

Is Gay Prejudice Taught in the Bible?

2014 Version



Do you want to believe what is written or what you have been taught is written?

By Richard Wayne Garganta

One way to define spiritual maturity is when you can study differing doctrinal viewpoints enough to understand how people arrive at their conclusions. You may not agree with their conclusions, but at least you have studied it with enough objectivity to understand how they arrived at their conclusions.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	4
This is Christianity?.....	4
What causes such prejudice?.....	4
ARE WE THROWING THE BIBLE OUT?.....	4
Ignorance Breeds Extremism.....	4
You must understand the “Prime Directive” to understand biblical laws on sexuality!.....	5
Why no law about a woman “lying with” a woman?.....	5
The Jews survived by NOT following the law as written!.....	6
A FEW POINTS ON “THE LAW”.....	7
The 613 some odd OT laws were given BY Moses, not TO Moses.....	7
“Sin” has and will continue to change over time!.....	8
The 613 Laws Of Moses Were For The Jews, Not Gentiles. And, Those Laws Are Abolished!.....	9
IGNORANCE MASQUERADING AS INTELLIGENCE.....	9
Homosexuality is against nature!.....	9
You are either straight or gay!.....	10
People choose to be gay!.....	10
The world shouldn't have ANY gays!.....	10
God created Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve!.....	11
Homosexuality is an abomination worthy of death!.....	11
SEXUAL IDENTITY ISSUES, TRANSVESTITES, TRANSSEXUALS, HERMAPHRODITES?.....	12
Sexual Identity Issues.....	12
Transvestites.....	13
Transsexuals.....	13
Hermaphrodites.....	13
ROMANS ONE – THE RELIGIOUS PERSON'S SLEDGE HAMMER.....	13
Woman EXCHANGED their natural practices, Men ABANDONED theirs!.....	13
Releasing someone to learn a lesson isn't the same as giving up on them!.....	14
The people doing these awful things were called and loved by God!.....	14
PEDERASTY – THE FORGOTTEN SIN AND THOSE WITH NO BACKBONE.....	15
First Corinthians 6:9 and First Timothy 1:10 and “abusers of mankind”.....	16
1 Corinthians 6:9 and the word “effeminate” or “soft”.....	18
OCCURANCES OF THE WORD SODOMITE IN THE KJV OLD TESTAMENT.....	19
One clear example of translator bias.....	19
SODOM AND GOMORRAH – A PLACE YOU WOULDN'T WANT TO VISIT!.....	20

Hospitality was VERY important in the ancient world.....	20
The sins of Sodom and Gomorrah.....	20
EUNUCHS – THE PEOPLE YOU NEVER HEAR ABOUT!.....	21
Eunuchs are people that did not fit into the normal sexual patterns of the majority.....	21
The Messianic Prophecy To Eunuchs.....	22
THE ULTIMATE QUESTION.....	22
Is gay prejudice taught in the Bible?.....	22
10 TYPES OF MARRIAGES ALLOWED IN THE BIBLE.....	23
Marriage Type One: Incestuous marriages:.....	23
Marriage Type Two: The standard nuclear family.....	23
Marriage Type Three: Polygamous marriage.....	24
Marriage Type Four: Levirate Marriage.....	25
Marriage Type Five: A man, a woman and her property -- a female slave.....	26
Marriage Type Six: A man, one or more wives, and some concubines.....	26
Marriage Type Seven: A male soldier and a female prisoner of war.....	26
Marriage Type Eight: A male rapist and his victim.....	27
Marriage Type Nine: A male and female slave.....	28
Marriage Type Ten – Pagan Marriages.....	28
YOU HAVE SAME SEX ATTRACTION? THEN LIVE CELIBATE OR BURN IN HELL!.....	28
Could YOU live celibate?.....	29
The unspoken truth for many.....	29
So, what is the answer?.....	29
SHOULD GAYS MARRY? IF SO, WHO AND WHAT?.....	29
The marriage that best represents Christ and the Church.....	30
Who marries you? God or the State?.....	30
My turning point.....	30
How about an almost sexless, dishonest marriage?.....	31
THE FOUR G's.....	31

The latest version of this document is always available at <http://GayPrejudice.com>

INTRODUCTION

This is Christianity?

We have a “church” protesting funerals of murder victims and dead soldiers with signs like, “God hates fags” and “this is God's judgment for homosexuality.”

A well known pastor preaching and seen on YouTube said, “If you are gay, we have to let you in, but don't be shouting and rejoicing when that is the way you are.”

A pastor in Rhode Island preaching to his congregation, “You have to watch out for homosexuals, a lot of them have a religious spirit and want to come around the church...but make no mistake about it...they want your little boys.

A vice president of the Midland School District, was against the call to wear something purple to show support against the rash of gay suicides that occurred recently. He posted on Facebook, "Seriously, they want me to wear purple because five queers committed suicide? The only way I'm wearing it for them is if they all commit suicide. I can't believe the people of this word have gotten this stupid. We are honoring the fact they sinned and killed themselves because of their sin. REALLY PEOPLE." He had also said he would “send his kid packing” if he found out they were gay.

After several days to think about it, in an interview on Anderson Cooper, when asked how he would react if one of his children was gay, he was unsure how he would react but still could not use the word “love” and said, “I would hope my kids will stick to their Christian roots.”

A single gay man struggling with his sexuality mentioned in a church men's meeting that he had been having a rough time and fell sexually. When he said it was with a woman, the men burst into cheers, patted him on the back and said, “Good for you!”

A gay man was speaking to a woman who knew of his same sex attraction asking, “Do you believe they want to pass a law to jail or execute gay men in Uganda? Forgetting about his same sex attraction for a moment she responded with, “Oh well.” That woman was his mother.

What causes such prejudice?

In a nutshell: Immaturity and ignorance, going beyond what is written in scripture and the fact everyone likes to believe God agrees with their personal prejudices. It is the intent of this document to bring clarity, balance and scriptural, reality based understanding to this issue.

ARE WE THROWING THE BIBLE OUT?

Ignorance Breeds Extremism

If scripture is not properly studied and proper context understood, people either become religious fanatics or they begin to diminish the validity of the Bible piece by piece because they find it unjustifiable. This eventually puts them into the heretic, religious nut case or back-slidden category and they are no longer taken seriously. Many today are “writing off” many parts of the Bible as

ridiculous as if God had a time (usually Old Testament) where He was evil, unreasonable and cruel and later got his act together in the New Testament. Some go so far as to say the Old Testament and New Testament God are not the same.

Let me be clear...my heart's desire and the purpose of this document is to know and understand what the Bible really says. I strive to understand it as clearly as the people that originally heard, read and wrote it. As a result, I have had to discard a lot of what I have been taught the Bible says. I have had to make a decision as to whether I was going to believe what the Bible says or I was going to continue to believe what I was taught it says.

You must understand the “Prime Directive” to understand biblical laws on sexuality!

In the Old Testament reproduction was THE PRIME DIRECTIVE, the primary commandment. The prime directive was, “Be fruitful, multiply and fill the earth.” Failing to reproduce was detrimental to humanity, the economy, the family, land inheritance etc. If you were gay, you would still be obligated to reproduce. So important was reproduction that if your brother died without heirs, it was your duty to go and have sex with his wife to give your brother an heir...and this was your duty even if you yourself had a wife! I won't even go into concubines or multiple wives...yet. Again, reproduction was a moral, societal, familial and financial necessity so, for that time, concubines and/or multiple wives were considered appropriate and acceptable due to the primary commandment regarding reproduction.

Why no law about a woman “lying with” a woman?

As an example of the Prime Directive mentioned above, there is a law against a woman wearing men's clothes AND a man wearing women's clothes. There is a law prohibiting BOTH men and women from lying with animals. There is a law against a man “lying with” a man, but no law against a woman “lying with” a woman. Why? Lesbians also had the lowest rate of aids – God's supposed judgment against gays according to some. Did God favor lesbians?

Lesbian activity did not interfere with reproduction. That is why the Jewish attitude towards lesbian activity was initially ambivalent or it was lightly frowned on. Later in Jewish history it is mentioned that lesbian activity was frowned on because it copied pagan practices...interference with reproduction wasn't mentioned as the cause for the disapproval.

Yet in extra biblical writings of males “lying with” males, two issues were constantly given as reasons for the prohibition:

1. Males lying with males followed pagan practices of physically damaging their bodies making men unfit for battle or temple service and/or
2. Males lying with males diminished or made reproduction impossible. This was always seen as the most horrible aspect.

The prohibition against gays in the Old Testament could really be said in today's language as, “Don't let your same sex attraction or any pagan idolatrous practices allow you to forget or neglect the fact that you have a God given societal, financial and familial obligation to reproduce.” This will become clearer as this study progresses.

It is hard for people to conceive of a culture where reproducing like rabbits without concern of birth control was a societal and economic necessity but that was the case...then. Today, it is the opposite. Paul said in 1 Corinthians to marry for sex (discussed elsewhere in this document)...BUT he was talking to a culture where teens were encouraged to marry and reproduce like rabbits as soon as they had sex drives. The structure of society, the economy, the life span and survival rates and many other factors at that time warranted this as being the best advice. Again, that is just the opposite of what we have today. Today, encouraging teens to marry is usually a recipe for disaster.

