

CHRISTIAN MEDIA FRAMING OF GAY MARRIAGE

A Thesis

presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

ALEX JACOBI

Dr. Debra Mason, Thesis Supervisor

MAY 2016

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the
thesis entitled

CHRISTIAN MEDIA FRAMING OF GAY MARRIAGE

presented by Alex Jacobi,

a candidate for the degree of master of arts,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Debra Mason

Dr. Cynthia Frisby

Dr. Victoria Johnson

Dr. Yong Volz

DEDICATION

To my family — Mom (Christi), Dad (Steve), Zach, Gran Gran (Ginny), Grancy (Charles), Amy, Clark, and Gracie: Your eternal love and acceptance has made me who I am today.

To my best friends — Lizzie Lee and Malorie Paine: When the road was dark, you were always my light.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I chose this topic because as a Christian I'm always looking for answers or a place to stand in the gray parts of life, both to help my own faith and to guide others. For me, sexuality and gender fluidity was a confusing reality that when dropped into my religious background, made for restlessness in my mind. Instead of choosing between the worlds, embracing sexual authenticity or choosing religious orthodoxy, I opted for finding the middle road where the truth often lies. This study helped me on that road, and in the end I decided it was not black-and-white answers that gave me the peace I sought, but I instead found peace in the love of a God who held my hand through it all.

No one does anything truly good alone, so of course, there are people to thank for the completion of this study.

Thank you to my thesis chair, Dr. Debra Mason. Without your constant guidance and expectance of me, this study wouldn't have happened. Also, I am eternally grateful that you provided me with an office space and free coffee.

Thank you to my committee members, Dr. Cynthia Frisby, Dr. Victoria Johnson, and Dr. Yong Volz. You all offered me different types of perspectives, which was extremely helpful in crafting a well-rounded thesis.

Thank you to my undergraduate professors at University of Tennessee at Martin, especially Tomi McCutchen Parrish. Without you guys, I would still be a shy girl who didn't know her capabilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Why Media is an Important Facet of Religion	
Religion in the Media	
The Religion Beat Today	
Christian Media	
LGBT Issues in U.S. News Media	
LGBT People in U.S. News Media	
Framing Theory	
LGBT Frame	
3. RESEARCH QUESTION.....	24
4. METHODOLOGY	25
Reading Process	
5. RESULTS	35
Defining Rodriguez and Blumell’s Frames Used In This Study	
Political evolution to equality.	
Religion as equality	
Religion as tradition.	

Marriage equality is harmful to children.

Inevitability as a concession to equality.

Inevitability as a myth.

Defining the New Frames Developed in This Study

Same-sex rights versus religious rights.

Gay marriage issue is dividing the church.

Avoidance of issue.

Government policy isn't a solution.

Summary of Frames Found

How Coverage Changed Over Time

Religion as tradition.

Religion as equality.

Law-related frames.

Gay marriage issue is dividing the church.

Government policy isn't a solution.

Avoidance of issue

Marriage equality is harmful to children.

Inevitability as a myth.

Inevitability as a concession to equality.

How This Study Compares to Evangelical Christians' Views

How the Data Compares to Rodriguez and Blumell's

6. CONCLUSION.....63

Limitations and Future Studies

Ending Thoughts	
REFERENCES	69
APPENDIX	
1. ARTICLES IN SAMPLE.....	74
2. ANALYSIS OF ARTICLE SAMPLE FROM CHRISTIAN TODAY	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of frames in articles of 2010	41
2. Number of frames in articles of 2011	41
3. Number of frames in articles of 2012	42
4. Number of frames in articles of 2013	42
5. Number of frames in articles of 2014	42
6. Number of frames in articles of 2015	43
7. Number of frames in whole article sample	43

CHRISTIAN MEDIA FRAMING OF GAY MARRIAGE

Alex Jacobi

Dr. Debra Mason, Thesis Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This mixed methods study explores Christian media's framing of gay marriage from 2010 to 2015, looking at a sample of articles on *Christianity Today's* website before and after gay marriage became legal. Using mixed methods, the researcher looked at these articles and identified what frames were used from 2010 to 2015, how those frames have changed over time, how those frames relate to the public opinion of each time period, and how those frames compare to existing research about framing of same-sex marriage in mainstream media. By looking at a Christian magazine's framing of gay marriage and using it as a lens through which to view culture, this study will hopefully shed some light on how the relationship between Christians and the gay community has changed, offering explanation and perspective on an issue that might not be so clear-cut as media make it out to be.

INTRODUCTION

Religion is an important facet of life in the U.S., with more than 75% claiming a faith, and all but 4.7% of those claiming the Christian faith (Pew Research, 2015). This means that Christian values are a significant thread in the tapestry of U.S. culture. As LGBT rights have grown in the U.S. and more people have come out of the closet (Pew Research estimated in 2013 that 3.5% to five percent of the population are in the LGBT community and that statistic will likely grow), those Christian values have been challenged, forcing those of faith to reevaluate their views on sexuality. This sexual awakening has led some Christians to soften their views and others to hold tighter to the reins of traditional doctrine. Many resistance efforts toward LGBT rights come from those who aim to maintain traditional Christian doctrine, showing that the relationship between these two groups is an important aspect of the gay rights movement.

Because of the importance of this relationship, this study will aim to look at how Christian media has covered gay rights, specifically gay marriage, in order to glimpse Christians' views. The study will show how *Christianity Today's* coverage of gay marriage has changed over time, how that coverage compares to public perception, and how that coverage compares to an existing study on framing of gay marriage in *The New York Times* in 2013.

Even though little research exists about how Christian media have covered the LGBT community, there is no doubt a relationship between the groups exists, and it is not always one of harmony. Stephen Hunt (2009) says that to many Christian churches, the LGBT community is seen as "a thorn in the flesh," a group with an ailment that is the

result of “the churches’ spiritual complacency or even machinations of the satanic” (Hunt, p. 1). Of course, over time, other churches have developed a more liberal bent, offering the LGBT community a place in the congregation or offering counseling to those who identify as LGBT. Yet, even with the progress made, in many churches, there is still the idea of “love the sinner, hate the sin,” insinuating that those with a non-heterosexual sexual orientation still have a sin to work out, a problem to correct.

Even though disapproval is still dominant among evangelicals, as time as gone by, evangelical attitudes toward LGBT people have softened. Denunciations of those who are LGBT are not as common, and Christians no longer employ ex-gay therapy, the idea that one can make homosexuality go away through counseling and prayer. Yet, some Christians opt for remaining celibate because many churches still do not practice full-blown acceptance of the LGBT lifestyle. A minority of denominations ordain LGBT clergy, with many of the ones that do classified as mainline Protestant churches (those that take a more liberal stance on social issues). However, even though “several mainline denominations have continued to move left on issues like women’s reproductive rights and the ordination of homosexuals,” evangelicals haven’t budged (Coffman, 2013, p. 221). The denominations that ordain practicing gay clergy as of 2016 include the Episcopal Church, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the United Church of Christ, the Disciples of Christ Church, and the Metropolitan Community Church. However, all of these denominations are mainline Protestant churches, not evangelical Protestant ones.

Even though many evangelical Christians still see homosexuality as sinful, according to a study from Pew Research Center in December of 2015, a majority of

Christians in the U.S. (54%) say that homosexuality should be accepted by society. This study shows that while many evangelicals are within denominations that discourage homosexuality, they feel that gay people should at least be accepted by U.S. society.

As for where *Christianity Today* fits in the Christian theology landscape, it is more on the evangelical Protestant side, as opposed to the mainline Protestant side. This means that those who subscribe to *Christianity Today*, along with those who write for it, are likely Christians who don't accept LGBT rights as readily or at least do not personally morally approve of gay marriage. *Christianity Today* was launched by Billy Graham, a staunch evangelical Protestant, and his father-in-law, Nelson Bell, was who inspired him to create it. When *Christianity Today* launched in 1956, editor of *Christianity and Crisis* John C. Bennett called Bell "intransigently conservative" (Coffman, 2013, p. 188). This history of the publication shows its theological position, which is typically more on the conservative side of Christianity.

Despite heated debates between the LGBT community and many Christian circles, not a lot of research exists about gay framing within Christian media. In general, not a lot of research exists about Christian media itself, at least within the print and online sphere. However, research does exist on how religion and the LGBT community are covered in secular news media, which will be used within the literature review of this study, along with literature on framing, to provide the contextual landscape necessary to conduct this research. By looking at articles within *Christianity Today*, one of the most popular magazines for evangelical Christians, from 2010 to 2015 that relate to gay issues, the researcher will analyze frames, comparing and contrasting them. This will shed light on how Christians frame the gay community, in hopes of giving a cultural picture of how

the interaction between these two groups has shifted. In *Normative Theories of the Media: Journalism in Democratic Societies*, Clifford Christians (2009) emphasizes the importance of media to culture:

Culture is ... a crucial dimension of our citizenship that requires nurturing and reflection. As cultural beings, the verbal and visual symbols of everyday life, images, representations, and myths make social relations meaningful for us and locate us in time and space. (p. 167).

Robert Fortner (2007) calls this relationship between communication and culture a “symbolic soup within which we all try to make sense of our experience” (p. 161). The communications within this symbolic soup is not only comprised of art, but also media, which tell individuals how to feel:

It is the reporting, the press conference, the portrayal of atrocity ... or the war crimes tribunals’ or reconciliation commissions’ findings that leave us reeling, as the world as we thought we knew it suddenly becomes strange and unfathomable, and we must reconstruct our symbolic life to take account of the newly experienced reality. (Fortner, 2007)

In studying writing, Mitchell Stephens (1998) found from Voltaire that writing is “the painting of the voice; the closer the resemblance, the better it is” (p. 17). This means that a lot of writing in media has the power to provide concrete representation of active conversation in society. Because media is a lens from which to view culture, by looking at Christian media’s framing of gay marriage, this study will show a picture of the relationship between Christians and the LGBT community as reflected in media.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review outlines what information has been gathered in terms of media representation of religion and the LGBT community. It can be quickly seen that there is no research available on how Christians cover the LGBT community, which is what drove this study and its purposes.

In looking at the topic of how Christians perceive and cover the LGBT community, it is important to have an understanding of how people in both of these worlds interact. While in the past many evangelical Christians have not accepted the LGBT community, more liberal attitudes amongst evangelical Christians are growing. Within the past decade, it's been observed that younger evangelical Christians don't have as hard of a time accepting gay and lesbian people (Hendershot, 2004, p. 114). They see it as sinful still, but they compare it to their own struggles with things like abstinence, masturbation, pornography, drugs, and alcohol (Hendershot, 2004, p. 114). In December 2015, Pew Research found the same to be true, that 51% of evangelical protestants in the Millennial generation (those born between 1981 and 1996) say homosexuality should be accepted by society, while only a third of evangelical Baby Boomers and a fifth of evangelicals in the Silent Generation agree. More liberal attitudes toward homosexuality are slowly making their way into a lot of evangelical Christian culture, but youth are still the major proponents of these attitudes. Part of this is because "evangelical youth are more attuned to the wider culture's discourses of therapy, addiction, and healing than the generation before them" (Hendershot, 2004, p. 113). Yet, church acceptance of those who live out a homosexual lifestyle and aren't "struggling" with it is still an issue in some

churches. Ordained pastor Mona West, the director of spiritual development at The Cathedral of Hope in Dallas, Texas, says that identifying as both gay and Christian can be a difficult place to be.

As gay and lesbian Christians, we are kind of in this Catch-22 situation in terms of the way the religious Right responds to us but also the ways in which non-Christian folks from our own community respond to us (Hendershot, 2004, p. 114).

Evangelical Christians have come a long way, attempting to “love the sinner, hate the sin,” rather than simply not letting anyone homosexual enter church (Hendershot, 2004, p. 113). Yet, as seen in July 2015 Pew Research data, a majority of evangelicals still oppose same-sex marriage, with 34% of black protestants opposing gay marriage and 24% of white protestants opposing it in 2015 (Pew Research, 2015). Therefore, the relationship between evangelicals and the LGBT community is still an important area to explore. Yet, existing literature largely focuses on secular media, how religion and LGBT issues are covered in these publications. Additionally, there is literature on the importance of media to religious communities, which shows how a publication like *Christianity Today* could be extremely important to the evangelical community.

Why Media is an Important Facet of Religion

Religion and media are similar to each other in that they both offer representation of the world, both ideologically and physically, whether it's through rituals and symbols or through spoken and written words. Robert White (1997), who explores this in his study of religion and the media in the construction of culture, says that these two entities have a social reflexivity to them, meaning that they sustain and repair meanings in cultures,

define boundaries of thought, and are places to conduct ideological discourses:

Both religion and media stand at the edges of the construction of the islands of commonsense meaning. ... they continually validate and maintain the internal coherence of the world of constructed meanings.

(Hoover & Lundby, 1997, p. 41)

Not only do both religion and media work independently to reflect culture, but they also act together, a set of opposing forces keeping the other in check. In many ways, White (1997) says that the religious aim for the sacred, creating “images of perfection,” but “then the image becomes an idol; and it is the secular that must enter to smash the sacred image so that it can be reborn and called back to its original holiness” (Hoover & Lundby, 1997, p. 46). So, by looking at both entities at the same time, a balanced reflection of culture surfaces.

The two forces not only work together, but often religion depends on media, as the nature of religion is abstract and requires physical representation. Without representation in the form of some sort of media, whether it's church media or secular media, religion isn't understood to the masses (Mahan, 2012, p. 16). Its ever-evolving and non-physical nature makes symbolic representation in some form necessary. Birgit Meyer (2008) found in *Religion: Beyond a Concept* that "Mediation objectifies a spiritual power that is otherwise invisible to the naked eye" and "mediation is 'dependent on currently available media and modes of representation'" (p. 712). Of course, this isn't to say that the religious need secular media to perform this duty. Much of this representation takes place within the church itself: through imagery, words, and physical rituals (Mahan, 2012, p. 17). For this reason, coverage of religion in secular media can be a vital part of people's

understanding of religion.

Religion in the Media

According to literature, secular media still play a significant role in how the public views religion, with Pew Research saying that 48% of those who view Muslims unfavorably have formed that opinion through media (Pew Research, 2007). Journalists' reports on religious topics have the power to make or break how those in religion are perceived and treated, because American citizens "get much of their information about religion from secular news sources" (Stout, 2012, p. 98).

Even with this noted importance of religion coverage, religion has not always had a full representation in secular media. Its presence has shifted over the years from stale and limited in the 1950s to 1970s to diverse and more edgy in the 1990s and at the turn of the century. Additionally, the change in journalism that occurred in the early 2000s as technology became more available and Americans entered the information age allowed the American audience to join religion discussions more.

The United States' first journalists conveyed religion in secular media. Some of the beginning advocates of freedom of the press in the 1600s, George Fox and John Milton, had religious motives in "demanding the right to express ... without restriction" (Underwood, 2002, p. 19). Doug Underwood (2002) also says journalists were a part of this:

It is almost forgotten in our more secular times that many of the early advocates of freedom of the press were preachers and proselytizers whose religious zeal—and the writings that poured forth from their pens—placed them solidly in the tradition of the world's first 'journalists.' (p. 19).

Underwood (2002) calls this beginning journalism with religious motivation and passionate expression "prophetic journalism" (p. 21). In this time, in Puritan New England, newspapers filled "both informational and religious functions" (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000, p. 3). Coverage at that time was simplistic, not relying on active newsgathering or overly political coverage (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000). Newspapers hardly even used typographic features, other than italics (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000). In the New-England Weekly Journal owned by Samuel Kneeland, religious news consisted of personal accounts that either served as "cautionary tales" or told of "remarkable events" as the result of "divine pleasure" or "divine displeasure" (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000). Many papers at the time aimed to be "uplifting and instructive for moral improvement," and tried not to publish material that could be offensive to communities (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000, p. 4). In 17th century New England, how journalists defined news was shaped by their "belief that everything happened according to God's perfect plan." Scholar David Nord (2001) calls this "teleological" (p.32). Also, the business of distributing religious texts emerged in this time period, and Nord (2004) sees this business as the foundation for the birth of mass media in America. The Bible and tract distributors used some of America's first printing presses and navigated the world of publishing, setting the foundation of publishing in America (Nord, 2004).

In the 1700s, though, differing opinions began to appear in newspapers, with ministers like Jonathan Edwards, William Stoddard and William Tennent splitting churches into two categories of "Old Light" and "New Light" and beginning the period of the First Great Awakening in churches (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000). "New Light"

churches embraced enthusiasm, where “emotions, impulses, and intense feelings are to be accepted as revelations from God” (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000, p. 31). “Old Light” churches were suspicious of these enthusiastic revivals, embracing traditional and orthodox theology and rationalism (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000). Toward the end of the 1700s, this "prophetic journalism" began to turn more into what we see in journalism today, as "commercial pressures and public opinion" began to push journalism toward a more secular route (Underwood, 2002, p. 27). Newspapers moved from having mostly religious motivations to seeing their “papers as fulfilling political functions” (Buddenbaum & Mason, 2000, p. 43).

In the 1950s to early 1970s, religion reporting could be seen as limited and stale (McCloud, 2004, p. 163). Media scholar Benjamin Hubbard found in his research of polling journalists in the 1980s that many resonated with the idea that "mainline Protestant denominations were under reported" in these decades "because their activities lacked pizzazz" (McCloud, 2004, p. 163). Also, there was a clear divide between secular media and sacred media, leaving secular periodicals out of the religion loop many times and leaving sacred media to cover their own issues (Stout, 2012, p. 100). In the 1940s onward, "most major denominations had some type of news outlet" (Stout, 2012, p. 101).

According to media scholar Stuart Hoover, before 1980, secular print journalists mostly dealt with religious coverage in a way that "deferred" to religion (Hoover, 1998). He said that writers and editors held a “received view” that “religion was not a serious object of press scrutiny; that it deserved limited and compartmentalized treatment; that the journalists who would cover it were less professional because it demanded less professional treatment; that its readers were largely older, less educated, and less

important; and that general readership was low" (Hoover, 1998, p. 4). This doesn't mean it wasn't covered, however; it was simply in its beginnings as a beat (Mason, 2012, p. 65). Debra Mason (2012) stated that religion's framing in that period was "homogeneous" (p. 65).

In the 1990s, diverse religious coverage in newspapers and news magazines grew, as reporters became interested in religious scandals, which thrust religion into a more negative spotlight. It is also important to note that news publications were interested in more edgy topics in this time period because of changes in journalism's economic models, along with the birth of infotainment. Religious stories in newspapers at this time were less focused on local religious issues and more on national issues, dedicating long-form pieces to them (Buddenbaum, 1996, p. 137). Sean McCloud (2004) thinks that most of these edgy stories were a "marginalization" of mainstream religious groups, showing standard religious groups involved in "fringe" activities (161). Periodicals conveyed what scholar Judith Buddenbaum calls "a 'good grief' style that portrayed religion as just an irrational and out-of-control force" (McCloud, 2004, p. 163).

One example of this type of coverage can be seen in the Catholic Church. From the late 1980s to the early 2000s, it was revealed via news media that several priests were involved in sexual abuse. One of the earliest cases was in the 1980s, when Jason Berry discovered a priest in Louisiana who had "a track record of sexually abusing children" and wrote about it in the *National Catholic Reporter* (Jurkowitz, 2002). Later, on January 6, 2002, the *Boston Globe* broke stories of clergy sexually abusing minors, including priest John Geoghan, who had a history of sexually abusing children but was still allowed to serve in the Catholic Church in a position in which he was around children

(Hungerman, 2013). From there, the *Boston Globe* began a series of sexual abuse cases in the Catholic Church, and instances of sexual abuse in the Catholic Church across the country began springing up:

The articles created a firestorm of criticism against the Catholic Church and led to thousands of accusations of sexual abuse by current and former Catholics. The magnitude of this crisis, along with the size of the Catholic Church itself, made this scandal unprecedented in the history of American religion. (Hungerman, 2013, p. 228).

Not only were the scandals news, but they revealed that Catholic Church “higher-ups had been aware of the problem, enabled criminal priests, and covered up thousands of rapes and sexual assaults” (D’Antonio, 2013, p. 4). Because of the quantity and severity of the stories themselves, Americans overall were tuning in to what news organizations had to say on the scandals, with 74% following the Catholic news “fairly” or “very” closely, making it the biggest story next to “defending against terrorism” (Jurkowitz, 2002).

Because of this coverage in the 1990s and early 2000s, individuals showed more skepticism toward religion in this time period. Stuart Hoover (2003) found that “the most important trend” present in religion during this time was “personal autonomy” (p. 11). This means that the individual is less interested in subscribing to a larger governing system for the sake of following rules and is more interested in investing in making his or her present life meaningful. Additionally, Hoover (2003) identified that there was a “re-articulation of what we used to call ‘religion’ into something else ... most commonly ‘spirituality,’” and that individuals can now get what religious meaning they need “outside

the bounds of traditional religion" (p. 12). Part of this autonomy led to Americans having a more widespread skepticism toward religious institutions. Religious institutions were still under the microscope of the "x-ray environment," making them subject to high criticism (McDonnell, 2003, p. 33).

As for how religion has been covered in periodicals in the past five years, the rise of community journalism has helped spark online debate related to religion (Stout, 2012, p. 97). Also, online journalism has added new elements to the sphere of religion coverage. Kellie Kotraba (2012) in a qualitative study of three online news media's framing of religion, found that religion is an important part of these communities, so blogs and space on the website are devoted to it. Kotraba (2012) says that in many ways, the shift to online has helped religion coverage, but in some ways, it's hurt it:

More voices can be included, thanks to the possibilities of the Internet, and those voices can take on more casual forms by way of blogs. The inside of a religion can really be explored and explained by one who knows it well. But subjectivity has its downside: internal assets can also limit the information that gets out to the public. As mentioned previously, the many-voiced web shift can mean a downshift in the watchdog function (p. 86).

The Religion Beat Today

While U.S. journalism's shift toward a secular route has allowed newspapers and magazines to look through a less biased lens, it has hindered in that media's coverage of religion is not as extensive as it could be. Religion's coverage in secular media is limited for possibly many reasons, but one of those is that religion itself is a difficult topic to

understand. First, there are so many religions, all of which are unique in some way, and it's hard to know everything about all of them, meaning that the journalist has a steep learning curve. Additionally, religion isn't just looking at what people believe theologically, but how they live their lives in light of that belief.

Statistics show that many journalists find covering religion difficult. Diane Winston and John Green (2010) found in a survey that half of reporters see lack of knowledge as a major reason why they struggle with covering religion (p. 1). Additionally, Winston and Green (2010) found that a fifth of journalists would categorize themselves as "'very knowledgeable' about religion, and most of these are mainly familiar with their own religious traditions, not the wider array of faiths and practices" (p. 1).

This lack of religious knowledge can be seen in the small amount of religious coverage in news publications in the U.S. Looking at a 2011 quantitative study conducted by Laura Johnston, University of Missouri professor, of CNN, *Huffington Post*, *USA Today*, *The New York Times*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Los Angeles Tribune*, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, and *Houston Chronicle*, *Huffington Post* and CNN have the most religion coverage, leaving the other newspapers at an average of six percent of the total religion coverage (p. 35). The study also revealed that about half of the religious stories in the statistics had no art or illustration with them, and only eight percent had a video or slideshow (Johnston 2011, p. 36). Most of these stories, 73.2%, were news and feature stories, with the remaining 26.8% being commentary and analysis (Johnston, 2011, p. 36).

There's not only a lack of quantity of content, but there's also a lack of the quality that audiences want. Winston and Green (2010) found that "more than two-thirds (69.7%)

of the public says that they prefer coverage that emphasizes religious experiences, spirituality, practices, and beliefs" (Winston & Green, 2010, p. 5). This desire for religious experiences, spirituality and belief and its practices can be attributed to the state of audiences in the past decade as part of the information age (Schement & Stephenson, 1996, p. 278). In the information age, audiences have more connections available through technology, but those connections aren't necessarily as meaningful, leaving a longing for deeper community and meaning (Schement & Stephenson, 1996, p. 278). However, more than three-fifths (62.9%) of journalists think that audiences "prefer religion coverage that emphasizes religious institutions, activities, events, and personalities" (Winston & Green, 2010, p. 5).

Christian Media

Even though secular media's coverage of religion is limited, people of faith do still get religious coverage, through niche publications, which have been around for centuries. There is little qualitative research about these religious publications, but the research that does exist is overwhelmingly about Christian media. Ken Waters (2001) found that Christian niche publications are numerous. Two Protestant media membership associations have members working at some 400 publications that reach about 47 million annual readers (Waters, 2001). Although the audience is large, those publications are "still less than one-quarter of the total of religious publications in America" (Waters, 2001, p. 307).

Most religious publications are funded by denominations, religious organizations, or individuals, but some still follow a more traditional funding model, relying on subscription fees and advertising revenue (Waters, 2001). Because most rely on religious

funding, it's easy for journalists who take part in these publications to get disheartened at the inability "to tell the whole story" (Waters, 2001). Editors and those who want to serve the religious organization can easily get into arguments over how to tell stories (Waters, 2001). Therefore, the voice of each of the publications can differ, depending on who funds it, and whether someone with more of a journalism background or religious background runs it.

As for the types of niche Christian media, most either belong to the Associated Church Press, which is more theologically liberal, or the Evangelical Press Association, which is more theologically conservative. Those who subscribe to Christian media are almost exclusively clergy or those of devout faith. Within *Christianity Today*, 81% of readers hold a position of church responsibility and the average amount of time readers spend studying theology, commentaries, and history is 15 hours (Christianity Today, 2015). *Christianity Today*, the niche publication this study will focus on, is aimed at serving evangelicals, as it calls itself "the foremost evangelical periodical for news and opinion" (Christianity Today, 2015). It was founded in the 1950s by Billy Graham, a leading Christian evangelist in the U.S.

As for other research on Christian media, most of the studies available do not relate to content or how that content influences social issues. Instead, they focus on the history and economic impact of certain publications. A couple of examples of these kinds of histories include *The Christian Century* by Elesha Coffman (2013) and *National Catholic Reporter at Fifty* by Arthur Jones (2014). Additionally, there are studies of religion's place in popular literature. Two of these include *Faithful Passages* by James Emmett Ryan (2013) and *What Would Jesus Read?* by Erin Smith (2015). Finally, there

is some research on how Christian media fuels the religious right, which includes those who are generally opposed to modernist viewpoints such as accepting evolutionary theory or the idea of sexual fluidity. The idea of how media fuels the beliefs of the religious right is looked at in *Media, Culture, and the Religious Right* (1998) by Linda Kintz and Julia Lesage. Here, in the chapter “Christian Media” Lesage finds that media of the religious right has “a complex and diverse infrastructure for disseminating their perspectives” (p. 21). Also, at the end of the chapter, Lesage touches on how Christians have used rhetorical strategies in the past to attack homosexual rights, showing that the relationship between the LGBT community and the religious community can be strained.

An exhaustive search of the University of Missouri library database and Google scholar found no research discussing coverage of social or moral issues in modern Christian media. Analysis of the content of modern religious media is rare. This gap in the literature is what informed the direction of this study, which is intended to provide an initial look at the framing of gay marriage in Christian media.

LGBT Issues in U.S. News Media

As for how LGBT issues are covered in U.S. media, LGBT representation in news media is a fairly new concept. LGBT coverage in newspapers didn’t begin until the 1940s, and even then, it was limited. According to Bennett (1998), only 356 news stories about gays and lesbians were in the weeklies *Time* and *Newsweek* from 1947 to 1997. In those early days, homosexuality was framed as a social problem, with 60% of the articles talking about how homosexuality was a threat to Americans and the U.S. military and government (Bennett, 1998). Coverage increased in the 1960s, but it still was not extensive, with many of the stories being about crimes or news related to “effeminate

men” or “masculine women” (Pan, Meng, Zhou, 2010, p. 631). In 1963, gay marriage finally made it to one of its first big stories. The story was called “Let’s Push Homophile Marriage” in *One*, the first American magazine dedicated to homosexuality and politics. This story was the first of its kind, talking about gay marriage “as a matter of winning legal recognition” (Pan, Meng, Zhou, 2010, p. 631). In September of 1967, the first gay themed newspaper was born — the *Los Angeles Advocate*. Then, in June of 1969, gay rights protests picked up in the U.S. after the Stonewall Riots, a series of protests from the community toward police officers, who raided the Stonewall Inn in New York City, a place where many of the LGBT community hung out. This began a greater amount of news coverage of the LGBT community in the 1970s, a mostly political coverage (Bennett, 1998). Because the LGBT community was a new concept to many Americans, in the late 1970s, more of the culture of LGBT life was explored in media:

The news media plumbed the breadth and depth of topics ranging from the gay and lesbian sensibility in art and literature to sex, spirituality, personal appearance, dyke separatism, lesbian mothers, drag queen, leather men, and gay bathhouses (Pan, Meng, Zhou, 2010, p. 632).

