

**What Does the Bible *REALLY* Say About
Homosexual Issues?**

by Tony Marco,

copyright 1995

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
WHY THIS DRAMATIC SHIFT IN PUBLIC OPINION?	2
WHAT “QUEER THEOLOGY” SAYS THE BIBLE SAYS ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY	2
DOES “QUEER THEOLOGY” SQUARE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW OF SCRIPTURE’S REFERENCES TO SODOM AND HOMOSEXUALITY?	4
NARRATIVE REFERENCES TO HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR	5
<i>GENESIS 19:4-11</i>	
<i>COMMENTARY REFERENCES ON THE SODOM ACCOUNT</i>	
<i>JUDGES 19</i>	
MORAL/CIVIL LAW REFERENCES TO HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR	7
“NEW REVELATION” REFERENCES TO HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR	8
<i>ROMANS 1:18-32</i>	
<i>1 TIMOTHY 1:8-11</i>	
<i>1 CORINTHIANS 6:9-11</i>	
BIBLICAL REFERENCES TO “HOMOSEXUAL” RELATIONSHIPS	12
A SUMMARY OF SCRIPTURE’S COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF HOMOSEXUALITY	13
A CRUCIAL INTERPRETIVE ASSUMPTION	13
“QUEER THEOLOGIANS” VIEWS DISAGREE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF SCRIPTURE	14
WHAT ACCOUNTS FOR THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THESE VIEWS?	14
BEFORE WE CAN TELL FOR CERTAIN <i>WHAT</i> THE BIBLE SAYS ABOUT HOMOSEXUAL ISSUES, WE NEED TO DECIDE <i>HOW</i> TO EVALUATE WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS...	15
THE COMPREHENSIVE INTERPRETIVE METHOD	15

“QUEER THEOLOGIANS” METHOD	16
WHAT ARE “QUEER THEOLOGIANS” “READING INTO” SCRIPTURE—AND WHY?	17
“QUEER THEOLOGIANS’,” “GAY ACTIVISTS” PROMOTIONS OF “GAYNESS” ARE INEXTRICABLY LINKED	17
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE “UNHOLY ALLIANCE” BETWEEN “GAY ACTIVISM” AND “QUEER THEOLOGY”	22
REVIEWING THE EVIDENCE	23
ENDNOTES	24

What Does the Bible *REALLY* Say About Homosexual Issues?

INTRODUCTION

In America's so-called "culture wars," one of today's most intense controversies rages around the issue of whether homosexual "orientation" is an "acceptable" lifestyle, and if so, whether homosexuality and openly gay individuals should enjoy protected "minority" status under civil rights laws and full participation in the active fellowship of "mainline" religious organizations.

Four decades ago, few in either public or religious sectors dared even to raise the possibility that it might be "O.K. to be openly gay" in America. Yet recent decades have seen slow but dramatic shifts in public attitudes toward homosexuality, in both secular and religious circles.

In 1960, all 50 states maintained laws criminalizing sodomy, even engaged in by "consenting adults." In 1970, 84 percent of respondents to a national Gallup poll agreed that homosexuality was "a social corruption that can cause the downfall of a civilization." Two-thirds of those polled thought homosexuals should not be allowed to work as school teachers, church pastors, or even government employees.

In 1973, several years of concerted pressure by self-styled "gay activists" culminated in a decision by the American Psychological Association (APA) to remove homosexuality from the APA's DMSIII list of "objective disorders" and declare it "a normal, if divergent lifestyle." Throughout the 1970s and early to mid-'80s, laws forbidding "sodomy" were repealed in state after state. By 1987, during "gay activists'" first "March On Washington," Jeffrey Levi, then executive director of the militant National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, told the National Press Club:

"[W]e are no longer seeking just a right to privacy and a right to protection from wrong. We also have a right—as heterosexual Americans have already—**to see government and society affirm our lives.**"

Now that is a statement that may make our liberal friends queasy. But the truth is, until our relationships are recognized in the law—through domestic partnership legislation or the definition of beneficiary, for example—until we are **provided with the same financial incentives in tax law and government programs to affirm our family relationships**, then we will not have achieved **equality** in American society (emphasis added)."

By 1989, 24 states had repealed sodomy laws criminalizing homosexual behavior between consenting adults. More than 100 local communities had placed "gay rights" ordinances (recognizing "sexual orientation" as a specially protected "minority" class distinction) "on the books."

In 1992, a poll of Colorado citizens revealed that, while Coloradans passed a statewide amendment banning “gay rights,” less than 50 percent said they considered homosexuality “immoral.” Only six percent of Coloradans thought homosexuals represented a danger to children. Well over 50 percent felt gay individuals should not be denied jobs as public school teachers. Today, 29 states have rescinded laws criminalizing consensual sodomy. Nine states now have statewide “gay rights” laws in force. Some 75 percent of Americans polled nationwide feel homosexuals should not be “discriminated against in employment, housing and public accommodations.” Even granting ordinary margins of error (+/-3 or 4%), these polls obviously reflect a considerable shift in American public opinion about homosexuality.

WHY THIS DRAMATIC SHIFT IN PUBLIC OPINION?

Part of this dramatic opinion change is certainly due to ongoing public action by self-described “gay activists”—and pressure on mainline denominations exerted by self-styled “queer theologians,” who insist that the Bible regards homosexuality as merely a normal, sin-less “way to be human.”

In secular circles, “gay militants” have argued that homosexuals represent an “oppressed minority,” needing recognition by government under civil rights laws specially designed to protect a select number of disadvantaged and politically powerless classes of Americans.

In religious circles specifically, debate on this issue centers on several crucial questions, among them: Does the Judeo-Christian Bible truly consider homosexuality a “sin”? Does Scripture clearly condemn homosexuality as “unnatural” and “an abomination,” as conservative theologians believe?

Or, as today’s self-styled “gay activists” and “queer theologians” claim, does the Bible regard homosexuality benignly? Is it possible that the Bible views homosexuality as an identity/lifestyle that should be considered normal and acceptable to God, Christians and Jews?

Have the ancient Judeo-Christian Scriptures suffered, as “queer theologians” insist, centuries of misinterpretation by “forces of religious oppression intent on irrationally persecuting homosexuals”? In the political sphere, do homosexuals truly constitute an “oppressed minority” comparable to others now recognized under special civil rights laws?

To begin answering these questions, let’s first consider what “queer theologians” say the Bible says about homosexuality.

WHAT “QUEER THEOLOGY” SAYS THE BIBLE SAYS ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY

“Not a Sin, Not a Sickness,” a pamphlet published by the California-based Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches (UFMCC), contains perhaps as good a summary as can be found of what “queer theologians” say Scripture says about homosexuality.

Founded in 1968, the UFMCC is a largely gay-populated “denomination,” now claiming more than 3,000 member churches nationwide. According to its “Not a Sin, Not a Sickness” pamphlet, the UFMCC holds that “[G]ay men and lesbians should be accepted—just as they are—in Christian churches, and homosexual relationships should be celebrated and affirmed!”¹ This acceptance,

celebration and affirmation are due gay men and women, says the UFMCC, on the grounds “that Scripture does not condemn loving, responsible homosexual relationships.”²

The UFMCC acknowledges that its conclusions are based on “new ways of understanding Scripture.” These “new ways,” says the UFMCC are rooted in “New scientific information, social changes, and personal experience...” These, UFMCC says, “are perhaps the greatest forces for change in the way we interpret the Bible and develop our beliefs.”(emphasis added)³

Stated briefly, “queer theologians” “new ways” of understanding Scripture result in the following kinds of discoveries: that the destruction of Sodom, recorded in Genesis 19:1-25, resulted from its “gross violation of hospitality rules” rather than the homosexual nature of the gang rape desired by Sodom’s male citizens. The UFMCC also speculates that the Sodomites’ actions also might “express intent to examine the visitors’ credentials.”

“Queer theologians” quote Ezekiel 16:48-50 to support the view that homosexual “sodomy” wasn’t the real sin of Sodom. According to “queer theologians,” Ezekiel 16:48-50 states that Sodom sinned primarily by neglecting the poor and practicing idolatry. The UFMCC says:

“[The] people of Sodom, like many people today, had abundance of material goods. But they failed to meet the needs of the poor, and they worshipped idols. The sins of injustice and idolatry plague every generation. We stand under the same judgment if we create false gods or treat others with injustice.”⁴

(Following the main text of “Not a Sin...” the UFMCC prints a principle statement that says it stands for “Confronting the injustice of poverty, sexism, racism, and homophobia through Christian social action.”)⁵

Apparent condemnations of homosexual behavior in passages like Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 refer not to “loving, responsible homosexual relationships,” but to God’s desire that His people not engage in idolatry-associated homosexual cult prostitution of the kind practiced by other nations.