I believe the body of Christ should take the explanatory approach to the difficult issues of scripture instead of avoidance or being cynical. Study to understand the original intent, historical context and meaning of scripture or fall prey to becoming pharisaical (like the pharisees), avoiding, mocking or diminishing the validity of scripture. The more we become pharisaical or the more we mock or diminish scripture due to our lack of proper textual and historical context and understanding, the more it looks like we are either unreasonable or don't really believe in scripture and the harder it becomes to teach from them.

The Jews survived by NOT following the law as written!

Regarding the difficult issues in the Old Testament, we need to study how the Old Testament law was PRACTICED...as well as how it was WRITTEN. Philo, a first century Hellenistic Jew, is great for this for those that have the patience to plow through his writings. It is best to approach the difficult passages of scripture with questions like, **What was the reason for the law and what was the alternative?**

Stop and think; if the Jews practiced the law as written, they would have never survived...everyone would be dead from various death penalties. Jesus pointed this out when they wanted to stone the woman caught in adultery. Jesus asked, "Which one of you is qualified to execute this judgment, who is without sin?" The wages of all sin was death! **The law was written to clarify and educate on the SEVERITY of sin.** When you see how it was practiced, except for the abusers, much of the so called absurdity disappears. Many times language followed the wording of a law stating, "this is said so you won't have sin in the land" which can easily be looked at as saying, "**This is said so you will have a deterrent to sin.**"

Before anyone was stoned they had to go through levels of councils where all the mitigating circumstances were discussed. Arrangements could also be made by aggrieved parties without going to councils. The result was very few were ever stoned. The law as PRACTICED was highly advanced for the time and has become the basis of rational law since. We have death penalties...yet most are never executed. We have fines written into law that most times are lessened in the courts or by law enforcement, sentences can be commuted, pardons can be given, plea bargains can occur and cases can be settled before trial. All our law, and much of the world's law has it's roots in Jewish law.

To mock the law as WRITTEN is to ignore it as PRACTICED and the two are inseparable. Prohibitions were based on realities of the day, many of which we can't easily relate to in today's culture and this is why it must be taught with proper historical context and understanding. If we take the stand that, in the beginning, the bible was "just crazy and God or his people were screwed up and irrationally making insane laws at random" you open a door you can't close. There were diseases at the time we don't know about, certain animals spread diseases requiring prohibitions we don't know about,

etc. Having said that I would be remiss if I didn't mention that there were times throughout history where legalistic Jews got carried away with law making and enforcement to the point of total absurdity as Jesus often pointed out.

Here is an example of scripture being put into proper historical context: one method of stealing in Old Testament times was for a man to dress as a woman or vice versa. This made it easier for thieving men to sneak up on a target. Also, a woman dressing as a man would allow thieving women to get into more places.

This is why many historians regard the male/female clothing prohibition as falling under the “Do Not Lie and/or the “Do Not steal” commandments. **All 613 some odd laws were classified under one or more of the original ten commandments.** The laws regarding male/female clothing had little or nothing to do with sexuality. Dress in ancient cultures said things about you and you were not to use clothing to lie about who or what you were. In most ancient cultures you could know all about a person's life by what they wore.

Leviticus 18:3 shows God wanted his people to be distinguished among all the people of the earth. Prohibitions against beard trimming, tattooing etc., were instituted to prevent the Jewish people from being confused with, and living life like, the heathen nations, particularly the heathen worship of Molech. Also, many Jewish laws had to do with health, sanitation and safety. Clothes, styles and behaviors stated your social class and status, your culture and could even signify the God you served. We live in a different time. So rather than ridiculing the old practices, we should be explaining them.

A FEW POINTS ON “THE LAW”

The 613 some odd OT laws were given BY Moses, not TO Moses.

The only things that came direct from God were the Prime Directive, the first commandment to reproduce and fill the earth followed much later by the 10 commandments. Many are unaware that the implementation and definition of the original 10 commandments was delegated to Moses and religious leaders. It is the implementation of the 613 some odd laws, not the original 10 commandments, that always come under ridicule and scrutiny.

The New Testament has many statements like this: Mat 19:8 Jesus said to them, "Moses permitted you to divorce your wives because of your hard hearts, but from the beginning it was not this way" or Jesus would say, “you have heard it said unto you in the past, but now I say unto you...”

There were reasons at the time for all the Mosaic laws with, of course, exceptions being made when the legalistic Jews got carried away with rule making. Some of the reasons we know, many we don't. Adjustments were also made over time. Sometimes exceptions were made. Virtually all of the Mosaic laws fall under and are an extension of and a further definition or clarification of one or more of the 10 commandments and the Prime Directive to reproduce and fill the earth. Many love pointing out the facts of multiple wives and other marriages in the Old Testament but you have to understand the priorities regarding their rule making.

1. Priority One: REPRODUCE!
2. Priority Two: Set laws based on the 10 commandments that best fulfilled moral living at the time WITHOUT eliminating, diminishing or negating Priority One which was to reproduce.

So, rules were put in place dealing with the reality that women can only reproduce and nurse at a certain pace. So, monogamy, **in that culture and time**, would not allow the fulfilling of the initial command to reproduce and fill the earth. Therefore rules were set up to legitimize and moralize various forms of marriage to enable all commands to be fulfilled. **Monogamy was NOT the top priority in the Old Testament; reproduction (the first commandment) was.** Mockery of Old Testament marriages is to be ignorant of the reasons for the marriage rules.

“Sin” has and will continue to change over time!

One thing is clear. The definition of sin can and has changed over time due to various circumstances and the evolution of society. At a time where it was an absolute necessity to reproduce, it would be sinful to not do so. At a time where reproducing like rabbits is detrimental to life and society, it would be sinful to reproduce like rabbits. There was a time when reproduction was a necessity to survive financially. Now it is necessary to curtail reproduction to survive financially.

The “Prime Directive” to reproduce and avoidance of pagan cult practices were the reasons for many Old Testament prohibitions. **Someone with same sex attraction during these periods would be obligated to not abandon sex with women and reproduce.** They would still have same sex attraction. History has shown those with same sex attraction remain that way regardless of how strongly societies outlaw or disapprove of homosexuality. The stories in ancient cultures of married people having same sex practices are many, legendary and in all cultures. Given the stress on reproduction in middle eastern countries regardless of anyone's same sex attraction, Jews and many of the middle eastern countries to this day still consider their countries as not having many homosexuals. In their minds, if you have reproduced you don't fall into the “gay” category. In those cultures, your children and/or your spouse are your “cover.” And this “cover” has been used in most every culture throughout history.

Imagine a situation where 2 gay men and 2 gay women were the last remaining human survivors. The right thing for them to do in that situation would be to not live exclusive homosexual lifestyles. Their moral and societal obligation would be to reproduce. I would go so far as to say it would be their moral obligation to forgo all monogamous rules of marriage and reproduce as much as possible. Why? The situation warrants it! **The Old Testament prohibition against an exclusive homosexual lifestyle was a condemnation of putting your same sex attraction before the greater needs of society at that time.** The command in Eden was to “reproduce and fill the earth.” During that time this would mean if you had same sex attraction, you still had a moral obligation to reproduce and anyone who didn't would be sinning against society. You were considered as being adversarial to the development of the human race.

Also, regarding other prohibitions, diseases were spread by particular plants and animals or exposure to things we don't know about today. This could explain all kinds of prohibitions to protect people. Centuries later if we don't have all the rationale or facts that were the basis for that law, it can appear ridiculous and/or unnecessary. People have a field day all the time with Old Testament laws because they do not study the REASONS for the laws. The end result is cynicism or outright stupidity due to “what is written” but not studied. Again, we should be asking, **“Why the law and what was the alternative?”**

Recently, I listened to a spokesman from Uganda talking about the law they wanted to pass to either jail

or kill homosexuals there. AGAIN, it came down to what he thought the Bible said. He knew about death penalties but did not know that in the Old Testament one would have to go through levels of councils before the penalty could be implemented and this resulted in very few executions. This Ugandan spoke nothing of the proper historical context of scripture. How many stonings are actually found in scripture that spans millenia? ANY valid mitigating factor could stop executions and usually did. If a person was deemed as having some sort of issue affecting compliance, other means would be used to address the issue. **The law was to teach the severity of sin and to act as a deterrent. It was rarely implemented as written.** Many times language followed the wording of a law which stated, "this is said so you won't have sin in the land" which can easily be looked at as saying, "This is said so you will have a deterrent to sin."

The 613 Laws Of Moses Were For The Jews, Not Gentiles. And, Those Laws Are Abolished!

