

# OpenTheo

## Is It Okay to Attend a Pride-Themed Happy Hour at Work?

July 24, 2023



### #STRask - Stand to Reason

Questions about the acceptability of attending a Pride-themed happy hour at work and how to respond to two phrases heard at a Pride event: “Love is love” and “We’re here to be with ‘family.’”

\* Would attending “Pride Month Happy Hour” at work be more like dining with sinners (something I should do) or attending a same-sex wedding (something I would not do)?

\* How would you respond to the phrases “Love is love” and “We’re here to be with ‘family.’”—slogans I encountered while sharing the gospel at a local Pride event?

### Transcript

I'm Amy Hall, I'm here with Greg Koukl and you're listening to Stand to Reason's hashtag, SDRaskPodcast. Alright, so Greg, today, I don't know, I hope people aren't tired of this topic. But we will be talking, we got a bunch of questions.

I'm not sure if you have questions about Pride Month in June, but since we are ahead in our recordings, this is coming up a little bit later. Still, I think going forward, it can still be helpful to people next year or in other situations when they hear the principles that we're addressing here. Yeah, in this country, every month is Pride Month.

That is true. Okay, let's start with a question from Daniel. I'm here in a large company and lead a reasonably large team.

When my organization holds a quote, Pride Month Happy Hour, would my attendance be like Jesus Dining with Sinners? Something I should do? Or more like my attending a same-sex wedding, something I would personally not do? And before you answer, let me just, because I asked him for a little bit more information, they have these happy hours with different themes throughout the year. So there are different ones with different types of events. And this one is just the one during Pride Month.

Okay, so if it were me, I wouldn't go. And with regards to Jesus Dining with Sinners, these

are sinners he dimes with all the time. This is a special event to celebrate gay pride.

And so, and to me, that makes it a different category than Jesus Dining with Sinners. We engage with sinners all the time. Remember the culture Jesus was in was the bigoted response of the religious leaders is we are not going to soil ourselves by being in the presence of these nasty people.

Okay, so when Jesus was in their presence in different contexts, that was iconoclastic. That broke the mold. But that is not the circumstance that noble Christians like Daniel here find themselves in.

What they, the circumstance they find themselves in is constantly being involved with these, all these people who are have these positive attitudes about gay pride, whatever. But when there's an event that is meant to celebrate it, then you're celebrating it. It's dedicated to gay pride.

Well, I don't know about the other mixers they have, but I bet you none of them have the word pride associated with them. And secondly, I bet you none of them have the moral ramifications. How about abortion pride? We're going to celebrate abortion at this abortion pride mixer.

I don't think that he would, I suspect, Daniel would have no compunction about staying away. What's, you know, why would that be different? And I'll tell you why it would be different in some way. It's not a criticism of anybody in particular.

We have gotten so used to gay pride that it's just normal. And when it's kind of part of the cultural thing and it doesn't bother anybody so much. It's like a couple years ago, I talked about the Bible study at Bethel Bible College in St. Paul, Minnesota.

That was for LGBTQ people. It's the, it's the gay Bible study. And it was like, well, that's not, that's wrong, but you know, whatever.

But what if it was an adultery Bible study? People would really say, wait a minute. So the one shocks, but the other doesn't because we just become so used to it. And we've been velocitized by that notion.

And so, and I think that homosexuality is one of those notions we've become velocitized to. If it were me, I wouldn't go. Yeah, when you put it as abortion pride month, it does seem very obvious that you shouldn't go.

What I was trying to. I was trying to think. We're adultery pride.

Yeah, I was trying to think, well, if it's a theme, is it okay to go? But you, but what you said, the very nature of the theme is pride. It is a. Approval of what's happening. Now, what if it was, and I don't know if they have this, but let's say it was a. They did

something for Ramadan and they had one of their happy hours celebrated Ramadan.

No, I wouldn't go either. And by the way, what's the downside of not going? I'm not sure I get it. You see, what there's going to be is a little bit of social disapproval, probably, that's associated with it.

But my, my feeling was why, why take the risk? You know, now, if I was invited by a Muslim family to come to their sundown meal on Ramadan, which is the fast month, and I was in Egypt during Ramadan. And the Muslims eat more food during the month of fasting than they do any other year of time of the year because they gorge before the sun comes up and they gorge after the sun goes down. There's parties galore.

Everybody's eating. It's just kind of a crazy thing. But if I were invited to to that with a family, I would participate.

I would take their hospitality, have the meal as long as I'm not participating directly in any of the religious enterprises. But why I would want to go to the Jewish Ramadan thing and celebrate it like this is a Islam. I'm sorry.

