

# **“Are Nocturnal Emissions (Wet Dreams) Sinful?”**

I have question about nocturnal emissions or wet dreams. As a Christian seeking to to be released from sexual temptation, your writings have helped me center my thoughts on truth and gain victory over my temptations through the power of Christ's blood. Despite these victories, and perhaps in spite of them, I am being plagued by nocturnal emissions.

Six months ago I gave my homosexuality over to Christ and am no longer living as a gay man. I have, however, struggled with the temptation to masturbate. It took me a while to recognize masturbation as sexually immoral. So I am no longer masturbating either.

At this point I began having frequent nocturnal emissions. It is somewhat embarrassing because it usually seems to be a problem that adolescents have; I am 22.

There have been some noticeable differences in how my nocturnal emission are occurring now than in the past. The biggest difference is that my dreams are often not sexual in content, where as in the past they usually were.

Scripture surprisingly seems to mention this more directly than masturbation, or at least in the Old Testament. It tells us that it is unclean, but compared to the verbiage used to describe homosexuality, it would seem it is not as bad. Is it wrong, though? Am I sinning, and if so, how do I keep from sinning when I am asleep? Do you think that they could be caused by spiritual attacks, or is it simply my body wanting to relieve tensions? I am truly concerned and very confused about this.

Thank you for a most open and encouraging email. You have made some tremendous strides forward in His grace that are humbling

to read for one who has not struggled with the intensity you report.

To answer your major question, nocturnal emissions are universally understood to be a normal bodily response to accumulated semen. You never really stop producing semen and when you are not providing an outlet either through sexual intercourse or masturbation your body must expel the excess. I find it quite interesting that the content of your dreams associated with the emissions have changed as you have responded in obedience. What an incredible confirmation that God is honored by your choices. It should also be of interest to you that God has provided a moral release of these fluids apart from sexual activity. God has provided for abstinence and obedience!

Concerning the uncleanness issue, remember that a woman's menstrual period was also considered a time of uncleanness in the Law of Moses. It is still normal and not sin, just unclean. Part of the reason for ceremonial uncleanness in the Old Testament was for simple hygienic reasons that early Israel would not fully understand so God gave laws for them to abide by.

In regard to their frequency, though I am not a medical doctor, I would expect for the frequency of emissions to diminish over time as your body adjusts to your abstinent choices. Our bodies are quite flexible and will adjust to most changes we institute. For instance, as you eat less, your stomach will eventually shrink a bit and it actually takes less to fill you up. As you begin to eat more, your stomach can begin to expand to accommodate the larger volume. So too with nocturnal emissions. I suspect that as your "demand" is reduced, production of semen will eventually slow down though never cease altogether.

Therefore I would not consider your emissions as sinful at all, just a natural bodily response to your current obedient

choices. Be assured brother, you are not in sin! Not in the least! This is actual confirmation of correct choices. I rejoice with you and pray your unnecessary guilt will melt away.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin, PhD  
Probe Ministries

*Addendum by Sue Bohlin, August 2010*

Recently I had the privilege of speaking to a group of young people at a conference about unwanted homosexuality. In a breakout session dealing with replacing the lies we believe with the truth from God's word and God's world, I was addressing the lie "I can't live without sex," replacing it with the truth that sex is not a basic requirement like food, water and sleep. I supported my argument with the verse from Psalm 139 that says we are "fearfully and wonderfully made," explaining how nocturnal emissions are God's design for expelling the buildup of seminal fluid.

One young man told us a fascinating story:

"I had never experienced a wet dream. I was reading one of the discussion threads on the Living Hope Youth Forum ([www.livehope.org](http://www.livehope.org)) about the '6 Week Challenge.' That's where people challenge each other to go six weeks without masturbating. [The original poster wrote, "The hope is that by abstaining for this period of time, we can break the cycle of continually running back to P & M (pornography and masturbation) as "medications" for our problems and struggles, and instead learn to run to Jesus and other healthy replacements.']

"I decided to take the six-week challenge. After I reached six weeks, I kept going. After no sexual activity for eight months, one night I had an incredibly intense dream. I was in

the throne room of God. There was glory and beauty and light everywhere. Suddenly I realized God was showering me with such delight and favor. Somehow in the dream He was letting me know that He loves me, He delights in me and He's proud of me. I had this amazing sense of incredible joy that exploded inside me. Then I woke up, and I realized I'd had a wet dream."

One of the other students said, "Dude, are you kidding me? You're saying that your wet dream was connected to this spiritual dream that God was, like, *proud* of you?"

He replied, "Yeah, that's exactly what I'm saying."

I thought that was *most* interesting.

---

## **"Can You Suggest Reasons Why I Am a Lesbian?"**

I just read Kerby Anderson's article on [Homosexual Theology](#). Very well written, although I do disagree on some points. I consider myself homosexual. I am a 36 year-old female. As far back as I can remember, from the age of 2 or 3, I've have "felt" like a boy. This goes beyond just same-sex attractions. It goes into wanting to play army and trucks as a child, rather than play with dolls and, eventually, being sexually attracted to females (even in grade school), rather than males. For me, as I can only speak for myself, it is not all about sex. I would rather share my life with a female, even if we never had sex. I want the same thing I assume most heterosexuals want; a home, family, decent job, vacation time, and hope for a healthy, happy future.

I guess my question for you is, what do you think caused my

homosexuality? I grew up in the "All-American Family." Stay at home mom, dad who always worked, middle-class, church on Sundays. I am the youngest of three, and the only girl. I was always encouraged to act and dress like a female by my parents. I had no doubt about my parents love for me and felt very secure and safe in my environment. I grew up about as "normal" as anyone can in American. So, can you shed any light? Thanks, \_\_\_\_\_

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Kerby Anderson forwarded your e-mail to me because I am very familiar with the homosexuality issue.

The difficulty in trying to explain the foundations for another person's same gender attraction is always increased when we are only given selective details. What you wrote to Kerby isn't your whole story, and you couldn't possibly be able to GIVE your whole story, especially when the most important parts are what happened inside your head and heart.

One of the things we have discovered over the past several years is that the contributing factors to homosexuality include not only events (such as sexual abuse) and relationships (especially with parents), but how a child PERCEIVES events and relationships. For example, dads can show and tell their love in one way, but if his son or daughter doesn't hear it or see it, s/he can feel unloved even though the love was there. Parents can feel that they are accepting their children, but sometimes the kids don't feel that acceptance. And that makes sense, since we are all broken people living in a fallen world, and sometimes our "love receptors" are broken just like a radio can be broken and not receive the radio waves that would translate into sound if it weren't broken.

There is an intriguing detail you DID include, which was being sexually attracted to females, even in grade school.

Emotionally healthy children do not experience sexual attraction until adolescence. (Kids sometimes develop crushes on other kids, but it's an intense emotional attraction, not a sexual attraction.) Becoming sexual at an early age isn't normal; all the examples I ever heard of were the result of sexual exposure (which is actually sexual abuse) at an early age.