The bias of some that choose to selectively pick individual Old Testament Mosaic laws to support their personal prejudice is most obvious regarding the issue of same sex attraction. Some of the most irreligious people will quote scripture when it comes to justifying their personal prejudice against, and ignorance of, same sex attraction. **It is common knowledge that the law of Moses was NEVER intended for Gentiles to follow. Christians know this but will quickly quote the Mosaic Law to condemn people who the law was never intended for and whose laws they were never expected to follow.**

IGNORANCE MASQUERADING AS INTELLIGENCE

Homosexuality is against nature!

Not so fast! From the Wiki Encyclopedia: *Homosexual behavior in animals refers to the documented evidence of homosexual, bisexual and transgender behavior in animals. Such behaviors include sex, courtship, affection, pair bonding, and parenting among same sex animals. A 1999 review by researcher Bruce Bagemihl shows that homosexual behavior has been observed in close to 1,500 species, ranging from primates to gut worms, and is well documented for 500 of them.*

Animal sexual behavior takes many different forms, even within the same species. The motivations for and implications of these behaviors have yet to be fully understood, since most species have yet to be fully studied. According to Bagemihl, "the animal kingdom [does] it with much greater sexual diversity — including homosexual, bisexual and non-reproductive sex — than the scientific community and society at large have previously been willing to accept."

Current research indicates that various forms of same-sex sexual behavior are found throughout the animal kingdom. A new review made in 2009 of existing research showed that same-sex behavior is a nearly universal phenomenon in the animal kingdom, common across species.

The observation of homosexual behavior in animals can be seen as both an argument for and against the acceptance of homosexuality in humans, and has been used especially against the claim that it is a "peccatum contra naturam" ('sin against nature'). For instance, homosexuality in animals was cited



of creation. Whatever period of history you study you will find homosexuality. Even in eras that were pro-homosexual, we don't see the majority becoming homosexual; the homosexuals remained a minority. I think the debate over the numbers is constantly confused by people not integrating the reality of bisexuality or the range of sexual behavior that is common to people.

God created Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve!

For the record, God created Adam, Eve, Steve, satan, bacon and everyone and everything else. **What was instituted in the Garden Of Eden was the means of PROCREATION and the relationship necessary to that procreation.** Let's not forget God also created them to initially reproduce within their own families...i.e. brothers procreating with sisters. Let's also not forget the rampant practice of concubines and multiple wives practiced during that time to fulfill the PRIME DIRECTIVE of reproducing and filling the earth. **There were a whole lot of Adams with multiple Eves in those days.** Do we really want to do things NOW the way they were done THEN?



Looked at today it is easy to be cynical, but there was a reason for reproducing like rabbits given the familial, societal and financial necessities of that time. Today we are so far removed from those circumstances it is hard for many to understand it. It is curious that we have no trouble accepting non-procreative marriages despite God's directive that commanded reproduction. We would also have no trouble with people entering into a sexless marriage. No one would say people were sinning by not having a sexual relationship or reproducing in a marriage. We would accentuate and applaud the companionship ideals of the couple.

We are now at a point in history where even the “Adam and Eve” method can be bypassed scientifically. We have test tube babies, in vitro fertilization, surrogate mothers and God only knows what is coming.

Having said all that be assured, the Adam and Eve method instituted by God and representative of Christ and the Church is going NOWHERE and NOTHING in this document or the whole issue of same sex attraction can or will ever change that.

Homosexuality is an abomination worthy of death!

As you will see, YOU are also an abomination and worthy of death according to Mosaic Law! People have the idea that calling something an abomination somehow puts the sin in a separate category of sin worse than all others. I saw a “bible thumper” one day in a discussion and all they would say like a mantra is, “homosexuality is an ABOMINATION.” ALL sin is an abomination and the wages of ALL sin is death! But, as proven, the definition of sin can change over time.

In context, Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 do not say same sex attraction is an abomination. You can have same sex attraction WITHOUT lying with anyone! Same sex ACTS only of MEN of ANY sexual persuasion that resulted in pagan practices and/or not fulfilling their reproductive mandate are mentioned as an abomination. In Romans, some heterosexual men were “going against their nature” in pagan sex cults. Job 36:14 mentions sexually based pagan cult



worship and many scholars believe Job is the oldest book in the Bible. Back then, a person with same sex attraction may not have been having sex or may have been fulfilling the Prime Directive by reproducing. **The prohibition in Leviticus was both a procreative mandate and warnings about pagan worship.** This will become clearer as this study progresses.

Leviticus 18 and 20 loudly refer to the pagan and idolatrous practices and laws of the nations surrounding Israel that, through governance, practiced all the abominations mentioned in those chapters. Romans one gives us an idea of what practices the law was preventing. A person with same sex attraction may have had nothing to do with pagan, idolatrous practices and sex cult worship services.

Be that as it may, we are ALL an abomination according to scripture! Here are all 117 references to abomination in the KJV or check out the complete word study [HERE](#). Trust me...**you** are included as an abomination!

Abominations, 61 occurrences:

Lev 18:26-27 (2), Lev 18:29, Deu 18:9, Deu 18:12, Deu 20:18, Deu 32:16, 1Ki 14:24, 2Ki 16:3, 2Ki 21:2, 2Ki 21:11, 2Ch 28:3, 2Ch 33:2, 2Ch 34:33, 2Ch 36:8, 2Ch 36:14, Ezr 9:1, Ezr 9:11, Ezr 9:14, Pro 26:25, Jer 7:10, Jer 44:22, Eze 5:9, Eze 5:11, Eze 6:9, Eze 6:11, Eze 7:3-4 (2), Eze 7:8-9 (2), Eze 7:20, Eze 8:6 (2), Eze 8:9, Eze 8:13, Eze 8:15, Eze 8:17, Eze 9:4, Eze 11:18, Eze 11:21, Eze 12:16, Eze 14:6, Eze 16:2, Eze 16:22, Eze 16:36, Eze 16:43, Eze 16:47, Eze 16:51 (2), Eze 16:58, Eze 18:13, Eze 18:24, Eze 20:4, Eze 22:2, Eze 23:36, Eze 33:29, Eze 36:31, Eze 43:8, Eze 44:6-7 (2), Eze 44:13

abomination, 52 occurrences:

Gen 43:32, Gen 46:34, Exo 8:26 (2), Lev 18:22, Lev 20:13, Deu 7:25-26 (2), Deu 12:31, Deu 13:14, Deu 17:1, Deu 17:4, Deu 18:12, Deu 22:5, Deu 23:18, Deu 24:4, Deu 25:16, Deu 27:15, 2Ki 23:13, Psa 88:8, Pro 3:32, Pro 6:16, Pro 8:7, Pro 11:1, Pro 11:20, Pro 12:22, Pro 13:19, Pro 15:8-9 (2), Pro 15:26, Pro 16:5, Pro 16:12, Pro 17:15, Pro 20:10, Pro 20:23, Pro 21:27, Pro 28:9 (2), Pro 29:27 (2), Isa 1:13, Isa 41:24, Isa 44:19, Jer 2:7, Jer 6:15, Jer 8:12, Jer 32:35, Eze 16:50, Eze 18:12, Eze 22:11, Eze 33:26, Mal 2:11

abominable, 4 occurrences:

Lev 18:30, Deu 14:3, Jer 16:18, Jer 44:4

NT references: Mat 24:15, Luk 16:14-15 (2), Rev 21:27, Rev 17:4-5 (2)

[SEXUAL IDENTITY ISSUES, TRANSVESTITES, TRANSSEXUALS, HERMAPHRODITES?](#)

Here are a few issues that usually get confused with the issue of same sex attraction:

Sexual Identity Issues: These are people having an issue regarding what sex they should be or what sex they relate to behaviorally. Some feel they have been born in the wrong body. Others have behaviors usually exhibited by the opposite sex. This could be males that act like women or women that act like men. Since this is an issue on what sex they feel they should be or what sex they relate to behaviorally and NOT an



issue of what sex they are attracted to, we won't deal with this issue. The general idea that people with same sex attraction are either effeminate men or masculine women is not reality based.

Transvestites: Sometimes called cross-dressers, these are people that take pleasure in wearing clothes of the opposite sex. This is not limited to gay people and also has nothing to do with same sex attraction. So, this subject will also not be discussed.



Transsexuals: These are people who take the sexual identity issue to the point of actually having what they believe is corrective surgery or what is commonly called “sex changes.” This also has nothing whatsoever to do with same sex attraction so will not be discussed.

This is a generic conversation starter that I have used for years: A man and a woman both go in for a sex change. They later both get saved and want to marry. Would you marry them?



The correct answer is yes. This would be a biblical marriage because either way you look at it you are marrying a man and a woman...but watch and learn about people as they discuss this. Some simply cannot see through their prejudice.

Hermaphrodites: A hermaphrodite is an individual who is born with variations of both male and female reproductive sex organs. However, usually one set is not fully developed. This occurs in about 1.7 percent of all human births. The term "hermaphrodite" comes from Greek mythology and the preferred term is now inter-sexed. Throughout history decisions were made regarding what sex the parents wanted for the child and doctors would attempt surgical corrections. It was discovered this was wrong and the preferred practice now is to wait until the child makes up their own mind regarding what sex they are. This is a medical condition and a completely separate issue from same sex attraction. A study of this issue can go a long way to educating and maturing views of sexuality that are based on ignorance or views based solely on what is normal for the majority.