In the 1980s, mainstream media coverage of the LGBT community changed drastically when AIDS and HIV first began killing mostly gay men. Media began covering the LGBT community as a “dangerous minority,” a group that was the direct cause of the HIV/AIDS epidemic (Pan, Meng & Zhou, 2010, p. 632). In the 1990s, the narrative changed a bit as LGBT visibility increased. News pieces talked about not only HIV and AIDS, but also if the military ban on gays should be eliminated (Pan, Meng, Zhou, 2010, p. 632). As the 1990s moved forward, the legitimacy of same-sex marriage

became a debate, with some U.S. citizens seeing homosexual relationships as a threat to family values (Pan, Meng & Zhou, 2010, p. 632). Yet, acceptance was growing too. *The New York Times* announced in August 2002 that it would begin to publish reports of same-sex marriage ceremonies in the Sunday Styles section, and other newspapers followed suit. A study by Po-Lin Pan, Juan Meng, and Shuhua Zhou (2010) found that *The New York Times* and the *Chicago Tribune* covered the following themes related to LGBT stories in 2002 to 2004: constitutional amendment (26.6% for *The New York Times* and 27.2% for the *Chicago Tribune*), equal rights (33.6% for *The New York Times* and 19.1% for the *Chicago Tribune*), adoption law and policy (7.7% for *The New York Times* and 7.4% for the *Chicago Tribune*), the AIDS epidemic (0.7% for *The New York Times* and 1.2% for the *Chicago Tribune*), the American tradition and family values (17.5% for *The New York Times* and 22.2% for the *Chicago Tribune*), religious disciplinary (11.9% for *The New York Times* and 19.8% for the *Chicago Tribune*), workplace discrimination (two percent for *The New York Times* and 1.9% for the *Chicago Tribune*), and sexual crime and violence (zero percent for *The New York Times* and 1.2% for the *Chicago Tribune*).

LGBT People in U.S. News Media

In the past couple of decades, more topics of the LGBT community have arisen in news media, as the gay rights movement gained traction. In the early 2000s, stories of gay couples began surfacing in news media more often. In *The Battle Over Marriage* (2013), Leigh Moscovitz looks at coverage of gay marriage in news media in the early 2000s, finding that much of it is white-washed and gender typical. In this time period, news media, in an attempt to normalize gay marriage, selected LGBT sources who were

white, middle-class, and educated, not anyone to be interpreted as “urban, alternative, and deviant” (Moscowitz, 2013, p. 58). Moscowitz (2013) additionally found that much of news media’s coverage of gay marriage in the early 2000s perpetuated “heterosexist notions of parenting, monogamy, marriage, family, and parenting,” giving in to typical representations of the LGBT community instead of questioning or challenging those representations (p. 62).

As time has passed, LGBT people’s representation in the media has only increased, as state laws regarding gay marriage changed, especially in the summer of 2015 when gay marriage became legal nationwide. Although coverage of the LGBT community in years has become more extensive, some frames can still be simplistic. According to a study conducted by Debra Mason and Cathy Ellen Rosenholtz (2012), many times media can frame stories as “gays vs. religion,” quoting sources from evangelical organizations who have negative things to say (Mason & Rosenholtz, 2012, p. 4). This framing can lead people to think that all who are religious oppose LGBT equality and all who are LGBT oppose religion:

Media portrayals, such as a “gays versus religion” frame, can reinforce cultural biases, as the media reflect and perpetuate dominant cultural assumptions. (Mason & Rosenholtz, 2012, p. 5)

This “gays vs. religion” frame makes much of the conversation about LGBT rights one of morality and theology, which brings religious conversation into the political sphere (Mason & Rosenholtz, 2012).

Framing Theory

Erving Goffman (1974) found that framing is a theory that shows how

“individuals make sense of their everyday lives” (Rodriguez & Blumell, 2014, p. 342). Robert Entman (1993) defined the functions of a frame as problem definition, causal analysis, moral judgment, and remedy promotion (Rodriguez & Blumell, 2014). Price, Nir, and Cappella (2005) define framing as “a package of associated ideas that helps to guide attention, comprehension, storage, and retrieval of information” (p. 180-181). It has to do with what a story creator focuses on in story telling, which can result from personal biases, an author’s life experiences, opinions, and worldviews. These frames affect audiences in both a sociological and psychological way, affecting how people converse and interact and affecting how people on an individual level interpret issues (Price, Nir & Cappella, 2005).

For the purposes of this study, framing will be defined under the social constructivism model, meaning that audiences are active “in interpreting and discussing public events, but they rely on the mass media to provide common frames of reference that guide interpretation and discussion” (Price, Nir & Cappella, 2005, p. 180). Several scholars see the importance of utilizing framing theory to understand culture better, with “institutions and texts of journalism” being central to the “larger symbolic myths and cultural narratives” (Parameswaran, 2004, p. 45). Textual analysis helps researchers “understand the ways in which members of various cultures and subcultures make sense of who they are, and of how they fit into the world in which they live” (McKee, 2003, p. 1). One reason the content is so central to helping researchers view culture is because content is “the only empirical evidence we have of how other people make sense of the world” (McKee, 2003, p. 15).

Denis McQuail in *Mass Communication Theory* (1987) found that media content

is valued by historians, sociologists, and anthropologists because of its constancy and representation of the culture it's a part of:

The uses to which content analysis have been put in the study of society and culture are many and varied. Media content happens to be one of the most voluminous and accessible sets of data which may indicate much about a society, and its accessibility extends over time and sometimes across national frontiers. (McQuail, 1987, p. 177)

McQuail (1987) also found that media content generally reflects journalists' "intentions, attitudes and assumptions about the audience" (p. 178).

LGBT Frames

Because the social constructivism model of framing shows that frames "guide interpretation and discussion" of culture, it can be gathered that the frames found in this study will show a picture of what some of the Christian community thinks of LGBT issues, specifically, gay marriage (Price, Nir & Cappella, 2005, p. 180). According to Gayle Rubin (1989), in the past, news media have been known to maintain boundaries of both gender and sexual identity, in addition to "giving privilege to heterosexuality" (Rodriguez & Blumell, 2014, p. 343). According to various sources, many stories relating to same-sex marriage in news media have either a morality or equality frame:

Those who favor same-sex marriage have often framed the issue in terms of equality and granting equal rights, specifically the right to marry. Those who oppose same-sex marriage frame the issue in terms of traditional morality and want to deny the right for same-sex couples to marry (Rodriguez & Blumell, 2014, p. 345).

Underneath those two master frames of morality and equality are other frames. The following are frames Rodriguez and Blumell (2014) found in their study of *The New York Times*' framing of marriage equality in 2013: Political Evolution to Equality, Political Stagnation in Morality, Marriage Equality is Beneficial to Children, Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children, Religion as Equality, Religion as Tradition, Inevitability as a Concession to Equality, and Inevitability as a Myth. The researcher will use these frames as a model because they deal with attitudes toward gay marriage, which is what this study will look at as well.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Looking at a sample of *Christianity Today* stories about gay marriage from 2010 to 2015, this mixed methods study looked at how framing changed over time in a leading religion publication. More specifically, the research answered:

- 1) How did *Christianity Today*'s framing of same-sex marriage change over time, specifically between 2010 and 2015?
- 2) How did framing of same-sex marriage in this Christian publication reflect or contrast with evangelical Christian support for or opposition to same-sex marriage from 2010 to 2015, based on Pew Research data?
- 3) How did framing of same-sex marriage in an evangelical magazine compare to existing research about framing of same-sex marriage in the mainstream media?

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to look at how *Christianity Today*, a U.S.-based evangelical Christian publication, has framed same-sex marriage over time, from 2010 (when same-sex marriage bans began to decline in the U.S., according to a study from ProCon.org) to 2015 (the year the U.S. Supreme Court made same-sex marriage legal in all states). Within *Christianity Today's* website, a sample of articles was chosen from January 1, 2010, to December 31, 2015. The sample was based on the search terms that Rodriguez and Blumell (2014) used: “gay marriage,” “same-sex marriage,” and “civil union.” The search terms yielded 48 stories that were chosen for the sample. All stories had at least one of those terms in the headline and/or in the first paragraph of the story, indicating the topic was central to the story. A few exceptions were made for headlines and first paragraphs that included terms very closely related to those search terms, such as “Prop 8,” “DOMA” (Defense of Marriage Act), and “gay wedding.”

A “story” or “article” was defined as news articles and features that were published on ChristianityToday.com. Certain short stories written in news release form were eliminated because of the short length. Also, columns, editorials, and blogs were not included. Additionally, the content had to be found specifically on *Christianity Today's* website (as opposed to content on other websites owned by *Christianity Today*). In searching on Google Advanced search for the above terms, if the results exceeded 20 pages, the researcher stopped at page 20, since content after search results beyond page 20 were mostly links to keywords on webpage navigation.

Within these 48 stories, the researcher only analyzed quotes from sources. By looking at just quotes, the sources of these quotes were categorized into a frame or multiple frames out of the 10 frames total, if more than one applied. The source types of these quotes were also recorded, and along with subsets of main frames, if applicable.

Christianity Today was chosen for this study because it is one of the most popular magazines for evangelical Christians in the United States. Its website has more than 2 million visitors every month, and Religion News Service has called it the “flagship magazine” of evangelicalism (Christianity Today, 2015, Advertising; Lupfer, 2015). *Christianity Today* calls itself “the definitive voice offering the most complete coverage of the Church in the world today” (Christianity Today, 2015, Our Brands). Its website visitor makeup is 63% male and 37% female, with the average age being about 55, and most (95%) having either attended or completed college (Christianity Today, 2015, Advertising). As for lifestyle, 80% of visitors are married and have an average household income of \$77,329 (Christianity Today, 2015, Advertising). As for faith practices, the average website visitor gives \$2,151 per year to non-church Christian organizations, and 98% spend an average of \$256 annually on 16 titles (Christianity Today, 2015, Advertising). In light of these statistics about *Christianity Today*, *Christianity Today* is a logical and effective lens through which to view evangelical Christian culture.

The timeframe of 2010 to 2015 was chosen, because initial research showed that in order to create a sample size large enough for study, several years’ worth of content was needed. Also, 2010 to 2015 is the most recent timeframe available to study, and recently, much progress has happened within the gay rights movement. In 2010, support for the legality of gay marriage began to pick up, with CNN releasing a poll showing that

more than half of respondents thought that gay marriage should be a constitutional right and recognized by law as valid (CNN, 2010). From there, support has only grown, with 55% of Americans supporting gay marriage in 2015, according to Pew Research (Pew Research, 2015). Within this landscape of five years of forward movement for gay rights, the evangelical Christian perspective was analyzed by reviewing *Christianity Today's* stories.

For the theoretical grounding of this study, framing theory and methodology were employed to answer research questions. In light of the idea that determining common themes or frames from a sample can be used as a way to see how “cultures and subcultures make sense of who they are,” a framing study offered a thorough way to better understand how Christians interpret gay marriage (McKee, 2003, p. 1).

Rodriguez and Blumell's (2014) study on the framing of gay marriage in *The New York Times* in 2013 was used as a model for this study. The frames from this study, in detail, are:

- **Political Evolution to Equality:** 19% of articles in the *The New York Times* in 2013 had this frame, which includes sources of politicians, judges, and heads of state talking about the legality and governmental ramifications of same-sex marriage.
- **Political Stagnation in Morality:** 14% of articles in *The New York Times* in 2013 had this frame, which includes sources of politicians, judges, and heads of state talking about the morality of same-sex marriage.
- **Marriage Equality is Beneficial to Children:** 12% of articles in *The New York Times* in 2013 had this frame, which includes sources of doctors,

specialists, and psychiatrists talking about the benefits of a child growing up in a home with gay parents.

- **Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children:** 10% of articles in *The New York Times* in 2013 had this frame, which includes sources of specialists, psychiatrists, and activists talking about the harm of a child growing up in a home with gay parents.
- **Religion as Equality:** 15% of articles in the *The New York Times* in 2013 had this frame, which includes sources of religious leaders and parishioners talking about how not allowing same-sex marriage is an infringement on religious freedom of individuals.
- **Religion as Tradition:** The articles with this frame include sources of religious leaders and parishioners talking about how allowing same-sex marriage would desecrate the traditions of religion.
- **Inevitability as a Concession to Equality:** The articles with this frame include sources of politicians and activists talking about how the issue of fighting for same-sex marriage will inevitably be a thing of the past soon and that equality is on its way.
- **Inevitability as a Myth:** The articles with this frame include sources of politicians and activists talking about how the issue of fighting for same-sex marriage is a movement with no momentum, that same-sex couples won't get marriage rights.

This study is important to journalists and mass communication scholars because there isn't much analysis of religious publications to determine how they portray relevant

social-moral issues such as LGBT rights. Evangelical Christians are a big part of the conversation right now because polls show that evangelical Christians tend to overwhelmingly disapprove of gay marriage. Religious groups have given significant contributions to the public discourse about these issues. Also, evidence abounds on social media showing the ongoing, emotional conversations about this topic, with individuals sharing columns or blogs to support or oppose positions.

The issue of how or if to welcome the LGBT community into churches has caused fissures among major Christian groups. Thus, regardless of the U.S. Supreme Court's position, this topic is certain to remain a contentious one in years to come. It's important to research themes, because then Americans can better understand the intellectual landscape before them and the role of evangelical Christians in reinforcing or challenging popular viewpoints. This issue is not as black and white as the public may perceive it; it's more nuanced, and understanding Christian media's framing will help the public navigate what's to come.

Reading Process

To begin with, the researcher printed off all 48 articles and grouped them by year and then numbered the articles within each year. Then, a sub-sample was looked at, 12 of the 48 articles, in order to test Rodriguez and Blumell's frames and see if any new ones emerged. The sub-sample was chosen to be 12 articles because that included two articles per year, which was the maximum amount possible since 2010 and 2011 only had two articles total. To choose the 12 articles to include in the sub-sample, a random number generator was used. Then a simple coding chart was used to check off which frames sources fell under, which types of sources utilized those frames, and if any new themes

arose. In going through this portion of the sample a minimum of three times, new information was found to factor in. First, source types were more extensive and slightly different than the Rodriguez and Blumell study. Second, a few new frames were present that Rodriguez and Blumell did not discern within their study of *The New York Times*, a large and secular newspaper. After gathering data on this sub-sample, the data was further tested through an intercoder reliability test, where the sub-sample was given to a second person, who went through and checked the categorization of quotes, coming up the same results of categorization as the researcher.

Once the new themes and source types were identified, they were added to the coding process, and coding began for the whole sample of articles, where the researcher went through the entire sample a minimum of three times. As more articles were analyzed, it was found that some frames had subsets, so these were added to better understand the different types of perspectives of sources. For example, the frame of Religion as Tradition required several subsets because some of the sources under this frame outright and bluntly opposed gay marriage, while others emphasized love and grace while still insinuating they oppose it. These two reactions, while showing the same theme, show it in vastly different ways, which is important to note. Because of these nuances within frames, on certain frames, the researcher decided subsets of frames were vital. After collecting data on paper, the data was transferred over to an electronic table for ease of reading and observing overall patterns.

In Rodriguez and Blumell's study, the frames that were used included themes and source types, but in this study, after implementing the source types into analysis, many of them were not found, leading to several different source types. Also, in going through the

coding process, the researcher discerned that not all of Rodriguez and Blumell's frames applied to the article sample. For the frames that did apply, they were renamed to help the researcher better understand the frames for the coding process.

Also, new frames were added from the researcher after the article sample was tested multiple times. Labeling of frames and source types was conducted by looking at source quotes only, whether they were direct or summarized quotes. Therefore, even though there are 48 articles total, there are 228 different labels because each source was categorized into a frame. As for the number of articles per year, there were two articles in 2010, two articles in 2011, eight articles in 2012, eight articles in 2013, 10 articles in 2014, and 18 articles in 2015.

For source types, the researcher labeled the sources under the types of politician; educator or leader of a secular institution; lawyer; leader of Christian organization, company, or school; faith advocacy group; secular advocacy group; clergy; Christian writer, author, or editor; laymen; or Christian celebrity. She labeled the quotes into these source types, but in analyzing, did not find significant patterns to include an in-depth analysis in this study.

There were a few instances where a quote did not get categorized, and that was because the quote was either completely irrelevant to the topic, such as sources talking about something not related to gay marriage, or the quote was so vague or short that it didn't meet requirements for any of the frames established by the researcher.

In order to have a better understanding of LGBT history, it was important to construct a timeline of significant issues in U.S. LGBT rights in the past 50 years, so that the researcher could understand any references to past events in the article sample:

- **January 13, 1958:** In *One, Inc. v. Olesen*, the U.S. Supreme Court rules in favor of the LGBT magazine *One: The Homosexual Magazine*, after the U.S. Postal Service and FBI found the magazine to have obscene material. This is the first case in U.S. history where the courts ruled in favor of the LGBT community.
- **June 28, 1969:** The Stonewall Riots (a three-day event) occur as a result of police officers trying to raid a gay bar near the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village. The raid was one of the police's attempts to "clean up the neighborhood of 'sexual deviants.'"
- **June 28, 1970:** To celebrate the one-year anniversary of the Stonewall Riots, members of the LGBT community march through New York City into Central Park, which is considered one of America's first gay pride parades.
- **November 8, 1977:** Harvey Milk introduces a gay rights ordinance to protect gays and lesbians from getting fired from their jobs and also leads a campaign against Proposition 6, an initiative that forbade homosexual teachers.
- **October 11, 1987:** Thousands of activists march in Washington to push President Ronald Reagan to address the AIDS crisis. The AIDS crisis was first reported on in 1981.
- **August 18, 1990:** President George Bush signs the Ryan White Care Act, which is a federally funded program for people with AIDS, in honor of an Indiana teenager who contracted AIDS in 1984.

- **December 21, 1993:** The Department of Defense issues the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” law, prohibiting the military from asking applicants of their sexual orientation and discriminating based on that. It still forbade individuals from engaging in homosexual acts or being openly gay.
- **May 20, 1996:** The U.S. Supreme Court decides in *Romer v. Evans* that Colorado’s 2nd amendment, which denied gays and lesbians protection from discrimination, is unconstitutional.
- **September 21, 1996:** President Bill Clinton signs the Defense of Marriage Act, which defines marriage as between one man and one woman and doesn’t require states to recognize same-sex marriages.
- **April 26, 2000:** Vermont is the first state to legalize civil unions and registered partnerships of same-sex couples, which begins a movement of states recognizing same-sex marriages. In the following decade, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Iowa, and Washington, D.C., will legalize gay marriage.
- **November 4, 2008:** California voters approve Proposition 8, which makes same-sex marriage illegal in California. This action inspires the NOH8 campaign, which is a national campaign that uses photos of celebrities to promote marriage equality.
- **October 28, 2009:** The Matthew Shepard Act is passed, which expands the 1969 Federal Hate Crime Law to include gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability.

- **December 18, 2010:** The U.S. Senate repeals the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, which allows gays to serve openly in the military.
- **February 23, 2011:** President Barack Obama states his administration will not support the Defense of Marriage Act.
- **May 9, 2012:** President Barack Obama is the first president to voice support for the legality of same-sex marriage.
- **June 26, 2015:** The Supreme Court declares gay marriage as legal in all 50 states.

RESULTS

Below are the definitions of both Rodriguez and Blumell's frames that were used in this study and the new frames that were developed in this study. After the definitions is the summary of the amount of frames each year in tables. Using that data, the researcher answered the three questions of this study: how *Christianity Today*'s coverage changed over time, how that coverage compared to public perception according to Pew Research data, and how that coverage compared to framing of gay marriage in *The New York Times* in 2013. The findings of this study show a picture of how Christians perceive gay marriage and gay rights and how those perceptions have changed from 2010 to 2015. By seeing how these perceptions have been presented in a magazine and how that compares to data on Christians' actual opinions, mass communication scholars can better understand how Christians view LGBT rights. This understanding can provide context to journalists about the resistance the U.S. has had toward LGBT rights, improving not only understanding of sources but also improving publications' explanations of this complex topic. If publications can move closer to accurately reflecting public opinion and explaining more sides of this debate, the public will better understand the issue and will have more opportunity to make informed decisions. Additionally, this research can be of use to Christians, whether it's churches or Christian organizations, showing those of faith how they are reacting toward the LGBT community in detail, which will perhaps help inform the policy decisions they make in the future. With these types of impact in mind, the following results shine a light on an uncharted territory of scholarly research: how Christians frame the issue of gay marriage.

Defining Rodriguez and Blumell's Frames Used In This Study

The following are descriptions of the frames from Rodriguez and Blumell's study that the researcher used for this study.

Political evolution to equality. This frame is when any source talks about the legality of same-sex marriage or the ramifications of the legality of same-sex marriage, talking about if it will happen and why or why not it should happen. Within the article sample, this frame is heavily present early in the sample, from 2010 to 2013. It isn't present in 2015, because for most of that year, gay marriage was already legal nationwide. For the most part, sources who fall into this frame are politicians, lawyers, and leaders in advocacy groups. These sources talk about the constitutionality of gay marriage.

Religion as equality. While Rodriguez and Blumell developed this frame to only show those who advocate for same-sex marriage because of their religion, for the purposes of this study, the researcher adjusted the frame description to make it broader, in order to allow more specificity and avoid over-generalization of sources' perspectives on this nuanced topic. In this study, the frame of a Religion as Equality includes any religious person supporting or allowing gay marriage. This can be someone accepting it on a personal level (moral acceptance) or someone accepting that banning gay marriage or allowing discrimination is unconstitutional (recognizing church/state separation). This frame isn't seen in the article sample until 2012, and from there, the amount it is seen grows slightly. Of all the times this frame is seen, about half are those recognizing church/state separation and the other half are those accepting it on a personal level.

Religion as tradition. This frame is the most complex one in this study, because the expression of moral disapproval of gay marriage can manifest in several different ways. All of these sources think that gay marriage is sinful, would desecrate the traditions of religion, or would somehow harm the current state of the “traditional family,” or the family that constitutes of heterosexual marriage. Yet, differences arose in the sources’ tone and approach within the Religion as Tradition frame. Some use language promoting love and compassion, but still, usually with more subtle language, disapprove of gay marriage (“Love the sinner, hate the sin”). Others are more harsh and upfront with their language, expressing that marriage is a central tenet of Christianity and allowing gay marriage would be a gross immorality of the faith, or that allowing gay marriage would be succumbing to culture and being “of the world” (upfront disapproval). There are others who think that while this is wrong, it shouldn’t be Christians’ main focus, that sin is sin and we should not lose focus on the other important parts of Christian faith (desire to focus elsewhere). This frame is one of the most used ones, with 56 out of 228 labeled sources falling in this frame. Most of those who speak in this frame speak from a place of upfront disapproval, but a significant number also utilize the “love the sinner, hate the sin” mentality. A small number of the sources within this frame show that while they see homosexuality as sinful, they would like the church or Christian community to focus elsewhere.

Marriage equality is harmful to children. This frame includes sources who touch on how homosexuality can negatively affect family life. It can be those who see it as harmful to children because it will encourage children to embrace the gay lifestyle (homosexuality is contagious) or it can be those who see it as harmful because children

need the nurturing of a man and woman (family is man and woman). Within this study, this frame didn't come up very much, only three times total within 228 labeled sources. When it did appear was early in the sample, in 2010 and 2011. Those who fell into this frame majorly expressed that children need a man and a woman to raise them, but there was one individual who expressed that gay marriage in a family could encourage the child to embrace a gay lifestyle.

Inevitability as a concession to equality. This frame is defined as sources who say or allude to how legalization and normalization of same-sex marriage is inevitable. This includes those who see this inevitability as a bad thing that Christians can't stop (negative), those who see this inevitability as a good thing that will promote equality (positive), and those who know it's inevitable but don't express an opinion on it (neutral). This frame is only shown in five of the 228 labeled sources, with it being present in every year except 2011. Those who were positive and negative within this frame were about even, with one person staying neutral.

Inevitability as a myth. This frame is defined as sources who say or allude to how same-sex marriage is not going to get the momentum everyone thinks it is, that it's not necessarily inevitable. This includes those who think that even if gay marriage becomes legal, the institution of heterosexual marriage will still be dominant (straight marriage will still dominate). It also includes those who think that gay marriage won't become legal or gay people won't get legal rights (gay couples won't receive rights). In the entire scope of the study, there are not many sources who fall within this frame. Those who do fall within this frame mostly express that the same-sex marriage movement won't get momentum because the institution of heterosexual marriage will

still dominate, but some think that gay marriage won't become legal or gay people won't get rights.

Defining the New Frames Developed in This Study

The following are frames the researcher developed as the article sample was analyzed.

Same-sex rights versus religious rights. This frame is about the battle between same-sex rights versus religious rights, featuring those who talk about how each group's rights can affect the other group's rights. This includes those who think both groups can be served through legal compromise (compromise), those who think same-sex marriage rights infringe on religious rights (gay rights hurt religious rights), those who think that religious rights will infringe on same-sex marriage rights (religious rights hurt gay rights), and those who simply mention the battle but don't express an opinion (neutral). This frame isn't seen until 2012, but from there onward, it is seen in many sources. It is easily one of the most used frames in the entire study, with 74 of the 228 labeled sources falling under it. Most of the sources who fall in this frame express that gay rights will infringe on religious rights. Some express that a legal compromise is possible, most of who are lawyers or politicians. A smaller number of those who fall in this frame express that religious rights will infringe on gay rights. Only a couple of sources are neutral in talking about this topic.

Gay marriage issue is dividing the church. This frame includes sources who talk about the division in the Christian community and/or church because of same-sex marriage. These sources are those who say that the division in the community is with good reason because the issue is central to the faith (issue is worth split), those who say

that this issue isn't important enough for churches or Christian communities to split over (issue isn't worth split), those who say that same-sex marriage legalization isn't good because it's splitting churches and communities (gay rights are to blame), and those who simply mention the divide but don't express an opinion (neutral). Beginning in 2012, this frame is present in 20 of the 228 labeled sources, with most saying that this issue is not worth the split of churches and/or the Christian community. Following that, there are a smaller number of sources who are neutral on the subject and an even smaller number of those who think this issue is worth a split in the church or Christian community.

Avoidance of issue. This frame includes sources who do not overtly speak an opinion on whether same-sex marriage should be legal or whether it's morally acceptable, but they instead broadly emphasize love, grace, understanding, or virtue. This frame is only present in 10 of the 228 labeled sources and where it is present, sources opt out of outright expressing an opinion by broadly promoting Christian values.

Government policy isn't a solution. This frame includes sources either outright stating or insinuating that ministry or individual action is the way for Christians to solve the issue of same-sex marriage rather than government action. These sources encourage those of the faith to not worry about government policy or how to solve this issue legally, expressing that Christians should teach others about "traditional family values," whether through living those values or overtly speaking about them. This frame is not present in a majority of the article sample, but it still has a strong presence, with these individuals encouraging those of the faith to not depend on government.

Summary of Frames Found

In the tables below, the researcher gathered how often each frame was present in the article sample by year. In reviewing the data, the researcher saw patterns of how often which frames were present and how the presence of those frames changed over time. These patterns helped inform the researcher of what themes *Christianity Today* focused on the most, which were then compared to evangelicals' perceptions of gay marriage according to Pew Research and Rodriguez and Blumell's study of *The New York Times*' framing of gay marriage in 2013.

Table 1		
<i>Number of frames in articles of 2010</i>		
<u>Frames</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Religion as Tradition	9	38%
Government Policy isn't a Solution	7	29%
Avoidance of Issue	4	17%
Political Evolution to Equality	1	4%
Inevitability as a Myth	1	4%
Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children	1	4%
Inevitability as a Concession to Equality	1	4%
<i>Note.</i> This table shows how many times each frame arose in the articles from 2010 (2 articles). N=24.		

Table 2		
<i>Number of frames in articles of 2011</i>		
<u>Frames</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Political Evolution to Equality	3	50%
Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children	2	33%
Religion as Tradition	1	17%
<i>Note.</i> This table shows how many times each frame arose in the articles from 2011 (2 articles). N=6.		

Table 3		
<i>Number of frames in articles of 2012</i>		
<u>Frames</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Political Evolution to Equality	10	55%
Religion as Tradition	2	11%
Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	2	11%
Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	2	11%
Inevitability as a Myth	1	6%
Religion as Equality	1	6%
<i>Note.</i> This table shows how many times each frame arose in the articles from 2012 (8 articles). N=18.		

