

**A Biblical
and Scientific
Analysis of
Homosexuality**

By

Chuck May

Our Purpose

Relational Concepts has been organized to provide motivational instruction for men and women interested in being used by God in their present positions in the community.

We believe that Christian doctors, mechanics, housewives, realtors, lawyers, secretaries, plumbers, businessmen, etc. are the most effective spokespersons the church has.

These people are generally not in a position where they can take the time to go to a Bible college. Our purpose is to bring quality instruction to them, where they are, to be applied in their family and their community.



P. O. Box 88095
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49518
relationalconcepts.org

This study book was compiled by Chuck May. Chuck is an Equiper and Discippler in the Relational Concepts' School of Discipleship. He is married to Becky and has two children.

First Printing: April 2014

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture is taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by the Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Chapter 1	7
<i>Is Anything Wrong with Anything?</i>	
Chapter 2	10
<i>Meaning – What Is It Anyway?</i>	
Chapter 3	13
<i>Does the Bible Forbid Homosexual Acts?</i>	
Chapter 4	32
<i>Is God’s Moral Will STILL Expressed in the Bible?</i>	
Chapter 5	37
<i>Are People Born Gay?</i>	
Conclusion	54
Appendix	55
<i>Answers to Other Arguments Used by Pro-Homosexuals</i>	

Introduction

Homosexuality is one of the most divisive and important issues in the world today. The topic has gained such momentum in the news and popular culture that it now seems to be discussed as frequently as the daily weather forecast.

Until recent history, homosexual sex acts were generally labeled as immoral, or at least aberrant. Thomas Jefferson, who helped write America's founding documents, introduced a bill which included civil punishments for sodomy [presspubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/amedVIII10.html]. Just a few short years ago, both the religious and non-religious derided homosexuals as deviants. Not until 1973 did the American Psychiatric Association remove homosexuality from its list of mental disorders [psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/facts_mental_health.html] and not until 1990 did the World Health Organization follow suit [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality_and_psychology]. This designation is in stark contrast to today's world, where the majority regards homosexual behavior as morally acceptable.

Presently, most TV shows have an openly gay character, who is often the hero of the plot, and most news organizations have gay anchors who symbolize trust, honesty, and integrity as they deliver their commentary on the world's events. While pop-culture and the media have already judged homosexuality as morally acceptable, some disagree strongly. A minority, representing various ethnic, religious, and political groups, are persuaded that homosexual behavior is an abhorrent evil and is detrimental to society.

Nowhere is the dispute more intense than among those who call themselves Christians. From one side of Christianity we see bold, fiery condemnation of homosexual behavior as a heinous sin, while the other side claims it is not a moral evil and is actually approved by God. What is fascinating about this debate among Christians is that both sides claim to be seeking God's will on the matter and both claim the Bible, at least in part, as their guide for determining God's moral directives. The divide is not just between theologically "conservative" and "liberal" Christians. Many, who would brand themselves "conservative, born-again, Bible-believing" Christians, feel homosexuality is morally acceptable. For many Christians, this topic has become a litmus test on fidelity to God and the Bible. For others, the homosexuality issue is proof of the judgmental character and intolerance endemic to certain ignorant and bigoted branches of the Christian faith. There seems to be no moderates on this issue.

So, which side is right? Assuming that there is a real God of the Bible who has a real opinion on the issue, both of these opposing views can't be right. Is it possible to find out what God really thinks? For Christians, should it not be God's opinion that settles the matter?

There are two purposes to this study. The primary goal is simply to determine God's opinion regarding homosexual behavior—in His eyes, is it sin or not? The method of attaining this goal will be to evaluate the pertinent biblical data. It is my assumption that the Bible is clear revelation from God. It is His infallible, inerrant Word and is our sole source of authority on matters of faith and practice.

My second aim is to determine if homosexual orientation is in-born. To reach this goal, I will itemize and provide comment on the significant biblical data as well as the vast amount of scientific research on the subject.

Some clarifications and definitions: When I am discussing the homosexual sex act, I will use the phrases “homosexual conduct,” “homosexual acts,” “homosexual sex,” and “homosexual behavior.” These phrases have nothing to do with a person's demeanor, that is, whether a person acts *gay* or dresses or talks in a certain way. These phrases are the titles I will use for the homosexual sex act.

The arguments here are directed to those who call themselves “Christian” and claim the Bible as the source of determining the mind of God. As Christians, we are servants of God, and as servants, we should delight and be trustworthy in doing God's will (Psalm 40:8; 1 Corinthians 4:2). My hope for the reader is that after evaluating this material you be found trustworthy in your response to God's guidance in this matter.

Chapter 1

Is Anything Wrong with Anything?

I recently heard a self-proclaimed “conservative, bible-believing, born-again” homosexual ask: “Who are you to say homosexuality is wrong?”

Now, that’s a very good question, but it raises a more profound question, namely, do right and wrong even exist? Is there really such a thing as morality? [Morality is defined as the differentiation between actions, intentions or decisions that are good (right) or bad (wrong).] Before you can determine whether or not a certain thing is right or wrong, you have to know *that* there really is right and wrong. For if there aren’t really rights and wrongs, then the homosexual’s question above is meaningless in the first place.

So what is the basis for claiming that right and wrong do exist, and that there is a difference between them? The Christian’s answer is that moral values are found in God and are based on His eternal, unchanging character. God’s perfectly good nature issues forth in commandments, which become moral duties, like, “you shall not commit adultery,” “you shall love your neighbor as yourself,” “you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, mind and strength,” and “keep away from the brother who leads an unruly life.” Doing certain things and abstaining from others are objectively right or wrong based on God’s commandments. And these commandments are not arbitrary, but flow necessarily out of God’s nature. So, if God is God, then He determines what right and wrong are, and He does this, not arbitrarily, but necessarily, in perfect accordance with His nature. And since His nature never changes (James 1:17; Malachi 3:6; 1 Samuel 15:29), what is *right* will always be right and what is *wrong* will always be wrong.

A person becomes a Christian, at least minimally, to be saved from the penalty of their sins. They admit that they have sinned, that this wrong has offended God, and that this offense must be paid for. So, implicit in becoming a Christian is the affirmation that objective rights and wrongs do exist. And since one becomes a Christian based on hearing the Word of the Bible, he or she must believe that the Bible is an accurate expression of God’s moral character—why else receive Christ as your Savior unless you believe that this is the *right* thing to do? If this be the case, then morality isn’t just *in your mind*, it is real and exists wholly apart from you. When we fail to keep God’s moral commandments, we are really guilty. The problem isn’t that we *feel* guilty; the problem is that we *are* guilty, regardless of how we feel. I might not feel guilty because my conscience has become dull, but if the above is true, when I’ve broken God’s law, I *am* objectively guilty, no matter how I feel.

Since morality is based in God, it is unaffected by human opinions—morality is truly OBJECTIVE. What do I mean by *objective*? An example will illustrate the point. If the antichrist comes to power and then succeeds in brainwashing everyone on earth to believe that he is god, and kills all who won't believe that idea, so that everybody left alive would end up thinking it is morally right to worship the antichrist, it would still be morally wrong to worship the antichrist because God is against it. Worship of the antichrist would be evil, regardless of unanimous human opinion. This is objective morality—right and wrong exist outside of humans or their opinions. Humans are subject to moral laws. They recognize them but do not make them. Since morality is outside of people, it is not subject to change as society and culture changes. Rights and wrongs never change—since they are based in God who never changes.

By seeing that objective morals do exist, we can answer the question, “Is anything wrong with anything?” The answer is undeniably—yes. Are there any absolutes?—Absolutely! Since God is God, and anything contrary to His nature is by definition sin, then some things are objectively WRONG. Hence, homosexual acts are *either* right or they are wrong—not both. Further, if it can be demonstrated that the Bible condemns homosexual behavior as sin, just as murder, adultery, premarital sex, kidnapping, lying and idolatry are sin, then for me to openly condemn homosexual behavior as sin makes me no more a “gay basher” than I am an “adulterer basher,” “premarital sex basher,” “kidnapper basher” or a “murderer basher.” If I label something as sin, that is in fact sin, then I’m simply agreeing with what God has said.

Now that we have this foundation, we can begin to think about the homosexual’s challenge above—“Who are you to say that homosexual conduct is wrong?” That question assumes that the burden of proof is on the one who is against these acts—they have to prove that it is wrong. But when one really thinks about the matter, the burden of proof is actually on the one who says homosexual behavior is morally right. Since *right* by the Christian definition is “that which conforms to God’s character,” the pro-homosexual [in this study, “pro-homosexual” means a person who believes homosexuality and/or homosexual behavior is not necessarily sinful, and this person may himself be either heterosexual or homosexual] has to prove that homosexual behavior is pleasing to God. My question to the above is—“Who are you to say homosexual conduct is *right*?”

To summarize what I’ve said to this point: **first**, objective morals do exist. **Second**, there is a real difference between right and wrong—if there isn’t, the persecutor of homosexuals is morally equivalent to the advocate of homosexuals. **Third**, objective morals are based in God’s character which never changes, therefore, human opinion is irrelevant to determining right and wrong. And **fourth**, to determine if something is wrong, we must first determine what is right, and what is right is that which conforms to God’s character. Therefore, the

question of the morality of homosexual conduct depends solely on God's opinion of it.

So, how do you find out what God thinks? The Christian says you look in the Bible. Historically, followers of the Bible have claimed, from their reading of the text, that homosexual acts are morally abhorrent to God. It is sin, end of story.

The argument for this position is as follows:

- 1) We are all obligated to do God's moral will.
- 2) God's moral will is expressed in the Bible.
- 3) The Bible forbids homosexual behavior.
- 4) Therefore, homosexual behavior is against God's moral will—it is sin.

In the last 50 years or so, there has arisen, from so-called "pro-homosexual Christians" ["pro-homosexual Christian" here means a person who claims they are a born-again Christian and also claims homosexual acts are not, in themselves, sinful—these "pro-homosexual Christians" themselves may be either heterosexual or homosexual] major challenges to the belief that homosexual acts are sin. These arguments are meant to disprove the aforementioned, four-point argument.

Logically speaking, to claim that homosexual acts are *NOT* sin, one has to deny either premise #2) "God's will is expressed in the Bible" or premise #3) "the Bible forbids homosexual behavior." If one cannot prove at least one of these premises is false, then the conclusion (that homosexual behavior is sin) follows necessarily and must be true. Consequently, for the pro-homosexual Christian, a lot is riding on their being able to defeat the above argument.

Interestingly, of those who claim Christ and yet say homosexual behavior is not sin, their defense is precisely one of these two methods. One group claims God's will for today's believer is not expressed in the Bible. The other group claims the Bible does not forbid homosexual behavior.

The foregoing discussion has established that objective morality does exist. Since that is the case, homosexual behavior is either right or wrong—there are no other options. Now, to determine if homosexual acts are sin, all we have left to do is reason through the meaning of the text to determine what God thinks on the matter. That should decide the case. What follows is meant to accomplish this goal.

Chapter 2

Meaning – What Is It Anyway?

Previously, I stated that this study is written to “Christians” who claim the Bible as their authority for determining what God is like and what He demands. The non-Christian world has discarded the Bible as just another irrelevant, old book from an ancient culture. The discussions that follow are *not* directed to the non-Christian world. I’m talking to people who admit that the Bible is God’s Word and are willing *to live* with those implications. To those who believe the Bible is the actual Word of God, it really matters (in fact, it should be the most important thing in their lives) what the meaning of the text is. The question we should always ask ourselves before we attempt to determine meaning is—“Once I know what this *means*, am I willing to do what it *says*?” If you aren’t, why do you care what it says in the first place? So our goal is to determine the meaning of the text, but before we can do that, we have to discuss what *meaning* is.

At the very minimum, the Bible is communication. It was written by someone to someone else to give them information or *meaning*. Meaning is “the idea or concept one intends to convey to another.” It is a foundational principle that all communication assumes a *source mind* which can convey meaning and a *receptor mind* which can understand meaning. Without this assumption, communication is pointless. Why would you ever speak or write to someone if you *knew* they had no ability at all to understand you? You wouldn’t, it is a waste of time. Nobody talks to a rock expecting it to understand. So we start by assuming that the author(s) of the Bible could convey meaning, and they believed that their readers could receive and understand meaning.

Next, you must understand that meaning is objective. The meaning in the text is determined by the words that make up the text, which words the author specifically chose to convey meaning to his readers. As such, it doesn’t matter if a reader thinks the author meant something else. The meaning of the text was put there by the author to express *his* actual thoughts at that time. Hence the meaning in the text is not dependent on the readers of the text.

An example will help clarify the issue. If I composed an email, and in it wrote, “The board was bad,” then I meant something by that phrase. Let’s assume Bill got a hold of my email and he “cut and pasted” that phrase from my email into a letter he was writing to Alice against the board of directors of a company. Bill, who accurately quoted me as saying “the board was bad,” used that quote to convince Alice that I was also against the board of directors. Bill said, “See, Chuck May agrees—‘the board was bad’.” However, if someone were to find my original email and actually read it, they would see the context was about a new deck I built on my house. In that email, I was talking about one specific piece of wood that warped and caused someone to trip. About that piece of

wood, I said, “The board was bad.” Now, what meaning did I convey by those words? I conveyed the meaning that a real piece of wood was bad. That meaning was objective—I was talking about wood. You cannot cut and paste my words to prove I was saying that a certain board of directors was bad. The meaning I conveyed was objective and it never changes, even if someone like Alice thinks I meant something else. Also note, and this is highly important, MEANING IS DETERMINED BY CONTEXT. The only way to find out what I really meant by “the board was bad” was to read the context of my original email. If you read *that* document there is *absolutely no way* you could come to the conclusion I was talking about a board of directors. CONTEXT DETERMINES MEANING.

Many in the world today believe that meaning is determined by the reader, not the author. The phrase “what does that verse *mean* to you?” is said daily. But it must be noted that any attempt to disprove the idea that the meaning in the text was put there by the author is done so by using self-defeating arguments. [Self-defeating arguments are statements which claim to be true, but prove to be false in the very act of making the claim. For example, if I were speaking to you in English, and said, “I can’t speak a word of English,” by speaking in English, I have disproved the claim that I cannot speak in English. This is a self-defeating claim.]

