

KEY TO THIS DOCUMENT

	頁數	內容	行動
A	2-3	Official Letter to SCMP	請加上恰當的地址和聯絡人姓名；發給其他研討會的合辦機構，問意見和會否聯署。 最後加上 Leo Lwan 文(C2) 發信給 SCMP。要盡快。
B1	4-5	尊重同志自願尋求輔導的自由 維護同性戀異見人士的權利	特刊=B1 和 B2 加上「一人一信」，再加 Matthew 寫的「關注組」簡介。再加回條。 可以找人製作和準備寄給所有教會和機構了。
B2	6-7	誰不寬容誰？——「重建整全 性工作坊」被抨擊事件簡述	此外 B1 和 B2 會用於 2 月的電子通訊，也要盡快發出了。
C1	8-9	Respect the freedom of homosexuals to seek counseling Uphold the rights of gay issue dissidents	英文特刊= C1 + C2 =>英文教會和以電郵發給他們的網絡傳開。 若找到人翻譯了「一人一信」和我那序言（中文特刊那裡）就更好，我已沒有心力和時間做這個了！
C2	10-13	Reflections on the Criticisms of “Restoring Sexual Wholeness Seminar” from SCMP and Horizons	
D	14	致堂會主任、傳道人和執事會主 席／或機構總幹事的信：	補充一些資料，可以 winfax 給教會和機構了。
E	15-16	致神學院信	請給鄭順佳問他意見，確定聯署人，可發信給各院長。啓文和其他人再透過個人網絡給神學院老師，遊說他們幫忙推動。
F	17	反對同性戀的人都是無知兼 OUT 的嗎？	找人把它製作成單張，好不好？
G	18-21	性傾向歧視法的不寬容 逆向歧視的真實例子	交明光社製作單張。 也可透過電郵廣傳。

All documents: 透過維護家庭聯盟發給其他團體，歡迎他們轉載和傳開。
另請準備一個相關的網頁，放所有資料於上。請明光社幫忙。

Official Letter to SCMP

Chief Editor

South China Morning Post

Address

Our address

Dear Chief Editor,

As the organizations which held the seminar entitled "Restoring Sexual Wholeness" on 29th Dec 2004, we write to you to clarify some matters. We do not write in a spirit of animosity, but with a desire to communicate. Unfortunately, communication is often clouded by preconceptions of us, which are not based on first-hand acquaintance of us or our writings, but on hearsay about us, often from people ideologically opposed to us.

We have never advocated the position that homosexuals should be compelled to change their sexual orientation. We respect the rights of homosexuals to choose their life-style, and their freedom to seek to change or not. We advocate the acceptance of homosexuals as persons who possess dignity, and the provision of help and unconditional care for homosexuals who have struggles regardless of their ultimate decision to change sexual orientation or not. However, if some homosexuals want to change their sexual orientation, we should also provide help. Of course, this should be their own choice and not something imposed on them. The above is our basic philosophy.

We have long held a high respect for SCMP as a reputable media, which is an exemplar of high-quality, trustworthy and conscientious journalism. We also appreciate the professionalism of the letters-to-editor section of SCMP, which continues to publish both pro-gay and anti-gay views. However, the way SCMP handled the coverage of our seminar has caused us to raise some questions:

- When the SCMP editorial on our seminar was published in the early morning of 29th December 2004, the seminar had hardly begun and no reporters had yet set foot on the scene. The editorial, to put it mildly, was less than friendly. Our question is: Is it fair to deliver a negative verdict before we even have the chance to be heard?
- We are also puzzled. Our seminar was only a small-scale activity organized by several small voluntary organizations. By no means it was a momentous social event. It also had nothing to do with social policy. Why did SCMP think that it deserved to be attacked by the editorial of a major newspaper in Hong Kong?
- The editorial foisted some demeaning labels on us, e.g. "ignorance," "fueling

discrimination,” and “transmitting a disturbing message.” We welcome rational criticisms based on accurate understanding, solid evidence and sound argument. However, these are negative, emotive labels which tend to foster in the readers a kind of stereotypical thinking about us. Is this the best way to make criticisms for a fair and reputable press which typically takes a firm stand against “discrimination” or “labeling” of ALL kinds? We wonder why we seem to be the only exception.

