

# Is Homosexuality a Sin for New Testament Believers?

Author Unknown

It may seem strange and even foolish that I should even ask such questions. Aren't the Scriptures clear on this subject? Apparently not, if you listen to the many voices now embracing this life style. There are scholars and theologians who adamantly try to defend their homosexual life style based on the Scriptures.

While some do not believe that homosexual sex is even mentioned or described in Scripture, others freely admit that it is mentioned and was a capital crime under Moses, and strongly condemned by the Apostle Paul as being worthy of death. But among the latter it is argued that neither of these condemnations in the Old or the New Testaments applies to homosexual Believers in Christ. That is a twist we will examine carefully, as most have probably never heard of such a defense.

The purpose of this paper is not to single out or come down upon homosexuals. I have never written a paper entitled: "Is Stealing a Sin for New Testament Believers?" or, "Is Bearing False Witness a Sin?" or, "Is Murder a Sin?" So why "homosexuality? Because more and more, the media, entertainment, the government, the Church, the general population of America and much of the world, no longer believes it is a sin to be discriminated against, whereas even the basest of nations have laws against stealing, false witness, and murder.

So, my purpose here is not to judge, but to specifically establish whether homosexuality is a sin or not a sin for Believers in Christ under the New Covenant.

If it is not a sin, and these practices are normal and virtuous, then we should not be speaking or discriminating against them. But if it is a sin, then we should certainly speak out against it just as we should against adultery, idolatry, lying, stealing, etc. Let's try and look at the Scriptural facts with unbiased, open minds. If we are interested in obedience to Jesus Christ then we should be eager to know the truth one way or the other.

Most homosexuals do not argue with Lev. 20:13:

"If a man also lie with mankind, as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them."

However, defenders of homosexuality argue that this scripture no longer applies to them as Believers in Christ under the New Covenant, stating that they are no longer under the law of Moses.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to go into what is meant by no longer being "under the law." But I will give just a few comments concerning whether Lev. 20:13 is still binding on Christian Believers.

## A Silly Argument

Over the years I have received some bizarre reasons from the gay community regarding why they don't think homosexuality is a sin. Here is an example I received this week from a self-professed lesbian:

"Also, don't you find it interesting that when Jesus walked the earth, he never once brought up the subject? If it was such a sin, it would be one of the Ten Commandments, don't you think?"

No, I don't think so at all. Lev. 20:13 does not need to be one of the Ten Commandments before it has any jurisdiction over Christian Believers.

Jesus did not address child-molestation either; neither is it one of the Ten Commandments. Neither did Jesus address drug abuse, nor pornography, smoking, spousal abuse, or torture. Does this fact therefore condone such sins and atrocities? Are we to assume therefore that none of these are wrong or sinful? I hope we are not foolish enough to believe that if something is not mentioned in the Bible, then it shouldn't be considered a sin.

Listen: One of the Ten Commandments was against "stealing." But stealing did not carry the death sentence. Yet witchcraft (not one of the Ten Commandments) did carry the death sentence (Lev. 20:27). Having sexual intercourse with an animal carried the death sentence for both men and women (Lev. 20:15-16).

Who among us would deign to suggest to their children that having sex with farm yard animals is now okay since it is not condemned in the New Testament by Jesus, neither is one of the Ten Commandments? When all else fails, try a little common sense and basic morality.

## What is Homosexuality?

The actual words "homosexual" and "lesbian" are not found in the Scriptures. The word "homosexual" is reported to be a German invention to euphemize and take the place of the distasteful word "sodomite." Although the word "sodomy" as used today may not even have a direct connection with the sexual sins of historical Sodom.

While the Scriptures do not speak to us in crude street language, describing the actual mechanics of homosexual acts, nonetheless, the practice of same sex lust assuredly is mentioned and condemned in Scripture as a sin that needs to be repented of just as idolatry, adultery, stealing, murder, and all sins.

The word homosexual is applied to both men and women whose sexual preference is with one of the same gender. Male homosexuals are generally called "gay" or "gay men," while female homosexuals are generally called "gay women" or "lesbians."

Most gay men will acknowledge that male homosexuality is mentioned in Scripture. What may be alarming to many of my readers is that while they concede that it is mentioned and talked about, they deny that it is categorically a sin. On the other hand, many argue that gay women or lesbianism are not mentioned in Scripture at all. I will briefly comment on the one main Old Testament Scripture forbidding homosexuality. Below is an excerpt from the gaychurch.org web site regarding Lev. 18:22 & 20:13.

