



## THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY GESTAPO— FRINGE EXTREMISTS IN THE HOMOSEXUAL MOVEMENT

The Gestapo in Nazi Germany entered Jewish-owned shops to intimidate and demolish them. To do so, they had the full support of the state, the courts and the media to carry out their mission.

Today, we are witnessing a similar attempt in Canada, the U.S. and the U.K. to intimidate and demolish businesses — only this time, it is not Jews who are being persecuted, but Christian men and women.

Today's apparent Gestapo are the fringe extremists in the homosexual movement and their supporters, who target Christian businesses, such as flower shops, print shops, bakeries, church halls, etc. to demand they supply services for their same-sex activities, such as same-sex marriages and receptions: These activists do so with full knowledge that the owners of these shops would be in contravention of the principles of their Christian faith. When refused the service, the activists then report to the Human Rights Commission and lay a complaint of discrimination against the offenders, knowing that the Commission will obligingly accept their complaint, and inevitably fine the Christian businesses. The punitive fines are designed to put the Christian shops out of business. If the shop owner appeals to the courts, the latter, with rare exceptions, support the discrimination order and the imposition of fines. The media, of course, huff and puff indignantly at the grossness of the supposed offence, and support the complainants. In short, the entire apparatus of the state, together with the media, fully support the persecution of the Christian business owner who only wishes to live by his/her faith. There is no attempt to balance the harm caused to the integrity of the Christian individual forced to act contrary to his conscience, as opposed to the temporary inconvenience caused to the same-sex couple, who can easily obtain the desired services elsewhere.

### THE FALSENESS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

The Supreme Court of Canada has declared that there is supposedly no hierarchy of rights under Canada's Charter of Rights. However, time and time again, in practice, it has ruled otherwise: freedom of religion, written into the Charter

in two different sections by Parliament, has been pushed aside by sexual orientation, that was, in fact, imposed on the public by being written into the Charter by the whim of the court and included by way of a profoundly undemocratic procedure in the *Canadian Human Rights Act* under Liberal Minister of Justice Alan Rock.

### FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION DENIED

Further, not only is it unwise to deny services to homosexuals contrary to one's religious faith, it is also unwise to express any opinion at all opposing the homosexual agenda. In the Whatcott case (2013), even though Mr. Whatcott presented carefully researched statistics showing a higher incidence of pedophilia among homosexuals than among heterosexuals, the Supreme Court of Canada declared such evidence as "hate" and found Mr. Whatcott guilty of distributing hate literature contrary to the Criminal Code. The court also decided that although Biblical passages, beliefs and principles may be expressed, this did not mean that religious interpretations of these principles cannot be considered "hate". That is, a pastor claiming that homosexuality is a sin and a destructive and evil force in society may be regarded as promoting hate. This Supreme Court decision also denied the Christian belief that one can "hate the sin, not the sinner" as a defence in a "hate" crime. In effect, the Supreme Court held that criticism of a lifestyle can now be treated as hateful speech against homosexuals, even though there is no actual "hate" being expressed.

## CONTENTS

THE 21 <sup>ST</sup> CENTURY GESTAPO—FRINGE EXTREMISTS IN THE HOMOSEXUAL MOVEMENT .....	PAGE 1
SAME-SEX MARRIAGE HITS A ROAD BLOCK .....	PAGE 2
FOR A CHANGE THE UN DOES SOMETHING RIGHT .....	PAGE 3
THE LEFT PLANTS FALSEHOODS TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC .....	PAGE 4

## REAL WOMEN ATTACKED

An example of a fabricated `hate` occurred in August 2013 when REAL Women objected to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, John Baird, funding, with tax-payer's money, a homosexual activist group in Uganda. We also questioned the Minister's attempt to force western policies on homosexuality on Third World countries, contrary to their faith and culture.

As a result, homosexual activists and the media descended on REAL Women with a vengeance. However, we were not swayed by their attempt to intimidate us. REAL Women is still in business and continues to speak out on the inconvenient truths of homosexuality and other issues.

## TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY

The horrendous attack on the Christian Trinity Western University, located in Langley, British Columbia, for establishing a law school, is yet another disgusting example of the Gestapo and its supporters at work. Trinity Western requires its students to sign a "covenant" pledging to reserve sexual intimacy for marriage, and has defined marriage as a union between a man and a woman. Such a statement was intolerable to the fringe extremists who set about to destroy the emerging law school. When the benchers of the B.C. Law Society decided to accredit the new law school despite this pressure, the attackers then turned to the provincial law societies demanding they prohibit graduates of the Christian law school from practicing law in their respective provinces. Two law societies, in Nova Scotia and Ontario, succumbed to these demands, but the other provincial law societies refused to submit to such bigoted, anti-Christian pressure. Trinity Western has now brought a legal action against the two bigoted, provincial law societies.

## NANAIMO, BRITISH COLUMBIA CITY COUNCIL

An incredible attack on Christianity by the Nanaimo B.C. City Council took place on May 5, 2014. It is a day that should stand out as a Day of Infamy in Canada. On that day, a Council member, Fred Pattje, introduced a surprise motion to cancel the agreement the Council had made, to rent out the City owned Vancouver Island Convention

Centre, to a conference to take place four days later on May 9. The conference, called "Leadercast", based in Atlanta, Georgia, had scheduled world-class speakers, such as former First Lady, Laura Bush and South African Nobel Prize laureate Bishop Desmond Tutu to discuss leadership, not homosexuality. The Nanaimo Council took offence, however, that this leadership conference scheduled to be podcast, had, as one of its sponsors, a U.S. restaurant chain, Chick-fil-A, whose CEO had publicly supported marriage as a union between one man and one woman. According to the Nanaimo councilors, who voted 8 to 1 to cancel the agreement, the city must ban "any events that are associated with organizations or people that promote or have a history of divisiveness, homophobia, or other expressions of hate". According to another councilor, Jim Kipp, banning the event was no worse than banning an organized crime ring, and the Christian view of marriage should "almost be a criminal point of view in this day and age". He also stated that the proposed event was comparable to the Nigerian terrorist group Boko Haram.

The mainstream media ignored the bullying tactics by this wildly bigoted city council. It was the conservative Sun News commentator, Ezra Levant, who publicized this anti-Christian flame-out. He also drafted a petition demanding that the ban be repealed. Mr. Levant's Sun News Network TV show on the subject went viral. The Nanaimo City Council was picketed and objections poured into the council. A lawsuit was threatened by lawyer, John Carpay, a leading civil liberties lawyer with the Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms. In view of the barrage of condemnation by the public on this ill-considered, bigoted motion, the Nanaimo City Council, on July 3rd, 2014, repealed the motion. The damage, however, had been done as the conference was cancelled, at a financial loss.

How much longer will decent citizens permit the homosexual Gestapo to dominate their personal faith and morals? Such outrageous behavior has to be stopped. We can no longer remain as silent witnesses or victims of these bully tactics being used to control our faith and public behavior. The longer the bullying continues, the bolder these bigots will become. †

# SAME-SEX MARRIAGE HITS A ROAD BLOCK

**The European Court of Human Rights was unequivocal that European human rights laws do NOT mandate same-sex marriage.**

Hopes that the European Court of Human Rights, the highest human rights court in Europe, would order the 28 member European Union (EU) to legalize same-sex marriage were shattered in July 2014.

The European Court of Human Rights, instead, was unequivocal that European human rights laws do NOT mandate same-sex marriage. It confirmed that the protection of the traditional institution of marriage between a man and a woman is a valid state interest, and it implicitly endorsed the view that relations between same-sex couples are not identical to marriage between a man and a woman, whose relationship may be treated differently in law.

This ruling was a bitter blow to homosexual activists, who had anticipated a different ruling, which they hoped would force same-sex marriage down the throats of a reluctant EU. They had hoped, in effect, to follow the precedent set by homosexual activists in the U.S. and Canada, who have used judicial activism to force, state by state and province by province, same-sex marriage on the public, contrary to the consensus of the public.