Though these passages do refer to same-gender sexual behavior as an “abomination,” according to the UFMCC, “Christians are no longer bound by these Jewish laws... To be sure, ethical concerns apply to all cultures and peoples in every age. Such concerns were ultimately reflected by Jesus Christ, who said nothing about homosexuality, but a great deal about love, justice, mercy and faith.”⁶ (This view assumes that *all* Mosaic law constraints, including those addressing moral law, are no longer binding on Christians.)

“Most New Testament books, including the four Gospels,” the UFMCC says, “are silent on same-sex acts, and Paul is the *only* author who makes any reference to the subject. The most negative statement by Paul regarding same-sex acts occurs in Romans 1:24-27 where... *certain* homosexual behavior is given as an example of the ‘uncleanness’ of idolatrous Gentiles” (emphasis added).⁷

The UFMCC also claims that “unnatural,” a word used by Paul in this Romans passage to describe same-sex behavior, “does *not* refer to violation of so-called laws of nature, but rather implies action contradicting *one’s own* nature. In view of this, we should observe that it is ‘unnatural’... for a person *today* with a lesbian or gay sexual orientation *to attempt living a heterosexual lifestyle*” (emphasis added).⁸ Again, the UFMCC claims that the *idolatrous context*

of the homosexual behavior Paul addressed was his main concern, not “loving, responsible lesbian and gay relationships seen today.”⁹

The UFMCC acknowledges that in “1 Corinthians 6:9, Paul condemns those who are ‘effeminate’ and ‘abusers of themselves with mankind...’”¹⁰ The first of these words, the UFMCC says, “most likely refers to someone who lacks discipline or moral control,”¹¹ rather than to a homosexual person or persons. Of the second word, the UFMCC says: “Paul [was] extremely concerned with prostitution, so it is very possible he was referring to male prostitutes,”¹² again, not gay persons.

Under the heading “Other Insights,” the UFMCC pamphlet quotes Robin Scroggs, a Union Theological Seminary Professor of Biblical Theology: “The homosexuality the New Testament opposes is the pederasty of the Greco-Roman culture...”¹³

The UFMCC claims that “[t]he rarity with which Paul discusses any form of same-sex behavior and the ambiguity in references attributed to him make it extremely unsound to conclude *any* sure position in the New Testament on homosexuality, especially in the context of loving, responsible relationships. Since any arguments must be made *from silence*, it is much more reliable to turn to great principles of the Gospel taught by Jesus Christ and the Apostles,”¹⁴ such as loving god, loving one’s neighbor, and non-judgmentalism (emphasis added).

The pamphlet text concludes with “An Invitation,” that says in part, “Whoever you are, wherever you may be, whatever the circumstances of your life, it is important for you to know that Jesus Christ died to take away *your sin, not your sexuality*. Christ accepts you as you are, and so do we. You are always welcome at MCC!”¹⁵ (emphasis added).

It should be pointed out that other “queer theologians” argue for homosexuality’s acceptance because they say... Biblical figures Ruth and Naomi were a lesbian couple obviously approved by God. David and Jonathan were also gay. Jesus himself was probably bisexual (he allowed a “disciple whom he loved” to lean against his chest). The Apostle Paul disliked women, spoke only out of the outmoded cultural prejudices of his time, was “homophobic” and was perhaps himself a repressed homosexual.

Supposedly, the above conclusions shore up “queer theologians” view that Christians and Jews should, based on Scripture, regard homosexuality and gay relationships with full acceptance and favor.

DOES “QUEER THEOLOGY” SQUARE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW OF SCRIPTURE’S REFERENCES TO SODOM AND HOMOSEXUALITY?

As “queer theologians” themselves admit, “any” arguments they have made in favor of Scriptural commendation of homosexuality have been extrapolated “*from silence*.”

However, it must be observed that interpreting Scripture’s “silence” about homosexuality to mean all negative references to homosexuality are not about homosexuality *per se*, and that Jesus must have approved of homosexuality because he is not reported to have discussed it, require accepting some far-stretched assumptions.

First, part of the “silence” “queer theologians” argue from may not be “silence” at all, but the impression of silence, obtained by ignoring clear commentary on homosexuality which they don’t want to acknowledge.

Second, Jesus isn’t reported to have spoken about any number of acts and attitudes we may be reasonably sure he didn’t approve of, such as wife-beating, child abuse and slavery, not to mention sins like computer fraud that didn’t exist in his times. It’s illogical to assume simply from his “silence” that Christ would have found such things acceptable.

Is Scripture, comprehensively viewed, as “silent” about homosexuality as “queer theologians” would have us believe? Let’s go to Scripture itself for evidence. Four types of Jewish/Christian Scripture passages have been regarded for centuries as touching on homosexual issues, Sodom, sodomy or “sodomites.”

Narrative references describe events in which homosexual actions and/or desires seem to play some part. *Moral/civil law references* state what seem to be proscriptions of and penalties for homosexual behavior. *New revelation references* seem to describe homosexuality’s relationship to the framework of Christian life and doctrine. *Commentary references* illuminate other apparent references to homosexuality throughout the Judeo-Christian Scriptures.

NARRATIVE REFERENCES TO HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR

GENESIS 19:4-11

This account, of what seems to be an attempted homosexual assault on two human-appearing angels by male citizens of Sodom, is familiar enough.

As we have seen, “queer theologians” insist that God’s anger with the Sodomites was over either homosexual *rape*, not homosexuality itself, or “poor hospitality” on the part of the Sodomites, who were annoyed because the angels’ host, Lot, refused to allow the men of Sodom to “examine the visitors’ credentials.”

Even a cursory examination of this single Biblical text casts doubt on “queer theologians’” view. First, Lot regards the *acts* he knows the Sodomites wish to engage in as “wicked,” and he has no doubt as to the homosexual nature of those intended acts.

Second, Lot should certainly have had no objections to Sodomites merely “examining the visitors’ credentials.” Nor, if “credentials” were the issue, should Lot have perceived any need to offer his two daughters to the men instead of the angels.

Surely, the Sodomites “knew” Lot’s daughters (they were engaged to citizens of Sodom, Scripture tells us). It is obvious from Lot’s description of his daughters as virgins that he didn’t imagine it was the angels’ “credentials” that the Sodomites wanted to “examine.”

If rape was the Sodomites’ motive, Lot seemed to think heterosexual gang rape was preferable to homosexual. Thus, the passage implies not only that gang rape was evil, but that the homosexual motive was “wicked” also. Commentary references throughout Scripture to the Genesis account of Sodom seem amply to bear out this conclusion.

COMMENTARY REFERENCES ON THE SODOM ACCOUNT

New and Old Testament “commentary references” to Sodom, its destruction and the sexual nature of Sodomites’ offenses, as Scripture describes these, are abundant.

For instance, if we allow the New Testament’s Book of Jude to “comment” on the Sodom account, the sexual nature of Sodomites’ offenses stands out in clear relief.

Jude 7, for instance, describes the citizens of Sodom and Gomorrah as “indulging in gross immorality,” and “going after strange flesh.” Authorities in koine Greek, in which the New Testament is written, more precisely describe Sodomites’ offense as excessive indulgence in *perverse* fornication, which called forth God’s judgment.

Similarly, 2 Peter 2:6,7 compares the judgment predicted to fall on false teachers to that of Sodom. Lot, this passage says, was oppressed by the *sensual conduct* (another translator calls it “lascivious, lustful behavior”) of “unprincipled” Sodomite men.

Some “queer theologians” claim that Old Testament passages negatively referring to “sodomites” are only speaking about male prostitutes. But Hebrew terms used indicate that the desires of “sodomites” were “different,” strongly implying that the behavior involved was criticized for being *homosexual*, not just mercenary.

Numerous Old Testament passages refer to Sodom or “sodomites” in clear contexts of sexual misconduct: Deuteronomy 23:17; 1 Kings 14:24, 15:12, 22:46; 2 Kings 23:7; Jeremiah 23:14. Sodom also serves as a persistent Biblical “paragon” of God’s most severe judgment on societies that have incurred his disfavor.¹⁶

It is difficult to imagine that poor hospitality, inordinate material luxury or even neglect of the needy would provoke Scriptural disparagement this extreme. It’s certainly clear from the “commentary” of all Scripture that *homosexual* immorality was one of Sodom’s serious sins, a precipitating factor in God’s judgment and a significant cause of Sodom’s annihilation.

JUDGES 19

This tragic episode, involving an attempted homosexual rape of a Levite and the “gang rape” of his female concubine, bears many similarities to the Sodom account.

