

# The Supreme Court's Decision on Sodomite "Marriage"

[Brian Schwertley](#)

God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. Then God blessed them, and God said to them [Adam and Eve], "Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth" (Gen. 1:27-28). And the LORD God said, "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make a helper comparable to him"... And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in its place. Then the rib which the LORD God had taken from man He made into a woman, and brought her to the man... Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh. And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed (Gen. 2:18, 21-22, 24-25).

## Introduction

On Friday, June 26, 2015, the United States Supreme Court decided in favor of so-called "gay marriage" by a 5 to 4 margin. With this ruling, sodomite marriage has been made or declared to be civilly "legal" in all 50 states. This decision merits a close examination from a biblical perspective because it is a reflection of the ethical trajectory of our nation, at least since the 1960s and it of logical necessity will lead to the persecution of Bible believing Christians (i.e. professing Christians who are unwilling to compromise on or ignore the moral law of God as revealed in the Scripture [the 66 books of the Old and New Testament]). Christians, at this time, have already been persecuted in the economic sphere as courts and judges have sided with sodomites and lesbians against Christian bakers and florists.

As we look at the decision and the reasoning behind it, we must keep in mind that we are witnessing an intellectual, philosophical and spiritual war between secular humanism and biblical Christianity. Christians believe in an objectively fixed moral order; ethical beliefs must be rooted in divine revelation. The Bible sets forth ethical precepts externally addressed to all mankind by God. These moral laws are inscripturated to reveal the eternal and universal will of God. Having universal, unchanging, objective criteria of truth is absolutely necessary for a genuine concept of the rule of law. For without true, objective, unchanging values, ethical ideas are at best only human opinions given at a particular time. As human opinions (i.e. subjective views) change over time, ethics change as well. The metaphysical agnosticism of modern thought leads to a denial of objective moral values that stand above all men.

Without ethical absolutes, man flounders and moves from pleasure ethics to power ethics. Pleasure ethics are what makes men happy or fulfilled. The problem with this view is that, without a biblical understanding of reality, pleasure ethics in its essence is simply an extension of philosophical hedonism. Power ethics is the idea that "might makes right" and the state must determine the course of reality. These two (pleasure ethics and power ethics) go together historically because pleasure ethics lead to moral anarchism and humanistic states seeking control over every area of life. Therefore, while on the one hand the secular state claims that morals are relativistic and changing, it chooses a position based on pleasure ethics and demands that Christians conform or at least stay in the closet. "In the name of toleration, the believer is asked to tolerate all things because the unbeliever will tolerate

nothing; it means life on the unbeliever's terms. It means that biblical order is denied existence, because all things must be leveled downward"<sup>1</sup> for the pleasure ethics.

The only real standard is not God speaking in the Scriptures but man himself acting as God. The liberal statist wants the radical leftists on the Supreme Court to make up their own ethics, while the humanistic conservative appeals to the Constitution and argues that the voters of each state have the right to determine whether sodomites can get married with the state's approval and blessing. Both views are radically anti-Christian and relativistic. The reason that conservatives and liberals agree in dethroning Jesus Christ and exalting man as the measure of all things is their accepting of the constitutional position that the Bible is not the ultimate standard and cannot be directly appealed to for ethical norms or civil laws. The liberals place their faith in the messianic state while the conservatives ask us to trust "we the people" or the majority of voters. When those voters (most of whom have been indoctrinated in state schools) approve of sodomite behavior and marriage, the conservative position gives us the same wicked unbiblical laws. A humanistic-relativistic landmark (which is not a landmark at all) ends with the same humanistic results. Both views (at bottom) are at war with Jesus Christ, the moral law of God and a Christian social order. The only solution to moral anarchism and humanistic statism in America is an *explicitly* Christian constitution, a strict adherence to biblical law and a restriction of voting rights to Bible believing Christians who are members in good standing in an orthodox Bible believing church.