So I would suggest there are parts to your story—your true relationship with your parents, possible experiences you don't mention—that are a big part of what you have experienced. Having boy-like interests at an early age, in and of itself, doesn't say that anything was wrong; there is a wide spectrum of what it means to be a female, just as there is a wide spectrum of what it means to be male. And that, I believe, is by divine design, because God is delighted to make people with great variety. But that doesn't mean He gave you same-gender attraction, and it doesn't mean He made you gay. It means something happened, even if you don't know what it is. Homosexuality is really about gender confusion, and something interfered with you embracing your femininity if you have closed yourself off from wanting intimate relationships with men.

I hope this helps.

Most respectfully,

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

# “Help! I’m a Gay Christian”

Thanks for being willing to help me. Here’s the deal:

I’m 18 and I’ve known for a while now that I’m gay. Yep, GAY!!!!!! But I’m also a Christian, and those two don’t usually mix well. I don’t have a boyfriend or anything. The problem is I don’t know whether I should accept my nature and try and be both a Christian devoted to others and God who just happens to like men, or to fight my nature and be alone for all my life.

What is your opinion on gay people? What do you think?

1. The world tells you that you have two choices: Accept that you’re gay and find a way to be a gay Christian even though the Bible says not to, or be alone and lonely forever. I would suggest those choices are a lie.

You can’t glorify God in gay relationships, especially sexual relationships. Sex was created (among other reasons) to show us what “unity within diversity” is, so we can see a physical demonstration of the unity of Christ and the church. Just as Jesus is very different from us (the church) as His bride yet the two become one, God-glorifying sex can only be between two very different (i.e., male and female) people who become one. The very biology of sex shows us that sex was intended to be heterosexual.

2. If God’s intention in His creation is holy heterosexuality, then all of us have the *capacity* for it. That’s why there are people ministering to those with same gender attraction (SGA), showing them how to move out of what feels normal but isn’t, into heterosexual attraction. It’s not fast, it’s not easy, but it IS possible. It’s about finding ways to relate in a healthy, nonsexual way with other men, and doing it in the power of the Holy Spirit. Which He is happy to give as we abide in Christ. (That’s the key, but it’s easier to talk about than to live, moment by moment. Nonetheless, that’s how

others have moved from being strugglers to being overcomers.)

There are a number of websites where you can read stories and get real help, including online message boards for encouragement. Here's a good place to start: Living Hope Ministries. This one has a lot of other sites listed, as well as a web forum where you can find people to talk to.  
<http://www.livehope.org>

The bottom line is, THERE IS HOPE. You don't have to live with the false choice of either being separated from God because of your sexuality, or alone and lonely because of it.

3. In terms of my opinion of gay people? Well, God passionately loves gay people, so who am I to argue with that? ::::smile:::: He grieves when men are attracted to men and women are attracted to women, because it means that something went wrong somewhere, whether biology or psychology or whatever. But it doesn't make the PERSON bad!!! I think that the reason gay people are in so much pain isn't because the world hates gays and is homophobic, which is the politically correct explanation you get these days, but it's because something went wrong and it's painful not to be able to relate correctly and healthily to people of the opposite sex.

And God has power to help us with problems like that, even though it's not easy—by ANY means—to change.

4. One last thing. Until their mid-20's or so, some people's sexuality is fluid. It's changeable. Surging hormones can create some alarming and disturbing feelings. It doesn't necessarily mean someone is hard-wired to be gay. That's a good reason not to act on it, totally apart from the moral issue of being sexually active outside of marriage.

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries



---

# **“How Can I Help My Gay Friend?”**

I have a friend who confessed to me that she was gay. I was shocked...but yet...something inside of me knew that there was something different about her. I have been searching of ways to tell her about the truth. Please understand...it has been so easy for me to lead others to the truth...but with her...I'm baffled. I have been speaking to her over the Internet mostly. She has had close family members that have been diagnosed with cancer, etc. I've been helping her stand on the word by giving her Biblical scriptures on healing. I “gently” tell her in a roundabout way (when given the opportunity) about sins in our lives etc...etc...etc...

I'm trying to tell her that God loves her but not the way she's living her life. As you can tell... I'm even having a hard time explaining it to you. I wish I knew of a book that helps Christians talk to gays to lead them to the truth. She once told me that men were so iffy and that her girlfriends treated her better. I should have caught on then...but I didn't. I don't think she's ready to give up this lifestyle...but I can't go on acting as though it's not a problem. I try to stay away from talking about this issue with her. She has a girlfriend at this time and lives about 3 hours from where I live. I just thought you may know of something that may help me minister to her or help me to understand before I leap out there and push her further away from knowing the truth. She is always sending me thank you notes saying that she knows that there was a reason why we met and that she would not be where she is with God if we didn't meet. Honestly...I couldn't believe her attitude. She started going to a Christian church...joined a Bible study from Genesis to Revelation... stood in faith for a

job (when she lost hers). It's like God is doing all He can to show her He's real, but deep down in my heart...I feel she's lost in another way. Before I keep going on...I'll close and ask again... Do you know of anything that will help me to reach her God's way?

I am so glad to hear of your friendship with this dear lady who needs the freedom Jesus offers!! You should know that almost all the people involved in ministries to those with unwanted homosexuality (you can check out [Restored Hope Network](#) and [Living Hope Ministries](#)) did so because of friends and family who showed a willingness to BE THERE for them and love them through the process of change.

Yes, there is a book I would recommend for women, *Out of Egypt* by Jeanette Howard. May I suggest that a good way to offer it is to say, "If you ever get to the point where your life isn't working for you, you might want to read this book." It's not threatening, and it leaves the door open to pursue something different when the Lord reveals truth to her. And nothing will change apart from HIM allowing her to see the truth instead of being deceived by the enemy. Which is why your prayers for her are of utmost importance.

If you want to educate yourself to better know how to minister to her, read *Someone I Love Is Gay* by Anita Worthen and Bob Davies. It's written for friends and family of those in the lifestyle.

I hope this helps; I know these resources have helped many, many other people in exactly your shoes.

In His grip,

Sue

---

# “How Should We Deal With Gay Activist Groups?”

I have been reading your articles on homosexuality. But I still didn't see anything on how we are to follow Jesus' commandment about loving your neighbor regarding homosexuality in the “institutionalized” church, and homosexual weddings and pastors. I don't want to judge others, and I don't want to see homosexuality forced into public schools as a “normal” lifestyle. How do I have mercy AND stand up for what I believe in my heart to be wrong according to my interpretation of the Bible? Where does mercy end and judgment begin in dealing with activist groups?

I turned to two friends for help in answering your excellent question. One is the director of an outreach to those wanting to leave homosexuality, a man who is a former gay activist himself. The other is a pastor who was convicted of his judgmental attitude toward homosexuals, and sought the Lord's heart by involving himself in Exodus International and a local ministry to those dealing with unwanted homosexuality. Both of them wrote such great answers that I'm just going to paste them in here.

