

## Victims of Political Correctness

Contributed by Rev Michael Bresciani  
Saturday, 31 March 2007

In the United States it is both legal and perfectly acceptable to say that homosexuality is not immoral before anyone with an ear to listen. It is also perfectly acceptable to the hearer or reader of such a statement to agree or completely disagree with the statement. Or is it?  
{mosbotwordcount}

In the United States it is both legal and perfectly acceptable to say that homosexuality is not immoral before anyone with an ear to listen. It is also perfectly acceptable to the hearer or reader of such a statement to agree or completely disagree with the statement. Or is it?

{bot\_wrgoogle}In fact it is not. While it has not become the law of the land to hold to an opposing opinion doesn't mean it cannot be stifled, refused and rejected depending what platform or what place the assertion is made.

The writer of the aforementioned statement was complaining about the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy in regards to homosexuality. He thought it was wrong to force the homosexual soldier to have to live a lie.

It is impossible to miss yet another double standard here that has emerged with the ongoing concept of political correctness.

I have written two books and I have hundreds of articles read throughout the world. I have columns online as well as articles in nationally syndicated periodicals and I have only had three articles rejected. The reasons, "not politically correct." The incorrectness sited was saying that homosexuality was immoral. No, I wasn't asked my opinion but I was told I couldn't "tell" it. Maybe I need help here but it sounds just like "six of one and a half dozen of the other" to me.

Being a Christian I cannot espouse or even suggest that homosexuals should be hated or harmed in any way whatsoever. To harm them would be clearly unlawful and immoral. It is an opinion not a battleaxe. If it is perceived as one then the kind of slander and character assassination that passes by political correctness proponents of the hour might be considered something akin to a nuclear weapon.

Few Americans have not heard the rantings of Charlie Sheen, Bill Maher, Sean Penn and Rosie O'Donnell regarding everyone from Jerry Falwell to President Bush.

The President has been called a murderer, a liar and some names I don't care to mention here. None of the chiefs or architects of political correctness had anything negative to say about these remarks. They are acceptable under PCs one sided definition. No one was censured for making these remarks and we can assume no ones written statement was excluded or deleted. Where then is the balance, where is the fairness, suffice it to say it is conspicuously missing.

Am I on a soap box? As long as my feet are planted here in America, you bet I am. I'm not mad at homosexuals I am rather quite displeased with the one sided and unreasonable double standards of political correctness. If that seems hard to understand remember that even as I write I have in mind previous experiments with political correctness that miserably failed. To be fair they did much more than fail because at the peak of its acceptance it cost the lives of millions of people.

Throughout history there have been despots, rulers and regimes that have decided what people could say or not say. In modern times that is often referred to as "the party line."

Nazi Germany had one, Communism had one and China's Mao had one. Has the "party line" shown up in America incognito, perhaps even clandestinely under a different name?

Do we need to be reminded that when taken seriously forcing people to mouth only "the party line" can and does cost millions of lives? Joseph Stalin alone is credited with the death of thirty million of his own countrymen for refusing to talk the right talk. In many cases their deaths were predicated only on a perceived truth and not based in proof that they ever spoke a single word against Stalin's policies.

The writer of the article previously mentioned in this article has a perfect right under the constitution to state his opinion and to put it forth with all argument and reason as he sees fit. Why is it that those with opposing views are getting censured more and more?

More people then ever are questioning both the meaning and the legality or constitutionality of the concept of "political correctness", among them of late has been highly respected Pastor John Hagee. He too is warning of the dangers of leaving this threat to freedom unchecked. Others are joining the ranks against this precursor to thought policing and I stand with them.

Suffice it to say that believers in the Christian faith that take their Bible seriously won't be saying a lot of things that can be considered "politically correct." The Bible has a message that can't be put into such a confining slot. The message of the Bible is neither modern nor ancient altogether but falls into the realm of the eternal. It holds a message for all times. Christ said "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away." Luke 21:33

Rev Bresciani is a Christian author and columnist. His articles on many important subjects are now read in every corner of the globe. For a list of subjects and news from around the world visit

<http://www.americanprophet.org>