The recent decision of the Supreme Court is simply another logical step in the nation's rejection of the Bible, Christian ethics and the biblical concept of absolute law (i.e. laws must be based on God's law [which is based on God's righteous character and absolute authority] which is transcendent, unchanging and nonnegotiable) for humanistic, arbitrary, evolving, relativistic, positivistic law. It is further proof that the United States (which in its early history was strongly influenced by the Christian world and life view) has abandoned the rule of law for man-made pragmatic law. The whole idea of the rule of law is that there is an ethical standard above all humanity that has authority over all men; that cannot be changed, denied or overturned. This has been rejected for relativism. The Supreme Court has ruled that culture and society must not conform itself to objective, unchanging ethical norms but, rather, laws must evolve and change to reflect what is popular in society. What has been regarded as immoral and perverse for thousands of years is now proclaimed by five incompetent and immoral judges to be moral. We live in irrational and dangerous times when the righteous are held in contempt as "homophobic" bigots and ignorant fools. As we examine this issue, let us not forget that while secular humanism with its relativistic-arbitrary ethics has been used to legalize sodomy and filthy unnatural sexual behaviors as well as sodomite marriage, it could also be used to justify incest, bestiality, the Holocaust, the gulags of the Soviet Union, torture, slavery and many other abominations. We must return to the rule of law which is founded on God's revealed law or absolute ethics. Rushdoony writes, "An absolute law set forth by an absolute God separates good and evil and protects good. When that law is denied, and relativism sets in, there no longer exists any valid principle of differentiation and identification. What needs protecting from whom, when all the world is equal and the same? When all the world is water, there is no shoreline to be guarded. When all reality is death, there is no life to be protected. Because the courts of law are increasingly unable to define anything due to their relativism, they are increasingly unable to protect the righteous and law-abiding in a world where crime cannot be properly defined."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1973), 295.

<sup>2</sup> Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, 119.

## The Basic Arguments Refuted

The arguments developed for sodomite marriage from homosexual activists and their supporters in the legal community have been adopted hook, line and sinker by the liberal activist judges on the Supreme Court. This should come as no surprise, given the fact that these judges were committed to the “morality” and “dignity” of homosexual acts (what they regard as moral, loving “intimacy”) before they heard the arguments in favor of sodomite marriage. We will briefly summarize each argument and then analyze it from a biblical and logical perspective.

### Argument 1: Respect and Need

The first argument for sodomite marriage is that homosexuals do not seek to demean or devalue the institution of marriage, but rather they seek “respect” and have a “need” for this institution (i.e. its privileges and responsibilities; by privileges we assume they refer to the tax, medical and relational benefits of marriage). By the word “respect” we assume that they mean not allowing sodomite marriage shows disrespect to sodomite and lesbian couples. This issue, if considered biblically, really revolves around whether we want to show respect toward God and His infallible Word or sodomites. God says that marriage is between one man and one woman. The institution of marriage is not an *arbitrary* arrangement decided upon by cavemen or early men on the plains of Africa. It was instituted directly by God who created the woman as a help-meet suitable for the man and presented her to the man in marriage. The task of godly dominion resides with the nuclear family consisting of a man and a woman (his wife) and under normal circumstances their children (Gen. 1:26-28; 2:18, 21-25). Sodomites and lesbians can seek respect for their sexual perversions and their pretend marriages all they want, but their behavior deserves no more respect than bestiality, incest, murder or adultery. God describes it as an abomination (i.e. it is evil and detestable) that deserves the death penalty (Lev. 18:22; 20:13; Rom. 1:24-29, 32; cf. 1 Cor. 6:9-10). We must always keep in mind that the sodomite and lesbian lobby and the left wing ethical relativists on the Supreme Court base their views not on biblical or moral realities, but, rather, on changing cultural mores. The sodomite activists waited until homosexual marriage was much more acceptable to society before they took it to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court follows the ignorant, immoral mob, not God, Jesus Christ and the Word of God. This is the law of atheists and relativists.

As Bible-believing Christians, we are not concerned that a thoroughly unethical, absurd and perverse understanding of marriage shows disrespect to marriage, for this institution cannot in reality be changed. In other words, one can *believe* marriage is valid between a man and man, or a man and a young boy, or a man and a goat, or a man and a tree but none of these unethical, abominable relations are really marriage, for *God defines marriage*. If marriage can be redefined to justify perverts living together and practicing sodomy and fisting, then it can be redefined to justify anything. If there are no ethical absolutes or fixed ethical reference points, why not redefine it further? Where does one draw the line? Our concern as Christians is that, as wicked men and women arbitrarily make up new laws that mock the true and living God, Jesus Christ and His infallible authoritative Word, God will pour out His wrath on our nation. Remember, the Bible presents the open acceptance and practice of homosexual behavior as one of the final stages of a society’s or culture’s apostasy from God. It reveals a nation ripe for destruction.