Let’s assume Frank believes that meaning is determined by the reader, not the author. To voice his opinion, Frank wrote, “Meaning does not originate with the author, it comes from the reader.” But what does Frank’s statement assume? It assumes that the words he chose to make his claim had meaning, and I am not free to impose my meaning on his words just because I am the reader. If I tried to understand Frank’s statement—“Meaning does not originate with the author, it comes from the reader”—to mean the opposite, namely, that meaning resides with the author, not the reader, Frank would immediately object by shouting, “That’s not what I meant. I meant that meaning resides with the reader.” Frank’s argument proves the very fact that he is trying to disprove, namely, that meaning resides in the words of the author, *not* with the reader. His argument also shows that the meaning the author intended to convey will never change. Frank always intends his readers to understand his meaning the way he meant it—not the way they want to.

So, to summarize: 1) all communication assumes a source mind that can convey meaning and a receptor mind that can receive and understand meaning, 2) meaning is given to a text by the author of the text, 3) meaning resides in the words of the text, 4) meaning is objective—the meaning the author gave the text will always be the same, no matter if EVERYONE in the world thinks he meant something else, 5) meaning never changes—since the meaning of the text was put there by the author of the text, and since, once the text is written down it can’t be changed, it follows logically that meaning never changes, 6) meaning is determined by context.

Now that we understand what meaning is, its source and its nature, we can look at the biblical texts which deal with homosexual behavior with a view toward understanding the meaning. Since the authors of these texts intended to convey meaning, we, as logical people, should be able to determine that meaning. For if the text meant something then, it still means the same thing now. And if the text has divine authorship, as Christians believe, then this objective meaning has enormous implications for its readers.

Chapter 3

Does the Bible Forbid Homosexual Acts?

As stated in the introduction, one goal of this study is to determine what God thinks about homosexual behavior—in His eyes, is it sin or not? For those who believe the Bible expresses God’s moral will for people of ALL TIMES, not just for people of the biblical era, this question begins and ends with the Bible. [As we will see in the next section, many today believe that the Bible does not express God’s will for people of today. Hence, they believe God is bringing culture toward an ideal ethic, and what was condemned in the past may no longer be evil for modern people.] But, while both sides of this debate agree that the Bible is God’s Word, we still need to interpret it—and this is where the problems begin and where the solution resides.

Those against homosexual acts say the Bible is abundantly clear—it is sin. But, the pro-homosexuals say that conclusion is incorrect and based on poor interpretations. The pro-homosexual feels that, upon closer examination of the text, it is evident that homosexual behavior is *not* sin.

The general thesis put forth by those who say that the Bible does *not* condemn homosexual acts is stated clearly by Daniel Helminiak, the author of the book, “What the Bible Really Says about Homosexuality.” This work is one of the most significant sources used today by pro-homosexuals to prove that the Bible does not condemn homosexual behavior. On his website, Dr. Helminiak states:

In general, our understanding of homosexuality as a fixed, core aspect of a person and current concern for loving, adult, homosexual relationships raise questions the biblical authors never imagined. So it is not to be expected that the biblical texts provide answers to those questions [visionsofdaniel.net/paperSummaryOfWhatBibleReallySays.htm].

Put simply, the pro-homosexuals believe there are “good” homosexual acts and “evil” homosexual acts. The pro-homosexual claims the Bible texts that address homosexual behavior are only condemning the “evil” homosexual acts, such as rape, promiscuous homosexual sex, or homosexual acts used during worship ceremonies to pagan gods. These texts, they say, have nothing to do with the “loving, adult, monogamous, homosexual relationships” we may see today. Therefore, the pro-homosexual concludes the Bible cannot be used to prove homosexual behavior, as such, is sin, as it is only discussing the evil homosexual conduct.

So, are the pro-homosexuals right? Has the church, and, for that matter, historic Judaism, misinterpreted the meaning of these Bible passages for thousands of years? The implications to this answer are enormous. If the pro-homosexual is

right, then God approves of homosexual acts, when done by two loving, committed people. If they are wrong, then they are sanctioning sin for countless people, leading them headlong into acts which turn God's stomach.

What follows is a discussion of the major biblical passages most often used to condemn homosexual behavior as sin. My method of evaluating each of these passages will be to **first**, quote the passage, **second**, give a brief commentary on the passage, explaining the traditional view that homosexual acts are sinful, **third**, state the arguments by the pro-homosexuals meant to show that the passage is *not* teaching that homosexual acts are sinful, and **fourth**, provide a critique and response to the pro-homosexual view.

Genesis 18 and 19

Passage: Chapter 18:17-20—*And the LORD said, "Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do...for I have chosen him so that he may command... his household after him to keep the way of the LORD by doing righteousness and justice...And the LORD said, "The outcry of Sodom and Gomorrah is indeed great, and their sin is exceedingly grave.* Chapter 19:1-8, 25—*Now the two angels came to Sodom in the evening ... And he [Lot] said, "Now behold, my lords, please turn aside into your servant's house, and spend the night ... They said however, "No, but we shall spend the night in the square." Yet he urged them strongly, so they turned aside to him and entered his house... the men of Sodom, surrounded the house... and they called to Lot and said to him, "Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may have relations with them." But Lot went out to them at the doorway, and shut the door behind him, and said, "Please, my brothers, do not act wickedly. Now behold, I have two daughters who have not had relations with man; please let me bring them out to you, and do to them whatever you like; only do nothing to these men, inasmuch as they have come under the shelter of my roof." ... Then the LORD rained on Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven, and He overthrew those cities, and all the valley, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and what grew on the ground.*

Commentary: In Genesis 18, the Lord told Abraham that He was about to destroy the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah because *their sin is exceedingly grave*. Chapter 19 describes the nature and extent of the sin of the city, specifically mentioning the citizens' desire for homosexual sex. Because of their wickedness, God delivered immediate destruction upon the population of the entire city and the surrounding areas. The traditional view interprets this passage to be a clear condemnation of extremely pervasive homosexual behavior, for which God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.

The Pro-homosexual Interpretation: The pro-homosexuals offer three alternative interpretations to Genesis 19, each attempting to show that this passage is *not* condemning homosexual acts. Their explanations for what Sodom’s sin was and why God destroyed the cities are: 1) The men of the city attempted to rape Lot’s guests, 2) the inhospitality of the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, 3) a general wickedness of the people of the cities. A summary and response to each view follows.

Pro-homosexual Argument #1: The city was destroyed because the men of the city tried to rape Lot’s guests.

Response: This argument fails immediately when one remembers that God had decided to destroy the city *days before* Lot’s guests even arrived. God had already stated He was destroying the city because of its exceedingly grave sin and not even ten righteous people could be found. Therefore, God’s judgment could not have been because of the attempted rape.

Pro-homosexual Argument #2: This argument says that the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah was the inhospitality of its citizens toward Lot’s guests, not homosexual behavior. John Boswell (d. 1994), former Yale professor and pro-homosexual, explains the situation this way:

Lot was violating the custom of Sodom...by entertaining unknown guests within the city walls at night without obtaining the permission of the elders of the city. When the men of Sodom gathered around to demand that the strangers be brought out to them, “that they might know them,” they meant no more than to “know” who they were, and the city was consequently destroyed not for sexual immorality, but for the sin of inhospitality to strangers [John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 93].

The expanded explanation of the idea put forth by Boswell and other pro-homosexuals is that Lot brought in the angelic guests, the men of the city found out about it and were furious that they had not been given the chance to interrogate the guests to see if they might be spies or to just get to know them that they might become friends. The men then created a mob and came to Lot’s door demanding to “know” his guests. This mob-like action was hostile and lacked hospitality toward Lot’s guests, and for this reason, God destroyed the city.

As further support for their arguments, the pro-homosexuals state that when the men of Sodom called on Lot to *bring out the guests that we may know them*, the word “know” (Hebrew: *yada*, יָדָע) is not a word that means sexual intercourse, it just means “to know or get acquainted with” or “to know in a friendly way.” The pro-homosexuals here say the men of the city simply wanted to know more

about Lot's guests and/or to be friends with them. They did not desire homosexual sex.

Response: In response to this, it should be pointed out that the Hebrew word *yada* is used 12 times in Genesis, and 10 of those times, it is used for sexual relations. In fact, in this very passage (Genesis 19:8) *yada* means sexual relations—Lot's daughters had not *known* a man. Did this mean that they had no cognitive knowledge of any man?—NO. It meant they had not had sexual relations with a man. So the pro-homosexuals are categorically wrong on this point. *Yada* here and in the rest of Genesis is often used for sexual relationships. Furthermore, as I said previously, context determines meaning, and this is definitely a sexual context—why would the daughters of Lot be offered to the men of the city, if it is not sex they are after? And further still, Lot begged the men of the city to not *act wickedly* when they asked to “know” Lot's guests. Now, if the men of Sodom simply wanted to get to know or be friends with Lot's guests, then why would Lot call it a *wicked act*? Lastly, the inhospitality to Lot's guests could not have been the reason for the destruction of the cities because God had already planned to destroy the cities for the grave sin before the guests ever came to Lot's house.

From the foregoing analysis, it is easily seen that the pro-homosexual's argument that Sodom's sin was inhospitality fails miserably. It simply does not explain the text and suffers from many internal contradictions.

Pro-homosexual Argument #3: This argument says that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed, not because of the homosexual conduct endemic to its people, but because of a general wickedness characterized by its citizens.

Interestingly, proponents of this view generally appeal to Ezekiel 16 rather than Genesis 19 to make their case. Alex Haiken, who calls himself “a gay, Jewish believer in Christ” summarizes the condemnation against Sodom by quoting Ezekiel 16:49-50,

Behold, this was the guilt of your sister Sodom: she and her daughters had arrogance, abundant food and careless ease, but she did not help the poor and needy. Thus they were haughty and committed abominations before Me. Therefore I removed them when I saw it.

Haiken then gives the following conclusion as to why Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed:

So what then were the grievous sins that caused God to judge Sodom worthy of such destruction? The sin of Sodom was avarice, pride, and a determination to have riches at any cost, according to God's commentary in Ezekiel. Sodom did practice pagan rituals, including cult prostitution involving

ambisexual sadomasochism. Why did they do such abominable things? Because they believed that these things would bring them fertility and secure their place in the world. They were haughty, had prosperous ease, too much food and did not aid the poor and needy. Ezekiel said that they practiced all that to get and to maintain their enormous wealth.

Sodom was perverse, according to Ezekiel, because it was rich and powerful and coveted ever more and yet more power. They believed they obtained that power through multi-sexual sadism, the drinking of blood, semen and other body fluids, the eating of flesh, animal sex and the sacrificing of their children to the pagan gods. This was the famous sin of Sodom, not what you've heard [that the sin was homosexual behavior] (jewishchristian-gay.wordpress.com/2012/01/01/genesis-19-what-the-bible-really-says-were-the-sins-of-sodom/ [bracketed information mine]).

If Haiken's conclusions are correct, then God did not destroy Sodom for its homosexual behavior, He did it because of its general wickedness. Consequently, in this view, Genesis 18 and 19 are not commenting on homosexual behavior at all, and, therefore, one cannot use these passages to say that all homosexual sex is sin.

Response: First, *if* Haiken's view is correct, then it follows logically that *context is irrelevant to determining meaning*.

One must remember that in Genesis 18 God told Abraham that He was about to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah for their *exceedingly great sin* (v. 20). According to Haiken's exposition of Ezekiel, the *exceedingly grave sin* to which God was referring was Sodom and Gomorrah's extreme "greed, avarice and pride." The problem that becomes immediately and overtly apparent is, Genesis 19 never mentions Sodom's greed, haughtiness, avarice or pride. Genesis 19 only mentions the desire for homosexual sex.

Since the context of Genesis 19 does not mention (or even hint at) the reasons Haiken gives, it would have been *impossible* for Moses' original readers to understand that God destroyed the cities for their haughtiness, avarice and pride. In other words, if Haiken is correct, NO ONE could have known the real reason for the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah until Ezekiel wrote in 590 B.C. (even though Moses wrote it in 1400 B.C.). According to Haiken, not until 810 years after Moses wrote did anyone understand why God really destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah! One would have to ask—Why in the world did Moses write this passage? For, without the information contributed by Ezekiel, this passage has NO information which conveys its true meaning. Why write documents to readers when you are not intending to convey meaning? It is like me writing to you "gloobwarts have gobknots." It is pointless for me to write this because it has no meaning. Remember, as I said earlier, CONTEXT DETERMINES MEANING,

and so Haiken's explanation cannot possibly be the real reason why God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.

Second, let's test the above view that Sodom's sin was greed, avarice, pride and the desire to have more riches at any cost. According to Haiken's view, Sodom and Gomorrah had become extremely wealthy cities and had gotten and kept their position of wealth and power through, among other things, multi-sexual sadism and sadomasochism (inflicting pain on another for your personal pleasure or personal sexual pleasure). Disregarding for the moment that neither Genesis nor Ezekiel even mentions these practices, this idea makes me wonder—if I was a businessman during the time of Sodom and Gomorrah, and I was traveling places to sell my goods and do business trade, would I EVER go into the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, knowing full well that I would get raped by a gang of men? I don't know about business men and travelers around 2000 B.C., but I sure wouldn't go into those cities knowing their reputation. And if the people of 2000 B.C. were anything like me, not desiring to be gang raped, and I can pretty much guarantee they were, then how did Sodom and Gomorrah get so wealthy in the FIRST PLACE? It takes other people to trade with in order to make a profit. If no one will go into your city for fear of being gang raped, then no one will trade with you and you will be POOR, not RICH. In short, Haiken's *utter assumptions* regarding God's reasons for the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah can't even stand up to his own background scenario, let alone the text itself, which mentions nothing of their supposed wealth and sadomasochism.

So, what do we do with the Ezekiel passage, for it obviously has meaning, too. Several comments can be made. First, we cannot believe that the Genesis and Ezekiel passages are contradicting each other. One text cannot be claiming that homosexual behavior was the sole reason for the destruction while the other text is saying that homosexual behavior was *not* the reason for the destruction. These passages are both in God's Word, and therefore, they cannot contradict. It is quite possible, and in fact, likely, that one passage may be adding additional information not supplied by the other, but additional information is not the same as contradicting information. An example of this is clearly seen by comparing Matthew 28 and Luke 24 with regard to the number of angels at Jesus' tomb. Critics of the Bible often say that Matthew is contradicting Luke, for Matthew mentions one angel at the tomb, while Luke says there were two. The solution to this problem is quite simple—where there are two angels, there certainly was one. In other words, Matthew only mentioned the one angel, but does not say there was *only* one angel at the tomb. Mentioning one angel served Matthew's purpose and style in his composition. Luke, typical of Luke, adds more detail than Matthew, but does not contradict Matthew's description.