ROMANS ONE – THE RELIGIOUS PERSON'S SLEDGE HAMMER

While this is often used as definitive proof that “God hates gays”, it is also the easiest to counter when rightly divided. First and foremost when these verses are used, people are generally speaking of people with same sex attraction who have not been saved, yet these verses are speaking of those “who knew God..and willfully left him” (verse 21). They REFUSED to RETAIN God in their knowledge.

Second, the people being talked about in Romans one created gods in the form of statutes, birds, four footed animals and reptiles and they used these false gods during worship services that involved sexual acts. The sexual acts were both strongly against their natural inclinations and damaging to their bodies.

Woman EXCHANGED their natural practices, Men ABANDONED theirs!

The women EXCHANGED their practice of natural sexual relations for ones that were unnatural. The Greek for EXCHANGED means to change from one state to another and the Greek for “nature or unnatural” means “their natural disposition”. Here we have 2 condemnations, abandoning normal reproduction AND exchanging the use of their body into something totally against their natural

disposition.

The men ABANDONED (the Greek is an INTENSIVE form of “sending away”) their reproductive practices with women and “burned or became inflamed in their passions to do sexual acts with other men that, according to the Greek, were a shame, embarrassment and dishonor to them and which damaged their bodies. A Greek antonym for the word “burn or inflame” means to relieve or refresh. So, it appears the “burning” was not a satisfying passion in the sense that to stop brought relief.

Studies of pagan worship services, many times, show highly charged music, drug and alcohol intoxication, sensuous dancing, orgiastic sex and fever pitches of emotion and trance states when people would engage in various acts, sex, mutilations or initiations. They were, in a word, riotous. History reports that, many times, mutilations were done to the worshiper's bodies during these worship services. The damage was something that is described as “meet” in the KJV meaning it was obvious by the acts that they were damaging their bodies. Damaging the body could and did affect reproduction – the ultimate Jewish taboo due to the Prime Directive.

Releasing someone to learn a lesson isn't the same as giving up on them!

God “gave them over”, not because they had same sex attraction, but because they KNEW God and made a choice to leave him and worship idols in sex cult worship services. **During these services they would go against their nature, abandon their natural inclinations and damage their bodies.** These people also encouraged others to join them.

During the HBO series, “Rome” some of these practices were shown. People would engage in idol worship. Animals would be involved and blood of animals was dumped on people without consideration of open orifices, wounds or any degree of cleanliness.

I have met many people in my life, but never met one that did any of the things mentioned in the first chapter of Romans. Romans never says these people were gay before or after they did these things. It says they involved themselves with dangerous, pagan sex worship that was against their normal practices and damaged their bodies. Detailed descriptions of what went on in these orgiastic, riotous sex cults are hard to find. **Some historians went so far as to say the practices were so bizarre and damaging they feared the practices would be repeated if written about so they preferred to not write about them at all.**

The people doing these awful things were called and loved by God!

Paul was also writing to those, “called to belong to Jesus Christ, to all those loved by God in Rome, called to be saints (Verse 6 & 7). Yet in the beginning of Chapter two Paul makes clear that the people he was writing to were DOING THE SAME THINGS mentioned in Chapter one! Was Paul writing to a “gay community?” If so they were called to belong to Jesus Christ, loved by God and called to be saints. Clearly Rome wasn't a gay community but idolatrous practices were rampant in those days.

I recall one day trying to show a “Bible person” about the idol worship in Romans and other facts explained above. She would shout out, “men with men and women with women.” Every sentence I said and every verse I would try to get her to read was met with a shout of “men with men and women with women.” She could see nothing else but, “men with men and women with women” in the entire

first chapter of Romans. **It is amazing how so many IMAGINE what was going on when the scripture isn't clear at all as to what the exact practices were.** We know it was same sex acts of a sexual nature but what does that mean? Were they shoving hot irons up their orifices? Were they into violent sadomasochism? **WE DON'T KNOW yet people INJECT their prejudice into these verses.**

Finally, if you replace “men with men and women with women” references in Romans one with “men with women and women with men”, would you assume Romans one was condemning ALL heterosexuals or a SUBSET of heterosexuals that have transgressed into wrongful, harmful sex cult practices? It is the dangerous, idolatrous and abusive ACTS being condemned and it was condemned for ALL people whatever their sexual attraction. The condemnations of ALL sex cult worship practices for ALL sexual persuasions is repeated over and over in scripture.

PEDERASTY – THE FORGOTTEN SIN AND THOSE WITH NO BACKBONE

Warning: this section contains what some could consider offensive material. It was necessary to show the realities of the times and the severity of the sin of pederasty. This is provided since many have no education on this issue.

If you were to ask the modern church, particularly those that have strong gay prejudice, what pederasty is, they would have no idea. Yet this was practiced routinely throughout the Greco-Roman world. Basically it is the practice of older men having relations of a bonding or sexual nature with teenage boys. The practice varied depending on culture, country and era. The general idea for the practice was two-fold.

1. This was a way a family or teenager could get favors, training, education, opportunities, gifts, etc.
2. It was thought this would help the teenager become comfortable with their bodies, experiment with and learn about their sexuality and be encouraged to become physically fit to prepare for the military marriage.

Wiki Encyclopedia says in part:

Intercrural sex was common in these pederast relationships. Intercrural sex is (from "inter-" and Latin "crura", legs), also known as femoral/interfemoral sex/intercourse. It is a type of non-penetrative sex, in which a male partner places his private part between the other partner's thighs, legs, breasts, feet or between the abdomens and thrusts to create friction. It is therefore a type of irrumatio which is oral sex or non-penetrative friction based sex. This was viewed in many pagan cultures as a form of sex education.

While in pagan societies slaves were considered fair game for anything, for non-slaves anal penetration was usually considered abusive given the culture, country and era. A teenager was also discouraged from becoming a passive sexual partner or continuing in this practice instead of going on to becoming a father and soldier. As shown, in ancient societies reproduction was paramount and a lifestyle that took any man away from reproductive sex or military service was frowned on. If you had same sex attraction you were still expected to reproduce and fight wars. **Those teens that continued favoring pederasty over reproduction and battle usually became pagan temple prostitutes – also condemned in scripture.**

The “friendship” between the older and younger men would usually last throughout their life with any sexual component being removed and the older man being looked at as some sort of appreciated mentor to the younger man. Given the strong societal divisions in those days (rich/poor, slave/free, royalty/non-royalty) it should be obvious to all that the potential for abuse was massive.

It is interesting that many artistic depictions of this practice would show the teen as not being aroused despite being in their prime indicating that, for many, it was a societal obligation to get favors, gifts or opportunities.

Variations of bisexual activity was commonly accepted in the cultures of that day so long as a man reproduced. The evidence is overwhelming that one did not have to be “gay” to engage in this practice. Some of these relationships involved nudity, physical fitness and “male bonding” without any overt sexual component. Public baths were common and nudity amongst athletes was routine. So common were abusive and/or forced sexual practices that historians report that in Rome it was common for the upper class young men to wear certain wrist bands to indicate they were not to be forced into sexual acts. Slaves were considered “open territory.”

Knowing what we know about human nature, one would have to be blind to not see the dangers inherent in the practice of pederasty, especially in strong class and slavery based societies. Temple prostitutes and pederasty were condemned in scripture and encompass a word in the Pauline epistles that have been wrongly equated with homosexuality. One is the Greek word **arsenokoites**. Let's take a look at that now...

First Corinthians 6:9 and First Timothy 1:10 and “abusers of mankind”

Here is how the time-honored and often worshiped KJV translates I Cor 6:9.

"Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate (malakoi), nor abusers of themselves with mankind, (arsenokoites)"

and 1 Timothy 1:10 says:

1Ti 1:10 “For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind (arsenokoites), for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;”

The Greek word number 733 definition given in the modern day Strongs Exhaustive Concordance states:

“one engaging in homosexual acts (likely referring to the active male partner), sexual deviant - abusers with mankind, them that defile with mankind.”

Does it say “all those with same sex attraction” or is it talking about those involved in abusive, defiling homosexual ACTS? I recall an incident in New York where several police officers were involved with an incident in the police station. The police sodomized a man with a stick. The police involved were

not homosexuals.. Forced acts of a sexual nature or passively submitting to damaging sexual acts was wrong and remains wrong.

While there is a bias in much modern literature regarding this word, Strong's defines ACTS of a person, not the STATE of the person. As Romans one and pagan cultures show, bizarre, damaging sex acts were committed by straight, bi and gay people. Second, if you replaced the word 'homosexual' with heterosexual in that definition, would you for one second take this definition to be a condemnation of all heterosexuals? Would it be saying all heterosexuals are deviants, abusers and defiling? Wouldn't you know it is describing a SUBSET of heterosexuals involved in damaging, abusive sex acts?