Professor Soards tells us:

"Old Testament experts view the regulations of Leviticus as standards of holiness, directives for the formation of community life, aimed at establishing and maintaining a people's identity in relation to God." This is because God was so determined that His people who were being formed into a new nation would not adopt the practices of the Baal worshipers in Canaan, and same-gender sex was part of Baal worship...

Even if we consider that morality was a factor in this rule, it is part of the Code, and when the Code became obsolete, as it is under Christ, that rule, as part of the Code, became obsolete. These verses in Leviticus have nothing to say to us today beyond the eternal principle of the need for purity in the worship of God. If the immorality expressed in them happens to be a principle for all time, then it will be found elsewhere in the Bible. (For heterosexuals it is found in Roman 1 which clearly condemns same-gender sex by

heterosexuals. There is nothing in the Bible to support any finding about homosexuals.)"  
By Bruce Lowe Appendix B: Bible Passages on Same-Gender Sex

Just a couple of comments: Clearly it is admitted that same gender sex was condemned under Moses (being punishable by death), and that it was a practice of "Baal worship." And so it suggested that homosexuality was not inherently wrong, but rather it was wrong because it was practiced in the worship of Baal.

Apparently, had not the pagans used homosexuality in their worship of Baal, God would have allowed it. I think not.

It is then suggested that since homosexuality was a part of the things forbidden under the law of Moses (which they call "the Code"), but Christian Believers are not under the Code, but under Christ, therefore, "the Code became obsolete."

Well I have already commented on the absurdity of this with regarding things like bestiality, which I seriously doubt they would condone under this same "became obsolete" argument. So what is the argument for not following the admonition of Paul regarding same gender sex in Rom. 1:26-27? Well you just read it: Once again, here is how they express it.

*"For heterosexuals it is found in Romans 1 which clearly condemns same-gender sex by heterosexuals. There is nothing in the Bible to support any finding about homosexuals."*

Now I must admit that statement overwhelms me. Since it cannot be denied that Paul is speaking of same gender sex in Rom. 1:26-27, what are they to do? Well, they dogmatically state that Paul is not condemning homosexuality sex between homosexuals, but rather they state that Paul is CONDEMNING HOMOSEXUAL SEX BETWEEN HETEROSEXUALS! Is that not akin to suggesting that it is not wrong for alcoholics to get drunk, but rather it is wrong for NON-ALCOHOLICS to get drunk?

We will now see whether the Scriptures substantiate the above assertion that:

*"There is nothing in the Bible to support any finding about homosexuals."*

We will first look at three sexual perversions closely allied with homosexuality.

## Three Categories of Perverted Sex

"Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators [Gk: paramours], nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate [Gk: catamites], nor abusers of themselves with mankind [Gk: sodomites] nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 6:9-10).

What are **paramours**, **catamites**, and **sodomites**?

- **paramours** (King James, 'fornicators')-Strong's #4205  **pornos** "to sell, a male prostitute (as venal), a debauchee (libertine): fornicator, whoremonger."
- **prostitute**: "one who solicits and accepts payment for sex" (American Heritage College Dictionary).
- **venal**: "capable of betraying honor, duty, or scruples for a price, corruptible" (AHCD).

- **debauchee/debauchery:** "to corrupt morally, to lead away from excellence or virtue, indulge in dissipation [lacking moral restraint, indulgence in sensual pleasure], orgies [unrestrained sexual activities],"
- **libertine:** "one without moral restraint" (AHCD)
- **catamites** (King James, 'effeminate')-Strong's #3120 malakos "soft, fine clothing, a catamite, effeminate."
- **catamite:** "a boy who has a sexual relationship with a man" (AHCD).
- **effeminate:** "having characteristics more often associated with women than a man" (AHCD).
- **sodomites** (King James, 'abusers of themselves with mankind'-Strong's #733 arsenokoites "a sodomite, defile self with mankind."

The elements of the Greek word **arsenokoites** are "male-lier"-A male who lies with a male. "Male bed partners"--Wycliffe Bible Dictionary.

## These Perversions are Condemned in Scripture

"I wrote unto you in an epistle not to keep company with **fornicators** [Gk: ' *pornos*'-paramour/male prostitutes] ...with such an one not to eat" (I Cor. 5:9-11).

