

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

Homosexuality and Christianity - A Christian's Defense to Liberal Teachings

The Article below was written by Rev. Michael Piazza of the Cathedral of Hope in Dallas, Texas. In **Black** you will see Rev. Piazza's notes and research and in **Blue** you will see the Christian Arsenal's response to what the Bible really has to say about these issues.

You can find his article below at his church's website below:
<http://www.cathedralofhope.com/homosexuality/index.htm>

Homosexuality & Christianity

The Bible

In our Judeo-Christian society, the documents known as the Bible serve as the primary guide on most issues. It is interesting that many Christians take literally the references to homosexual acts while interpreting other text with great flexibility. One person reported listening to a nationally known woman speak in her campaign against homosexuality. She spent much time quoting impressively from Leviticus. The listener accepted much of what the speaker had said until realizing that by Levitical standards, the crusader had herself broken many biblical laws; women speaking in church, women teaching men, wearing a dress made of cotton and polyester, and probably others of which he was unaware.

(Here the author of the article is showing his ignorance of Hermeneutics and basic interpretative skills. Mr. Piazza seems to be assuming that all other Christians that do not believe his view of things must fall into the camp of the "Legalistic and Blissfully Ignorant". There were several laws and restrictions in the Old Testament that were not carried forth in the New Testament. For example, the wearing of a garment of mixed materials found in Deut. 22:11 is not mentioned in the New Testament. Various dietary restrictions were not carried forward into the New Testament as many other things were left as Christ came and fulfilled the Law of the Old Testament. For those who are unsure of what that means, read the book of Galatians, particularly chapters 3 and 5. There are sins listed in the Old Testament that were listed in the New Testament. Murder, gossiping, stealing, lying, and sexual impurity are mentioned in both.)

What does the Bible really say about homosexuality? Actually, very little. Jesus said nothing at all, which is most significant. Considering the relatively small amount of attention the Bible gives to the subject, we must ask ourselves why this is such a volatile issue while other subjects (e.g. judgment, pride, hypocrisy) about which the scriptures say a great deal, receive much less passionate attention. Before looking at specific passages, let us note that everyone understands the scriptures on and through the light of what they have been taught. The Bible was not written in a cultural void, and many of its instructions and laws we simply classify as less relevant today (e.g. prohibition of eating pork).

The author is correct that the Bible does not speak volumes about homosexuality. This was understood as wrong even by the morally low in the days of the OT and NT and it did not need to be addressed often in those days. The subjects of pride, hypocrisy and judging do need to be addressed more by the Church today along with other sins and inconsistencies in the Christian

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

life. (For a Biblical view of Judging and Discerning [CLICK HERE](#).) There are many subjects that the Bible does not speak directly on but there are still scriptures that address these subjects. For example the word "abortion" is not once found in the Bible. There is sufficient evidence in the Bible to prove that abortion is wrong.

Nowhere in the Bible is the idea of persons being homosexual addressed. The statements are, without exception, directed to certain homosexual acts. Early writers had no understanding of homosexuality as a psycho-sexual orientation. That truth is a relatively recent discovery. The biblical authors were referring to homosexual acts performed by persons they assumed were heterosexuals.

The reason that the Bible does not address homosexuals as an accepted life style is because that it is not. Just as living as an Adulterer, Thief, Fornicator, Liar or Alcoholic was and is not acceptable to God, living a homosexual lifestyle is not acceptable to God. Mr. Piazza states that *"Early writers had no understanding of homosexuality as a psycho-sexual orientation."* Using this as the reason homosexuality is not positively and definitively spoken of in the Bible can lead to serious problems. Let's examine some of them:

First, this calls the entire subject of "Biblical Inspiration" into question. This is simply saying that God was incapable of either foreseeing "homosexual psycho-sexual orientation", afraid of telling someone about it, or could not find someone open minded enough who was willing to introduce such a radical idea. Any of these afore mentioned choices are totally unacceptable. God knows the beginning to the end. God is not afraid to rock the boat or deliver an unpopular message. Consider Moses and Pharaoh, the Prophet Nathan and King David, John the Baptist and King Herod, Jesus and the Scribes and Pharisees and the many prophets in the Old Testament. Look what Paul went through to spread the message that God gave him. Look at the obedience of Ezekiel whom God asked to symbolize God's judgments in various peculiar ways. Finally, look at the obedience of Jesus, who was obedient unto death on the cross.

