

MARRIAGE,
SAME-SEX MARRIAGE
AND THE ANGLICAN
CHURCH OF
AUSTRALIA

Essays from the Doctrine Commission



The Anglican Church of Australia

THE DOCTRINE COMMISSION
OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA

Marriage, Same-Sex Marriage And The Anglican Church Of
Australia: Essays From The Doctrine Commission

Copyright © 2019, The Anglican Church of Australia Trust
Corporation.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be re-
produced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any
form or by any means electronic, photocopying, recording
or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the
publisher.

Broughton Publishing Pty Ltd
32 Glenvale Crescent
Mulgrave VIC 3170

First Printing, June 2019

ISBN 978-0-6482659-4-8

Contents

Foreword | *Jonathan Holland* 1

Context

The debates over the doctrine of marriage
in the Anglican Communion | *Michael R Stead* 9

The doctrine of marriage of the Anglican
Church of Australia | *Michael R Stead* 31

A response: An alternative reading of BCP | *Matthew Anstey* 49

Scripture and Hermeneutics

Scripture and moral reasoning | *Matthew Anstey* 57

Attentively reading scripture | *Mark D Thompson* 73

How does the Old Testament help us think about marriage
and same-sex marriage? | *Meg Warner* 87

Belonging to God in relational wholeness | *Katherine M Smith* 105

Marriage, headship and the New Testament | *Dorothy A Lee* 123

Family ties: marriage, sex, and belonging
in the New Testament | *Claire Smith* 139

History, Theology and Ecclesiology

Christian marriage: a concise history | *Muriel Porter* 155

For better or for worse: The changing shape of marriage
in Christian history? | *Claire Smith* 167

Friendship and religious life in the Bible and the church <i>Dorothy A Lee</i>	185
Friendship and the trinity <i>Mark D Thompson</i>	201
Steps towards a theological understanding of desire <i>G. J. Seach</i>	207
To what end? The blessing of same-sex marriage <i>Rhys Bezzant</i>	227
Disagreement and Christian unity: re-evaluating the situation <i>Stephen Pickard</i>	241
 The Case For and Against	
The case for same-sex marriage <i>Matthew Anstey</i>	267
The case against same-sex marriage <i>Michael Stead</i>	285

Scripture and Moral Reasoning

Matthew Anstey¹

Introduction

I have always loved Scripture, from the first time I read right through the Bible at age ten, through to twelve years of full-time tertiary study, majoring in Biblical Hebrew linguistics, and then onto seventeen-plus years of teaching Biblical studies and languages, including the supervising of many honours and doctoral students. Not only have the stories and the poetry always fascinated me, they continue to shape my life, posing new questions, unsettling old assumptions. I have literally given almost my entire life to pondering the Scriptures, because God as revealed in Christ through the Spirit is in my bones and in this Book.

It is due to this lifetime of immersion that I have come to the position I have on same-sex marriage (chapter 17), and the view of Scripture articulated herein. The reader will see that the lived experience of God's people past and present also figures prominently in both essays, because the Scriptures themselves are a testimony to such experience, in all its evocative calligraphy, sprawled across millennia of cultures and languages, inked through dark stretches

¹ The Rev'd Associate Professor Matthew Anstey is a Research Fellow of the Public and Contextual Theology Strategic Research Centre of Charles Sturt University, an Honorary Visiting Fellow at The University of Adelaide and a priest in the Anglican Diocese of Adelaide.

of God's aching silence to irruptions into our lives of that word from God we are unable to say ourselves: 'Today, I have set you free'.

So, I hope the reader has some sense of where I am coming from, as we now turn our minds to the weighty matters before us.

On our current context

The Anglican Church of Australia, like many church denominations around the world, is evaluating its doctrinal position on same-sex marriage. The fact that such evaluation is occurring, and books such as this are being written, speaks to the reality that the church is able to perceive and discern through the Spirit 'the work of God in the world and "decide for God" in response to such discernment'.²

That is, the church is doing what it has always done (and what Israel has always done)—being the people of God living out our faith in each historical moment and context, seeking to be faithful to our God, and to be 'response-able', able to respond using our God-given faculties of decision-making, rationality, argument, and reflection, under the guidance of the Spirit.