"For this you know, that no **whoremonger** [Gk:  *pornos*-paramour/male prostitute] ...has any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God" (Eph. 5:5).

"Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for ...**whoremongers** [Gk:  *pornos*-paramour/male prostitute] ...and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine" (I Tim. 1:9-10).

"Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled, but **whoremongers** [Gk:  *pornos*-paramour/male prostitute] and adulterers God will judge" (Heb. 13:4).

"But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and **whoremongers** [Gk:  *pornos*-paramour/male prostitute], and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone which is the second death" (Rev. 21:8).

"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs and sorcerers, and **whoremongers** [Gk:  *pornos*-paramour/male prostitute], and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loves and makes [practices] a lie" (Rev. 22:14-15).

"Be not deceived, neither ...**effeminate** [Gk:  *malakos*-catamite/boy with man sex] shall inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 6:9-10).

"Be not deceived, neither ...**abusers of themselves with mankind** [Gk:  *arsenokoites*-sodomites/male bed partners/male-liers] shall inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 6:9-10).

Paul states that none who continue to commit the sins listed above "shall inherit the kingdom of God." These sins need to be repented of and put in the past. And that is what the chosen Few in these Gentiles churches were doing.

Notice Paul's consolation to those who repented of these sinful deeds of the flesh:

**"And such [unrighteous, fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, effeminate, abusers of themselves with mankind, thieves, covetous, drunkards, revilers, extortioners] WERE [past tense, but not now] **some of you but you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God"** (1 Cor. 6:11).**

Next we will see whether the Scriptures actually and specifically speak of both male and female homosexuality. Here are a couple more statements from gaychurch.org:

"Clearly the passage [Rom. 1:26-27] is talking about people for whom sex with the opposite gender is "natural." We call them "heterosexual." There is nothing in this passage that relates to homosexual people."

Conservative theologian Richard Hays says:

"No direct appeal to Romans 1 as a source of rules about sexual conduct is possible."

We shall see.

## Men with Men and Women with Women

"For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even [1] their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also [2] the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense [penalty] of their error which was meet [due]" (Rom. 1:26-27).

There is a lot more contained in this verse than perceived in the eye of English.

First of all, all that is to follow in this dissertation by Paul comes under the general category of "**vile affections.**" The word **vile** in this verse is Strong's #819 **atimia**, which means, "infamy, indignity, disgrace, dishonor, reproach, shame, vile." And so the things of which Paul is going to speak, are things that are: infamous, indignant, disgraceful, dishonorable, reproachable, shameful, and vile. Not a pretty picture; not a dissertation on godly virtue and morality.

## What was "Against Nature?"

First Paul mentions:

**"...their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature..."**

Some foolishly bury their heads in the sand and suggest that nothing immoral is actually mentioned here. Does it sound to you that leaving the natural use of something and using it in a way that is **against nature burning in their lust**, is a good thing? No, I think not. Okay, but can we determine exactly what it is that was being misused and against nature? Yes, we certainly can.

We just saw that it has to do with **affections** that women have that are **against nature**. That is, against the nature of the proper use of something ('**did change the natural USE**'). But what? Just what is that certain something that women change from **the natural use** of into something that is vile, disgraceful, and shameful? What is it that they are **using** disgracefully because of **unnatural vile affections**? I'll now show you maybe more precisely than you really want to know, what it was that **"...their women did change the natural use [of] into that which is against nature..."**

Do we think Paul is referring to the improper use of their ears? Did they change the natural use of their eyes? Maybe it was their hands? Did these men and women in question here start using their feet in an unnatural way?

Whatever it was that the women were doing **against nature**, the men were likewise also doing the very same thing:

"And likewise also the men leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men..." (Verse 27).

What does Paul mean by "**likewise also**?" Simple, the Greek for "likewise" is *homoios*, and it means "similar," "likewise." The Greek for "also" is *kai* and it means "and, also, even, too, both indeed, likewise."

Interestingly, we have another verse of Scripture which also uses these same two Greek words and translates them the same:

"**And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also [Gk: kai] to them likewise [Gk: *homoios*]" (Luke 6:31).**

We are to treat others in a similar way, as we would want others to treat us. That is how these two words are used in Luke 6:31, and that is how they are used in Rom. 1:27. What the women were doing **against nature**, the men "**likewise also**" were doing "**against nature**." Now then, what was it that they were doing?