Second, consider that in the Bible you never find the mention of "gay couples". In the Garden of Eden it was Adam and Eve. If the Homosexual life style was to be so normal, then why didn't God put three couples in the Garden and set the record straight from the beginning? We would have had Adam and Eve, Hezekiah and Bill, along with Jezebel and Sally.

Third, this puts the definition of any and all kinds of sin subject to the social trends of the day. God is sovereign. He does not put things to a vote nor does He change His mind because of what society says. The problem here is that man is trying to reinterpret the Bible to justify his sin.

Fourth, Mr. Piazza states *"Early writers had no understanding of homosexuality as a psycho-sexual orientation. That truth is a relatively recent discovery. The biblical authors were referring to homosexual acts performed by persons they assumed were heterosexuals."* Let us examine what Mr. Piazza is saying here. The Biblical author's under the Divine Inspiration of the Holy Spirit were too ignorant to know that what these people were doing was actually OK because they were ignorant of the psychosexual make up of the people. Therefore the Holy Spirit must have also been mistaken and wrong in this instance. Thanks to recent discoveries we can shed these errors that have been laid on us by these ancient writers and the Holy Spirit. As far as discoveries that would have brought this to light, we are not quite sure what discovery he is speaking of but we remain confident that it is nothing that would hold water in a true academic situation.

The Sodom Story

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

A chief text for condemnation of homosexuality has been the Sodom story. This story has often been interpreted as showing God's abhorrence of homosexuality. In the story, two angels in the form of men were sent to Sodom to the home of Lot. While they were there, all the men of the city, "both young and old, surrounded the house --everyone without exception," and demanded that the visitors be brought out, "so that we might know them" (verse 5). Lot begged the men to leave his guests alone and take his daughters instead. The men of the city became angry and stormed the door. As a result, they were all struck blind by the angels.

There are several problems with the traditional interpretation of this passage. Whether or not the intent of the men of Sodom was sexual, the inhospitality and injustice coming from the mob and generally characterizing the community were "the sin of Sodom". Jesus himself refers to the inhospitality of Sodom. If, indeed, the men were homosexuals, then why would Lot offer them his daughters? What is threatened here is rape. The significant point then is that all rape is considered horrible by God. The story deserves another reading by all of us.

The Bible itself best interprets this story. **Sodom** was a city known for its sexual perversion and general wickedness. Let's look at what the Bible says about **Sodom**:

Jeremiah 23:14 I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem an horrible thing: they commit adultery, and walk in lies: they strengthen also the hands of evildoers, that none doth return from his wickedness: they are all of them unto me as **Sodom** and the inhabitants thereof as Gomorrah.

Jude 7 Even as **Sodom** and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

2 Peter 2: 6 And turning the cities of **Sodom** and Gomorrha into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly; **7** And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked:

Luke 10:2 Therefore he said unto them, The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few: pray therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest. **3** Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. **4** Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way. **5** And into whatever house you enter, first say, Peace be to this house. **6** And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again. **7** And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the laborer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. **8** And into whatsoever city you enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you: **9** And heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. **10** But into whatsoever city you enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, **11** Even the very dust of your city, which cleaves on us, we do wipe off against you: notwithstanding be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. **12** But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable in that day for **Sodom**, than for that city. **13** Woe unto you, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. **14** But it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment, than for you. **15** And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven, will be thrust down to hell. **16** He that hears you hears me; and he that despises you despises

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

me; and he that despises me despises him that sent me. **17** And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through your name.

The above-cited passage is used by Gays to prove that Sodom's sin was inhospitality and not Homosexuality. Their claim is that when Jesus spoke of Sodom he always used it as an example of inhospitality. The above passage does not define Sodom as inhospitable. It simply states that the cities that rejected those Christ sent out would find their treatment in the end rougher than that of Sodom. Look at the passage below. If we follow the method of interpretation that Mr. Piazza uses, we would have to conclude that Jesus changed his mind and that the great sin of Sodom is lack of faith.

Matthew 11:20 Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: **21** Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. **22** But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. **23** And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, will be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in you, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. **24** But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for you.

In **Ezekiel 16:49** Sodom is condemned for social injustice. So we can safely assume that Sodom had more than one type of problem, but the overwhelming scriptural references speak of Sodom a city of wickedness and perversity.