While carrying out this strategy, the mainstream media in the U.S., Canada and Europe, attempted to further push the momentum for same-sex marriage and social and economic rights for lesbians, gays, homosexuals and transsexuals (LGBT) by claiming that the momentum for the establishment of these rights is unstoppable. This is not the case. Over half of U.S. states still define marriage as the union of a man and a woman. In Europe, constitutional amendments to preclude same-sex marriage have occurred in Croatia, Hungary, Slovakia, Finland, Poland and Romania. The Italian Constitutional Court, as well as the Constitutional Court in India, have both rejected same-sex marriage.

The media are attempting to invigorate their unsavory support for same-sex marriage and LGBT rights by ignoring objective truths on the subject and the public's opinion on these issues. They do so by relentlessly publishing so-called "scientific opinion polls".

## CONTEMPORARY POLLING

These polls are fueled by partisan think tanks, with slanted questions, in order to achieve the desired response. Polling companies, however, are hampered today by the reality that the public's opinions are difficult to obtain since more homes use cell phones only and not mainline telephone lines where they could be more easily reached.

Also, the response rate has fallen dramatically in the last 20 years. The majority of people either don't pick up the phone or hang up. The response rate for automated calls is even lower than for human interviewers. The New York Times and other U.S. news organizations refuse to publish automated polls because anyone of any age can pick up the phone and push buttons. Also, before pollsters release their final numbers they have to carry out their "weighing" of the numbers. That is, i.e. adjust the numbers to reflect the makeup of the broader population. The latter is not exactly a precise science.

This all explains the widely differing poll numbers. As someone explained, pollsters are like weather broadcasters: they are usually wrong, but they still get to keep their jobs!

The courts, the media and the pollsters in Europe, the U.S. and Canada have done their utmost to trick the public into believing that same-sex marriage and LGBT rights are inevitable. They are wrong. †

## FOR A CHANGE, THE UN DOES SOMETHING RIGHT

**The resolution for the traditional definition of the family easily passed, with 26 votes for, 14 against, and 6 abstentions.... [I]t was greeted by thunderous applause.**

The UN Human Rights Council, located in Geneva, Switzerland is some weird agency. Many of its 47-nation council members are as far removed from human rights and democracy as can possibly be imagined.

It is astonishing that this Council even has the nerve to call itself a "human rights" council with members sitting on it from China, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Congo, Algeria, Viet Nam, United Arab Emirates and Kuwait.

With so many members from the Muslim world sitting on the Council, Israel has served as a punching bag for the Council's resolutions. Israel, it seems, can do nothing right and is always at fault, but the Palestinian Authority and Hamas can do almost no wrong.

On the other side of the coin, however, with so many Muslim, African and Asian members on the Council, it has remained solidly in support of the natural family, traditional values and is strongly opposed to western ideas on homosexual marriage and special rights for homosexuals.

This was evidenced on June 26, 2014 when the Council adopted a resolution on "Protection of the Family", which provided for the traditional definition of the family. The resolution also stated that the family was the "natural and fundamental unit of society" and the "natural environment" for the education and development of children.

The United States and all the seven (7) members of the EU and some Latin American countries on the Council rejected this definition, claiming that it imposed a single model of family and tried to qualify the resolution by inserting the expression "various forms of a family". This latter definition has been introduced at the UN many times since 1994, in an attempt to give recognition to cohabiting individuals of the same sex which, if successful, would then have provided an international enforceable right for same-sex marriage.

The resolution for the traditional definition of the family easily passed, with 26 votes for, 14 against, and 6 abstentions. When the vote was announced at the Council, it was greeted by thunderous applause.