There is a tried and true principle of interpretation that states, "The clear passage should be used to interpret the less clear." In other words, use what you are more certain about to interpret what you are less certain about. Given that the context

of Genesis 19 specifically mentions rampant homosexual behavior in Sodom and Gomorrah, which Lot called “wicked” (and not even ten righteous people could be found there), and given that Genesis 19 is the very illustration of the conduct which God had previously called “exceedingly grave sin” and for which God was destroying the cities, it seems most logical to believe that the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah was homosexual behavior. Ezekiel then cannot be contradicting the Genesis passage, but must rather be seen as adding additional information which serves Ezekiel’s specific purpose in writing, which purpose was condemning *Jerusalem* for its sin. One must take note of the fact that the theme of Ezekiel 16 is the judgment of *Jerusalem* (not Sodom) for its sin in light of, and in spite of, it being hand-picked and cared for by God. Therefore, the mention of the judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah in Ezekiel is used as an illustration against Jerusalem—not as a detailed exposition of the judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah. As such, we should not expect an in-depth analysis by Ezekiel of the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah, for that is not the theme of Ezekiel 16.

Third, Ezekiel 16:50 states, “*Thus they were haughty and committed abominations before Me. Therefore I removed them when I saw it.*” The word “abomination” here is the Hebrew word *toevah* (תועבה). This is the same word translated “detestable act” in Leviticus 20:13 when describing homosexual sex. It is possible that Ezekiel is saying homosexual sex was at least one of the reasons God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.

We do well to remember that, while the Bible has many human authors, it also has one Divine author. Since God is the common author of Scripture, the Bible must be seen as a unity. Since this is true, corroborative passages (like Ezekiel) must be giving additional, amplifying information, not contradictory information. Those secondary passages are highly useful and should not be ignored, but their meaning can never be seen as contradicting the plain meaning of the original passage, which can only be discovered by its own context.

Now back to the Haiken critique: The idea that Sodom was destroyed for general wickedness which did NOT include homosexual behavior does not fit the majority of the biblical evidence. The following facts should be considered:

- 1) Sodom’s sin was called exceedingly grave (Genesis 18:20) and a wicked thing (Genesis 19:7).
- 2) God destroyed the cities as an example to those who would live ungodly thereafter (2 Peter 2:6).
- 3) Sodom’s sin had the peculiar qualities of *gross immorality* and *going after strange flesh* (Jude 7).
- 4) The conduct of the men of Sodom was *sensual* in nature (2 Peter 2:7) and indulged fleshly desires (2 Peter 2:10), and it tormented Lot day after day (2 Peter 2:8).

Remembering that succeeding biblical passages may amplify, but not contradict, prior passages, we can piece all the data together to give us an accurate picture of Sodom’s offenses. This sin of Sodom and Gomorrah was some kind of activity—a grave, ongoing, lawless, sensuous activity—that tormented Lot as he witnessed it day after day. It was an activity in which the inhabitants indulged the flesh in corrupt desires by going after strange flesh, ultimately bringing upon them the most extensive judgment anywhere in the Bible outside of the book of Revelation.

What do we know about the conduct of the men of Sodom and Gomorrah that fits this description?

We know that the men of Sodom and Gomorrah wanted to have sex with Lot’s male guests, *both young and old and all the people from every quarter*, asked for the guests to be brought out so that they could *know* them (Genesis 19:6). Their desire was even to the point of disregarding available women with whom they were offered sex (Genesis 19:5-8), and their sexual desire was so strong that they persisted even after being supernaturally blinded (Genesis 19:11). Besides fitting the context of Genesis 19 itself, the sin of homosexual conduct fits the biblical details as a whole. It was the sin that epitomized the gross wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah—the “grave,” “ungodly,” “lawless,” “sensual conduct of unprincipled men” that tormented Lot as he “saw and heard” it “day after day,” the “corrupt desire” of those who went after “strange flesh.” And the homosexual conduct fits the judgment delivered by God. The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah amounts to a one-time judgment of capital punishment for all the citizens for their ongoing, complete homosexual behavior. Nowhere in the Bible does it even hint at the idea that stingy, non-hospitable, greedy people are worthy of capital punishment. But the Bible does make it clear that homosexual behavior was worthy of such punishment (Leviticus 20:13—see more below).

In summary, the pro-homosexuals offer three arguments in an attempt to show that Genesis 18 and 19 do not condemn homosexual behavior as gross sin. Their attempts fail at every turn. Therefore, based on the overwhelming biblical data, the traditional view—that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed for ongoing, pervasive and blatant sin of homosexual conduct—is the clear meaning of these chapters.

Leviticus 18:22-25 & 20:13, Reviewed Together

Leviticus 18:22-25

Passage: *You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination. Also you shall not have intercourse with any animal to be defiled with it, nor shall any woman stand before an animal to mate with it; it is a perversion. ‘Do not defile yourselves by any of these things; for by all these the nations which I am casting out before you have become defiled.*

For the land has become defiled, therefore I have brought its punishment upon it, so the land has spewed out its inhabitants.

Commentary: This passage was written to Israel under the Mosaic Covenant. Here, God says homosexual sex: 1) is an “abomination,” 2) defiles the people who engage in it (this defilement affects both pagan and Jew), 3) God’s punishment is on those who practice homosexual acts, and 4) God’s chosen land is pictured as vomiting out those who have defiled it.

Leviticus 20:13

Passage: *If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act; they shall surely be put to death. Their bloodguiltiness is upon them.*

Commentary: Here, homosexual sex is called a *detestable act* for which those who practice it shall be put to death. Those who engage in homosexual sex have their blood on their own heads. While the Mosaic Law made provision for many sins through a Temple sacrifice, no such provision was made for homosexual sex. God’s wrath toward those engaging in homosexual sex could not be assuaged through blood sacrifice. Immediate capital punishment was the penalty of this *detestable act*.

The traditional view states that Leviticus 18 and 20, taken together, show God’s clear hatred of homosexual behavior. As reinforcement of the heinous nature of this sin, God commanded capital punishment for those who commit homosexual acts.

Pro-homosexual Interpretation: The pro-homosexual offers two alternative interpretations to Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 in an attempt to prove that homosexual behavior is not sin. Their first argument states that the prohibition here was a religious prohibition, not a moral one. The second argument states that homosexual behavior was prohibited because it did not produce children, and God wanted the Israelites to be fruitful and multiply. I will review and examine each argument.

Pro-homosexual Argument #1: The pro-homosexual Christians deny that Leviticus 18 is a moral condemnation against all homosexual acts. Instead, they say, this is a religious prohibition against participating in idolatrous Canaanite temple worship, which happened to use homosexual acts in the worship of their pagan gods.

One pro-homosexual provided the following explanation of why Leviticus 18 is NOT a moral condemnation against all homosexual acts:

One of the most prominent themes weaving its way through the Bible is that of paganism and the constant call to turn from it. In connection with the call to turn from worshipping pagan gods is the admonition to turn from participating in a myriad of pagan rituals or practices. But most of us [today] have no idea what these practices were. They're now extinct and therefore totally foreign to our contemporary thinking. As a result, statements, like those found in Leviticus 18:22, may appear clear on the surface, but their application and context are not.

But what were these idolatries that the Israelites were to avoid? For starters, we discover that the Canaanites burned their children alive, performed sexual intercourse with animals and a host of other gross and detestable practices. Why did they [the Canaanites] do such bizarre things? FERTILITY! Canaanite religion was replete with practices believed to appease the fertility gods of the day...to win them [the Canaanites] the blessing of fertility in the form of rains, pregnancy and birth, fertility for their livestock and so on.

The Canaanite culture utilized cult prostitution as a way of promoting fertility. Devotees...would visit the shrine and use the services of male and female cult prostitutes prior to planting and...In this way they gave honor to the gods to ensure fertility.

Now, equipped with a bit of background on the text, let's look at the Leviticus passage again.

21 Do not give any of your children to be sacrificed to Molech, for you must not profane the name of your God. I am the Lord.

22 Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; it is an abomination.

23 Do not have sexual relations with an animal and defile yourself with it. A woman must not present herself to an animal to have sexual relations with it; that is a perversion.

If we look at the passage in context, we notice that the prohibition, against sex with a cult prostitute, is sandwiched right between two other forbidden pagan cult rituals: against child sacrifice and against women having sexual relations with animals.

So, if we refrain from ripping the passage from its context...we begin to see that Leviticus prohibits these acts for RELIGIOUS reasons, not MORAL ones. The concern is to keep Israel distinct from their idolatrous neighbors and serve no other god but Yahweh. If we don't catch the fact that male-to-male pagan rite prostitution was common in Bible times for promoting fertility, we will completely miss the point of the biblical condemnation and misconstrue verses like Leviticus 18:22 to forbid any and all same-sex be-

havior [jewishchristiangay.wordpress.com/2011/10/18/leviticus-18-what-was-the-abomination/].

So according to the pro-homosexual interpretation, in this passage God is not condemning homosexual behavior, as such, He is prohibiting Israelites from participating in religious ceremonies to false gods which happen to use sex with [male] cult prostitutes as part of their worship.

Response: Many intractable problems are created or unanswered by the pro-homosexual explanation. These are detailed below.

1) The pro-homosexual explanation openly admits that there were both male and female cult prostitutes. So if the meaning in Leviticus 18:22 regards prohibiting the Israelites from sex with cult prostitutes while taking part in pagan worship, then why doesn't the text also prohibit "lying with women" (the female cult prostitute)? If the pro-homosexual is indeed correct about the meaning of this passage, then in addition to saying *you shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female*, the text should also say, "you shall not lie with a female as one lies with a female." If the pro-homosexual is correct about the context, then the text is missing prohibitions against ceremonial sex with *women* cult-shrine prostitutes. But how could God leave out something that is such a grievous sin to Him? The answer, of course, is that He did not leave out anything. This text is setting up "wrong sex" vs. "right sex." The comparison here is homosexual sex is wrong versus heterosexual sex which is right.

2) The pro-homosexual author above states that the other Canaanite idolatrous practices (child sacrifice, bestiality, etc.) were "gross and detestable." He admits that the practices themselves were gross and detestable. Not because the pagans did them during ceremonies, but because these acts *themselves* are evil.

3) When one reads Leviticus 18, he quickly sees that God prohibits Israel from a whole host of sins and states that these sins "defile" the Israelites as the same sins have "defiled" the Gentile nations around them. Now, if these are just religious prohibitions and not moral ones, in what way have the Gentiles become defiled by the acts, since they are not in covenant relationship with God? But the text says that the Gentiles were defiled by these acts *BEFORE AND APART FROM* the Levitical code. The only way for these acts to defile the Gentiles apart from the Mosaic Law is if, indeed, these acts themselves are morally wrong.

4) Part of the pro-homosexual interpretation of Leviticus states that the word for "abomination" (Hebrew *toevah*, תועבה) is a word that is usually associated with idolatry. Therefore "abomination," here, means religious abomination, not *just* moral abomination. The fact is that it does not matter how a word is "usually" used. Context determines meaning, not some statistical average. And, in point of

fact, *toevah* is frequently used of “moral abomination,” not religious/idolatry abomination. Proverbs 6:16-19 says the haughty eyes, lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood and a heart that devises wicked schemes are all abominations (*toevah*) to God, and none of these sins have to do with religious idolatry.

5) Lastly, if (as the pro-homosexual says) the context of this passage is actually about separating Israel from idolatrous religion and not about morality, then not only would homosexual behavior be permissible when not done in pagan idolatrous worship, all the other sins mentioned in Leviticus 18 would be permissible too—as long as they were not performed in the setting of idolatrous worship. Do not miss this point. If the pro-homosexual logic is correct, then incest, adultery, bestiality, and others are not sin, in and of themselves—they would be permissible at all times, except when they are done in the context of the worship of a false god.

The pro-homosexual understands this problem all too well. His response to this dilemma is to make an arbitrary claim that, while Leviticus 18 is about separation from pagan idolatry, some of the sins the pagans practiced (bestiality, adultery, child sacrifice) were to be avoided because they are evil in themselves, while other prohibitions mentioned were only evil because they were associated with pagan idolatry (homosexual sex) [jewishchristiangay.wordpress.com/2011/10/18/leviticus-18-what-was-the-abomination/]. Actually, when you read their arguments, homosexual behavior just happens to be **THE ONLY SIN** that is not evil, in and of itself.

The pro-homosexual has two choices with each of the prohibitions mentioned in Leviticus 18. *Either* it is a sin, in and of itself, *or* it is condemned only as a religious prohibition. If it is just a religious prohibition, then that act would be permissible at any time except when connected to a pagan ritual. But no thinking pro-homosexual Christian would say that bestiality, incest, adultery and child sacrifice are generally permissible. But if bestiality and child sacrifices are ALWAYS morally offensive, then why make the claim that homosexual sex isn't ALWAYS morally offensive—when the passage itself makes no such assertion.

The pro-homosexual might try to avoid the embarrassment of admitting that homosexual sex is the *one and only* prohibition that is *just* a religious prohibition by claiming that some of the other listed sins were *just* religious prohibitions, too. But, take note—even if the pro-homosexual were to claim one of the other prohibitions mentioned, say, sex with your neighbor's wife (v. 20), was not sin for Israel, in and of itself, it was just a religious prohibition, they would then have to prove that “sex with your neighbor's wife,” was actually used during an idolatrous ceremony to a pagan god. Remember, their argument is that homosexual behavior is prohibited, not because it is sin itself, but because it was done in pagan ceremonies. Therefore, to prove that some of the other prohibitions mentioned in Leviticus 18 are not sin, as such, they would have to claim

that they were prohibited for the same reason that they say homosexual acts were prohibited—namely, because they were used in pagan worship ceremonies. But no one anywhere is claiming that sex with your neighbor's wife was used in worship of false gods. Therefore, the pro-homosexual is left with the embarrassing admission that the only prohibition in Leviticus 18 that is not sin, in and of itself, is the prohibition against homosexual behavior, which just happens to be the one prohibition they NEED to be *just* a religious prohibition. This is a highly significant and revealing point. This illogical abuse of the text reminds me of Peter's warning in 2 Peter 3:16—the *unstable and untaught distort...the Scriptures to their own destruction*.