It should be noted that all of the men of Sodom could not have been homosexual or there would have been no need to destroy them since they would have all died off with no heirs. (I fail to see the logic of this point. Just because ALL of the men were not homosexual does not mean that many of them weren't. The Bible does not say that all of the men were. Christian Scholars do not make this statement either.) Quite likely they were a mixed group of evil men attempting to be abusive to people who were different. Ironically, lesbian and gay people are often the victim of that sin. (While this is true, they are also participants in this type of behavior just as other groups are. This is not a point of irony.)

Although the traditional interpretation of the Sodom story fails as an argument against homosexuality, there are several other Old Testament passages which do condemn homosexual acts. Again, it should be noted that these passages do not deal with same-sex orientation, nor is there any references to genital love between lesbian or gay persons.

This story in Genesis does not fail as a condemnation of Homosexuality. It is difficult to follow the reasoning of "there are several other Old Testament passages which do condemn homosexual acts." "Again, it should be noted that these passages do not deal with same-sex orientation, nor is there any references to genital love between lesbian or gay persons." The first two chapters of Numbers would qualify as proof texts for this. This statement is simply nonsense. What Mr. Piazza is saying here is that it is not condemned by his definition therefore it cannot possibly point to homosexuality. One could make the statement: "there are several Old Testament passages which do not condemn using LSD." Look at the book of Numbers chapters 1 & 2. You will not find one mention of LSD or Homosexuality for that matter in these scriptures. By using ridiculous statements like this, many are swayed to believe that there are supporting scriptures for homosexuality. After making this ridiculous statement, notice the next thing he says See Numbers chapters 1 & 2.

Homosexual Acts

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

Of thousands of Old Testament passages, only two make explicit reference to homosexual acts; Leviticus 18:22 and Leviticus 20:13. Both of these passages are a part of the Levitical holiness code which is not kept by any Christian group. If it were enforced, almost every Christian would be excommunicated or executed. It has been logically argued that science and progress have made many of the Levitical laws irrelevant for us. ([Science and Progress is not what keeps us from needing the Levitical Codes. Even though there is a keen interest for sanitation in the Law, Mr. Piazza seems to be overlooking Galatians chapter 3 and the whole book of Romans for starters.](#)) For example, Tim LaHaye states that, although Levitical laws prohibit intercourse during menstruation, medical authorities do not view it as harmful; and, therefore, it should not be viewed as sinful. He further explains, "those laws were given 3,500 years ago before showers and baths were convenient, before tampons, disinfectants, and other improved means of sanitation had been invented". With that, LaHaye makes this law irrelevant and rightly so. Ironically, though, in his book, *The Unhappy Gay*, the Levitical laws are one of the chief cornerstones. Much of the holiness code is now irrelevant for us as moral law. Thus, having children which was of exceptional importance to the early Hebrews is now made less relevant by overpopulation, just as the prohibition against eating pork and shell-fish has been made irrelevant by refrigeration. [Biblical Holiness is not irrelevant, 2 Corinthians 7:1 Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. 1 Thessalonians 4: 7" For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness."](#) In these two (Leviticus 18:22 and Leviticus 20:13) verses it is clear that there is a prohibition of the act of homosexuality. Gay theology maintains that since this is in the holiness code that it is no longer applicable. By the same reasoning then Leviticus 18:21 "And thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I am the LORD. A prohibition of sacrificing children by placing them on a fire-heated stone alter and watching them burn to death." is no longer applicable. We don't think so.

The Bible never addresses the issue of homosexual love, but has several examples of same-sex love. David's love for Jonathan was said to exceed his love for women. Ruth's relationship with Naomi is certainly an example of a deep, bonding love. The Bible does value love between persons of the same sex.

[Here is another point that homosexuals recognize but never seem to draw the proper conclusion as to why. God never provided guidance for the building of this type of relationship because He never intended this to be. The Biblical examples of David and Jonathan and Naomi and Ruth are deep friendships between the same sex persons, but there is no hint of erotic love here. These are strong friendships. As for Ruth and Naomi, this was a mother-in-law/daughter-in-law relationship. In fact Naomi was helping Ruth find a husband, which is not something a lesbian lover would do. This fails to serve as a scriptural justification for a Gay or Lesbian lifestyle.](#)

Jesus' Attitude

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

In the context of the New Testament there is no record of Jesus saying anything about homosexuality. This ought to strike us as very odd in light of the great threat to Christianity, family life, and the American way that some would have us believe homosexuality is. Jesus saw injustice and religious hypocrisy as a far greater threat to the Realm of God.