Sue Bohlin

## ***The director:***

Unfortunately for us, because it makes it more difficult, mercy and judgment go hand in hand. The challenge is to know where to apply them both in situations that require both. With judgment, the Bible clearly calls us to judge sinful behavior. Especially if we are judging the behavior of other Christians. It isn't an option according to Matthew 18, and the Lord has blessed us with a model of how to approach one who is in sin. What we cannot judge are the motivations of the heart or a

person's worth to God. It is hard for modern Americans to see that calling something sinful is an act of mercy. God was very merciful to us to show us not only the good things of Himself, but also the things He will not accept—which is also good. Others use the same words to condemn, but if we are mindful of our own sin and the mercy extended to us, when we are called to speak the truth in a situation, it will be delivered with such compassion and mercy that it will be an effective witness. Judgment comes in the words; mercy comes in the delivery of the message.

Here's an example of how to communicate:

“According to my spiritual convictions, homosexuality is sinful. I don't know what it is like to be gay or to have the feelings you do but I do know the loving character of my God. If He says, which I believe He does, that a certain sexual activity is sinful, then I believe that He says so because He wants you to have the very best in life and will make a way to meet the deep cries of your heart. I know for myself and my struggles with different issues, that what seems impossible to me is very possible for a holy and loving God.”

As far as institutionalized Christianity, I don't know that any institution will change until the hearts of individuals change. Of course we must vote our conscience and speak what the Lord tells us to, but I think the main focus should be the person next to us. When we can look them in the face with love and compassion, nothing but positive change can occur. They may not like it at first, so we must be prepared to receive at least rejection and at most hostility—neither of which should move us past love.

With regard to activist groups, I don't suggest dealing with them as a group is a good idea. To be an activist means you are sold out to whatever you are fighting for, and as a group I think it would take another group to deal with them. If one is dealing with an activist, don't see them as an activist but

as a saint of God in the making. Turn the other cheek, love them enough to hurt at the thought of their pain. I have learned that saying a small amount of appropriate truth and being a steadfast witness is the best way to witness to activists.

### ***The Pastor:***

I am assuming from the tone that the writer believes homosexual conduct to be sin. S/he also seems to fear that if we aren't strong enough in our denunciation that gays will take over the public arena. If we show too much love and mercy it will be construed as acceptance. I understand that.

I just read a response J.P. Moreland made to Charles Templeton who was asserting that it is intellectually impossible to believe in God. Moreland pointed out that how the argument is framed is extremely important. If we accept a faulty premise we've already lost. This is what gay activists, with the collusion of much of the media, have done—for example, all those who do not accept homosexuality as normative are “homophobic.” Of course this is linguistically and logically wrong. If you and I were homophobic we would never be around homosexuals willingly. But we also frame the argument incorrectly if we accept that.

So I would begin by saying that God showed me I wasn't responsible for how the world viewed what I do and say as long as it squares with His Word. Of course going by that Word can be dangerous; it can get you crucified. People, even religious people, may misinterpret what you do and say. As a fundamentalist I was always bothered by Jesus telling His disciples that the world would know they belonged to Him by the way they loved each other. I've come to see that I can love people without condoning or approving their actions—or their positions. But if my loving them consists of telling them “I am speaking the truth in love” or something similar it will not ring true. We absolutely must learn to see gays—and

all other people—as people whom Jesus loves dearly. He cries out for them to come to Him. He wants them to know that no matter how far they drift, He longs passionately for them to come to Him. So, I began by realizing how much Jesus loved homosexuals—including activists—and then because He was so pained by their sin and the cruelty of others, I found myself wanting to serve Him by helping to show them His love. I had to be Jesus in the flesh. I couldn't do that if my "love" was a veneer or simply putting on an act so I might get them to listen to my arguments. I had to decide if I really believed what God says about people who are separated from Him. Are they really basically empty spiritually? Can they really find true Joy apart from Him? If I really accept that then I don't have to argue with them that they really are or aren't happy, etc. I can simply proceed with the assurance that it is the task of the Holy Spirit to do that. My job is to love and speak the truth—gently for the most part.

\_\_\_\_\_ (an outspoken gay activist) has been good for me in that regard. He has even asked me to appear with him at a PFLAG (Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, a pro-gay support and activist group) meeting next year. He wants his side to see that someone can totally disagree with him (and them) and not be harsh or obnoxious. He and I have kind of a running joke that "I love \_\_\_\_\_ but we disagree totally on homosexuality." I do love him. He is well aware that I oppose gay marriage or adoption and acceptance of what we believe to be sin by the culture at large. I grieve over his views on homosexuality. But I am encouraged that thru lots of conversations and e-mails with some of the ex-gay folks, he has for the most part let go of his anger and bitterness toward the church and indirectly toward God. He now once again identifies himself as a Christian. I still pray that one day he will see the whole truth. But I know he wouldn't even be in a position to consider it if he had not seen God's love in the flesh.

I have heard the same kind of testimony over and over since getting involved with Exodus. Many of the leaders in Exodus ministries came to Christ because some Christians loved them. Most had experienced a lot of anger and rejection from the church and were bitter and antagonistic. It is imperative that we not allow ourselves to put homosexuality into a separate category from other sins. If we slip into that it will show in the way we relate and those to whom we are trying to minister will know it. For instance, do we oppose adultery and adulterers in public life with the same standard we use for homosexuality? I think we think we do, but I haven't seen consistency there. The bottom line is that we are in the business of reconciling ALL sinners to our Father. We must see ALL people as God sees them.

---

## **“Can't Homosexuality Be Seen as Population Control?”**

**From an evolutionary perspective, wouldn't homosexuality be seen as a population control? This would then make it useful, contradicting to your assumptions made in the obviously biased partial commentary.**

Many evolutionary biologists have wrestled with the widespread presence of homosexuality in human populations. Essentially, their quandary is not that homosexuality is present in large numbers (2-3% at most in any population), but that it is found in virtually all cultures and societies at least to some degree. Evolutionarily, this implies that there is some evolutionary benefit and some genetic component, which usually means it contributes to survival and reproductive success in some way. But how can that be when homosexuals reproduce at a

far lesser rate than heterosexuals? The original sociobiologist, E. O. Wilson, stated the problem this way: "The homosexual state itself results in inferior genetic fitness, because of course homosexual men marry much less frequently and have far fewer children than their unambiguously heterosexual counterparts." (*Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, Belknap/Harvard, 1975, p. 555.) Evolutionary explanations require an immediate genetic benefit for the individual expressing the trait or behavior. Things such as "population control," as you suggest, require a cooperative spirit (technically referred to as group selection) that is normally considered outside direct genetic influence and is therefore rejected by most evolutionary biologists.

Most evolutionary biologists have tried to deal with the problem by one of two suggestions. First, the genes involving homosexuality (if there are indeed any at all, but so far there is no evidence for any) could be advantageous somehow in the heterozygous state (individuals who have one copy of a gene leading to homosexuality but not both and therefore not truly expressing the trait), and therefore the gene or genes are kept in the population that way even though when both copies are expressed in the same individual (homozygosity) reproduction is prevented. Second, some have suggested that homosexuals may gain a genetic fitness by being primarily helpers in raising offspring of their brothers and sisters, therefore preserving their own genes through aiding the survival of their nieces and nephews who carry about 1/8 of their own genes (technically referred to as kin selection). Aiding the survival of eight or more such nieces and nephews preserves a full complement of your genes into the next generation which is how natural selection supposedly works. Both of these options may at first sound reasonable but, neither of these options has a shred of evidence in support of it.