Table 4		
<i>Number of frames in articles of 2013</i>		
<u>Frames</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Religion as Tradition	7	24%
Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	6	21%
Political Evolution to Equality	5	17%
Government Policy isn't a Solution	3	11%
Religion as Equality	3	11%
Inevitability as a Concession to Equality	2	7%
Inevitability as a Myth	1	3%
Avoidance of Issue	1	3%
Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	1	3%
<i>Note.</i> This table shows how many times each frame arose in the articles from 2013 (8 articles). N=29.		

Table 5		
<i>Number of frames in articles of 2014</i>		
<u>Frames</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	13	28%
Religion as Tradition	12	26%
Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	11	24%
Political Evolution to Equality	6	13%
Religion as Equality	3	7%
Inevitability as a Concession to Equality	1	2%
<i>Note.</i> This table shows how many times each frame arose in the articles from 2014 (10 articles). N=46.		

Table 6		
<i>Number of frames in articles of 2015</i>		
<u>Frames</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	55	52%
Religion as Tradition	26	25%
Religion as Equality	7	6%
Avoidance of Issue	5	5%
Government Policy isn't a Solution	4	4%
Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	4	4%
Inevitability as a Myth	3	3%
Inevitability as a Concession to Equality	1	1%
<i>Note.</i> This table shows how many times each frame arose in the articles from 2015 (18 articles). N=105.		

Table 7		
<i>Number of frames in whole article sample</i>		
<u>Frames</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	74	33%
Religion as Tradition	57	25%
Political Evolution to Equality	25	11%
Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	20	9%
Religion as Equality	14	6%
Government Policy isn't a Solution	14	6%
Avoidance of Issue	10	4%
Inevitability as a Myth	6	3%
Inevitability as a Concession to Equality	5	2%
Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children	3	1%
<i>Note.</i> This table shows how many times each frame arose in all of the articles from the sample. N=228.		

How Coverage Changed Over Time

In reviewing the above data, the researcher began by answering the first question of this study: how *Christianity Today's* coverage changed over time. The following shows how frames increased or decreased over time, along with how subsets of these frames shifted over the years.

Religion as tradition. One frame that was consistently present across the board was Religion as Tradition, where evangelicals talked about how same-sex marriage would desecrate the traditions of religion. Despite the legalization of same-sex marriage and the American move toward acceptance of the LGBT community, looking at *Christianity Today's* coverage, most evangelicals still subscribe to the idea that embracing gay marriage would be embracing sin or succumbing to worldly ways that are against Christian ways. This disapproval of gay marriage can manifest in three ways — upfront disapproval, where a source openly and clearly opposes gay marriage; in a “love the sinner, hate the sin” manner, where a source less overtly disapproves and blankets his or her response in terms of grace or love; and in a way that shows a desire to focus elsewhere, where a source says that homosexuality is a sin, but wishes that Christians wouldn’t make it such a central issue. Of these three approaches, the first two are seen the most in this study.

The approach that is seen most often within this frame is upfront disapproval. One source that falls within this frame subset often is Russell Moore, the president of the Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, who had a consistent presence in the article sample from 2013 onward. He always expressed an upfront disapproval of gay marriage, seeing the allowance of gay marriage as a central moral issue in American society, one that Christians should fight against. In a June 2013 article “Ministry Leaders and Experts Respond to the DOMA and Prop. 8 Rulings,” Moore called the banning of DOMA and allowance of Prop. 8 “a loss for those who are concerned about marriage.” He followed this by emphasizing that “the church has to take a concentrated effort at teaching a counter-cultural understanding of marital fidelity and

family life.” Moore is also quoted in the article sample as criticizing Christian organization World Vision’s decision to hire people in same-sex marriages, saying that “World Vision is a good thing to have, unless the world is all you can see,” in a March 2014 article “World Vision: Why We’re Hiring Gay Christians in Same-Sex Marriages.” Finally, he appears in a June 2015 article “‘Outrage and Panic’ Are Off-Limits, Say Evangelical Leaders on Same-Sex Marriage,” where he emphasizes the need to rescue people from the “sexual revolution,” because it won’t “be able to keep its promises or remain sustainable.”

While Moore is certainly one of *Christianity Today*’s most utilized sources on the topic of same-sex marriage, he isn’t the only staunch dissenter represented in the article sample. There are 47 people who express in an upfront way that same-sex marriage will desecrate the traditions of religion out of the 56 who fall within this frame. One article in 2010, “What is the Gospel Response to the Prop. 8 Decision?”, quotes several who clearly and openly disapprove of gay marriage. Timothy George, the founding dean of Beeson Divinity School of Samford University, an evangelical affiliated school, expressed the following in this article:

Thinking biblically does not allow us to regard marriage as merely prudential or preferential (I like strawberry, you like pistachio), but as a covenantal union of one man and one woman established by God for a purpose that transcends itself.

Here, George is clearly disapproving of gay marriage from a purely moral standpoint. Some sources also incorporate sociological or scientific views as well, such as

Gerald McDermott, professor of religion at Roanoke College, a Lutheran-affiliated school, in the same article:

Christians should be concerned about the common good, and this is not for the common good. Social science has shown that children do best in a home with two parents of the opposite sex in a low-conflict marriage, and gay marriages make that impossible for their children and less likely for society generally. ... Gay marriage will also encourage teens who are unsure of their sexuality to embrace a lifestyle that suffers high rates of suicide, depression, HIV, drug abuse, STDs, and other pathogens.

Of those who express upfront disapproval in their expression of the idea that gay marriage would desecrate the traditions of religion, most see this issue as one of utmost importance, just as important as any other sin. One dissenter, Franklin Graham, president of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, expresses how this issue has led to the ultimate deterioration of morality in America in a November 2015 article, “How Christians Can Flourish in a Same-Sex Marriage World”:

I believe the end is coming. I believe we are in the midnight hour ... you see how quickly our country is deteriorating ... we have seen that it has taken like a nose dive off of the moral diving board into the cesspool of humanity.

Additionally under this frame, there are eight sources who fall into the “love the sinner, hate the sin” subset. One of these is Alan Chambers, former president of Exodus International, a non-profit ministry group that set out to convert gay people into a

heterosexual lifestyle.¹ He expressed in an August 2010 article, “What is the Gospel Response to the Prop. 8 Decision?” that Christians “should respond with 100 percent grace and 100 percent truth,” sharing good attitudes toward others but also telling them that “gay marriage is less than God’s best for relationship.” Others express this idea of truth and grace also. Ed Stetzer, executive director of LifeWay, expresses in a April 2015 article, “Having Gay Friends Changes Evangelicals’ Minds on Marriage, But Not Morality,” that Christians’ task is “to clearly articulate Christian teaching on sexuality with grace to those who disagree,” stating that “you can’t reach people if you hate them.” Justin Anderson, pastor of Redemption Church in San Francisco, expressed in a June 2015 article “‘Outrage and Panic’ Are Off-Limits, Say Evangelical Leaders on Same-Sex Marriage,” that in sharing Christian teachings of sexuality, Christians “absolutely have to have open arms, and leave judgement [sic] and ridicule and ‘I told you so’ behind.”

In addition to these two subsets of upfront disapproval and “love the sinner, hate the sin,” there are also a couple of sources who express that gay marriage will desecrate the traditions of religion, but Christians should focus elsewhere. These two sources are present in the same November 2015 article, “How Christians Can Flourish in a Same-Sex Marriage World.” One is Richard Hays, a New Testament scholar, who talks about how homosexuality is mentioned briefly in the Bible and should only lightly be focused on, saying that “what the Bible does say should be heeded carefully, but any ethic that intends to be biblical” should “seek to get the accents in the right place.” Within this same article, C.S. Lewis is quoted from his book, *Mere Christianity*, stating that “the

¹ Exodus International shut down in June 2013, after president Alan Chambers decided that the organization had “been imprisoned in a worldview that’s neither honoring toward our fellow human beings, nor biblical,” according to a statement made by him when the company shut down.

centre of Christian morality is not” homosexuality, and that “a cold, self-righteous prig who goes regularly to church may be far nearer to hell than a prostitute.”

Religion as equality. While the frame of Religion as Tradition is consistently present throughout the whole article sample, the frame of Religion as Equality applies to only 14 of the 228 sources categorized, being seen most often in 2015. In 2012, one religious leader, president Barack Obama, supported gay marriage in a May article titled “President’s Evolution Is Over: Obama Commits to Supporting Same-Sex Marriage.” In this article, he stated that his views had evolved and he sees his religion as a basis for allowing same-sex couples to get married, that the Golden Rule is an important part of Christianity that can advocate for gay rights. Someone who is clergy isn’t seen accepting gay marriage until 2013, in a January article titled “Steve Chalke Stuns British Evangelicals By Coming Out in Support of Same-Sex Relationships.” Here, Steve Chalke, an Evangelical clergy in the United Kingdom, says that “tolerance is not the same as Christ-like love,” and that Christians should want rights for gay people and want to provide positive homosexual role models to help them in relationships. From 2013 onward, the number of sources in the article sample who fall within this frame grows, but it still remains small in comparison to those who see gay marriage as a desecration of religion. In 2015, only seven sources fall into the frame of a Religion as Equality, while 26 sources fall into the frame of seeing gay marriage as a desecration to religion.

Law-related frames. Not only are sources within this article sample heavily interested in same-sex marriage from a moral standpoint, but they also, across the spectrum of five years, consistently fall in frames relating to law — Political Evolution to Equality and Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights. In the beginning of the sample,

from 2010 to 2013, the frame of Political Evolution to Equality is heavily seen. In the beginning of the sample, there are a number of politicians and lawyers discussing both the constitutionality of same-sex marriage, DOMA, and Proposition 8. An example of sources falling within this frame can be seen in a June 2012 article titled “California’s Gay Marriage Case Likely Headed to Supreme Court.” Here, Judge Diarmuid O’Scaannlain discusses how the Ninth Circuit in declaring California’s ban on same-sex marriage as unconstitutional had “silenced any such respectful conversation” and “trumped California’s democratic process without at least discussing” the issue. Another example of this frame can be seen in the June 2013 article “Ministry Leaders and Experts Respond to the DOMA and Prop. 8 Rulings,” where Justice Anthony Kennedy is quoted talking about how DOMA tells people that same-sex marriages are “less worthy than the marriages of others.” Others who fell into the Political Evolution to Equality frame had similar points as the ones above, talking either about constitutionality of gay marriage or laws attempting to ban gay marriage.

As time passed, though, and the nationwide legalization of same-sex marriage was around the corner, this frame lessened and more sources began falling under the Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights frame. This frame focuses more on the legal balance between the two groups and whether such a balance is even possible. The first source to fall under this frame is in 2012, and from there, the frame’s presence grows. In 2014, this frame was the third most used in that year’s articles. In 2015, it was the most used frame, with 55 sources total falling into this frame out of the 105 sources marked. Toward the end of the article sample, less sources talked about the constitutionality of gay marriage and talked more about what religious groups can and should do in the face

of the gay rights movement. Most sources who fell beneath this frame saw gay rights as infringing upon religious rights, wanting religious groups to be able to not support gay marriage. This can range from allowing churches the freedom to not officiate gay weddings to wedding photographers or wedding cake makers having the ability to tell a gay couple no. One source who talked about this in a June 2012 article “Declining to Photograph a Same-Sex Ceremony: Is It Legal to Refuse a Gay Client?” is Jordan Lorence, senior counsel for Elane Photography, a photography company that refused service to a gay couple. Lorence brings up a point that any Christian businessperson could face:

Should the government force a videographer who is an animal rights activist to create a video promoting hunting and taxidermy? Of course not, and neither should the government force this photographer to promote a message that violates her conscience.

Others who see gay rights as harmful to religious rights see that the majority of America is moving toward acceptance of gay marriage, leaving them in the minority. In a February 2014 article titled “Would Jesus Bake a Cake for a Gay Wedding in Arizona?” Josh Kredit, legal counsel of the Center for Arizona Policy, states that the move toward gay rights has produced “a growing hostility toward religion.” Some who hold this view want to fight legislation for gay rights, while others see the need to develop protection laws that will help religious organizations as gay rights increase. This can be seen in a January 2014 article “Evangelicals’ Favorite Same-Sex Marriage Law?,” where University of St. Thomas law professor Thomas Berg states that too many people “see

this as an all-or-nothing matter” and “if religious liberty is tied to defeating same-sex marriage altogether, religious liberty is going to lose.”

Although many sources spoke in a way that said that gay rights hurt religious rights, others emphasized that legal compromise is possible, that laws to keep religious freedom but not discriminate the gay community are the way to go. In outlining some of these legal possibilities for compromise, beginning in 2014, *Christianity Today* often utilized the voice of Robin Fretwell Wilson, a professor at University of Illinois College of Law. In an April 2015 article “Why ‘RFRA’ Is America’s Latest Four-Letter Word” Wilson expressed “that faith groups and supporters of same-sex marriage don’t need to be enemies” and that “the rights of both can be protected within the law.” In both this article and a March 2015 article titled “Revisiting Evangelicals’ Favorite Same-Sex Marriage Laws,” Wilson emphasizes how the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) is not the answer to creating a balance between same-sex marriage rights and religious rights, and that working to completely ban gay marriage “is not going to work” to achieve that balance. In this article, Wilson states that Utah’s approach to same-sex marriage in light of religious groups’ beliefs, the Utah Compromise, is a better example of how to achieve compromise. Others, including politicians and members of advocacy groups, advocate for legal compromise as well, but Wilson is the most prominent source on the subject within this article sample.

Finally, there are seven within the 74 in the Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights frame who see religious rights as hurting gay rights. All of the sources who fall under this frame subset are politicians, educators or leaders of a secular institution, or members of a secular advocacy group. There are no religious individuals shown who see

religious rights as infringing upon gay rights. One source within this subset, Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, expressed in a April 2015 article “Why ‘RFRA’ Is America’s Latest Four-Letter Word” that allowing “too much religious freedom would be ‘courting anarchy’.” Of the few sources within this subset, most only had brief statements like Scalia’s.

Gay marriage issue is dividing the church. Within the article sample there were 20 out of 228 total sources who fell under the frame Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church. This frame was consistently present throughout the five-year span, not growing or waning at any particular point in time. Some sources briefly alluded to this theme while others expounded upon it in length. Of the 20 sources who fall within this frame, half think that this issue is not worth splitting over. These sources emphasize the need for unity and allowance of different opinions. One source, World Vision U.S. president Richard Stearns, in the March 2014 article “World Vision: Why We’re Hiring Gay Christians in Same-Sex Marriages” stated that all the division surrounding this topic is “heartbreaking,” and that “it’s tearing churches apart, tearing denominations apart, tearing Christian colleges apart, and even tearing families apart.” He emphasized that this issue isn’t worth the split by saying that World Vision wouldn’t “jump into the fight on one side or another on this issue,” but rather it would work to focus on its mission and find unity. Others acknowledge the split in more succinct ways, such as Maxie Dunnam, chancellor of Ashbury Seminary and leader in the Good News movement for evangelical Methodists. In a June 2014 article “Is Gay Marriage Destroying the United Methodist Church?” Dunnam states that some find it difficult to be in the United Methodist Church

as it currently defines sexuality and that “forty years of wrestling with the issue is enough.”

In addition to those who find the division of the Christian community and church to be a split not worth making, there are eight sources who acknowledge the division on neutral terms, not expressing a personal opinion. An example of this can be seen in a January 2013 article “Steve Chalke Stuns British Evangelicals by Coming Out in Support of Same-Sex Relationships,” where editor Ruth Dickinson acknowledges that evangelical leader Steve Chalke’s decision to support same-sex relationships will “reverberate for years” because of the divided Christian audience it meets. Another example of this sub-frame of neutrality can be seen in a June 2014 article “PC(USA) Permits Pastors to Perform Same-Sex Marriages, Thanks to Conservative Exodus,” where PC(USA) moderator Heath Rada talks about how Presbyterians are “tired of being defined by the controversy over same-sex marriage,” which shows a brief allusion to the theme that same-sex marriage is causing division within the Christian community.

As for those who think the issue of whether to oppose or support same-sex marriage is worth creating rifts in the church, there was only one source in this study who expressed that viewpoint. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School president David Dockery, in an October 2015 article “Crisis Averted: Christian Colleges Avoid Split Over Same-Sex Marriage,” said that denominational differences “help shape these matters,” meaning that divisions can sometimes help a hazy issue like same-sex marriage.

Government policy isn’t a solution. There are 14 sources who fall under the frame Government Policy isn’t a Solution. There is no pattern for the presence of this frame in terms of when it was seen; it was seen periodically throughout the entire

expanse of the study. Of the 228 sources total, 14 fell under this frame (6%). Those who fell under this frame not only advocated for ministry and individual action to help the issue of gay marriage, but they also spoke of not taking government action or ignoring the government to look to individual solutions.

Avoidance of issue. Another frame that had a small presence in this study is the frame of Avoidance of Issue. This frame is present in 10 sources and arises periodically throughout the five-year span of the article sample. Those who fall under this frame usually emphasize the importance of loving the LGBT community and striving for unity. One source, president of The Marin Foundation Andrew Marin, in an August 2010 article, “What Is the Gospel Response to the Prop. 8 Decision?,” stated that fighting “a drawn-out battle with a government that is not governed through an evangelical worldview,” will produce “more casualties for Christ” and Christians should “live in relation to, and relationship with LGBT people as gay marriage is legalized.” Other sources who fall under this frame say similar things, ultimately advocating for simply loving the gay community.

Marriage equality is harmful to children. Additionally, there are a few frames that make a brief presence in the study. In 2010 and 2011 there are a few sources who fall under the frame Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children, where sources see gay marriage as ruining the family structure. Of the ones who fall under this frame, most emphasize the idea that children need both a man and woman to raise them and without that, a child would be missing a vital part of a positive upbringing. However, one source, Gerald McDermott, professor of religion at Roanoke College, in an August 2010 article “What Is the Gospel Response to the Prop. 8 Decision?” emphasized that gay marriage

can encourage a child to embrace a gay lifestyle, which is one “that suffers high rates of suicide, depression, HIV, drug abuse, STDs, and other pathogens.” The few sources who fell within this frame are only in 2010 and 2011, and afterwards, the frame isn’t present again.

Inevitability as a myth. Also, the frame of Inevitability as a Myth has a brief presence in this study, showing up in six sources throughout the entire study. Of the times it does appear, a majority of the sources who fall within this frame enforce this theme by emphasizing that even with gay rights taking off, the idea of straight marriage will still dominate. An example of this frame can be seen in a June 2013 article titled “Ministry Leaders and Experts Respond to the DOMA and Prop. 8 Rulings” where senior counsel for Alliance Defending Freedom Austin Nimrocks expresses that despite legal progression for gay couples, “marriage between one man and one woman will remain “timeless, universal, and special” and that it “will not change.” This quote sums up the attitude of most sources within this subset of the Inevitability as a Myth frame. The rest of the sources (only two people) under this frame express that gay couples won’t receive rights and this political movement will not go anywhere.

Inevitability as a concession to equality. Conversely, there is also a brief presence of those who fall into the frame of Inevitability as a Concession to Equality. Only five sources within the whole sample fall into this frame, and of those who do, two see it as a positive thing, two see it as a negative thing, and one has a neutral stance. Those who see it as positive are clergy who also fall under the frame of Religion as Equality. As for those who see the inevitability of same-sex rights as a negative thing, one of the sources in a 2010 article approaches it from a legal perspective, saying that

Christians should work to vote against bills like Proposition 8. The other source in a 2013 article approaches it from an individual perspective, saying that ministry and teaching “correct” sexuality is important. This shift from looking for legal solutions to relying on individuals to live out their faith and ministry can be seen in several sources over the course of five years.

How This Study Compares to Evangelical Christians’ Views

In order to answer the second research question of this study, the researcher reviewed Pew Research data to see statistics on how many evangelicals supported and opposed gay marriage from 2010 to 2015. This data was compared to the amount of supporters and dissenters categorized in this study, so that the researcher could compare *Christianity Today*’s coverage to actual public perception, seeing if the coverage was fully reflective of public opinion. In the following data from Pew Research, white evangelicals and black protestants are separate categories,² and both will be shown here, since both groups are covered by *Christianity Today*. According to Pew Research data from June 2015, a majority of white evangelicals do not support gay marriage, with two-thirds seeing “a lot” of conflict between homosexuality and their beliefs. As for black protestants, almost half see “a lot” of conflict between homosexuality and their beliefs. Yet, a small number of both black protestants and white evangelicals do support gay marriage, and for both groups, that number has risen slightly from 2010 to 2015, according to Pew Research data from July 2015. According to this July 2015 data, black protestant supporters have seen a slightly greater rise in five years than white evangelicals, going from 29% to 34%, while white evangelical supporters have risen

² Black protestants and white evangelicals are separate categories in Pew Research data because the two groups are quite different in political viewpoints, usually, and creating separate groups avoids “lumping groups with clearly distinct political ideas into one bucket” (Kurtzleben, 2015).

from 20% to 24%. This means that over the five-year span of this study, an average of 32% of white evangelicals supported gay marriage, and an average of 22% of black protestants supported gay marriage. In looking at both of those percentages, an average of 27% of evangelicals overall supported gay marriage from 2010 to 2015.

While this number of supporters (27%) is still a minority in both groups, it is still a significant portion of the evangelical population that is not fully represented in the article sample of this study. In the article sample of this study, 228 sources were documented into frames, but the researcher realized that it was more accurate to only look at the categorizations that reflected a positive or negative opinion of gay marriage, not those who were simply neutral, since the Pew data only reflects those who approve or disapprove of gay marriage. When the frames expressing a positive or negative opinion were counted, 137 of the 228 sources expressed support or dissent for gay marriage, while the other sources were neutral. Looking at only these 137, 16 sources were shown regarding same-sex marriage in a positive manner, which is 12% of the 137. The 16 sources counted either fell into the frame of religious leader openly supporting gay marriage or the positive side of the frame of same-sex marriage is an inevitability and equality is on the way. The researcher counted these two categories because they were the only ones regarding same-sex marriage in an openly positive way.

As for those who disapprove of gay marriage, the researcher categorized those who fell under the frames: Inevitability as a Myth, Religion as Tradition, Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children, the negative side of Inevitability as a Concession to Equality, Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church (subsets of gay marriage is worth splitting over and gay rights are to blame for the split), and Same-Sex Rights Versus

Religious Rights (subset of gay rights hurt religious rights). In counting, the researcher found that 121 sources fell into these categories, which is 88% of the 137 sources.

Overall, these statistics show that *Christianity Today*'s coverage of evangelical Christians' views of gay marriage over the past five years doesn't match the actual statistics of how evangelical Christians responded in anonymous surveys about gay marriage. In averaging numbers, the data says that an average of 27% of evangelical Christians supported gay marriage from 2010 to 2015. In the article sample of this study, 12% of the 137 sources recorded as having a positive or negative opinion supported gay marriage. While there are 27% of evangelical Christians according to Pew who support gay marriage, only 12% of quoted sources in this sample of *Christianity Today* support gay marriage.

How the Data Compares to Rodriguez and Blumell's Study

For the third research question of this study, the researcher aimed to compare *Christianity Today*'s framing to framing in *The New York Times* in 2013. In reading Rodriguez and Blumell's study on how *The New York Times* framed gay marriage in 2013 and then beginning research on *Christianity Today*'s framing of gay marriage, the researcher quickly noticed the difference in the two publications' purposes and source types. First of all, *The New York Times* is a secular newspaper, while *Christianity Today* is a religious magazine. Therefore, *The New York Times* serves a more widespread religiously diverse audience, while *Christianity Today* serves a niche audience of evangelical Christians. Because of this difference, the frames of *The New York Times* study were broader and focused on the political side of the same-sex marriage debate, and these types of frames didn't work for *Christianity Today* because the sources in

Christianity Today focused more on morality and how the legality of same-sex marriage affects the church.

In looking at the article sample, the researcher found that *Christianity Today* had more content related to morality, and when political content arose, it was about the rights of religious people versus gay people and how both groups could co-exist. Overall, Rodriguez and Blumell's frames reflected more general themes that for the most part didn't touch on individuals' viewpoints of gay marriage, which is what this study set out to do — find how coverage of viewpoints aligned with actual viewpoints and how these viewpoints changed over time. Rodriguez and Blumell's frames of political stagnation in morality and marriage equality is beneficial to children didn't arise in the article sample.

Additionally, the source types were quite different between the two publications. In *Christianity Today*, many sources were religiously affiliated somehow, so the researcher developed source types that were more specific than Rodriguez and Blumell's "religious leaders and parishioners," creating the source types: leaders of Christian advocacy groups; Christian writer, author, or editor; leader of Christian organization, company, or school; Christian celebrity; and clergy. Outside of those source types, the researcher kept Rodriguez and Blumell's source types of politicians and added lawyers, leaders of secular advocacy groups, and educators or leaders of secular institutions. The source type of doctors, specialists, or psychiatrists was eliminated since it was not present in this article sample. The source type of LGBT advocates was not present in this article sample either.

As for the findings of Rodriguez and Blumell's study, overall, the most used frame was Political Evolution to Equality (19%), which encompasses all political talk

relating to same-sex marriage legalization. In this study, the frame of Political Evolution to Equality was only in 11% of the sources in the article sample. This is still a considerable portion of the frames, with it being the third most used, but it still isn't as largely used as it was in Rodriguez and Blumell's study. This can possibly partly be contributed to the fact that a portion of this article sample is from 2015, when gay marriage became legal nationwide. In 2015, there are no articles that fall within the Political Evolution to Equality frame. Also, as time shifted, the frame of Political Evolution to Equality lessened and more sources talked about religious rights vs. gay rights, attempting to figure out a balance between the two sides.

Also, in Rodriguez and Blumell's study, they found that the frame Religion as Equality was in 15% of sources. In this study, six percent of sources fall into this frame, which is significantly less than in Rodriguez and Blumell's study. This difference in percentages is likely because of source types. In this study, there were much more evangelical sources than there were in *The New York Times* study, and as seen by the Pew data earlier in this study, a majority of evangelicals see homosexuality as sinful.

Furthermore, Rodriguez and Blumell's study found that 13% of sources fell into the Religion as Tradition frame. In this study of *Christianity Today*, 25% of the sources fell into the frame of Religion as Tradition. For Rodriguez and Blumell's study this was the fourth most used frame (13%); for this study, it was the second most used frame. Once again, this difference in percentages is likely because of source types, wherein this study has much more evangelical sources.

For the frame Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children, Rodriguez and Blumell found that 10% of their article sample contained this frame. The researcher renamed this

frame harm of a child growing up in a house with gay parents. Within this study, the percentage of this frame was much lower, at one percent. This frame only arose at the beginning of the article sample and then went away toward the end. This is likely because as gay rights picked up, the public became more aware of what a gay family can look like, altering people's perceptions to gay couples and their children. Also, in looking at this article sample, it seems that evangelicals are more concerned with how the church should respond to gay marriage more than if a family could thrive with two same-sex parents.

For the frame Inevitability as a Concession to Equality, Rodriguez and Blumell found that 9% of the sources within the article sample fell in this frame. For this study, the researcher found that two percent of sources fell within this frame. The lack of sources within this frame in this study could be because there is a large amount of evangelical sources and those sources don't necessarily want to admit that same-sex rights are on the way.

Finally, Rodriguez and Blumell found in their study that the frame Inevitability as a Myth was present in eight percent of the sources. In this study, the researcher found that three percent of the sources fell within this frame. Part of the reason this frame could be less present in this study is because a significant portion of the study takes place after 2013, and by then, many sources knew of the traction the gay rights movement was achieving. Of the ones who did fall into this frame in this study, most fell into the subset of straight marriage will still dominate, meaning that they didn't necessarily think gay rights weren't going to happen, but they still believed that ideologically, straight marriage would still be the dominate standard.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the researcher saw that from 2010 to 2015, 25% of sources consistently fell into the frame of Religion as Tradition, and the numbers didn't necessarily drop as time went on. Of those who fell into this source, approaches to expressing this opinion were quite different, however. Most sources expressed their disapproval in upfront ways, but many expressed this in a "love the sinner, hate the sin" manner, meaning that they emphasized love and grace while subtly implying that they still saw homosexual behavior as sinful. A few who fell into the desecration frame showed a desire to focus elsewhere, meaning that even though they considered homosexual behavior as sinful, they didn't think it should be a central issue in the church. Also, the researcher found that over the span of five years, the amount of religious supporters of gay marriage didn't grow much, and this group overall did not have a large presence in the stories of this study's sample. Those who fell within this frame either expressed an acceptance on an individual moral level or recognized the separation of church and state.