The men who were doing **likewise also** as the women "**burned in their lust one [man] toward another [man], MEN WITH MEN...**" Okay, lest someone suggest that this is merely human companionship and doesn't involve SEX, let's continue and see just what parts of the human anatomy is being referenced here.

## What did Paul Mean by "Unseemly?"

"...likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is **unseemly**..."

It is so easy when reading Scripture to not pay close attention to all the words. These five words "**working that which is unseemly**" are translated from only one Greek word, *aschemosune*, and this word is used only one other time in Scripture, which I will now show you so as to remove all doubt as to its meaning:

"Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed *is* he that watches, and keeps his garments, lest he walk naked, and they SEE his shame [*aschemosune*]" (Rev. 16:15).

Here Jesus is using figurative language. In the same way someone is shamed by taking off all their clothing in public (so will those who do not spiritually watch for Jesus be spiritually shamed).

So what is it that people see when someone is naked? Why, for example, are there many topless beaches around the world where total nudity is not allowed? What **shame** [*aschemosune*] is made visible in Rev. 15:16 by **walking naked**? And what is it that is "**working that which is unseemly** [*aschemosune*]" in Rom. 1:27? Some of you are already way ahead of me.

The King James translators have often chosen words of modesty, so as to not offend the sensitive reader.

Strong's Greek Dictionary: "**unseemly/shame**" #808, *aschemosune*, "an indecency; by implication the puḗnda: shame, which is unseemly."

And just what is the "pudenda?"

*The American Heritage College Dictionary*: **pudendum/ pl. pudenda** *n.* "The human external genital organs, especially of a woman" (p. 1127). There it is.

It was the genital organs of the female that:

**"...women did change the natural use into that which is against nature** [women with women]: **And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman** [and her genital organs], **burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working** [with each other's genital organs] **that which is unseemly**" (Rom. 1:26-27).

I will not get anymore graphic than that.

Romans 1:26-27 is a very strong condemnation of the list of **vile affections** starting with sex between women with women, and men with men. And professing faith in the love and Sacrifice of Jesus Christ does not turn this perversion into a virtue.

When Isaiah tells us to:

"Cry aloud, spare not, lift up your voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins" (Isa. 58:1).

Should I just keep my mouth shut on this subject?

Few Christians believe that those who practice adultery, stealing, and lying will enter God's Kingdom without repenting. But this is not the case with practicing homosexuals.

Speaking against homosexuality may soon become a hate crime law in which offenders will be prosecuted as criminals. Let's take a closer Scriptural look at this subject while the law still allows it.

## The Rest of Paul's Proclamation against Homosexuals

Let's look at these verses on homosexuality by the Apostle Paul, in the context of this section of Scripture:

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold [back] the truth in unrighteousness... Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves... For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature:

And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another, men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which is meet.

And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers,

Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenant breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are WORTHY OF DEATH, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them" (Rom. 1:18, 24, 26-32).

This is the largest single list of ungodliness, unrighteousness, sins, crimes, and corruption found anywhere in the entirety of the Scriptures, and notice that heading the list are:

- "to dishonor their own bodies between themselves"
- "women did change the natural use into that which is against nature"
- "men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another, men with men"

Paul concludes this list of carnal sins by stating: "**they which commit such things are WORTHY OF DEATH**" (as is every other sin mentioned). Now the very fact that the perpetrators of such sexual perversions deny they are sins, and large segments of society and government condone these sins, shows how morally decayed our nation is becoming.

## Homosexuality in America

In Politics and Government: Most Democratic presidential candidates recently spoke at a gay forum in which they unanimously gave approval to the homosexuals in America. There was a split over whether gays can legally marry partners of the same sex, but as for gay relationships and gay rights they received overwhelming support from these wanna-be presidents of the USA. Likewise it is reported that up to three-quarters of Americans support gay rights and civil unions, but half do not support gay marriage.

In Entertainment: TV dramas, situation comedies, and major films are now glamorizing the gay life. A recent film about two gay cowboys, entitled BROKEBACK MOUNTAIN, received rave reviews, such as the following:

*"This is simply one of the greatest love stories in film history." (Film Focus)*

*"Brokeback Mountain is about as close to perfection as it's possible to come in modern Hollywood." (St. Louis Post-Dispatch)*

How have some churches responded to the national acceptance of what Paul clearly condemns? Consider the following reports from some of the nations leading news sources:

"Flouting what they call a "don't ask, don't tell" policy, more than 80 gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgendered Lutheran ministers declared their sexuality on Tuesday in hopes of changing a church rule that excludes gay and lesbian clergy who do not live chastely."