Respectfully,



Ray Bohlin, Ph.D.

Probe Ministries

---

# **“It’s OK to Act Out Because Christ Has Already Forgiven Us?”**

I have a question that I believe you can help me answer. I am a Christian who struggles with homosexual desires. Since I have accepted Christ as my Lord and savior, I no longer regard myself as gay or homosexual, but instead I claim the new identity I have in Christ. I have a friend who is also a Christian as far as I know, and I do believe he is, who also has these same desires. He doesn’t believe that homosexuality is a sin, and has bought into the pro-gay theology. I don’t know if he really believes that homosexuality is not a sin, or if he just wants to believe it is not, I can’t judge his heart, but he presented me with an argument that I have a hard time with. He said that even if homosexuality were a sin, as a Christian, covered by the righteous sacrifice of Christ, he could continue to practice that lifestyle in harmony with his faith, and because of the work of Christ on the cross, it really wouldn’t matter. In conjunction with what Paul said “all things are permissible, but not all things are beneficial”, I am having a hard time refuting that argument. Yet I don’t believe that he is correct. Am I wrong, do I not understand the power of grace? If so, then why shouldn’t I act on my desires and be perfectly comforted in the knowledge that God has already paid the necessary price for my actions? Thank you for your time.

I salute you and honor you for taking the position you have, choosing to take the identity of a child of the King rather than someone who is at the mercy of his desires. That is a HUGE step toward freedom from those desires, and towards healing!

I do share your concern for your friend's rationalization, for that is what it is. Let me share an image that has really touched me from the heart of my friend Randy Thomas, the former director of Living Hope, a ministry to those leaving homosexuality ([www.livehope.org](http://www.livehope.org)). He says that when he is tempted to indulge in a sin, especially of a sexual nature, he imagines himself at the foot of the cross looking up at the Lord Jesus, Who is suffering a horrible death for him. If he allows himself to think, "This sin doesn't matter, You're going to die for it anyway," it's like picking up the nail and the sledgehammer and pounding it into His body.

Another friend suggested an amazing concept to me. Even though Christ's death was 2000 years in the past, He died for all sins, past present and future. All of my sins were future at that point. That means that every time I choose to sin, I am making Him pay for yet another sin that He didn't have to, and every time I choose NOT to sin, that means that's a sin He didn't have to experience and take onto Himself for me. So, by my choices today, I can affect the number and burden of the sins He suffered and paid for 2000 years ago. Isn't that astounding?

Concerning the power of grace: Paul already answered that very question in Romans 6:1-2: "What shall we say, then? Shall we go on sinning so that grace may increase? By no means! We died to sin; how can we live in it any longer?" Seeing grace as the license to sin is a slap in the face of our Savior. And not seeing homosexual practice as sin is an act of self-deception. Here's a question to pose to your friend: what is glorifying to God about homosexual practice? Consider the biology of sex, for starters. Consider the spiritual meaning of sex between a

husband and wife (Ephesians 5), as well. There are very good reasons God limits sex to heterosexual marriage.

Concerning the argument “all things are permissible, but not all things are beneficial,” people have to do some serious theological gymnastics to get around God’s condemnation of homosexual sin. There is no way it is permissible because every act of homosexual sin, just like every act of heterosexual sin, is immoral, and God stands against all immorality. Scripture is very, very clear that God’s intent for sex is restricted to within the marriage of one man and one woman, and everything else outside of those confines is sin. Joe Dallas’ fine work *A Strong Delusion* is an excellent answer to the pro-gay theology that he understands well because he was an apologist for it before repenting of it. I heartily suggest it to you and to your friend. In fact, that book was the reason one of MY friends finally made the decision to leave lesbianism behind—it was such a powerful statement of truth.

I do hope this helps clear things up. I pray that God will overwhelm you with the peace that comes with His truth, and you will enjoy the confidence of trusting Him no matter what others say.

In His grip,

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

**Cherishing Our Children’s**

# Gender

A wise friend of mine recently took her little boy for a walk down to the lake. Along the way she said, "Parker, let's look for frogs and toads. Mommy is so glad God made you a little boy so you could like yucky things like frogs and toads." When they got back to the house, his grandmother asked, "So how was your walk?" and Parker said, "Mommy's glad that I'm a boy because I like yucky things like frogs and toads."

Parker's mommy is a wise lady because she is supporting and cherishing her child's gender. That little guy is proud to be a boy and glad that he's a different gender from his mother. And you know what? As he grows up, he most probably won't struggle with homosexuality. One of the best-kept secrets in our culture is the good news that homosexuality can often be prevented through healthy relationships.

Homosexuality is really about gender identity confusion. Boys aren't comfortable being boys, and girls aren't comfortable being girls, and they grow up not fitting in because they have trouble accepting the way God made them. One of a child's basic needs is to feel loved and accepted and, well, CELEBRATED for who they are! This includes the fact that God chose little girls to be female and He decided that little boys would be male. As parents, we need to support God's wise choice of gender for our kids. They need to hear us say, "I'm so glad you're a boy! Boys are so neat." Little girls need to be celebrated for their femininity because girls are so special. Every child deserves to know that the gender that they are is a good, good thing, and we're so glad God made them that way.

One of the best ways we as parents can celebrate our child's gender is to understand and support the differences between boys and girls. Affirm your kids in their maleness and their femaleness. Boys' tendency to be active and physical isn't a

pathological problem; we need to channel it with grace, not shame it! Yes, girls are soooooo verbal and emotional—but those aren't design flaws, they're designed!

It's important for dads to support their son's masculinity even if he's not the stereotypical jock. God makes some boys to be artistic and sensitive because we need them! Can you imagine what King David must have been like as a young boy, out in the field playing instruments and composing songs and poetry? Boys like David need their dads to say, "I'm so proud of who you are, son." And girls really need their daddies to love and accept them and celebrate their femaleness. It's one thing for your mother to say you're a pretty princess, but a girl believes it when her father tells her.

One of the greatest gifts we can give our children is the security of knowing that when God made them, He "did good"—even if they like yucky things like toads and frogs.

©2001 Probe Ministries

---

## **Homosexual Theology: A Biblically Sound View**

*Kerby Anderson helps understand the complete biblical perspective on homosexuality. As Christians, Kerby helps us understand the biblical truth and how to apply it with compassion in our dealings with those around us.*

### **The Sin of Sodom—Genesis 19**

Does the Bible condemn homosexuality? For centuries the answer to that question seemed obvious, but in the last few decades

pro-homosexual commentators have tried to reinterpret the relevant biblical passages. In this discussion we will take a look at their exegesis.