In addition to these frames, the researcher found that legal frames were consistently present over the five-year span, but that the numbers of frames shifted from being largely Political Evolution to Equality to Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights. Overall, Political Evolution to Equality was present in 11% of the sources, and Gay Rights vs. Religious Rights was present in 33% of the sources. Of those who fell within the Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights frame, most saw gay rights as hurting religious rights, while a smaller number thought legal compromise was possible. A few sources, not many, saw religious rights as hurting gay rights.

Also, there was a significant presence of those who fell into the frame Gay Marriage is Dividing the Church (nine percent). There was not a pattern to this frame in terms of when it occurred. Of those who fell into this frame, most saw the issue of same-sex marriage as something that wasn't worth a church or community split. However, a large number also didn't express an opinion on church division, simply acknowledging that it was occurring. One source thought that the same-sex marriage issue is worth a church or community splitting, while another source thought that gay rights are to blame for churches and communities splitting.

As for the rest of the frames, the researcher found that they didn't have a high presence in the article sample, with them being six percent and lower of the total sources. These frames include Government Policy isn't a Solution, Avoidance of Issue, Inevitability as a Myth, Inevitability as a Concession to Equality, and Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children. These frames showed up sporadically throughout the study and the only one with a time pattern was harm of a child growing up in a house with gay parents, which showed up at the beginning of the study and went away at the end.

In comparing these findings to Pew Research data, the researcher found that representation of supporters and dissenters of same-sex marriage in *Christianity Today* didn't reflect actual public opinion. In averaging numbers, it was found that approximately 27% of evangelical Christians have supported gay marriage from 2010 to 2015, and only 12% of sources in *Christianity Today* are religious supporters of gay marriage. The researcher also compared findings to Rodriguez and Blumell's study of *The New York Times'* framing of gay marriage in 2013. In doing this, it was found that results were not similar, mostly because of source types and publication differences, with

one publication creating news for a secular audience and the other publication creating stories for a religious audience.

In these findings, the results were surprising in that there was such a strong presence of sources who bluntly disapprove of gay marriage. The researcher expected that there would be more of a presence of Christian sources who were for gay rights or Christians who were unsure of their beliefs. Reviewing the Pew data solidified the expectations the researcher had, showing that in actuality there are more evangelicals who are for gay rights than are represented in *Christianity Today*. It was also surprising that of the dissenters of gay marriage, most expressed opinions in a harsh and upfront way. The researcher expected that more dissenters would fall into the subcategory of love the sinner, hate the sin. Another surprising element in this study is the strong presence of the Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights frame. The researcher expected that more Christians would be still fighting against legalization of same-sex marriage, but instead, many Christians seem to have accepted the inevitability of the legalization of gay marriage and have opted for figuring out how to keep their religious rights in the midst of this culture shift.

This study is important because it is the first of its kind. As seen in the literature review of this study, there is a gap in research about Christian media and no research that the researcher could find on the relationship between the LGBT community and Christians. Understanding the relationship between these two groups is important for the gay rights movement, as much of the resistance against it is seen in the evangelical Christian community. If people can better understand the relationship between these two groups, they can better understand how to navigate the cultural shift that is happening, as

gay rights grow. Additionally, for the research field, this study can be the starting point for more research on how these two groups interact and how they are reflected in media. For the journalism research field, this kind of research can help journalists understand sources better, specifically those who are LGBT or Christian. It's helpful to those in Christian journalism, showing them the gaps in their own coverage and the themes their sources fall into. Overall, the relationship between these two groups is a complex one, and the more research that is available, the more representation that is available, so that sources are not oversimplified or stereotyped.

Limitations and Future Studies

While the researcher was thorough in methodology of this study, there were some limitations present. One was that the article sizes per year were not even. In 2010 and 2011, there were only two articles per year, while in 2015, there were 18 articles. In some ways, this size discrepancy illuminated to the researcher the difference in evangelical Christians' priority regarding gay rights from 2010 to 2015. The article sample increases each year, with 2010 and 2011 having two articles, 2012 and 2013 having 8 articles, 2014 having 10, and 2015 having 18. These numbers can't be helped, but it still skews the study slightly to where more articles from 2015 are going to be factored in than in any other year. Another limitation present in this study is that the article sample size is small and might not be as thorough as an article sample size that were bigger. This is part of the reason the researcher chose a time span that was larger than simply a year, because in only looking at one year, there aren't enough articles for a significant analysis.

Additionally, the fact that the researcher only looked at *Christianity Today* could be seen as a limitation, but it is also reflective of Christian media, in that its presence in American

media overall is not large. The researcher chose this medium because it is one of the most definitive voices in the media that evangelicals pay attention to and has large audiences.

As for future studies, a researcher could use the frames established here and compare them to public opinion again, to see if *Christianity Today*'s coverage changes, perhaps more accurately reflecting public opinion of same-sex marriage. A researcher could also take these findings and compare them to some sort of secular medium, analyzing the difference between religious coverage and secular coverage of same-sex marriage. Additionally, a researcher could use these frames and see how they are present in another type of religious media, perhaps analyzing either another Christian publication or looking at a publication reflecting another religion, to get further perspective of how religious people view same-sex marriage. Furthermore, a researcher could take this data and add further perspective through interviews, perhaps receiving a more in-depth look at religious perspectives of gay marriage. These are but a few possibilities for future research regarding religion and same-sex marriage.

Ending Thoughts

This study is important because it explores a gray area, the intersection of Christianity and gay rights as expressed in media. In seeing the data collected here, it is obvious that the way evangelical Christians view gay marriage is complex and nuanced, that even those who disapprove of it are not always those screaming of hell or exhibiting homophobia. Many evangelicals are searching for a way to maintain morality while exhibiting love. In trying to find the balance, some evangelicals deem that bluntly telling the truth is the right course of action, while some cloak their disapproval in terms of love and grace. A smaller number decide that same-sex marriage isn't sinful and decide to

wholeheartedly embrace those in same-sex marriages. Others opt out of the morality discussion altogether, either broadly encouraging brotherly love or perhaps looking for legal solutions to the ever-growing legal conundrum of allowing the freedom of choice while protecting the rights of the religious. There are a few who perhaps don't understand the science of homosexuality at all, yet pretending they do and advocating for a straight lifestyle. The perspectives found here are but a small picture of the complex landscape that is how Christians view gay marriage. This study is important because it marks the perspectives of evangelical Christians at an important time, the years leading up to the nationwide legalization of gay marriage. The end of this study, 2015, marks an end and a beginning, and this study helps shed light on the nature of evangelical Christians' perspectives leading up to that point in time.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, L. (1998). Fifty years of prejudice in the media. *The Gay and Lesbian Review Worldwide*, 7(2), 30–42.
- Buddenbaum, J. (1996). The role of religion in public attitudes toward religion news. In D. Stout and J. Buddenbaum (Eds.), *Religion and Mass Media: Audiences and Adaptations* (pp. 135-147). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Buddenbaum, J., & Mason, D. (2000). *Readings on Religion as News*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- CNN. (2010). CNN Opinion Research Poll. Retrieved from <http://www.freedomtomarry.org/page/-/files/pdfs/CNN%20Poll.pdf>.
- Christians, C. (2009). *Normative Theories of the Media Journalism in Democratic Societies*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Christianity Today. (2015). Advertising. Retrieved from <http://www.christianitytodayads.com/christianity-today/>.
- Christianity Today. (2015). Our Brands. Retrieved from <http://www.christianitytoday.org/ourbrands/>.
- Coffman, E. (2013). *The Christian Century and the Rise of the Protestant Mainline*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- D’Antonio, M. (2013). *Mortal Sins: Sex, Crime, and the Era of Catholic Scandal*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Emerson, M. (2012). Study reveals changes in attitude toward religion, morality, politics and other social issues. Retrieved from <http://phys.org/news/2013-06-reveals-attitude-religion-morality-politics.html>.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York City: Routledge.
- Fortner, R. (2007). *Communication, Media, and Identity*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Hendershot, H. (2004). *Shaking the World for Jesus: Media and Conservative Evangelical Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Hoover, S. (1998). *Religion in the News: Faith and Journalism in American Public Discourse*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Hoover, S. (2003). Religion, media, and identity: Theory and method in audience research on religion and media. In J. Mitchell and S. Marriage (Eds.) *Mediating Religion* (pp. 9-19). New York: T&T Clark.
- Hoover, S., & Lundby, K. (1997). Religion and Media in the Construction of Cultures. In *Rethinking Media, Religion, and Culture*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Hungerman, D. M. (2013). Substitution and stigma: Evidence on religious markets from the catholic sex abuse scandal. *American Economic Journal. Economic Policy*, 5(3), 227-253. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/pol.5.3.227>
- Hunt, S. (2009). *Contemporary Christianity and LGBT Sexualities*. Farnham, England: Ashgate Pub.
- Johnston, L. (2011, January 1). Lasting legacies: A framing analysis of religion news online and in legacy media. Retrieved from <https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/14548/research.pdf?sequence=2>.
- Jones, A. (2014). *National Catholic Reporter at Fifty*. New York: Roman & Littlefield.
- Jurkowitz, M. (2002, July 28). When 'two alien cultures' face off. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved from http://www.boston.com/globe/spotlight/abuse/stories2/072802_media.htm.
- Kintz, L., & Lesage, J. (1998). *Media, Culture, and the Religious Right*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kurtzleben, D. (2015, December 19). Are You An Evangelical? Are You Sure? Retrieved April 05, 2016, from <http://www.npr.org/2015/12/19/458058251/are-you-an-evangelical-are-you-sure>
- Lupfer, J. (2015, June 10). Why a 'yes' to gays is often a 'no' to evangelicalism (COMMENTARY) - Religion News Service. Retrieved November 4, 2015, from <http://www.religionnews.com/2015/06/10/yes-gays-often-no-evangelicalism-commentary/>.
- Mahan, J. (2012). Religion and media. *Religion Compass*, 6(1). Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail/detail?sid=830c2ebd-2021-49b5-a59e-f225384229f3@sessionmgr115&vid=0&hid=126&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=a9h&AN=70116912>.

- Mason, D. (2012). Religion news coverage between 1930 and 1960. In Diane Winston (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Religion and American News Media* (pp. 65-92). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mason, D., & Rosenholtz, C. (2012). *Missing Voices: A study of religious voices in Mainstream Media reports about LGBT equality*. University of Missouri Center on Religion & the Professions. Retrieved from <http://www.glaad.org/publications/missingvoices>
- McCloud, S. (2004). *Making the American Religious Fringe: Exotics, Subversives, and Journalists, 1955-1993*. Chapel Hill & London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- McDonnell, J. (2003). Desperately seeking credibility: English Catholics, the news media and the church. In J. Mitchell and S. Marriage (Eds.) *Mediating Religion* (pp. 33-43). New York: T&T Clark.
- McKee, A. (2003). *Textual Analysis: A Beginner's Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McQuail, D. (1987). *Mass Communication Theory*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
- Meyer, B. (2008). *Religion: Beyond a Concept*. New York City: Fordham University Press.
- Moscowitz, L. (2013). *The Battle Over Marriage*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Nord, D. (2001). *Communities of Journalism: A History of American Newspapers and Their Readers*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Nord, D. (2004). *Faith in Reading: Religious Publishing and the Birth of Mass Media in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pan, P., Meng, J., & Zhou, S. (2010). Morality or equality? Ideological framing in news coverage of gay marriage legitimization. *The Social Science Journal*, 630-645.
- Parameswaran, R. E. (2004). Spectacles of Gender and Globalization: Mapping Miss World's Media Event Space in the News. *The Communication Review*, 7(4).
- Pew Research Center. (2015). *Changing Attitudes on Gay Marriage*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org/2015/07/29/graphics-slideshow-changing-attitudes-on-gay-marriage/>.
- Pew Research Center. (2015). *Most U.S. Christian Groups Grow More Accepting of Homosexuality*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/12/18/most-u-s-christian-groups-grow-more-accepting-of-homosexuality/>.

- Pew Research Center. (2015). Section 2: Knowing Gays and Lesbians, Religious Conflicts, Beliefs About Homosexuality. Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/2015/06/08/section-2-knowing-gays-and-lesbians-religious-conflicts-beliefs-about-homosexuality/#views-of-whether-homosexuality-conflicts-with-religious-beliefs>.
- Pew Research Center. (2015). The U.S.'s Changing Religious Landscape: Christians Decline Sharply as Share of Population; Unaffiliated and Other Faiths Continue to Grow. Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org/files/2015/05/RLS-08-26-full-report.pdf>.
- Pew Research Center. (2014). How Americans feel about religious groups. Retrieved from [http://www.pewforum.org/2014/07/16/how-the U.S.ns-feel-about-religious-groups/](http://www.pewforum.org/2014/07/16/how-the-U.S.-ns-feel-about-religious-groups/).
- Pew Research Center. (2013). A Survey of LGBT Americans. Retrieved from [http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/06/13/a-survey-of-lgbt-the U.S.ns/](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/06/13/a-survey-of-lgbt-the-U.S.ns/).
- Pew Research Center. (2007). Public Expresses Mixed Views of Islam, Mormonism. Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org/2007/09/26/public-expresses-mixed-views-of-islam-mormonism/>.
- Price, V., Nir, L., & Cappella, J. (2005). Framing Public Discussion of Gay Civil Unions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 179-212.
- ProCon.org. (February 2016). State-by-State History of Banning and Legalizing Gay Marriage, 1994-2015. Retrieved from <http://gaymarriage.procon.org/view.resource.php?resourceID=004857>
- Rodriguez, N., & Blumell, L. (2014). What a Year! The Framing of Marriage Equality Through Media's Selected Sources in 2013. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 341-359.
- Ryan, J. (2013). *Faithful Passages: American Catholicism in Literary Culture*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Schement, J., Stephenson H. (1996). Religion and the information society. In D. Stout and J. Buddenbaum (Eds.), *Religion and Mass Media: Audiences and Adaptations* (pp. 261-289). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Smith, E. (2015). *What Would Jesus Read?*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Stephens, M. (1998). *The Rise of the Image the Fall of the Word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Stout, D. (2012). *Media and Religion*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Underwood, D. (2002). *From Yahweh to Yahoo! : The Religious Roots of the Secular Press*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Waters, K. (2001). Vibrant, But Invisible: A Study of Contemporary Religious Periodicals. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 307-320.
- Winston, D., & Green, J. (2010). Most Americans say media coverage of religion too sensationalized. Retrieved from <http://annenberg.usc.edu/~media/PDFs/winston-bliss.ashx>.

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Articles in sample

Year-#	Headline	Byline	Pub. date
2010-1	U.S. Judge: Gay Marriage Ban Unconstitutional	Sarah Pulliam Bailey	7/8/2010
2010-2	What is the Gospel Response to the Prop. 8 Decision?	None (All quotes)	8/9/2010
2011-1	New York Approves Gay Marriage	Tobin Grant	6/24/2011
2011-2	Poll: Growing Public Approval of Gay Marriage	Tobin Grant	3/18/2011
2012-1	California's Gay Marriage Case Likely Headed to Supreme Court	Tobin Grant	6/5/2012
2012-2	Episcopal Church Approves Same-Sex Blessing Rites	Sarah Pulliam Bailey	7/11/2012
2012-3	Passing the Plate for Politics	Matt Branaugh	6/14/2012
2012-4	President's Evolution Is Over: Obama Commits to Supporting Same-Sex Marriage	Tobin Grant	5/9/2012
2012-5	How Evangelicals Have Shifted in Public Opinion on Same-Sex Marriage	Tobin Grant and Sarah Pulliam Bailey	5/11/2012
2012-6	Black Americans on Gay Marriage: Is Obama Changing Opinion?	Tobin Grant	5/25/2012
2012-7	Declining to Photograph a Same-Sex Ceremony: Is It Legal to Refuse a Gay Client?	Tobin Grant	6/13/2012
2012-8	New Archbishop of Canterbury Justin Welby Inherits a Divided Anglican Communion	Trevor Grundy	11/9/2012
2013-1	Half of Conservative Christians Now Believe Same-Sex Marriage is Inevitable	Melissa Steffan	3/12/2013
2013-2	N.M. Supreme Court: Photographers Can't Refuse Gay Weddings	Ted Olsen	8/22/2013
2013-3	Steve Chalke Stuns British Evangelicals By Coming Out in Support of Same-Sex Relationships	Jeremy Weber	1/16/2013
2013-4	Jim Wallis Now Supports Same-Sex Marriage	Melissa Steffan	4/09/2013
2013-5	Ministry Leaders and Experts Respond	Melissa Steffan	6/26/2013

	to the DOMA and Prop. 8 Rulings	and Ted Olsen	
2013-6	Why a Lesbian Lawmaker Voted Against Hawaii's Same-Sex Marriage Bill	Kate Tracy	11/14/2013
2013-7	Survey: Evangelicals Increasingly Countercultural on Same-Sex Issues	Abby Stocker	7/9/2013
2013-8	Britain Legalizes Same-Sex Marriages After Church of England Backs Down	Melissa Steffan	6/6/2013
2014-1	World Vision: Why We're Hiring Gay Christians in Same-Sex Marriages	Celeste Gracey and Jeremy Weber	3/24/2014
2014-2	PC(USA) Permits Pastors To Perform Same-Sex Marriages, Thanks to Conservative Exodus	Ruth Moon	6/20/2014
2014-3	Would Jesus Bake a Cake for a Gay Wedding in Arizona?	Joshua Wood	2/25/2014
2014-4	Methodists Debate Punishing Pastors Who Perform Same-Sex Marriages	Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra	3/13/2014
2014-5	Time to Rend Marriage? 1 in 4 Pastors Agree with First Things Petition	Ruth Moon	12/2/2014
2014-6	Is Gay Marriage Destroying the United Methodist Church?	Timothy Morgan	6/11/2014
2014-7	Evangelicals' Favorite Same-Sex Marriage Law?	Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra	1/17/2014
2014-8	For First Time, State Bans on Same-Sex Marriage Upheld by Appeals Court	Joshua Wood	11/7/2014
2014-9	Will Utah Eventually End America's Same-Sex Marriage Debate?	Joshua Wood	1/7/2014
2014-10	World Vision Reverses Decision To Hire Christians in Same-Sex Marriages	Celeste Gracey and Jeremy Weber	3/26/2014
2015-1	Can the Baker, the Florist, the Photographer, and the Clerk Win?	Compiled by Bob Smietana	9/28/2015
2015-2	Why is 'RFRA' Is America's Latest Four-Letter Word	Bob Smietana	4/1/2015
2015-3	Sodom, Leviticus, and Obergefell: The Bible After Friday's Decision	Stephen Smith	6/29/2015
2015-4	Hope College and Belmont University to Offer Benefits to Same-Sex Spouses	Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra, Morgan Lee, and Bob Smietana	7/8/2015
2015-5	Should Pastors Stop Signing Civil Marriage Certificates?	Compiled by Ruth Moon	1/26/2015
2015-6	Revisiting Evangelicals' Favorite Same-Sex Marriage Laws	Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra	3/27/2015
2015-7	Here's What Supreme Court Says about Same-Sex Marriage and Religious	Morgan Lee and Jeremy Weber	6/26/2015

	Freedom		
2015-8	Peace Church Out: Mennonite Schools Leave CCCU to Avoid Same-Sex Marriage Split	Jeremy Weber	9/21/2015
2015-9	Struggle over Same-Sex Marriage's Religious Liberty Ramifications Begins	Bob Smietana	6/29/2015
2015-10	Having Gay Friends Changes Evangelicals' Minds on Marriage, But Not Morality	Bob Smietana	4/16/2015
2015-11	Crisis Averted: Christian Colleges Avoid Split over Same-Sex Marriage	Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra	10/26/2015
2015-12	Oklahoma Wesleyan and Union U. Quit CCCU Over Same-Sex Marriage Moves	Bob Smietana	8/31/2015
2015-13	'Outrage and Panic' Are Off-Limits, Say Evangelical Leaders on Same-Sex Marriage	Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra and Morgan Lee	6/26/2015
2015-14	PCUSA Makes Marriage a 'Unique Commitment'	Morgan Lee	3/18/2015
2015-15	Two CCCU Colleges to Allow Same-Sex Married Faculty	Bob Smietana, Morgan Lee, and Sarah Eekhoff Zylstra	7/28/2015
2015-16	How Christians Can Flourish in a Same-Sex-Marriage World	Michael Gerson and Peter Wehner	11/2/2015
2015-17	Kim Davis Went to Jail. 'Mark of the Beast' Coal Miner Won \$586k. What Gives?	Heidi Hall	9/10/2015
2015-18	A Clash of Church and Cake	Bob Smietana	7/10/2015

Appendix B. Analysis of article sample from *Christianity Today*

Year-Story #	Quotes	Frame(s)	Source Type	Subsets Used in Frame(s)
2010-1a	Tauro agreed, and said the act forces Massachusetts to discriminate against its own citizens. “The federal government, by enacting and enforcing DOMA, plainly encroaches upon the firmly entrenched province of the state, and in doing so, offends the Tenth Amendment. For that reason, the statute is invalid,” Tauro wrote in a ruling in a lawsuit filed by Attorney General Martha Coakley.	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2010-1b	The Family Research Council’s Tom McClusky issued a statement saying the organization is confident the decision will be overturned on appeal. “The federal DOMA does not violate equal protection principles and has not interfered with Massachusetts’ freedom to determine its own definition of marriage,” he said. “In part, this decision results from the deliberately weak legal defense of DOMA that was mounted on behalf of the government by the Obama administration, which has called for repeal of the law.”	1. Political Evolution to Equality 2. Inevitability as a Myth	Leader of Christian advocacy group	1. None 2. Gay couples won’t receive rights
2010-2a	Matthew Lee Anderson, author of the forthcoming <i>Earthen Vessels: Breathing New Life into a Broken Faith</i> and blogger at Mere Orthodoxy: “Within the happy confident hope we have in Christ (Jesus is still Lord, and nothing can undo that), evangelicals need to expand their intellectual horizons. While this is a landmark decision, it comes amid a long shift in culture and philosophy. We need to look	1. Religion as Tradition 2. Inevitability as a Concession to Equality	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Upfront disapproval 2. Negative

	<p>backward to discern what's at the root of that trend, look inward to see the ways that we have been co-opted by it, and look a long ways forward to determine how we can work to reverse it.</p> <p>Practically, I think we have relied too heavily on the will of the majority as our foundation for our legal actions. While political orders must on some level be representative of the people to be legitimate, our founding fathers set up a representative democracy for a reason. Without rejecting efforts like Proposition 8, politically conservative evangelicals should shift their focus toward equipping the next generation of leaders with the philosophical and theological training they need to affect society and government from the 'top-down.' Majorities are unstable, and while traditional marriage has the upper hand now, it may not in 20 years."</p>			
2010-2b	<p>Alan Chambers, president of Exodus International:</p> <p>"I believe that God is calling his church to a place far above the arguments surrounding what is sin and what isn't. We cannot avoid the glaring scriptural truth that there is, and will always be, a right way and a wrong way concerning just about everything we can imagine. And, yet, I believe that our attitudes towards people (internal and external) are just as important as our positions on the issues at hand. So, when I first saw the news that Prop. 8 had been overturned, my very first thought was, 'Dear Lord, please let the Christians who speak in response to this share your heart and not their judgment.'</p>	<p>1. Religion as Tradition</p> <p>2. Government Policy isn't a Solution</p>	<p>Leader of Christian advocacy group</p>	<p>1. Love the sinner, hate the sin</p> <p>2. None</p>

	<p>We should respond with 100 percent grace and 100 percent truth. As Christians, we must constantly be sharing God's best for people. He created us for a lot more than we, as humans, tend to settle for—in every area of our lives. Because gay marriage is less than God's best for relationship, we need to equip ourselves to minister to those who will choose it and later realize it might not have been the best decision. I firmly believe that if we had spent as much money, time, and energy battling for people's hearts as we did fighting against their agendas, the gay rights battle would look very different today.”</p>			
2010-2c	<p>Timothy George, founding dean of Beeson Divinity School of Samford University: “Proposition 8 was passed in California with the strong support of the Christian community, including Catholics, evangelicals, and (especially) the African American churches. The decision of Judge Walker could lead to a Supreme Court ruling as charged as <i>Roe v. Wade</i>. Christians who thought they would be able to just sleep through this issue will not be allowed to. At stake in the debate is the very nature of marriage itself. Thinking biblically does not allow us to regard marriage as merely prudential or preferential (I like strawberry, you like pistachio), but as a covenantal union of one man and one woman established by God for a purpose that transcends itself. Marriage is not a ‘right’ to be defended or exploited but rather a union of one man and one woman offering their lives to one another in service to the human community. A</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval

	gospel response to this judicial decision and the public battles it will generate requires humility, repentance, love, and forbearance. In other words, grace and truth, lots of both.”			
2010-2d	<p>Andreas J. Köstenberger, author of <i>God, Marriage, and Family</i> and professor of New Testament and biblical theology and director of Ph.D. studies at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary:</p> <p>“The ruling shows that as Christians, we should not look for a political solution to the crisis surrounding marriage and the family in our culture. The only true and lasting solution is found in a return to our spiritual foundations. The Bible makes clear that marriage is God's idea rather than a social contract that we are free to renegotiate based on changing social trends. But we can't expect the unbelieving world or any government or judicial system to understand or reinforce that. For this reason we should focus our efforts not on swaying political opinion but on teaching people what the Bible says about God's plan for marriage and the family.”</p>	<p>1. Religion as Tradition</p> <p>2. Government Policy isn't a Solution</p>	Christian writer, author, or editor	<p>1. Upfront disapproval</p> <p>2. None</p>
2010-2e	<p>Dale S. Kuehne, Brady Chair for Ethics, Economics and the Common Good at Saint Anselm College and author of <i>Sex and the iWorld</i>:</p> <p>“There are several questions about the legal logic of this decision and where it might lead, yet it appears many outside observers have been left with a clear sense of what Christians are against, instead of what we're for. Little wonder the world openly questions how the orthodox Christian belief that</p>	<p>1. Religion as Tradition</p> <p>2. Government Policy isn't a Solution</p>	Christian writer, author, or editor	<p>1. Love the sinner, hate the sin</p> <p>2. None</p>

	sexual relations should be confined to a marriage between one man and one woman could possibly benefit everyone. Too often we respond with anger, outrage, or a disillusioned silence instead of pointing out the wonder and fulfillment of the different relational path of gospel.”			
2010-2f	Andrew Marin, author of <i>Love is an Orientation</i> and president of The Marin Foundation: “We can continue to politically fight a drawn-out battle with a government that is not governed through an evangelical worldview, producing more casualties for Christ. Or we can learn right now what it means to live in relation to, and relationship with LGBT people as gay marriage is legalized—continuing to actively show Christ's compelling nature regardless of state or national policy. The choice is ours.”	1. Avoidance of Issue 2. Government Policy isn't a Solution	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. None 2. None
2010-2g	Gerald R. McDermott, professor of religion at Roanoke College: “Christians should be concerned about the common good, and this is not for the common good. Social science has shown that children do best in a home with two parents of the opposite sex in a low-conflict marriage, and gay marriages make that impossible for their children and less likely for society generally. More children will be created by artificial sperm donation, which in many cases forever cuts the children off from knowing both their biological parents. Gay marriage will also encourage teens who are unsure of their sexuality to embrace a lifestyle that suffers high rates of suicide, depression, HIV, drug abuse, STDs, and other	1. Religion as Tradition 2. Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children	Leader of Christian org, company or school	1. Upfront disapproval 2. BOTH Homosexuality is contagious & Family is man and woman

	pathogens.”			
2010-2h	<p>Scot McKnight, professor in religious studies at North Park University:</p> <p>“I wish Christians would cease using so much money and time to establish our Christian ethic through legal processes. Instead we need to witness by word and deed to an alternative reality in our churches. We need to tell a better story through our families. Whether our laws change or not, we are to love our neighbor as ourselves.”</p>	<p>1. Avoidance of Issue</p> <p>2. Government Policy isn’t a Solution</p>	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. None</p>
2010-2i	<p>Jennifer Roback Morse, founder and president of the Ruth Institute:</p> <p>“‘Have you not read that from the beginning the Creator made them male and female? (Matt. 19:4)’ ‘In his image, he created them. Male and female he created them. (Gen 1:27)’ Our culture cannot understand the point of gendered marriage, without an understanding of gender itself. Male and female are two different and complementary ways of imaging God and of being human. We must teach with conviction the goodness of God's creation of male and female.”</p>	<p>1. Religion as Tradition</p> <p>2. Government Policy isn’t a Solution</p>	Leader of Christian advocacy group	<p>1. Upfront disapproval</p> <p>2. None</p>
2010-2j	<p>Jenell Williams Paris, professor of anthropology at Messiah College and author of the forthcoming <i>The End of Sexual Identity: Why Sex is Too Important to Define Who We Are</i>:</p> <p>“The gospel invites believers to support marriages and families, including in their legal and institutional dimensions, an effort that will surely last beyond our lifetimes. Whether believers accept legal gay marriage or work to preserve marriage as a heterosexual institution, they should work with</p>	<p>1. Avoidance of Issue</p> <p>2. Government Policy isn’t a Solution</p>	Christian writer, author, or editor	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. None</p>

	civility and with concern for the public good. An even more immediate challenge for those who believe marriage is properly between a man and a woman is to live with genuine love and concern for homosexual individuals and families in our local contexts.”			
2010-2k	Glenn T. Stanton, director of global family formation studies and global strategic development at Focus on the Family: “The gospel is deeply serious while Judge Walker's decision is a jumbled mess of sloppy thinking and accusation. He asserts religion is the cause of violence against gays. Jesus, when asked a tough legal question about marriage, explained, ‘God created them male and female.’ This dual identity of humanity is no small thing for us nor our Lord because male and female image the invisible God, creating a full human communion. But Judge Walker says, ‘Gender no longer forms an essential part of marriage.’ The Christian's allegiance is clear.”	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian advocacy group	1. Upfront disapproval
2010-2l	Sarah Sumner, dean of A.W. Tozer Theological Seminary: “In a democracy, Christians can love others best by voting for laws that uphold the truth as revealed by God. When a law lies by saying something forbidden by God is permissible in society, people are set up for long-term hurt. God's universal laws are for the benefit and welfare of all people, not just Christians. It's just as harmful for an unbeliever to be involved in same-sex sin as it is a Christ follower.”	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Love the sinner, hate the sin
2010-2m	Mark Yarhouse, professor of psychology and endowed chair at	1. Avoidance of Issue	Leader of Christian	1. None

