 23 February 2015, <<http://www.firstthings.com/blogs/firstthoughts/2015/02/congratulating-wesleyan>> (17 August 2015).

<sup>x</sup> For the record, I find this phenomenon tragic.

---

<sup>xi</sup> See “Admission of Transgendered Students,” *Mount Holyoke College*, <<https://www.mtholyoke.edu/policies/admission-transgender-students>> (17 August 2015).

<sup>xii</sup> For the record, I believe they have.

<sup>xiii</sup> As just one example of an increasing number of such cases around the time at which this essay was being written, see Erik Eckholm, “Colorado Court Rules Against Baker Who Refused to Serve Same-Sex Couples,” *New York Times*, 13 August 2015, <<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/14/us/colorado-court-rules-against-baker-who-refused-to-serve-same-sex-couples.html>> (17 August 2015).

<sup>xiv</sup> Although his resignation was voluntary, Mozilla CEO Brendan Eich found himself and his company under enormous social and financial pressure when his political donation to California’s Proposition 8 legislation was disclosed. The circumstances of his departure from Mozilla are documented on the company’s website. See “FAQ on CEO Resignation,” *The Mozilla Blog*, 5 April 2014, <<https://blog.mozilla.org/blog/2014/04/05/faq-on-ceo-resignation/>> (17 August 2015).

<sup>xv</sup> For a helpful perspective on this phenomenon, see Greg Lukianoff and Jonathan Haidt, “The Coddling of the American Mind,” *The Atlantic*, September 2015, <<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/>> (17 August 2015).

<sup>xvi</sup> Incidentally, it is worth noting that the current oath taken by all of the Boys Scouts of America (BSA) includes a promise to be “morally straight.” In light of the BSA’s recent moves to permit openly gay members and leaders, I predict that it will not be long before this particular language in the Scout Oath changes. Gay members and leaders in the BSA will point out its historically “offensive” connotations, with respect to same-sex orientation and behavior and will demand that it be changed.

<sup>xvii</sup> For the record, while the concern for speaking in gracious and edifying ways is a good one, the moral compass upon which acts of microaggression are judged is fundamentally flawed.

<sup>xviii</sup> In the English Standard Version, Matthew 10:16 reads, “Behold, I am sending you out as sheep in the midst of wolves, so be wise as serpents and innocent as doves.” In the text above, I have substituted “gentle” for “innocent” favoring the King James term “harmless”. In this instance, I believe that the KJV has better captured the sense.

<sup>xix</sup> For an illustration of the profound personal impact of Socrates’s life, see Plato’s *Crito*.

<sup>xx</sup> See John 4:1-45 and John 7:53-8:12

<sup>xxi</sup> This, of course, is now enshrined in that infamous statement from Justice Kennedy’s majority opinion in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* (1992): “At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.”

<sup>xxii</sup> As evidence for this claim, witness the recent differences in the cultural reception for Bruce “Caitlyn” Jenner’s re-imagined identity as a woman, as opposed to the social scorn heaped upon Rachel Dolezal for her professed identity as a black woman.

---

<sup>xxiii</sup> For an illuminating treatment of this idea, see Ralph C. Wood, "The Crucified Beauty That Will Save the World," 20 October 2011, < <http://www.uu.edu/audio/detail.cfm?ID=608> > (27 August 2015).