"The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America voted to refrain from disciplining clergy in committed same-sex relationships." (The Post Chronicle)

Reuters reported:

The largest U.S. Presbyterian Church body approved a measure on that would open the way for the ordination of gays and lesbians under certain circumstances.

After Paul states "**For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections,**" he gives us the following list of sins:

"...women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly... unrighteous, fornication, wicked, covetous, malicious, envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity, whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful,

proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful..." (Rom. 1:27-31).

What justification, pray tell, is there in lifting out the first two sins: "...women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly..." as being perfectly virtuous (if done out of what gays would call true love) while the rest of the sins remain sins?

By whose authority are the government, the media, and the Church rendering these sins as defensible and virtuous?

It is now both politically incorrect and socially incorrect to speak of these perversions as sin, and now (according to polls) the majority of Americans also either feels pressured, or just cannot see any immorality in homosexuality.

When immorality is condoned and even lauded, it spills over into every aspect of society. Even child rapists are getting off with little more than a slap on the hand and a few months probation. Such behavior in our judicial system forty or fifty years ago would have been outrageous, but few are showing much alarm over such judicial travesties today.

I am not condemning the sinners, but I am condemning the sin and the lax attitudes toward this sin. As Paul clearly states:

**"...and such were some of YOU."**

How is it that Paul can state: "**such were**" some of you?

"For ALL HAVE SINNED and come short of the Glory of God" (Rom. 3:23).

God will pardon all of our sins, but they must be put in our past.

If I condoned my own past sins, I never would have repented of them.

"Wherein in time past you walked according to the course of this world... Among whom also we all had our conduct in times past in the lust of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh..." (Eph. 2:2-3).

Continuing:

"For ALL have sinned... Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are PAST, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. (Rom. 3:24-26).

Now back up to the beginning of Romans 6:

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" (Rom. 6:1-2).

There is salvation available, and it is by grace, not our own personal works of righteousness, but we must first repent. This repentance is also by grace. It is a gift from God just like salvation itself. Once again, we are ALL in the same boat for we have ALL sinned.

Notice next what Paul says after his declaration against a list of 27 major sins. Paul's statement that **"...they which commit such things are worthy of DEATH,"** does not end his declarations on this subject. We must continue into chapter 2:

"Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judges: for wherein you judge another, thou condemn yourself; for thou that judge do the same things. But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth against them which commit such things.

And think you this, O man, that judge them which do such things, and do the same, that thou shall escape the judgment of God? Or despise you the riches of His goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leads thee to REPENTANCE?" (Rom. 2:1-4).

While "Christ died for our sins" (I Cor. 15:3), all sins that Jesus died for must be repented of or that person will not inherit the Kingdom of God, but will rather be raised up in Judgment. Christ dying for the sins of the world is not the final step with the issue of sin and sinners. The final step is to GET THE SIN OUT OF THE SINNER, and that is precisely what will happen, Christ "will judge the world in righteousness" (Acts 17:31) and the ungodly "will learn righteousness" (Isa. 26:9). Then and only then will "God be ALL in ALL" (I Cor. 15:28).

Here is one of the most sobering Scriptures in the entire New Testament:

And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? (Luke 6:46).

Jesus Christ personally commissioned Paul to be the Apostle to the Gentiles. What Paul wrote to the churches was under divine inspiration of Jesus Christ. All of these profound life and death declarations of Paul are just as valid as if Jesus Himself declared them.

### As Long as it Doesn't Hurt Anyone

It has been foolishly stated that virtually anything is permissible including deviant sex, "As long as it doesn't hurt anyone."

But what some can't seem to realize is that it hurts them. Having sex with animals doesn't hurt anyone else, but it sure hurts the one doing it. It is both a perversion of the body and a perversion of the mind.

### Doesn't Nature Teach us the Proper Use of Sex?

Numerous species of animals have been seen performing sex on the same gender. Therefore, if this is a part of God's own nature of things among some animals, then surely it is permissible among humans? Oh really? And since when are we to look to the beasts of the field for the proper interpretation of human morality?

Since animals kill and eat each other, does this set a moral standard for people to do the same?

Since numerous species kill and eat their own young, does this justify people killing and eating their own babies?