	<p>Regent University:</p> <p>"I don't know that there is one response to the Proposition 8 decision that will reflect the depth and breadth of the gospel in the life of believers today. A gospel response is shaped by many factors, including how one views Christ and culture. Some Christians will see appealing the decision as part of the gospel response, drawing upon legal avenues and hoping it will be overturned upon appeal. Other Christians will prayerfully consider alternatives to legal means to be a witness to a rapidly changing culture. I think younger Christians, in particular, are more likely to explore such alternatives."</p>		org, company, or school	
2011-1a	<p>Family Research Council's Peter Sprigg said "the principal objection to homosexual 'marriage' has nothing to do with religion."</p> <p>"At its heart, marriage is neither a civil institution nor a religious institution. Instead, marriage is a natural institution—rooted in the order of nature itself," Sprigg said.</p> <p>"The core message of the opposition to homosexual 'marriage' is not just, 'Don't make us perform same-sex weddings in our church.' Instead, it is: 'Society needs children, and children need a mom and a dad.'"</p>	1. Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children	Leader of Christian advocacy group	1. Family is man and woman
2011-1b	<p>[David] Tyree was the hero of the Giants Super Bowl win in 2007. Tyree told the New York <i>Daily News</i> he "probably would" give up the Super Bowl to stop same-sex marriage.</p> <p>"Nothing means more to me than that my God would be honored," Tyree said. "Being the fact that I firmly believe that God</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Christian celebrity	1. Upfront disapproval

	created and ordained marriage between a man and a woman, I believe that that's something that should be fought for at all costs."			
2011-2a	[National Association of Evangelicals president Leith] Anderson said that the NAE disagreed with Obama's decision. "We hope that Congress will hire its own lawyers to vigorously defend DOMA in federal courts," said Anderson. "Marriage is foundational to a healthy society in which children enjoy the care and nurture of both their mother and father. Radically redefining marriage will have a far-reaching impact on the health of our nation."	1. Marriage Equality is Harmful to Children	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Family is man and woman
2011-2b	Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) said, "The constitutionality of this law should be determined by the courts—not by the president unilaterally—and this action by the House will ensure the matter is addressed in a manner consistent with our Constitution."	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2011-2c	Family Research Council president Tony Perkins commended the Speaker's position while also accusing the president of violating his constitutional oath. "We thank Speaker Boehner for working to protect the rule of law and the institution of marriage," said Perkins. "The Speaker is sending a bold message that Congress will not stand idly while the President picks and chooses which laws will be nullified by Executive Branch surrender to antagonistic litigants."	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Leader of Christian advocacy group	1. None
2011-2d	The Heritage Foundation's Hans A. von Spakovsky believes it is the latter. "The president's decision seems	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Leader of secular advocacy group	1. None

	driven by politics and violates his law enforcement duty, calling into question the integrity of our justice system," said Von Spakovsky. "It contravenes long-standing Justice Department policy to defend Acts of Congress unless no reasonable argument can be made in their defense or they infringe on core presidential constitutional authority, neither of which is the case with DOMA."			
2012-1a	"Today our court has silenced any such respectful conversation," [Judge Diarmuid] O'Scannlain wrote. "We should not have so roundly trumped California's democratic process without at least discussing this unparalleled decision as an en banc court."	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2012-1b	Charles Cooper, lead counsel in favor of the proposition, said, "The idea that Californians—of all people—sought to 'send a message that gays and lesbians are of lesser worth,' as the [February panel's] decision claims, is simply absurd. Voters from all walks of life, political parties, races, and creeds supported Proposition 8."	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Lawyer	1. None
2012-2a	"It's significant, but I don't think it's a surprise," said Samuel Candler, dean of the Cathedral of St. Philip in Atlanta and an evangelical who favored the proposal. "Even with this vote, most of the people who wanted to leave have already left."	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Clergy (Episcopal)	1. Neutral
2012-3a	"This will be a first for us," said [senior pastor William] Cripe, who has led Faith's congregation for nearly 22 years. "I see it as a duty, responsibility, and obligation part-and-parcel to our being salt and light in the world."	1. Religion as Tradition	Clergy (Evangelical)	1. Upfront disapproval
2012-	"There is a real misunderstanding	1. Political	Lawyer	1. None

3b	<p>about what is involved in the tax code when it concerns a church engaging in legislative efforts," said Erik Stanley, senior legal counsel for the Alliance Defense Fund (ADF). "They can be a vital partner in this process."</p> <p>Attorneys like Sommerville and Stanley say they tell churches to make sure their efforts run less than 15 percent. Stanley notes that PMM is asking churches to take up collections only on Father's Day, and possibly a handful of other Sundays throughout the summer and fall.</p> <p>"Churches would really have to spend an awful lot of money or an awful lot of time before they're going to cross that IRS threshold," he said. "It's not something churches really need to worry about."</p>	Evolution to Equality		
2012-3c	<p>Strict language from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) regarding what churches can and cannot do with political candidates may be one reason why church leaders assume any involvement with legislative efforts is a no-no, says Steve King, a Virginia attorney who regularly advises churches and nonprofits. "A ballot initiative is not a political campaign, because by definition you have to have a candidate," King said.</p>	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Lawyer	1. None
	<p>Frank Sommerville, a Texas-based attorney, says some churches understand this distinction, and he expects to see more churches take action as they learn about it.</p> <p>"Generally these [efforts] are related to a moral issue that most churches can agree upon," said Sommerville, an editorial advisor for <i>Church Law and Tax</i></p>	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Lawyer	1. None

	<i>Report</i> (published by <i>Christianity Today</i>).			
	"This is really our first effort to reach out and say, 'Okay, this is our campaign and we're counting on you [churches] to fund this campaign from the beginning,'" [Carroll Conley Jr., executive director of the Augusta-based Christian Civic League] said.	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Leader of Christian advocacy group	1. None
2012-4a	<p>President Obama told ABC News today that he supports same-sex marriage, saying that he believes same-sex couples should be able to marry.</p> <p>"I've just concluded that for me personally it is important for me to go ahead and affirm that I think same-sex couples should be able to get married," Obama told ABC News' Robin Roberts.</p> <p>In 2010, Obama said that his views on same-sex marriage were "constantly evolving." But he said then and in interviews since that he believed civil unions could provide same-sex couples with the same legal rights as marriage does.</p> <p>Obama said his support for same-sex marriage is consistent with his Christian beliefs.</p> <p>"[Michelle and I] are both practicing Christians and obviously this position may be considered to put us at odds with the views of others but, you know, when we think about our faith, the thing at root that we think about is, not only Christ sacrificing himself on our behalf, but it's also the Golden Rule, you know, treat others the way you would want to be treated," Obama said. "And I think that's what we try to impart to our kids and that's what motivates me as president, and I figure the most</p>	1. Religion as Equality	Politician	1. Moral acceptance

	<p>consistent I can be in being true to those precepts, the better I'll be as a dad and a husband and hopefully the better I'll be as president."</p> <p>On Monday, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney fielded numerous questions at a briefing, where he told the press that Obama's personal position was still "evolving."</p> <p>"The President was asked this and said that his views on—his personal views on this were evolving," Carney said. "The President does have, as you noted, significant support in the LGBT community, and that's because of his unparalleled record in support of LGBT rights."</p>			
	<p>Republican nominee Mitt Romney said that he does not support same-sex marriage or most civil unions. "I do not favor marriage between people of the same gender, and I do not favor civil unions if they are identical to marriage other than by name," Romney said. "My view is the domestic partnership benefits, hospital visitation rights and the like are appropriate, but that the others are not."</p>	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2012-5a	<p><i>Washington Post</i> columnist Mike Gerson noted that social conservatives may need to frame marriage differently due to the generational shift.</p> <p>"In much of the country, social conservatives may need to choose a more defensible political line — the protection of individual and institutional conscience rights for those who disagree with gay marriage," he wrote. "It is also a commitment of genuine pluralism to allow those with differing moral</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	beliefs to associate in institutions that reflect their convictions."			
2012-5b	<p>Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney said Thursday that he believes gay couples should be allowed to adopt children as he reiterated his position that marriage should be between a man and a woman.</p> <p>"If two people of the same gender want to live together, want to have a loving relationship, even want to adopt a child—in my state, individuals of the same sex are able to adopt children," he said. "In my view, that's something which people have the right to do, but to call that marriage is, in my view, a departure from the real meaning of the word."</p>	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2012-5c	<p>Obama emphasized his view that same-sex marriage is a state's right issue and that he doesn't want to "to nationalize this issue" by committing to something like making same-sex marriage a right protected by the federal Constitution.</p> <p>ABC's Robin Roberts asked Obama, "Can you ask your Justice Department to join in the litigation in fighting states that are banning same-sex marriage?" Obama responded, "Well, I—you know, my Justice Department has already—said that it is not gonna defend—the Defense Against Marriage Act."</p>	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2012-6a	<p>Roslyn Brock, chairman of the NAACP Board of Directors, said the resolution was limited to same-sex civil marriage, not marriage as a religious institution.</p> <p>"The NAACP did not issue its support of marriage equality from a</p>	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Secular advocacy group	1. None

	<p>personal, moral, or religious perspective. Rather, we deeply respect differences of personal conscience on the religious definition of marriage, and we strongly affirm the religious freedoms of all as protected by the First Amendment," Brock said. "As the nation's leading civil rights organization, it is not our role or intent to express how any place of worship should act in its own house. We have not done so in the past and will not do so in the future."</p>			
2012-6b	<p>Frank Schubert, national political director for the National Organization for Marriage, told the <i>Washington Post</i> that he doubted that there is any change among black Americans. "There is not a chance in God's green earth that African Americans support same-sex marriage," Schubert said. "[Obama's] opinion of same-sex marriage is not going to be changing the opinion of African Americans in a significant way."</p>	1. Inevitability as a Myth	Christian advocacy group	1. Straight marriage will still dominate
2012-7a	<p>"Should the government force a videographer who is an animal rights activist to create a video promoting hunting and taxidermy? Of course not, and neither should the government force this photographer to promote a message that violates her conscience," said senior counsel Jordan Lorence. "Because the Constitution prohibits the state from forcing unwilling artists to promote a message they disagree with, we will certainly appeal this decision to the New Mexico Supreme Court." "We should encourage business owners to operate their businesses</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	with ethics and higher principles so that they do not mindlessly dispense goods and services with no thought to the impact of their actions. The Constitution protects people's expression of their views, even when it comes in a commercial context," said Lorence.			
2012-8a	<p>Speaking at a news conference on Friday, [Bishop Justin] Welby said he is "utterly optimistic" about the future of the Church of England. He said that the question of gay marriage in his new global flock was a complicated issue "and not one to be handled today, off the cuff."</p> <p>But he offered a definite olive branch to the gay community despite reaffirming his opposition to same-sex marriage. Welby pledged to re-examine his own thinking on homosexuality while speaking out against exclusion and homophobia.</p> <p>"I know I need to listen very attentively to the LGBT communities and examine my own thinking prayerfully and carefully," he said.</p> <p>Returning home from a visit to Africa, his 7-month-old daughter, Johanna, was killed in a car crash in France. "It was," he said in an interview, "a very dark time for Caroline and myself but in a strange way it also brought us closer to God."</p> <p>American-born Christina Rees, a leading member of the Church of England's General Synod and the Archbishops' Council, said that while Welby takes a traditional approach on same-sex marriage, he is nonetheless flexible and a man prepared to change his mind to do</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Clergy (Anglican)	1. Love the sinner, hate the sin

	<p>the right thing.</p> <p>"He's known to be a visionary and strategic leader and he is prepared to take risks and is extremely astute," she said.</p>			
2012-8b	<p>[Archbishop Rowan] Williams, a highly respected theologian, scholar and poet, warned that the Church of England could break apart over the role of gays and women in the church. "Not everybody in the Anglican Communion or even the Church of England is eager to avoid schism or separation," he warned.</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Clergy (Anglican)	1. Neutral
2013-1a	<p>[U.S. Sen. Rob] Portman said, "The overriding message of love and compassion that I take from the Bible, and certainly the Golden Rule, and the fact that I believe we are all created by our maker, that has all influenced me in terms of my change on this issue."</p>	1. Religion as Equality	Politician	1. Moral acceptance
2013-1b	<p>Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, a Democrat, also spoke out in favor of same-sex marriage for the first time in a video posted online Monday.</p> <p>In the Human Rights Campaign clip, Clinton said she believes America must uphold and protect the dignity of all its citizens, including lesbians and gays. "I support marriage for lesbian and gay couples," she said. "I support it personally and as a matter of policy and law."</p>	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2013-2a	<p>"The difficulty in distinguishing between status and conduct in the context of sexual orientation discrimination is that people may base their judgment about an individual's sexual orientation on the individual's conduct," wrote Justice Edward Chávez. "To allow discrimination based on conduct so closely correlated with sexual</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Religious rights hurt gay marriage rights

	orientation would severely undermine the purpose of the NMHRA."			
2013-2b	<p>But it is Justice Richard Bosson's concurring opinion, not the majority opinion, that is already getting the most attention. The Huguenins, he wrote "now are compelled by law to compromise the very religious beliefs that inspire their lives. Though the rule of law requires it, the result is sobering. It will no doubt leave a tangible mark on the Huguenins and others of similar views."</p> <p>He continued:</p> <p>"The Huguenins are free to think, to say, to believe, as they wish; they may pray to the God of their choice and follow those commandments in their personal lives wherever they lead. The Constitution protects the Huguenins in that respect and much more. But there is a price, one that we all have to pay somewhere in our civic life.</p> <p>In the smaller, more focused world of the marketplace, of commerce, of public accommodation, the Huguenins have to channel their conduct, not their beliefs, so as to leave space for other Americans who believe something different. That compromise is part of the glue that holds us together as a nation, the tolerance that lubricates the varied moving parts of us as a people. That sense of respect we owe others, whether or not we believe as they do, illuminates this country, setting it apart from the discord that afflicts much of the rest of the world. In short, I would say to the Huguenins, with the utmost respect: it is the price of citizenship."</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

2013-2c	In a press statement, Alliance Defending Freedom Senior Counsel Jordan Lorence, who represented Elane Photography in the case, said the decision was a step toward tyranny. "Government-coerced expression is a feature of dictatorships that has no place in a free country," he said. "This decision is a blow to our client and every American's right to live free."	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2013-3a	<p>[Steve] Chalke, whose strong views on atonement theology broke up one of Britain's biggest Christian conferences, writes:</p> <p>I feel both compelled and afraid to write this article. Compelled because, in my understanding, the principles of justice, reconciliation and inclusion sit at the very heart of Jesus' message. Afraid because I recognise the Bible is understood by many to teach that the practice of homosexuality, in any circumstance, is a sin or 'less than God's best'.</p> <p>Some will think that I have strayed from scripture – that I am no longer an evangelical. I have formed my view, however, not out of any disregard for the Bible's authority, but by way of grappling with it and, through prayerful reflection, seeking to take it seriously.</p> <p>It's one thing to be critical of a promiscuous lifestyle – but shouldn't the Church consider nurturing positive models for permanent and monogamous homosexual relationships?</p> <p>Tolerance is not the same as Christ-like love. Christ-like love calls us to go beyond tolerance to want for the other the same respect, freedom and equality one wants for oneself. We should find ways to formally</p>	1. Religion as Equality	Clergy (Baptist)	1. Moral acceptance

	support and encourage those who are in, or wish to enter into, faithful same-sex partnerships, as well as in their wider role as members of Christ's body.			
2013-3b	<p>"Firstly, Steve has been a contributor for a long time, as well as a prominent evangelical. He spoke at Spring Harvest for many years and appeared with Billy Graham at Mission England. We wanted to let him have his say, rather than for rumour and hearsay to dictate the conversation," wrote [Ruth] Dickinson. "Secondly, opening up the issues is what this magazine does. We're evangelical in conviction, but our approach has never been to suppress what others think, whether within or outside of evangelicalism. Steve's is not the only voice."</p> <p>Dickinson expects Chalke's reversal to reverberate for years. "Chalke is going against the majority of U.K. evangelical opinion. Furthermore, many see this as a primary issue, not a secondary one and one for which liberals will suffer grave consequences," she told <i>Christian Today</i>. "Others, of course, will welcome his announcement, seeing it as an opportunity to make the Church more open and welcoming to homosexual people."</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Neutral
2013-3c	In his follow-up essay, [Greg] Downes writes "Those who say the Bible does not teach homosexual practice is wrong are simply engaging in hermeneutical gymnastics," and notes, "my fear is that any shift to embrace this new interpretation is nothing short of a denial of the authority of the Bible itself."	1. Religion as Tradition	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Upfront disapproval
2013-	Steve Clifford, general director of	1. Religion	Leader of	1. Upfront

3d	<p>the U.K.'s Evangelical Alliance, noted in an open letter (full text at bottom) that Chalke is a friend and believes "when the history of the Church in the U.K. is written, Steve's contribution over the last 25 years will be recognised as profoundly significant," but said, "While I understand and respect Steve's pastoral motivations, I believe the conclusions he has come to on same-sex relationships are wrong." "Generations of Christians have faced the challenge of making the gospel relevant within their cultural settings," writes Clifford. "The danger we all face, and I fear Steve has succumbed to, is that we produce 'a god' in our own likeness or in the likeness of the culture in which we find ourselves."</p> <p>Full statement from Evangelical Alliance general director Steve Clifford: "Steve Chalke is a friend of mine. We go back many years. I am convinced that when the history of the Church in the UK is written, Steve's contribution over the last 25 years will be recognised as profoundly significant. So with this as a backdrop I am writing my response to Steve's article in Christianity magazine. While I understand and respect Steve's pastoral motivations, I believe the conclusions he has come to on same-sex relationships are wrong. It is with both sadness and disappointment that I reflect on how Steve has not only distanced himself from the vast majority of the evangelical community here in the UK, but indeed from the Church</p>	as Tradition	Christian org, company, or school	disapproval
----	--	--------------	-----------------------------------	-------------

	<p>across the world and 2,000 years of biblical interpretation.</p> <p>Steve has raised issues which touch on deep areas of human identity. At a Soul Survivor seminar last summer, a Baptist minister who lives with same-sex attraction introduced his talk to a marquee full of young people by indicating that he would love to find a theology in the Bible which would support a sexually-active gay life. But, he said: 'I've come to the conclusion that it is not there and I don't want to live in rebellion to the one that I love.'</p> <p>This pastor is just one of tens of thousands of Christians who have come to the conclusion that sex was designed by God to be expressed within a committed relationship for life between a man and a woman - we call this marriage - and have chosen to live a celibate life.</p> <p>Steve Chalke's challenge to historic biblical interpretation is in danger of undermining such courageous lifestyle decisions. Last year, the Evangelical Alliance produced a resource for leaders entitled Biblical and Pastoral Responses to Homosexuality - put together by a commission of eight and peer reviewed by 40. I trust this resource reflects a considered, gracious and mature response. It follows on from the highly respected Faith, Hope and Homosexuality book produced some 14 years ago, combining a clear and succinct statement of biblical teaching on marriage and sexuality. It expressed regret for the Church's past and present failure in relation to the lesbian and gay community. Realistically and honestly, it engages with real-life</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>scenarios to help Christians, and especially pastors and others in Christian ministry, discern how we can speak and live the truth in love. It can be downloaded online www.eauk.org/current-affairs/publications/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&pageid=25152 and hard copies can be purchased for £7 via our website. Generations of Christians have faced the challenge of making the gospel relevant within their cultural settings. The danger we all face, and I fear Steve has succumbed to, is that we produce 'a god' in our own likeness or in the likeness of the culture in which we find ourselves.</p> <p>Steve's approach to biblical interpretation allows for a god in the likeness of 21st century Western-European mindsets. His call for "Christ-like inclusion" is not radical enough in its inclusiveness. We all come to the gospel in our brokenness, with an attachment to things, self-centeredness, addictions, fears and pride. We all need a saviour in every area of our lives, including our sexuality. We all live with pain. The radical inclusiveness of the gospel means we are all welcomed. In a wonderful grace-filled process we find repentance and forgiveness and Christ commits himself through the work of the Holy Spirit to bring transformation to our lives - a life-long process.</p> <p>This is the radical inclusiveness I believe the gospel offers to all of us. God doesn't leave us on our own, He promises to work in us, to bring us into our ultimate goal which is His likeness.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	Inevitably Steve's article will open again the conversation on human sexuality. But as we have this discussion let's remember that Jesus requires us to disagree without being disagreeable. We must listen honestly and carefully to one another, being courteous and generous. In 1846, our Evangelical Relationships Commitment was created to guide us in our relationships with other Christians - especially those we disagree with."			
2013-4a	<p>In an interview with the <i>Huffington Post</i>, [Jim] Wallis said he now supports same-sex marriage as part of the ongoing conversation about how to "commit liberals and conservatives to re-covenanting marriage, reestablishing, renewing marriage."</p> <p>"I think we have to talk about, now, how to include same-sex couples in that deeper understanding of marriage," Wallis said. "I want a deeper commitment to marriage that is more and more inclusive, and that's where I think the country is going."</p> <p>"I think equal protection under the law is something that does support the idea of a civil, civic decision that provides same sex couples the same benefits and rights under the civil law as married couples have. That's the direction we're going, but what the church says about sacramental marriage is a larger, deeper question that has to be resolved over time. They need freedom to look at the scriptures and determine what is possible. People can have different views theologically and still support equal protection, which is inclusive more and more of marriage equality."</p>	<p>1. Religion as Equality</p> <p>2. Inevitability as a Concession to Equality</p>	Christian writer, author, or editor (*Source speaking in present)	<p>1. Moral acceptance</p> <p>2. Positive</p>

	That's a recent shift from 2008, when Wallis told CT he didn't believe in same-sex marriage. "I don't think the sacrament of marriage should be changed," he previously told CT. "Some people say that Jesus didn't talk about homosexuality, and that's technically true. But marriage is all through the Bible, and it's not gender-neutral." ... Wallis told CT, "There is a Religious Left in this country, and I'm not a part of it."	1. Religion as Tradition	Christian writer, author, or editor (*Source speaking in past)	1. Upfront disapproval
2013-5a	"DOMA instructs all federal officials, and indeed all persons with whom same-sex couples interact, including their own children, that their marriage is less worthy than the marriages of others," Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote for the court.	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2013-5b	"We have never before upheld the standing of a private party to defend the constitutionality of a state statute when state officials have chosen not to. We decline to do so for the first time here," Chief Justice John Roberts wrote.	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
	Justice Antonin Scalia, who sided with the majority on the Proposition 8 case, wrote a strongly worded dissent on the DOMA case, which he read aloud from the bench: The majority says that the supporters of this Act acted with malice—with the "purpose" "to disparage and to injure" same-sex couples. It says that the motivation for DOMA was to "demean," to "impose inequality," to "impose ... a stigma," to deny people "equal dignity," to brand gay people as "unworthy," and to "humiliate" their children. I am sure these accusations are quite untrue. ... It is one thing for a society to elect	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None

	<p>change; it is another for a court of law to impose change by adjudging those who oppose it <i>hostes humani generis</i>, enemies of the human race. ... It is hard to admit that one's political opponents are not monsters, especially in a struggle like this one, and the challenge in the end proves more than today's Court can handle. Too bad.</p>			
2013-5c	<p>Both rulings—especially when viewed together—have profound political and congregational implications, said Russell Moore, president of the Southern Baptist Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission.</p> <p>"It is a loss for those who are concerned about marriage," he said, "but it is not an ultimate loss. If marriage is as resilient as the Bible tells us it is, marriage cannot be raptured away by a Supreme Court decision."</p> <p>Still, Moore says, the decisions reveal the illusion that evangelical Christians are some sort of moral majority in this country.</p> <p>"Appealing to family values as though the rest of the culture understands what that means is no longer viable. The church has to take a concentrated effort at teaching a counter-cultural understanding of marital fidelity and family life," he said. "That's not unusual in the history of the church, but it does mean we can't assume the people around us or even in our pews immediately understand the implications of marriage."</p> <p>The different views of marriage and family are both good news and bad news for the church, Moore said.</p> <p>"Now we are going to seem, in many ways, freakish to the outside</p>	<p>1. Religion as Tradition</p> <p>2. Government Policy isn't a Solution</p> <p>3. Inevitability as a Concession to Equality</p>	<p>Leader of Christian org, company, or school</p>	<p>1. Upfront disapproval</p> <p>2. None</p> <p>3. Negative</p>

	<p>culture, which isn't necessarily bad news. Our position on marriage is no more freakish than a gospel that says it saves sinners and a crucified Christ who is alive. It gives us opportunity to be a contrast," Moore said. "Congregations must be very clear on teaching about marriage. A pastor cannot simply say we ought to have healthy and happy marriages; a pastor needs to articulate what marriage is biblically and how it is rooted in the gospel mystery of Christ and his church."</p>			
2013-5d	<p>Ed Stetzer, president of of LifeWay Research, said he doesn't expect the decisions to significantly change church mission.</p> <p>"I was preaching at Pathway Vineyard Church in Maine on the Sunday after the state of Maine legalized gay marriage," he said in a blog post. "After such a strong statement and shift in the culture around them, what did the believers there do? The same thing they did the week before: loved people, served the hurting, and preached Jesus. Maybe we should follow that example this Sunday. And next Sunday. And the next." Christians have erred, he said, in responding to cultural changes with anger. Fifty years ago, Stetzer said, "we railed against atheists and Hugh Hefner. They were not necessarily mad at us, but we were mad at them without apology for the lies and immorality they promoted in our world. Over the past five decades, they returned the favor, marginalizing our faith as out of touch and culturally unacceptable. ... We can either get furious at them again and perpetuate the cycle</p>	1. Avoidance of Issue	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. None

	(as I am afraid some of us are already doing), or we can respond like Jesus."			
2013-5e	<p>Michael McConnell, director of the Stanford Constitutional Law Center, says "the rhetoric suggests that Justice Kennedy is prepared to hold there's a right to same-sex marriage everywhere."</p> <p>As a result, McConnell says, the rulings also are a good reminder for Christians not to place their faith in the government to uphold Christian standards.</p> <p>"It's time, if the church believes in what it preaches about marriage, for the church to explain why and particularly to find ways to communicate more effectively to its own young people."</p>	<p>1. Government Policy isn't a Solution</p> <p>2. Political Evolution to Equality</p>	Educator or leader of secular institution	<p>1. None</p> <p>2. None</p>
2013-5f	<p>ADF senior counsel Austin R. Nimrocks says marriage between one man and one woman will remain "timeless, universal, and special."</p> <p>"That will not change," he said.</p> <p>"Americans will continue advancing the truth about marriage between a man and a woman and why it matters for children, civil society, and limited government."</p>	<p>1. Inevitability as a Myth</p>	Lawyer	<p>1. Straight marriage will still dominate</p>
2013-5g	<p>Andrew Marin, founder and president of The Marin Foundation, an organization that seeks "to build bridges between the LGBT community and the church," says difficult conversations about sexual ethics and theology will remain complicated whether or not same-sex marriage is legalized.</p> <p>"As a body, whether people agree or disagree with the rulings, the church must start functioning in the reality of this new world instead of continuing to function in one's ideal, best case scenario, which</p>	<p>1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights</p>	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	<p>1. Gay rights hurt religious rights</p>