In this journey, there have been tumultuous upheavals. It is hard to surpass the upheaval of the inclusion of the Gentiles, and the story of this as told in Acts 10–15 especially illustrates precisely my point. As Peter puts it:

As I looked at it closely I saw four-footed animals, beasts of prey, reptiles, and birds of the air. I also heard a voice saying to me, 'Get up, Peter; kill and eat.' But I replied, 'By no means, Lord; for nothing profane or unclean has ever entered my mouth.' But a second time the voice answered from heaven, 'What God has made clean, you must not call profane.' This happened three times; then everything was pulled up again to heaven. At that very moment three men, sent

² L. T. Johnson, *The Revelatory Body: Theology as Inductive Art*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015), 17.

to me from Caesarea, arrived at the house where we were. The Spirit told me to go with them and not to make a distinction between them and us. (Acts 11:6–12)

Though this upheaval was tumultuous and its implications far-reaching, there has been no shortage of equally disruptive shifts in the history of the church. It took the church 400 years or thereabouts to settle on its credal affirmations on the Trinitarian nature of God. It took the church 1,500 years for the idea that salvation is the free gift of God to become front and centre to the church's understanding of redemption. It took the church (a staggering) 1,900 years to discern that slavery is nowhere and never the will of God. It took the church and society no less a staggering—one can hardly overstate this—1,950 years give or take to assert the full equality of men and women, notwithstanding that we still must struggle with these issues today in many places.

As a not unimportant aside, this observation of *la longue durée* is important for our current debate, because opponents of same-sex marriage frequently appeal to 'the traditional view of marriage' as if its long shelf-life ought to mean that a change is unlikely to be right (the weight here being on 'traditional'). But this cuts the other way clearly: holding a view for a long time offers no guarantee that the next generation will continue so to do. Hence the longevity of an established position is moot—what matters is how we discern the way forward, to which I now turn.

On the role of Scripture

When the church debates its doctrinal position, there are passionate advocates on each side and passionate appeals to Scripture. Under analysis, it is clear that *the role* Scripture plays in the debate is where the most important differences lie. Hence this volume contains two essays on the role of Scripture, as we seek

to interrogate the role Scripture plays in the discernment of the Anglican Church of Australia in its decision regarding the doctrine of same-sex marriage.

Let me be clear about my view from the outset: *Scripture shows us how the people of God come to make moral and theological judgments, rather than providing the substantive content of those judgments.* Hence to be faithful to Scripture in this debate (as in all debates) does not mean we *exegete from Scripture and apply to lived human experience a timeless moral-doctrinal precept* (and such a so-called ‘excavative’ approach is adopted by opponents to same-sex marriage in this volume), but rather we seek to make our case for the doctrinal position we are arguing *in dialogue with both Scripture and lived human experience.*³ I propose furthermore that such an approach accords with Scripture itself.⁴

My argument in this essay follows largely the trajectory of Luke Timothy Johnson’s *The Revelatory Body: Theology as Inductive Art*, not because it is novel to him (in fact, such an approach to Scripture is common), but because I find his presentation especially cogent and compelling. So, in his words, the role of Scripture is

3 Johnson, *The Revelatory Body*, states it this way: ‘Scripture ... points readers to the human body as the preeminent place of God’s self-disclosure’ (38).

4 I dislike the term ‘revisionist’ to describe those in favour of same-sex marriage because such a revisionist approach often still assumes an excavative perspective, namely, revisionists ‘excavate’ from Scripture a doctrine affirming of same-sex marriage. A number of scholars who affirm same-sex marriage take this route, such as Branson and Achtemeier. This is not my approach, because I take issue with the notion that it is desirable (let alone coherent) ‘to find out what Scripture teaches’ on X. For elaborations of the problems with, and the historical origins of, the excavative approach, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Democratizing Biblical Studies: Toward an Emancipatory Educational Space*, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009); Susanne Scholz, *The Bible as Political Artifact: On the Feminist Study of the Hebrew Bible*, (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2017), and Mark Brett, *Political Trauma and Healing: Biblical Ethics for a Postcolonial World*, (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2016).

summarised thus: ‘Scripture is best understood, not as containing revelation, but as participating in revelation’.⁵

On the diversity of Scripture

The Bible, like all areas of life and art and the church, is marked by diversity and differences of views from beginning to end. Diversity is, it seems, part and parcel of the way the world is and it is a helpful way to enter this debate.