It is true that Jesus did not deal with a lot of the ills in society that the church has to deal with. However, Paul did deal with many of them in detail. One must not and cannot fall prey to the error of thinking that if Jesus did not say it and Paul did that we can ignore it. Remember that the Holy Spirit inspired the writers of the Bible and that the Epistle to the Romans is just as important, relevant and binding as the Gospel of John. Jesus addressed a body of core beliefs and things that were essential for mankind. He spoke of the relationship of child to parent, parent to child, God to man, man to God, brother to brother, and husband to wife. Not once did He ever address the subject of same-sex oriented relationships as defined by today's gay's and lesbians. This is not to be seen as an approval. This is to be seen as a resounding disapproval.

Episcopal priest, Dr. Tom Horner has written the Gospels imply in two places that Jesus' attitude toward lesbians and gays would not have been hostile. The first is found in the story of Jesus healing the Centurion's servant. The word used for the servant is "pais" which in the Greek culture referred to a younger lover of an older more powerful or educated man. Clearly the story demonstrates an unusually intense love, and Jesus' response was wholly positive.

While the word "pais" could possibly have been used for such a person. Dr. Horner and Mr. Piazza are grasping for straws here. This is clearly a case of wishful thinking on his part and intellectual dishonesty as well. This type of exegetical conclusion would get a first year New Testament Greek student a failing mark for poor reasoning skills, poor presentation and sloppy research. It is deceitful to give information like this without giving the whole story about this word, it's meanings and usage.

This word is used a total of 24 times in the New Testament. Matthew 8 times. Luke 9 times, John 1 time, Acts 6 times. It is translated **servant** 10 times. See: Matthew 8:6, 8 & 13 ; 12:18 ; 14:2. Luke 1:54 & 69, 7:7, 15:26 ; Acts 4:25. It is translated **child** 7 times. See: Matthew 2:16, 17:18, 21:15. It is translated **Son (referring to Christ)** 2 times. Acts 3:13 & 26. It is translated once for **son**. See John 4:51. It is translated **man servant** once in Luke 12:45. It is translated **maid servant** once in Luke 8:51. It is translated as maiden in **Luke 8:54**. It is translated **young man** in Acts 20:12.

The word "pais" comes from a family of words that mean "children or having to do with the things of a child" There are 10 words in this family that are used in the New Testament. None of these carry the primary or even secondary meaning of "younger lover of an older more powerful or educated man" as Dr. Horner asserts here.

For those who wish to check these references out for your self and don't happen to read New Testament Greek, here are the Strong's Concordance Key numbers. PAIS is number 3816. The other nine words in this family are numbers: 3807, 3808, 3809, 3810, 3811, 3812, 3813, 3814, and 3815. For the skeptical readers, the information can be verified through the same resources used by the staff here: A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature by Arndt, Gingrich and Bauer. Thayer's Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and the Eberhard Nestle Novum Testamentum Graece 21st edition. New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology edited by Colin Brown, and the 5 volume Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible edited by M. C. Tenney.

The other hint of Jesus' attitude is seen in his comments about eunuchs. Jesus opposed divorce in opposition to the abuses experienced by women. It is in the context of marriage which Jesus said that "some eunuchs were born so; others had been made eunuchs and still others choose to be eunuchs for the Kingdom's sake."

Jesus' remarks about celibacy and castration are clear, but a male child being born without testicles is a rare birth defect. It is only in our day that the Kinsey Institute has demonstrated that sexual orientation is likely determined prior to birth. It could well be that those to whom Jesus refers as being "born eunuchs" are the people we call lesbian or gay. [Click here to read more on this subject.](#)

Jesus' attitude toward eunuchs differed greatly from the fundamentalist Pharisees of his day. (Who imposed this restriction on them? Read Deuteronomy 23:1) To them, eunuchs were excluded from the covenant and barred from worship and participating in the community of faith. Jesus' graceful approach to eunuchs is beautifully pictured in the promise of the prophecy of Isaiah 56:4-8, "To the eunuchs...I will give them an everlasting name that will not be taken away." Rightfully so, It was the place of Jesus to do this and not the Pharisees. They had no authority to

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

Paul's References

Paul's statement in Romans 1:18-32 has been taken as the strongest New Testament rejection of homosexuality. He is concerned about the influence of the pagan culture on the Roman Christians. After giving a detailed description of a world that "exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served created things rather than the Creator, " he continues, "Therefore, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lusts for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men and received in themselves the due penalty of their perversion."