Regarding the supposed “need” for this institution, we ask, “What need?” If they argue that it is needed to fulfill their love or to have the special intimacy of the marriage relationship, then we need to point out the biblical definition of love. Paul says that “love does not rejoice in iniquity, but rejoices in

the truth” (1 Cor. 13:6). Jesus said, “If you love Me, keep My commandments” (Jn. 14:15). John says that if we really *know* Jesus (i.e. if we have a saving relationship with Him and the communion with God that flows from that saving relationship) then we will keep His commandments (1 Jn. 2:3). In 2 John he adds, “This is love, that we walk according to His commandments” (v. 6). Since God’s moral commandments explicitly teach that same-sex “intimacy” is sinful, wicked, evil, damning and worthy of death, then men or women who have lust toward the same sex would express their love by maintaining a platonic (non-sexual) relationship. Obviously, this does not require marriage. Like David and Jonathan who loved each other deeply from the heart, they can have a covenant of *friendship*. Sodomites and lesbians assume that their perverted lusts are a justification for acting on their sinful desires. This sodomite justification is based on naturalism and existentialism instead of objective, transcendent ethics. It is a revolt against human responsibility, self-restraint and those imperatives regulating proper sexual relations which God has imposed upon His rational creatures. If we allow inward lusts to define what is good, proper and ethical, then adultery, incest, child molestation, bestiality and sadomasochism carry their own self-justifications. The position of homosexual activists and liberals on the Supreme Court logically leads to relativism, moral anarchy and a lust-driven subjectivism.

## Argument 2: Marriage Has Changed in History

The second argument for sodomite marriage is based on various events in history. Page 2 of the Supreme Court’s syllabus reads, “The history of marriage is one of both continuity and change. Changes, such as the decline of arranged marriages and the abandonment of the law of coverture, have worked deep transformations in the structure of marriage, affecting aspects of marriage once viewed as essential. These new insights have strengthened, not weakened, the institution. Changed understandings of marriage are characteristic of a Nation where new dimensions of freedom become apparent to new generations.” A little later the right of interracial marriages is set forth as another example of the evolution of marriage. This use of history is easily refuted by the following observations:

(1) Although certain aspects surrounding marriage have changed in history, these are peripheral matters and do not relate to the core aspect of marriage under discussion (That is because true and genuine marriage can only exist between a man and a woman not a man and a man, or a man and a goat, or a man and a tree). Laws of coverture (i.e. laws based on the biblical teaching of the covenant headship of the husband, where a married woman is considered as under the protection and authority of her husband) have fallen away as our society rejected the Bible and embraced feminism. But this is a view of how a marriage relationship should operate, *not what a marriage is*. The abandonment of covenant headship by our nation has been a disaster for society, especially for women and children. Abuses of coverture have occurred when societies go beyond the clear teaching of Scripture (e.g., not allowing women to own property or engage in economic activities; Islamic cultures are extreme examples of the perversion of covenant headship).

The use of arranged marriages has been and still is a popular cultural practice in some societies. But this practice is also peripheral regarding the topic of what constitutes a real, lawful marriage. If a man and a woman reject the arrangement and elope with another person of the opposite sex, they are married and under normal circumstances can bear children. There are many cultural things surrounding marriage that are non-essential and do not speak to what constitutes a lawful marriage at all. These things are brought up simply to confuse those with weak reasoning capabilities. The liberal justices are blowing smoke.

(2) The elimination of laws which banned interracial marriages also does not speak to the issue

of homosexual marriage even though this is a popular and common argument. The banning of interracial unions is a late innovation of racists and has *never* been a moral requirement of Scripture. The marriage of different “races” is obviously not contrary to nature. There are different ethnic groups in the world but only one race, the human race. All humans are created in God’s image and are ontologically equal. If a dark-skinned woman from Africa marries a blonde, blue-eyed, light skinned man from Sweden, they can have lawful, natural sexual relations and under normal conditions bear children and have a household. (Moses, the great Old Testament prophet and leader who received God’s law, was married to a black African woman from Ethiopia.) But two homosexual men who pretend to get married can engage in anal intercourse (which is unnatural, perverse, disgusting and detestable), yet they will never bear children or have a real family. The only births that come from the sodomite’s rectum (which they incorrectly regard as a sex organ) are made of excrement. It was designed by God as an *exit* not an entrance.