The first reference to homosexuality in the Bible is found in Genesis 19. In this passage, Lot entertains two angels who come to the city to investigate its sins. Before they go to bed, all the men (from every part of the city of Sodom) surround the house and order him to bring out the men so that "we may know them." Historically commentators have always assumed that the Hebrew word for "know" meant that the men of the city wanted to have sex with the visitors.

More recently, proponents of homosexuality argue that biblical commentators misunderstand the story of Sodom. They argue that the men of the city merely wanted to meet these visitors. Either they were anxious to extend Middle-eastern hospitality or they wanted to interrogate the men and make sure they weren't spies. In either case, they argue, the passage has nothing to do with homosexuality. The sin of Sodom is not homosexuality, they say, but inhospitality.

One of the keys to understanding this passage is the proper translation of the Hebrew word for "know." Pro-homosexuality commentators point out that this word can also mean "to get acquainted with" as well as mean "to have intercourse with." In fact, the word appears over 943 times in the Old Testament, and only 12 times does it mean "to have intercourse with." Therefore, they conclude that the sin of Sodom had nothing to do with homosexuality.

The problem with the argument is context. Statistics is not the same as exegesis. Word count alone should not be the sole criterion for the meaning of a word. And even if a statistical count should be used, the argument backfires. Of the 12 times the word "to know" is used in the book of Genesis, in 10 of those 12 it means "to have intercourse with."

Second, the context does not warrant the interpretation that the men only wanted to get acquainted with the strangers. Notice that Lot decides to offer his two daughters instead. In reading the passage, one can sense Lot's panic as he foolishly offers his virgin daughters to the crowd instead of the foreigners. This is not the action of a man responding to the crowd's request "to become acquainted with" the men.

Notice that Lot describes his daughters as women who "have not known" a man. Obviously this implies sexual intercourse and does not mean "to be acquainted with." It is unlikely that the first use of the word "to know" differs from the second use of the word. Both times the word "to know" should be translated "to have intercourse with." This is the only consistent translation for the passage.

Finally, Jude 7 provides a commentary on Genesis 19. The New Testament reference states that the sin of Sodom involved gross immorality and going after strange flesh. The phrase "strange flesh" could imply homosexuality or bestiality and provides further evidence that the sin of Sodom was not inhospitality but homosexuality.

Contrary to what pro-homosexual commentators say, Genesis 19 is a clear condemnation of homosexuality. Next we will look at another set of Old Testament passages dealing with the issue of homosexuality.

## **Mosaic Law—Leviticus 18, 20**

Now we will look at the Mosaic Law. Two passages in Leviticus call homosexuality an abomination. Leviticus 18:22 says, "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable." Leviticus 20:13 says, "If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable." The word for "abomination" is used five times in Leviticus 18 and is a strong term of disapproval, implying that something is abhorrent to God. Biblical commentators see

these verses as an expansion of the seventh commandment. Though not an exhaustive list of sexual sins, they are representative of the common sinful practices of nations surrounding Israel.

Pro-homosexual commentators have more difficulty dealing with these relatively simple passages of Scripture, but usually offer one of two responses. Some argue that these verses appear in the Holiness code of the Leviticus and only applies to the priests and ritual purity. Therefore, according to this perspective, these are religious prohibitions, not moral prohibitions. Others argue that these prohibitions were merely for the Old Testament theocracy and are not relevant today. They suggest that if Christians wanted to be consistent with the Old Testament law code in Leviticus, they should avoid eating rare steak, wearing mixed fabrics, and having marital intercourse during the menstrual period.

First, do these passages merely apply to ritual purity rather than moral purity? Part of the problem comes from making the two issues distinct. The priests were to model moral behavior within their ceremonial rituals. Moral purity and ritual purity cannot be separated, especially when discussing the issue of human sexuality. To hold to this rigid distinction would imply that such sins as adultery were not immoral (consider Lev. 18:20) or that bestiality was morally acceptable (notice Lev. 18:23). The second argument concerns the relevance of the law today. Few Christians today keep kosher kitchens or balk at wearing clothes interwoven with more than one fabric. They believe that those Old Testament laws do not pertain to them. In a similar way pro-homosexual commentators argue that the Old Testament admonitions against homosexuality are no longer relevant today. A practical problem with this argument is that more than just homosexuality would have to be deemed morally acceptable. The logical extension of this argument would also have to make bestiality and incest morally acceptable since prohibitions to



these two sins surround the prohibition against homosexuality. If the Mosaic law is irrelevant to homosexuality, then it is also irrelevant to having sex with animals or having sex with children.

More to the point, to say that the Mosaic law has ended is not to say that God has no laws or moral codes for mankind. Even though the ceremonial law has passed, the moral law remains. The New Testament speaks of the “law of the Spirit” (Rom. 8:2) and the “law of Christ” (Gal. 6:2). One cannot say that something that was sin under the Law is not sin under grace. Ceremonial laws concerning diet or wearing mixed fabrics no longer apply, but moral laws (especially those rooted in God’s creation order for human sexuality) continue. Moreover, these prohibitions against homosexuality can also be found in the New Testament as we will see next as we consider other passages reinterpreted by pro-homosexual commentators.

## **New Testament Passages**

In our examination of the Old Testament teachings regarding homosexuality, we found that Genesis 19 teaches that the men of Sodom were seeking the strangers in order to have sex with them, not merely asking to meet these men or to extend Middle Eastern hospitality to them. We also discovered that certain passages in Leviticus clearly condemn homosexuality and are relevant today. These prohibitions were not just for the Old Testament theocracy, but were moral principles binding on human behavior and conduct today.

At this point we will consider some of the New Testament passages dealing with homosexuality. Three key New Testament passages concerning homosexuality are: Romans 1:26-27, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10. Of the three, the most significant is Romans 1 because it deals with homosexuality within the larger cultural context.

*Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even*

*their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.*

Here the Apostle Paul sets the Gentile world's guilt before a holy God and focuses on the arrogance and lust of the Hellenistic world. He says they have turned away from a true worship of God so that "God gave them over to shameful lusts." Rather than follow God's instruction in their lives, they "suppress the truth in unrighteousness" (Rom. 1:18) and follow passions that dishonor God.

Another New Testament passage dealing with homosexuality is 1 Corinthians 6:9-10. "Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God." Pro-homosexual commentators make use of the "abuse" argument and point out that Paul is only singling out homosexual offenders. In other words, they argue that the Apostle Paul is condemning homosexual abuse rather than responsible homosexual behavior. In essence, these commentators are suggesting that Paul is calling for temperance rather than abstinence. While this could be a reasonable interpretation for drinking wine (don't be a drunkard), it hardly applies to other sins listed in 1 Corinthians 6 or 1 Timothy 1. Is Paul calling for responsible adultery or responsible prostitution? Is there such a thing as moral theft and swindling? Obviously the argument breaks down. Scripture never condones sex outside of marriage (premarital sex, extramarital sex, homosexual sex). God created man and woman for the institution of marriage (Gen. 2:24). Homosexuality is a violation of the creation order, and God clearly condemns it as unnatural and specifically against His

ordained order. As we have seen in the discussion thus far, there are passages in both the Old Testament and the New Testament which condemn homosexuality.