### I Was Born This Way

[In search of the elusive homosexual gene]

Numerous homosexuals have written me stating that God made them homosexuals, seeing that they were "born this way."

Much of this research has been done by gays that have a vested interest in the outcome. Hence much of their research is in fact biased, as is admitted by those who favor homosexuality. Is there a homosexual gene which causes homosexuality, and has any such thing ever been scientifically proven?

There are hundreds and hundreds of web sites on this one aspect of homosexuality alone. Here are some quotations from the NARTH web site:

"Volunteers from gay groups may only participate if they have a gay brother or sister. Even gay advocates such as J. Michael Bailey (in Bailey & Dawood, 1998) admit: "If, for example, a gay twin who sees an advertisement for a [twin] study may be less likely to call if his twin is heterosexual, this would cause concordance-dependent bias" (p. 10).

The "genetic and unchangeable" theory has been actively promoted by gay activists and the popular media. Is homosexuality really an inborn and normal variant of human nature? No. There is no evidence that shows that homosexuality is simply "genetic." **And none of the research claims there is.** Only the press and certain researchers do, when speaking in sound bites to the public.

Occasionally you may read about a scientific study that suggests that homosexuality is an inherited tendency, but such studies have usually been discounted after careful scrutiny or attempts at replication. No one has found a single hereditary genetic, hormonal or physical difference between heterosexuals and homosexuals - at least none that is replicable. While the absence of such a discovery doesn't prove an inherited sexual tendencies aren't possible, it suggests that none has been found because none exists

What the majority of respected scientists now believe is that homosexuality is attributable to a combination of **psychological, social, and biological factors.**

From the American Psychological Association:

"[M]any scientists share the view that sexual orientation is shaped for most people at an early age through complex interactions of biological, psychological and social factors."

From "Gay Brain" Researcher Simon LeVay:

"At this point, the most widely held opinion [on causation of homosexuality] is that multiple factors play a role."

From Dennis McFadden, University of Texas neuroscientist:

"Any human behavior is going to be the result of **complex intermingling of genetics and environment.** It would be astonishing if it were not true for homosexuality."

From Sociologist Steven Goldberg:

*"I know of no one in the field who argues that homosexuality can be explained without reference to environmental factors."*

[Above quotations from NARTH web site (National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality) All **bold** emphasis are theirs, not mine]

Here are a few quotations from THE NATIONAL VALUES COALITION:

Homosexual researchers Bailey and Pillard conducted the famous "twins study" quoted by homosexual activist groups to promote the idea that being "gay" is genetic. The study found that among those twins studied, the researchers found a rate of homosexuality of 52% (both twins homosexuals); 22% among non-identical twins; and a 9.2% rate among non-twins.

This was hailed by homosexual activists groups and by the media as supposedly proving that homosexuality is genetic. The study actually proved the opposite. As Byrd, et al, note: "This study actually provides support for environmental factors. If homosexuality were in the genetic code, all of the identical twins would have been homosexual."

In short, the three most famous studies in recent years that homosexual activists use to claim that homosexuality is genetic prove no such thing. **In fact, two of the authors of these studies admit their research has not proven a genetic basis to homosexuality.** [bold is emphasis of The National Values Coalition-traditional values.org, Article: "Homosexual Urban Legends-BORN GAY"]

The Catholic Medical Association web site is helping to debunk the notion that individuals are "born gay."

"There is no verifiable evidence that same-sex attraction is genetically determined. If same-sex attraction were genetically determined, identical twins would always have the same sexual attraction pattern. Numerous studies of twins have shown that this is not the case. And there are numerous studies documenting change of sexual attraction patterns." (bold emphasis is by 'Homosexuality and Hope,' available at cathmed.org.)

Although there are some agencies that still adhere to the "born gay" theory, some of their own advocates are now admitting there is no known gay gene. Even the Catholic Church who has had to deal with an insurmountable plethora of sexual sins within their priesthood of recent years, cannot and do not attempt to blame such sexual perversion on genes or heredity which would lighten their burden in this matter enormously.

Interestingly I could find no web-page which discussed whether or not there is a reported gene for child molesters. Not one. And yet some of them also contend that they were "born pedophiles," and at a very young age fantasized over having sex with little children. Homosexuality is not even in the same ball park with the gross perversion of pedophilia, yet both claim to be "born that way." Should we lighten the burden; lighten the sentence; lighten the moral perspective of pedophiles because they CLAIM to be "born that way?" Nonsense. It is not a defense for the pedophile, and neither it is a defense for the homosexual.