In Scripture we are struck by this from the outset with two creation accounts, the first being Genesis 1:1–2:3 and the second Genesis 2:4–25. They differ in a great number of ways. The first occurs over six days, the second has no timeframe. The first is set ‘everywhere’ and the second in a particular location in the Middle East. The first has man and woman made together on Day Six, the second has the man interacting with God first, and then the woman is made subsequently (and differently). The first ends with the focus on the Sabbath, the second on the man and woman ‘leaving and cleaving’. The first has the pronouncement ‘it was good’ as a core theological assertion and the second early on states ‘it was not good for the man to be alone’. Many scholars believe that the first is written by the so-called Priestly School and the second by the so-called Yahwist (who might be an individual, or a School). And so on go the differences.

Such a presentation of two accounts of the same story, or two different views on the same matter, is ubiquitous in the Bible. Here

5 *Ibid.*, p. 38. He has published a number of important related papers on this approach, most importantly *Scripture & Discernment: Decision Making in the Church*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996).

is a small OT sample for consideration, presented in abbreviated form:⁶

1. The Deuteronomists' theology (see Deut 28) is built around the notion of 'if you obey God, God will bless you, if you don't God will curse you'. The Book of Job torpedoes this theological approach by telling the story of Job who obeys God and yet is cursed. The story is not simply about Job; it is a critique of the Deuteronomistic theology.
2. The Deuteronomists centralised worship in Jerusalem (Deut 12) but other traditions state that God's people can worship anywhere they wish.
3. Ezra-Nehemiah ostensibly advocate ethnic purity, especially with regards to marriage. Yet inter-racial marriage is alive and well in the Old Testament (Ruth!).
4. Deuteronomy states: 'I the Lord your God am a jealous God, punishing children for the iniquity of parents, to the third and fourth generation of those who reject me, but showing steadfast love to the thousandth generation of those who love me and keep my commandments' (Deut 5:9–10), but Ezekiel explicitly argues against this: 'The person who sins shall die. A child shall not suffer for the iniquity of a parent, nor a parent suffer for the iniquity of a child; the

6 For a full treatment of the diversity of views in the Old Testament, I recommend Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997). From a systematic theology perspective, I recommend David Kelsey, *Eccentric Existence: A Theological Anthropology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009) for his masterful engagement with Scripture in the formulation of theology. At a more accessible level, Peter Enns has written a great deal on this topic, see, *How the Bible Actually Works: In Which I Explain How an Ancient, Ambiguous, and Diverse Book Leads Us to Wisdom Rather Than Answers—and Why That's Great News*. (New York: HarperOne, 2019).

righteousness of the righteous shall be his own, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be his own' (Ezek 18:20).

5. Joshua presents the settlement of the Promised Land as a large-scale, relatively successful military-style takeover, but Judges presents it as a fraught, piece-meal, relatively unsuccessful dispersion.
6. Exodus 33:20 states that no one can see God's face, yet earlier in the same chapter (v. 11) it says God spoke to Moses 'face-to-face'.
7. The Day of the Lord is presented as a day of warfare and bloodshed in many texts, and yet as a day of cosmic peace in others. This is starkly represented by two texts that are inverse to each other: Isa 2:4 '...they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more' versus Joel 3:10, 'Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears'.

For the New Testament, we have an equally significant list of differences, such as those found in the Gospels, between the Gospels and Paul's writings, and between Paul's writings and the so-called Catholic Epistles.

These differences are not skin-deep, so attempts to minimise or harmonise them not only do a disservice to the texts themselves but they miss the point entirely, namely, that the different theological traditions in the Old and New Testaments *is what characterises* the Scriptures; it is part and parcel of its gift to us.