This vote also reflects the fact that the influence of the Western world has been greatly undermined at the UN and elsewhere. African, Asian and Middle East countries have made it clear that they will no longer be intimidated by the West with its decadent values. †

# THE LEFT PLANTS FALSEHOODS TO MISLEAD THE PUBLIC

**[F]alsehoods promoted by the left and relentlessly amplified, like a megaphone, by the mainstream media, are constantly repeated so that they become accepted dogma, or perceived as conventional wisdom, no longer to be questioned by the public. We should not be fooled by this attempt to manipulate us.**

One should be skeptical about the information provided by the mainstream media. This is due to the fact that the media plant falsehoods in order to promote left wing/progressive policies to mislead the public. That is, the media believe that the public can be influenced by falsehoods if they are repeated often enough. As a result, these falsehoods promoted by the left and relentlessly amplified, like a megaphone, by the mainstream media, are constantly repeated so that they become accepted dogma, or perceived as conventional wisdom, no longer to be questioned by the public. We should not be fooled by this attempt to manipulate us.

Some of these planted falsehoods are as follows:

## **I. Income Splitting Will Only Help Upper Income Families**

Left-wing interest groups and feminists loudly objected to income splitting for families with children under 18, promised by Prime Minister Harper during the 2011 federal election if the budget is balanced. The latter is likely to occur in 2015, and, accordingly, the howls of dissent against income splitting have resounded across the land. For example, the left-wing Broadbent Institute claims that income splitting will disproportionately benefit only a small number of Canadians, while ignoring lower income families. In reaching this conclusion, the Institute took into consideration all families - even those who pay no income tax, families with no young children, single parents, etc. Of course, such families won't benefit from income splitting! However, they do receive other benefits not available to many single-income families.

A single-income family usually pays much higher taxes when compared to a two-income family with the same household income. Splitting the income for tax purposes with a lower income spouse, or non-working spouse in families with children 18 years or younger, would benefit 46% of families (nearly half of families with children under 18 years of age). That's a lot of families. Feminists call income splitting "bribing women to stay at home" (they want all women in the paid work force and not dependent on a male earner). Corporations also don't like income splitting as it may take individuals out of the work force because income splitting

provides families with a choice for a spouse not to enter paid employment. Left-wing bureaucrats and think tanks seem to want tax money to be distributed to the lower income groups only, and never to higher income groups, even though they experience discrimination under the tax system. In short, the left doesn't think middle-income and higher-income families should have equality in the tax system.

## **2. Parents Want Institutional Child Care**

According to polling carried out by the Vanier Institute of the Family in February 2005, and the Institute of Marriage and Family (an associate of Focus on the Family), in May 2013, three-quarters of Canadians believe it is best for young children under six to be at home with a parent.

The second choice is a relative taking care of the child, followed by neighbourhood, home child care. Coming in last in choice is institutional child care. Both studies also found that parents prefer that government money go to them directly, rather than to schools or public child care institutions.

## **3. There Are Long Waiting Lists For Child Care Spaces**

Parents planning on placing their child in child care, some even without making the final decision on childcare, place their child's name on a number of child care lists just in case they may need the space in the future. Most of these applications, however, are never followed up by the parents. Despite this, the so-called "waiting lists" for spaces, are waved about by child care advocates to indicate the "need" for spaces, when, in fact, these lists are meaningless.

## **4. There Is A Large "Unmet Need" for Contraception In The Developing World**

In 2012, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) reported a staggering "222 million women have an unmet need for contraception". This is false. In 2011, the Guttmacher Institute (an associate of Planned Parenthood) surprisingly admitted that the data revealed that only 8% of women in Africa, when asked why they did not use contraceptives, attribute their non-use to a lack of access. There is little demand for contraception among African women for reasons of religion, health (side effects), culture and other factors, such as a desire for large families. Also, it was found by researchers that natural family planning methods not only work well, but are successfully used by large numbers of African women. Surveys by the UN have completely ignored natural family planning in determining so-called "unmet needs" for contraception. The demand for contraceptives is even less in Latin America (4%) and (6%) in Asia.



This falsehood of “unmet needs” for contraceptives is almost entirely based on appeals by population controllers for increased funding.

## **5. Most Hate Crimes Are Based on Sexual Orientation**

Homosexual advocates claim that homosexuals/lesbians are overwhelmingly targets of hate crimes. This is false. Statistics Canada stated, in its 2014 report, that there were 1,414 hate-motivated criminal incidents in 2012, up 82 from 2011.

