

Common Challenges In Support of Homosexuality

Timothy Zebell
February 15, 2014

Challenge 1: Promiscuity would decrease if homosexuals were allowed to marry.

Data indicates that the majority of homosexuals do not desire marriage. Sociologist Kathleen Hull of the University of Minnesota was quoted by *USA Today* as saying:¹

“

Some gays and lesbians clearly want to get married, but others are unsure or reject marriage for themselves. And many LGBT people seem to have mixed views on whether marriage is a good model for same-sex relationships. ... We asked people whether they thought marriage was a good relationship model for same-sex couples. About half were ambivalent, about a third said it was a good model, and less than a fifth said it was a bad model. Those who were ambivalent talked about marriage not being right for everybody or not being desired by everybody, about the fact that other relationship models can also work, that marriage is not necessary for happiness. Some said they just didn't see the point of marriage, but if others want it, they should have that option.

Similarly, researcher Bill Muehlenberg reported in his book *Strained Relations* that Australian studies have found that only about 20% of homosexual couples have shown an interest in marriage.² He references the Netherlands, where same-sex marriage has been legal since 2001. Within the first five years of legalization, only about 4% of Dutch homosexuals married.³ Ten years after legalization, another study revealed that 9 out of ten homosexual couples opted not to marry.⁴ Even in Massachusetts—which was the first U.S. state to legalize same-sex marriage, and only the Sixth jurisdiction in the world to do so—merely 16% of the state's homosexual couples took advantage of the new law.^{5,6}

The inability to marry is not the primary culprit in homosexual promiscuity. Many homosexuals readily admit this. After declaring the wayward impulse to be “inevitable in man-to-man affairs,” Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, wrote in their book *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 1990's*, “If, as statistics have often shown, at least two-thirds of

¹ Jayson, “Not All Gays and Lesbians Want to Marry, Research Shows.”

² Sotirios, “Same-sex Marriage,” 82, Source: Muehlenberg, *Strained Relations*, 98.

³ Gallagher, “Demand for Same-sex Marriage,” 2, Source: Muehlenberg, *Strained Relations*, 98.

⁴ Duncan, “The Tenth Anniversary,” 3, Source: Muehlenberg, *Strained Relations*, 99.

⁵ Wikipedia, “Same-sex Marriage”.

⁶ Gallagher, “Demand for Same-sex Marriage,” 6, Source: Muehlenberg, *Strained Relations*, 99.

married men are, at one time or another, unfaithful to their wives, then surely the cheating ratio of ‘married’ gay males, given enough time, approaches 100%. Men are, after all, as said earlier, more easily aroused than women, who tend to act as a relatively stabilizing influence; a restless gay man is more apt to be led astray by a cute face in the subway or the supermarket. Two gay men are double trouble, arithmetically squaring the probability of the fatal affairette.”⁷ Likewise, former homosexual William Aaron said, “In the gay life, fidelity is almost impossible. Since part of the compulsion of homosexuality seems to be a need on the part of the homophile to ‘absorb’ masculinity from his sexual partners, he must be constantly on the lookout for [new partners]. Consequently the most successful homophile ‘marriages’ are those where there is an arrangement between the two to have affairs on the side while maintaining the semblance of permanence in their living arrangement.”⁸

Given the available data, it appears as though homosexual promiscuity is not the consequence of being denied marriage. Rather, it is a defining element of the homosexual lifestyle, just as gay authors Charles Silverstein and Edmund White wrote in their book, *The Joy of Gay Sex*, “Sexual promiscuity is one of the most striking distinguishing features of gay life in America.”⁹ This is not to say that every homosexual is promiscuous, but according to the data, the vast majority have been, and this is not likely to change with the legalization of same-sex marriage.

Challenge 2: Homosexuality is natural and acceptable because it is found within the animal kingdom.