### Argument 3: Beliefs, Attitudes and Laws Regarding Homosexuality Have Changed

The third major argument for sodomite marriage is that attitudes and laws regarding homosexual behavior and marriage have radically changed. On page 2 of the Supreme Court’s syllabus we read, “Well into the 20th century, many States condemned same-sex intimacy as immoral, and homosexuality was treated as an illness. Later in the century, cultural and political developments allowed same-sex couples to lead more open and public lives. Extensive public and private dialogue followed, along with shifts in public attitudes. Questions about the legal treatment of gays and lesbians soon reached the courts, where they could be discussed in the formal discourse of the law. In 2003, this Court overruled its 1986 decision in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 U.S. 186, which upheld Georgia law that criminalized certain homosexual acts, including laws making same-sex intimacy a crime ‘demea[n] the lives of homosexual persons.’ *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 575. In 2002, the federal Defense of Marriage Act was also struck down. *United States v. Windsor*, 570 U.S.\_\_\_\_. Numerous same-sex marriage cases reaching the federal courts and state supreme courts have added to the dialogue.”

With this argument, the high court’s secular humanism and relativism comes to the forefront. The assumption behind this argument is that there are no objective and eternal truths or moral standards. Their repudiation of ethical absolutes has led them to the idea that values are determined by subjective opinions and attitudes. Ethics are determined by subjective concepts of fairness and equity, as well as sentimental and romantic concepts of love. Human experience, as interpreted through a radically liberal worldview, must determine right or wrong. It is important to remember that while liberal judges in our land proclaim a change of attitude that justifies their opinion, they fail to note that in several states the voters rejected sodomite marriage for heterosexual monogamous marriage. Thus, on the one hand, the court appeals to the change of attitude; but, on the other hand, they are simply asserting raw, arbitrary power. The pleasure ethic always gives way to the power ethic. While rejecting the Christian world and life view and the claim of absolute truth that is universally valid for all men in all times and places, the liberals on the court arrogantly proclaim their views superior to all prior history and demand that their views be universally held. They are caught in a blatant inconsistency. On the one hand, they assume that ethical absolutes as proclaimed by the true and living God in the Bible are invalid, implying there are no real ethical absolutes but only a shifting public dialogue that is evolving. On the other hand, discrimination against sodomites and lesbians (even outlawing homosexual acts) is immoral and must universally (i.e. in the whole nation) be forbidden. They are simply couching their totalitarian, arbitrary, dictatorial, atheistic, barbarian, positivistic nonsense in emotional, “caring,” existential terminology.

Having noted the underlying presuppositions and inconsistencies of the high court's arguments, let us turn our attention to the specifics. They note that well into the 20th century same-sex intimacy was condemned as immoral. Yes, for thousands of years in many cultures and civilizations (even ones without the benefit of special revelation [i.e. the Bible]), homosexual behavior was viewed as immoral and was a civil crime. Why was this so? Why did peoples, nations, tribes and empires throughout history regard homosexuality as immoral and grossly perverted, even apart from the biblical world and life view? The answer to this question is simple: homosexuality is against nature. It is unnatural. It is an act of human autonomy and a perversion of the created order. Contrary to modern thought, homosexual behavior is not the same as heterosexual intimacy. One was designed by God to function naturally, the other is a forced perversion. Paul notes that homosexuality and lesbianism are judgments of God for rejecting the truth and embracing idolatry. It is humanistic thinking that leads to perverse concepts of sexuality. In Romans 1:21-28 we read,

Although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man – and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things. Therefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, in the lusts of their hearts, to dishonor their bodies among themselves, who exchanged the truth of God for the lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. For even their women exchanged the natural use for what is against nature. Likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust for one another, men with men committing what is shameful, and receiving in themselves the penalty of their error which was due. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a debased mind, to do those things which are not fitting.