	<p>does not exist," he said. Now, the battleground ought to shift toward religious freedom, in order to protect churches' right to preach according to Scripture, which in a number of situations will go against today's ruling, Marin says. But he adds that there is reason to be encouraged on this front: In a statement this morning, President Barack Obama emphasized that the need to "maintain our nation's commitment to religious freedom [is] vital ... and how religious institutions define and consecrate marriage has always been up to those institutions."</p>			
2013-5h	<p>In a statement, Focus on the Family president Jim Daly called the rulings "deeply disappointing." He said Christians should not despair but should rather see "new opportunity to shine light into a confused culture."</p> <p>"The two rulings don't diminish the job of the church to proclaim God's truth to a culture that desperately needs it. As we continue to distance ourselves from God's design for marriage and family, Christians will need to take their oath and commitment to marriage more seriously," Daly said. "The single greatest argument we can present to the world on this issue of marriage is to personally live out marriage in all its God-ordained fullness and radiant beauty."</p>	<p>1. Religion as Tradition 2. Government Policy isn't a Solution</p>	Christian advocacy group	<p>1. Upfront disapproval 2. None</p>
2013-6a	<p>Rep. Jo Jordan voted against SB1 because she said its exemptions were "too narrow," especially regarding religious freedom. "It wasn't protective enough for everybody," Jordan told <i>Honolulu Magazine</i>, later noting, "I'm not</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Compromise

	here to protect the big churches or the little churches, I'm saying we can't erode what's currently out there. We don't want to scratch at the religious protections at all, because if we don't create a measure that's bulletproof, or as close to bulletproof as possible, then the measure will go to the courts."			
2013-7a	Barna Group president David Kinnaman noted in the report that evangelicals maintain their beliefs regardless of cultural trends. "Some will say this demonstrates evangelicals' principled behavior; others will claim this proves their repressive social views. Either way, the data shows that evangelicals remain countercultural against a rising tide of public opinion," he said.	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school *Talking about evangelicals here, not the source's opinion	1. Upfront disapproval
2013-8a	According to George Conger, an analyst for the Church of England newspaper, African church leaders 'rebuked' Welby for "(compromising) the Christian faith in an attempt to curry favor with secular Britain and with the liberal Anglican Churches of North America."	1. Religion as Tradition	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Upfront disapproval
2013-8b	The full text of the statement from the bishop is as follows: Both Houses of Parliament have now expressed a clear view by large majorities on the principle that there should be legislation to enable same-sex marriages to take place in England and Wales. It is now the duty and responsibility of the Bishops who sit in the House of Lords to recognise the implications of this decision and to join with other Members in the task of considering how this legislation can be put into better shape. The	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Clergy (Anglican)	1. Compromise

	<p>concerns of many in the Church, and in the other denominations and faiths, about the wisdom of such a move have been expressed clearly and consistently in the Parliamentary debate. For the Bishops the issue now is not primarily one of protections and exemptions for people of faith, important though it is to get that right, not least where teaching in schools and freedom of speech are concerned. The Bill now requires improvement in a number of other key respects, including in its approach to the question of fidelity in marriage and the rights of children. If this Bill is to become law, it is crucial that marriage as newly defined is equipped to carry within it as many as possible of the virtues of the understanding of marriage it will replace. Our focus during Committee and Report stages in the coming weeks and months will be to address those points in a spirit of constructive engagement.</p> <p>Rt Revd Tim Stevens, Bishop of Leicester</p>			
2014-1a	<p>Stearns asserts that the "very narrow policy change" should be viewed by others as "symbolic not of compromise but of [Christian] unity." He even hopes it will inspire unity elsewhere among Christians. World Vision's board was not unanimous, acknowledged Stearns, but was "overwhelmingly in favor" of the change.</p> <p>"Changing the employee conduct policy to allow someone in a same-sex marriage who is a professed believer in Jesus Christ to work for us makes our policy more consistent with our practice on</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Issue Isn't Worth Split

	<p>other divisive issues," he said. "It also allows us to treat all of our employees the same way: abstinence outside of marriage, and fidelity within marriage."</p> <p>Stearns took pains to emphasize what World Vision is not communicating by the policy change.</p> <p>"It's easy to read a lot more into this decision than is really there," he said. "This is not an endorsement of same-sex marriage. We have decided we are not going to get into that debate. Nor is this a rejection of traditional marriage, which we affirm and support."</p> <p>"We're not caving to some kind of pressure. We're not on some slippery slope. There is no lawsuit threatening us. There is no employee group lobbying us," said Stearns. "This is not us compromising. It is us deferring to the authority of churches and denominations on theological issues. We're an operational arm of the global church, we're not a theological arm of the church."</p> <p>"This is simply a decision about whether or not you are eligible for employment at World Vision U.S. based on this single issue, and nothing more."</p> <p>Stearns said World Vision has never asked about sexual orientation when interviewing job candidates. Yet World Vision has long had a Christian conduct policy for employees that "holds a very high bar for all manner of conduct," said Stearns.</p> <p>Stearns said World Vision's board has faced a new question in recent years: "What do we do about someone who applies for a job at</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>World Vision who is in a legal same-sex marriage that may have been sanctioned and performed by their church? Do we deny them employment?</p> <p>"Under our old conduct policy, that would have been a violation," said Stearns. "The new policy will not exclude someone from employment if they are in a legal same-sex marriage."</p> <p>Stearns said the new policy reflects World Vision's parachurch and multi-denominational nature.</p> <p>"Denominations disagree on many, many things: on divorce and remarriage, modes of baptism, women in leadership roles in the church, beliefs on evolution, etc.," he said. "So our practice has always been to defer to the authority and autonomy of local churches and denominational bodies on matters of doctrine that go beyond the Apostles' Creed and our statement of faith. We unite around our [Trinitarian beliefs], and we have always deferred to the local church on these other matters."</p> <p>The reason the prohibition existed in the first place? "It's kind of a historical issue," said Stearns.</p> <p>"Same-sex marriage has only been a huge issue in the church in the last decade or so. There used to be much more unity among churches on this issue, and that's changed." And the change has been painful to watch. "It's been heartbreaking to watch this issue rip through the church," he said. "It's tearing churches apart, tearing denominations apart, tearing Christian colleges apart, and even tearing families apart. Our board felt we cannot jump into the fight</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>on one side or another on this issue. We've got to focus on our mission. We are determined to find unity in our diversity."</p> <p>Stearns was adamant the change will not impact World Vision's identity or work in the field. "World Vision is committed to our Christian identity. We are absolutely resolute about every employee being followers of Jesus Christ. We are not wavering on that," he said.</p> <p>"This is also not about compromising the authority of Scripture," said Stearns. "People can say, 'Scripture is very clear on this issue,' and my answer is, 'Well ask all the theologians and denominations that disagree with that statement.' The church is divided on this issue. And we are not the local church. We are an operational organization uniting Christians around a common mission to serve the poor in the name of Christ."</p> <p>"Concerns over government funding had no impact on this decision," said Stearns, noting that World Vision caps federal funding at 35 percent of its cash revenues. "We fought for the whole Christian community, reminding USAID that faith-based organizations have a religious exemption and are not required to follow government hiring guidelines.</p> <p>"If the U.S. government ever requires us to give up our religious hiring rights in exchange for grants, we would walk away from U.S. grants. World Vision's ministry is not for sale."</p> <p>Yet Stearns said World Vision is not suggesting other ministries</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>should now follow its lead.</p> <p>"We made this decision for our organization based on who we are. Every organization has to come to its own conclusion," he said. "We are still passionate about protecting religious hiring rights—making sure that every Christian organization gets to decide this issue for themselves and not have the government decide it for them."</p> <p>"We're not doing this for any legal reasons," he said. "If we wanted to, we would fight another battle on this all the way to the Supreme Court."</p> <p>"The last 12 to 24 months have been among the most challenging of any we have ever faced," Stearns wrote to 408,000 donors in a January letter that marked "the first time Stearns had sent out a letter asking child sponsors to increase their giving due to cutbacks," the newspaper reported.</p> <p>Stearns hopes World Vision will not experience similar division like Thrivent and risk losing conservative supporters as a result.</p> <p>"I don't want to predict the reaction we will get," he said. "I think we've got a very persuasive series of reasons for why we're doing this, and it's my hope that all of our donors and partners will understand it, and will agree with our exhortation to unite around what unites us. But we do know this is an emotional issue in the American church. I'm hoping not to lose supporters over the change. We're hoping that they understand that what we've done is focused on church unity and our mission."</p> <p>And Stearns believes that World</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Vision can successfully remain neutral on same-sex marriage. "I think you have to be neutral on hundreds of doctrinal issues that could divide an organization like World Vision," he said. "One example: divorce and remarriage. Churches have different opinions on this. We've chosen not to make that a condition of employment at World Vision. If we were not deferring to local churches, we would have a long litmus test [for employees]. What do you believe about evolution? Have you been divorced and remarried? What is your opinion on women in leadership? Were you dunked or sprinkled? And at the end of the interview, how many candidates would still be standing?"</p> <p>"It is not our role to take a position on all these issues and make these issues a condition of employment." Stearns said he doesn't expect any outcry among World Vision's 100 country affiliates, since World Vision International allows each country to set its own hiring policies appropriate to its local legal context.</p> <p>"This is a very narrow policy change. It's strictly about whether this issue should be a condition of employment at World Vision."</p> <p>"We're not trying to do anything that's symbolic for the rest of the church," he said. "But if we're making a statement at all, I hope it's a statement about unity."</p> <p>"I hope it's a statement that says when Christ left, he gave us the Great Commission [to make disciples] and the Great Commandment [to love others as ourselves], and we're trying to do</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>just that," said Stearns. "Bridging the differences we have, and coming together in our unity."</p> <p>"In some manner we haven't finished Christ's mission for the church because we've been divided and distracted by too many other things," he said. "We've got to find our way to unity beyond diversity in the Christian church."</p> <p>"I know the Evil One would like nothing better than for World Vision to be hobbled and divided on this issue, so that we lose our focus on the Great Commandment and the Great Commission," said Stearns. "And the board is determined not to let that happen."</p> <p>"I hope if it's symbolic of anything, it is symbolic of how we can come together even though we disagree. We—meaning other Christians—are not the enemy. We have to find way to come together around our core beliefs to accomplish the mission that Christ has given the church."</p> <p>"We feel positive about what we've done. Our motives are pure," said Stearns. "We're not doing this because of any outside pressure. We're not doing this to get more revenue. We're really doing this because it's the right thing to do, and it's the right thing to do for unity within the church."</p> <p>"I'm hoping this may inspire unity among others as well," he concluded. "To say how can we come together across some differences and still join together as brothers and sisters in Christ in our common mission of building the kingdom."</p>			
2014-1b	At a conference that laid the foundation of the new Evangelical	1. Religion as Tradition	Clergy (ECO	1. Upfront disapproval

	<p>Covenant Order of Presbyterians, the Minnesota megachurch pastor [board member and pastor John Crosby] stated, "We have tried to create such a big tent trying to make everybody happy theologically. I fear the tent has collapsed without a center." However, as a World Vision board member, Crosby didn't have a problem voting for the policy change. "It's a matter of trying to decide what the core mission of the organization is," he said. Crosby, who leads Christ Presbyterian Church in Edina, Minnesota, told CT that the decision was about making sure that World Vision is focusing on its mission to eliminate poverty worldwide. World Vision stretches across countless cultural and theological divides in a hundred countries, and so the issue of theology and how to interpret Scripture should be left to the local church, he said.</p> <p>"Many of us support World Vision specifically because of its Christian identity. While there are many other good relief organizations, it's the faith component of World Vision that makes it distinctive for us," said Crosby. "[But] how can we represent ourselves as a Christian organization in such a diverse world? That's what we're trying to work through on a daily basis."</p>		Presbyterian)	
2014-1c	<p>Board member and seminary professor Soong-Chan Rah told CT the decision to leave theology to others "honors the church as a whole." "It is not a statement in a particular direction, but it is trying to acknowledge the proper</p>	<p>1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights 2. Gay Marriage</p>	<p>Leader of Christian org, company, or school</p>	<p>1. Compromise 2. Neutral</p>

	relationship between the church and the parachurch," he said. "If there is something we can learn from [this], it is the value of having conversations and commitment to prayer, over not just this particular issue but all controversial issues that divide the church."	Issue is Dividing the Church		
2014-1d	One of the first prominent voices out of the gate: Russell Moore, president of the Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, who tweeted, "I'm glad Carl Henry didn't live to see this," and promptly penned a reaction, concluding: "World Vision is a good thing to have, unless the world is all you can see."	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2014-2a	PC(USA) moderator Heath Rada said at a news conference that he thought the measures passed because many Presbyterians were tired of being defined by the controversy over same-sex marriage, reports <i>The New York Times</i> .	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Neutral
2014-3a	A bill in Kansas sparked conflict among Christians after Kirsten Powers, whose testimony was CT's No. 1 most-read story of 2013, published a column for <i>USA Today</i> saying that "Christians backing this bill are essentially arguing for homosexual Jim Crow laws." Powers ends the column by asking, "What would Jesus Do?" insisting that Jesus would bake the cake for a same-sex wedding. Powers quoted evangelical pastor Andy Stanley as saying it's "offensive that Christians would leverage faith to support the Kansas law."	1. Religion as Equality	Politician	1. Moral acceptance
2014-3b	"In America, people should be free to live and work according to their faith, and the government shouldn't	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious

	be able to tell us we can't do that," [Joe] LaRue told <i>The New York Times</i> .	Religious Rights		rights
2014-3c	New Mexico Supreme Court Justice Richard C. Bosson wrote in his ruling that while Elaine and her husband are "free to think, to say, to believe, as they wish," the public accommodation of differing beliefs is "the price of citizenship."	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	1. Politician	1. Compromise
2014-3d	Finding a balance will be hard to navigate, said Douglas Laycock, a professor at University of Virginia Law School. "It's hard to get the middle that protects the rights of gay individuals to marry and protects the rights of those who don't want to participate," Laycock told Religion News Service. "Both gay rights and religious liberty people want rights for their side but not for the other."	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Compromise
2014-3e	[Russell] Moore wrote in a Gospel Coalition column that "the couple asking you to do this wedding aren't your enemies. They are made in the image of God and loved by him and so should be loved by us." But Moore advised against participating, saying, "But we must stand with kindness as well as with conviction."	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Love the sinner, hate the sin
2014-3f	"We see a growing hostility toward religion," [Josh] Kredit told <i>Time</i> . "These are intentional, purposeful distractions to try to kill this bill."	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Lawyer	Gay rights hurt religious rights
2014-4a	"Today there was a very clear and strong signal from the church, and that message is, 'Change is on the way,' " [Frank] Schaefer told <i>The New York Times</i> . "One day we will celebrate the fact that we have moved beyond this horrible chapter	1. Religion as Equality 2. Inevitability as a Concession to Equality	Clergy (Methodist)	1. Moral acceptance 2. Positive

	in our church's life."			
2014-4b	"The just resolution provisions of the Book of Discipline are clear in voicing just resolution as the preferred response in Judicial Administration," [Bishop Martin] McLee wrote in a statement. "Church trials produce no winners."	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Clergy (Methodist)	1. Neutral
2014-4c	"The impact of this settlement today will be that faithful United Methodists who support the church's teachings will feel ignored and will face their own crisis of conscience, as to whether they can continue to support a church that will not abide by its own rules," Randy Paige, one of the pastors who brought the complaint against Ogletree, wrote in a statement. "Far from avoiding schism, today's settlement increases the probability that schism will take place." Paige wrote the trial resolution was like "a green light to disobey" the Book of Discipline without consequences.	1. Religion as Tradition	Clergy (Methodist)	1. Upfront disapproval
2014-4d	Tom Lambrecht, vice president of the conservative Good News ministry, agreed. "When certain parts of the church decide they can no longer live according to church teachings, you've got an intolerable situation in the church," he told the Boston Globe.	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2014-5a	Wycliffe College's Ephraim Radner and Christopher Seitz, who drafted the pledge, write, "To continue with church practices that intertwine government marriage with Christian marriage will implicate the Church in a false definition of marriage."	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2014-5b	"It's time make a clear distinction between the government-enforced legal regime of marriage and the biblical covenant of	1. Religion as Tradition	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Upfront disapproval

	<p>marriage," argues R. R. Reno, editor of <i>First Things</i>, in presenting the pledge. "For a long time Christianity has sewn its teachings into the fabric of Western culture. That was a good thing," he noted. "But the season of sewing is ending. Now is a time for rending, not for the sake of disengaging from culture or retreating from the public square, but so that our salt does not lose its savor."</p>			
2014-5c	<p>"In many countries, there's a split between civil marriage and religious marriage," noted LifeWay's Ed Stetzer. "In the United States, those two aspects have been combined. That's led to some tension, as American views about marriage change." The findings surprised Stetzer. "It's the size of the minority view, among pastors and Americans, that surprises me—a noteworthy number are ready for pastors to stop saying, 'By the power vested in me by the state...' during a church wedding," he said. "We don't know if the view is growing, but it certainly is worth noticing."</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Neutral
2014-6a	<p>"We can no longer talk about schism as something that might happen in the future. Schism has already taken place in our connection," said Maxie Dunnam, chancellor of Asbury Seminary and leader in the Good News movement for evangelical Methodists, in comments to Good News magazine. "There are conscience-bound persons who find it impossible to live in the United Methodist Church as we presently define ourselves in relation to human sexuality," said Dunnam. "Forty years of wrestling with the issue is enough."</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Issue Isn't Worth Split

2014-6b	<p>"Church trials produce no winners," [Bishop Martin] McLee said.</p> <p>"Church trials result in harmful polarization and continue the harm brought upon our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters."</p> <p>He also said, "I call for and commit to a cessation of church trials for conducting ceremonies which celebrate homosexual unions or performing same gender wedding ceremonies."</p>	<p>1. Religion as Equality</p> <p>2. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church</p>	Clergy (Methodist)	<p>1. Moral acceptance</p> <p>2. Issue Isn't Worth Split</p>
2014-6c	<p>"We found that regardless of a person's position on homosexuality, members felt strongly that the church could offer a positive and different voice to the broader conversation occurring in society today," said John Deuterma, president of Corporate Research, which conducted the survey for the UMC Communications agency.</p>	<p>1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church</p>	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	<p>1. Issue Isn't Worth Split</p>
2014-7a	<p>In short, states where courts have ruled on same-sex marriage are "black hole" states where few or no specific religious protections are given, according to Robin Fretwell Wilson, a University of Illinois law professor who leads a group of legal scholars that advise lawmakers on religious exemptions. By contrast, she said, "There is not a single state that has accepted same-sex marriage [through legislation] where they haven't gotten a religious exemption."</p> <p>Other states will follow the current 17 states, said Wilson.</p> <p>In about two-thirds of those 28 states, marriage amendments are not hard to change, she said.</p> <p>Wilson identifies four layers of needed protections. She starts with the clergy, who need—and already get—the best defense from the U.S. Constitution. While most states</p>	<p>1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights</p>	Educator or leader of secular institution	<p>1. Gay rights hurt religious rights</p>

	<p>where same sex-marriage is legalized specify this protection, she calls it a "fake religious liberty protection" because it's already guaranteed at the federal level. Religious facilities which may be rented out to non-members make up the next layer, Wilson said. Next are religious social service agencies (such as the Salvation Army or Catholic Charities), religious universities, and religious marriage counseling services which may be open to prosecution or civil suit if they don't accommodate same-sex couples seeking services.</p> <p>The fourth layer comprises people of faith who work in so-called secular jobs. The marriage counselor at a non-religious practice, the judge asked to perform the marriage, the bakers and florists and photographers—all should have religious rights, she said.</p> <p>While New Mexico and Colorado courts have ruled that anti-discrimination trumps religious rights for private businesses, Delaware has gone so far as to recognize a judge's right to turn down a same-sex couple's request to perform the ceremony. Even though the state offers few other protections (thus its low ranking on CT's chart above), the sheltering of people in the fourth layer makes Delaware ironically one of the most robust in terms of protections for individuals, Wilson said.</p> <p>"Delaware is amazing, because they don't do anything for big religion but they do a lot for the small guy," she said. "In our view, the government employee can stand off as long as somebody else is there to</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>do the service."</p> <p>"It's better to have protections now than holding out and getting nothing," [Wilson said].</p>			
2014-7b	<p>"Too many folks see this as an all-or-nothing matter," says University of St. Thomas law professor Thomas Berg. "If religious liberty is tied to defeating same-sex marriage altogether, religious liberty is going to lose."</p> <p>"Social services and schools are outgrowths of the ministry of churches and denominations," he said. "Serving people is a core exercise of religion."</p> <p>Another critical issue is protection from losing a tax-exempt status or license to operate, said Berg.</p>	Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2014-7c	<p>Opposing same-sex marriage on its merits is not an effective long-term strategy, according to Stanley Carlson-Thies, president of the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance.</p> <p>"There is a decreasing worry about same-sex relations—maybe because a lot of us know somebody in a same-sex relationship," he said.</p> <p>"There has also been a change in what people regard as equal treatment."</p> <p>Carlson-Thies says exchanging opposition of same-sex marriage laws for religious protection isn't a trade-off, but reading the signs of the times and doing something about it.</p> <p>"You don't want to tell people [the definition of marriage] doesn't matter, because it does matter. That weighs heavily on people," he said.</p> <p>But if same-sex marriage legalization is unavoidable in certain states, then conservative Christians need to build space</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian advocacy group	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	where their view of truth can still be testified to and exemplified, he said. "It is the reality of living in a broken world."			
2014-7d	<p>While some states offer fairly robust protection—such as Maryland, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire—none of the state laws are ideal, according to law professor Doug Laycock, a leading advocate of religious protections alongside Wilson. "They're often drafted in a hurry. They are incomplete or sometimes deeply ambiguous."</p> <p>Part of the problem is a lack of political support for exemptions among opponents of same-sex marriage, he said. "Somebody has to credibly say, 'Give us a real religious liberty provision and we'll withdraw our opposition.'"</p> <p>It's a hard shift for same-sex marriage opponents, but a necessary one, Laycock said. "They're losing this fight, and need to get some more liberty protections while they have a chance. Once a law is passed, it's too late."</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2014-7e	<p>Caleb Dalton, litigation counsel for Alliance Defending Freedom, agrees that legalization of same-sex marriage via state laws is preferable to court rulings. "A ruling doesn't provide for specific protections the way a legislature can," he said. "That's one of the downsides of judicial fiat on this issue."</p> <p>"It's not an either-or," said Dalton, whose team focuses on marriage and family issues, including the Tulsa County clerk who is a defendant in the Oklahoma case. "We will continue to advocate for marriage between one man and one woman as the building block of</p>	1. Religion as Tradition 2. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian advocacy group	1. Upfront disapproval 2. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	<p>society. But in cases where a state has chosen to redefine its marriage laws, we support the active inclusion of robust religious liberty protections in pending legislation."</p> <p>"Same-sex marriage is not inevitable in the court system," said Dalton. "The only current federal appeals court that stands on this issue—the Eighth Circuit's 2006 decision upholding Nebraska's marriage laws—has ruled that a state can constitutionally define marriage." He notes that the Ninth Circuit came to a different conclusion, but its decision was vacated by the U.S. Supreme Court last year in <i>Perry v. Brown</i>.</p> <p>"Furthermore, last year's Supreme Court decision in <i>Windsor</i> clearly affirms the right of each state to define its own marriage policy in this arena," he said.</p>			
2014-7f	<p>Russell Moore, president of the Southern Baptist Convention's Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, also opposes the strategy of abandoning opposition to same-sex marriage laws and instead focusing on "let's just get what we can get" on religious freedom protections.</p> <p>"I think it would be a mistake to abandon the fight for the definition of marriage. I think we should do both. One needn't choose one or the other," he said. "The historical parallel would be the prolife movement, which includes both a constant articulation of why we should protect unborn children and women harmed by abortion, while at the same time, working for conscience protection for prolife conviction.</p> <p>"So while we're fighting for</p>	<p>1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights</p> <p>2. Religion as Tradition</p>	<p>Leader of Christian org, company, or school</p>	<p>1. Gay rights hurt religious rights</p> <p>2. Upfront disapproval</p>

	religious liberty, we're articulating why we believe marriage is significant and important. And while we're fighting for marriage, we're articulating why the religious liberty concerns that inevitably come from these discussions are significant," he said. "We do both, and we don't abandon or marginalize either plank."			
2014-8a	<p>"Our judicial commissions did not come with such a sweeping grant of authority," Judge Jeffrey S. Sutton wrote in the decision, "one that would allow just three of us—just two of us in truth—to make such a vital policy call for 32 million citizens who live within the four states of the 6th Circuit."</p> <p>Sutton noted:</p> <p>When the courts do not let the people resolve new social issues like this one, they perpetuate the idea that the heroes in these change events are judges and lawyers. Better, in this instance, we think, to allow change through the customary political processes, in which the people, gay and straight alike, become the heroes of their own stories by meeting each other not as adversaries in a court system but as fellow citizens seeking to resolve a new social issue in a fair-minded way.</p> <p>The decision deems it "dangerous and demeaning to the citizenry" if judges feel they are the only ones capably of fairly understanding same-sex marriage. Sutton goes on to say his "hands are tied" by a 1972 one-sentence Supreme Court ruling which "upheld the right of the people of a state to define marriage as they see it."</p>	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2014-	Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg	1. Political	Politician	1. None

8b	recently spoke at the University of Minnesota, saying, "Now if that court should disagree with the others then there will be some urgency in the [Supreme] Court taking the case."	Evolution to Equality		
2014-8c	Since the Sixth Circuit is mostly conservative, Dana Nessel, lead attorney for two clients involved, said they are, "going straight to the Supreme Court." "We feel absolutely confident that the US Supreme Court will accept one of the cases out of the Sixth Circuit, most likely Michigan or Kentucky," she said.	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Lawyer	1. None
2014-8d	"The US Supreme Court will have the final word on this issue. The sooner they rule, the better," Michigan attorney general Bill Schuette said in response to the decision.	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Lawyer	1. None
2014-9a	U.S. District Judge Robert Shelby issued a 53-page ruling declaring that Utah's constitutional amendment, passed by voters in 2004, violates the rights of gay and lesbian couples to due process and equal protection under the 14th Amendment. "The state's current laws deny its gay and lesbian citizens their fundamental right to marry," Shelby wrote, "and, in so doing, demean the dignity of these same-sex couples for no rational reason."	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2014-9b	Utah governor Gary Herbert spoke out against Shelby's ruling, saying, "I am very disappointed an activist federal judge is attempting to override the will of the people of Utah."	1. Political Evolution to Equality	Politician	1. None
2014-10a	"The last couple of days have been painful," president Richard Stearns told reporters this evening. "We feel pain and a broken heart for the	1. Religion as Tradition 2. Gay Marriage	Leader of Christian org, company, or	1. Upfront disapproval 2. Issue isn't worth

	<p>confusion we caused for many friends who saw this policy change as a strong reversal of World Vision's commitment to biblical authority, which it was not intended to be."</p> <p>"Rather than creating more unity [among Christians], we created more division, and that was not the intent," said Stearns. "Our board acknowledged that the policy change we made was a mistake ... and we believe that [World Vision supporters] helped us to see that with more clarity ... and we're asking you to forgive us for that mistake."</p> <p>"We listened to [our] friends, we listened to their counsel. They tried to point out in loving ways that the conduct policy change was simply not consistent ... with the authority of Scripture and how we apply Scripture to our lives," said Stearns. "We did inadequate consultation with our supporters. If I could have a do-over on one thing, I would have done much more consultation with Christian leaders."</p> <p>"What we are affirming today is there are certain beliefs that are so core to our Trinitarian faith that we must take a strong stand on those beliefs," said Stearns. "We cannot defer to a small minority of churches and denominations that have taken a different position."</p> <p>"Yes, we will certainly defer on many issues that are not so central to our understanding of the Christian faith," he said. "But on the authority of Scripture in our organization's work [and employee conduct] ... and on marriage as an institution ordained by God between a man and a woman—</p>	Issue is Dividing the Church	school	split
--	---	------------------------------------	--------	-------