- The editorial was followed the next day by a misleading report by your reporter Ravina Shamdasani. We want to know whether she can understand Cantonese, the language used in the seminar. In any case, we question whether she has really understood the message of our seminar. She distorted one example used by Dr. Hong Kwai-wah out of context (for more explanation see the essay attached), and used a very misleading caption. What is the real purpose of this report: to produce an accurate rendering of the event, or to produce polemics against us?

We have a more general question concerning SCMP's self-perceived role: an advocate of the gay movement, or facilitator of discussion of controversial questions in the civil society? For example, Tim Cribb's "Justice for all" (January 27) does not seem to do justice to those views which oppose the SODO, and he also made unfounded claims about the stance of the Christian community towards SODO. Of course we respect the personal convictions of journalists- whether they are for or against homosexuality. However, we believe that when they are doing a report on the gay issues, their primary duty is to stick to the facts, and avoid misleading statements. They should not produce an one-sided report, and should reflect fairly the existing spectrum of opinions. This is to ensure that the public will have a comprehensive understanding of the issues. Only then they can have their own informed judgment, and the media perform their role as a facilitator of in-depth discussions in the civil society.

Perhaps our understanding of SCMP is inadequate. If it is the case, we sincerely hope that you can enlighten us, answer our questions above, and explain SCMP's policy concerning the gay issues. Please contact ??? at ... Thanks for your kind attention.

Hong Kong Sex Culture Society
Society for Truth and Light ???
New Creation???

「急不容緩——同志運動對教會的衝擊」特刊

由去年年底到現在，同志運動對香港社會和教會的衝擊已逼在眉睫。先有南華早報(SCMP)事件，顯示同志運動的霸氣，繼而政府表示有可能立法禁止所謂「性傾向歧視」。本特刊會為你介紹這些最新發展。首兩篇文章分析南華早報(SCMP)事件，及揭示其深遠意義。第三篇文章介紹反對「性傾向歧視」立法的「一人一信運動」，極需你的支援。最後一篇介紹剛成立的「性傾向歧視立法關注組」，它現在還是勢孤力弱，極需你們的參與。懇請你務必閱讀這特刊的文章，和把最後的回條發回，時間已經不多了。

願神憐憫香港的社會和教會！

關啓文（香港性文化學會主席 香港浸會大學宗教及哲學系副教授）

2005 年 2 月

尊重同志自願尋求輔導的自由 維護同性戀異見人士的權利

關啓文

2004 年 12 月 29 日香港性文化學會和其他機構合辦了一個「重建整全的心性」的工作坊，目的是訓練更多可以關懷和輔導同性戀者的人材，然而卻引起了《南華早報》和一些同志團體的猛烈攻擊（事件的始末和分析請參下文），這事件的意義不容少覷，它標誌著同志運動在香港已進入新的階段，它不再是在邊緣爭取生存空間，而是開始主流化和制度化，在傳媒的協助下將會毫不留情地對所有反對力量發動攻勢，務求把它們扼殺於萌芽階段。

尊重同志自願尋求輔導的自由

我們從不主張勉強同性戀者改變性傾向，我們尊重同志選擇生活方式和決定是否要改變的自由。我們認為那些對自身性傾向感到困惑的人，有權利得到適當的關懷、輔導——無論他願否改變，我們都應付出無條件的關心。若同志希望改變性傾向，我們應提供幫助。這一切完全出於當事人的意願，沒有絲毫勉強。這就是工作坊的基本理念。

但令人不安的是，一些同性戀團體千方百計阻止其他受困擾的同性戀者尋求改變，反對任何團體及專業人士為同性戀者提供輔導，對那些不喜歡以激烈及出位手段爭取本身權益，卻感到困擾的同性戀者並不公平。