## God is the Law-Giver and Determines what Sin Is

When David acknowledged his sins of adultery and murder by having Bathsheba's husband Uriah killed so he could then take Uriah's beautiful wife Bathsheba in adultery, he didn't repent toward Bathsheba, or Uriah, or even the nation of Israel, but rather said:

**"Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight"** (Psalm 51:4).

James informs us that:

**"There is one Lawgiver Who is able to save and to destroy"** (James 4:12).

God also inspired Isaiah to write:

"WOE unto them that call evil good and good evil... Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight! ...Which justify the wicked [Heb: *rasha*, 'morally wrong] for reward..." (Isa. 5:20-21 & 23).

Did the Apostle Paul have totally different criteria than that of Isaiah? Was Paul's condemnation of "**women with women and men with men**" an example of "**rasha**" (morally wrong), but somehow this same sin to Isaiah would be "good" and not "evil?" Nonsense.

## God Condemns All Lust for Sex

The seventh commandment states: "**You shall not commit adultery**" (Ex. 20:14). It is generally thought that adultery means one partner of a marriage having sex with a third person. This is a narrow view of the commandment, however. Jesus plainly taught us the spiritual meaning of this commandment:

"You have heard that it was said by them of old time, You shall not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looks on a woman [Gk: *gune*, 'a woman; a wife'] to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. 5:27-28).

The word **gune** can mean a wife, but it is also used many times to represent unmarried women.

So notice the profound implications of Jesus declaration: He quotes the Old Testament commandment against adultery and states that it applies to lusting after a women (not just physically intercourse). And not just someone's wife, but any woman.

Now under Moses, the law against adultery applied equally to women who committed adultery against their husbands. And so, likewise, if a woman just "looks upon a man to lust after him," she has committed adultery with him in her heart.

But does this include women lusting after women, and men lusting after men?"

Of course it does!

Do we think that a man is not allowed to "lust" after a women (which can be legally married together), but it is perfectly okay for a man to "lust" after another man (which can not be legally married together)? And if you think the 7th commandment does not cover this sin, then I assure you that the 10th one does.

## The 7th and 10th Commandments Bookend Homosexuality

If you think that homosexuals don't "LUST" for sex with the same gender, then I believe there is still some cheap swampland available in Florida.

Speaking of the 7<sup>th</sup> Commandment, Jesus said:

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looks on a woman to lust [Gk: *epithumeo*, Neg. 'covet, desire, lust after'] after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. 5:27-28).

Likewise, one breaks the 7th commandment if a woman lusts after a man, or a woman lusts after a woman, or a women lusts after a little boy, or a man lusts after a man, or a man lusts after a little boy, or a little girl. If the "lust" itself BREAKS the commandment, what in the world do we think the actual "act" BREAKS?

With respect to the 10<sup>th</sup> commandment, Paul said:

"What shall we say then? **Is the law sin?** God forbid. **Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law:** for I had not known lust [Gk: *epithumia*, 'a longing (for what is forbidden),

concupiscence {a strong sexual lust}, desire, lust] except the law had said, You shall not covet [Gk: epithumeo, Neg. 'covet, desire, lust after']" (Rom. 7:7).

Okay then, if we can all walk and chew gum at the same time, we should not have a problem in putting these two Greek words together. Jesus said that "**epithumeo**-covet, desire, lust after" breaks the 7th commandment against adultery. And Paul said that the reason that "**epithumia**-a longing for what is forbidden, concupiscence {a strong sexual lust}, desire, and lust" is wrong is because the 10th commandment states "**You shall not covet**"-"**epithumeo**, covet, desire, lust after." But wait, there's more.

The 10th commandment goes on to say:

"You shall not covet your neighbor's house, you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is your neighbor's" (Ex.20:17).

Now then, let me spell it out for you: Believers in Christ Jesus are NOT to **covet** [epithumeo-"covet, desire, lust after"] his neighbor's:

**WIFE**-neither men nor women are to covet one's neighbor's wife.

**MANSERVANT**-neither men nor women are to covet their neighbor's manservant, whether they be 9 years old or 29 years old.

**MAIDSERVANT**-neither men nor women are to covet one's neighbor's maidservant, whether they are 9 years old or 29 years old.

**OX OR ASS**-neither men nor women are to covet one's neighbor's ox or ass whether for production of meat or to have sex with them.