	<p>those are age-old and fundamental Christian beliefs. We cannot defer on things that are that central to the faith."</p> <p>Stearns expects the board to continue to deal with questions about employment and same-sex relationships. "I think every Christian organization will continue to deal with this sensitive issue," he said. "The board will continue to talk about this issue for many board meetings to come. ... We need to have a process to do further and wider consultation with key Christian leaders around the country, and we will be discussing how that can happen."</p> <p>Today's letter explaining the reversal was overwhelmingly approved by the board, Stearns said.</p> <p>Stearns acknowledged Wednesday [March 26] that "a number" of child sponsors canceled their sponsorship in the past 48 hours in protest of the change to World Vision's conduct policy.</p> <p>"That grieves us, because the children we serve will suffer because of that," he told reporters.</p> <p>"But our choice is not about money or income. It's a sincere desire for us to do the right thing. To be consistent with our core values, and to respond to the legitimate feedback and counsel we have received from supporters and friends of World Vision."</p> <p>Stearns reached out to those partners in World Vision's announcement of the reversal, asking for forgiveness:</p> <p>We are writing to you our trusted partners and Christian leaders who have come to us in the spirit of</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	Matthew 18 to express your concern in love and conviction. You share our desire to come together in the Body of Christ around our mission to serve the poorest of the poor. We have listened to you and want to say thank you and to humbly ask for your forgiveness.			
2014-10b	"The U.S. branch of World Vision has placed Pentecostal and evangelical churches in a difficult position," said George O. Wood, general superintendent of the 3-million-member AG, before the reversal. "On the one hand, we applaud the work they do among the poor in America and around the world, and many churches have supported that work financially for some time. On the other hand, World Vision's policy change now puts them at odds with our beliefs regarding sexual morality." On Wednesday night, Wood encouraged "Pentecostals and evangelicals who hastily canceled their sponsorship of children in World Vision programs to immediately reinstate that support in order to ensure continuity of care for the poor children whom Christ loves."	1. Religion as Tradition 2. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval 2. Issue isn't worth split
2014-10c	"They were not taking a position supporting same-sex marriage or homosexuality," said Tim Dearborn, director of Fuller Seminary's Lloyd John Ogilvie Institute of Preaching, who previously oversaw how World Vision's Christian commitments were implemented across its international partners. Instead, he said World Vision, which has a "deep commitment to live and serve in ways that are consistent with	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Issue isn't worth split

	<p>Scripture," was attempting to do three things.</p> <p>"First, to focus on the aspects of the biblical mandate that are non-negotiable: caring for the poor, victims of injustice, and especially children," said Dearborn. "Second, to contribute to the unity of the church around those things, at a time when the church is fractured. And third, to contribute as a result of that to the credibility of the gospel and the church in the eyes of American society."</p> <p>Dearborn said that World Vision U.S.'s relationship with its partner organizations also played a role in today's decision. "There's an effort on the part of World Vision U.S. not only to be subject to the authority of Scripture, but also to be sensitive to being a member of an international partnership," he said. "There are 50-some World Visions in the world. Especially in Africa and Asia, the position World Vision just rescinded would have been troublesome."</p>			
2014-10d	<p>"Assuming the '2,000' figure is accurate, that amounts to just under two-tenths of one percent of all kids sponsored through World Vision U.S.," [Ben] Irwin wrote. "But this was never about percentages. This is about real lives. It's about kids in impoverished communities who just became pawns in our culture war."</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Issue isn't worth split
2014-10e	<p>Esther Fleece reflected on her experience at Focus on the Family when TOM'S Shoes ended a partnership over Focus's stance on homosexuality.</p> <p>"We can disagree with each other and still serve people in urgent need. The days of boycotting</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Issue isn't worth split

	everything are over, but that doesn't mean Christian convictions are," she wrote for On Faith. "Correct theology is loving people, and no Bible-believing Christian is going to withhold service from a person in need who disagrees with his or her interpretation of Scripture."			
2014-10f	"World Vision has done the right thing," tweeted [Russell] Moore after the reversal. "Now, let's all work for a holistic gospel presence, addressing both temporal and eternal needs."	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-1a	"We're absolutely on the right side of the law on these cases. We're probably going to see lower courts deciding different ways, but the Supreme Court has already twice found that First Amendment rights trump sexual orientation nondiscrimination laws." ~Jeremy Tedesco, attorney, Alliance Defending Freedom	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights 2. Inevitability as a Myth	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights 2. Gay couples won't receive rights
2015-1b	"Most of these cases involving Christian business owners have arisen on the West Coast and more liberal-leaning areas of the country. They have not fared well, but most are still in play. I hope that we will see better results in other geographical areas." ~Roger Gannam, attorney, Liberty Counsel	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-1c	"The best bet for these religious objectors is to seek accommodation in the political process. They're not likely to get a specific exemption in statewide law unless they bargain. In Utah, for example, laws protect LGBT individuals and religious objectors." ~Robin Fretwell Wilson, professor, University of Illinois College of Law	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Compromise
2015-	"Exemptions for small vendors	1. Same-Sex	Leader of	1. Gay

1d	from providing personal services directly for a wedding when other vendors are available would protect providers' religious conscience without undermining access. Even so, courts thus far have been reluctant to recognize them." ~Thomas C. Berg, professor, University of St. Thomas School of Law	Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian org, company, or school	rights hurt religious rights
2015-1e	"Society's compelling interest in preventing discrimination will likely trump religious freedom arguments, judging from how civil rights laws have been applied. This will likely be the case even in states with Religious Freedom Restoration Acts or strong free-exercise protections." ~Charles C. Haynes, scholar, First Amendment Center, Newseum	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-2a	Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia once warned that too much religious freedom would be "courting anarchy." Scalia, who wrote the majority opinion in <i>Smith</i> , argued that allowing people to disobey the law on religious grounds would lead to chaos.	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Religious rights hurt gay rights
2015-2b	Supporters like Indiana Gov. Mike Pence say the law is needed to protect believers who feel under siege.	1. Same-Sex Rights Hurt Religious Rights	Politician	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-2c	"Because of RFRA, we don't let whatever bureaucrats happened to be in power decide who gets religious liberty," said Adèle Auxier Keim, counsel for the Becket Fund for Religious Liberty. Instead of chaos, said Keim, RFRA created an orderly way for courts to resolve disputes involving religious liberty. She argues that it balances the government's compelling interests while protecting religious	1. Same-Sex Rights Hurt Religious Rights	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	rights.			
2015-2d	<p>Marci Hamilton, professor of public law at Yeshiva University, was the attorney for the city that opposed the church expansion. She's become a leading critic of RFRA, and argues that the law was unconstitutional from the start. Now, she says, state lawmakers have turned the law into a tool for intentional discrimination.</p> <p>"The original federal RFRA was misguided and a leap from prior First Amendment doctrine," she wrote on her blog about the Indiana law, "but it was nothing like this new iteration in the conservative states."</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Religious Rights Hurt Gay Rights
2015-2e	<p>Lawmakers tinkering with the RFRA language in recent years have turned it into a political minefield, says J. Brent Walker, executive director for the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty, which has supported RFRA laws since the 1990s. The 1993 version protected believers against the government.</p> <p>Walker says now it's time to take a break, since RFRA's reputation has taken such a hit.</p> <p>"I hate to say, 'Take a deep breath,' since it such a cliché," he said. "But maybe we should take 100 deep breaths. Let's hold off for a little while. In this toxic political environment, things will blow sky high."</p> <p>That was bad timing, said Walker, and led to accusations that RFRA is intended for discrimination against gays.</p> <p>No judge is going to accept that faith allows people to discriminate, said Walker.</p> <p>"RFRAs are not designed to allow</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Compromise

	<p>people to discriminate,” he said. “The courts are almost certain to find that the state has a compelling interest in preventing discrimination.”</p> <p>He thinks that those with religious objections to same-sex marriage should wait till the Supreme Court rules on the matter. Then they can sit down with those who support same-sex marriage and work out a compromise that works for everyone.</p> <p>What to do with marriage is the big issue, he argued.</p> <p>“The Christian ice cream shop is not going to turn away a gay couple,” he said. “A Christian car dealer is still going to sell cars to gay people. But baking a wedding cake, where you may have to take part in the ceremony or event, is something different.”</p>			
2015-2f	<p>University of Illinois law professor Robin Fretwell Wilson says that faith groups and supporters of same-sex marriage don’t need to be enemies. The rights of both can be protected within the law, she argues.</p> <p>She said that the feud over RFRA and discrimination is regrettable. “If there is one thing to regret here, it’s that we have to be at each other’s throats all the time,” she said. “It’s unnecessary. It doesn’t have to be that way.”</p> <p>Wilson believes supporters of RFRA have a lot of work to do after the Indiana debacle. “Setting the record straight is going to be a slow process,” she said. “The opportunity here is to be statesmen and to say, ‘There is a missed opportunity in our law. We mean to fill it. We hope people will</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Compromise

	trust us, that we were doing it for the right reason—because it’s needed,” Wilson said.			
2015-2g	<p>Russell Moore, president of the Southern Baptist Convention’s Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, doesn’t see much chance for peace between RFRA supporters and foes. The dispute runs much deeper than one law. “There is a fundamental clash over the conception of religious liberty,” Moore said. “It is regrettable that religious liberty has become a culture war issue.”</p> <p>Moore argues that RFRA is meant to protect religious minorities and unpopular beliefs. That’s something everyone should support, he argued.</p> <p>He also thinks that Utah’s approach is doomed to fail.</p> <p>“I am afraid that there all kinds of unforeseen consequences for religious liberty,” he said. “I hope I am wrong.”</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-2h	<p>“I support gay marriage,” [Boston University professor Stephen Prothero] wrote. “I support anti-discrimination laws protecting lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) citizens. But I also support religious liberty. These commitments sometimes conflict. But it is a sad day when there is so little support for the liberties of US citizens, especially among liberals who should be their staunchest defenders.”</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Compromise
2015-3a	<p>AllyBrook Hernandez @AllyBrooke</p> <p>"And now these three remain: faith, hope and love. But the greatest of these is love." 1Corinthians 13:13#LoveTrumpsAll</p>	1. Avoidance of Issue	Christian celebrity	1. None
2015-	David Platt @plattdavid	1. Religion	Clergy	1. Upfront

3b	Of this, be sure: No declaration by a government can change a definition from God. (Gen. 2:24) #marriage	as Tradition	(Southern Baptist)	disapproval
2015-4a	<p>“In employment policy and practice, Hope College has always followed the state’s legal definition of marriage,” Hope College president John Knapp wrote in a statement to the college community. “Spouses are eligible for benefits, so long as their marriage is legally recognized by the State of Michigan.”</p> <p>However, Hope’s chapel will only be available to weddings that “are consistent with [the Reformed Church in America’s] definition of marriage as ‘a joyful covenanting between a man and a woman,’” Knapp wrote. “This respects our enduring affiliation with the RCA, a relationship that is also reflected in the Board of Trustees’ Position Statement on Human Sexuality.”</p> <p>Knapp's letter to the campus acknowledged that the move to provide benefits to same-sex married couples could be controversial.</p> <p>“Here at Hope College we are a family of Christians who hold diverse and often conflicting points of view,” Knapp wrote. “We understand that the new legal definition of marriage is an intensely heartfelt matter for many. We also recognize that not everyone will agree with decisions that have been made; that is to be expected.”</p>	<p>1. Religion as Equality</p> <p>2. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church</p>	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	<p>1. Recognizing church/state separation</p> <p>2. Neutral</p>
2015-4b	In May, Baylor University revised its sexual misconduct policy to leave out language specifically banning homosexual acts, but still stands by	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval

	the Baptist Faith and Message of 1963, spokesperson Lori Fogleman told CT. The policy will be applied in a way that complies with the amended 1963 Baptist Faith and Message position on marriage, said Fogleman.			
2015-4c	"Fuller and I have chosen different paths in our pursuit of integrity as we stand in relationship to Christ, scripture, and the church," [New Testament professor J.R. Daniel Kirk] wrote on his blog.	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-4d	Fuller president Mark Labberton has affirmed the seminary's belief in marriage as the union of one man and one woman.	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-4e	"The Supreme Court decision (in Obergefell v. Hodges) to legalize same-sex marriage nationwide has no specific impact on Gordon College since Massachusetts was the first state to do so back in 2004," said Rick Sweeney, vice president of marketing and communications at Gordon.	1. Religion as Equality	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Recognizing church/state separation
2015-4f	"In today's pluralistic society, we respect that there are many who do not share the College's Christian conviction on the definition of marriage," Carla Gross, a spokesperson for Messiah College, told CT. "While Pennsylvania previously, and now the U.S. Supreme Court, have legalized same-sex marriage, the state or federal government have not imposed laws at this point that require private faith-based institutions to recognize same-sex marriage in their hiring or benefits protocols. Accordingly, nothing has changed for us in these practices at this point in time."	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-	"For a long time, Christianity has	1. Religion	Christian	1. Upfront

5a	sewn its teachings into the fabric of Western culture. That was a good thing. But the season of sewing is ending. Now is a time for rending, not for the sake of disengaging from culture or retreating from the public square, but so that our salt does not lose its savor." ~R. R. Reno, editor, First Things	as Tradition	writer, author, or editor	disapproval
2015-5b	"The pledge is a small gesture, but gestures provoke and can galvanize. It's a bit of political theater, but theater can shatter complacency. Political theatrics must be preceded and followed by principled and strategic discussion, but effective political theater raises the stakes and intensifies debate." ~Peter Leithart, senior fellow, New St. Andrews College	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-5c	"Not yet. We cannot so easily divorce Christian and civil marriage, because everyone has a compelling interest in legal, natural matrimony. It is a common grace. Every important measure of social thriving is driven by the prevalence of natural marriage in a community." ~Glenn T. Stanton, director of family formation studies, Focus on the Family	1. Religion as Tradition 2. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian advocacy group	1. Upfront disapproval 2. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-5d	"Not yet. For now, by registering gospel-qualified unions as civil marriages and not officiating at unions that are not gospel-qualified, we call the government to its responsibility even as we call attention to its limits." ~Russell Moore, president, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-5e	"The people who would be punished are the ones who conform to the pastor's vision of marriage, who now have to have a second ceremony with a civil figure. Every	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	<p>First Amendment scholar agrees that religious figures won't be asked to sanction marriages they don't believe in."</p> <p>~Robin Fretwell Wilson, law professor, University of Illinois</p>			
2015-6a	Governor Mike Pence said the law will protect business from laws that might require them to violate their faith.	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-6b	<p>"It's a good deal," said University of Illinois law professor Robin Fretwell Wilson, who helped Utah legislators pass the compromise. "Both for gay people and for believers, this is a whole new level of protection we haven't seen before."</p> <p>It's a complicated approach, said Wilson, requiring a four-fold test to determine if a government's action was legal.</p> <p>Wilson said RFRA works best in clear cases of laws that clash with religion, such as laws that ban steel wheels on Amish buggies or bans on religious symbols at cemeteries. But RFRA is not an effective way to deal with the social changes caused by legalized gay marriage, she said.</p> <p>"If I want assurances about what I'm permitted to do and not do in a time of great social change," said Wilson, "I don't want a RFRA. I want an exemption."</p> <p>The downside of Indiana's approach is that it pits religious groups against advocates for same-sex marriage, Wilson argues. Before the bills passed, a clerk could get a conditional exemption handling licenses only if that did not exemption did not cause a hardship for a same-sex couple.</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Compromise

	<p>Now a clerk could get an exemption, and it would be up to the state for find a replacement clerk to handle the marriage license, said Wilson.</p> <p>Utah's bargain was enacted just five months after the state was ordered by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals to recognize same-sex marriage, and proves that working together through legislation is a better way to protect religious freedom than a knock-down fight to ban same-sex marriage altogether, Wilson said.</p> <p>"[Battling to ban same-sex marriage] is not going to work," she said. "You want to extend a fig leaf to the other side. Nobody should be trying to hold the other guy down."</p> <p>But Wilson said other states, like Idaho, are already taking a closer look at Utah's legislation. "I felt more hopeful out there [in Utah] than I have in years," she said.</p> <p>"You can kick a ball rolling just by showing that it's possible."</p> <p>The Mormon church's strong hierarchical leadership made an effective partner in forging a compromise, she said. "If evangelical churches who are tired of the culture war could get together in coalitions, they could have the same effect," she said.</p>			
2015-6c	<p>"Here we make history, said Republican Steve Urquhart, a state senator who co-sponsored the bill.</p> <p>"We have shown that LGBT rights and religious liberties, they are not opposites, they are not mutually incompatible, they are pillars in the pantheon of freedom."</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Compromise
2015-6d	<p>"Negotiators didn't have as big a gap to close as in some other places," wrote Jonathan Rauch of</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus	Secular advocacy group	1. BOTH Gay rights hurt

	the Brookings Institute, warning that “Utah won’t be a template for other states, because no such template exists.”	Religious Rights		religious rights & Religious rights hurt gay rights
2015-6e	“Peter and John didn’t stay, all the time, in the temple court preaching Jesus. But they didn’t cease while they were under orders to do so (Acts 4:21-23),” [Russell] Moore wrote. “Religious liberty isn’t ours to give away to Caesar, and soul freedom isn’t subject to a subpoena from City Hall.”	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-7a	"Many who deem same-sex marriage to be wrong reach that conclusion based on decent and honorable religious or philosophical premises," acknowledges Justice Anthony Kennedy, writing for the majority in <i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i> , "and neither they nor their beliefs are disparaged here." He explains that while that "sincere, personal opposition" cannot be "enacted law and public policy" without harming gay couples and violating the Fourteenth Amendment, he favors a continued "open and searching debate" between those who favor and oppose same-sex marriage. "It must be emphasized that religions, and those who adhere to religious doctrines, may continue to advocate with utmost, sincere conviction that, by divine precepts, same-sex marriage should not be condoned," writes Kennedy in a paragraph that will likely become the focus of scrutiny by church-state experts. "The First Amendment ensures that religious organizations and persons are given proper protection as they seek to teach the principles that are	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Compromise

	<p>so fulfilling and so central to their lives and faiths," he continues, "and to their own deep aspirations to continue the family structure they have long revered."</p> <p>On the overall question of same-sex couples being allowed to wed, Kennedy concludes:</p> <p>No union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family. In forming a marital union, two people become something greater than once they were. As some of the petitioners in these cases demonstrate, marriage embodies a love that may endure even past death. It would misunderstand these men and women to say they disrespect the idea of marriage. Their plea is that they do respect it, respect it so deeply that they seek to find its fulfillment for themselves. Their hope is not to be condemned to live in loneliness, excluded from one of civilization's oldest institutions. They ask for equal dignity in the eyes of the law. The Constitution grants them that right.</p>			
2015-7b	<p>Chief Justice John Roberts is less confident. In his dissent, he argues that today's decision "creates serious questions about religious liberty."</p> <p>"Many good and decent people oppose same-sex marriage as a tenet of faith, and their freedom to exercise religion is—unlike the right imagined by the majority—actually spelled out in the Constitution," he writes. "Respect for sincere religious conviction has led voters and legislators in every State that has adopted same-sex marriage democratically to include</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	<p>accommodations for dissenting religious practice." But he says the Supreme Court is too much of a "blunt instrument" to do likewise. [Thus the evangelical argument for "if you can't beat them, amend them."]</p> <p>Roberts looks ahead to the likelihood of future conflicts between gay rights and religious rights, such as the tax status of conservative Christian colleges. He notes:</p> <p>Hard questions arise when people of faith exercise religion in ways that may be seen to conflict with the new right to same-sex marriage—when, for example, a religious college provides married student housing only to opposite-sex married couples, or a religious adoption agency declines to place children with same-sex married couples. Indeed, the Solicitor General candidly acknowledged that the tax exemptions of some religious institutions would be in question if they opposed same-sex marriage.</p> <p>There is little doubt that these and similar questions will soon be before this Court. Unfortunately, people of faith can take no comfort in the treatment they receive from the majority today.</p> <p>Roberts concludes:</p> <p>If you are among the many Americans—of whatever sexual orientation—who favor expanding same-sex marriage, by all means celebrate today's decision. Celebrate the achievement of a desired goal. Celebrate the opportunity for a new expression of commitment to a partner. Celebrate the availability of new benefits. But</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	do not celebrate the Constitution. It had nothing to do with it.			
2015-7c	Russell Moore of the Ethics and Religious Liberty Convention believes it's too soon. "For now, by registering gospel-qualified unions as civil marriages and not officiating at unions that are not gospel-qualified, we call the government to its responsibility even as we call attention to its limits," he wrote.	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights 2. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights 2. Upfront disapproval
2015-7d	The Supreme Court's verdict means evangelicals should expect both more challenges to florists, but also more opportunities to witness, argued law professor John Inazu.	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-7e	Where same-sex marriage is legal, amending a church's bylaws to define marriage as between a man and a woman might not be a bad idea, wrote Richard Hammar at <i>Church Law & Tax Report</i> . "The bottom line is that including a statement in a church's bylaws defining marriage may be of some help should the church's tax exemptions be challenged, or if the church is sued for violating a public accommodations law due to its refusal to host same-sex marriages, but it is no guaranty of protection." Religious schools may have a tougher time of it, he wrote. When the Supreme Court revoked Bob Jones University's tax-exempt status in 1983 because of its racial discrimination, it noted that "certain governmental interests are so compelling as to allow even regulations prohibiting religiously based conduct." That means that doctrinal provisions of religious schools "may not be enough to fend off IRS challenges to tax-exempt status if	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	<p>the IRS or the courts conclude that the right of same-sex couples to marry is a fundamental and compelling public policy,” he wrote. “During the oral arguments last month before the Supreme Court, Justice Alito asked the Solicitor General (who was arguing that same-sex couples have a constitutional right to marry) if the Bob Jones University ruling would result in the loss of tax-exempt status of any religious school that opposed same-sex marriage. The Solicitor General responded, ‘it’s certainly going to be an issue.’”</p>			
2015-7f	<p>In his own dissent, Justice Samuel Alito argues today’s ruling will make it "impossible" for further religious exemptions to be created. "If the issue of same-sex marriage had been left to the people of the States, it is likely that some States would recognize same-sex marriage and others would not. It is also possible that some States would tie recognition to protection for conscience rights," he writes. "The majority today makes that impossible. By imposing its own views on the entire country, the majority facilitates the marginalization of the many Americans who have traditional ideas."</p> <p>Alito notes: The majority attempts, toward the end of its opinion, to reassure those who oppose same-sex marriage that their rights of conscience will be protected. We will soon see whether this proves to be true. I assume that those who cling to old beliefs will be able to whisper their thoughts in the recesses of their homes, but if they repeat those</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	views in public, they will risk being labeled as bigots and treated as such by governments, employers, and schools.			
2015-7g	<p>In his own dissent, Justice Clarence Thomas argues that "the majority's decision threatens the religious liberty our Nation has long sought to protect."</p> <p>"It appears all but inevitable that [civil marriage and religious marriage] will come into conflict, particularly as individuals and churches are confronted with demands to participate in and endorse civil marriages between same-sex couples," Thomas writes. He continues:</p> <p>The majority appears unmoved by that inevitability. It makes only a weak gesture toward religious liberty in a single paragraph. And even that gesture indicates a misunderstanding of religious liberty in our Nation's tradition. Religious liberty is about more than just the protection for "religious organizations and persons . . . as they seek to teach the principles that are so fulfilling and so central to their lives and faiths." Religious liberty is about freedom of action in matters of religion generally, and the scope of that liberty is directly correlated to the civil restraints placed upon religious practice. Although our Constitution provides some protection against such governmental restrictions on religious practices, the People have long elected to afford broader protections than this Court's constitutional precedents mandate. Had the majority allowed the definition of marriage to be left to the political process—as the</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	<p>Constitution requires—the People could have considered the religious liberty implications of deviating from the traditional definition as part of their deliberative process. Instead, the majority’s decision short-circuits that process, with potentially ruinous consequences for religious liberty.</p>			
2015-8a	<p>During the survey, the CCCU found that "the affiliate category was widely confusing," said CCCU president Shirley V. Hoogstra in a press conference.</p> <p>Given that "lack of clarity, purpose, and common understanding" about its membership categories, the CCCU has formed a task force led by Biola University president Barry H. Corey and Wheaton College president Phil G. Ryken. The task force will "explore how the Council will remain rooted in historic Christianity while also fruitfully engaging with other institutions seeking to advance the cause of Christian higher education or religious freedom."</p> <p>Those denominations disagree on a wide range of issues, from baptism and communion to contraception and human origins, said Hoogstra in an earlier statement.</p> <p>“Until very recently,” Hoogstra said, “there was not a divergence of opinion regarding hiring same-sex married persons. Now there is.”</p> <p>At the same time, there is a desire for unity, she said today. "There's a biblical principle for unity. In John 17 Jesus prays for unity for those in the world and not of it. Our presidents are deeply faithful Christians. If there was a way for the CCCU to remain strong and advocating for the kinds of liberties</p>	<p>1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church</p>	<p>Leader of Christian org, company, or school</p>	<p>1. Issue isn’t worth split</p>

	<p>we need to fulfill our mission, that was a primary goal for our presidents."</p> <p>"Following a good and respectful process does not mean that we do not recognize the importance of this issue in our current cultural climate," Hoogstra stated earlier.</p> <p>"[W]e do, and as such, CCCU is advocating vigorously on behalf of schools that hold the orthodox view of marriage, and we will continue to do so both for our members and for others who hold that view but are no longer members."</p>			
2015-8b	<p>"We believe in missional clarity and view the defense of the biblical definition of marriage as an issue of critical importance," said Everett Piper, president of the Bartlesville, Okla., school, in an earlier press release. "The CCCU's reluctance to make a swift decision sends a message of confusion rather than conviction."</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-8c	<p>"The fact that this is not unanimous damages our witness," Union president Samuel W. "Dub" Oliver wrote earlier to the CCCU. "The reason we are passionate about this is because what we are talking about is not a secondary or tertiary theological issue—marriage is at the heart of the Gospel. To deny the Bible's concept of marriage is to deny the authority of Scripture."</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-8d	<p>"This decision is in keeping with our commitment to non-discrimination and our mission as a Christ-centered, liberal arts academic institution," EMU board chair Kay Brenneman Nussbaum stated in announcing the school's move. "Our education is grounded in Mennonite/Anabaptist values, and we believe people in same-sex</p>	1. Religion as Equality	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	Recognizing church/state separation

	covenanted relationships are valued members of our learning community with equal rights to standard benefits.”			
2015-9a	<p>But Kelly Shackelford, president of the Plano, Texas-based group, referred to the decision as a 9-0 statement of support for the rights of religious believers.</p> <p>He pledged to use laws such as the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to make sure the Supreme Court’s promises are heeded.</p> <p>“We will not allow people of faith to be silenced or censured because of their religious beliefs, and we appreciate that the court unanimously recognized the importance of protecting religious liberty in this area,” Shackelford said in a statement.</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian advocacy group	1. Compromise
2015-9b	<p>Stanley Carlson-Thies, founder and senior director of the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance, said that the majority opinion acknowledged that their decision would be controversial. But they fell short in endorsing religious liberty, he told CT.</p> <p>“As several of the dissenting opinions pointed out, though, the majority opinion did not very strongly affirm the religious freedom of persons and organizations that for religious reasons believe in the historic conception of marriage,” said Carlson-Thies. In a written analysis of the positive and negative aspects of the ruling, he noted:</p> <p>There is good reason to be concerned that many outside and inside of government will be working to override the freedom for people and organizations to live</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian advocacy group	1. Compromise

	consistently with their commitment to traditional marriage. Yet there is no good cause for despair. The history and principles of the United States strongly uphold freedom of religion, speech, and association.			
2015-9c	"Private institutions that dissent from today's reformulation of marriage must be prepared for aggressive legal attacks on all fronts," Michael McConnell, director of the Constitutional Law Center at Stanford University Law School, told Inside Higher Ed for its exploration of the consequences for Christian colleges.	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-9d	Russell Moore, president of the Southern Baptist Convention's Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission (ERLC), considered the <i>First Things</i> pledge but didn't sign it. He said that pastors can sign marriage licenses without endorsing the state's view of marriage. "There have always been marriages that the state has allowed that the church would not," he said before the ruling was issued. The ERLC's Moore agrees that churches should be prepared. He says that pastors and church leaders should make their beliefs about marriage and family clear. "We can't compromise on the Gospel and biblical authority," he said. "We can't negotiate away a Christian ethic of sexuality without betraying Jesus."	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-9e	Robin Fretwell Wilson, a law professor who directs the University of Illinois's family law and policy program, told CT she is wary of unwinding the ties between civil and religious marriage. "If we unwind civil and religious	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Religious rights hurt gay rights

	marriage as a way to solve the conflict in legal and religious understandings, we will have reduced that couple to mere cohabitants, with crappy remedies if the couple breaks up,” she said.			
2015-9f	<p>John Inazu, associate professor of law at Washington University in St. Louis, was doubtful that protests against the Supreme Court’s ruling would accomplish any good. “My own sense is that CT readers would be best served by focusing on the practical work of strengthening relationships within the church and acts of service and neighbor love outside of the church,” he told CT before the ruling was announced. “It’s not clear to me that protests or symbolic divorces help anyone, and they will further alienate many of our neighbors.”</p> <p>Inazu doesn’t believe pastors would be in any danger of having to perform same-sex weddings. “We’re a long way from pastors being forced to perform civil ceremonies, and there are strong constitutional protections already in place that would prevent that from happening,” he said. “On the other hand, there will likely be increased cultural and legal pressure on the membership and leadership boundaries that traditionalist institutions draw around questions of sexuality and same-sex marriage, and these institutions would be wise to anticipate these challenges.”</p>	<p>1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights</p> <p>2. Government Policy isn’t a Solution</p>	Educator or leader of secular institution	<p>1. Gay rights hurt religious rights</p> <p>2. None</p>
2015-9g	Carl H. Esbeck, an emeritus law professor at the University of Missouri who gathered the National Association of Evangelicals, the Assemblies of God, the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, and other	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	<p>groups for an amici brief, believes that “specific religious-liberty protections” will be needed for churches, religious believers, and religious organizations. But the focus on religious liberty is “largely defensive,” he said.</p> <p>“That said, if the churches do not take the opportunity now to ‘advocate’ and ‘teach’ why same-sex marriage is wrong for everyone (i.e., harmful to children, to the couple, and undermining of a culture of marriage), religious people should not expect to find a lot of sympathy for their right to exercise their religious freedom to dissent from same-sex marriage,” Esbeck told CT. “In other words, church leaders no longer enjoy the luxury of not teaching biblical marriage, as much as large numbers of the laity don’t want to hear it. It is not religious liberty <i>or</i> marriage culture. It is both, or we likely have neither.”</p>			
2015-9h	<p>Justice Anthony Kennedy’s majority opinion in the case:</p> <p>“The First Amendment ensures that religious organizations and persons are given proper protection as they seek to teach the principles that are so fulfilling and so central to their lives and faiths,” Kennedy wrote, “and to their own deep aspirations to continue the family structure they have long revered.”</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Politician	1. Compromise
2015-10a	<p>“When it comes to support for gay marriage, a lot of it depends on who you know,” said Ed Stetzer, LifeWay's executive director. That leaves evangelicals at odds with American culture, says Stetzer, and in danger of being trapped in the culture war.</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Love the sinner, hate the sin