As we can easily see, the pro-homosexual counter argument, that some of the prohibitions mentioned were sin, as such, is baseless, arbitrary, and capricious. One would rightfully ask, "How do you know which 'sins' are evil of themselves, and how do you know which ones are only religious prohibitions?" The answer seems to be—"Ask the person who is pro-homosexual, he will explain it to you."

Further, the pro-homosexual's problem cannot be avoided *even if* one grants the arbitrary distinction they make that homosexual acts are not sin, in and of themselves, while the rest of the sins mentioned are. The pro-homosexual still has to deal with Leviticus 20:13, **which is not in the context of separation from pagan practices**, the context is separation from sin itself. In this verse, participants in homosexual sex are to suffer capital punishment, simply for engaging in homosexual sex.

Pro-homosexual Argument #2: A second interpretation used by the pro-homosexual Christians is that homosexual practices were forbidden in Leviticus 18 because homosexual relations did not produce children. God wanted the Israelites to be fruitful and multiply, but He knew that homosexual sex won't produce children, therefore, He prohibited it. It is not, they say, that God thought homosexual behavior was evil. It just didn't accomplish His goal of making Israel a numerous people.

Response: This supposed reason creates more problems than it solves. First, if the prohibition against homosexual behavior is because it did not create children, then why put offenders to death for homosexual acts—for you can't have any more children when you are dead. If the problem was that they weren't having enough children, then the punishment for homosexual sex should be making the homosexual man marry many wives. God should have made polygamy the punishment for homosexual acts. For this produces the most children. It makes no sense to have capital punishment for homosexual conduct unless it was a moral offense to God. Under the Mosaic Law, some severe sins carried with them the penalty of capital punishment: for example, murder (Exodus 21), idolatry (Exodus 20), and blaspheming the name of the Lord (Leviticus 24).

Other sins carried lesser punishments. To prescribe capital punishment for homosexual behavior only makes sense if this act was a severe affront to the character of God.

Furthermore, the supposed reason for the restriction [homosexual behavior doesn't produce children] is not given in the text. That reason is only there when you try to read between the lines, but when you read the lines, you don't find that reason. Furthermore, Leviticus 18:24 says the homosexual act has defiled the Gentile, too. If Leviticus was condemning homosexual acts because it did not produce children for the Israelites, then why say it defiled the Gentiles, too? God was not trying to make the Gentiles have a lot of children. The reason the Gentiles were defiled by homosexual behavior is the same reason the Israelites were defiled by it—because it is a moral abomination to God.

In summary, both of the pro-homosexual alternative interpretations of Leviticus 18 and 20 fail to show that homosexual behavior is not sin. Therefore, the traditional interpretation that all homosexual acts are an abomination before God should be maintained.

Romans 1:25–27

Passage: *For they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.*

Commentary: Homosexual behavior here is called *unnatural* and *indecent acts*, and by homosexual sex, these people have received *due penalty of their error*. Further, the desire for homosexual sex is called *degrading passions*. This passage, written to the church not Israel, is further confirmation for the traditional view that God hates homosexual behavior—He hates it in any age, by all people of any race, nationality, or ethnic origin.

The Pro-homosexual Interpretation: The pro-homosexuals say that this passage is God's condemnation of *heterosexuals* who have *abandoned their natural desire for women* and have participated in homosexual sex (for whatever reason). They further state that this passage isn't talking about homosexuals **at all**, and therefore, Romans 1 cannot be used to prove homosexual behavior is sin.

Their argument is based on the idea that the term “natural” is a sociological phrase, not a biological one. They say that Paul is here describing what is “natu-

ral” for a person subjectively, based on his or her sexual orientation, not what is “natural” objectively and biologically. “Natural” for a heterosexual is to desire the opposite sex. So, if you are “naturally” heterosexual, then homosexual acts (for you) would be going against your “nature,” and thus, sin. “Natural” for a homosexual is to have desire for the same sex. It is not, they say, that God condemns homosexual acts as such. He only condemns homosexual acts for those who are “naturally” of heterosexual persuasion.

Pro-homosexual John Boswell explains:

The persons Paul condemns are manifestly not homosexual: what he derogates are homosexual acts committed by apparently heterosexual persons. The whole point of Romans 1, in fact, is to stigmatize persons who have rejected their calling, gotten off the true path they were once on [Boswell, p. 100].

In short, the pro-homosexual says, Paul, in Romans 1, describes heterosexuals who have deliberately committed homosexual acts, thus violating their “natural” sexual orientation. According to the pro-homosexual position, homosexual conduct, if committed by true homosexuals, is not a sin.

Response: The assumption that Paul is here discussing sociological terms not biological terms is completely unfounded. There is nothing in his wording to suggest he even recognized such a thing as a “natural” homosexual versus an “unnatural” one. He simply describes homosexual behavior as unnatural, no matter who commits it.

The context of Romans 1:18-32 is that of the General Revelation of God. General Revelation describes the concept that God has made certain truths about Himself and His order of creation known to everyone who has ever lived. These truths are *written on our hearts* (Romans 2:14, 15). We cannot not know them, for they are *self evident* (Romans 1:19). It is within this context that Paul is describing “natural” and “unnatural.” Paul is talking about what is OBJECTIVELY natural and unnatural, based on God’s revelation, not what is sociologically or subjectively natural. Notice also that this condemnation of homosexual acts is right in the middle of Paul’s discourse of General Revelation, i.e., Paul is not speaking to some localized aberration of pedophilia or cult prostitution in the Mediterranean area. This passage is about all of creation.

Observe that, to support his argument, Paul uses biological terms, not sociological terms. *Men with men, committing indecent acts* and *women exchanging the natural function* are biological terms. Paul says that “biological” men committed sinful acts with other “biological men.” He is not saying that a *straight* person committed an indecent act by momentarily acting *gay*. He is saying that homosexual behavior is unnatural to people “as males and females” not as heterosexuals. He is not referring to, nor does he even consider the concept, of sexual

“orientation.” Further, the text says that those who engage in homosexual acts had to “exchange” the natural for the unnatural. Given that the text defines “natural” in terms of God’s created order, then homosexual orientation is NOT “natural,” that is, something they were born with. They had to *exchange* the natural to *get the unnatural desire* for the same sex.

Additionally, the fact these men were *burning in lust* for each other makes it highly unlikely they were heterosexuals experimenting with homosexual sex. Their behavior was born of an intense, unnatural desire for the same sex.

Besides all this, if verses 26-27 condemn homosexual actions committed by people to whom they did *not* come “naturally,” but do not apply to people to whom those actions *do* come naturally, then does not consistency compel us to also allow the practices mentioned in verses 29-30—so long as the people who commit them are people to whom they *do* come naturally? Is it okay for people to commit murder, gossip, and hate God if it is their “natural” inclination to do so? One would have to believe this conclusion if he accepts the pro-homosexual logic here.

The assumption that Paul is discussing “natural” sexual persuasion is completely unfounded and not only not supported by the text, it is contradicted by the wording of the text. In addition to this intractable problem, if the rest of the passage were interpreted under the same scheme, then the other sins mentioned become non-sins for those people who find them “natural.” In short, the pro-homosexual interpretation fails to defeat the conclusion that all homosexual behavior is sin.

1 Corinthians 6:9 & 1 Timothy 1:8-11, Reviewed Together

1 Corinthians 6:9

Passage: *Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals.*

Commentary: The passage calls on its readers to not believe the lie that homosexual acts are morally acceptable to God. In this English translation, the word “effeminate” seems to be speaking of a person’s demeanor, that is, a man with a feminine personality rather than strongly masculine. In the Greek, the word translated “effeminate” is the word *malakoi* (Greek: μαλακοί). This word describes the passive partner in homosexual male sex. The word is talking about actions, not demeanor. The word translated “homosexual” in this passage, also is not describing “persuasion.” This Greek word is *arsenokoitase* (Greek: ἀρσενικοίτης) and as used here is describing the active partner in homosexual male sex. The text says that both of these actions are unrighteous, and those who do these acts will not inherit the kingdom of God.

1 Timothy 1: 8-11

Passage: *But we know that the Law is good, if one uses it lawfully, realizing the fact that law is not made for a righteous person, but for those who are lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers and immoral men and homosexuals and kidnappers and liars and perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound teaching, according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, with which I have been entrusted.*

Commentary: Here those who practice homosexual sex (the *arsenokoitase*) are grouped with the ungodly, sinners, unholy, profane, and contrary to the sound teaching of the glorious Gospel of God.

The Pro-homosexual Interpretation: The arguments put forth by pro-homosexuals for 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1:8-11 are very similar, so they will be addressed together.

Pro-homosexual Argument #1: We should not believe that God is against homosexual behavior because Paul is just giving his opinion in these passages, not prohibitions from God. The pro-homosexuals say that Paul fully admits that the things he writes are just his opinions—not commandments from God. To back up their claims, they quote 1 Corinthians 7:12, *I [Paul] say, not the Lord* and 1 Corinthians 7:25, *I [Paul] have no command from the Lord, but I give my opinion*. Therefore, they claim, the prohibitions mentioned in 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1 are just Paul's opinions, not God's condemnation of homosexual conduct.

Response: The pro-homosexual's arguments take Paul's phrases out of context. Paul is not saying that these are just his opinions, devoid of moral judgment. Paul fully believed and wanted his readers to believe that, when writing his epistles, his words were the same as God's words. In 1 Corinthians 2:13, he claims his words are *taught by the Spirit*. In 1 Corinthians 7:40, he claims, *I have the Holy Spirit*, and in 14:37, he states that he is writing the commands of the Lord. What Paul means is that Jesus never spoke to the matter under discussion in 1 Corinthians 7. Therefore, Paul was now addressing it, and as an apostle of God, who speaks the words of God, Paul's words were just as divinely authoritative as the words of Jesus on the matter. One would rightly ask the pro-homosexual if the fact that the Mosaic Law does not apply to Christians is just Paul's opinion. And if that is *just* Paul's opinion, then the Law must still be operative, and since that is the case, should we continue capital punishment for homosexual behavior? Do you want that part of Paul's writings to be "just his opinion"?

Pro-homosexual Argument #2: This view holds that 1 Corinthians 6:9 is condemning homosexual “offenses,” not homosexual acts, per se. They claim that there is good homosexual behavior and bad. Paul is only condemning the bad type (rape, promiscuity, etc.).

Response: This is clearly reading into the text, not out of it. The passage never mentions “homosexual offenses.” It just condemns those who perform homosexual acts. As with the other pro-homosexual interpretations, an immediate problem arises when we apply their assumptions to the rest of the passage. If the pro-homosexual was consistent in his interpretive method, then he must conclude the passage is teaching that there are good drunks and bad drunks, and this passage is only condemning the bad ones. Are there good fornicators and bad fornicators? Are there good idolaters and bad idolaters, such that idolatry is okay, if you do it in a manner of which God approves?

Pro-homosexual Argument #3: We don’t know for sure what the words *arsenokoitase* and *malakoi* mean. *Arsenokoitase* is a word coined by Paul. It never appeared in Greek literature before he used it in these Scriptures. There were, at the time, other words for “homosexual.” Had Paul meant to refer to homosexuality, he would have used one of the words already in existence. Most likely, he was referring to male prostitution, which was common at the time.

Boswell points out that the word is peculiar to Paul, suggesting Paul did not have typical homosexual behavior in mind when he used it [Boswell, p. 109]. Prostitution is Boswell’s first choice for what Paul is condemning. If not that, he suggests Paul was condemning general immorality. At any rate, the term, according to this argument, means some sort of immoral man but not a homosexual. Dr. Helminiak agrees with this line of thinking, suggesting that *arsenokotase* might mean masturbators, those who practice heterosexual anal sex, sodomites or catamites [visionsofdaniel.net/paperSummaryOfWhatBibleReallySays.htm]. Helminiak’s conclusion is “there is no good reason to suppose that these texts apply to consensual, respectful, homosexual acts, per se, especially since such an interpretation would conflict with all the rest of the Bible.”

Response: Paul coined many new words in his writings. But the words Paul used, even if they are original, must fit the context in which he was writing. And Paul’s context was describing serious ongoing sin. **Context determines meaning.** Even if Paul coined this word (*arsenokoitase*), it is highly likely that Paul did so by combining two words from the Greek version of the Old Testament.

The Greek of Leviticus 18:22 reads:

“kai meta **arsenos** ou koimethese **koiten** gyniakos”
And with **male** not you shall lie **have sex** female

And that of Leviticus 20:13 reads:

“hos	an	koimethe	meta	arsenos koiten	gynaikos”
Whoever		lies down	with	male has sex	female

Remember that these two passages specifically condemn homosexual behavior in the Old Testament, even prescribing capital punishment for those who practice it (see argument above). It is easy to see that Paul could have combined words from these passages to create the word he used in 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1:8-11 (*arsenokotase*). The meaning, then, could not be clearer: Though the term is unique to Paul, it refers specifically to homosexual behavior.

Notice also that Helminiak’s conclusion that this passage could not be talking about consensual homosexual sex is based on his assumption that the rest of the Bible does not condemn such acts. But, we have already clearly seen that this assumption is just wrong.

Conclusion: When the evidence is weighed, the pro-homosexual arguments fail at each turn. Therefore, the conclusion that homosexual acts are sin stands.

What the Bible has to say about homosexual conduct is very emphatic and very clear. Here is a summary:

- 1) It is an abomination to God.
- 2) It defiles those who practice it.
- 3) God’s punishment is on those who engage in it.
- 4) Under the Mosaic Law, it was considered a detestable act worthy of capital punishment.
- 5) Worthless men practice it.
- 6) It is unnatural, a degrading passion, an indecent act.
- 7) Those who practice it will not inherit the kingdom of God.
- 8) It is ungodly, unrighteous, unholy, profane, and contrary to the sound teaching of the Gospel.

Some further observations:

- 100% of the verses addressing homosexual behavior denounce it as sin in the strongest possible terms.
- 100% of the verses referencing God’s ideal for marriage involve one man and one woman.
- 100% of the verses referencing parenting involve moms and dads with unique roles.
- 0% of 31,000 Bible verses refer to homosexual behavior in a positive or even benign way or even hint at the acceptability of homosexual unions.