True homosexuality within the animal kingdom is very rare. It is certainly not a strong argument for proving that homosexuality is normal. If anything, it affirms that homosexuality is not typical, being an aberration of the norm. Consider, for example, penguins. Because of their habit of mating for life, and because of some high profile “gay penguins” at zoos, penguins have often been cited in support of true homosexuality within the animal kingdom. However, this claim has been proven false. According to *The Daily Mail*, “Penguins do not form long-term homosexual relationships despite same-sex flirting, a new study has found. ... Experts believe that the penguins might indulge in some same-sex flirting because they are ‘lonely’ due to a lack of female penguins in the colony. Gay ‘flirting’ could also be due to high levels of testosterone within the colony among males.”¹⁰

More importantly, we are not animals. We are created in the image of God. Unlike us, animals are controlled by their passions and instincts. One need only observe a dog clinging to its owner’s leg to realize that animals may relieve their sexual passion on anything and everything. Were we to determine moral behavior based upon practices within the animal kingdom, then we could murder and maim others to acquire their position because they are weak; we could eat fellow humans; and we could abandon, or even murder, our spouses after procreation. Certainly, behavior within the animal kingdom is not sufficient to condone human behavior.

⁷ Kirk, *After the Ball*, 330.

⁸ Aaron, *Straight*, 208, Source: Muehlenberg, *Strained Relations*, 104-105.

⁹ Muehlenberg, *Strained Relations*, 9.

¹⁰ Daily Mail Reporter, “Penguins have ‘Gay Flings’ because they are Lonely – but End Up in a Heterosexual Couple.”

Challenge 3: What about a person with a same-sex orientation who never finds members of the opposite sex attractive?

Sex has a context. It cannot be separated from that context, which is marriage between a man and a woman. What about the man who can't have sex because his wife won't have sex with him? Is he then free to have sex with other women? Of course not, and yet this is essentially the same argument. This argument maintains that if a person cannot experience sex within the acceptable parameters of God, then he must be free to seek sex outside of those parameters.

Sometimes we mistakenly assume that sexual relations is a right to which everyone is entitled. However, as Jesus noted in [Matthew 19:12](#), some people are born eunuchs, and some are made so by other men. Is it fair that the man who was born a eunuch or made so by other men does not get to experience sex? No ... but life is not entirely fair because of the curse of sin.

God is fully capable of granting a person a new sexual orientation. Certainly, there are many testimonies to this effect. However, it is possible that some may never experience this. Instead, God may be calling them to demonstrate God's grace and provision through life-long celibacy. After all, Jesus also noted in [Matthew 19:12](#) that some have made themselves eunuchs—meaning that some have chosen celibacy—for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.

Challenge 4: Jesus overturned the Law. It is hypocritical for anyone who does not continue to offer sacrifices to say that homosexuality is still a sin.

Jesus declared in [Matthew 5:17](#), *“Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them.”* Jesus did not nullify the Law. If Jesus did away with everything in the Law, then it must be permissible to murder, steal, lie, covet, *et cetera*; however, these are reaffirmed as sins throughout the New Testament. The redemption laws—dietary matters, rituals, cleansings, sacrifices, and priestly duties—were fulfilled when Jesus died on the cross, but Jesus never removed the moral law. (This is expounded upon in the answer to the next challenges.)

Challenges 5 & 6:

- **God called eating shell fish and other things that we do today an abomination. If these are no longer abominations then why is homosexuality still considered an abomination?**
- **In the Old Testament, God commanded the Jews to kill those who practiced homosexuality. Are we supposed to kill homosexuals today?**

The Old Testament Law consisted of three categories:

- **Ceremonial law:** This included such things as dietary matters, rituals, cleansings, sacrifices, and priestly duties.

- Civil law: Israel was a Theocracy, so God established laws for social order. These laws were for Israel's government, not the governments of all nations.
- Moral law: These laws were based upon God's eternal character.