What Paul was referring to was homosexual temple prostitution which was performed by various cults (though far more cults used heterosexual prostitution). Again, Paul is not referring to same-sex love, and he clearly has no concept of persons for whom this lifestyle is "natural."

Let's take this last statement and see what Mr. Piazza is saying here. I am sure that in this condemnation that Paul is including temple prostitutes, but the text does not state that this is what the focus of the text is. This text is a condemnation of men having sex with men and women with women. The assumption that, "Paul is not referring to same-sex love, and he clearly has no concept of persons for whom this lifestyle is "natural."" is illogical. The assertion is that Paul could not be referring to Homosexuals because he did not know about it being right. Again, the theory that homosexuality as God-ordained is just too radical and new of a concept to be dealt with here is presented.

Some may argue that we are just now able to comprehend homosexuality and can finally come to grip with this radical idea. This entire line of reasoning is to be rejected for many reasons. First, there are several radical ideas that are presented in the Bible that the world has still failed to come to terms with. Here are some examples:

1. There is only one God.
2. He is a personal God.
3. Jesus was and is fully God and man.
4. Jesus died for your sins, and his blood cleanses you from sin.
5. Jesus is the only way to make peace with God.
6. The concept that Gentiles could be a part of God's plan was totally incomprehensible to the Jewish people of the New Testament. This was a concept that Paul fought in the Synagogues for many years.
7. What about, the universe is a creation not an accident of evolution.

If homosexuality were normative and God ordained, God would have openly spoke of it and it would not have been as radical of an announcement as they would like to think. Any group that thinks that they are so special and unique that even God could not rightfully address their existence as approved is deceived. God does not require current psychological studies to help define the creature He created. Heterosexuality was addressed in the second chapter of Genesis in verse 24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh. There is no corresponding blessing, approval or instructions for a homosexual life-style.

Paul's other reference to homosexual acts is similar to that of 1 Timothy 1:8-11. Both passages contain lists of persons to be excluded from the Realm of God. The interpretation of these passages depends on two Greek words which have always presented a problem for translators. In the King James Version, they are translated "effeminate" and "abusers of themselves with mankind." In the Revised Standard Version, they were combined and rendered homosexuals; however, these are not the Greek words for homosexual, so that translations reflects the scholars' bias. The New International Version illustrates the difference in these two words by

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

translating them "male prostitute" and "homosexual offenders". The Jerusalem Bible uses the terms "catamites and "sodomites". Catamites were youth kept especially for sexual purpose; they were usually paid large sums of money. Neither passage refers to persons of same-sex orientation, but to people who used their sexuality for personal gain.

Here once again is the approach that they are a legitimate entity created gay by God and are different. Therefore, they claim this material is irrelevant because no one knew about them. The burden of proof is on them and there is no proof. An examination of the words here will shed some light on this. This first word in the passage in question is **PORNOS**. This word means a male prostitute or someone who engages in illicit/unlawful sex. This word is used 10 times in the New Testament and is generally translated whoremonger or fornicator. The words in the family that this term belongs to appear 56 times in the New Testament and are translated as harlot, fornicator, whore, and whoremonger. The other term is **ARSENOKOITES**. It means one who lies with a male as a female, a sodomite. Once again, there is no Biblical acknowledgement or ratification of same-sex orientation. Therefore the scriptures that speak against these sexual practices do apply to all occasions.

The argument of silence does not hold water here or anywhere else. What the silence does do is to fail to underscore the existence of a legitimate class of sexuality defined as "same sex orientation". The argument from silence is then if it were so important and that is the way God made people and intended for them to be then surely He would have said something about it. He did not.

The Love of Christ

Jesus did a great deal to change many social customs and ideas. He elevated the position of women, and they were ultimately his best and most faithful disciples. He did this by example and by commandments which were absolutely inclusive of the rights of all people. Yet, in the name of the Christ whose love encompassed all, the Church has been the most homophobic of all institutions. This should not be surprising when we realize that the Church is still the largest institution which is primarily racially segregated.