	<p>Their task now, he said, is to clearly articulate Christian teaching on sexuality with grace to those who disagree.</p> <p>“You can’t reach people if you hate them,” he said.</p>			
2015-10b	<p>Meanwhile, some evangelical writers, such as David Gushee and Matthew Vines, have argued that homosexuality is not sinful.</p>	1. Religion as Equality	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Moral acceptance
2015-11a	<p>“We believe in missional clarity and view the defense of the biblical definition of marriage as an issue of critical importance,” said OKWU president Everett Piper. “The CCCU’s reluctance to make a swift decision sends a message of confusion rather than conviction.”</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-11b	<p>“In a very general way, I think the denominational differences help to shape these matters,” said Trinity Evangelical Divinity School president (and former Union president) David Dockery. But such influence is waning, he said.</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Issue is worth split
2015-11c	<p>Many Christian colleges were founded to separate themselves from the values of secular culture, said sociology professor John Hawthorne at Spring Arbor University, a CCCU member. “In this context, for Union and OKWU, being a Christian university means you have to have a strong stance in separation from the broad cultural trends,” Hawthorne said. “This is how people know you’re a Christian school.”</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-11d	<p>“We don’t want to repeat the old fundamental withdrawal,” said Rod Sider, theology professor at CCCU member Eastern University’s Palmer Theological Seminary. “At the same time, we need to be</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval

	faithful to what we believe is the biblical teaching.”			
2015-12a	<p>“We believe in missional clarity and view the defense of the biblical definition of marriage as an issue of critical importance,” said Everett Piper, president of the Bartlesville, Okla., school, in a press release.</p> <p>“The CCCU’s reluctance to make a swift decision sends a message of confusion rather than conviction.”</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-12b	<p>Those denominations disagree on a wide range of issues, from baptism and communion to contraception and human origins, said CCCU president Shirley V. Hoogstra in a statement.</p> <p>“Until very recently,” Hoogstra said, “there was not a divergence of opinion regarding hiring same-sex married persons. Now there is.”</p> <p>“Following a good and respectful process does not mean that we do not recognize the importance of this issue in our current cultural climate,” Hoogstra said. “[W]e do, and as such, CCCU is advocating vigorously on behalf of schools that hold the orthodox view of marriage, and we will continue to do so both for our members and for others who hold that view but are no longer members.”</p>	1. Gay Marriage Issue is Dividing the Church	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Neutral
2015-12c	<p>That approach is not good enough, says Samuel W. “Dub” Oliver, president of Union University in Jackson, Tennessee.</p> <p>By dropping their non-discrimination policies on sexual orientation, CCCU member schools Eastern Mennonite University and Goshen College “abandoned fidelity to God’s Word,” Oliver wrote in a letter.</p> <p>The CCCU board, said Oliver, knew the two schools were</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval

	<p>considering allowing same-sex married employee for years. Still they did not act, he said.</p> <p>“There have been several gatherings where the Council could have been clear about our expectations of membership,” he said in a statement. “The Council could have even deliberated and voted on such matters. We did not. As a result, we appear unprepared to state our commitments, much less take action.”</p> <p>But Oliver believes the CCCU and Union no longer share a common commitment to Christian teaching. “The fact that this is not unanimous damages our witness,” Oliver wrote to the CCCU. “The reason we are passionate about this is because what we are talking about is not a secondary or tertiary theological issue—marriage is at the heart of the Gospel. To deny the Bible’s concept of marriage is to deny the authority of Scripture.”</p>			
2015-13a	<p>Jim Daly, president of Focus on the Family, stated:</p> <p>In the days to come, we must remember to season our words with salt. It’s time to be a light in these dark times. It is not time to be combative and caustic. Now, more than ever, we must emulate Jesus Christ. We must continue to show that loving kindness as we talk with our neighbors and friends who see this issue differently.</p>	1. Avoidance of Issue	Christian advocacy group	1. None
2015-13b	<p>Lynne Marie Kohm, the associate dean at Regent University School of Law, told CT she was “disappointed” but not “saddened or disheartened” even though she filed an amicus brief arguing against same-sex marriage.</p> <p>“The Court has found a new</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval

	<p>fundamental right which will expand marriage toward a broader spectrum than was ever expected when women gained rights toward equality in modern marriage law,” Kohm told CT. “For centuries, that [traditional] understanding of marriage has served to forestall the ills—especially to women, children, and underprivileged populations—that all too often result when society separates sex, procreation, and childrearing. It has provided stability where there might otherwise be disorder.”</p>			
2015-13c	<p>This will be "important for churches and clergy as they seek to defend themselves in future cases,” said Joshua Hawley, an associate professor of law at the University of Missouri.</p>	<p>1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights</p>	<p>Educator or leader of secular institution</p>	<p>1. Gay rights hurt religious rights</p>
2015-13d	<p>“The Court holds that denying civil marriage to same-sex couples violates their fundamental right to civil marriage under the due-process clause and their right to equal protection in the enjoyment of that fundamental right. I think this holding is correct,” said Tom Berg, a law professor at the University of St. Thomas. “Many of the same principles that support religious liberty—the right to live one's life with integrity consistent with a fundamental element of one's identity—also support the right of gay couples to marry.” It’s possible to protect both same-sex couples and religious objectors, Berg said. He believes Justice Anthony Kennedy’s majority opinion tried to signal protection for religious dissenters, but its message was ambiguous. While religious organizations and people “may continue to advocate</p>	<p>1. Religion as Equality 2. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights</p>	<p>Leader of Christian org, company, or school</p>	<p>1. Recognizing church/state separation 2. Compromise</p>

	<p>with utmost, sincere conviction” against same-sex marriage, Kennedy’s decision doesn’t say anything about the right to exercise religion, like “for example, a religious college refusing to extend married student housing to same-sex couples,” said Berg.</p> <p>The court also says that the denial of same-sex marriage "demeans" and "disparages" gays and lesbians and their children, Berg said. “That could bode ill for religious-freedom protections if it means that the traditional view of marriage itself is demeaning and disparaging—even though the court elsewhere tries to express respect for the traditional view.”</p> <p>Of course, a state “imposing the wide-ranging denial of marriage rights, for insufficient public reasons, is very different from the traditional organization or believer seeking to avoiding participating in or directly facilitating a marriage,” he said. “The court does say it's the state's action that is demeaning, but it could have made the distinction much more clearly.”</p>			
2015-13e	<p>Potential conflict areas include colleges and universities that don’t allow the hiring of faculty in same-sex relationships, military chaplains who don’t want to marry same-sex couples, or agencies that have contracts with the government—like adoption or faith-based service organizations—that want to maintain their standards of heterosexual marriage, said ERLC president Russell Moore in a press conference.</p> <p>Most Americans resonate with basic religious liberty protections, Moore said. “If we see the</p>	<p>1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights</p> <p>2. Inevitability as a Myth</p> <p>3. Religion as Tradition</p>	<p>Leader of Christian org, company, or school</p>	<p>1. Gay rights hurt religious rights</p> <p>2. Straight marriage will still dominate</p> <p>3. Upfront disapproval</p>

	<p>overreaching that would attempt to pave over consciences of dissenters, I think the American people will stand with us.”</p> <p>Moore told reporters that “our mission field has profoundly changed.”</p> <p>“I don’t think the sexual revolution will be able to keep its promises or remain sustainable,” he said. “We need churches who can receive refugees from the sexual revolution” that makes promises it can’t keep.</p> <p>“In the short term, things are certainly stacked against us,” said Moore. “But marriage is resilient, and this infinitely expanding definition of marriage is not sustainable. After the marriage revolution, we have to be the people still standing with light lit.”</p> <p>Straightening out the tangle of the definition of marriage won’t be quickly done, Moore said.</p> <p>“This is a 100-year struggle in front of us, in terms of defining what marriage and family mean and should mean,” he said. “Even if the Supreme Court had ruled the right way today, it wouldn’t have solved the skirmish. It would’ve just pushed it back to the 50 states to solve it. There’s not going to be a magic moment to restore things to the way they were. We have to have a long-term view.”</p>			
2015-13f	<p>Though Kennedy wrote that “the First Amendment ensures that religious organizations and persons are given proper protection” in the majority opinion, Samford University law professor David Smolin said it wasn’t enough.</p> <p>“Kennedy’s defense of religious liberty is short and weak,” Smolin</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	told CT. “He writes about the capacity to believe certain things but not practice them.” Kennedy’s assertion even prompted a sarcastic summary from Justice Samuel Alito that people can “whisper their thoughts in the recesses of their homes, but if they repeat those views in public, they will risk being labeled as bigots and treated as such by governments, employers, and schools.”			
2015-13g	Legislatures and courts will need to specifically act to protect the religious freedom of organizations and persons, Stanley Carlson-Thies, director of the Institutional Religious Freedom Alliance, told CT. “In the meantime, religious organizations should take care that their policies and practices be aligned with the religious convictions that are the reason for their existence.”	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Christian advocacy group	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-13h	“Most of those waiting for the Supreme Court ruling expected this decision,” Mark Yarhouse, director of the Institute for the Study of Sexual Identity at Regent University, told CT. “We live in a diverse and pluralistic culture, and this ruling reflects just that.” He continued, “My primary responsibility today is as it was yesterday: to point people to Christ and to a good and loving Father whose plan and will for them is better than their own. How Christians love those with whom we disagree will also be a part of that pointing to Christ.”	1. Avoidance of Issue	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. None
2015-13i	It is likely that Christians who hold to a traditional view of marriage will seem more and more backwards and unloving, said John Starke, who pastors at Apostles	1. Religion as Tradition	Clergy (Non-denominational)	1. Love the sinner, hate the sin

	Church in New York City. “This will likely put us in uncomfortable and even isolating places. But it's an opportunity to dig deep into the resources of the gospel and seek wisdom and identification with Christians throughout the world and history who have flourished in marginal places.”			
2015-13j	As Christians “work arduously to recognize the image of God in every individual,” they must build a “firewall against intolerance and bigotry toward followers of Christ,” stated Samuel Rodriguez, president of the National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference. “At the same time ... we reject and repudiate all vestiges of homophobia, intolerance, and bigotry.”	1. Avoidance of Issue	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. None
2015-13k	Justin Anderson, who pastors Redemption Church in the middle of San Francisco, agreed. “If the gospel is true, then eventually those whom Christ is saving and the Holy Spirit is revealing itself to will open eyes to see that this thing [the sexual revolution] is bankrupt,” he said. “We absolutely have to have open arms, and leave judgement and ridicule and ‘I told you so’ behind. We have to be ready with the gospel to welcome people into life and truth.” His advice to pastors facing same-sex marriage cultural pressure is to “disciple your people well.” “We have to have an answer for the hope we have in Christ, to speak intelligently and winsomely about it,” he said. “Our people are on the front lines. They have to go to work and face the inevitable conversation and question.... Pastors need to	1. Inevitability as a Myth 2. Government Policy isn’t a Solution 3. Religion as Tradition	Clergy (Non-denominational)	1. Straight marriage will still dominate 2. None 3. Love the sinner, hate the sin

	equip our people to be able to know what people have believed for 2,000 years and why. Give them confidence in that answer, and also temper them and prepare them for the backlash that will happen.”			
2015-14a	<p>“In terms of the PCUSA’s witness to the world, this vote demonstrates a complete accommodation to the prevailing winds of our culture,” said Carmen Fowler LaBerge, PLC president, in a statement. “Any prophetic voice that the denomination may have once had to speak truth and call people to repentance is now lost.”</p> <p>LaBerge also noted the effects of the departure of conservative churches with large votes at presbytery meetings and a significant number of small member churches.</p> <p>"We’re going to continue to see diminished vote totals and swings in presbyteries where the constituency is now almost exclusively progressive because so many conservatives have left," she said in a statement.</p>	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-14b	<p>“We hope that such ‘up/down’ voting does not mark the end, but the continuation of our desire to live in community; a partnership that requires prayer, the study of Scripture, listening to and with one another, and a dedication to partnership in the midst of our diversity of opinion,” said Heath K. Rada and the Rev. Larissa Kwong Abazia, the moderator and vice-moderator of the General Assembly.</p>	1. Inevitability as a Concession to Equality	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Neutral
2015-15a	In announcing the move, Goshen president James Brenneman said the school still has a “strong relationship” with the Mennonite	1. Religion as Equality	Leader of Christian org, company, or	1. Recognizing church/stat

	<p>Church USA, where wrestling with same-sex marriage recently led to the creation of a more conservative Mennonite church network. Goshen's decision will be controversial, Brenneman acknowledged. Unmarried employees will still be expected to practice celibacy at the Indiana school, he said.</p> <p>"We seek forbearance and grace amidst our differences. We deeply affirm the goodness of marriage, singleness, celibacy, sexual intimacy within marriage, and a life of faithfulness before God for all people," Brenneman said in a statement. "...We affirm the equal value and worth of each unique member of our community as a beloved child of God, and we seek to be a hospitable community for all—including those who disagree with this decision—as Christ modeled to us."</p>		school	e separation
2015-15b	<p>The school will hire those who are committed to Eastern Mennonite's "mission and core values," said Kay Brenneman Nussbaum, board chair, in a statement announcing the new policy.</p> <p>"This decision is in keeping with our commitment to non-discrimination and our mission as a Christ-centered, liberal arts academic institution," she stated.</p> <p>"Our education is grounded in Mennonite/Anabaptist values, and we believe people in same-sex covenanted relationships are valued members of our learning community with equal rights to standard benefits."</p>	1. Religion as Equality	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. 1. Recognizing church/state separation
2015-15c	<p>Supreme Court Justice John Roberts wrote:</p> <p>Hard questions arise when people</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus	Politician	1. Gay rights hurt religious

	of faith exercise religion in ways that may be seen to conflict with the new right to same-sex marriage—when, for example, a religious college provides married student housing only to opposite-sex married couples, or a religious adoption agency declines to place children with same-sex married couples. Indeed, the Solicitor General candidly acknowledged that the tax exemptions of some religious institutions would be in question if they opposed same-sex marriage.	Religious Rights		rights
2015-16a	Tony Perkins of the Family Research Council said that <i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i> will be “the downfall of America.”	1. Religion as Tradition	Christian advocacy group	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-16b	Franklin Graham has publicly voiced this view. “I believe the end is coming,” said the president of the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association. “I believe we are in the midnight hour...you see how quickly our country is deteriorating...we have seen that it has taken like a nose dive off of the moral diving board into the cesspool of humanity.”	1. Religion as Tradition	Clergy (Evangelist)	1. Upfront disapproval
2015-16c	What matters in this view, according to Michael Wear, “is that I’m following Jesus, I’m modeling what family means. By building up healthy lives, this is somehow adding up to sweeping change.” Wear, who served in the White House’s faith-based office during President Obama’s first term, warns that many millennial Christians view political engagement as a “distraction from holiness.”	1. Government Policy Isn’t Solution	Politician	1. None
2015-16d	With the Supreme Court’s decision, “the ground under our feet has shifted tectonically,” writes [social commentator Rod] Dreher. It’s hard	1. Government Policy isn’t a Solution	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. None

	to overstate “the seriousness of the challenges [that a secularizing world] presents to orthodox Christians and other social conservatives.” The only answer, he writes, is for Christians to “build resilient communities within our condition of internal exile.”			
2015-16e	Richard B. Hays, the New Testament scholar, has written, “The Bible hardly ever discusses homosexual behavior. There are perhaps half a dozen brief references to it in all of Scripture....What the Bible does say should be heeded carefully, but any ethic that intends to be biblical will seek to get the accents in the right place....”	1. Religion as Tradition	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Desire to focus elsewhere
2015-16f	C. S. Lewis, in <i>Mere Christianity</i> , offers a corrective: [T]hough I have had to speak at some length about sex, I want to make it as clear as I possibly can that the centre of Christian morality is not here. If anyone thinks that Christians regard unchastity as the supreme vice, he is quite wrong. The sins of the flesh are bad, but they are the least bad of all sins. All the worst pleasures are purely spiritual: the pleasure of putting other people in the wrong, of bossing and patronizing and spoiling sport, and backbiting; the pleasure of power, of hatred. For there are two things inside me, competing with the human self which I must try to become. They are the Animal self, and the Diabolical self. The Diabolical self is the worse of the two. That is why a cold, self-righteous prig who goes regularly to church may be far nearer to hell than a prostitute. But, of course, it is better to be neither.	1. Religion as Tradition	Christian writer, author, or editor	1. Desire to focus elsewhere

2015-16g	<p>“Apocalyptic and hysterical rhetoric is inappropriate for people who are children of the King,” James Forsyth, senior pastor at McLean Presbyterian Church, told us. “Christians should not be characterized by white knuckles of fear and terror.”</p>	1. Avoidance of Issue	Clergy (Presbyterian)	1. None
2015-17a	<p>Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act is cited in religious accommodation cases involving private or government employers, said Howard M. Friedman, a University of Toledo law professor. Friedman points to two major drivers: Greater numbers of observant Muslims in the US workforce and more conservative Christians feeling that they’re being discriminated against. “Whether that discrimination is accurate or not, the perception is there,” he said. “And you have less inclination on the part of employers to accommodate hijabs, etc.”</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-17b	<p>It doesn’t apply to elected officials like Davis, said Jeffrey Usman, Belmont University assistant professor of law. Davis ran for and was elected to her post last year. But there are other, practical complications when it comes to religious or ethical beliefs in the workplace, Usman said. What about a devout Catholic clerk refusing to issue a license to someone who’s been divorced? Or an Orthodox Jew refusing to issue one to an interfaith couple? Or a vegan clerk refusing to issue a fishing license? Should they be granted accommodations as well? The question is whether Davis is being substantially burdened, Usman said. Bunning, in his ruling, said she wasn’t.</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Leader of Christian org, company, or school	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	<p>“While she may be entitled to some accommodation—for example, not having her name on the license—she is not entitled to prevent couples in Rowan County from obtaining a valid marriage license because of her religious beliefs,” Usman said.</p>			
2015-17c	<p>Charles Haynes, director of the Religious Freedom Education Project at the Newseum, said that Davis is going a step further than refusing to issue marriage licenses for same-sex couples—an act she says goes against her Apostolic Christian faith.</p> <p>“Even if the Kentucky legislature passes legislation allowing clerks to opt out, which appears likely, that would not satisfy Mrs. Davis,” he said. “She contends that the clerk’s office should not give same-sex couples marriage licenses because such marriages break God’s law. Kim Davis has a right to the free exercise of religion, but that right does not extend to using her office to violate the constitutional rights of others.”</p> <p>Haynes believes there is a flaw in Title VII religious protection itself. Employers can refuse to grant an accommodation if it causes an “undue hardship.” But often those hardships are actually minor inconveniences, says Haynes.</p> <p>“That’s why a broad coalition of religious groups has been trying for many years to amend Title VII to strengthen the requirement that employers provide reasonable accommodation,” he said.</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Religious rights hurt gay rights
2015-17d	<p>As an elected official, she can be impeached but not fired, said Alan Lescht, a Washington, D.C.-based employment attorney whose firm</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious	Lawyer	1. Neutral

	<p>handles religious discrimination cases. He doesn't see Davis prevailing if she continues her strategy. "When the Supreme Court of the United States rules, there's really no further appeal from that," he said.</p> <p>It depends on whether the court finds a company has a good reason for what it's requiring employees to do, Lescht said.</p> <p>"We have to show that the reason given is not true, it's a pretext to cover up an unlawful motive, and the real reason has to do with a protected class," Lescht said.</p> <p>Lescht said he's not seeing more cases in his firm but believes that news coverage of the most unusual cases—like those involving the mark of the Beast—tend to overshadow the vast majority, which typically deal with conflicts in scheduling.</p> <p>"We have a case right now where a guy worked in a restaurant, he's a Seventh-day Adventist, and the manager changed his schedule to work Saturdays and then fired him," Lescht said.</p>	Rights		
2015-18a	<p>The Kleins and their attorney believe the BOLI ruling is essentially a gag order. Aaron Klein plans to ignore it.</p> <p>"I am not going to keep quiet," Aaron Klein told CT this week.</p> <p>"She (Melissa) is not going to keep quiet."</p> <p>In the final ruling, Akavian pointed to a September 2, 2013, CBN interview, where Aaron Klein said.</p> <p>"I didn't want to want to be a part of her marriage, which I think is wrong.</p> <p>"I am who I am and I want to live my life the way I want to live my</p>	<p>1. Religion as Tradition</p> <p>2. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights</p>	Layman	<p>1. Upfront disapproval</p> <p>2. Gay rights hurt religious rights</p>

	<p>life, and you know, I choose to serve God.”</p> <p>Akavian also pointed to a note left on the bakery’s door after it closed down. The note read, “This fight is not over. We will continue to stand strong.”</p> <p>That’s enough to pay the fine, Aaron Klein told CT.</p> <p>“The Lord has taken care of us,” Klein said. “It has increased our faith. It’s been a blessing.”</p> <p>He says his family has also suffered emotional harm due to the publicity.</p> <p>But Melissa, whose website is still active, now only bakes for family and friends as a hobby, says Aaron Klein. “We are no longer a public accommodation.”</p>			
2015-18b	<p>“That’s nice of them,” Anna Harmon, attorney for the Kleins, told CT in a phone interview. “But that’s not in the ruling.”</p> <p>Harmon said the ruling quotes from public comments made by the Kleins and punishes them for those public comments. The cease and desist order is aimed at keeping her clients quiet, she told CT.</p> <p>“Cakes are more than just flour and water mixed together,” said Harmon, attorney for the Kleins.</p> <p>The Kleins say that their wedding cakes are works of art, and Melissa doesn’t want to use her talents to promote a cause she doesn’t believe in. That would make them complicit in sin.</p> <p>Harmon said that customers who go to bakers like Melissa aren’t just looking for a tasty wedding cake. They want a creation that will celebrate their marriage.</p> <p>“If a person wants cake, they go to Costco,” said Harmon. “If they</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	want edible art, they go to Melissa or a specialty cake shop.”			
2015-18c	<p>Eugene Volokh, a prolific blogger and UCLA law professor who specializes in free speech and religious freedom law, told CT that government is free to ban business from advertising that they will discriminate.</p> <p>“Here’s one way of thinking about it,” he said in an email. “Saying ‘We won’t bake cakes for same-sex couples’ is a threat, to be sure not a threat of violence but a threat to engage in specific activity that has been found to be illegal—denying equal access to a public accommodation. Such threats are constitutionally unprotected, especially since they are often tantamount to a specific refusal to make the cake said to a person who shows up to order it.”</p> <p>On the other hand, he added, simply disagreeing with the law is protected free speech. So the Kleins should be free to voice their opinions about the case and to promote their beliefs about marriage.</p> <p>He told CT, “Saying ‘We disapprove of same-sex marriage, we disagree with the ruling, and we think that the law shouldn’t require us to bake cakes for same-sex couples’ would not be a threat; it might make some customers lose interest in going to your bakery, but it’s a political statement about what you think the law ought to be (or even what the law, as properly interpreted, is).”</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Neutral
2015-18d	David French, a long-time First Amendment lawyer, told CT that state courts tend to side with administrative agencies like BOLI.	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights

	That's problematic, as those agencies act as "judge, jury, and executioner," he told CT.	Rights		
2015-18e	<p>At the 2014 National Religious Broadcasters convention in Nashville, Jay Sekulow, senior counsel for the American Center for Law and Justice, warned that Christian business owners who object to same-sex weddings face an uphill battle.</p> <p>"My initial reaction was, 'Bake the cake,'" Sekulow said during a panel discussion.</p> <p>Sekulow told his audience that courts would likely frown on Christian businesspeople who say their faith doesn't allow them to serve gay couples. That's because most judges now equate sexual orientation with race. So they are unlikely to rule in favor of religious liberty challenges to anti-discrimination laws, he said.</p> <p>If a state official tried to require pastors to marry same-sex couples, he said, that's a different story.</p> <p>"That's the case you want," he said.</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Lawyer	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-18f	<p>The fact that the Kleins live in Oregon makes their case even harder, said Douglas Laycock, a professor of law at the University of Virginia.</p> <p>"They have very little hope in Oregon, which is one of the states least protective of religious liberty," he told CT. The state has no Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) and frowns on RFRA claims, Laycock said.</p> <p>"There is no federal religious-liberty defense unless the state gay-rights law has secular exceptions," he said. "On the central issue, this is probably a lost cause in Oregon."</p>	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious Rights	Educator or leader of secular institution	1. Gay rights hurt religious rights
2015-	Yale law professor Reva Siegel and	1. Same-Sex	Educator or	1.

18g	<p>UCLA law professor Douglas NeJaime raised that issue in an article for <i>The American Prospect</i> and in a post at the Balkanization legal blog.</p> <p>They argued that the court should consider the harm caused to third parties before granting religious liberty exemptions.</p> <p>They wrote:</p> <p>Many claimants assert what we call ‘complicity-based conscience claims’—objecting to being made complicit in the assertedly sinful conduct of their fellow citizens. So, for instance, business owners refuse to provide goods and services to same-sex couples because they object to being made complicit in relationships they deem sinful. Accommodating claims of this kind can inflict harms on third parties. These include material harms—obstructing access to goods and services—and dignitary harms—stigmatizing other citizens as sinners. Justice Kennedy’s approach in <i>Obergefell</i> suggests that these harms matter in deciding whether and how to accommodate claims for religious exemptions. “For instance,” they wrote, “the bakery owner who turns away a same-sex couple treats that particular couple as sinners. Both the general condemnation expressed by the corporate claimants in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and the individualized condemnation in the bakery are actions that address third parties as sinners in ways that can stigmatize and demean.”</p>	Rights Versus Religious Rights	leader of secular institution	Religious rights hurt gay rights
2015-18h	That argument worries John Inazu, a law professor at Washington University in St. Louis. “Christians should be concerned if merely	1. Same-Sex Rights Versus Religious	Educator or leader of secular institution	Gay rights hurt religious rights

	using the language of sin could be construed as creating a dignitary harm that can be restricted under the law,” he told CT.	Rights		
--	--	--------	--	--