傳媒應報導而不應倡導同志運動

在這件事上傳媒的角色也令我們擔憂，我們相信，傳媒工作者個人可以支持或反對同性戀，但在報導同性戀議題時，應報導真相，不誤導讀者，不應只反映單方面意見，應公平反映分歧的意見。這樣，社會人士才能對雙方有正確的理解，然後作出自己的判斷。

致堂會主任、傳道人和執事會主席／或機構總幹事：

性傾向歧視法逼在眉睫 南華早報扭曲教會立場 教會還能閉口不言嗎？

2005年1月27日的《南華早報》這樣說：「沒有一間主流教會（它們代表了香港的基督徒群體的大多數），是反對性傾向歧視法這意念的。」“None of the mainstream churches, representing most of Hong Kong's Christian community, oppose the idea of a Sexual Orientation Discrimination Ordinance.” (Tim Cribb's “Justice for All”) 你能同意這說法嗎？

- 誰是主流教會？文中訪問了一些「大宗派」的發言人，就得出以上結論，你認為公平嗎？還是文章根本就是為性傾向歧視立法造勢，不惜扭曲教會的立場？
- 性傾向歧視法肯定會對教會的宗教自由和辦學自由等帶來嚴重衝擊，我們深信很多堂會都是反對的，但社會需要聽到你們公開表達聲音。
- 不要以為教會可以自動得到豁免，一些同志團體和議員並不會輕易讓教會獲得「特權」。就算比較溫和的邵國華也清楚在論壇說：就算教會聘請牧師可獲豁免，但若聘請與宗教活動無關的員工（如會計、堂役）則不能，教會辦的青年中心和學校等當然更不能豁免，福音機構和神學院也難免受衝擊。
- 今天不為我們自己的權利爭取，法例一旦通過了則後悔莫及了！
- 請貴 教會／機構今天就行動：
 - 寫信給《南華早報》抗議它無理的說法；
 - 在執事會正式通過反對性傾向歧視立法的立場，並找專人關注此事件；
 - 向政府（如民政事務局）和傳媒表達你們的意見。
 - 參與我們最近成立的「性傾向歧視立法關注組」。

南華早報全文，性傾向歧視法對教會衝擊的例子，和我們反對這法例的理由，以及「性傾向歧視立法關注組」的資料，都可到??? 網頁查看。

南華早報電郵：scmplet@scmp.com 傳真：

民政事務局電郵： 傳真：

有甚麼問題，請與香港性文化學會的幹事黃小姐或明光社的余先生聯絡：
絡：.....

perceived not as a debate between different analyses of homosexuality but as an issue of whether we should give an "unbiased" advice on sexuality to the youth. What is that "unbiased" advice and where does it come from? Well, the "unbiased" position is of course those of gay right activists and SCMP, so the logic goes even if evidence suggests otherwise.

Recently, SCMP posted an essay by Tim Cribb who criticized the government for not being sufficiently enthusiastic about the Sexual Orientation Discrimination Ordinance (e.g., saying that the SODO has to have enough public support). In contrast, Cribb believed that the rights of the gay community under SODO are non-negotiable human rights, and hence all who oppose are regarded as intolerant people who violate others' rights. (I believe that this is a dubious claim.) It is unfortunate that in his essay Cribb chose to use the pejorative label: "the so-called family values groups" and made the false claim that the majority of churches in Hong Kong do not objected to SODO. Are family values groups not entitled to an opinion on how children are best raised, how tax dollars are used and what constitutes healthy sexuality? Are Hong Kong Churches really that positive to SODO? The quotation from just a few church representatives cannot point to such conclusion, especially when one of the church representative spoke plainly that this disputable matter is left to individual member church to decide. The same tricks of badmouthing the opponent and distorting fact are commonplace in articles in SCMP. Critical analysis of Cribb's essay goes beyond the scope of this essay, but the pro-gay position of SCMP again is pretty clear.