It is true that the church is not perfect, this is a given because the church is made up of sinners saved by grace. They are imperfect and are awaiting that time of perfection that comes when they are taken beyond this life. However, another element of argument has been introduced here. The concept of racial segregation is introduced. Gays present themselves as a "third sex", a "minority", and a new unique and misunderstood creature in this world. You will find gays aligning themselves with racial minorities for the purposes of furthering their political agenda. In many of their arguments they will define themselves as a legitimate God approved moral lifestyle and work from there.

The final and central message of the New Testament is that ALL persons are loved by God so much that God's Son was sent as a means of redemption from a disease by which we are all afflicted. The cure for this disease cannot be found in any set of actions. Neither homosexuality nor heterosexuality is redemptive. God's love through Christ was given to all people.

The above paragraph is correct. One's sexual orientation is not what saves them. Sexual sin is sexual sin whether it is sodomy or adultery. Both are sin. At this point it seems as if Mr. Piazza is going for what we refer to as "lets just all hold hands and love Jesus". Jesus dealt with many problems while He walked with us on this Earth. As the church matured and grew, the apostles dealt with issues. St. Paul wrote most of the books of the New Testament dealing with issues among which were sexual perversions. It is true that Jesus loves us no matter who or what we are. God will take us no matter what we are or what we have done, but He also loves us too much to let us stay that way.

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

The Theological Reflection

For the Christian, sin must be understood as a disease which results FROM a broken relationship with God and which results IN a broken relationship with one another and with ourselves. Hence, Jesus' supreme command is to love God and to love our neighbors as we love ourselves. Christianity is not a religion with new rules and laws, but is rather a new relationship with God. Those things which the legalists are fond of labeling "sins" are actually just symptoms of the much deeper disease of alienation and estrangement. Much of the energy of the Church has been spent dealing with symptoms while leaving the disease intact. Jesus did not seem overly concerned about the legal transgressions of those to whom he ministered. Rather, he was much more concerned with healing the physical, spiritual, emotional, or relational brokenness of people. Perhaps if the Church would again give itself to the healing/reconciling ministry of Jesus, then some of the symptoms about which we are so concerned would begin to disappear.

[On the above paragraph we can agree. So much of the misconception about the Church's response to homosexuality and many other problems that people deal with come from modern day Pharisees in the church.](#)

That brings us to the question: Is homosexuality a symptom of brokenness? In some few cases perhaps so. Yet, obviously pointing fingers of blame and accusation is not Christ's way. Rather, Jesus accepted people as they were and allowed love and acceptance to work its miracle. However, most lesbians and gays have been lesbian or gay for as long as they can remember. For them, it is a much a natural characteristic as their eye color or their handedness. Kinsey Institute research has suggested that homosexuality may well be genetic or a least linked to some prenatal factors. Certainly most competent psychologist would concur that sexual orientation is set prior to the age of five in most persons. It is, therefore, not a matter of choice, so it cannot be a moral or ethical issue.

[We would like to introduce some information on the above-cited Kinsey Institute research and the flaws that were inherent in their methodology and data. This study is one that those that are for the homosexual agenda quote reverently as if it were Bible itself. The following is an excerpt of an article published in the Summer 1992 edition of the Christian Research Journal. This quote is dealing with the assertion that at the time the survey was made \(1948\) that the US population was about 10% homosexual.](#)

[To begin with, The truth is that this ten percent statistic comes from a report published more than 40 years ago — the famous 1948 study led by William Kinsey.⁶ The only problem with this report is that its findings were terribly flawed by the methodology used to collect the supposedly representative sample of the U.S. population.⁷](#)

[Why were his findings flawed? For several reasons, first and foremost being that approximately 25 percent of the 5,300 individuals Kinsey studied were prison inmates, "who by the nature of their confinement, couldn't have heterosexual intercourse." In addition, 44 percent of these inmates had had homosexual experiences while in prison.⁸ This was hardly a representative sample of the American population.](#)

[But there were other major flaws in the group selected for the research. Kinsey admitted that "several hundred male prostitutes" were used in his sample. This alone would make a major difference in his findings.⁹](#)

[In addition there was clearly a "volunteer bias." In attempting to select a representative group to work with, one does not merely run an ad and accept](#)

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

anyone who responds. Research has shown that those responding to a study as intimate as the one Kinsey was doing would *not* be representative of the general population. In fact, the widely renowned psychologist Abraham Maslow pointed this out to Kinsey before his findings were published, but he refused to listen.¹⁰

To make matters worse, the people who refer back to this old and flawed study do not quote it accurately. Kinsey did not say that 10 percent of the entire U.S. population was homosexual. Rather, he affirmed that ten percent of white American males were "more or less" exclusively homosexual for at least three years of their lives between the ages of 16 and 65. The statistic for females was five percent. The actual percentage of those thought to be *exclusively* homosexual for their entire lives was only four percent of men and two or three percent of women, all based on his allegedly representative sample of the population.¹¹

To see this article [CLICK HERE](#). To see part 2 of this article [CLICK HERE](#).