As in Sodom, this couple takes shelter in a town (Gibeah) to which they are strangers. As in Sodom, the city’s men attempt to break into a house to assault the male stranger.

The host, an old man, begs the men of Gibeah: “No, my friends, don’t be so vile... don’t do this disgraceful thing.” In this instance, the Levite hands his concubine over to the men, who abuse her so savagely she dies. These events so outrage the whole nation of Israel that a civil war is launched against the perpetrators (Judges 20, 21), resulting in the near-annihilation of one of Israel’s 12 tribes.

Again, the Biblical context and overall commentary (see footnote 18) on homosexuality clearly condemn the homosexual nature of the attempted rape.

One significant difference in the Genesis and Judges accounts is that, unlike the first, the second account follows the giving of the Mosaic law. Though during the era of the Judges, Israel as a nation had largely abandoned active adherence to the law (it's repeatedly said that "everyone did what was right in their own eyes"), the law had already commented on homosexual behavior. To explain how, we will examine next the...

MORAL/CIVIL LAW REFERENCES TO HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR

The Mosaic law contains two direct references to male homosexual behavior. The first describes the act, in terms of *moral law*; the second prescribes a penalty under *civil law*:

"You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination."
Leviticus 18:22 (New American Standard)

"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." Leviticus 20:13 (New American Standard)

In both cases, these negative references to homosexual behavior are placed in contexts which plainly list proscribed acts of *sexual* immorality.

These texts certainly don't appear to deal exclusively with forms of prostitution or idolatrous cult activity. They simply say, "Here's a certain kind of behavior—don't engage in it, or these penalties apply."

In both cases, the two translations above come close to being literal. The word translated "male" in both is generic—the passages refer to any sexual activity between males and males, of any age or other non-sexual form of differentiation.

In other words, the proscriptions are *categorical*, and this is all the more apparent from the contexts in which they are given. "Mosaic moral and civil law does not smile on homosexual behavior" is the plain sense of these Scriptures.

Does the proscribed *civil* penalty (death) for engaging in homosexual behavior still apply in today's Judeo-Christian circles—or, like other Mosaic "abominations," have proscriptions against gay behavior been swept away by new revelation, given by Christ and/or others? "New revelation" references will supply the answer, as we will see in a few moments.

Another reference we will consider under the "moral/civil law" heading is Ezekiel 16:49-50:

"Now this was the sin of your sister Sodom: She and her daughters were arrogant, overfed and unconcerned; they did not help the poor and needy. They were haughty and did detestable things before me. Therefore I did away with them as you have seen." (New International Version)

In a verse just preceding this passage, the writer, personifying Israel as an unfaithful daughter, compares Israel with Samaria and Sodom. He says, "You not only walked in their ways and copied their detestable practices, but in all your ways you soon became more depraved than they." Later, in verse 58, the prophet says to faithless Israel, "You will bear the consequences of your

lewdness and detestable practices,' declares the Lord." As we have seen, "queer theologians" "proof-text" this passage to imply that God was not concerned with the Sodomites' sexual behavior, but with their idolatry and neglect of the needy.

But in light of the rest of Scripture, it is far-fetched indeed to posit that the "detestable things and practices" the passage refers to consisted solely of neglecting the poor (which, though Scripture does consider Sodom guilty of it, is a more sin of omission than commission).

Obviously, this passage doesn't "let homosexual behavior off the hook"; taken at face value, the passage simply includes such behavior in a nexus of offenses, all of which God was displeased with, and for which he brought Sodom into judgment.

However, verses 53-63 also introduce a note of hope that Israel/Sodom will be restored, despite her (sexual, among other) offenses. Throughout the Hebrew Scriptures such notes of restoration hopes are struck, and these appropriately lead us into the "new revelation" hope in the New Testament's references to homosexuality.

"NEW REVELATION" REFERENCES TO HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR

Though, as we have seen, Christian New Testament Scriptures speak numerous times about Sodom (sometimes in references that comment on Sodomites' "gross immorality" and "lascivious, lustful behavior"), only three passages speak directly to the subject of homosexual behavior (together with other kinds of sexual immorality and sin): Romans 1:18-32; 1 Timothy 1:8-11; and 1 Corinthians 6:9-20.

As we've noted, "queer theologians" view no New Testament references to homosexuality as condemnations of "natural, committed" gay relationships per se, but rather link any negativity apparently attached by New Testament authors to homosexuality with pagan idolatry or Greco-Roman pederastic practices.

Since the Romans passage stands as the most lengthy and significant "new revelation" reference dealing with homosexuality, we'll analyze these verses at some length.

ROMANS 1:18-32

This passage forms the "pagan" section of a sustained argument by the Apostle Paul written to prove that (1) Godless pagans and idolaters, (2) virtuous pagans, and (3) Jews under the Mosaic law *all* (a) are fundamentally sinful and corrupt by nature and by choice; (b) fall short behaviorally of God's nature and standards revealed in creation and in Scripture; (c) are incapable even by "good works" of pleasing and making peace with God; and (d) in need of his grace through faith in Christ to be reconciled to him.

Thus, Paul's statements regarding homosexuality must be seen in his perspective that not only *many* different kinds of sin, but all self-willed "good works" as well, thoroughly disqualify *all* humankind from relationship with a holy God.

And, while the passage we're looking at does discuss idolatry, these verses have as their primary subjects *godlessness*, *wickedness* and their effects, such as idolatry. They also deal with a host of other offenses, including homosexual behavior. Note how the passage begins:

“The wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness, since what may be known about God is plain to them, because God has made it plain to them. For since the creation of the world God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse” (vs. 18-20)¹⁷.

Paul’s analysis of factors that bring on God’s wrath begins, not with pagan humankind’s descent into idolatry, but with its outright, willful rejection of God’s clear self-revelation in creation. He explains how the next step to idolatry is taken:

“For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles” (vs. 21-23).

Early 20th-century author G.K. Chesterton once observed that when men refuse to believe in God (as Scripture reveals him), they don’t believe in *nothing*, they believe in *anything*.

In Paul’s view (which Chesterton shared) humankind are not atheists by nature, but *worshippers*. When people en masse become futile in thought and dark in heart, says Paul, and reject the concept of an omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, holy, loving, and sometimes wrathful God, they don’t *cease* to worship, they cast about for something *else* than God to worship.

Those who reject God, says Paul, begin the worship-“exchange” of God for something else with some kind of embodiment of things he created. In more primitive societies, people create and worship material images of animals, celestial bodies or other natural phenomena—or idealized images of human beings themselves.

In more sophisticated societies, worship of creation may become more “intellectualized”; people may revere “the cosmos” or “the mind of man” or anything else awe-inspiring, but less threatening, than the omnipotent Deity Paul speaks of.

Almost inevitably, people trying to find the God-less object most worth of their reverence end their search with the highest natural manifestation of creation, humanity itself. (We might refer to this stage as discovering the essence of what’s known today as secular humanism.)

In Paul’s frame of reference, the highest of all created beings in spirit, intellect and authority is man. And, as Paul says elsewhere, his view is that the male gender possesses the higher authority of the two genders. Thus, Paul posits, when God-less human beings seek an ultimate being to worship other than God, they eventually conclude their search revering the most awe-inspiring and esthetically beautiful specimen(s) of humanity itself. At this point, Paul implies,

“God [gives] them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with another. They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen” (vs. 24-26). In most cultures that have taken this direction, fervent admiration (approaching or encompassing) worship of human male and female forms becomes common.

Often, sexual preoccupation of this sort manifests itself in ritual, religious prostitution (as it did in the Baalistic cults the Israelites contended with and sometimes indulged in Canaan). At other times it resolves into elevating various esthetic sexual obsessions to the status of cultural norms.

In such eras, as they combine admiration for the acme of creation with sexual estheticism, males pursue passionate, quasi-worshipful sexual relationships with other males. Reacting to male neglect, yet still pursuing a physical manifestation of similar esthetic ideals, women seek sexual relations with other women. At this juncture, Paul says, God lifts any restraints the Deity might have sovereignly placed on such pursuits:

“Because of this, 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 lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion” (vs. 26-27).

Clearly, if we allow the entirety of Scripture to “comment” on these verses, it is a sheer distortion to try to square their meaning with the “spin” put on their depiction of homosexuality by “queer theologians.” The text plainly regards both the desires/“lusts” and physical activities of both males and females (this is Scripture’s only reference to lesbianism) who desire and have sexual relationship with partners of the same gender as “shameful” and “indecent,” and as “perversion.”

The references seem as generic in regard to same-sex behavior as those in Deuteronomy. And there seems no reason from the plain sense of the text to assume that Paul is positing that the offenders are heterosexuals deliberately and perversely engaging in homosexual relations, or that he in any way considers homosexuality “natural.”