We see in fact diversity and creativity in every dimension of human endeavour. God grants humanity the ability and no less the responsibility to shape the world in which we live for its well-being, and continues so to do despite our abject failures at such. So in every area, we are on a constant journey of discovery, learning,

study, to better understand the world, to address the problems of the world, and to contribute to the future of the world.

The theological rationale for this is located in the freedom and love of God, who as Creator has gifted us with dignity and freedom, through the Spirit. The theological task of discerning the moral rightness or wrongness of same-sex marriage is analogous to the task of investigating the properties of water dynamics, or of seeking a cure for cancer, or in writing a symphony, or so on, in that they all require the full engagement of human rationality and creativity.

On the necessity of lived experience

Diversity in and of itself though does not make the case for the role I am arguing that Scripture should play, though it is not insignificant.

Rather, it is understanding its testimony to God's engagement with the world that is significant. Scripture testifies without hesitation that God is alive and present and engaged with God's world in the midst of our lives through the Spirit. The word of God is spoken not only through Scripture but in and through human experience (a reality that our Pentecostal sisters and brothers have rightly brought back into focus). As Johnson puts it: 'The world of Scripture is one that is answerable to God at every moment; it is a world in which God acts intimately and graciously within creation, above all within the freedom of those created according to the image of God.'⁷ The early church's struggle with Gentile inclusion (Acts 10–15) was guided in the end by the undeniable reality of God's Spirit at work in the lives of the Gentiles.

Such recognition of God through the Spirit in our lived experience has throughout history always been the impetus for the re-evaluation of our doctrine. It was the stories coming out

⁷ Johnson, *The Revelatory Body*, 46.

of Nazi Germany that prompted a radical rethink of Christian attitudes to Judaism; it was the stories of the oppression of slaves, of women, of indigenous people, and so forth, that has led to changing in our doctrinal views on these matters. Or in recent years, the contribution to theology by people with disabilities has led to very significant changes in our theology of disability.⁸ And very recently, it is the stories of children suffering childhood sexual abuse that have led to changes in the doctrine of confession in the Anglican Church of Australia in 2017.

In each of these cases, it was not exegesis of Scripture that led to the changes; rather, it was the testimony of those on the inside, those affected by the issues, be they faithful members of the church or not. In the debate on slavery, ultimately there was ‘the recognition that no matter what Scripture says, owning persons cannot be compatible with the mind of Christ’.⁹ Johnson goes on to counter those who might understand this is a rejection of Scripture:

Rereading and reinterpreting Scripture in the light of human experience that at first appears to be dissonant with Scripture—finding texts that formerly were not seen, discovering new dimensions of commonly read passages, relativising those texts that do not accord with God’s new work—is not a form of disloyalty to Scripture. To the contrary, it is loyalty of the highest sort, for it is driven by the conviction that Scripture truly is God-inspired, truly does speak God’s word to humans, when it is passionately and patiently engaged by those listening for God’s word as well in human experience.¹⁰

Further below, I will address the specific condemnation of

8 See S. Clifton, *Crippled Grace: Disability, Virtue Ethics, and the Good Life* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2018) and Amos Yong, *Theology and Down Syndrome: Reimagining Disability in Late Modernity*, (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007).

9 Johnson, *The Revelatory Body*, 50.

10 Johnson, *The Revelatory Body*, 50.

homosexuality in the Scriptures, but first I wish to further elaborate the role Scripture plays in the formation of our moral judgments.

On moral reasoning and Scripture

At the outset, I put my thesis in this way: *Scripture shows us how the people of God come to make moral and theological judgments, rather than providing the substantive content of those judgments.*

Clear evidence of this is found in the stories and parables found in the Bible. If we limit ourselves just to the stories of Genesis, we find almost a total absence of moral judgment by the narrator. Even stories that cry out for comment, such as the binding of Isaac (Genesis 22), the rape of Dinah (Genesis 34), Hagar's expulsion into the desert (Genesis 16), Jacob's wrestling at Jabbok (Genesis 32), Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38), are notable for their absence of anything like 'And so the moral of the story is...'. In fact, many stories remain morally ambiguous and deeply confronting:

- Does Abraham really tie up his teenage son and draw his knife to sacrifice him? (Genesis 22)
- Does Jacob really not consider anything other than his own well-being when confronted with news of the rape of his own daughter? (Gen 34:30)¹¹
- Does Jacob actually wrestle with God skin-on-skin and survive? (Gen 22:28)¹²

11 See further M. Anstey, 'Remembering Dinah: Genesis 34,' *St Mark's Review* (2004) 197:31–35.

12 See further M. Anstey, 'Scriptural Reminiscence and Narrative Gerontology: Jacob's Wrestling with the Unknown (Genesis 32),' in E. MacKinlay (ed.), *Ageing, Disability and Spirituality: Addressing the Challenge of Disability in Later Life*, (London: Jessica Kingsley, 2008), 106–117.

- Does the angel of YHWH really tell Hagar to return to a situation of family violence? (Gen 16:9)¹³
- How does it make sense for Judah to declare Tamar righteous after she engaged in prostitution with him? (Genesis 38)

Biblical stories frequently present moral and doctrinal dilemmas in significant tension with other parts of Scripture. As Rabbi Burton Visotsky, who more than most scholars demonstrates how the texts facilitate the development of moral judgment rather than provide the content for such judgments, so lucidly puts it:

Read simply, in fact, Genesis is an ugly little soap opera about a dysfunctional family. Four generations of that family dynasty are charted, their foibles exposed and all the dirty laundry, as it were, hung out in public for millions to see. It is a story about rape, incest, murder, deception, brute force, sex, and blood lust. The plotlines and characterizations of Genesis are so crude as to call into serious question how this book became and remained a sacred canonical text for two thousand years and more.¹⁴

Let me conclude though with one of the very few stories in the Old Testament which does have a narratorial moral comment, albeit placed in the mouth the villain of the story (itself a provocative literary feature). Judges 19 tells the shocking story of an unnamed concubine, whose master, a Levite no less, offers her up to be raped and beaten all night to strangers, in place of the virgin daughter of the household where he is visiting (and, yes, such a story really is in sacred Scripture).

The story concludes:

In the morning her master [the Levite] got up, opened the doors of

13 See further M. Anstey, 'Seeing Hagar the Theologian: The Interpretation of Genesis 16,' in G. Garrett (ed), *'Into the World you Love': Encountering God in Everyday Life*, (Hindmarsh: ATF Press., 2007), 17–35.

14 B. Visotsky, *The Genesis of Ethics: How the Tormented Family of Genesis Leads us to Moral Development* (New York: New Rivers Press, 1996).

the house, and when he went out to go on his way, there was his concubine lying at the door of the house, with her hands on the threshold. 'Get up,' he said to her, 'we are going.' But there was no answer. Then he put her on the donkey; and the man set out for his home. When he had entered his house, he took a knife, and grasping his concubine he cut her into twelve pieces, limb by limb, and sent her throughout all the territory of Israel. Then he commanded the men whom he sent, saying, 'Thus shall you say to all the Israelites, "Has such a thing ever happened since the day that the Israelites came up from the land of Egypt until this day? Consider it, take counsel, and speak out."' (Judg 19:27–30)

What is especially distressing about this story is in the details: that her hands are 'on the threshold', depicting her desperate attempt to flee from the rapists, that her master stumbles over her, not noticing at first she is even there on the ground, and most shocking of all, that the narrator notes only that she fails to answer, not that she is dead, suggesting she might have been dismembered alive. Little comfort comes from the next chapter in which we read that the Levite says otherwise: 'she was raped and died' (Judg 20:5; Then again, should we believe him?)

And then, a final comment, which an astute reader will take as addressed to the reader rather than those in the storyworld: 'Consider it, take counsel, and speak out' (NRSV). The readers (as the verbs are all plural 'you') here are enjoined to consider this story together and speak out. Clearly the people of God, in choosing to include this story in the canon, judged it as important for the well-being of the community. Thank God that they did, and that they retained the stories above, and so many other difficult stories.

And the point is this: Scripture itself, here and as shown above, leaves the reader with little guidance. The stories are not told so as to convey a moral precept but to evoke and provoke reflection in ways that lead to moral development. And in this one story where the narrator does subtly comment, we are asked to figure it out amongst ourselves and then to share our reflections (note that to whom we are to speak, and about what, and for what ends, and so forth, is left unspecified). Many of Jesus' parables are like this—the point is in the theological conversations they generate rather than any particular propositional content to be conveyed (otherwise, we could just have propositions and no stories or parables).