Note: in 1 Cor. 6:9, some translators define **arsenokoites** as “the active or initiating partner” in wrongful sex practices and the word 'malakos' defined below as referring to the passive or receiving partner in wrongful sex practices. They believed the writers wanted to make clear both parties were guilty. **Given extensive studies of these words and usage in history, the argument can be made that this was referring to the pederast and the pederast's teenage boy.**

Some translations lazily define this word with a broad brush using the catch all word 'homosexual', yet the BDAG (A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature) considered an invaluable source of original biblical Greek states the meaning as:

“a male who engages in sexual activity with a person of his own sex, a pederast”

Does it say “all men with same sex attraction?” No, it says “a male.” If this definition said, “a male who engages in sexual activity with the opposite sex, a pederast”, wouldn't it be clear to you it is not referring to all those that engage in heterosexual sex, but a SUBSET of heterosexuals involved in pederasty? Notice lesbians seem to get a free pass here also as in Leviticus?

Many other references point back to Romans one to explain the 2 incidences of this word, again indicating abusive sex, pagan worship, cult practices and pederasty. Those that lazily define this word as referring to all homosexuals are ignoring the overwhelming historical usage of the word, pederasty and other abusive sex practices practiced by all types of people in that period. They tend to use only the root word method of interpretation. The “root fallacy” is responsible for many incorrect translations. From the latest Strongest Strong's Exhaustive Concordance introduction:

“..Strong's dictionaries are flawed by a methodology of the nineteenth century that has come to be called the “root fallacy.” It was assumed that biblical words could be defined by the sum of their parts. But, just as we do not think that a pineapple is an apple that grows on a pine tree or that a butterfly is a fly that likes [or is made of] butter, so we should not use this methodology to define biblical words as was so common in the nineteenth and even the twentieth centuries.”

The root fallacy was one of the reasons given for the necessity of, and corrections in, the latest Strongest Strong's Exhaustive Concordance. The root words for **arsenokoites** are “male liar” or “male bed”. Now, consider this, if I pointed to a heterosexual woman and said, “She is a man bed” or, “she lies with men”, would you think I am referring to a chaste woman or all heterosexual women? While some think using the “root fallacy” method of interpretation is being true to original text, Strong's makes clear if it is used alone, errors can and often do result.

One of the first Christian theologians, Clement of Alexandria (died 220), wrote that the Sodomites (properly defined below as temple prostitutes) had “through much luxury fallen into uncleanness, practicing adultery shamelessly, and burning with insane love for boys.” Here again we have pagan temple worship involving sex and being associated with young boys (pederasty).

Eusebius - Preparation of the Gospel, 6:10. Eusebius uses the word in reference to pederasty or rape.

Exhaustive studies of how this word was used in historical writings indicate this word meant either not procreating, rape, prostitution, pagan cult practices and sexually abusing one’s power, people and/or slaves through various means including pederasty. This word always had the connotation of promiscuity, someone sexually and behaviorally unrestrained and acting in a harmful manner.

Also bible researcher and author John Boswell points out that there was another word used in the Greek language of Paul's time for a person naturally oriented toward homosexuality. That word is arrenokoites. It differs from arsenokoites only in its third letter. But arrenokoites is never used in the Scriptures.

But make no mistake about it, the controversy over this word rages on and the interpretations vary widely. However, seeing the rampant pederasty, sex cults and temple worship in Bible times the weight of the evidence indicates the KJV got this right using the interpretation: “**abusers and defilers of mankind.**” **It is inconceivable given the prevalence of pederasty that Paul would not have addressed this issue directly.**

1 Corinthians 6:9 and the word “effeminate” or “soft”

The word sometimes translated effeminate (Malakos) is translated "soft" in Matthew 11:8 (twice) and in Luke 7:25. Therefore, "effeminate" in 1 Cor. 6:9 does not necessarily refer to a person's sexuality at all. This Scripture would apply equally to heterosexuals and homosexuals who are spineless. Many heterosexual people are spineless in this context, and therefore would not be fit for the Kingdom.

Many times this word is translated as effeminate. During Bible times, the word effeminate did NOT have the same meaning as it does today. The list of historical references are overwhelming that “effeminate” in the ancient world meant something quite different than today's usage. Today's word “**weakling**” or “**weak**” would be much closer to the biblical meaning of the word effeminate. People can be weak, soft or have no backbone whether they have same sex attraction or not.

What is important to note is that the word (malakoi) was not translated as homosexuality until the 1900's and no English translation had that meaning until that period. In the Bible, Jesus never used the (malakos) word group to mean homosexual. Cultural factors influenced modern translators to inject anti-homosexual bias into their translation. Here are some of the many translations of this word: weaklings, wantons, effeminate, anyone guilty of unnatural crimes, boys who have sex with men, sexual perverts, boy prostitutes, male prostitutes, men kept for unnatural purposes, abusers, one who is less than a man, a pervert. AGAIN, pederasty is brought into the picture.

Josephus, AD 37-100, used malakos to describe men who appeared soft or weak through lack of courage in battle or who were reluctant to commit suicide in defeat or who enjoyed too much luxury.

This usage does not indicate homosexuality. -Wars of The Jews, 7.338; Antiquities of The Jews, 5.246; 10.194.

Aristotle, 384-322 BC, in Nicomachean Ethics, used malakos to describe lack of restraint and excessive enjoyment of bodily pleasures.

Plato, 427-347 BC, in The Republic, has Socrates opine that too much music effeminates a warrior, causing him to be malakoteroi, soft, feeble, sensitive. Plato expressed an ancient Greek concept, that too much music made a man soft, not homosexual. - Plato, The Republic, 360 BC, Book III.

If you ever want clarity on biblical word usage, writings from non-biblical sources of the relevant ages are a great tool.

OCCURANCES OF THE WORD SODOMITE IN THE KJV OLD TESTAMENT

All 6 occurrences of the word “sodomite” (Deut. 23:17, 1 Kings 14:24, 1 Kings 15:12, 1 Kings 22:46, 2 Kings 23:7, Job 36:14) in the King James Version should have been translated as “cult prostitute” and has been correctly translated in many other translations like the AMP, NAS, NIV, NET, CEV, HCSB and MESSAGE Bibles. It is obvious from the contexts that temple worship was being referred to. As an example, the reference to “sodomite” (discussed below) translated “unclean” in Job 36:14 KJV states that the young men that lived among the temple prostitutes were dying young.

This word is the noun form of the root verb which means “to be holy, set apart for religious service.” According to the Hebrews a GADOSH served Jehovah God, and a GADESH (temple prostitute) served some pagan deity. The root meaning of the word itself is priestly, not homosexual.

One clear example of translator bias

I have a Hebrew/Greek Keyword Study Bible that has 2 dictionaries in it. One dictionary written by the note writers, another a Hebrew/Chadee dictionary. The definition of word number 6945 (Gadesh) says in part...”word derived from word meaning a sacred, devoted one...a devotee to licentious idolatry, a cult prostitute.” The writer then takes complete license to ADD to this, “it is ironic that such a “holy” word could be applied to the abominable practices of male homosexuals dedicating themselves to the honor of a false god.” They ASSUME these prostitutes were homosexual AND dedicated to homosexual acts when nothing of the sort is in the text.

The Hebrew/Chaldee dictionary in the SAME Bible defines the same word as “a male devotee by prostitution to licentious idolatry.”

The NKJV “corrects” the translation putting the word “perverted one” in place of sodomite with a footnote saying it means, “one practicing sodomy and prostitution in religious rituals.” They again add, at least implicitly, homosexuality when the word is temple prostitute. And the temple prostitute could have been doing all kinds of sex acts. Even if they are talking only about pagan temple prostitutes with same sex attraction, this is not a condemnation of all people with same sex attraction no more than it would be a condemnation of all heterosexuals if they were talking about heterosexual pagan temple prostitutes.

It is important to point out that the condemnation of the temple prostitutes in the Old Testament is very similar, if not the same, as the condemnation of the acts mentioned in Romans One.

The Family Research Council, known for their strong gay prejudice, in their 2004 article titled, “The Bible, the Church, and Homosexuality: Exposing the ‘Gay’ Theology”, tried to counter the correct meaning of this word with,

“The Septuagint uses several words to translate qadesh, but of special interest is endiellagmenos, used, as already noted, in 1 Kings 22:46. In this passage the Hebrew qadesh is translated endiellagmenos, “one who has **changed his nature**.”

We discussed going against your nature and natural inclinations in Romans one. The Family Research Council inadvertently helped make our case in this discussion.

The Complete Word Study Dictionary, a very extensive Hebrew/Greek Word Study dictionary, an add-on to E-Sword, defines the word as:

A masculine noun meaning male temple prostitute. Although the term denotes one who was holy or sacred, the question must be asked, Holy for what?" In the context of a pagan temple cult, which was the proper context for this word, it connotes a man who was set apart for pagan temple service, namely, male prostitution.

SODOM AND GOMORRAH – A PLACE YOU WOULDN'T WANT TO VISIT!

Some ancient cities were a nightmare to visit. Sodom and Gomorrah are perfect examples. Amongst the sins of these cities was their nighttime insanities which included gang rape of foreigners.