Nor does he conversely spend any time condemning *homosexuals* for “unnaturally” engaging in *heterosexual* behavior, which would seem, if “queer theologians’” analysis of this passage is correct, to be a parallel and comparable sin. Lest any reader think that in this passage Paul is implying that homosexuality is the “lowest” form of sin, he finishes this first chapter of Romans by detailing a *further* decline into what Paul calls “a depraved mind.”

We must assume from the context that Paul considers this a stage of even greater evil. As such, it is characterized by a whole cluster of “every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity,” a sinful **mindset**, if we accept Paul’s logic, collectively **worse** than mere homosexual behavior, that includes as...

“...envy, murder, strife, deceit and malice. They are gossips, slanderers, God-haters, insolent, arrogant and boastful; they invent ways of doing evil; they disobey their parents; they are senseless, faithless, heartless, ruthless. Although they know God’s righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them” (vs. 29-32).

Obviously, throughout this passage Paul is talking about descending degrees of “wickedness” resulting from a God-rejecting mindset, and about individual behavior not directly related to formal worship of idols. Therefore, it would be scarcely reasonable to assume that every offense he recounts, including homosexuality, is to be directly associated with cultish idolatry.

Furthermore, Paul doesn't end his "disqualifying" argument with this chapter. He goes on to demonstrate that not only "high-moraled" pagans but Jews with the advantage of knowing Mosaic law are also totally incapable of pleasing God. Not only so, but Paul indicates that God regards Jews under the law as most culpable of all; their responsibility is greater in God's eyes because of they are familiar with the law yet fail to adhere to the heart of its precepts.

Thus, Paul's attitude in Romans toward sexual sin is remarkably similar to that of Jesus Christ, who was far more condemnatory toward hypocritical religious leaders than he was toward "sinners" given to more "fleshly" vices. Not that Paul or Jesus condoned "fleshly" vices; both regarded such sins as contrary to law and "sound teaching," as we will see clearly from analysis of the two other "new revelation" passages that deal with homosexuality.

1 TIMOTHY 1:8-11

These verses include but a brief reference to homosexuality, but the context of that reference is again significant:

"But we know that the Law is good, if one uses it lawfully, realizing the fact that law is not made for a righteous man, but for those who are lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinners, or the unholy and profane, for those who kill their fathers and 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."¹⁸

Again, some "queer theologians" conveniently claim that the word translated "homosexuals" above (also used in the 1 Corinthians passage we will examine shortly) does not refer to homosexuality per se, but to "general moral weakness," ritual prostitution, or some other form of immorality. Their argument is, again, one "from silence." "We know of no pre-Pauline use in koine Greek of this term, so Paul may have invented it, and we don't really know why, so it doesn't necessarily have to do with homosexuality."

This view conceals the simplest translation possible of the word used: "a male who goes to bed with another male." If Paul invented this term, it's quite likely that he did so to make his disparagement of homosexuality as generic as the Deuteronomy references, with which, as a Hebrew scholar, he was doubtless familiar.

As in Deuteronomy, no age distinction is made here; the reprehensible nature of any male bedding any other male is what Paul wishes to communicate, in as simple terms as possible. In the context of this passage, it is obvious that Paul regards homosexual behavior as a *sin*, among those offenses listed that it's the law's function to proscribe and control, though he doesn't seem to single out homosexuality as worse than other sins listed.

It's also clear, from the final "new revelation" passage we'll examine, that Paul doesn't consider the offense of homosexuality unforgivable or irremediable.

1 CORINTHIANS 6:9-11

In this, the last we'll examine of three "new revelation" references dealing directly with homosexuality, Paul introduces a strong note of hope that, while homosexuality is a sin, it can be forgiven, and homosexuals can be "cleansed," "made whole" and "made right with God":

"...[D]o you not know that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God."¹⁹

Here again, the word used for "homosexuals" merely means "men who bed men." Its sense is *active* or *aggressive*. The preceding word translated as "effeminate" has traditionally been interpreted to connote *passive* homosexual behavior. Negatively, Paul appears to be saying (1) that neither active nor passive homosexual behavior are acceptable; both are sins. Note the many other offenses he also regards as unacceptable. No one should conclude from this passage that Paul regards homosexuality as more reprehensible than the other offenses listed—or any less possible to be freed from.

(2) Paul is saying that individuals for whom these sins are so dominant as to constitute *personal identities* will have no place in "the kingdom of God." One can't, Paul says, claim to accept God's rulership and continue to be dominated by these offenses at the same time.

(3) Paul points out that it is possible to be deceived into thinking that one *can* continue to let one's life revolve around these sins and still take part in God's kingdom. Paul says, "Do *not* be deceived." It's *not* possible, he says.

In this passage, Paul also strikes three *positive* notes. And he precedes these with a remarkable observation: "*And such were some of you...*" In other words, among Paul's Corinthian readers (Corinth was known to be a "wide open" town sexually in his day) were some *who had at one time been homosexuals*—but were not gay any more! What were they? In earlier verses of 1 Corinthians, Paul describes his readers as "saints" (people "set apart," vs. 1:2), "babes in Christ" (vs. 3:1), "newborn," new creations saved by God's power (vs. 1:18).

Because this is true, Paul goes on to say in 6:11, his readers, including former homosexuals, had been (1) *washed*, cleansed within from their previous sins; (2) *sanctified*, set apart and made holy, separated from sin and reserved for God; (3) *justified*, made morally and legally acceptable to God because of the sacrificial death on Calvary of Jesus Christ. Thus, these offenders, including some who had been homosexuals, were *forgiven*, restored to *right relationship* with God, and accepted in his eyes *as if they had never sinned*.

BIBLICAL REFERENCES TO "HOMOSEXUAL" RELATIONSHIPS

Comprehensively viewed, Scripture gives us no reason to believe that the close personal relationships it describes, such as David/Jonathan, Ruth/Naomi, Jesus/John or Paul/Timothy were *sexual* in nature.

Especially in the case of Jesus, whom Scripture describes as being “without sin,” the inference of homosexuality is ludicrous. If we grant a comprehensive Scriptural view that homosexuality is a sin, we must assume that Christ did not indulge in it.

To insist that the close relationships described in Scripture were sexual is by implication to virtually deny the possibility that true non-sexual intimacy can exist between persons of the same gender, which would almost deny the possibility of the existence of true friendship.

History and human experience emphatically confirm that people can enjoy, and have enjoyed deep, non-sexual, same-gender friendships. If anywhere in Scripture, the application of an “argument from silence” would be appropriate here: Scripture gives no hint whatsoever that these relationships were sexual, and its silence makes it reasonable to assume they were not.

A SUMMARY OF SCRIPTURE’S COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF HOMOSEXUALITY

We can summarize a *comprehensive* Scripture view of homosexuality in this way:

1. Both Old and New Testaments clearly declare homosexual acts and “lusts” sinful, “unnatural” and among a number of sins that tend to provoke God’s anger and bring His judgment on individuals and societies.
2. No Scripture references even hint at the notion that homosexuality is “natural” or innate; homosexuality is regarded as an offense that can be forsaken and repented of. (Scripture may never call homosexuality “natural” simply because the idea that homosexuality or homosexual relationships might be “natural” never entered the authors’ minds.)
3. Scripture doesn’t consider homosexuality the worst of sins, nor does the Bible hold homosexuality up for extraordinary censure; Scripture regards homosexuality, along with and often in connection with a host of other sins, as an abridgment of God’s law.
4. The Bible clearly indicates that homosexuality, though a sin, can be and has been forgiven by God, and homosexuals can be cleansed and transformed as persons through the power of an indwelling Christ.
5. Comprehensively viewed, Scripture offers no evidence that should lead us to believe that any of many close, same-gender personal relationships it describes were *sexual* in nature.

A CRUCIAL INTERPRETIVE ASSUMPTION

In the “Scripture-comprehensive” overview we’ve undertaken, we have made the “traditional” interpretive assumption that the import of “commentary” and “new revelation” references *supersedes* earlier Scripture references where there seems to be a difference in the Bible’s proscriptions and prescriptions.

For instance, where the Mosaic law contains certain dietary proscriptions, such as against eating shellfish, “new revelation” references “open the door” for Christians to eat an unlimited variety of foods. This understanding has largely influenced Christian practice ever since that “new revelation” was given. Thus, eating pork, which Mosaic law calls an “abomination,” is no longer regarded as such, and pork is commonly enjoyed by Christians.