We would like to point out that 4 years after the study the following work point out many of these fallacies. Abraham Maslow and James M. Sakoda, "Volunteer Error in the Kinsey Study," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 47 (April 1952), 259-62.

Many Christians insist that God can change/cure the homosexual. In the book, *The Third Sex*, there are six reported cases of homosexuals whom God has "cured". Of these six, at least four are known to have returned to their gay life style. Many lesbians and gays spend most of their lives trying, with no success, to persuade God to change them. It is like trying to get God to change your eye color. What option then is left to these persons? They have been told that they can't be gay and be Christians; and since all efforts have failed in their struggle not to be gay or lesbian, then their only recourse, according to the Church, is that they can't be Christian. So the Church has discounted or discarded as much as 10% of the population.

We have already seen that the 10% figure is erroneous. The statistics that are given in the above paragraph about failed attempts to change from a homosexual to a heterosexual orientation is far too small of a group to have any significant meaning. For other statistics, see the works of William H. Masters and Virginia E. Johnson, *Homosexuality in Perspective* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979), 333. Also, after a ten-year study of homosexuality they found that those desiring "conversion" to heterosexuality had only a 21 percent failure rate. There has also been much discussion about there being a distinct genetic difference between male, female and homosexuals. To date there is no evidence that any reputable geneticist will confirm. Studies by LeVay, Bailey and Pillard have been proved to be faulty. For a summary of these studies [CLICK HERE](#).

If they are excluded from the life of the Christian community, who then will tell them of God's inclusive love and of Jesus' reconciling death? Are they left to assume that God is so narrow-minded as to exclude them for something over which they have no control and for a choice they did not make? When will the Church finally be brave enough to say with Paul, "in Christ there is neither Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female," gay or straight. God has enough love for all! By calling the homosexual life style a sin is no more excluding them from the church than calling robbery or murder a sin and claiming that robbers and murders can not come to the church. Our staff has served in churches where convicts, drug dealers, prostitutes, thieves, adulterers, fornicators and others were welcomed and ministered to. To define something as a sin does not exclude that person from the work of the church. What Mr. Piazza wants here is wholesale vindication for his sin and asks the church to look the other way. It's a "lets pretend that what I do isn't so bad and I can be one of you without doing what the Bible says about repentance and obedience." To this we say, "It can't be done." Why??? Because the Bible says so. Read Ephesians 5:1-15. There is a difference as to who we let in the doors to minister to and who we let identify with the church as a member. All people are welcome in the church. If they are not then they are not being the church. They are a social club or something else but not a New Testament Church. For the record Galatians 3:28 does not mention gay or straight.

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

On this we must stand strong. Dr. Wolfhart Pannenberg of Munich University in Germany has this to say on this issue of the Church's acceptance of gays and same-sex marriages. "the Biblical assessments of homosexual practice are unambiguous in their rejection." Dr. Pannenberg made the following observation that if the church would accept same-sex marriages then, "the church would cease to be the holy, catholic, and apostolic church." See the Nov. 11 1966 Issue of Christianity Today.

The issues come to these points. There is no acceptance of gays, same sex-orientation or same sex marriages in the Bible. This is spelled out in scripture to be a sin just as lying, pride and adultery to name a few. The church is God's instrument of propagating the gospel in this world. As the church we must be true to our founder, Jesus Christ. We are to win the lost and not be judge, jury and executioner. We must hold to the standards that God defined for those in the church to hold to. When we disregard these standards then we have done a disservice to the world because as Dr. Pannenberg has so aptly observed, WE CEASE TO BE THE CHURCH. If we do not stand for the truth, who will? If we do not reach out with compassion, who will? If we do not carry the uncompromised Gospel, who will? If we do not tell the truth and help others to avoid disaster, who will? If we do not help to mend lives, who will?