Hospitality was VERY important in the ancient world

Travelers were dependent on the hospitality of those they met along the way. Commerce, visits and expansion of societies depended on hospitality. It is very difficult for people to understand this in today's society.

Many judgments occurred due to similar examples of in-hospitality or rape. (Deuteronomy 23:3-4, Judges 20:38-44, Genesis 34) On the flip side, there were those applauded throughout the Bible due to their hospitality like the story of Rahab in Joshua mentioned in Hebrews 11:31 and James 2:25. The Disciples were told to not waste their time in places that were inhospitable, the places being compared with Sodom. (Luke 10:10-13) Even Jerusalem was referred to as Sodom in Rev. 11:8. Was Jerusalem gay? No. Jerusalem was guilty of countless abominable acts particularly being inhospitable to messengers of God, including the Christ?

The sins of Sodom and Gomorrah

Eze 16:49 "See here — this was the iniquity of your sister Sodom: She and her daughters had majesty, abundance of food, and enjoyed carefree ease, but they did not help the poor and needy. They were haughty and practiced abominable deeds before me. Therefore when I saw it I removed them."

The Apocrypha states:

And punishments came upon the sinners not without former signs by the force of thunders: for they suffered justly according to their own wickedness, insomuch as they used a more hard and hateful behavior toward strangers. For the Sodomites did not receive those, whom they knew not when they came... (KJV, Wisdom 19:13-14)

Clearly, the stories of Sodom and Gomorrah are lessons dealing with inhospitality, the sins listed in Eze. 16:49 and gang rape. The story of Sodom and Gomorrah is not a blanket condemnation of those with same sex attraction.

EUNUCHS – THE PEOPLE YOU NEVER HEAR ABOUT!

This is the verse you never hear preached on or it is just glossed over. Did Jesus ever specifically address homosexuality? Let's look at these mysterious verses that are never talked about. The Apostles had just said to Jesus after his teaching on divorce, "Maybe it is better for men not to marry" and Jesus said, "that can only be done if "it has been given you." Jesus also said many had a hard time understanding this.

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

Eunuchs are people that did not fit into the normal sexual patterns of the majority. More specifically, those that did not or could not reproduce. You were a eunuch until you reproduced. Once you reproduced, you were no longer a eunuch even if you had same sex attraction.

In this portion of scripture Jesus and the disciples were discussing marriage and reproduction since, in the Bible, the equation was this: Marriage = reproduction. Marriage was always spoken of in reproductive terminology of the two (spouses) becoming "one flesh." Many think the 2 becoming one is referring to sex. I maintain the 2 becoming one flesh refers to the CHILD. The child is the "one flesh" made from the two.

We know "those who have made themselves eunuchs" is referring to those that are able, as a special gift, to forgo sex totally. While some became eunuchs via mutilation by themselves or others, we certainly know Jesus didn't encourage mutilation, especially since this was abhorrent to the Jews and would mean expulsion from the temple. He is referring to it, not promoting it.

History proves people with same sex attraction have always existed regardless of the times or the cultural views on the issue. Jesus plainly taught here that some people did NOT fit the norm of marriage/reproduction and even admitted it is hard for some to accept it.

The historical proof that eunuchs did not just refer to those that had some sort of castration is clear from any cursory historical research AND this statement by Jesus. Jesus clearly taught he considered them eunuchs if:

1. They didn't fit into the norm of marriage/reproduction from their mothers womb or

2. Those that had been castrated by men as was the custom in some cultures and
3. Those that had what Paul called a “gift that not all have” of being able to do without sex completely. (asexual or celibacy)

It is important to note that **being a Eunuch didn't mean you had no sex drive**. Even physical mutilation or castration didn't always have the result of killing the sex drive as both medicine and history proves. The bible speaks of married Eunuchs...Potiphar being one. The Bible and history makes clear if, for whatever reason, you did not reproduce fitting into the sexual lifestyle of the majority, you were considered a eunuch in one form or another.

The Messianic Prophecy To Eunuchs

To further prove eunuchs were those that didn't reproduce, here is the messianic prophecy given to all eunuchs in Isaiah 56. Note: many times this prophecy is not listed along with prophecies that have been fulfilled in Christ. Why not?:

And let no eunuch complain, “I am only a dry tree.” For this is what the LORD says: “To the eunuchs who keep my Sabbaths, who choose what pleases me and hold fast to my Covenant— to them I will give within my temple and its walls a memorial and a name better than sons and daughters; I will give them an everlasting name that will endure forever.

“I am only a dry tree” clearly refers to reproduction and this figure of speech is so translated in some versions. The prophecy says God will give godly people who don't reproduce something “better than sons and daughters.” **This specific prophecy makes clear any stigma for those not fitting into the norm of reproduction is completely removed in Christ.** Remember the stigma in the Old Testament was that if their status as a eunuch was due to mutilated organs, they weren't allowed in the temple. Yet, this prophecy and Jesus make clear that ALL stigmas regarding eunuchs, all those that live a non-procreative life, are removed. We are now the temple!

A critic could argue that when Jesus said, “those that are eunuchs from their mother's womb”, he was referring to those that, for some medical reason, can't reproduce or have damaged sex organs. But, medical science proves that, for the overwhelming majority, even those born with various abnormal sexual conditions, some form of sex is possible and sex drives can still exist.

Jesus taught some didn't fall into the norm of marriage/reproduction despite their sex drive and he spoke of others that were able to forgo sex completely. It is interesting to note that throughout history, eunuchs were known for being gifted in areas of administration, arts, fashion, cosmetology, music, service related industries and yes, even military service. One example is the ancient Greek Lambda warriors, an army of homosexual male soldiers who successfully conquered neighboring lands and made history for their fierceness and willingness to fight to the death.

THE ULTIMATE QUESTION

Is gay prejudice taught in the Bible?

We have dealt with every biblical reference used to condemn those with same sex attraction. Now that

we have done so, is gay prejudice taught in scripture? Do you see anything in scripture that can justify venom, hatred and abuse of people with same sex attraction? Do you see anything in scripture that teaches they should be classified as the worst sinners on earth? Do you see the consistent theme in all these references? Let's review.

Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Job, 1 & 2 Kings, Sodom, Romans, 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy all talk about the same themes which are:

- Idol Worship
- Sex cult practices
- Damaging, mutilating sex acts
- Rape, coercive, forced or wanton sex and/or
- Pederasty

all of which are condemned for heterosexuals as well. Today, the overwhelming majority of people, regardless of their sexual proclivity, are not involved in those practices mentioned above and, therefore, should not be classified as guilty of them.

In order to continue perpetuating gay prejudice, your only option left is to:

- go back under the Mosaic law, meant for the Jews and abolished in Christ and
- go back to a time where the heterosexual relationships allowed would be considered morally bankrupt by today's standards (see 10 types of marriages below) and
- go back to a time where there was no law against a women lying with a women and
- go back to a time where there were reproductive mandates and the “abominations” in question were tied in with pagan cults and worship, just like Romans one, making same sex attraction far from the core issue.

Having said that, let's take a trip back in time:

10 TYPES OF MARRIAGES ALLOWED IN THE BIBLE

Since gay people have always existed regardless of the culture or the society's view on the issue, this section makes clear that if you were gay in Old Testament times, your duty to reproduce was still paramount. It also brings home the weight of the Prime Directive to reproduce and proves the definition of sin has changed over time. Let's look at exactly what type of sexual/marriage relationships the Bible did allow:

Marriage Type One: Incestuous marriages:

Clearly in the beginning, incestuous relationships were allowed and ended as soon as the law makers deemed appropriate.

Marriage Type Two: The standard nuclear family:

Genesis 2:24 describes how a man leaves his family of origin, joins with a woman, consummates the marriage and lives as a couple. There were quite a few differences between the customs and laws of contemporary North Americans and of ancient Israelites. In ancient Israel:

- Inter-faith marriages were theoretically forbidden. However, they were sometimes formed.
- Children of inter-faith marriages were considered illegitimate.
- Marriages were generally arranged by family or friends; they did not result from a gradually evolving, loving relationship that developed during a period of courtship.
- The law stated that a bride who had been presented as a virgin and who could not be proven to be one was stoned to death by the men of her village. (Deuteronomy 22:13-21) There appears to have been no similar penalty for men who engaged in consensual pre-marital sexual activity.

Balance

Marriages were based more on financial arrangements, convenience, circumstance, location of property and the paramount command to reproduce than anything else. People today often define love as worshiping, idolizing and being “in lust” with another.

“Love” in ancient times was having the state of mind where you considered practicalities, financial and societal or familial obligations FIRST. It was considered you would “grow” to love your spouse. Love, as defined today, was not considered essential at all.

Stoning were rarely, if ever, executed like they were written. The law was written to show the severity of sin. Implementation of the law as written was mitigated and delegated by circumstances, leaders, councils and/or private agreements.

For instance, 2 parties could decide on an arrangement without taking it before others. The common notion that once a wrong was discovered, people were routinely and immediately dragged out and stoned has no basis in fact. While I am sure it did happen, it certainly was not the norm.