However, where “new revelation” references *do not* overrule earlier proscriptions and prescriptions, the earlier understandings remain in force. As theologian J.I. Packer has pointed out:

“...Christ said in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:17) that he came not to *destroy* the law but to *fulfill* it; that is, to be, and help others to be, all that God in the Commandments had required. What Jesus destroyed was inadequate expositions of the law, not the law itself (Matthew 5:21-48; 15:1-9; etc.). By giving truer expositions, he actually republished the law. The Sermon on the Mount itself consists of themes from the Decalogue [the Ten Commandments] developed in a Christian context” (emphasis Packer’s).²⁰

Likewise, says Packer, “When Paul says that ‘he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law’ (Romans 13:8; cf. 10), he explains himself by showing that love to neighbor embraces the specific prohibitions of adultery, murder, stealing, and envy. He does *not* say that love to neighbor cancels them!” (emphasis Packer’s)²¹

In the case of homosexuality, as we have seen, both Mosaic law and “new revelation” teaching condemn homosexual behavior, so the proscription against it remains in effect. Also, the fact that Jesus never commented directly about homosexuality (though he did speak negatively about Sodom and its sins) doesn’t nullify the import of other Old and New Testament Scripture passages that clearly condemn it. However, “new revelation” references indicate that, where homosexuality is forsaken by a Christian believer, the penalty/prescription of death *no longer automatically applies*.

These understandings resolve the apparent “disagreement” “queer theologians” say exists between Old and New Testament attitudes toward homosexuality. What we see in fact is a remarkable *consistency* in Old and “new revelation” views of homosexuality, when this “Scripture-comprehensive” approach is taken.

“QUEER THEOLOGIANS” VIEWS DISAGREE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF SCRIPTURE

Clearly, “queer theologians” views on what Scripture says about homosexuality sharply disagree with the results of a comprehensive Scripture approach like the one we’ve just taken. Again, “queer theologians” insist that...

1. The Bible considers homosexuality neither a sin nor a sickness; Scripture never condemns “‘natural,’ normal, responsible, committed” homosexual relationships.
2. Scripture references that appear to condemn homosexuality are not addressing homosexuality per se, but idolatrous/cultic homosexual prostitution and practices.
3. Christians are under no obligation to give regard to Old Testament proscriptions because Jesus never spoke about homosexuality, and Christians are not bound by Jewish laws.
4. God judged Sodom, not for homosexual lusts or acts, but for Sodomites’ attempted rape, poor hospitality, and neglect of the poor.
5. Scripture depicts what “queer theologians” believe to be a number of homosexual relationships apparently smiled upon by God.
6. Because homosexuality is not a sin or a sickness, sexually active homosexuals need not repent of their behavior or seek any change of their desires; sexually active homosexuals should be accepted “as is” into the full fellowship of religious life.

WHAT ACCOUNTS FOR THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THESE VIEWS?

Obviously, the “Biblical” assessments of homosexuality by “queer theologians” and those arrived at by a comprehensive approach to Scripture are irreconcilable. Yet they both appear to be derived

from the same Bible. How do we account for the profound differences just observed? We believe the differences are precipitated by sharply divergent *methods of interpretation* of the Biblical text.

BEFORE WE CAN TELL FOR CERTAIN *WHAT* THE BIBLE SAYS ABOUT HOMOSEXUAL ISSUES, WE NEED TO DECIDE *HOW* TO EVALUATE *WHAT* THE BIBLE SAYS...

To discover what Scripture truly says about homosexual issues, we must first choose *how* to approach *interpreting* the text. Should we approach the Bible as an internally coherent work whose ideas themselves, whether we agree with them or not, should be allowed to clarify the distinct issues it deals with? Should we examine Scripture as a work which, though written over many centuries by numerous authors, communicates *to us* a consistent view of humanity, God and nature? Or...

Do we engage Scripture as a kind of “blank slate” *onto which* we “write” our reactions to what it says, and *into* which we read certain preconceptions about the issues the text deals with? In other words, do we *exegete* the text—draw *out* of it what is manifestly, consistently and solely there? Or do we *isogete* the text—that is, base our evaluation on ideas that are not necessarily *in* the text, but ideas and concepts we may *wish* were, or feel *should* be present, or that we believe would make the text more compatible with contemporary cultural trends or our own private beliefs?

Obviously, these two approaches may produce quite different conclusions about what the Bible says about homosexual issues. In truth, only one of the two approaches—the *exegetical* approach—actually constitutes *interpretation* of the text. However couched, *isogesis* is nothing other than *commentary* on the text—opinion expression which may or may not have any interpretive basis.

Ultimately, if we agree with the principle that the *reality* of a matter lies in the entirety of what it is, regardless of what we think about it judgmentally, we’ll have to conclude that we will only determine the *truth* about a matter when our thoughts about it are consistent with its self-defined and expressed reality. Logically, a single text cannot both say and *not* say something simultaneously. What is the “reality” of the Bible’s stand on homosexuality, judged on Scripture’s own terms?

THE COMPREHENSIVE INTERPRETIVE METHOD

The *comprehensive* interpretive method employs the following principles, which are common to literary textual criticism:

1. The Bible is assumed to be an internally consistent text whose parts must be allowed to “explain” one another in order to arrive at accurate conclusions about its views of various issues it deals with.²²
2. More definitive passages about issues, both in Old Testament and “new revelation” Scriptures, “rule” the interpretation of vaguer passages dealing with the same issues, and “new revelation” passages “rule” the interpretation of Old Testament texts.²³
3. Wherever possible, the “plain sense” of Scripture’s meaning should supply the “preferred” sense of its import.²⁴
4. Literary, historical or “contemporary,” sources or opinions *external* to Scripture should not be allowed to add to or pass judgment on its clear meaning, or pretend to provide valid “interpretation” of the text.²⁵

Clearly, this approach involves *exegesis* of the text, as defined earlier. Allowing the text to “explain” itself in terms of its own internal consistency results in the comprehensive view of homosexuality we’ve described.

“QUEER THEOLOGIANS” METHOD

To arrive at views on homosexuality utterly contradictory to those given by the comprehensive interpretive method, “queer theologians” clearly resort to quite different principles in reading Biblical texts. Some of these principles seem to be along these lines:

1. “Queer theologians” consciously neglect to allow the entirety of Scripture to interpret or “comment” on itself.
2. “Queer theologians” allow vague, non-definitive Scripture passages to “rule” definitive, plain-sense passages that deal with sexual issues, including homosexuality.
3. After first excising from their Scriptural approach any and all texts which don’t agree with their views about homosexuality, “queer theologians” then employ the resulting “argument from silence” to (a) claim Scripture has no clear position on homosexuality, and to (b) read homosexuality into close, same-gender relationships described non-sexually in Scripture.
4. “Queer theologians” consciously filter contemporary cultural notions *through* ancient Biblical texts in order to claim that Scripture “says” what they want it to say about homosexuality.

Clearly, “queer theologians” approach to Scripture is, by definition, *isogetical*, and as such, cannot be properly said to constitute interpretation at all. If this is true, Scripture commentators holding the “comprehensive” view are in error even to compare their *exegesis* with “queer theologians” *isogetical* comments, since these two methods of examining a text are *not truly comparable*, their conclusions having been arrived at by entirely different means. “Queer theologians” “interpretations” represent, in fact, no more than “queer theologians” subjective opinions about homosexuality.

One particularly objectionable process in “queer theologians” isogetical method has been dubbed *phantasie* (German for fantasy) by feminist author Dorothee Solle. As “queer theologian” Robert Williams describes it:

“The technique is simply one of creative visualization. You select a biblical passage, read it carefully and thoughtfully, then close the Bible and allow yourself to *experience* the passage....

“As with any visualization, the secret is to set the scene as vividly as possible. When you close your eyes and imagine the setting you just read about, imagine it in the most intense detail you can muster. Pay attention to colors, sounds, smells. Notice what people are wearing, what color their eyes and hair are, what their facial expressions are.”²⁶

The results of such a seemingly mystical process, which verges on (if not veers into) self-hypnosis ought not to be considered valid textual interpretation by any serious critic.

In fact, even some “queer theologians” find this methodology too far-fetched to be credible. Elsewhere in the book just cited, Robert Williams himself is reduced, under the weight of plain analysis of 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 and 1 Timothy 1:9-11, to saying, “Paul, like most of us, had his good moments and his bad moments.”²⁷

He quickly tries to resolve his apparent internal contradiction by saying, in effect, “Maybe Paul had a bad day, but if what he says doesn’t ring true to your ‘deepest capacity for truth and goodness,’ you’re certainly not obligated to believe him.” Elsewhere, and perhaps a bit more honestly, Williams also frankly acknowledges that Paul may well be saying what he seems to be saying in Romans 1, but we’re at liberty, in effect, to jettison Paul’s opinions from Scripture if we don’t like them:

“Perhaps Paul is condemning homosexuality in this passage, or at least labeling it as ‘unnatural’ (which is not *exactly* the same thing as calling it sinful). But the bottom line for you is: So what? Paul was wrong about a number of other things, too. Why should you take him any more seriously than you take Jerry Falwell or Anita Bryant or Cardinal O’Connor?”²⁸

Perhaps a more pertinent question is, why should we take the obviously subjective opinions of “queer theologians,” blatantly isogeted from their own self-induced meditations on Scriptural texts, with any seriousness whatsoever?