It's like, thank you, Islamic thing celebrate. But my thought is when in doubt, don't do it. What is the, what is the downside of not doing it? Well, the only downside is people might be mad at you for not, for not supporting it in some way.

Well, why would I be obliged to support it? Would a good Muslim go to what a, some kind of religious celebration associated with directing with Christianity? To me, I'd have to think about this a little more because I think Muslims do go to Christmas parties and things like that. Yeah, but Christmas is cultural. That's true.

But, but also the distinction I see and I'd have to think about whether or not I'd go to one that was Ramadan themed. But the difference is it's not a Islam is right party. It's not an Islam is right theme party.

Like you would be doing with pride month. Yeah. It's just this is our holiday income celebrate or this is the theme for the party.

It does seem a little bit different. Yeah, that's a good point. You know, and I might, I might defer if, if faced with that, I have to look at the circumstances.

Certainly it's a different kind of circumstance. But, but here's the danger. If the activities are always different, you don't know what you're going to encounter once you get there.

So you might be in a position where you'll have to really make it clear that you're not going to take part. And you're not going to take part in something. So I guess you have to take that into consideration also.

Yeah, and there should be no problem. I mean, this is in a perfect world, right? There

should be no problem. Any employee saying, you know what? I have, I have conscience concerns about participating in this party.

So I'm not going to go. I'm recusing myself or whatever. So we're excusing myself.

Okay. Now the problem is that in the current cultural context, they're probably going to give that person a hard time. Well, you remember this blah, blah, blah.

You got to do this is one of your responsibilities. And this is what you have to say. I don't have a responsibility to celebrate homosexuality.

That's what this is. And I'm glad you brought up conscience because I would say do not go against your conscience in any of these situations. If you're not feeling like this is something that you can do to the glory of God, then don't go.

Don't do it because you think that people will be mad at you. Yeah, if you don't do it or think that they will like you if you do. They're not going to like you if you do.

They're just not going to not get mad at you. Yeah. So I would definitely do not go against your conscience.

Paul is really clear that when we do that we're sending even even if the case is that it's not in itself a sin to go to something. If you are going against your conscience and you're not doing it in faith to the glory of God, then you are sinning. Okay.

So here's a question they could ask if anybody gives push back. What asked this question? What do you call a religious person who believes one thing and he does something else? What do you call a good one, Greg? Yeah. So are you asking me to be a hypocrite? That's their complaint.

What do you call a religious person who believes one thing and does something completely opposite or does something else? Whatever. It's a hypocrite. You want me to be a hypocrite? Or if you want to use their language too, I think that's good.

That is using their language somewhat. It's said, do you believe that people should be authentic to their true selves? And of course, this is the clarion cry of this age. You do you, right? Well, then, then do you think I should be authentic to my true self in this issue? I'm writing this down, Greg, because I'm going to make you write about these later.

I think these are really helpful. Okay, let's go on to the next question. This one comes from Lisa.

Hello, my husband and I shared the gospel at a local pride event last evening. How would you respond to the two phrases we heard most often? Quote, love is love and quote, we're here to be with family. Thank you so much.

We appreciate your ministry. Well, the first one, this doesn't make any sense to me. This is not all this.

The love is love is just rhetorical slate of hand. That's all it is. So this is where it's required to ask, I'm not sure what you mean.

That's all. Is it loving? So, and I know here's some follow up thoughts. So what they mean, it love is love.

The value of the power of that rhetorical phrase is that there's no comeback to it. It's a tautology. I mean, if you wanted to be being spirited, you could say, yeah, I'm sin is sin.

Bad is bad. Evil is evil. Wicked is wicked.

You know, no, I'm not suggesting anybody say that. But it's like, all this is rhetorical air. But what it makes it sound like is it makes it sound like that if you do not support gays, then you are not loving.

Or maybe it makes it sound like all we are doing is loving one another. And so I do have a little dialogue in the new book coming out September 12, Street Smarts. Why is God against love challenge? What makes you think God is against love? Well, he thinks that that gays and, you know, you guys say that God is against gays.

Well, to be more specific, God is against homosexual behavior. Okay. So are you saying that love and sex are the same thing? That's the question.

Well, the obvious answer is they're not. You can have sex without love. You can have love without sex.

So they're not the same thing, but they're equating it subtly. And so the question brings that to the surface. Okay.

That's the way God sees it too. Love and sex are different things. God wants people to love.

God wants people to use sex in an appropriate way. I think another question you can ask because nobody really believes that all kinds of quote love are the same. Nobody believes that.