Marriage in Jewish culture was about proper lineage. Land was divided by tribe. Lineage and first borns could not be verified if the woman was not a virgin. Women in that time were also looked at as property and if a woman wasn't a virgin, whoever she had been with could come and make a claim.

Marriage Type Three: Polygamous marriage:

A man would leave his family of origin and join with his first wife. Then, as finances allowed, he would marry as many additional women as he desired. The new wives would join the man and his other wives in an already established household. Polygamy was practiced by members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Mormons, until the practice was suspended, at least temporarily, in the late nineteenth century. It is still practiced by separated fundamentalist Mormon groups which have left and been excommunicated from the main church.

There are many references to polygamous marriages in the Bible:

Lamech, in Genesis 4:19, became the first known polygamist. He had two wives.

Subsequent men in polygamous relationships included:

Esau with 3 wives;

Jacob: 2;

Ashur: 2;

Gideon: many;
Elkanah: 2;
David: many;
Solomon had 700 wives of royal birth;
Rehoboam: 3;
Abijah: 14.
Jehoram, Joash, Ahab, Jeholachin and Belshazzar also had multiple wives.
From the historical record, it is known that Herod the Great had nine wives.

We have been unable to find references to polyandrous marriages in the Bible -- unions involving one woman and more than one man. It is unlikely that many existed because of the distinctly inferior status given to women; they were often treated as property in most all ancient cultures.

Balance

Here is proof reproduction was paramount. It is very hard for people today to understand what it is like to live in a world where reproduction had to be "the prime directive." Women are only able to reproduce so fast and society's need for reproduction was greater than woman's ability to reproduce.

We have the 10 commandments from the "finger of God" but the implementation of the 10 commandments and the definitions of sin were delegated to men like Moses and the elders. This is why the definitions of sin have always changed. As the numbers of human beings increased, the rules for reproduction changed. Incestuous and polygamous marriages were eventually frowned on and then outlawed. Secondary legal arrangements with slaves and/or concubines replaced polygamy.

Marriage Type Four: Levirate Marriage:

The name of this type of marriage is derived from the Latin word "levir," which means "brother-in-law." This involved a woman who was widowed without having borne a son. She would be required to leave her home, marry her brother-in-law, live with him, and engage in sexual relations. If there were feelings of attraction and love between the woman and her new husband, this arrangement could be quite agreeable to both.

Their first-born son was considered to be sired by the deceased husband. In Genesis 38:6-10, Tamar's husband Er lost his life due to unspecified sinful behavior. Er's brother, Onan, was then required by custom to marry Tamar. Not wanting to have a child who would not be considered his, he engaged in an elementary (and quite unreliable) method of birth control: coitus interruptus. He "spilled the seed."

God appears to have given a very high priority to the levirate marriage obligation. Being very displeased with Onan's behavior, Onan paid with his life. Ruth 4 reveals that a man would be required to enter into a levirate marriage not only with his late brother's widow, but with a widow to whom he was the closest living relative.

Balance

Again, reproduction was paramount. Land was divided by families and lost if there was no lineage. So the definition of adultery was tailored to fit this circumstance. This obligation to give your brother an heir was true whether you were married or not.

Marriage Type Five: A man, a woman and her property -- a female slave: As described in Genesis 16, Sarah and Abram were infertile. Sarah owned Hagar, a female slave who apparently had been purchased earlier in Egypt. Because Hagar was Sarah's property, she could dispose of her as she wished.

Sarah gave Hagar to Abram as a type of wife, so that Abram would have an heir. Hagar conceived and bore a son, Ishmael. This type of marriage had some points of similarity to polygamous marriage, as described above. However, Hagar's status as a human slave in a plural marriage with two free individuals makes it sufficiently different to warrant separate treatment here.

Balance

Reproduction was paramount. Societal and familial obligations were given higher priority than all else, including today's views regarding intimacy and sex. People today project THEIR modern day feelings onto people that did not have the same feelings. Societies today are much more evolved.

Studies repeatedly show people's idea of right and wrong can shift dramatically and rapidly depending on circumstances. Killing innocent people or children is horrible, but how many were feeling that way when we ended WW2 by dropping several atomic bombs? People just like us and as civilized as us danced in the streets.

During these times, slavery was the most humane alternative to abandonment to the elements in most situations. You became a slave or were left out to die. What would YOU have chosen, especially if you had children?

The Jews were on a mission to deliver the Christ and could not simply hand over Jewish citizenship to pagans. There were Theocratic land ownership issues and countless other issues. Also, there were paths to freedom that were allowed for in Jewish culture.

Today, slavery is ALWAYS wrong but, again, the definitions of sin were allowed to be set by the leaders, times and cultures. We tend to think we are morally superior yet there are people today being held in jails without evidence...how outraged are you and what are you doing about it?

Marriage Type Six: A man, one or more wives, and some concubines: A man could keep numerous concubines, in addition to one or more wives. These women held an even lower status than a wife. As implied in Genesis 21:10, a concubine could be dismissed when no longer wanted.

Abraham had two concubines; Gideon: at least 1; Nahor: 1; Jacob: 1; Eliphaz: 1; Gideon: 1; Caleb: 2; Manassah: 1; Saul: 1; David: at least 10; Rehoboam: 60; Solomon: 300!; an unidentified Levite: 1; Belshazzar: more than 1.

Balance

How much proof do we need that REPRODUCTION WAS PARAMOUNT? The rules of relationships, adultery and fornication were defined to fit the times. Concubines were women you could reproduce with if others weren't available.

Marriage Type Seven: A male soldier and a female prisoner of war: Numbers 31:1-18 describes how

the army of the ancient Israelites killed every adult Midianite male in battle. Moses then ordered the slaughter in cold blood of most of the captives, including all of the male children who numbered about 32,000. Only the lives of 32,000 women - all virgins -- were spared.

Some of the latter were given to the priests as slaves. Most were taken by the Israeli soldiers as captives of war. Deuteronomy 21:11-14 describes how each captive woman would shave her head, pare her nails, be left alone to mourn the loss of her families, friends, and freedom. After a full month had passed, they would be required to submit as a wife.

Balance

The alternative back then was to leave people to die exposed to the elements or take them back and try to give them some kind of a life. The women had no fathers to live with, no shelters and no social or mental health services. Where would they live? Land was owned by families and deeded by the Theocratic government of the time. So they were dispersed to those that had the means to take care of them.

Pathetic and cruel by today's standards, but again, the times and leaders of the times had to define what was and was not sin. Their options were to leave these totally helpless people to die exposed to the elements, killed by thieves or animals or to give them some kind of life.

During these periods many lived in large groups with huge families sprawled over large areas. We don't know how close these forced marriages were or, for that matter, how sexual they were. These marriages may have been simply custodial. Women had to belong to someone in those days for their own safety, either their father or a husband.

Marriage Type Eight: A male rapist and his victim: Deuteronomy 22:28-29 requires that a female virgin who is not engaged to be married and who has been raped must marry her attacker, no matter what her feelings were towards the rapist. A man could become married by simply sexually attacking a woman that appealed to him, and paying his father-in-law 50 shekels of silver. Also, he was not allowed to subsequently divorce her.

Balance

This is horrifying by today's standards. Back then the thinking was “do the crime, do the time. You made the baby, you raise it and take care of this woman the rest of your life.”

Curious that this rule was only for those “who were found out.” So it appears a woman could avoid the forced marriage by denying the rape occurred, still horrifying by today's standards. It is extremely difficult for people today in this culture to understand this rule. Again, the alternative was to be totally abandoned by family and society. Back then if a man was jailed for rape, who would support the baby? There was no welfare services and a woman would be abandoned by her family and society and could not live alone.

It has to be repeated also that, many if not most times, the Law as written was NOT the Law as practiced. Laws were written to teach the severity of sin and to avoid situations. Many times language followed the wording of a law which stated, “this is said so you won't have sin in the land” which can easily be looked at as saying, “This is said so you will have a deterrent to sin.” So some of

these rules could have been written to DISCOURAGE certain behaviors, not encourage it.

It also bears repeating that during these periods many lived in large groups with huge families sprawled over large areas. We don't know how close these forced marriages were or, for that matter, how sexual they were. These marriages may have been simply custodial. Women had to belong to a man in those days for their own safety, either their father or a husband.

Marriage Type Nine: A male and female slave: Exodus 21:4 indicates that a slave owner could assign one of his female slaves to one of his male slaves as a wife.

Balance

Again, awful by today's standards. We know a slave owner could do this but we don't know how much input was accepted or received from the slave.