WHAT ARE “QUEER THEOLOGIANS” “READING INTO” SCRIPTURE—AND WHY?

Despite their flagrant lack of interpretive integrity, “queer theologians” *do* demand to be taken seriously, as evidenced by their constant pressure for full acceptance of “gayness” in academia and in mainstream religious life. And their demands force us to confront still another crucial question: If “queer theologians” are indeed passing off isogesis as interpretation, what ideas are they “reading into” Scripture, and why are they doing so?

First, as we have seen, “queer theologians” insist that homosexuality is “natural”; most also insist that “gayness” is inborn and immutable. Second, “queer theologians” insist that homosexuality and homosexuals have been oppressed and persecuted due to faulty readings of Scripture, and that homosexuals have been unjustly excluded from deserved “places at the tables” of religious fellowship and general participation in society.

If we examine the implications of these assertions, it may easily be discovered that “queer theology’s” major tenets coincide precisely with those that undergird the *politically* active “gay rights” movement. In fact, though some object to attempts to even discuss possible linkages between “gay activism” and “queer theology,” in this writer’s opinion it is impossible to fully explain either of these movements without reference to the other.

“QUEER THEOLOGIANS’,” “GAY ACTIVISTS” PROMOTIONS OF “GAYNESS” ARE INEXTRICABLY LINKED

It is also essential that we explore the below-the-surface connections between “queer theology” and “gay activism,” because the two depend on one another for “credibility” by shoring up one another’s positions. Therefore, it will serve us well to now examine “gay activism” and try to arrive at some conclusions about **its** credibility.

As we will see, alongside “queer theologians’” activities in religious circles, “gay activists” are waging among the most ambitious public image and *political* campaigns in American history, with

the media's generous help. The message: Homosexuals are an oppressed, disadvantaged "minority," with an "orientation" identity as innate and fixed as African-Americans' and Hispanics'—and gays deserve special legal status and privileges under civil rights law equal to those granted to traditional minorities like these.

This message appears to be tailored to help gays claim to meet three "criteria" established by courts and civil rights authorities in awarding special "protected" or "suspect" status to disadvantaged minority classes.²⁹

Criterion #1: Averaged as a whole group, the class must have suffered a history of societal oppression evidenced by lack of ability to obtain economic mean income, adequate education, or cultural opportunity.³⁰

Gay activists claim gays as an entire class are economically, educationally and culturally disadvantaged. Numerous extensive/intensive marketing studies several boasting accuracy beyond 99% refute these claims³¹, and reveal gays to be, on the contrary, perhaps America's most affluent self-identified "subculture":

Homosexuals have average individual incomes ranging from \$37,800 to \$42,100+, depending on the study cited, versus about \$12,300 for average Americans and a minuscule \$3,041 for truly disadvantaged African-American households.³²

More than three times as many homosexuals as average Americans are college graduates (59.6% v. 18%) -- a percentage dwarfing that of truly disadvantaged African-Americans and Hispanics.

65% of gays are overseas travelers—more than four times the percentage (14%) of average Americans. More than 13 times as many gays as average Americans are frequent flyers. (Truly disadvantaged Americans don't even "make the charts" in these categories.)

"America's gay and lesbian community is emerging as one of the nation's most educated and affluent, and Madison Avenue is beginning to explore the potential for a market that may be worth hundreds of billions of dollars.... It's a market that screams opportunity." So said Eric Miller, editor of *Research Alert*, a New York-based consumer research publication.³³

Robert Bray, a spokesman for the "gay rights" promoting National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, complains to the "politically correct" about "epidemic oppression" of gays. Yet he has also been quoted thus: "Gay greenbacks are very powerful and the gay and lesbian community is a virtual motherlode of untapped sales."³⁴

Surely, affluent "gay activists'" attempts to secure status and benefits reserved for the poor constitute every bit as grievous a "sin" against the truly disadvantaged as any such sin Ezekiel 16 (see earlier reference) attributes to "Sodomites."

Yet "queer theologians," who boast of "Confronting the injustice of poverty, sexism, [and] racism... through Christian social action", remain curiously **non**-confrontational about such blatant duplicity as that practiced by Robert Bray and other "gay activists."

Criterion #2: Averaged as a whole group, specially protected classes should exhibit obvious, innate, immutable, or distinguishing characteristics, like race, color, gender, national origin or disability, that clearly define them as a discrete group³⁵.

Attempting to apply this criterion to homosexuals, “gay activists” claim that (1) gays represent some 10% of the general population (in this way, they appear to be as substantial a minority as, say, African-Americans); (2) “gayness” is innate and immutable. As with activists’ “poverty and oppression” claims, recent studies cast serious doubt on both these assertions.

Earlier 1948 “Kinsey Report” figures lending “support” to the “10%” theory have largely been discredited.³⁶ Later studies³⁷ reveal the 10% figure to be almost undoubtedly bogus. One of the most recent and major of these studies, a survey of male sexual behavior conducted by researchers from Seattle’s Batelle Human Affairs Research Centers, concluded:

“...[O]nly 2 percent [of American men] ever engaged in homosexual behavior... Only 2.3 percent of the men reported any homosexual activity in the past 10 years, and just 1.1 percent said they had engaged in exclusively homosexual sex. That is far less than the 10 percent figure attributed to the landmark Kinsey report from 1948.”³⁸

In a remarkably frank 1993 statement, pioneer “gay activist” attorney Tom Stoddard virtually admitted the fraudulence of the “10%” figure, and revealed the apparent reason both “gay activists” and “queer theologians” have eagerly promoted it:

“We used that figure when most gay people were entirely hidden to try to create an impression of our numerousness.”³⁹

“Gay activist” Bruce Voeller has written elsewhere:

“I campaigned with Gay groups and in the media across the country for the Kinsey-based [10%] finding that ‘We are everywhere.’ This slogan became a National Gay Task Force *leitmotif*. And the issues derived from the implications of the Kinsey data became key parts of the national political, educational and legislative programs during my years at New York’s Gay Activist Alliance and the National Gay Task Force. And after years of our educating those who inform the public and make its laws, the concept that 10 percent of the population is gay has become generally accepted ‘fact’ ... As with so many pieces of knowledge and **myth**, repeated telling made it so—incredible as the notion was to the world when the Kinsey group first put forth its data or decades later when the Gay Movement pressed that data into public consciousness.”⁴⁰

In an equally duplicitous ploy, “gay activists” claim that “gayness” is inborn and unchangeable. Ironically, three or four decades ago, almost no homosexuals answering anonymous surveys said they thought they were “born homosexual.” Nor did any but a fraction of psychological practitioners agree that gays were “born that way.”

Yet “gay activists” attempt to move into the civil rights arena forced them to try to justify this parallel with ethnicity and color. As “evidence,” they most often cite a “study” (by “gay activist”

Simon LeVay) purporting to find “differences” between the brains of “homosexual” HIV-created and “heterosexual” corpses.

Among the most devastating of many critiques of LeVay’s “findings” was that of self-avowed gay writer Michael Botkin, who wrote, shortly after the release of LeVay’s “study”:

“...[I]t turns out that LeVay doesn’t know anything about the sexual orientation of his control group, the 16 corpses ‘presumed heterosexual.’ A sloppy control like this is... enough by itself to invalidate the study. LeVay’s defense? He knows his controls are het[erosexual] because their brains are different from the HIVer corpses. Sorry, doctor, this is circular logic. You can use the sample to prove the theory, or vice versa, but not both at the same time.”⁴¹

As other critics of LeVay’s work point out, his dubious methodology and speculations also lead to the conclusion that three corpses LeVay identified as “heterosexual” “should” have been homosexual, and three supposedly “homosexual” corpses “should” have been heterosexual. Methodologically misclassify 6 out of a total of only 35 corpses, and you scarcely have a theory that can stand much scientific scrutiny.