In today's society Homosexuality and Lesbianism are being hailed by many as a normal healthy life styles. Many laudatory and complimentary things are being reported and circulated about individuals in these lifestyles. We at The Christian Arsenal believe that the people in this life style are precious in God's site just as we all are. We believe that they should be treated with the same dignity as anyone. We however disagree with their position in the matter of sexuality. We do not look down on them, we disagree with them.

For those who are wanting help with these issues there are several solid Christian organizations that we can recommend.

- [Love Won Out](#) - It is possible to come out of the homosexual lifestyle. Focus on the Family's Love Won Out seminars tell the stories of those who have done so.
- [Exodus International](#) - Exodus International is a worldwide interdenominational Christian organization called to encourage, strengthen, unify and equip Christians to minister the transforming power of the Lord Jesus Christ to those affected by homosexuality.
- [Love in Action](#) - Finding freedom from homosexuality.

The following links will provide some excellent resources on this subject.

Homosexuality: Fact and Fiction Part One in a Two-Part Series on Homosexuality by Joseph P. Gudel. <http://www.equip.org/free/DH055-1.htm>

That which is Unnatural: Homosexuality in Society, the Church, and Scripture Part Two in a Two-Part Series on Homosexuality by Joseph P. Gudel. <http://www.equip.org/free/DH055-2.htm>

Probe Answers Our E-Mail: Homosexuality: This is a list of excellent answers to many questions. <http://www.probe.org/menus/em-homo.html>

Homosexual Myths: An insightful article dispelling many of the rumors the homosexual community is perpetuating. <http://www.probe.org/docs/homomyth.html>

Homosexual Theology: A solid response to the misrepresentations of Gay Theology.

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

<http://www.leaderu.com/orgs/probe/docs/homotheo.html>

Homosexuality: Nature, Nurture and Compassion: An article calling for compassion while debunking some of the research myths cited by the gay community.

<http://www.probe.org/docs/homosex1.html>

Homosexuality: Questions and Answers: A good Q&A section on the subject.

<http://www.probe.org/docs/homo-q&a.html>

Same-Sex "Marriage": Should America Allow "Gay Rights" Activists to Cross The Last Cultural Frontier? <http://www.leaderu.com/marco/marriage/index.html>

Commentaries on Homosexuality: A collection of several well-written articles on this subject by Gregory Koukl of Stand to Reason.

<http://www.str.org/free/commentaries/homosexuality/index.htm>

The Gay '90's: A Response to the Gay Activist Movement. A very well written article.

<http://www.leaderu.com/critical/gay90.html>

The Homosexual Movement. A good overview of the movement from a Christian view.

<http://www.leaderu.com/ftissues/ft9403/articles/homo.html>

What should Christians think about those with homosexual orientation? A hard hitting article that is a must read! <http://www.leaderu.com/critical/stan1-lu.html>

Personal Pages: Testimonies of ex-gays who have been delivered from this deception by Christ.

<http://www.stonewallrevisited.com/menus/pages.html>

The Gay Gene? by Jeffrey Satinover, M.D. A more thorough look at the claim that "being gay" is a genetic trait. <http://www.stonewallrevisited.com/issues/gene.html#top>

Searching for Truth in Lifestyles: Homosexuality and Christian Morality. A must read!

<http://www.stonewallrevisited.com/issues/tomschmidt.html>

What Does the Bible REALLY Say About Homosexual Issues? A hard-hitting expose!!!

<http://www.stonewallrevisited.com/issues/marco2.html>

Responding to Pro-Gay Theology by Joe Dallas. Former gay activist and Metropolitan Community Church elder Joe Dallas explains why he no longer promotes or accepts gay theology. <http://www.stonewallrevisited.com/menus/issues.html>

Gender Identity Disorder. A well written article on this subject by Dr. George A, Rekers.

<http://www.stonewallrevisited.com/issues/rekers.html>

New Direction. A resource of research and information that offers help for those caught in the gay-lifestyle. <http://www.newdirection.ca/articles.htm>

Support Groups. A list of support agencies to help those who struggle with this life-style.

<http://www.stonewallrevisited.com/menus/support.html>

FAQ's about Homosexuality. Honest and to the point answers to difficult questions.

The Christian Arsenal

www.christianarsenal.com

<http://www.stonewallrevisited.com/menus/faq.html>