Comments on the family types in the Bible:

- God was displeased with Solomon's approximately 1,000 wives and concubines. But it was not because of the polygynous arrangement of one male and multiple females. God was concerned that many of the women were foreigners, and worshiped foreign Gods. They eventually lead Solomon to stray from worshiping Yahweh. (1 King 11:1-6).
- Polygamous marriages were part of God's plan FOR AN AGE. According to the Hebrew Scriptures (Old Testament). Jacob had twelve sons who became the patriarchs of the twelve Tribes of Israel with the help of two wives and two female slaves.
- Jesus never addressed polygamous marriages, levirate marriages, or any of the other marriage types listed above but DID address the one man, one woman marriage that is symbolic and representative of Christ and the church.
- John the Baptist criticized Herod's polygamous marriage to Herodias. (Matthew 14:3). But the criticism was based on Herod's inappropriate choice of Heodias, since she was the wife of his brother Philip. The fact that it was a polygamous marriage wasn't mentioned.
- Polygamy was less common during the first century than it was in earlier times, but it was still practiced. As noted above, Herod the Great had nine wives. We later find Paul speaking of selecting people for positions that were a "husband of one wife", but some argue that he meant to select people that were not single.

Marriage Type Ten – Pagan Marriages

Pagan marriages were forbidden to Israel, but pagan marriages themselves were not considered as invalid unless, due to societal norms, it was inappropriate or immoral for the times. We have no examples of people of God not considering pagan marriages valid, and this is despite most all of these marriages being forced, child marriages, bought women and performed in pagan temples in front of pagan gods.

YOU HAVE SAME SEX ATTRACTION? THEN LIVE CELIBATE OR BURN IN HELL!

The consensus amongst some Christians is, "Ok, if you have same sex attraction, then live celibate and you are fine." This is the stand of many churches including Catholicism. It is also the stand amongst many Christians with same sex attraction. They believe they will be saved IF they don't act on their sex

drive.

I encourage anyone believing they are called to a life of celibacy to follow their conscience. However, when someone issues mandates for others to be celibate, I am uncomfortable. A woman once told me, "I have a dear lady friend of many years that is gay. I told her I love her, respect her and wish her only the best. I also told her she must be celibate. If she has same sex attraction she must live a sexless life."

Could YOU live celibate?

Let me ask you, could YOU live celibate? If so, for how long? If not, be careful what commandments you are dumping on others. I have seen MANY people over the years of all sexual inclinations try to live celibate that didn't have the ability to do so. They became some of the most unhappy, judgmental and miserable people I have met....Christian or not. If you are celibate and an unhappy, judgmental and miserable person, are you pleasing to God or man?

The unspoken truth for many

Of course when these issues are discussed, the whole subject of sexual expression via various forms of fantasy or masturbation are usually not discussed. The reality is, even for many that aren't sexually active with others, there are usually varying degrees of sexual expression via differing forms of masturbation, stimulation or fantasy. So, many may brag that they are celibate, but they are only celibate in the sense they are not having a physical sexual connection with another person.

In 1 Corinthians 7, Paul taught the ability to do without sex for long periods was a gift that not everyone had. **So the issue of whether anyone can live celibate is gift based, not commandment based.** If you don't have the gift, you can't do it. Paul wrote saying, "If you don't have the gift of celibacy, you can only go without sex for a period of time before the 'burning' kicks in and if you can't control your passion...marry."

Some take issue with Paul's apparent view of "marry for sex" instead of "marry for love", but keep in mind, marriages then were based more on practicalities and Paul was saying this during a time when teenagers were allowed, encouraged and maybe even forced into marriage at young ages. The birth of a teenage boy's sex drive and a teenage girl's menstrual cycle were considered signs from God that the person was entering the marriage phase of their life. **Regardless, Paul makes clear that, for most, sex drives need to be reckoned with.**

So, what is the answer?

We live in radically different times with people not marrying, on average, until the mid to late twenties and beyond. Our bodies still become sexually alive with a passion much younger than the mid to late twenties. We must all do the best we can whether you have same sex attraction or not. We must all work out our salvation with the sincerity, attention and respect it deserves. We are ALL growing, learning and maturing. **The realities regarding sex that Paul talked about are true for all of us and the same understanding and patience regarding these issues must be equally applied to all.**

SHOULD GAYS MARRY? IF SO, WHO AND WHAT?

The marriage that best represents Christ and the Church

Make no mistake about it – the loving union of a heterosexual man and woman where the two become one flesh [the 2 spouses become one flesh – the child] with new life springing forth is awesome! It is an incredible and beautiful mystery representative of Christ and the Church. Jew and Gentile are made one flesh in Christ! God “fertilized” humanity “birthing” the Christ resulting in a new creation – ONE NEW MAN in Christ! **Nothing can or will ever change that...ever!** But as is crystal clear from this document, God, at various times, allowed and blessed MANY different types of marriages due to the procreative Prime Directive and other harsh realities of the times. We find Old Testament objections from God for Jews to marry pagans, but, for the most part, we see no rejection of pagan marriages themselves. Well, times have continued to change, the wall between Jew and Gentile is gone, the Mosaic Law is abolished and reproduction is far from the Prime Directive anymore.

Who marries you? God or the State?

Let's be clear on something. You might get married in church but you get divorced in court! The state marriage license means you are legally and officially married, the family “corporation” has been formed. Young people unprepared for marriage can do it, drug addicts can do it, alcoholics, liars, cheats, atheists...anyone can go to their state offices and become legally and officially married by PURCHASING a marriage license. People can get a marriage license without them invoking God at all. If Christians get a marriage license and chose to have a church wedding later, the State still considers them married from the time of the issuance of the license.

Some libertarian types don't get a marriage license and only marry in a church but several years later the state will consider you legally and officially married just as if you had gone for the state license. So, regardless of your views, **the state legally marries you** – the marriage license is a civil, legally binding agreement. A marriage license followed by a church wedding or spiritual ceremony to acknowledge God is one of the most beautiful experiences of life. However, if the couple got their license before the ceremony, the state considered them married already.

States are passing laws now due to valid civil rights issues raised in our courts that have extended marriage licenses to same sex couples. I remember for decades the church criticized gays saying they were promiscuous. Now they are complaining because gays want to have THE STATE marry them. Once the legal issues are studied, even the religious right now says, “have civil unions, just don't use the word marriage.” I thought the same way for decades.

My turning point

I know a gay couple that has been together about 20 years in a mutually monogamous relationship. One developed an illness and had to stop working. He lost his health insurance. The other had health insurance that would only cover same sex spouses if they were legally married. They could not be partnered or have a civil union, they had to be married. This was my turning point. There are many valid civil rights and legal issues surrounding same sex marriage. I strongly recommend everyone educate themselves on the related civil rights and legal issues before making up your mind. A purchased, state issued contract called a marriage license has NOTHING to do with any church. **If the government ever tries to force churches to marry anyone, you will see me at the front of the**

protest lines. No church should be forced to marry anyone.

We are taught in scripture to respect our Governments and we live in a Democratic Republic which means we can all work to change it and have a voice in it. You can agree or disagree with Governments as we all do, but they are the Government and I suspect within a few years the United States Supreme Court will rule in favor of same sex marriages. It does NOTHING to diminish the marriage that best represents Christ and the Church – a loving union between a man and a woman, becoming one flesh by new life springing forth in the child (the “one flesh”, the new creation). **That will never change.** But this is where we are in the evolution or devolution of society, however you choose to view it. We are a democratic republic with a constitution, not a theocracy. Reproduction is no longer paramount, people are getting married later in life and reproducing much less, and those with same sex attraction no longer have to live a double life or live life dishonestly.

How about an almost sexless, dishonest marriage?

We live in a culture where marriages are sometimes based on a euphoric, sensuous, idolatrous kind of love. When the euphoric, sensuous love wears off, trouble starts. We have to understand marriages in Bible times were based on non-emotional practicalities, societal arrangements and obligations. Marriages were arranged, spouses selected and “euphoric love” was nice, but not the main focus. Many times you didn't even know your wife before you were married. The emotional/sexual bonding of a marriage during bible times was secondary to society's need for reproduction.

Given today's society, do you think it is fair for a person to marry when there is no strong sexual attraction and the marriage is viewed simply as a means to have a child or two? Would you want to be married to someone that you know is not really aroused by you sexually or has to go through hoops to enjoy you physically? Do you want to be married to a person that hides who they really are from you?

I have met some gays that do enter into sexless marriages solely for companionship but the sexual issues are clearly and thoroughly addressed before hand. Most of these relationships are fragile because people need, want and deserve closeness and intimacy and if that comes along the relationship can disintegrate rapidly.

Many gays enter “straight” marriages for acceptance in society, for careers that favor being married, hoping to cure themselves or blend in more easily. The numbers of families devastated by a parent that lived a lie about their same sex attraction issue are too numerous to count.

THE FOUR G's

There are some that cannot get the sex issue out of their minds when finding out someone has same sex attraction. They become obsessed with visualizing the most personally reprehensible sex acts they can imagine and assume the person with same sex attraction is doing those things for breakfast, lunch and dinner. If your life and mind is that void of purpose that you have to spend your time filling it with images and assumptions about what others MIGHT be doing in their private moments, I would STRONGLY suggest the four G's:

Grow up!

Get a life!

Get over it and

Get out more!

Christ is the truth. The closer we can get to the truth of any matter, we are that much closer to Jesus the Christ, the Way, the Truth and the Life! Whatever made us believe we could get closer to the truth which is Christ without honesty on this or any other issue?