Chapter 4

Is God's Moral Will *STILL* Expressed in the Bible?

At the beginning of this study, I stated that there were two ways to deny that homosexual acts are sin. The first way was to claim the Bible does not forbid such acts. We have just seen that it is a highly irrational argument to claim that the Bible does not forbid homosexual behavior. The Bible is emphatic—God hates homosexual behavior, and the attempts by the pro-homosexuals to explain away the biblical data fail miserably.

But, for the pro-homosexual, there is another method employed in an attempt to show that God is not against homosexual behavior. That path is to assume that God's moral will, *for people today*, is not expressed in the Bible. This argument briefly summarized says: "Because of the Bible's influence and the work of God in the world, the current moral nature of today's people and culture has actually progressed on many issues (such as homosexuality) *beyond* what the Bible's statements actually teach. That is, there is continued moral progression in culture after the writing of the Bible. Consequently, the current culture on such issues would have a superior ethic than the Bible's statements." So what God used to prohibit, He may now allow and even encourage, because culture has advanced such that what was once a moral evil is now a means of continued growth toward God's plan for humanity.

One of the greatest proponents of this rationale is Rob Bell, pro-homosexual and former pastor of Mars Hill Church in Grandville, MI. Bell states:

What we're seeing right now in this day, [is] God pulling us ahead into greater and greater affirmation and acceptance of our gay brothers and sisters. And we're realizing that God made some of us one way and some of us another. And it can be a beautiful thing. Some people are gay and want to share their life with someone and they should be able to. That's how the world is and we should affirm that. We should affirm monogamy, fidelity and commitment—both gay and straight.

So this is a huge moment when I think lots of us are realizing the old way of seeing things doesn't work. It causes so much pain and heartache. And God's inviting us to see things in new ways. And we need to say yes and then we need to step into the future together.

And I think what has happened with the Internet—you are all suddenly exposed to thousands of different viewpoints which can call your own into question and it can have this refining fire sort of dimension to it when you realize, "Wow, I've been living with a bunch of views and perspectives that don't actually work and don't actually bring life. So I need to be honest about that." And that can be painful, but it's also liberating. It's where the

life is [odysseynetworks.org/video/interview-why-rob-bell-supports-gay-marriage].

I think the ship has sailed and I think that the church needs to just...this is the world that we are living in and we need to affirm people wherever they are.

I think it's time for the church to acknowledge that we have brothers and sisters who are gay and want to share their life with someone. This is a part of life in the modern world and that's how it is. And that cultural consciousness has shifted, and this is how the world is and that what's happening for a lot of people [relevantmagazine.com/slices/new-interview-%E2%80%98why-rob-bell-supports-gay-marriage%E2%80%99].

Some people are gay. And you're our brothers and you're our sisters and we love you. At an early age I was like, some people are gay, and God loves them just like he loves me. And they are passionate disciples of Jesus just like I'm trying to be. So let's all get together and try to do something about the truly big problems in the world [apprising.org/2012/07/26/rob-bell-comes-out-gay-affirming/]. ...Like nuclear weapons and immigration [and] the addiction to technology and email and the ways in which people are overwhelmed by stress and worry and Jesus did say don't worry [christianpost.com/news/rob-bell-grows-frustrated-amid-questions-on-sinfulness-of-homosexuality-95209/].

Response: Since Rob Bell seems to be the most well-known and vocal proponent of the idea under question, I will use his statements to critique this view. However, my critique would be generally applicable to anyone who espouses this method of determining God's moral directives.

Notice that this position is not a biblical argument at all. It is purely philosophical, based solely on presuppositions and assumptions of the one who espouses the view. As such, it is somewhat difficult to evaluate from a biblical standpoint. Therefore, we will critique it primarily on a philosophical level, adding biblical data to hammer home the points.

1) One of this view's major problems is that it suffers from the "is-equals-ought" fallacy. This idea states that what *is being done*, *ought to be done*. But this does not logically follow. Christians are getting divorced at a much greater rate than they used to. Does this make divorce right? No, divorce is wrong because God hates it (Malachi 2:16). "Is" does not equal "ought." In Old Testament Israel, the people were consistently setting up idolatrous shrines and "high places." Does this make these shrines right? No. God hated them even though people were setting them up. "Is" does not equal "ought." Bell seems to think that the standards of the world should be the standards for Christians. He says, "I

think the ship has sailed and I think that the church needs to just...this is the world that we are living in and we need to affirm people wherever they are.” My question is, “Since when did the standards of the world become the standards for Christians?” The standards of *Christians* aren’t even the standards for Christians. The standards for Christians are in the Bible, not in what the world is doing. And since God’s Word doesn’t change, our standards don’t change.

2) This view assumes that culture is actually getting better. Why would one assume that? Why assume that, since culture is moving in a particular direction, it is a good direction? If the Bible is clear about anything, it is that men, left to their own direction, will always seek for evil, not God (Romans 3:11).

3) This view assumes that God changes, but nothing could be further from the truth. *I, the Lord do not change* (Malachi 3:6). James says there is no variation in God (James 1:17). God doesn’t even change His mind, *The glory of Israel will not lie or change His mind, for He is not a man that He should change His mind*” (1 Samuel 15:29). If God hated homosexual behavior in biblical times, He still hates it, because God can’t change.

4) Bell assumes tolerance and affirmation are virtues. But this is demonstrably false. Tolerating and affirming sinful behavior in those close to you is the very essence of hatred, not love. Only when you hate someone can you willfully allow them to do acts which are harmful to them. It is a fearful thing to fall into the judgment of the living God, and by affirming one in their sin, you are sanctioning it, instead of warning them of the peril ahead. This is not a virtue, it is hatred. Since homosexual acts are sinful, you cannot claim you love someone while affirming their homosexual lifestyle.

5) This ideology has a culturally-based ethic instead of a Bible-based ethic. Bell assumes that our system of morality is based on what the general culture is doing, not what God has defined. What’s worse, Bell has no standard of even judging this culture’s ethic. If the ethic is changing, by what can we measure its movement, unless there is a fixed, absolute ethic found in God? But Bell’s method seems disinterested in what the Word of God says. Bell says gay people should be able to share their life with someone in a homosexual relationship. How does he know that they should be able to do this? Who told him that this was right? What it really boils down to is, Bell gets to state what God is doing, and anyone who disagrees with him is not following where God is leading. This is utterly arbitrary and arrogant.

6) Bell doesn’t interpret the Bible as much as he uses the Bible. Bell talks about the Bible a lot, but he seems disinterested in its objective meaning. He speaks of creating heaven, but by “heaven” he doesn’t mean what the author meant by “heaven.” He talks about hell, but doesn’t mean the same thing the author meant by “hell.” Bell loves to talk about “love.” But “love,” for Bell, means making

sure everyone feels happy and included. But alcohol makes the alcoholic happy, so is it love to give alcohol to the alcoholic? No, it is hateful, because it destroys him. To a group of “homosexual Christians,” Bell says, “we love you and you’re our brothers and sisters.” But if homosexual behavior is sin, then accepting them without a call to repentance is hatred, not love. Love seeks what is good for the object of the love. You can’t tell sinners, “I love you” and at the same time affirm, “it is ok if you keep sinning.” The crux of the problem for Bell is that his love is fundamentally different from God’s love. For God does not accept people as willful sinners, He only accepts repentant sinners. He begs people to quit sinning and warns them of coming wrath if they don’t (Isaiah 1:18-20). Why? Because God loves them. Bell assumes that people can maintain a position of grace with God, even while committing willful sin. But this is not what the Bible teaches (Romans 1; Revelation 1–3). Isn’t Bell’s method consistent with the warning from Paul to Timothy, *For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but wanting to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires.*

On the other hand, Jesus portrays true love. Jesus says He loves the Father and keeps His commandments (John 14:31) and that He came to fulfill the Law (Matthew 5:17), but one of the things that was written in the Law was to call homosexual acts sinful. Bell says loving God is affirming gay people in their homosexual behavior. But Jesus says loving God is condemning homosexual behavior as sinful. Now either Bell is right or Jesus is right when they define love. They both can’t be right. So who is right—the eternal Son of God or Rob Bell?

One of Bell’s basic problems is he ignores the simple meaning of the text to create his own new “Christianity,” but sadly, it is a Christianity that brings death, not life. For life is found in Christ, and by Christ, I mean the Christ described in the Bible who said the whole Law is God-breathed, inspired, inerrant, infallible, and imperishable (John 10:34-35). Now this same law says homosexual behavior is an abominable act, and this same Christ does not accept sinners as sinners but rather advises people to stop sinning and repent (John 5:14; Matthew 4:17; 11:20). Bell has created a caricature of Christianity, with a Christ who is not identical with the Christ of the Bible. For Bell’s Christ thinks homosexual behavior is not sin. As such, he has created a false Christ, and faith placed in this false Christ is entirely misdirected. What I find fascinating is that the only way for Bell to claim I’m wrong is to go to the Bible to prove “his” Jesus is the real Jesus. But once he does this, he admits that the Bible is what settles disputes about Christianity, the very thing he cannot say and still keep his position regarding homosexual conduct.

7) This method denies the sufficiency of Scripture. This is obvious. If we need other people to tell us where God is leading morally, then the Bible is not sufficient to determine God’s moral will.

8) Bell's method contains an elitism and lack of clarity of the Bible. For, under Bell's system, there is no biblical basis for determining which direction we are moving morally or when we have arrived at the ultimate ethic. How does Bell know that affirming homosexual conduct is actually where God is leading? Bell simply assumes his assumptions are correct for the sole reason that they are his assumptions.

9) Bell's method suffers from subjectivism and relativism. Why think that homosexual relationships are the way God is leading us toward the ultimate ethic? The Bible says that in heaven people will not be sexually active but will be like the angels. Why not assume that God's ideal for this age is no sexual relationships at all? The only reason is because Bell says so.

10) Bell seems to believe that monogamous homosexuals aren't hurting anyone, therefore, it is right. Whether or not they are hurting anyone is highly debatable. There is ample evidence to suggest that homosexual relationships and homosexual actions are detrimental to society through increased medical costs, suicide rates, dissolution of legitimate family units, and the like. *BUT* that is not the point. The point is that homosexual acts are offensive to God—God is grieved by it, and therefore, it should not be done. And it certainly should not be sanctioned by the very people who call themselves followers of Christ.

In summary, the idea that the Bible does NOT express God's moral will for today's people is simply wrong. It is not a biblical idea, it is a philosophical assumption. But the assumption is baseless, arbitrary, and self-defeating. One would rightfully ask, "If the prohibitions in the Bible are no longer binding on today's people, is the plan of salvation by grace through faith in Christ still valid? Or was that *just* for people of the New Testament era?"

The conclusion, therefore, is that the Bible accurately expresses God's moral will for people at all times. Therefore, when the Bible condemns homosexual conduct as sinful, it means it is sinful for all people of all times.

Chapter 5

Are People Born Gay?

“I can’t change, even if I tried, even if I wanted to.”

Through the summer of 2013, the above chorus from a wildly popular, pro-homosexual song¹ echoed across the radio waves the strongly held belief that homosexual orientation is inborn.

While in the previous parts of this study I have been discussing homosexual acts themselves, I will now turn the discussion to sexual orientation. The use of the words “gay” or “homosexual” in this section means those who have sexual desire for the same sex. “Straight” means those who have sexual desire for the opposite sex.

Today, most believe that people are born gay or born straight, and there is nothing that can change that. What’s further, why would we even try to change it? From the pro-homosexual Christian’s standpoint, why would we even want to change what God has created us to be? God would never *make* someone gay when it was a sin to be gay, would He? What *loving* God would create a person with drive for the same sex, and then tell them they can’t exercise that sexual desire so that they either live alone for the rest of their lives or live in a relationship with someone they are not at all attracted to or even repulsed by? This is not the God of the Bible, says the pro-homosexual Christian.

So just what did God do? There are only two options. God either created some people with homosexual desire or He didn’t—there are no other options. There are two lines of evidence we will consider to answer the question. First, we will summarize the scientific data regarding the hypothesis that people are born gay. After that, the biblical evidence will be considered.

The Scientific Evidence

The idea that homosexual orientation is determined at birth is weighed against the evidence of many scientific studies, such as:

1. The study of slight differences in the hypothalamus region of the brain of homosexuals as hypothesized by Dr. Simon LeVay at the Salk Institute in San Diego, California.
2. Studies of identical twins:
 - a) Done by Dr. J. Michael Bailey from the Department of Psychology at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois and Dr. Richard

¹ *Same Love*. By Macklemore, produced by Ryan Lewis. From 2012 album *The Heist*.

C. Pillard of the Family Studies Laboratory, Division of Psychiatry, Boston University School of Medicine.

- b) Eight major studies of identical twins conducted in Australia, the United States and Scandinavia during the last two decades.
3. Studies of people who have changed sexual orientation from gay to straight.
4. Studies regarding homosexual orientation in the animal world.

Dr. LeVay's Brain Studies

Dr. LeVay studied the brain structures of 41 cadavers, 19 of whom were allegedly homosexual men, 16 of whom were assumed to be heterosexual men, and 6 of whom were assumed to be heterosexual women.

He found that some of the neurons in the hypothalamus region of the brain of heterosexual men were larger than those he found in homosexual men. He therefore theorized that if homosexual men had smaller neurons, then possibly these smaller neurons were responsible for causing these men to be homosexual. Likewise, if heterosexual men had larger neurons, then possibly these larger neurons caused them to be heterosexual.

He assumed that if the size difference in neurons could be shown to be true 100% of the time, this would be evidence that homosexual orientation was biologically based.

But upon review, LeVay's theory did not hold up to the evidence or even its assumptions. The following facts show the invalidity of the theory.

- 1) LeVay's own statistical chart, published in *Science* magazine, revealed that his theory was flawed. Three of the 19 homosexual men actually had larger nuclei than did the heterosexual men. Also, 3 of the heterosexual men had smaller nuclei than did the homosexual men. Thus, 6 of the 35 male subjects he investigated, or 17 percent of his total study, contradicted his own theory.² Yet in spite of this contradiction, the Associated Press reported that Dr. LeVay had *always* found that the nuclei were larger in heterosexual men and smaller in homosexual men.
- 2) There is no scientific proof or even reason for assuming that this region of the brain is even related to sexual orientation.