These hate crimes were as follows:

- i. One half of the incidents involved racial or ethnic motives (21% aimed at blacks);
- ii. 30% involved hatred towards a particular religion, including crimes targeting Jews, Muslims and Catholics. (17% of the incidents were against the Jewish population);
- iii. 13% of incidents were motivated by sexual orientation;
- iv. 6% were motivated by reason of language, mental or physical disability, sex, age or some other characteristic, such as occupation or political belief.

All hate crimes are disgusting and unacceptable, but let's put them in perspective and not embellish the facts by falsehoods.

## **6. Marijuana is Not Addictive or Harmful**

A definitive, comprehensive review of the current state of scientific knowledge on marijuana was published by leading U.S. drug scientists in the June, 2014 issue of the prestigious *New England Journal of Medicine*.

According to this study, it is false to claim that marijuana is not an addictive drug, and that it is not harmful.

Specifically, the analysis reveals that marijuana can produce addiction and withdrawal symptoms. About 9% of marijuana users develop addiction to the drug, which increases to 17% if marijuana use begins in the adolescent years. If marijuana is used daily, addiction increases 25% to 50% among its users.

The report also states that there is a strong association between marijuana use and diminished lifetime achievement, motor vehicle crashes, and symptoms of chronic bronchitis. Moreover, there is a relationship between marijuana use and abnormal brain development; progression to the use of other drugs; schizophrenia; and depression and anxiety.

The report also stated that over the past three decades, the potency of marijuana, measured by concentration of Tetra Hydro Cannabinol (THC), has increased by about 300 percent and, therefore, previous studies on marijuana no longer apply.

The report concluded:

Marijuana is a drug of abuse that produces serious adverse health consequences. Increasing the availability and social approval of marijuana use through its legalization (for

medical or “recreational” uses) is not in the interest of the nation's public health or public safety.

## **7. Drug Injection Sites Reduce Harm and Save Lives**

Research on the Vancouver Drug Injection Site, Insite, was carried out by the University of British Columbia's (UBC) Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS, which reported that the site reduces harm and saves lives. This is false.

The B.C. Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS carried out its research, not for scientific purposes, but for the purpose of supporting the political objective to continue operation of the injection site.

This conclusion is based on the fact that these researchers had a conflict of interest in their research in that they had previously been lobbyists and advocates for the establishment of the injection site in 2001.

Under the *Access to Information Act*, it was learned that between 2003 and 2011, these advocates from the B.C. Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS, received \$18 million from the Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR) to carry out its research on the Vancouver Injection Site. All the studies (over two dozen of them) by these researchers were peer reviewed only by supporters of the drug site. Also, the researchers, contrary to standard scientific procedure, refused to share their data with other researchers so that their studies could be replicated. Without exception, these advocates/researchers for the drug injection site concluded that the injection site was reducing harm and death rates for addicts. Their most recent study on Insite was published in the medical journal *Lancet* on April 18, 2011. This study was pivotal in the decision by the Supreme Court of Canada, handed down on September 30, 2011, against the attempts by the federal Minister of Health to close down the injection site.

According to this 2011 study, because of the presence of the injection site, there had been a 35% reduction in overdoses in the 500 metre radius around Insite, while the rest of Vancouver decreased by 9%.

However, an international team, consisting of three Australian medical doctors, (including an epidemiologist and two addiction medicine specialists), a Canadian academic and an American psychiatrist found serious errors in the study, which entirely invalidated its findings.

In addition, the B.C. Coroner's report showed that overdoses actually increased by 14%, or 11% when population-adjusted, between 2002, the year before Insite opened, and 2005, the final year of their study period.

However, during the arguments before the Supreme Court on this issue, Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin stated that, “Insite has saved lives and improved health”. This conclusion was also repeated numerous times throughout the court's written judgment. It is not without significance that intense publicity was given to the questionable *Lancet* study during the week of the court hearing. Since the results

of the study were published during the week of the hearing, this gave the narrowest window of time to provide any critique of the study. No further evidence was admissible to the Supreme Court after the hearing held May 12, 2011 to raise questions as to the credibility of the study, as well as other questionable studies submitted in evidence by the B.C. Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS.