“Gay activists” also frequently cite a “study” purporting to show “genetic origins” for homosexuality among fraternal twins. Again, though the media has tended to tout this “study” as if it were “gospel,” its methodology is flawed from the outset: It derives 100% of its results from groups of twins *raised together*—thus totally neglecting to eliminate possible environmental factors. Perhaps developmental biologist Anne Fausto Stirling has dismissed this study as accurately and succinctly as possible:

“In order for such a study to be at all meaningful, you’d have to look at twins raised apart. It’s such badly interpreted genetics.”⁴²

Furthermore, another “gay twin” study, providing very different results, has been mysteriously ill-reported by the mass media. The authors, Michael King, M.D., and psychologist Elizabeth McDonald, found a much lower concurrence among twins than Bailey and Pillard—only 12% versus 22%. The authors concluded that “genetic factors are insufficient explanation of the development of sexual orientation.”⁴³

Other critics have pointed out that, in both studies, environmental factors, such as incest, offer a more likely explanation of homosexual development than “genetics.” (Incidentally, all efforts to duplicate “gay twin” results among lesbian populations have failed utterly.)

Research shows that gays not only can, but **do** change their “sexual orientation”—some numerous times. One post-1975 Kinsey Institute study found that 84% of homosexual men shifted their “sexual orientation” at least once in a lifetime. 32% reported a second shift. 13% claimed **at least five changes** in “sexual orientation” during their lifetimes.⁴⁴

“Gay activists” and “queer theologians” know these facts well—but pretend they don’t, out of sheer political expediency. Author and American University history professor Jerry Z. Muller explains:

“In political arguments toward the non-homosexual public, [’gay activism’] has tended toward a deterministic portrait of homosexuality as grounded in irrevocable biological or social-psychological circumstance. Yet among homosexual theorists in the academy, the propensity is toward the defense of homosexuality as a **voluntarily affirmed ‘self-fashioning.’**”

“The confluence of feminism and [’gay activist’] ideology has now led to a new stage, in which the politics of stable but multicultural and multisexual identities is being challenged by those who regard **all permanent and fixed identity as a coercive restriction of autonomy**, which is thought to include self-definition and redefinition.”⁴⁵

In March, 1992, The National Association for Psychoanalytic Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) “was founded... by psychoanalysts and psychoanalytically informed individuals who believe that obligatory homosexuality is a treatable developmental disorder,” according to the group’s literature.

Faced with “gay activists”’ attempts to perpetuate (what even they know is) the myth that “gayness” is immutable, NARTH will “Endeavor to protect the rights of [homosexual] patients to receive treatment” to change their homosexuality. As of this writing, more than 300 psychologists, psychoanalysts and other professionals have joined the new organization.

But perhaps the very best “refutation” of “gay activist/queer theologian” innateness claims are the thousands of “ex-gay” individuals who claim their “sexual orientation” has radically and permanently changed as the result of religious conviction and conversion—just the possibility the Apostle Paul’s ancient writings hold out so clearly! But if “gay activists”’ claims to meet the first two “minority status” criteria are bogus, so is their attempt to satisfy...

Criterion #3: Specially protected classes should clearly demonstrate political powerlessness.

Far from being politically powerless, “gay activists” have in recent years demonstrated enormous political “clout” relative to their numbers. Combining educational advantage with high-pressure lobbying tactics, gay activists have ridden waves of tolerance emanating from the sexual revolution to a position of almost irresistible influence in today’s America. Extraordinary quantities of political dollars spent by “gay activists” explain why. As recently as 1987, a report issued by the Federal Elections Commission (FEC) stated:

The Human Rights Campaign Fund (HRCF), the national gay activist political action committee (PAC), was at that time “the 16th largest independent political action committee (PAC) in the nation” and “the 39th largest PAC overall.” Considering that, at the time, more than 4,500 PACs had registered with the FEC, this represents enormous political power.

Robert Brasile, then HRCF’s executive director, commented on this news:

“We have clearly become a big-league PAC, which means the gay and lesbian community has increasing power in American politics.... This means we have recognizable clout in the election and in the legislative process of this country...”

“For better or worse, politics in this country responds to money, and politicians now know they had better respond to our community.”⁴⁶

During the 1986 elections, HRCF raised more than \$1.4 million. “Gay militants” are reported to have financed President Bill Clinton’s election campaign to the tune of some \$3.5 million. HRCF announced a 1992-1993 projected budget of over \$5 million. “Gay activists” have since established a Washington, D.C.-based PAC known as the “Victory Fund” to empower local, openly-homosexual candidates. Its current operating budget exceeds \$1 million. The top 12 “gay rights”-promoting national PACs sport budgets totaling well in excess of \$12.5 million. In one state alone, “gay activists” plan to spend at least \$2 million defending “gay rights.”

Lastly, the Washington, D.C., Convention and Visitors Association (CVA) estimates that gay participants in 1993’s “March On Washington” (in support of gays in the military) spent more than \$177 during that four-day event—more, according to CVA, than on any other single event they’ve ever tracked, nearly triple CVA estimates of spending on all Clinton Presidential inaugural ceremonies and festivities combined.⁴⁷ Political powerlessness all this is **not**.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE “UNHOLY ALLIANCE” BETWEEN “GAY ACTIVISM” AND “QUEER THEOLOGY”

One factor makes the coincidence we’ve noted between “gay activists” and “queer theologians” presuppositions and goals particularly significant: Even conservative religious organizations firmly holding to the view that homosexuality is immoral and that openly practicing homosexuals should not be admitted to full religious fellowship will be compelled to embrace both homosexuality as an “orientation” and practicing gays in religious fellowship if the “gay rights” movement is totally successful. This is because “gay activists” and “queer theologians” frequently employ deceitfully written “gay rights” legislation to try to lull conservative religious organizations into a false sense of security.

Proposed local and state “gay rights” legislation often courts public acceptance by including compliance “exceptions” for religious organizations. Typically, “exceptions” clauses in “gay rights” bills state that religious **denominations** will not be compelled by these ordinances to hire “persons who are not members of their **denominations**.” Such wording gives religious organizations the illusion that they will be protected from “gay activist” attempts to force them to hire or receive self-avowed, practicing gays into church or synagogue membership.

Even cursory analysis reveals that, at best, these “protections” would (1) place religious organizations in an unflattering public light at best; and (2) would prove only temporary at worst.

At best, these kinds of “allowances” for church impunity against enforcement of “gay rights” laws place churches and other religious organizations in a negative public light. “Gay activists” may continue attacking these organizations as “the only institutions in society that are allowed to ‘discriminate against gays’” and other such epithets.

So-called **parachurch** ministries will usually receive no protections at all under “gay rights” bills with “religious exceptions.” Non-compliance clauses customarily say something like: “Religious organizations need not hire persons **not of their denominations**.” Since most parachurch organizations are non-

denominational, and denominational affiliation is not a condition of employment, these organizations enjoy no real protection from “gay activist” aggression.

Because “sexual orientation” is impossible to identify just by looking at a person, any “gay activist” might take steps to meet membership requirements in a denominational church, then suddenly claim to be gay and demand church employment, on the grounds that they’re “now members in the denomination.” Thus, these organizations also have no real protection against the threat of “gay militancy.”

In a key U.S. Supreme Court decision (*Bob Jones University vs. Simon*, 1983), the High Court ruled that the beliefs of any tax-exempt religious organization “must be approved by [federal] public policy” if that organization is to retain its tax exempt status. According to Constitutional attorneys, this may well mean that, under the guise of “preventing religious subsidies,” the Federal government now has the power to completely regulate tax-exempt religious organizations’ **beliefs** according to Federal dictates.

If homosexuals gain inclusion in Federal civil rights laws, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, promotion of “gay activists’/queer theologians’” aims will be the “public policy” of the United States of America throughout its borders. In that even, any existing “religious exceptions” in “gay rights” legislation will collapse under court scrutiny.

While many religious organizations have been “lulled to sleep” by such “exceptions,” “gay activists” and “queer theologians” are well aware of the implications of *Simon*—and know how to apply pressure that (they hope) will one day give this decision “teeth”:

“Queer theologians” apply the pressure of their arguments *inside* religious organizations; “gay activists” supply the political “clout” *outside* church doors, with the intent to thrust gays **in**; while gay PAC dollars energize both “pushes.”

Yet, belying “gay activists’” and “queer theologians’” apparent sincerity in promoting their cause, inside and outside church doors is the ample evidence that both their political and “spiritual” claims are rooted in blatant (and probably conscious) **fraud**. (Note: We do not seek to imply that the entire gay community is guilty of the duplicity employed by the small “gay activist” and “queer theology” segment of that community.)

REVIEWING THE EVIDENCE

“Queer theologians” employ dubious (if not consciously deceitful) methods of Scripture interpretation to twist the text into “saying” homosexuality is not sinful; that it is “normal, natural” and acceptable behavior; that homosexuality and homosexuals have been unjustly judged and oppressed by society and religion; that it is therefore mandatory that openly practicing gays be fully accepted into all aspects of religious life.