Dr. Nicolosi, renowned expert in same sex attractions, states: "We're talking about a general area of the brain that has to do with emotions, including

² "Homosexual Brains," Family Research Report, June/September 1991. See the evaluation of the original report in *Science* magazine available from the Family Research Institute.

sexuality; but in this *particular nuclei*, we have no clear understanding of what function it serves at this point.”³

Dr. Charles Socarides, Professor of Psychiatry at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York, states: “I believe this theory is completely erroneous. There’s no possibility of somebody developing homosexuality from hereditary or organic causes. It’s just impossible.” He further noted that “the question of a minute section of the brain—sub-microscopic almost—as... deciding sexual object choice is really preposterous.... Certainly...a cluster of the brain cannot determine sexual object choice. We know that for a fact.”⁴

- 3) It is not known if the differences in brain structures are the cause of the homosexual behavior or a consequence from it. Even if we could show that this area of the brain deals with sexual orientation, it might be the case that behavior itself might cause the differences we see in the homosexual brain vs. the heterosexual one. For example, Dr. Kenneth Klivington, assistant to the president of the Salk Institute where Dr. LeVay did his study, has pointed to “a body of evidence showing the brain’s neural networks reconfigure themselves in response to certain experiences.”⁵ Therefore, even if there was a demonstrable difference in the brain structure of the homosexual, such difference may be the *result* of homosexual behavior not the *cause* of it.
- 4) LeVay never verified the sexual orientation of his subjects. Some were *alleged* to be homosexual, some bisexual, but since they were cadavers with unknown histories, their sexuality was never certain.
- 5) There was researcher bias in the LeVay study. LeVay himself was gay and is on record saying his goal was to prove a genetic cause for homosexuality.⁶
- 6) The very measurement LeVay used is questionable. Do you measure the nuclei by size, by volume, by cell count or density? And why? There is no scientific evidence backing any method, and again, there is no evidence that this area of the brain even causes sexual orientation.⁷
- 7) No replication by other studies. To date, there has never been another study performed that shows that homosexual orientation is genetically determined.

³ Dr. Joseph Nicolosi, taped Interview for “The John Ankerberg Show.”

⁴ jashow.org/wiki/index.php?title=What_%22Causes%22_Homosexuality/Part_1

⁵ Dr. Kenneth Klivington, Newsweek, 24 February 1992.

⁶ Newsweek, 24 February 1992.

⁷ jashow.org/wiki/index.php?title=What_%22Causes%22_Homosexuality/Part_1

The Identical Twin Studies

The Bailey and Pillard (himself a homosexual) study revealed a serious problem to the idea that homosexual orientation is inborn. That problem is that identical twins often have different sexual orientation. But how can this be, if they share the same genetic make-up?

As identical twins have identical genetic make-up, it is much easier to interpret the findings as supporting the *nurture* rather than the *nature* theory. If a homosexual orientation is genetic, then 100% of all identical twin brothers should have been homosexual, but only half were. Therefore, it is easy to conclude that environmental factors, not genes, cause homosexuality.⁸

LeVay admitted that neither his research nor the Bailey and Pillard study have shown that homosexual orientation is inborn.

At the moment it's still a very big mystery. Not even my work nor any other work that's been done so far really totally clarifies the situation of what makes people gay or straight.... In fact, the twin studies, for example, suggest that it's not totally inborn because even identical twins are not always of the same sexual orientation.⁹

Other scientific studies conclude that homosexual orientation is not genetically determined.

- 1) Masters and Johnson stated: "The genetic theory of homosexuality has been generally discarded today... no serious scientist suggests that a simple cause-effect relationship applies."¹⁰
- 2) Dr. John Money, leading sex researcher at Johns Hopkins University, reported:

No chromosomal differences have been found between homosexual subjects and heterosexual controls. On the basis of present knowledge, there is no basis on which to justify an hypothesis that homosexuals or bisexuals of any degree or type are chromosomally discrepant from heterosexuals. He also stated: "The child's psychosexual identity is not written, unlearned, in the genetic code, the hormonal system or the nervous system at birth."

- 3) John DeCecco, the editor of the *Journal of Homosexuality*, said: "The idea that people are born into one type of sexual behavior is foolish."

⁸ In Richard A. Cohen, *Perpetuating Homosexual Myths* (Seattle, WA: Public Education Committee, 1992 rev.), pp. 18-19.

⁹ Dr. Simon LeVay, taped Interview for "The John Ankerberg Show."

¹⁰ William Masters, V. E. Johnson, R. C. Kolodny, *Human Sexuality* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1984), pp. 319-320.

- 4) Alfred Kinsey, noted sex researcher, believed that homosexuality was not biologically or genetically based. Rather, he admitted: “I have myself come to the conclusion that homosexuality is largely a matter of conditioning.”
- 5) Dr. van den Aardweg stated: “No genetic factor—sexual or otherwise—has been found that would differentiate persons with homosexual tendencies from others.”¹¹
- 6) Eight major studies of identical twins in Australia, the U.S., and Scandinavia during the last two decades all arrive at the same conclusion: gays were not born that way. Dr. Neil Whitehead¹² states identical twins have the same genes or DNA. They are nurtured in equal prenatal conditions. If homosexuality is caused by genetics or prenatal conditions and one twin is gay, the co-twin should also be gay.” “Because they have identical DNA, it ought to be 100%,” Dr. Whitehead notes. But the studies reveal something else. “If an identical twin has same-sex attraction the chances the co-twin has it are only about 11% for men and 14% for women.”

Because identical twins are always genetically identical, homosexuality cannot be genetically dictated. “No-one is born gay,” he notes. “The predominant things that create homosexuality in one identical twin and not in the other have to be post-birth factors.”¹³

Studies of Those Who Have Changed Their Sexual Orientation from Gay to Straight

The inability to find a genetic cause for homosexuality also explains why there are numerous examples of people who have changed their sexual orientation from gay to straight. In their 1970 report, the Kinsey Institute stated that 84% of gays shifted or changed their sexual orientation at least once. 32% of the gays reported a third shift, and 13% of gays reported at least five changes.¹⁴

The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescents followed 10,800 adolescents between 16 and 22 years old. Of the 16-year-old males who had exclusively same sex attractions at age 16, 61% had opposite sex attractions at age 17. 75% of adolescent males who had same sex attraction at 17 had opposite sex attraction at age 22. Dr. Neil Whitehead notes that the vast majority of orientation changes by adolescents (from either homosexual to heterosexual or from heterosexual to homosexual) are shifts from same sex orientation to opposite sex ori-

¹¹ The above quotes compiled by John Ankerberg in his paper “What Causes Homosexuality?” - jashow.org/wiki/index.php/What_%22Causes%22_Homosexuality/Part_2

¹² Dr. Neil Whitehead, Ph.D. Biochemistry. New Zealand. Dr. Whitehead has studied the possibility of a genetic link to homosexuality since 1987 and has published numerous articles on the topic.

¹³ hollanddavis.com/?p=3647

¹⁴ See “Born That ‘Way’,” Family Research Report Special Report 1991.

entation. Based on the data, 16 year olds with same sex attraction are “25 times more likely to change towards heterosexuality at age 17, than those with heterosexual orientation are likely to change toward bi-sexuality or homosexuality.” This means that heterosexuality is 25 times more stable than homosexuality. It also seems to suggest that heterosexuality is the “default orientation,” that is, it is natural. What’s more is that approximately 3% of the current heterosexual population claim that they once had, but no longer have, either same sex or bi-sex attraction. That means there are more people who have changed to exclusively heterosexual attraction [from same sex or bi-sex attraction] than there are currently homosexuals and bisexuals combined. Dr. Whitehead states: “Ex-gays outnumber actual gays.” Moreover, it is noteworthy that the people in this study who change to opposite sex attraction did so without *any* influence from a faith-based organization. They changed “on their own” from natural life experiences. This study was a project by UNC Chapel Hill, mandated by the United States government. This data was published in the Archives of Sexual Behavior in 2007.

Switching your sexual orientation should be impossible if you are genetically pre-wired for a specific orientation. But it is not impossible. Therefore, sexual orientation is not inborn.

The Studies Regarding Homosexuality in the Animal Kingdom

The pro-homosexuals point to supposed homosexual activity in the animal kingdom as further evidence that homosexual orientation is natural. Their argument goes as follows:

Premise 1: Homosexual behavior is observable in animals.

Premise 2: Animal behavior is determined by their instincts.

Premise 3: Nature requires animals to follow their instincts.

Premise 4: Therefore, homosexuality is in accordance with animal nature.

Conclusion: Since man is also animal, homosexuality must be in accordance with human nature.

Pro-homosexuals cite many examples of homosexual activity in the animal world. Because the examples are quite similar in nature, only a few will be listed here.

- 1) It is sometimes observed that male animals will mount other male animals. The pro-homosexuals claim this as an example of animals desiring homosexual sex based on a supposed homosexual orientation in animals.
- 2) Two males or two females of certain primates, for example, bonobo monkeys, will sometimes rub each other’s genital areas. Again, this action is claimed by the pro-homosexuals to be proof of homosexual orientation in the animal world.

- 3) Some same-sex animal couples have formed supposed life-long relationships. For example, the male “homosexual” penguin couple of the San Francisco zoo. Two male penguins, Harry and Pepper, “coupled” from 2003 through 2009. The pair nested together and even incubated an egg laid by another penguin in 2008. The pro-homosexuals claim this as a clear example of a natural homosexual orientation in animals.

Response: Many scientists have studied these apparently homosexual acts and have concluded the following:

- 1) These acts are infrequent at best and can be explained by other factors than homosexual orientation. Consequently, it cannot be claimed that homosexuality is an “instinct” or is “natural” for animals.

To explain this abnormal behavior, the first observation must be the fact that animal instincts are not bound by the absolute determinism of the physical laws. In varying degrees, all living beings can adapt to circumstances, by responding to internal or external stimuli. Second, animal cognition is purely sensorial, limited to sound, odor, touch, taste and image. Animals lack the human’s ability for reason. Therefore, animals frequently confuse one sensation with another or one object with another. Third, an animal’s instincts direct the animal to a certain goal in accordance with its nature. But differing animal instincts can conflict at any given time. Moreover, the conflict between two or more instincts can sometimes modify the original impulse. In man, when two instinctive reactions clash, the intellect determines the best course to follow, and the will then holds one instinct in check while encouraging the other. With animals that lack reason, when two instinctive impulses clash, the one most favored by circumstances prevails.¹⁵ At times, these internal or external stimuli affecting an animal’s instinctive impulses result in cases of apparent “homosexuality.”

Since animals lack reason, their means of expressing their affective states (fear, pleasure, pain, desire, etc.) are limited. Animals lack the rich resources at man’s disposal to express his sentiments. Man can adapt his way of talking, writing, gazing, gesturing in untold ways. Animals cannot. Consequently, animals often express their affective states ambiguously. They “**borrow,**” so to speak, the manifestations of the instinct of reproduction to manifest the instincts of dominance, aggressiveness, fear, gregariousness and so on.¹⁶ [Emphasis mine]

Bonobo monkeys are a typical example of this “borrowing.” These primates, from the chimpanzee family, engage in seemingly homosexual behavior to express acceptance and other affective states. Thus, Frans B. M. de Waal, who spent hundreds of hours observing and filming bonobos, says:

¹⁵ narth.org/docs/animalmyth.html

¹⁶ Ibid.

There are two reasons to believe sexual activity is the bonobo's answer to avoiding conflict.

First, anything, not just food, that arouses the interest of more than one bonobo at a time tends to result in sexual contact. If two bonobos approach a cardboard box thrown into their enclosure, they will briefly mount each other before playing with the box. Such situations lead to squabbles in most other species. But bonobos are quite tolerant, perhaps because they use sex to divert attention and to diffuse tension.

Second, bonobo sex often occurs in aggressive contexts totally unrelated to food. A jealous male might chase another away from a female, after which the two males reunite and engage in scrotal rubbing. Or, after an adult female hits a juvenile, the latter's mother may lunge at the aggressor, an action that is immediately followed by genital rubbing between the two adults.¹⁷

Like bonobos, other animals will mount another of the same sex and engage in seemingly “homosexual” behavior, although their motivation may differ. Dogs, for example, usually do so to express dominance. Cesar Ades, ethologist and professor of psychology at the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil, explains, “When two males mate, what is present is a demonstration of power, not sex.”¹⁸

And further:

Usually, an un-neutered male dog will mount another male dog as a display of **social dominance**—in other words, as a way of letting the other dog know who's boss. While not as frequent, a female dog may mount for the same reason.¹⁹

Dogs will also mount one another because of the vehemence of their purely chemical reaction to the smell of an estrus female:

Not surprisingly, the smell of a female dog in heat can instigate a frenzy of mounting behaviors. Even other **females who are not in heat will mount those who are**. Males will mount males who have just been with estrus females if they still bear their scent....And males who catch wind of the estrus odor may mount the first thing (or unlucky person) they come into contact with.²⁰

¹⁷ [7] Frans B. M. de Waal, “Bonobo Sex and Society,” *Scientific American*, Mar. 1995, pp. 82-88, songweaver.com/info/bonobos.html

¹⁸ “Cachorro Gay?” *Focinhos Online*, 2.uol.com.br/focinhos/petsnodiva/index.shtml.

¹⁹ Jacque Lynn Schultz, “Getting Over the Hump,” *ASPCA Animal Watch*, Summer 2002, petfinder.org/journalindex.cgi?path=/public/animalbehavior/dogs/1.2.36.txt&template.

²⁰ Ibid.

- 2) The pro-homosexual's claim that certain animals form homosexual couples is grossly exaggerated and anthropomorphized.

In the aforementioned case of Harry and Pepper, the "homosexual" penguin couple, the end of the story is quite enlightening.

San Francisco's Fox affiliate KTVU reported in its story, "Gay Penguin Flies Straight":

"The San Francisco Zoo's popular same-sex penguin couple has broken up."

"Male Magellan penguins Harry and Pepper have been together since 2003. The pair nested together and even incubated an egg laid by another penguin in 2008, but their relationship hit the rocks earlier this year when a female penguin, Linda, befriended Harry after her long-time companion died.

"Zookeepers say Harry and Linda are happy and were able to successfully nest this year," reported KTVU.