## **“God Made Me Gay,” Part 1**

At this point in our discussion, we need to consider the claim made by some homosexuals that, “God made me gay.” Is this true? Is there a biological basis to homosexuality? For the remainder of this essay, we will consider the evidence usually cited. Simon LeVay (a neuroscientist at the Salk Institute) has argued that homosexuals and heterosexuals have notable differences in the structure of their brains. In 1991, he studied 41 cadavers and found that a specific portion of the hypothalamus (the area that governs sexual activity) was consistently smaller in homosexuals than in heterosexuals. He therefore argued that there is a distinct physiological component to sexual orientation. There are numerous problems with the study. First, there was considerable range in the size of the hypothalamic region. In a few homosexual men, this region was the same size as that of the heterosexuals, and in a few heterosexuals this region was as small as that of a homosexual.

Second is the chicken and egg problem. When there is a difference in brain structure, is the difference the *result* of sexual orientation or is it the *cause* of sexual orientation? Researchers, for example, have found that when people who become blind begin to learn Braille, the area of the brain controlling the reading finger actually grows larger. Third, Simon LeVay later had to admit that he didn't know the sexual orientation of some of the cadavers in the study. He acknowledged that he wasn't sure if the heterosexual males in the study were actually heterosexual. Since some of those he identified as “heterosexual” died of AIDS, critics raised doubts about the accuracy of his study.

In December 1991, Michael Bailey and Richard Pillard published

a study of homosexuality in twins. They surveyed homosexual men about their brothers and found statistics they believed proved that sexual orientation is biological. Of the homosexuals who had identical twin brothers, 52 percent of those twins were also homosexual, 22 percent of those who had fraternal twins said that their twin was gay, and only 11 percent of those who had an adopted sibling said their adopted brothers were also homosexual. They attributed the differences in those percentages to the differences in genetic material shared.

Though this study has also been touted as proving a genetic basis to homosexuality, there are significant problems. First, the theory is not new. It was first proposed in 1952. Since that time, three other separate research studies come to very different conclusions. Therefore, the conclusions of the Bailey-Pillard study should be considered in the light of other contrary studies. Second, most published reports did not mention that only 9 percent of the non-twin brothers of homosexuals were homosexuals. Fraternal twins share no more genetic material than non-twin brothers, yet homosexuals are more than twice as likely to share their sexual orientation with a fraternal twin than with a non-twin brother. Whatever the reason, the answer cannot be genetic.

Third, why aren't nearly all identical twin brothers of homosexuals also homosexual? In other words, if biology is determinative, why are nearly half the identical twins not homosexual? Dr. Bailey admitted that there "must be something in the environment to yield the discordant twins." And that is precisely the point; there is something (perhaps everything) in the environment to explain sexual orientation. These are two studies usually cited as evidence of a biological basis for homosexuality. Next we will consider a third study often cited to prove the claim that "God made me gay."

## **“God Made Me Gay,” Part 2**

Now let's look at another study often cited as proof of this claim. This study is often called the “gay gene” study. In 1993, a team of researchers led by Dr. Dean Hamer announced “preliminary” findings from research into the connection between homosexuality and genetic inheritance. In a sample of 76 homosexual males, the researchers found a statistically higher incidence of homosexuality in their male relatives (brothers, uncles) on their mother's side of the family. This suggested a possible inherited link through the X chromosome. A follow-up study of 40 pairs of homosexual brothers found that 33 shared a variation in a small section of the X chromosome. Although this study was promoted by the press as evidence of the discovery of a gay gene, some of the same concerns raised with the previous two studies apply here. First, the findings involve a limited sample size and are therefore sketchy. Even the researchers acknowledged that these were “preliminary” findings. In addition to the sample size being small, there was no control testing done for heterosexual brothers. Another major issue raised by critics of the study concerned the lack of sufficient research done on the social histories of the families involved.

Second, similarity does not prove cause. Just because 33 pairs of homosexual brothers share a genetic variation doesn't mean that variation causes homosexuality. And what about the other 7 pairs that did not show the variation but were homosexuals?

Finally, research bias may again be an issue. Dr. Hamer and at least one of his other team members are homosexual. It appears that this was deliberately kept from the press and was only revealed later. Dr. Hamer it turns out is not merely an objective observer. He has presented himself as an expert witness on homosexuality, and he has stated that he hopes his research would give comfort to men feeling guilty about their homosexuality.

By the way, this was a problem in every one of the studies we have mentioned in our discussion. For example, Dr. Simon LeVay said that he was driven to study the potential physiological roots of homosexuality after his homosexual lover died of AIDS. He even admitted that if he failed to find a genetic cause for homosexuality that he might walk away from science altogether. Later he did just that by moving to West Hollywood to open up a small, unaccredited "study center" focusing on homosexuality.

Each of these three studies looking for a biological cause for homosexuality has its flaws. Does that mean that there is no physiological component to homosexuality? Not at all. Actually, it is probably too early to say conclusively. Scientists may indeed discover a clear biological predisposition to sexual orientation. But a predisposition is not the same as a determination. Some people may inherit a predisposition for anger, depression, or alcoholism, yet we do not condone these behaviors. And even if violence, depression, or alcoholism were proven to be inborn (determined by genetic material), would we accept them as normal and refuse to treat them? Of course not. The Bible has clear statements about such things as anger and alcoholism. Likewise, the Bible has clear statements about homosexuality.

In our discussion in this transcript, we have examined the various claims of pro-homosexual commentators and found them wanting. Contrary to their claims, the Bible does not condone homosexual behavior.

©1997 Probe Ministries

---

# Homosexual Myths – Exposed from a Biblical Perspective

*Sue Bohlin looks at common myths concerning homosexual behavior that are prevalent in our society. These myths prevent us from looking at homosexuality with a biblical worldview and from dealing with this sin in a loving and consistent manner.*



*This article is also available in [Spanish](#).*

In this essay we'll be looking at some of the homosexual myths that have pervaded our culture, and hopefully answering their arguments. Much of this material is taken from Joe Dallas' excellent book, *A Strong Delusion: Confronting the "Gay Christian" Movement*.<sup>{1}</sup> While the information in this essay may prove helpful, it is our prayer that you will be able to share it calmly and compassionately, remembering that homosexuality isn't just a political and moral issue; it is also about people who are badly hurting.

## **10% of the Population Is Homosexual.**

In 1948, Dr. Alfred Kinsey released a study called *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, claiming that between 10 and 47% of the male population was homosexual.<sup>{2}</sup> He got his figures from a pool of 5,300 male subjects that he represented as your average "Joe College" student. Many of the men who gave him the data, though, actually consisted of sex offenders, prisoners, pimps, hold-up men, thieves, male prostitutes and other criminals, and hundreds of gay activists.<sup>{3}</sup> The 10% figure was widely circulated by Harry Hay, the father of the homosexual "civil rights" movement, urging that homosexuality be seen no longer as an act of sodomy but as a 10% minority class.<sup>{4}</sup>

Kinsey's figures were exposed as completely false immediately

afterwards, and by many other scientists since. The actual figure is closer to 2-3%.[{5}](#) But the 10% number has been so often reported in the press that most people think it's valid. It's not.