“Gay activists” employ conscious deceit to persuade the public that the gay community as a whole is disadvantaged and oppressed; that “gayness” is innate and immutable; that the gay community

as a whole is politically powerless; that gays should therefore be recognized under special civil rights laws as a protected class akin to traditional racial, ethnic and disabled “minority” classes.

It may be difficult to believe any group capable of perpetrating such blatant fraud with such seeming sincerity, but, as we have seen, neither “gay activists” claim to protected “minority” status, nor “queer theologians” claim that Scripture smiles on “gayness” seem to possess a thread of authenticity to commend them.

Thus, we can safely assume that these claims represent neither valid public policy nor sincere theology, but rather blatant **propaganda** in the service of a two-pronged “hidden agenda” (1) to use government to coerce society at large into accepting homosexuals and “gay rights” in all areas of community life; and (2) to use church acceptance (compelled by government edict) to achieve any and all privileges, including the right to marry, now available to religious individuals across America.

One oft-recognized purpose of propaganda is to persuade by so skillfully communicating opinion that opinion “smells like” truth. Truth in communication can exist only when speakers say what they honestly believe. If we think or know one thing and say another, we lie.

We can say further that truth in communication requires speaking with a complete absence of intent to deceive. Nothing we have learned about “gay activists” and/or “queer theologians” claims indicates that they speak with any other intent **than** to deceive.

Our conclusion: If “gay activists” and “queer theologians” claims are clearly and self-consciously fraudulent, neither secular citizens or organizations, nor religious persons or organizations should feel obligated to (1) promote “gay activist” or “queer theological” aims; (2) embrace self-avowed, practicing homosexuals into either protected “minority” status or religious fellowship.

Secular organizations may well elect to tolerantly employ self-avowed homosexuals as individuals according to these persons own merits—but should not feel coerced into treating gays as if they were a legitimate “minority” class.

Religious organizations may certainly wish to encourage gay individuals to pursue the hope of change in their “sexual orientation”—and religious people may wish to take steps toward becoming ably-equipped “change agents” in the lives of persons desiring spiritual transformation.

In the final analysis, how we respond to “gay activism” and “queer theology” hinges on seeking the *truth* in Scripture and public policy—then responding appropriately and with integrity to the answers we discover at our search’s end.

ENDNOTES

1 “Not a Sin, Not a Sickness: What the Bible does & does not say about homosexuality,” pamphlet published by the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches, Los Angeles, CA, page two.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid, page three.

4 “Not a Sin, Not a Sickness,” page four.

5 Ibid, page ten.

6 Ibid, page five.

7 Ibid, page six.

8 Ibid, page six.

9 Ibid, page 6.

10 Ibid, page seven.

11 Ibid, page seven.

12 Ibid, page seven.

13 Ibid, page eight.

14 Ibid, page seven.

15 Ibid, page nine.

16 Cf. Deut. 29:23, 32:32; Isaiah 1:9-10 (in which apostate Israel’s comparison to Sodom constitutes one of Scripture’s most stinging insults), 3:9, 13:19; Jer. 49:18, 50:40; Lam. 4:6; Amos 4:11; Zeph. 2:9; Matt. 10:15, 11:23-24; Mark 6:11; Luke 10:12, 17:29 (in which the world’s final judgment is compared with the judgment that fell on Sodom); Romans 9:29; Rev. 11:8.

17 All Scripture quotations in this section are from The New International Version.

18 This Scripture section is quoted from The New American Standard version.

19 New American Standard rendering.

20 Packer, J.I., *I Want to Be a Christian*, Tyndale House, Publishers, Inc., Wheaton, IL, pp. 253,254.

21 Ibid., p. 262.

22 Christ himself is reported to have said “...and the Scripture cannot be broken [or divided, split into self-contradictory pieces]...” (John 10:35, identically translated in New American Standard, New King James and New International Version); “All Scripture is inspired by God [lit. “God-breathed”] and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness” (2 Timothy 3:16, New American Standard.)

23 Christ himself established the latter principle, in saying on various occasions, “You have heard that the ancients were told... but I say to you...” (ex. Matthew 5:21,22, New American Standard).

24 “All the utterances of my mouth are in righteousness; There is nothing crooked or perverted in them. They are all straightforward to him who understands, and right to those who find knowledge” (Poverbs 8:8,9); “For this commandment which I command you today is not too difficult for you, nor is it out of reach. It is not in heaven, that you should say, ‘Who will go up into heaven for us to get it for us and make us hear it, that we may observe it?’ Nor is it beyond the sea, that you should say, ‘Who will cross the sea for us to get it for us and make us hear it, that we may observe it?’ But the word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you may observe it” (Deuteronomy 30:11-14, New American Standard).

25 “I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: if anyone adds to them, God shall add to him the plagues which are written in this book” (Revelation 22:18, New American Standard); “Every word of God is tested; He is a shield to those who take refuge in Him. Do not add to His words/Lest He reprove you, and you be proved a liar” (Proverbs 30:5-6, New American Standard).

26 Robert Williams, *Just As I Am*, New York: Crown, 1992, p. 26, emphasis the author’s.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 51

28 *Ibid.*, p. 53

29 The U.S. Supreme Court has established and reaffirmed these criteria through a series of decisions familiar to civil rights authorities: *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez*, 1973; *Massachusetts Board of Retirement v. Murgia*, 1976; *Plyler v. Doe*, 1982; *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center*, 1985. Also cf. *Jantz v. Muci*, 1991, recently allowed by the U.S. Supreme Court to stand against “gay activist” plaintiffs and the American Civil Liberties Union; cf. also *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 1973.

30 *Ibid.*

31 Among many media articles reporting on these marketing studies: “Overcoming a Deep Rooted Reluctance, More Firms Advertise to Gay Community,” *The Wall Street Journal*, July 18, 1991; “Gay Market a Potential Gold Mine,” *The San Francisco Chronicle*, August 27, 1991; “For Gays, Ship Charters Are a Boon, Say Two Travel Companies,” *Travel Weekly* magazine, August 5, 1991; and “Where the Money Is: Travel Industry Eyeing Gay/Lesbian Tourism,” *The Bay Area Reporter*, September 19, 1991.

32 Cf. *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1990.

33 *Op. cit.*, *San Francisco Chronicle* article above.

34 “Corporate America comes out: Companies trying to win share of lucrative gay market,” *The Rocky Mountain News*, November 30, 1991.

35 See footnote 6.

36 Cf. Reisman and Eichel, *Kinsey, Sex and Fraud*, Lochinvar-Huntington House, 1990.

37 Tom W. Smith, *Adult Sexual Behavior in 1989: Numbers of Partners, Frequency and Risk*; Dawson, Fitti, Cynamon, “Aids Knowledge and Attitudes for January-March, 1990, Provisional

Data From the National Health Interview Study”; “Study of U.S. sex habits may contain surprises,” Dallas Morning Times, September 2, 1992, citing a recent University of Chicago study; Science magazine, July 3, 1992, reporting a very recent French study finding that only 4.1% of men and 2.6% of women claimed having had homosexual intercourse even once in their lives (cf. “Homosexual figures grossly exaggerated,” AFA Journal, September, 1992; a London Daily Mail report on “the most exhaustive survey ever conducted into British sexual habits,” citing findings that only 1.1% of British men said they were active homosexuals (cf. World magazine, January 29, 1994); and many more.

38 “Homosexual activity lower than believed, study shows,” Colorado Springs Gazette Telegraph, April 15, 1993, emphasis added.

39 “The Homosexual Numbers,” Newsweek, March 22, 1993.

40 Voeller, “Some Uses and Abuses of the Kinsey Scale, in Homosexuality, Heterosexuality: Concepts of Sexual Orientation, June Machover Reinisch, ed., Oxford University Press, 1990, emphasis added.

41 “Salk and Pepper,” the Bay Area Reporter, September 5, 1991.

42 Newsweek, February 24, 1992, p. 48.

43 The British Journal of Psychiatry, March 1992, vol. 160, pp. 407-409.

44 Cf. Bell and Weinberg, Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women, New York, Simon Schuster, 1978; Hammersmith, S.K., Sexual Preference: Its Development in Men and Women, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1981.

45 “Coming Out Ahead: The Homosexual Movement in the Academy,” First Things magazine, August/September 1993.

46 The Dallas Voice, June 19, 1987.

47 “Capital Gains,” Out magazine, Fall 1993, p. 91.

48 The writer thanks a friend, Dr. Lamar Allen, for his thoughts on Truth in Communication, from which these observations are in part drawn.