But not everyone is celebrating Harry and Linda's newfound love. Some believe there can be no such a thing as an "ex-gay" penguin. Upon news of Harry's decision to fly the same-sex-coop, outspoken pro-homosexual activist and anti-ex-gay crusader Wayne Besen cried fowl: "Attempts to change sexual orientation are patently offensive, discriminatory by definition, theologically shaky, uniformly unsuccessful and medically unsound!" exclaimed a visibly angry Besen. "There is no 'ex-gay' sexual orientation. Harry is simply in denial. He's living what I call the 'big lie.'"²¹

The preponderance of evidence has led many pro-homosexuals to admit that homosexuality among animals is a myth.

In 1996, homosexual scientist Simon LeVay admitted that the evidence pointed to isolated acts, not to homosexuality:

... it seems to be very uncommon that individual animals have a long-lasting predisposition to engage in such behavior to the exclusion of heterosexual activities. Thus, a homosexual *orientation*, if one can speak of such thing in animals, seems to be a rarity.²²

²¹ americansfortruth.com/2009/07/15/gay-penguin-flies-straight/

²² Simon LeVay, *Queer Science: The Use and Abuse of Research into Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1996). 207.

Despite the “homosexual” appearances of some animal behavior, this behavior does not stem from a “homosexual” instinct that is part of animal nature. Dr. Antonio Pardo, Professor of Bioethics at the University of Navarre, Spain, explains:

Properly speaking, homosexuality does not exist among animals.... For reasons of survival, the reproductive instinct among animals is always directed towards an individual of the opposite sex. Therefore, an animal can never be homosexual as such. Nevertheless, the interaction of other instincts (particularly dominance) can result in behavior that appears to be homosexual. Such behavior cannot be equated with an animal homosexuality.²³

In summary, the scientific evidence does not support the claim that homosexual orientation is “natural” in the animal world. Therefore, one cannot attempt to claim that homosexual orientation is in some way “natural” for humans because it is natural for animals. This line of reasoning is simply contrary to the evidence.

But, here is the really significant issue that Christians should notice regarding the pro-homosexual’s depraved argumentation in this area. The pro-homosexual is claiming:

Animals practice homosexual behavior so it must be natural.
What is natural is morally acceptable.
Therefore, homosexual behavior is morally acceptable.

In short, the pro-homosexual is claiming: **“the animals do it so it must be morally acceptable.”**

It is this author’s opinion that the pro-homosexual has reached an all-time low by appealing to animal behavior to justify the morality of their actions.

I ask: “Since when did animal behavior become normative for human beings?” Animals do it, so why shouldn’t we? You want to know why? —Because they are animals, and we are humans, made in the image of God. You must have a depraved mind to even attempt this line of reasoning.

But, for the sake of argument, let’s apply their logic, that animal behavior is normative for humans. The following questions arise from that position:

Some animals kill and eat their young—Should humans do so?

²³ Antonio Pardo, "Aspectos mŽdicos de la homosexualidad," *Nuestro Tiempo*, Jul.-Aug. 1995, pp. 82-89.

Some animals kill their partner after mating and eat them—Should we do so?

Some animals barf up food for their young to eat—Is this desirable for humans?

Some animals eat their own feces or that of their children—Is this a good idea for us?

But, since people will differentiate between a sexual conduct and eating poop, they apply the “it-is-done-in-the-animal-kingdom standard of morality” to themselves in a selective fashion—particularly when it centers around their own fleshly desires. If the pro-homosexual wants to follow the animal’s supposed homosexuality as their moral example, then I suggest they follow the other animal’s rules of conduct, too. At least then they would be consistent in their morality.

In summary, the pro-homosexual claims that there is homosexuality in the animal kingdom. Based on that, it is natural and therefore must be morally acceptable for humans. We have seen that it is simply not true that homosexuality exists in the animal kingdom—the animals are getting a bad rap from the pro-homosexuals. Further, even if it were true, that fact would not make it morally acceptable for humans. Animals are not moral beings. They cannot sin. Humans can sin, and animal behavior is not morally normative for humans—the will of God is. God forbid that we attempt to live even lower than the animals to justify our own depravity.

Conclusion: The Scientific Data

There have been many scientific studies in the last 50-80 years to determine if sexual orientation is genetically determined or inborn. Not one of them has been able to prove the idea that people are born gay. What has happened, somewhat unexpectedly, is that many researchers have been led by the evidence to believe the opposite—**homosexual orientation is a choice.**

The Biblical Data

When analyzing the biblical data, there are several possible ways the Bible could address the idea that God created some people gay. First, there could be positive statements affirming that some people are created with homosexual orientation. Second, there could be denials of this idea by statements saying God *did not* create people gay. An analysis of the biblical data follows.

First question: Is there any statement in the Bible that explicitly affirms that God created some people with homosexual attraction. Answer: No. In all the pages of Scripture, there is not a single statement, no hint or inference, that can be drawn which affirms the idea that God has given some people a genetic predisposition toward the same sex. Not one.

There is, however, one passage that, although it does not mention homosexual behavior or orientation, the pro-homosexual uses in an attempt to prove that some people are born gay. That passage is Matthew 19:12. I will now provide a summary and response to the pro-homosexual argument regarding Matthew 19.

In the passage Jesus says:

*For there are eunuchs who were born that way from their mother's womb; and there are eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men; and there are also eunuchs who made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. He who is able to accept **this**, let him accept **it**.*

The pro-homosexual states that Jesus use of the word *eunuch* is a reference to a homosexual. Therefore, Jesus is here admitting that some people are born gay (born eunuchs).

Response: The answer to the pro-homosexual's argument, like all of our answers, comes from an analysis of the context which begins in Matthew 19:3. The question under consideration is, "*is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?*"

Jesus states the following about marriage:

- 1) From the beginning, God made two sexes: male and female (v. 4).
- 2) Because of God's design, a man shall be joined to a woman and become one flesh (v. 5).
- 3) What God joined, in the one-flesh union between a man and a woman, no man should separate—therefore, divorce is wrong.
- 4) Adultery is committed when a man divorces his wife (a woman) and marries another wife (a woman).

The disciples were amazed at how seriously Jesus took the marriage covenant. Because of the gravity of this situation, the disciples surmised that it was better to not marry at all (v. 10).

Before we proceed, we must notice one glaring fact about the context. That fact is that Jesus is talking about marriage of a man with a woman. He says God created two sexes, male and female, and God's design is for a male to join a female in a one-flesh relationship. This passage has nothing to do with homosexuals or homosexual behavior—these concepts are not even under consideration in the passage.

Now, we can consider Jesus' words about eunuchs. Notice that when Jesus speaks of eunuchs, He does so in His answer to the disciples' assumption that it may be better not to marry (v. 10).

What is a eunuch? The word translated *eunuch* is the Greek word *eunouchos* (εὐνοῦχος). According to the *Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, this word is used in several ways: 1) of a physically castrated man, 2) of those, who, although not having been castrated, are incapable of having children, and 3) of those who abstain from marriage, even though they are physically able to have sexual relations and children.²⁴

Notice that the lexicon (dictionary) does not list “homosexual” as one of the possible meanings for the word “eunuch.” There were other Greek words for homosexual, but Jesus chose the word “eunuch.” Jesus is here using “eunuch” as a figure of speech for those who, although born with the necessary anatomy, don’t have normal sex drive toward the opposite sex. Jesus affirms that there are some men who are born eunuchs—those men who have no, or very little, sexual drive toward women. Notice that some people have a strong drive toward the opposite sex (witness King David), and some, in rare cases, have very little. ***But having no drive toward the opposite sex is entirely different than having drive toward the same sex.*** Jesus admits that some men are born without much drive toward women, but He in no way admits that anyone is born with drive toward the same sex.

Notice also that, even if you try to make the word *eunuch* mean “homosexual,” you are left with a problem. For Jesus would then be saying that some people have made themselves homosexual for the kingdom of God (v. 12). But according to the pro-homosexual position, no one can make himself gay. For, the pro-homosexual says, homosexuality is *not* changeable. It is inborn and, therefore, permanent.

We now resume our investigation. We have heretofore seen that the Bible nowhere affirms the idea that people are born gay.

So are there any denials of this idea? Can we find direct statements saying that God *did not* create anyone for whom homosexual behavior is natural? Answer: Yes.

The aforementioned Romans 1 passage teaches that *EVERYONE* God created *KNOWS* that homosexual acts are *NOT* natural. Since homosexual acts are not natural for anyone, they certainly cannot be natural for a particular person who feels it is natural for him. The passage further teaches that any sexual desire for the same sex comes not from God but from fallen man himself. A review of the passage will settle the issue.

²⁴ Bauer, Gingrich and Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, p. 323.

Romans 1:18-32 teaches the unsaved world is guilty before a righteous God, because, even though God has given them plain, clear knowledge of His existence, moral law, and the coming judgment for offenders, they have chosen to ignore this knowledge and follow their own desires rather than God's.

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because that which is known about God is evident within them; for God made it evident to them (Romans 1:18-19).

So, humanity is guilty, not because they did not know information about God, but because they did know and willfully chose to suppress or hold down the truth God gave them.²⁵ Paul says people have the truth *already* or *innately*, because God Himself gave it to them, and they are guilty precisely because they have it and willfully exchange it for a lie. They did not have the lie first. They had the truth first and ignored it to live according to the lie. The source of humanity's problem is that we have exchanged God for what God has made, because we prefer the creature to the Creator (vv. 23, 25, 28a).

Once humanity selects to exchange the glory of God for that of corruptible man (v. 24), God gives them over to the lusts of *their* hearts (v. 25). In effect, God says, "Have it your way, but the consequences of having it your way is defilement of your bodies and life" (v. 24).

The reason God is righteous in this condemnation is that the evidence about God is so abundant and so clear (*being clearly seen*—v. 21) that God considers them *without excuse* (v. 20). For *although they [already] knew God; they exchanged* (v. 23) *the glory of God for corruptible things*.

In verses 24-32, Paul elaborates with some examples and consequences of those who denied God's General Revelation, specifically mentioning homosexual desire and homosexual acts in verses 26 and 27.

God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire [sexual lust] toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts.

Notice first what Paul says about sexual "function." By function, Paul is here describing sex acts themselves, and he says these acts are either "natural" or "unnatural." This text clearly labels heterosexual sex as natural and homosexual

²⁵ This is the knowledge of General Revelation. It does not save, but only serves to condemn. Special Revelation, the truth about Christ, is what, if accepted, provides salvation.

sex as unnatural. But what does “natural” and “unnatural” mean in this context? “Natural” means in accordance with God’s original design for humanity, since the creation of the world (v. 20), which design God disclosed in the revelation of His truth (v. 18) to *ALL* men, which revelation they, the guilty, *already* understand (v. 20). This God-supplied, innate *truth*, that everyone has, teaches that heterosexual sex is natural or God-intended and homosexual sex is unnatural or contrary to God’s design for humanity. And the paramount point for our discussion here is that this passage clearly states that God has made all people to *know* homosexual acts are unnatural by truth that is innately within them, written on their hearts, as it were (Roman 2:14-15). The passage starts with the statement *that which is known about God is evident within them, for God made it evident to them* (v. 19) and ends with the same affirmation, *and although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death* (v. 32). What things are worthy of death? The list of sins which goes before, one of which is homosexual sex.

So, according to the “truth,” *which everyone knows* (v. 32), it is “natural” to take part in heterosexual sex. And it is “unnatural” to take part in homosexual sex. What follows from this is, no one will be able to stand before God and claim that they thought it natural to perform homosexual sex, for they know it is not.

But we still haven’t answered our question—Did God make some people with desires for the same sex? In addition to clearly defining natural and unnatural sex acts, Paul has some very illuminating ideas on homosexual desire. Three times in Romans 1 Paul repeats a three-fold sequence describing the root of man’s rebellion against God:

- 1) Humans exchange God for what God has made; we prefer the creature to the Creator (v. 23, v. 25, v. 28a).
- 2) God hands us over to our own desires (v. 24a, v. 26, v. 28b).
- 3) We act, externally in our actions, and bodily in our sexual relations, in accordance with our own desires which results in our bodies being dishonored and doing things that are not proper (v. 24b, v. 26b – 27, v. 28c).

Paul says that since humanity willfully suppressed the truth God supplied to them, God abandoned them to the evil desires they pursued, *in their hearts* (v. 24). One of those evil desires is the desire for the same sex. Here Paul calls female homosexual desire “degrading passions” and male homosexual desire “sexual lust”²⁶. So it is clear that God hates these homosexual desires. But that is not the important point for our current discussion. The important point is that

²⁶ This word translated “desire” is the Greek word *orexei*, meaning a sexual lust. It is used only here in the New Testament and is different from the normal word for lust.

these desires did not come from God. These desires had their origin in the hearts of humanity, after they exchanged God’s truth for a lie. Therefore, homosexual desire or orientation is not God-given. God did not create *anyone* with sexual desire for the same sex. (The Bible says God doesn’t even tempt people to sin, let alone give people the desire for sin—James 1:13).

The logic of the passage is summarized here:

- 1) God created people with knowledge of the truth (vv. 18, 19, 32).
- 2) That knowledge is based on what is objectively natural—the way God ordered creation (v. 20).
- 3) That truth includes the knowledge of natural sexual function (vv. 26, 27). Heterosexual sex is natural and homosexual sex is unnatural, and by virtue of God-supplied knowledge, everyone knows this.
- 4) That truth God supplied includes the knowledge that punishment is waiting for those who perform these acts. They are worthy of death, and this denial of God’s revelation is the whole reason that His wrath is revealed (v. 32).

- 5) So what about the *desire* for homosexual sex?

We know that the desire for homosexual sex is called “degrading passions” and “sexual lust” (vv. 26, 27). And we can conclude that, if everyone knows that homosexual sex is sin, then everyone must know the desire for homosexual sex is also sin. (Just as fornication and adultery are sin, so is lust—which is mental desire for immoral sexual acts.)

But where did these desires come from? There are only two options—either from God or from man himself. (Some pro-homosexuals, ignorant to this argument, may claim that the desire came from Satan, but that instantly defines it as an evil desire, so they quickly drop this line of reasoning, as they are trying to maintain it is a good desire not an evil one.)

So did the desire come from God? No. God gave humanity over to these degrading passions. He did not give them the degrading passions, but He gave them over to what they had out of their heart.

Since the desire for homosexual sex did not come from God, it must originate in man. There are no other logical options, and this conclusion is exactly what the text teaches. James 1:13-14 hammers home the point:

Let no one say when he is tempted, “I am being tempted by God”; for God cannot be tempted by evil, and He Himself does not tempt anyone. But each one is tempted when he is carried away and enticed by his own lust.