The teaching of the Old Testament, the New Testament, the 7th commandment, the 10th commandment, the teachings of the Apostle Paul, and our Lord Jesus Christ, all condemn homosexuality as SIN. This subject is completely book-ended-there is no wiggle room left for justifying the practice of homosexuality in any form.

Does the Bible speak of "illegal sex" and "legal sex?" Yes, it does:

## God's Remedy for Sexual Gratification

How are we to be sexually gratified? Here's the Scriptural teaching.

"For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain [remain sexually pure and virtuous], let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn [Gk: *puroo*-'inflamed with lust']" (1 Cor. 7:7-9).

So what would the homosexual say to this? Well at least some of them would totally agree. Why do you think that they are trying to get same-sex marriage legalized? Yes, they would agree with Paul-let's get MARRIED.

Back up a few verses for God's answer as to who should be married to whom:

"Nevertheless, to avoid fornication [Gk: porneia], let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband" (1 Cor. 7:2).

Paul gives only one answer to the problem of **fornication**, and it is for each man to have his wife and each woman to have her own husband. Does anyone see Paul suggesting an "alternative life style" in which **fornication** can be avoided? Does Paul suggest that **porneia** can be avoided by every man having his own husband, and every woman her own wife?

Paul knew about "**women with women and men with men**" when he wrote his epistle to the Romans (Rom. 1:26-27). Such unions **against nature** are clearly not acceptable solutions to burning with inflamed sexual emotions, and a way to "**avoid fornication/porneia.**" Peter warns against being **willingly ignorant**, and Paul sternly warns against "Believers" who "**willfully sin?**"

"For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries" (Heb. 10:26-27).

Paul could not have been more clear. To avoid the sin of **porneia**, we are to [1] MARRY, [2] MEN marry a WIFE, and [3] WOMEN marry a HUSBAND. Men marrying men and women marrying women are not legal options. Men and women who have **vile affections**, and **BURN in their lust, women with women and men with men... are worthy of DEATH** (Rom. 1:26-27 & 32).

How many homosexuals would dare insinuate that their passion for one another of the same gender is not "coveting/lust?" Are Believers to think that they can continue living in such sin and somehow be covered by the "the grace of God?"

Long after Christ's resurrection and the introduction of faith, grace, and justification, Paul is still teaching that such burning affections for the same sex are **VILE, and worthy of DEATH**. And if you can't **contain**, then get married-MEN TO WIVES AND WOMEN TO HUSBANDS.

Does anyone in their right mind believe that Paul would tell us: "To avoid sexual perversion, you should enter into a union of **sexual perversion?**"

The ONLY way to avoid the sins of **porneia** if one cannot contain one's inflamed desires, is to marry a mate of the opposite sex. When our Creator God Almighty inaugurated holy matrimony, He joined together Adam and Eve, not Kevin & Steve or Alice & Marie!

I know that some homosexuals are arrogant and try to justify their sin. Others hate their sin and wish to stop but can't. We all make choices, and a choice is what we prefer. One may hate the fact that he is a smoker, yet, he "prefers" the feeling he gets from smoking over the feeling he doesn't get when he runs out of cigarettes or tries to quit. To quit you must have a stronger reason for not doing something than you have for doing something. It's all about motivation.

Sometimes just knowing that something is a sin is reason to quit. That is why I quit smoking. I knew it was not good for my health, it was dirty, it was annoying to others, and it was costly, etc. But I did not quit until I became convinced that is was sinning against God.

I enjoyed smoking a LOT when I quit. But sometimes it takes a doctor telling you that you will die if you don't quit a particular life style. But the bottom line is, you won't stop committing the sin unless and until God Almighty has determined that you will quit. And that is equally true for atheists, although they don't know or won't acknowledge that as yet.

Heterosexual men are just as weak when it comes to lusting after women, as homosexuals are when it comes to lusting after members of the same gender. The ONLY way that I know of to break these sins and have victory over them is for God to empower you with a greater motivation to live righteously than to live un-righteously. If what you desire to be is "good," then there is only One Source:

"And also that every man should eat and drink, and enjoy the good of all his labor, It is the gift of God" (Ecc. 3:13).

"EVERY good gift and EVERY perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (James 1:17).

We will continue to pray for all those who desire to come out of the bondage and slavery of "**...the sin which does so easily beset us....**" (Heb. 12:1).