So you just need to push them a little bit so that they can see that they're not being consistent. Although I'm not sure they care about it as a principle. I mean, it's just a slogan.

But, but do you really think that? Do you really think that any kind of sex is an attraction is good? They're all equally good. And if they say, yes, well, I can think of some examples that they might not. What about incest? What about bestiality? Then they might bring up

some other thing like consent.

That's what they usually do. Yes. Yes.

But see this. Yeah. And this is the liability of question like that.

You may get a throw back in your face. Yeah, that's fine. Everything's fine.

You know, they're not. If you say pedophilia, they're not going to say that's fine. I mean, most for most part right now.

We'll see. Okay. Nothing surprises me anymore in this as long as there's consent.

That's that would be an issue to them. If there wasn't consent, that's different. Okay.

Well, then in that case, then they're not saying love is love because what if I force myself on somebody? I love them. Isn't that the same as all other kinds of love? I mean, they're already adding other qualifications where love is love is not legitimate. I get where you're going.

I'm trying to anticipate like you often do with me. You know, what is the other side going to say? You know, and they say, wait, it's not loving to force yourself. Obviously, they don't love them if they're forcing them into something that they don't want to do.

But in any event, I mean, that's you could take a shot at it, you know, but of course that presumes the answer to the question. What do you mean by love is love. And then they say, well, all sexual behavior as long as it's motivated by love is not.

Is okay. What if it's not motivated by love? Oh, well, that's okay too. You know, so this is why it's an empty slogan and just try to get people to talk about it.

The other one where they say, well, we're just here for family. I don't know what there's anything to say to that. That's not advice.

You know, it's they're just being supportive of family. And if they think homosexuality is morally benign, then then they're supporting, you know, their family who are. Pursuing morally benign behaviors, you know, and they're just being supportive because there are people who disagree with them and they want to show their support.

I don't know if there's anything clever to say about that last. So I should have said this when I said the quote because I do have something to say about it. But there's something I didn't mention in the quote and that is family is in quotes.

I'm here. We're here to be with quote family. And so here's what I have to say about this because I happen to be listening to an interview with James Lindsey this morning.

And James Lindsey is the one who wrote cynical theories right right about critical theory.

So he was talking about how the very, I mean, you can go back and read people who were writing back in the 60s, what their goal was in breaking down our culture and breaking down the ideas in our culture to introduce these other ideas. And one of the things he said is that they're trying to break down the idea of family of the traditional family and change our understanding of what that is so that they can dispense with it.

I know I had, I heard another interview a long time ago I wrote about this on our blog, but there was a woman who was arguing for same sex marriage, but then she says in this interview, she says, well, really, I don't want any marriage. That was her real goal. She wanted to destroy marriage.

So now this doesn't mean that every person who's there has that goal, but it does mean that the worldview behind what's happening right now and the people who are the thinkers behind what's happening right now, that was their goal. So when they change the meaning of family, that's what they're doing. Now, I don't know how I would respond to someone to communicate that.

It might not even be worth responding to that, but I think that's what's going on there. Yeah. Well, when the family means anything, then it means nothing.

Okay, that's part of it. And then, and there's also it's so these guys are so clever. So I saw this was a number of years ago, but when all this was, you know, a Burger fell in the 2015 and the Supreme Court and all that.

And there was the poster said, it's said, believe it or not, the new traditional family and then had all this ad mixture, you know, people, you know, the new traditional family. Well, if it's new, it's not traditional, but notice how they're trying to trade on words that are connotation words. We believe in a traditional family.

It's just a different kind of traditional family. Well, then it's not a traditional family, but see that's lost on a lot of people because the words do the work. And think about how many things this affects.

It affects because the whole, the whole purpose of marriage is because this union is a very particular unique union between a man and a woman that creates children and it creates a family, it builds a family. Now, if that's no longer family, now you open the door to all sorts of things to surrogacy to same sex relationships. There's not, there's not.

Polyamory. Yeah, all sorts of things. Polygamy, polyamory, poly poly poly.

There's a couple of poly. What's poly, what's the multiple husbands? Oh, my gosh, I can't think of what it is now. But polyandry.

So, polyandry, you got polyamory. What's poly, that's a scoop marriage. You know, it's everybody's married to each other.

You have four or five people that are all married to each other, you know. And anyway, this is. So, so the point is there, there are objective reasons that have to do with human nature that the family exists and they're trying to break those things down so that they can create some new society, which will never survive because you cannot go against reality forever.

And since the actual family is something that grows out of the nature of reality and who we are as men and women and how we create children to fight against that. To fight against that, you will have to have a whole bunch of force for a long time and it cannot survive. You can't fight reality forever.