## People Are Born Gay.

Ann Landers said it, and millions of people believe it. The problem is, the data's not there to support it. There are three ways to test for inborn traits: twin studies, brain dissections, and gene "linkage" studies.[{6}](#) Twin studies show that something other than genetics must account for homosexuality, because nearly half of the identical twin studied didn't have the same sexual preference. If homosexuality were inherited, identical twins should either be both straight or both gay. Besides, none of the twin studies have been replicated, and other twin studies have produced completely different results.[{7}](#) Dr. Simon LeVay's famous study on the brains of dead subjects yielded questionable results regarding its accuracy. He wasn't sure of the sexual orientation of the people in the study, and Dr. LeVay even admits he doesn't know if the changes in the brain structures were the cause *of* homosexuality, or caused *by* homosexuality.[{8}](#) Finally, an early study attempting to show a link between homosexuality and the X-chromosome has yet to be replicated, and a second study actually contradicted the findings of the first.[{9}](#) Even if homosexuality were someday proven to be genetically related, *inborn* does not necessarily mean *normal*. Some children are born with cystic fibrosis, but that doesn't make it a normal condition.

Inborn tendencies toward certain behaviors (such as homosexuality) do not make those behaviors moral. Tendencies toward alcoholism, obesity, and violence are now thought to be genetically influenced, but they are not good behaviors. People born with tendencies toward these behaviors have to fight hard against their natural temptations to drunkenness,



gluttony, and physical rage.

And since we are born as sinners into a fallen world, we have to deal with the consequences of the Fall. Just because we're born with something doesn't mean it's normal. It's not true that "God makes some people gay." All of us have effects of the Fall we need to deal with.

## **What's Wrong with Two Loving, Committed Men or Women Being Legally Married?**

There are two aspects to marriage: the legal and the spiritual. Marriage is more than a social convention, like being "best friends" with somebody, because heterosexual marriage usually results in the production of children. Marriage is a legal institution in order to offer protection for women and children. Women need to have the freedom to devote their time and energies to be the primary nurturers and caretakers of children without being forced to be breadwinners as well. God's plan is that children grow up in families who provide for them, protect them, and wrap them in security.

Because gay or lesbian couples are by nature unable to reproduce, they do not need the legal protection of marriage to provide a safe place for the production and raising of children. Apart from the sexual aspect of a gay relationship, what they have is really "best friend" status, and that does not require legal protection.

Of course, a growing number of gay couples are seeking to have a child together, either by adoption, artificial insemination, or surrogate mothering. Despite the fact that they have to resort to an outside procedure in order to become parents, the presence of adults plus children in an ad hoc household should not automatically secure official recognition of their relationship as a family. There is a movement in our culture which seeks to redefine "family" any way we want, but with a profound lack of discernment about the long-term effects on

the people involved. Gay parents are making a dangerous statement to their children: lesbian mothers are saying that fathers are not important, and homosexual fathers are saying that mothers are not important. More and more social observers see the importance of both fathers and mothers in children's lives; one of their roles is to teach boys what it means to be a boy and teach girls what it means to be a girl.

The other aspect of marriage is of a spiritual nature. Granted, this response to the gay marriage argument won't make any difference to people who are unconcerned about spiritual things, but there are a lot of gays who care very deeply about God and long for a relationship with Him. The marriage relationship, both its emotional and especially its sexual components, is designed to serve as an earthbound illustration of the relationship between Christ and His bride, the church.<sup>{10}</sup> Just as there is a mystical oneness between a man and a woman, who are very different from each other, so there is a mystical unity between two very different, very "other" beings—the eternal Son of God and us mortal, creaturely humans. Marriage as God designed it is like the almost improbable union of butterfly and buffalo, or fire and water. But homosexual relationships are the coming together of two like individuals; the dynamic of unity and diversity in heterosexual marriage is completely missing, and therefore so is the spiritual dimension that is so intrinsic to the purpose of marriage. Both on an emotional and a physical level, the sameness of male and male, or female and female, demonstrates that homosexual relationships do not reflect the spiritual parable that marriage is meant to be. God wants marriage partners to complement, not to mirror, each other. The concept of gay marriage doesn't work, whether we look at it on a social level or a spiritual one.

## **Jesus Said Nothing about Homosexuality.**

Whether from a pulpit or at a gay rights event, gay activists

like to point out that Jesus never addressed the issue of homosexuality; instead, He was more interested in love. Their point is that if Jesus didn't specifically forbid a behavior, then who are we to judge those who engage in it?

This argument assumes that the Gospels are more important than the rest of the books in the New Testament, that only the recorded sayings of Jesus matter. But John's gospel itself assures us that it is not an exhaustive record of all that Jesus said and did, which means there was a lot left out![\[11\]](#) The gospels don't record that Jesus condemned wife-beating or incest; does that make them OK? Furthermore, the remaining books of the New Testament are no less authoritative than the gospels. All scripture is inspired by God, not just the books with red letters in the text. Specific prohibitions against homosexual behavior in Romans 1:26-27 and 1 Corinthians 6:9,10 are every bit as God-ordained as what is recorded in the gospels.

We do know, however, that Jesus spoke in specific terms about God's created intent for human sexuality: "From the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; and the two shall be one flesh. . . What therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder" (Matt. 19:4-6). God's plan is holy heterosexuality, and Jesus spelled it out.

## **The Levitical laws against homosexual behavior are not valid today.**

Leviticus 18:22 says, "Thou shalt not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; it is an abomination." Gay theologians argue that the term "abomination" is generally associated with idolatry and the Canaanite religious practice of cult prostitution, and thus God did not prohibit the kind of homosexuality we see today.

Other sexual sins such as adultery and incest are also

prohibited in the same chapters where the prohibitions against homosexuality are found. All sexual sin is forbidden by both Old and New Testament, completely apart from the Levitical codes, because it is a moral issue. It is true that we are not bound by the rules and rituals in Leviticus that marked Yahweh's people by their separation from the world; however, the nature of sexual sin has not changed because immorality is an affront to the holiness and purity of God Himself. Just because most of Leviticus doesn't apply to Christians today doesn't mean none of it does.

The argument that the word "abomination" is connected with idolatry is well answered by examining Proverbs 6:16-19, which describes what else the Lord considers abominations: a proud look, a lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises evil imaginations, feet that are swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaks lies, and a man who sows discord among brothers. Idolatry plays no part in these abominations. The argument doesn't hold water.

If the practices in Leviticus 18 and 20 are condemned because of their association with idolatry, then it logically follows that they would be permissible if they were committed apart from idolatry. That would mean incest, adultery, bestiality, and child sacrifice (all of which are listed in these chapters) are only condemned when associated with idolatry; otherwise, they are allowable. No responsible reader of these passages would agree with such a premise. [\[12\]](#)

## **Calling Homosexuality a Sin Is Judging, and Judging Is a Sin.**

Josh McDowell says that the most often-quoted Bible verse used to be John 3:16, but now that tolerance has become the ultimate virtue, the verse we hear quoted the most is "Judge not, lest ye be judged" (Matt. 7:1). The person who calls homosexual activity wrong is called a bigot and a homophobe,

and even those who don't believe in the Bible can be heard to quote the "Judge not" verse.