As idolatry is contrary to reality and God's intention for His rational creatures in religion, homosexuality is unnatural in the sexual sphere. Human beings were created to have sexual relations with those of the *opposite sex* within the covenantal institution of marriage (see Heb. 13:4). "Although verse 26 is ambiguous regarding the precise sense in which women acted contrary to nature, verse 27 clarifies that what is unnatural is same-sex relations."<sup>3</sup> As the Western nations apostatized from the biblical world and life view, God delivered these nations over to judicial afflictions. This explains the rise of homosexuality in the West. God gave over many people unto vile passions of dishonor. Homosexuality is not a blessed good thing, but is a penalty for wicked, idolatrous thinking. Paul follows the Old Testament teaching of God's moral law in defining homosexuality and lesbianism as one of the most aggravated forms of sexual misbehavior, uncleanness and vile passion. If homosexuality were natural, Paul, writing under divine inspiration, would *not* say that being handed over to the sin of homosexuality was God's judgment for idolatrous thinking. Homosexuality is a judgment for rejecting God. The whole focus of Paul in this section is on the unnatural character of this sexual vice and its abominable nature in God's sight. "The implication is that however grievous is fornication or adultery, the desecration involved in homosexuality is on a lower plane of degeneracy; it is unnatural and therefore evinces a perversion more basic."<sup>4</sup> Homosexual behavior is much worse than adultery and fornication but not as bad as bestiality which is even more unnatural and perverted. This explains why, according to the Old Testament moral case laws, bestiality and homosexuality are both death penalty offenses.

One, however, does not need to read the Bible to see that homosexual behavior is unnatural.

---

<sup>3</sup> Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 96.

<sup>4</sup> John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959, 65), 1:47.

Secular scholars and medical doctors have regarded homosexual acts as unnatural, dangerous and harmful for *generations*. Because the secular scholars did not adhere to a biblical world and life view and did not understand the fall or sin, they looked at homosexuality as a mental illness or disorder.<sup>5</sup> Why was homosexuality viewed for generations by secular scholars as a serious mental illness? Because it is obviously abnormal, perverse and unnatural! Homosexuality was removed from psychology and psychiatry books as a mental illness because of severe pressure by the homosexual lobby in 1973.<sup>6</sup> The homosexual community is not interested in objective truth, justice or righteousness but rather self-justification. In a society that has largely embraced moral relativism—that, in many areas (especially human sexuality), is suffering from a moral paralysis—it is not difficult to manipulate the media and the masses to declare gross perversions to be wonderful while condemning the righteous as hateful bigots. As Solomon says, “Those who forsake the law praise the wicked, but such as keep the law contend with them. Evil men do not understand justice, but those who seek the LORD understand all” (Prov. 28:4-5).

That homosexuality is unnatural can be objectively demonstrated, not only by how the human bodies of men and women are designed by God, but also by the great harm that results from homosexual behavior. This point has been ably documented by David Chilton. Chilton appeals to secular scientific and medical studies. The facts associated with homosexual behavior are shocking and disgusting but they must be noted in order to demonstrate just how unnatural and perverted homosexual “intimacy” really is. We must face the fact that the homosexuality carries its own God-given sanctions. It is a lifestyle of debauchery and death. Chilton writes,

We must begin with a rather basic and obvious point about the difference between heterosexual and homosexual intercourse: God designed the vagina to be penetrated by a penis. The vaginal walls can stretch, and they are naturally lubricated during intercourse. The anus, and rectum, in contrast, were not designed for sexual activity. They were created to excrete feces, period. The rectum is neither elastic nor lubricated; consequently, anal intercourse routinely tears the lining of the rectum and causes the anus to split and crack into bleeding fissures. These tears and fissures in turn become channels for HIV to pass into the bloodstream. Studies have shown that “receptive anal intercourse was the specific sexual activity which correlated most strongly with reduced levels of helper T-cells” and the consequent breakdown of the immune system.

Repeated anal intercourse commonly results in other harmful conditions, such as colitis (or

---

<sup>5</sup> See the 1952 Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders published by the American Psychiatric Association.