The ceremonial and civil laws were rescinded in the New Testament, but not the moral law ([Acts 10:9-15](#); [Romans 13:1-9](#)). Instead, the moral law was taken to a higher level ([Matthew 5:20-48](#)). Jesus never contradicted or negated the moral law. When Jesus spoke of such things as sexual immorality, murder, theft, etc., He was affirming the common understanding and practice of the moral law found in the Old Testament ([Matthew 5:19-20](#)). However, Jesus fulfilled the ceremonial law in His ministry on the cross ([Matthew 5:17](#)). Thus, what was considered abominable based upon ceremonial law—such as eating shell fish, wearing clothes of mixed fibers, and touching pig skin—was only abominable to the Jewish people, and that only for a set period of time. These are not considered by God to be abominable practices for us today.

Laws such as killing those who participated in homosexual practices, or the stoning of rebellious children were limited to the Jewish nation when they were governed by a Theocracy. This is not how God expects His people to handle these civil matters today. Instead, we are commanded to follow the civil laws of our nation's particular government regarding these matters ([Romans chapter 13](#)).

In contrast to ceremonial and civil laws which were given for a time, God's moral law preceded the giving of the Old Testament Law, and it has remained in effect subsequent to the fulfilling of the Old Testament Law ([Leviticus chapter 18](#); [Leviticus 20:13 and 23](#); [1 Corinthians 6:9-10](#)). For more information on this, read *Laid Bare* chapter two, "How Does Theology Determine Sexuality?"

Challenge #7: Society has evolved its understanding of what is socially acceptable. The taboo against same-sex marriage is the modern equivalent of America's former taboo against inter-racial marriages.

Same-sex marriages and inter-racial marriages cannot be equated. This is a clear case of comparing apples to oranges. Although homosexuals have been—and in too many cases are still being—mistreated and abused, their experiences cannot be compared to the history of enslavement, segregation, and abuse of other races. There are no gay-only drinking fountains, bathrooms, or seating. In many ways, the homosexual community has attempted to hijack the black civil rights efforts, but behavior cannot be compared to skin color and ethnicity. Behavior can be voluntarily controlled and altered—even if it were true that some people are born gay—but a person has no ability to voluntarily control or alter his skin color and ethnicity. Furthermore, these are morally neutral characteristics; whereas, behavior is not morally neutral.

The only things that prevented inter-racial marriages was bigotry and bias. The nature and definition of marriage did not have to change in order to facilitate a heterosexual union between members of two races. However, same-sex marriages would require a fundamental change in the nature and definition of marriage as well as a whole series of other civil laws. Moreover, there is nothing irregular about the sexual union and reproductive nature of an inter-racial, heterosexual union. This is not true of homosexual unions. Similarly, there is nothing in Scripture which would preclude inter-racial marriages, but Scripture does forbid the practice of homosexuality.

Works Cited

Aaron, William. *Straight*. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

Daily Mail Reporter. "Penguins have 'Gay Flings' because they are Lonely – but End Up in a Heterosexual Couple." *The Daily Mail*, October 21, 2010.
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1322492/Penguins-gay-flings-mate-life-heterosexual-couple.html>.

Duncan, William. "The Tenth Anniversary of Dutch Same-sex Marriage: How is Marriage Doing in the Netherlands?" *iMAPP Research Brief*, vol. 4, no. 3, May 2011.

Gallagher, Maggie, and Joshua Baker. "Demand for Same-sex Marriage: Evidence from the United States, Canada, and Europe." *Institute for Marriage and Public Policy*, vol. 3, no. 1, April 26, 2006.

Jayson, Sharon. "Not All Gays and Lesbians Want to Marry, Research Shows." *USA Today*, June 29, 2013. <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/06/27/same-sex-marriage-research/2465023/>.

Kirk, Marshall and Hunter Madsen. *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90s*. New York: Doubleday, 1989.

Muehlenberg, Bill. *Strained Relations: The Challenge of Homosexuality*. Melbourne: Culture Watch Books, 2014.

Sotirios, Sarantakos. "Same-sex Marriage: Which Way to Go?" *Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 24, no. 2, April 1999.

Wikipedia. "Same-sex Marriage in Massachusetts." Last updated February 10, 2015. Accessed February 15, 2015. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Same-sex_marriage_in_Massachusetts.

Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture quotations are taken from *The Holy Bible, English Standard Version*, copyright ©2001 by Crossway Bibles, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.