When Jesus said "Do not judge, or you too will be judged," the context makes it plain that He was talking about setting ourselves up as judge of another person, while blind to our own sinfulness as we point out another's sin. There's no doubt about it, there is a grievous amount of self-righteousness in the way the church treats those struggling with the temptations of homosexual longings. But there is a difference between agreeing with the standard of Scripture when it declares homosexuality wrong, and personally condemning an individual because of his sin. Agreeing with God about something isn't necessarily judging.

Imagine I'm speeding down the highway, and I get pulled over by a police officer. He approaches my car and, after checking my license and registration, he says, "You broke the speed limit back there, ma'am." Can you imagine a citizen indignantly leveling a politically correct charge at the officer: "Hey, you're judging me! Judge not, lest ye be judged!" The policeman is simply pointing out that I broke the law. He's not judging my character, he's comparing my behavior to the standard of the law. It's not judging when we restate what God has said about His moral law, either. What is sin is to look down our noses at someone who falls into a different sin than we do. That's judging.

## **The Romans 1 Passage on Homosexuality Does Not Describe True Homosexuals, but Heterosexuals Who Indulge in Homosexual Behavior That Is Not Natural to *Them*.**

Romans 1:26-27 says, "God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones. In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men

committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.” Some gay theologians try to get around the clear prohibition against both gay and lesbian homosexuality by explaining that the real sin Paul is talking about here is straight people who indulge in homosexual acts, because it’s not natural to them. Homosexuality, they maintain, is not a sin for *true* homosexuals.

But there is nothing in this passage that suggests a distinction between “true” homosexuals and “false” ones. Paul describes the homosexual behavior itself as unnatural, regardless of who commits it. In fact, he chooses unusual words for men and women, Greek words that most emphasize the biology of being a male and a female. The behavior described in this passage is unnatural for males and females; sexual orientation isn’t the issue at all. He is saying that homosexuality is biologically unnatural; not just unnatural to heterosexuals, but unnatural to anyone.

Furthermore, Romans 1 describes men “inflamed with lust” for one another. This would hardly seem to indicate men who were straight by nature but experimenting with gay sex.[\[13\]](#) You really have to do some mental gymnastics to make Romans 1 anything other than what a plain reading leads us to understand all homosexual activity is sin.

## **Preaching Against Homosexuality Causes Gay Teenagers to Commit Suicide.**

I received an e-mail from someone who assured me that the blood of gay teenagers was on my hands because saying that homosexuality is wrong makes people kill themselves. The belief that gay teenagers are at high risk for suicide is largely inspired by a 1989 report by a special federal task force on youth and suicide. This report stated three things; first, that gay and lesbian youths account for one third of

all teenage suicides; second, that suicide is the leading cause of death among gay teenagers, and third, gay teens who commit suicide do so because of “internalized homophobia” and violence directed at them.[{14}](#) This report has been cited over and over in both gay and mainstream publications.

San Francisco gay activist Paul Gibson wrote this report based on research so shoddy that when it was submitted to Dr. Louis Sullivan, the former Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Sullivan officially distanced himself and his department from it.[{15}](#) The report’s numbers, both its data and its conclusions, are extremely questionable. Part of the report cites an author claiming that as many as 3,000 gay youths kill themselves each year. But that’s over a thousand more than the total number of teen suicides in the first place! Gibson exaggerated his numbers when he said that one third of all teen suicides are committed by gay youth. He got this figure by looking at gay surveys taken at drop-in centers for troubled teens, many of which were gay-oriented, which revealed that gay teens had two to four times the suicidal tendencies of straight kids. Gibson multiplied this higher figure by the disputed Kinsey figure of a 10% homosexual population to produce his figure that 30% of all youth suicides are gay. David Shaffer, a Columbia University psychiatrist who specializes in teen suicides, pored over this study and said, “I struggled for a long time over Gibson’s mathematics, but in the end, it seemed more hocus-pocus than math.”[{16}](#)

The report’s conclusions are contradicted by other, more credible reports. Researchers at the University of California-San Diego interviewed the survivors of 283 suicides for a 1986 study. 133 of those who died were under 30, and only 7 percent were gay and they were all over 21. In another study at Columbia University of 107 teenage boy suicides, only three were known to be gay, and two of those died in a suicide pact. When the Gallup organization interviewed almost 700 teenagers

who knew a teen who had committed suicide, not one mentioned sexuality as part of the problem. Those who had come close to killing themselves mainly cited boy-girl problems or low self-esteem. [{17}](#)

Gibson didn't use a heterosexual control group in his study. Conclusions and statistics are bound to be skewed without a control group. When psychiatrist David Shaffer examined the case histories of the gay teens who committed suicides in Gibson's report, he found the same issues that straight kids wrestle with before suicide: "The stories were the same: a court appearance scheduled for the day of the death; prolonged depression; drug and alcohol problems; etc." [{18}](#)

That any teenager experiences so much pain that he takes his life is a tragedy, regardless of the reason. But it's not fair to lay the responsibility for gay suicides, the few that there are, on those who agree with God that it's wrong and harmful behavior.

## Notes

1. Dallas, Joe. *A Strong Delusion: Confronting the "Gay Christian" Movement*. Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House, 1996.
2. Dr. Judith Reisman, "Kinsey and the Homosexual Revolution," *The Journal of Human Sexuality* (Carrollton, Tex.: Lewis and Stanley, 1996), 21.
3. *Ibid.*, 26.
4. *Ibid.*, 21.
5. Richard G. Howe, *Homosexuality in America: Exposing the Myths* (found on the American Family Association website at <http://www.afa.net>) gives this citation: "Knight lists the following sources in support of the 1%-3% figures: J. Gordon Muir, "Homosexuals and the 10% Fallacy," *Wall Street Journal*, March 31, 1993; Tom W. Smith, "Adult Sexual Behavior in 1989: Number of Partners, Frequency of Intercourse and Risk of AIDS," *Family Planning Perspectives* (May/June 1991): 102; John O.G. Billy, Koray Tanfer, William R. Grady, and Daniel H.



Klepinger, "The Sexual Behavior of Men in the United States," *Family Planning Perspectives*, The Alan Guttmacher Institute, vol. 25, no. 2 (March/April 1993)."

6. Dr. Jeffrey Satinover, "The Gay Gene?", *The Journal of Human Sexuality*, 4.

7. Dallas, 114.

8. Ibid., 112-114.

9. Ibid., 116.

10. Ephesians 5:25-32

11. John 20:30

12. Dallas, 193.

13. Ibid., 195.

14. Peter LaBarbera, "The Gay Youth Suicide Myth," *The Journal of Human Sexuality*, 65.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid., 66.

© 1996 Probe Ministries