<sup>6</sup> If one carefully reads the statements released by scientific or professional organizations that have passed statements or resolutions favorable to homosexuals and their behavior, one will note an abandonment of empirical scientific principles for statements of faith that are absolute but not proven. For example, the American Psychological Association’s January 24th, 1975 news release uses terms such as “oppose” (as in oppose the anti-homosexual position), “support” (the removal of homosexuality from the Psychiatric Association’s list of mental disorders, 1973), “urges” (the removal of homosexuality as a stigma), “deplores” (all public and private discrimination against homosexuals) and “supports and urges the repeal of *all* discriminatory legislation singling out *homosexual acts* by *consenting adults in private*.” The very people who are supposed to be engaged in science and claim to be objective, empirical and probabilistic are making *absolute* claims regarding ethics that have not been proven by science and are unprovable. Such statements (which are common in our society) are intellectually dishonest, arbitrary and subjective. They are more political and emotional than scientific. We are supposed to accept such statements by faith because the supposed scientific experts say so. But what about the “experts,” who, for the past 5,000 years or so, said the exact opposite? These statements on homosexuality by modern supposedly “scientific” secular organizations are not a reflection of absolute truth but what is popular in modern secular intellectual circles. They have no more scientific or objective validity than a statement by the Three Stooges or Marx Brothers. Yet, such statements are used in our courts to justify the legalization of homosexual activities and marriage. Modern secular scientists reject absolutes unless they are repudiating the Christian world and life view. Thus, on the one hand, they argue that there are no ethical absolutes since we live in a materialistic chance universe but, on the other hand, homosexuality is good and Christianity is bad. Such is the reasoning of the insane asylum.

colonitis), an extremely painful inflammation of the mucous membrane of the colon; mucosal ulcers in the rectum; and Kobner's phenomenon, a psoriasis of the rectum, penis, and scrotum. Anal intercourse also weakens the sphincter, causing—to put it delicately—“fecal incontinence.” The damaged muscle is just unable to hold it in, and the rectum dribbles with bloody feces. This involuntary ooze can leave deposits wherever the homosexual sits: on toilet seats, on benches, in saunas and locker rooms, and anywhere else. If the fecal matter is contaminated with the AIDS virus, there is a possibility that others might be infected as well.

Further, anal intercourse has been found—even apart from AIDS—to damage the body's immune system. Large quantities of sperm cells enter the bloodstream of the passive partner. (The thick walls, elasticity, and lubrication of the vagina prevent this from being a problem in normal sexual intercourse.) After repeated instances of sodomy, the body develops antibodies to fight off invading sperm. These antibodies then circulate throughout the bloodstream, suppressing the immune system itself. Moreover, sperm containing HIV is extremely efficient at communicating the disease: “Leukocytes in the seminal fluid carried the AIDS virus directly to the lymphoid organs of homosexual partners, thus achieving a highly efficient transfer of the infection to most lymphoid cells.” A recent study of disease within “monogamous” homosexual relationships revealed that 75 percent of the passive partners “manifested sperm-induced immune dysregulation.” Gene Antonio rightly remarks: “From a purely biological perspective sodomy, even apart from the transmission of AIDS, is an intrinsically unsanitary and pathological act. In addition, the practice of sodomy has been a primary reason why AIDS has been so readily transmitted and fostered among homosexuals.”

The passive partner is not the only one at risk of disease. Over time, the penis of the active partner can become chafed; various diseases may also cause sores to erupt on the penis. Infected blood and other fluids from the rectum can then enter the body through these abrasions, as well as through the urethra.

But there is much more to homosexuality than anal intercourse. The practice of “fisting” is also common: the active partner shoves his hand and forearm up the other man's rectum and into the colon. Other instruments—dildos, vibrators, and even cola bottles (which occasionally get stuck)—are rammed into the rectum; according to some reports, live rodents (such as gerbils) have been used for this purpose as well. Fisting only further aggravates the problems caused by sodomy: as one “Safe Sex” kit advises, “putting a hand or fist into someone's rectum or vagina is very dangerous because the internal tissue can be easily bruised or torn.” (Jeffrey Hart comments on that phrasing: “There is every reason to doubt that heterosexual couples are ‘fisting.’ The word *vagina* is present in the above sentence only in order to protect the gay practice.”)