### 8. Children Are Not Harmed By Same-sex Parenting

In order to promote the notion that same-sex relationships are equal to heterosexual ones, it is necessary for homosexual activists to promote the falsehood that children of same-sex couples are as healthy or, perhaps even healthier, than children raised by their opposite-sex biological parents. To promote this concept, “studies” on same-sex parenting have been carried out. These are not studies in the true sense, but merely propaganda pieces promoting a political objective.

Biased pro-homosexual researchers followed flawed procedures, not in accordance with standards of ethics and science, in order to achieve their pre-determined results. For example, instead of carrying out research on randomly selected individuals, as required, researchers pre-selected the participants in their studies by advertising in homosexual publications and websites and by distributing flyers to social and support groups in the homosexual community. That is,

the researchers actively pursued and selected participants, who were told the purpose of the study, which was to make homosexual parenting appear successful. These factors obviously influenced the responses of the participants.

The children of these same-sex couples were not interviewed in the studies. Instead, only the parents were interviewed. They were asked to give their opinion on the effectiveness of their parenting and their views of their children’s physical, mental and social wellbeing. Naturally, the same-sex couples considered their parenting skills to be excellent, and that their children doing well was due to their being so successfully raised.

The most recent of such studies on same-sex parenting was a 2014 Australian Study of Child Health in Same-sex Families (ACHESS) conducted at the University of Melbourne. The study applied the same failed methodology used in other studies on same-sex parenting, such as failing to use randomly selected participants. The Australian study, as was intended, generated only positive headlines in one country after another by the ever obliging mainstream media, which never questioned the credibility of the study. On the contrary, the media reported the conclusions from the study as absolute fact, rather than the fantasy they actually were.

These are only some of the falsehoods deliberately planted in the media. Other falsehoods will be explored in the next issue of REALity. †

## MAKING A GIFT UNDER YOUR WILL TO REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

Making a gift under your Will to REAL Women of Canada is a lasting gift, not just to REAL Women itself, but also to Canada as a whole.

Canada needs strong families, especially now, when the fabric of society is being torn apart by materialism, selfish individualism, and disrespect for human life.

REAL Women’s efforts on behalf of the traditional family

have never wavered. Through turmoil and adversity, we have put forward our voice on behalf of the family in a clear and uncompromising manner. We can only continue this vital work for many generations to come with your help.

When preparing your Will, please consider assisting REAL Women by making a bequest to our organization so that we can continue with our crucial work. †

## MESSAGE BOARD

- Invite one person to [become a member](#) of REAL Women. Personal one-to-one contact is the best method to recruit new members.
- Write your MP and [Prime Minister Harper](#) to let them know you oppose euthanasia and assisted suicide. Although euthanasia is illegal in Canada, the pro-euthanasia Bill 52 has passed in Quebec. Its constitutionality will be challenged. Meanwhile, a federal MP has proposed a private member’s bill to allow euthanasia in Canada.
- Write the federal [Finance Minister Joe Oliver](#) to thank him for the direction the economy is taking, by lowering the national debt and promising income tax cuts. House of Commons, Ottawa, K1A 0A6 †

REALity is a publication of **REAL Women of Canada**

PO Box 8813 Station T Ottawa ON K1G 3J1 • Tel 613-236-4001 Fax 613-236-7203  
[www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) • [info@realwomenofcanada.ca](mailto:info@realwomenofcanada.ca)

## SUPPORT REAL WOMEN OF CANADA

PLEASE MAKE A CONTRIBUTION TO JOIN OUR WORK TO DEFEND & PROTECT LIFE & THE FAMILY

Membership \$30/year • Groups \$50/year • Donation \_\_\_\_\_  
*Contributions, unfortunately, are not tax deductible.*

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

Province \_\_\_\_\_ Postal Code \_\_\_\_\_

Tel \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

Send online at [www.realwomenofcanada.ca](http://www.realwomenofcanada.ca) or by mail. Thank you.