Johnson's central argument is not only that the stories are told in such a way as to leave moral discernment to the reader, but in such a way that repeatedly gives witness to God's presence in the lives of people, experienced in ways that lead to a re-evaluation of our view on God and God's work in the world.

On the Scriptures concerning homosexuality

I have made the case that Scripture does not provide the content of our doctrinal and moral judgments, but rather testifies to the way the people of God go about making such judgments in the light of God's ongoing presence in the lives of God's people and the world. Thus we are now able to address the elephant in the room: the seven or so Scriptural texts on homosexuality, all of which depict it as sinful. It is difficult in my view to read them otherwise.¹⁵

15 So in this, I follow W. Loader, *The New Testament on Sexuality*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012) who affirms homosexuality but argues the Scriptures do not. When I say 'very difficult', I do think there is a case for arguing that the actual sort of same-sex relationship we are considering in the twenty-first century is outside the purview of the Scriptural authors, but equally, we must admit that the Scriptural authors might well have been just as condemning of these, were they a reality in their time.

Again, Johnson is characteristically forthright:

I think it important to state clearly that we do [with regard to homosexuality], in fact, reject the straightforward commands of Scripture, and appeal instead to another authority when we declare that same-sex unions can be holy and good. And what exactly is that authority? We appeal explicitly to the weight of our own experience and the experience thousands of others have witnessed to, which tells us that to claim our own sexual orientation is in fact to accept the way in which God has created us. By so doing, we explicitly reject as well the premises of the scriptural statements condemning homosexuality—namely, that it is a vice freely chosen, a symptom of human corruption, and disobedience to God’s created order.¹⁶

Thus affirming same-sex marriage in my view is not to dismiss Scripture but indeed the opposite, to take it with the utmost seriousness. The rationale for our rejection of the view espoused in these seven texts is grounded then in Scripture itself, in its witness to Christ and the nature of God, and in its taking with the utmost seriousness the testimony of the presence of God in the lives of God’s people. We are thus *not* rejecting the word of God, but discerning and embracing the word of God.

And even if these seven texts were all in lavish praise of homosexuality, extolling its virtues, that too would not determine our moral judgment on the matter. (For the Scriptures do not condemn slavery, yet we must do so.) What matters always is that we make a coherent and cogent case to discern the mind of Christ on each issue. I find this liberating – to engage deeply in Scripture and the experiences of God in our lives, in order to arrive at a theologically coherent and morally defensible position.

16 <https://www.commonwealmagazine.org/homosexuality-church-o>.

Finally, I wish to comment on method: many of those opposed to same-sex marriage claim that approaches such as mine view and interpret Scripture in a way that is (radically) different from theirs. I dispute such an accusation; I would submit that both approaches are essentially the same (and so then, their claim to be ‘following the clear teaching of Scripture alone’ is not true in practice).

I encourage the reader to consider this for themselves, by reflecting upon the ways in which both sides present their arguments in this book: is it not the case that each of us puts forward in much the same way a rational, coherent, moral-doctrinal argument, with reference to Scripture, tradition, and experience? I strongly believe that this is the case, and I state this clearly because I will never accept the claim that the position I am advocating requires abandoning the Scriptures.

Conclusion

For the matter before us, I am arguing that to be faithful to Scripture means to engage in a considered conversation about the doctrine of same-sex marriage, taking Scripture with the utmost seriousness as a witness as to how the people of God undertake such discernment. This requires listening to how God’s people have responded to (new) manifestations of God’s presence in their lives, so as to discern together the mind of Christ on this issue. And clearly, the lived experience of gay and lesbian Christians is paramount to our deliberations.

In sum, in the light of God’s full revelation, our responsibility is to discern what is compatible with the mind of Christ. (It is to this end that my other essay in this volume is directed.)

Or to put it the way Scripture does in the most haunting of all its texts:

Let us consider it, take counsel, and speak out.