The same kit provided, along with two brochures, two condoms, and a tube of lubricant, a little latex square called a “rubber dam” to use for hygienic “rimming”—the practice of anilingus (about two-thirds of homosexual men regularly lick or insert their tongue into their partner's anus). Without the rubber dam—or if it breaks, slips, or overflows—the anilinguist ingests his partner's fecal material. In a national study of homosexual practices, 17 percent of the homosexuals admitted to getting their partner's bodily waste, or smearing it on themselves. Twelve percent gave and received enemas as part of their “sexual” activity.

To appreciate this fully one must understand the phenomenon known as “Gay Bowel Syndrome,” made up of the following conditions among others:

*Amebiasis*, a colon disease caused by parasites, causing abscesses, ulcers, and diarrhea;  
*Giardiasis*, a parasitic bowel disease, again causing diarrhea and sometimes enteritis;  
*Shigellosis*, a bacterial bowel disease, causing severe dysentery; and  
*Hepatitis A*, a viral liver disease, which its victims can spread to others through handling food, and even through the water splashed on toilet seats.

Homosexuals are especially vulnerable to these conditions because of their sexual practices. Between 30 and 50 percent of homosexual males have contracted amebiasis through swallowing fecal

matter...

All of these perverse practices are invitations to deadly disease. Hepatitis B virus (HBV) has been common to male homosexuals for many years, and is traceable to both anal intercourse and anilingus. In addition to causing hepatitis, cirrhosis, and liver cancer, HBV also results in bleeding rectal lesions—more channels for the AIDS virus to pass through, in either direction.

Then there are the venereal diseases:

*Syphilis* – Fifty percent of the cases in the U.S. occur in homosexual men, who comprise 4 percent of the population. There is evidence of a connection between a history of syphilis and the contraction of AIDS.

*Genital herpes* – an incurable condition afflicting virtually all practicing male homosexuals; this is also associated in homosexuals with tongue and rectal cancer.

*Cytomegalovirus (CMV)* – again, a frequent condition among homosexuals; there is evidence that CMV contributes to both the depression of the immune system and Kaposi's sarcoma (a cancer of AIDS).

*Venereal warts* – this common affliction among homosexuals appears in large clumps in and around the anus, and can affect the penis as well. The warts itch violently, emit a foul-smelling discharge, and are extremely resistant to treatment.

All of these problems are compounded by the extent of homosexual promiscuity. According to Bell and Weinberg, “in their comprehensive work *Homosexualities*, the majority of homosexual males have scores of homosexual partners in a year. Over a relatively brief period, this may encompass hundreds of encounters. Over an entire lifetime, it involves thousands.” The same authors observed that homosexual bathhouses exist primarily “to provide an inexpensive place where homosexual men can engage in frequent, anonymous sexual activities without fear of social or legal reprisal.” A single visit can result in up to a dozen sexual encounters.

Anonymous, promiscuous sex is a hallmark of homosexuality, and this can be true even in what are called “monogamous” relationships. *New York* magazine lamented the case of one AIDS sufferer who had had, ironically, a rather stable sex life, staying with the same lover for more than ten years—*except for one night a week*. That makes, at the very least, over fifty partners a year, and possibly five hundred! A heterosexual who acted that way might be called promiscuous. For the ultimate in anonymity, homosexuals use what is known as a “glory hole”—a hole in the partition between toilet stalls and bathhouse booths, through which they can engage in anal and oral intercourse without even ever seeing each other.<sup>7</sup>

This little glimpse into the homosexual lifestyle is grotesque and offensive, yet necessary because, contrary to modern thought, homosexuality is not simply men who like fashion, flamboyant clothes, Judy Garland and who talk funny. It is a movement advocating sexual perversion. It is a lifestyle that mocks God and His law. A state that does not seek to suppress such behavior with civil laws against sodomy, fisting, gerbil asphyxiation, etc. is not protecting society from detestable, unnatural behavior. Such a society is on the path to destruction.