If homosexual sex is sin, which we have already seen it is, then the desire for it or temptation to it, does not come from God—it comes from man’s own lust.

Lastly, even if, despite the foregoing arguments, one is still convinced homosexual desire is “natural” for them, this still does not make it right. For NATURE IS FALLEN—see Romans 8.

In conclusion, neither the biblical evidence nor the scientific facts support the hypothesis that homosexual tendencies are genetic or inborn. There is simply no proof that people are born gay.

Conclusion

In this study, we have clearly seen several things:

- 1) Objective morality does exist. Actions are either sinful or not sinful, and the determinative factor is simply God's view of the matter. Further, since God doesn't change, God's view of sin will never change.
- 2) We have seen that the meaning of any Bible passage lies in the context of that passage. Since meaning is objective, it will never change, whether anyone agrees with it or not.
- 3) We determined that each passage in the Bible that speaks of homosexual sex condemns the act as detestable to a Holy God. One-by-one, we witnessed that the pro-homosexual arguments simply do not achieve their goal and are inconsistent and/or self-defeating.
- 4) We reviewed the overwhelmingly clear data from both the Bible and science that proved, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that no one is born gay. God simply does not create people with a homosexual orientation.

With these in mind, we can now review the goals of this study.

There were two purposes to this study:

The first question under consideration was—Is homosexual behavior sin? For those who believe the Bible is the sole source for determining the mind of God, the unequivocal answer to this question is YES. The biblical data is substantial and clear: God hates homosexual acts. The distinction the pro-homosexual makes between so-called “good” and “bad” homosexual behavior is a distinction the Bible simply does not make. Homosexual sex is a sin no matter if it is done by Jew or Gentile, Christian or non-Christian, during Bible times or modern times.

The second purpose of this study was to determine if anyone is born gay. Considerable evidence was presented and the verdict has been rendered. No one has in-born homosexual tendencies. The source of such desires is man's own sinful nature—not a righteous God.

Appendix

Answers to Other Pro-Homosexual Arguments

1) 10% of the population is gay. Could so many people be wrong?

Below is a summary of the argument taken from Joe Dallas, a former gay rights activist and staff member of the Metropolitan Community Church.

In 1948, sex researcher Alfred Kinsey published “Sexual Behavior in the Human Male,” which listed his findings after taking the sexual histories of 5,300 American men. Kinsey reported that 37% of the subjects admitted at least one homosexual experience since their adolescence,²⁷ and 10% claimed to have been homosexual for at least 3 years.²⁸

Word was out—ten percent of the male population was homosexual! Knowing there is power in numbers, pro-gay theorists and spokesmen repeated the statistic relentlessly until it became a given: one out of every ten males was gay. Therefore, homosexuality was much more common than anyone had previously thought. The concept was extremely useful to activists when, decades later, they would ask how anyone could believe ten percent of the population was abnormal, immoral, or just plain wrong.

Response #1: The argument is exaggerated. Kinsey did NOT claim 10% of the male population was homosexual.

Kinsey’s wording was plain—“10% of the males surveyed claimed to have been homosexual for at least three years.” They had not necessarily been homosexual all their lives, nor would they necessarily be homosexual in the future. Future studies by the Kinsey Institute, in fact, would confirm that sexual orientation is not necessarily fixed, and may change throughout a person’s lifespan. The 1990 Kinsey Institute New Report on Sex states:

Some people have consistent homosexual orientation for a long period of time, then fall in love with a person of the opposite sex; other individuals who have had only opposite-sex partners later fall in love with someone of the same sex.

Response #2: The “10%” is misleading for two reasons:

First, Kinsey’s data was not taken from a population accurately representing American men. Dr. Judith Reisman, in her book “Kinsey, Sex and Fraud: The

²⁷ Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: Saunders Press, 1948), p. 625.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 638.

Indoctrination of a People” has soundly discredited Kinsey’s conclusions and methods. One of her important findings was that 25% of the men he surveyed were prisoners, many of whom were sex offenders. Naturally, a higher incidence of homosexuality would be found among prisoners, especially sex offenders, many of whom may have been in prison for homosexual behavior.

Second, subsequent studies have disproved the 10% claim. “USA Today” reported on April 15, 1993, a new survey of 3,321 American men indicating 2.3% of them had engaged in homosexual behavior within the previous ten years. Only 1.1% reported being exclusively homosexual.

This was only the latest in a series of studies proving Kinsey wrong. In 1989, a U.S. survey estimated no more than 6% of adults had any same-sex contacts and only 1% were exclusively homosexual. A similar survey in France found 4% of men and 3% of women had ever engaged in homosexual contacts, while only 1.4% of the men and 0.4% of the women had done so within the past five years. The article concluded, not surprisingly, that the 10% statistic proposed by Kinsey was “dying under the weight of new studies.”

A candid remark by a lesbian activist explains how the 10% figure stayed in the public’s awareness for so long:

The thing about the ‘one-in-ten’—I think people probably always did know that it was inflated. But it was a nice number that you could point to, that you could say ‘one-in -ten,’ and it’s a really good way to get people to visualize that we’re here.

If what she’s saying is true, gay spokesmen were willing to repeat something they knew to be false, for the sake of furthering their cause. With that in mind, one wonders what other “facts” on homosexuality (“gays are born gay,” “gays cannot change”) will someday be disproved as well-exposed as propaganda that people “always knew was inflated,” but promoted anyway because the end justified the means.²⁹

2) Jesus said nothing about homosexuality, therefore, it is obvious that He is not against it.

Oftentimes at gay parades, you will see someone holding up a sign which says “What Jesus said about homosexuality: _____.” The idea the homosexual advocate is trying to put forward here is that if Jesus did not specifically forbid a behavior, then the behavior must not have been wrong or even important enough to be mentioned.

²⁹Point 1 is taken entirely from <http://www.narth.org/docs/dallas.html>. Responding to pro-Gay Theology. Dallas, Joe.

Troy Perry³⁰ states:

As for the question, “what did Jesus say about homosexuality?”, the answer is simple. Jesus said nothing. Not one thing. Nothing! Jesus was more interested in love.

So according to the argument of silence, if Jesus did not talk about it, neither should we.

Response: The argument is misleading and illogical for four reasons:

First, the argument assumes the gospels are more authoritative than the rest of the books of the Bible. In other words, if a concept isn’t mentioned by Jesus in the gospels, then it must not be important. But this idea contradicts 2 Timothy 3:16, which says, *all Scripture is inspired by God*. If homosexual behavior is condemned anywhere in the Bible, it is sin, whether or not Jesus mentioned it. Should we conclude that pedophilia is okay, since Jesus didn’t mention it? Is internet pornography okay, since Jesus did not condemn it? How about wife beating or incest? It is obvious that this idea is false.

Second, this argument assumes that the gospels should address every relevant topic. But this is a false, baseless assumption. The gospels never claim that they are all we need to know to live godly lives. Jesus Himself promises future revelation which would guide believers into *all Truth* (John 14:26 and 16:13). Some of the Bible’s most important doctrines are not specifically mentioned by Jesus, for example, justification by grace through faith (Romans 3; Galatians 2), baptism of the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 12:13), the priesthood of the believers (1 Peter 2:9) or the priesthood of Christ (Hebrews). The fact that Jesus did not mention some things in no way makes them unimportant.

Third, the argument assumes because Jesus said nothing specific about homosexuality, that He said nothing about heterosexuality as a standard. But this is clearly false. Jesus referred in the most specific terms to God’s created intent for human sexuality:

But at the beginning of creation of God “made them male and female. For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh” (Mark 10:6-9).

In this passage, Jesus had been presented with a hypothetical question: Is divorce lawful? Instead of giving a simple yes or no, He referred to God’s created intent as the standard by which to judge sexual matters. By quoting Genesis, He emphasizes several elements of the created intent for marriage and sexual relat-

³⁰ Perry is a leader in the Metropolitan Church, a pro-homosexual denomination.

ing, one of which was for man to become *one flesh* with a woman. Male and female were designed as complimentary sexes. Male with male or female with female cannot compliment each other, nor should they be attracted to each other. It is like having two magnets and you are trying to join them. You cannot join the positive pole of a magnet to the positive pole of another magnet. By design, the positive poles repel each other. This should be the case with human sexuality. Two of the same sexes should repel each other. The reason they sometimes don't is that humans have a free will that can override God's design for sexuality by willfully engaging in homosexual acts.

3) The Levitical laws about homosexuality are not binding today.

Response: The prohibitions against homosexual acts in Leviticus were moral prohibitions, not ceremonial. This is clearly seen by the fact that the author of Leviticus states that around Israel, the Gentile nations themselves had been defiled by homosexual behavior. They were morally guilty for a moral abomination, regardless of their race and religion. Further, the New Testament condemnations against homosexual behavior are written to Gentiles, not Jews. Therefore, we can conclude that God hates homosexual behavior, no matter who does it.

4) Calling homosexuality sin is judging, and we aren't supposed to judge.

Response: This argument has previously been dispensed in several places in this short book. In summary, Jesus' statement, *do not judge so that you will not be judged* (Matthew 7:1) must be understood in context. Jesus is not prohibiting all judgment. He is warning those who judge that they, too, will be judged, and therefore, don't carry out justice against another and be hypocritical in your judgment. However, this should not be taken as a prohibition against judging sin in your neighbor. Jesus Himself says in Matthew 18:15-18 that we must confront our brother about his sin. This assumes that we call sin—sin. Jesus commands us to judge with “righteous judgment” (John 7:24). We do not condemn the person in our judgment of their sin. But we must condemn sin as sin. If we claim to love our neighbor, we cannot ignore or tolerate their sin, knowing full well that the One who does condemn hates their sinful actions.

5) My partner and I are in a monogamous, loving relationship, and we truly love each other. That can't be wrong.

Response: The biblical definition of the highest form of love (*agape*, Greek: ἀγάπη) is not emotion based, but volitional. Love is a choice to bring about the greatest good for the object of the love. If I love you, then I will exercise my will to bring about your greatest good.

Living in a relationship that is eternally damaging to both you and your partner is not love. Simply by being involved in a homosexual relationship you are demonstrating that you do not love your partner—for you are allowing him/her to take part in evil. You may have strong emotions for that person and claim you “love” him/her. But the relationship is sinful, and therefore, allowing them to be in it with you is not a loving act.

6) Isn't sexual orientation analogous to race, and therefore isn't discrimination based on sexual orientation akin to discrimination based on race?

This pro-homosexual argument can be summarized by the following argument:

Major Premise: Sexual orientation is analogous to the category of race.

Minor Premise: Race is a category protected by anti-discrimination laws.

Conclusion: Therefore, sexual orientation should be protected by anti-discrimination laws, i.e. gays should have the same civil rights protection as those afforded to race.

Response: The purpose of anti-discrimination laws is to protect categories of people (such as race or gender) from discrimination. These laws say it is wrong to discriminate against a person based on his race or gender, and it is right not to discriminate for reasons of race or gender.

The reasons these categories are protected are because belonging to that category: 1) is itself morally neutral, 2) is unchangeable, 3) was not due to one's choice, and to a lesser extent, because 4) discrimination has detrimental economic and political impact.

So we are not allowed to discriminate against a person because he or she is of a certain race because there is nothing morally wrong with being of that race. But notice, we are allowed by law to discriminate against certain categories of people, if being in that category is morally wrong. For example, landlords can discriminate (not rent to) sex offenders. By law, the landlord can choose to not rent to or can evict all people in the category of “sex offenders.” But the landlord cannot choose not to rent to or evict someone in the category of “female.” It is against the law for a landlord to discriminate against a person simply because she is female. Another example—it is discrimination for a police officer to pull over a driver simply because he is a minority race. But that same police officer is not guilty of violating anti-discrimination laws because he pulls over a drunk driver. In other words, it is legal to discriminate against drunk drivers because that action is morally wrong. (All people who engage in drunk driving are in the category of people who should be discriminated against.)

Now, back to the pro-homosexual argument that homosexual orientation should be a class protected by anti-discrimination laws.

Let's first analyze the major premise. Is it true that homosexual orientation is analogous to race? Notice that to be of a certain race: 1) you had to be born that way, 2) it is entirely based on your genetics, 3) since your genetics are immutable, you cannot change your race, and 4) since you can't pick your parents, your race is completely independent of your free choice.

So is homosexual orientation analogous to race? The answer is a resounding NO! Listing the reasons for the negative response: 1) no one is born homosexual, 2) sexual orientation is not based on genetics, 3) homosexual orientation is entirely changeable and 4) it is 100% based on your choice to be gay!

Therefore, the pro-homosexual's argument fails immediately, as we have clearly seen that their major premise is false. Homosexual orientation is not analogous to race. Therefore, homosexual orientation should not be a protected class in anti-discrimination matters, since it fails to meet the requirements for a class that should be protected.

But ignoring for the moment that homosexual orientation is not analogous to race, there is much more to be said about this idea regarding civil rights for homosexuals.

In the 1960s, America went through an era of minorities fighting for their civil rights. The argument of the civil rights leaders was basically that, while African-Americans are the minority ethnic group, there is nothing morally wrong with being a minority ethnic group, and therefore, as human beings, they deserved all the civil rights as Caucasians. The protestors were correct. They did deserve the same civil rights as whites, because minority rights should exist for minorities doing right. But minority rights should not exist for minorities doing wrong. Minority civil rights for doing wrong is a contradiction in terms.

Since homosexual behavior is morally evil, homosexuals, as homosexuals, do not deserve civil rights. As human beings they deserve civil rights—and they already have them. But to claim that homosexual orientation should be a class deserving civil rights' protection ignores the obvious fact that to be in this class is morally wrong. Drunks have civil rights as Americans, but they have no civil rights as drunk drivers. Therefore, we are right to discriminate against drunk driving because it is morally wrong—the drunk driver has no civil right to drink and drive.

I offer a new syllogism to consider:

Major Premise: A morally good society should not provide anti-discrimination protection to those engaging in morally evil behavior.

Minor Premise: It is morally evil to engage in homosexual behavior.

Conclusion: Therefore, a morally good society should not provide anti-discrimination protection to homosexuals.

Homosexuality and homosexual behavior are not civil rights, they are civil wrongs, and therefore, they cannot be afforded anti-discrimination protection.