I just did the read for story of reality for the audio book last week. And when we got to this section, there was a question I asked. And the question was, do you think that family, characteristically, family becomes, comes before marriage or marriage comes before family? I said, oh, no marriage characterously comes before family.

Do you think that's a good thing? Oh, yeah. Why? Well, because when you're married, you have the stability, whatever, for the family that follows. When I say family, I mean children, you know, kind of standard understanding of family.

I said, you know what just you just assumed? What? Well, what you affirm there is that marriage is about stabilizing an environment for the sake of children. And see, when you come in the back door there a little bit and catch up by surprise, there are a lot of times people are going to confess the intuitive understanding of these things. They're not careful to protect their philosophical turf.

And that's what I'm after. See, well, yeah, that's right. That makes sense.

Do you think the government should intrude in private relationships between people? No. But the government intrudes all the time in the issue of marriage. In fact, O'Bergaffeld demanded that government intrude and solemnize whatever the same-sex relationships that they now call marriage.

He said, why is it okay for the government to intrude in that private relationship, but not intrude in other private relationships? This is the question I asked them. Well, the reason is because it's that private relationship that characteristically produces something the government really cares about. And our culture does.

And that is the stability of the family and the family is the cornerstone of culture. So it's the culture doesn't define family. It's family defines culture.

Just like the building doesn't define the bricks that build it. It's the bricks that define the building. So families, classical, ordinary, traditional families are the building blocks of culture.



And culture means to protect those building blocks because the culture depends on those being stable for culture to be stable. It's hard to believe that this is only we've only had same-sex marriage for eight years, seven years. Less than a decade.

It would have been eight years because the decision came out in June. Usually that's when those decisions came out. Of course, some states already had it.

But I mean, as just an assumed thing. So we do have on our website at str.org, a post that's titled, Understand the Same-Sex Marriage Issue. And I have a whole bunch of links there because I think we need to understand it.

Even if it's if we're not going to be able to change at this point, maybe we can in the future. I don't know. But you need to understand why as Christians, we were arguing against same-sex marriage.

It wasn't out of bigotry. It was because marriage is an actual thing based on human nature. And messing with that is going to cause a whole bunch of problems.

It's grounded in reality. And so not even as a Christian, but as a human being who is reasonably observant about the nature of reality, you should be against same-sex marriage. Because as it is right now, the word marriage means nothing but two names on a piece on a piece on a piece of paper.

That's all it means. It has no meaning other than that. Two names of people that are connected to each other in some way for some time.

That's all it means. It means nothing else. There's no other assumptions that are made by that.

It's interesting that there were people in Australia, remember, that got two guys who were heterosexual who got married because they wanted the additional benefits that they would get that they're not getting a single people. And this infuriated the gay community. And of course the question is why? Why? It's the same-sex union.

They're doing it for reasons that are their own reasons. Well, it's about marriages about love. They're not in love.

Marriage isn't about love. That's not in the law. Ask any married couple.

There are billions of people in time who have thought they were married but weren't if marriage is about love. Those are arranged marriages. People are very deeply confused about this.

But it's a challenging thing to think through. This is why we have the page that link to help people understand that. And I think people just have not thought through it.

We're so frightened by slogans like love is love and things that we don't want to look like a bigot. And I think we need to have the strength of conviction to know the truth and to know that when people say those things, it's not true. And that's not easy.

But again, I would read 1 Peter because I've been talking about that a lot lately. But it's so relevant to what we are going through right now and facing, you know, it's better to suffer at the hands of men for doing what is right than to suffer at the hands of God for doing what is wrong. Better in every way at all times.

So I'm just wondering about this love and love though. I'm just toying with something. What if somebody says love is love? And I said, orange juice is orange juice.

So what if I just said, you tell me, what did I just say? What what what meaning is there? Orange juice is orange juice. Nothing. That's a tautology.

It's it's meaningless. A is a. Okay. But see that what's the difference between your common in mind? Anyway, like I said, I'm just thinking out loud.

Well, anything you can do to help people start to think about the slogans they're saying is good. But but the first thing you have to do is understand why we were arguing for a man, woman marriage. And I think even a lot of Christians don't understand that.

And so it'd be really helpful if you go to that understand the same sex marriage issue at [str.org](http://str.org) and hopefully we can help you out with that. Alright, thank you for listening. We love hearing from you.

Send us your question on Twitter with the hashtag STRask or send it through our website at [str.org](http://str.org). This is Amy Hall and Greg Cogle for Stand to Reason.