The liberals on the court do not appeal to any objective criteria for their decision or make any attempts to prove that homosexual behavior is normal or natural from an empirical or scientific perspective. They point rather to the spreading idea after World War II “of the humanity and integrity of homosexual persons” (p. 7). They note that in more recent years “psychiatrists and others recognize that sexual orientation is both a normal expression of human sexuality and immutable” (p. 8). These are subjective opinions masquerading as substantial proofs.<sup>8</sup> Yes it is true that after World War II

---

<sup>7</sup> David Chilton, *Power in the Blood: A Christian Response to Aids* (Brentwood, TN: Wulgmuth and Hyatt, 1987), 32-35.

<sup>8</sup> The Christian world and life view has been abandoned for the old paganism *masquerading* as modern science. Modern

(especially after the sexual revolution in the 1960s) people have had a more favorable view of homosexuals and their behavior. But this is not due to any new ethical discoveries or objective studies proving that their sexual practices are normal, good or healthy. It is because of our culture's rejection of ethical absolutes and the biblical world and life view that dominated Western civilization since the fall of the Roman Empire.

The liberals on the court have adopted a sloppy form of existentialism where objective ethical norms are denied and thus cannot be appealed to in order to determine proper ethical behavior. Instead what exists or is popular (even though it is immoral and disgusting) must be the foundation and guide for ethical norms. It leaves society with no fixed reference point as to meaning, ethics or truth. This results in the determination of "moral" law through raw political power. Furthermore, while the liberals on the court appeal to views of ethics as that which is arbitrary and changing over time, they assume that what is new or more modern is moral. New and more relevant values are emerging which should be adopted. This way of thinking assumes a kind of humanistic evolutionary process, essentially that humanistic man acting autonomously discovers better morals over time. Society, in this view, is becoming more and more just.

There are a few serious problems with this line of thinking. One is that it posits an objective standard of justice while denying that such an objective standard can exist. Secular humanists have denied that transcendent, objective, unchanging moral laws exist. They have embraced the humanistic, atheistic idea that morals are essentially social conventions that evolve over time. That is why their arguments are essentially subjective. They must look to human experience to attempt to form ethical norms. We have repeatedly pointed out that this leaves them with naturalism, existentialism and, in the end, bare assertion in their formation of laws. In fact, based on their presuppositions, what is declared to be just now may very well be deemed immoral in a future generation.

It also explicitly contradicts the historical record. While some bad things such as chattel slavery have been outlawed in England and America (in England it was removed peacefully by the work of Christian statesman), most of the court's evolving standards in the 20th century have been for the worse. No-fault easy divorce has penalized the innocent (usually women) and hurt families; the practical elimination of the death penalty has denied thousands of victims justice under law and created many repeat felons; the legalization of abortion has led to a holocaust of innocent children in America (over 53 million unborn babies have been murdered since 1973); the change of attitude and legalization

---

secular humanistic ideas of sexuality are rooted in 19th-century macro evolutionary theories. According to their presuppositions, man (and his cultural and sexual practices) is simply an arbitrary, meaningless product of the process of evolution. This evolutionary view led leading psychologists such as Sigmund Freud to remove strange, perverted, unnatural sexual acts such as homosexuality from the sphere of ethics and religion to one of "natural" evolutionary biological urges. Thus, even though Freud did not see homosexuality as immoral at all, his evolutionary analysis made sexual behaviors a medical issue, instead of a moral problem. Perverted behaviors were no longer defined as sin or something objectively wrong that is an abomination in God's sight. Instead, they were *sicknesses* that in the first part of the 20th century were to be treated with drugs and psychological counseling. Then, as homosexuality became accepted in western nations and the psychological and psychiatric associations came under immense pressure from homosexual activists, it *arbitrarily* was removed from being an aberration or sickness. Now the goal of psychologists and psychiatrists is to help homosexuals *accept* their behavior and take pride in their lifestyle. People are taught to adjust to their sexual perversions and hate Bible believing Christians so they can be happy and fulfilled while they continue to rebel against the true and living God and trample His commandments underfoot. What is truly amazing about this whole process (that took less than 100 years) is that "science" or provable empirical objective analysis had nothing to do with any of it. Men in authority who were regarded as leaders in their field and, thus, were regarded as scientific simply changed their minds. It is on this completely arbitrary, dishonest, unethical and misguided foundation that our civil government has legislated immorality and gross perversion. Remember that if 1000 or 1 million or 100 million people make up a lie, their positions of authority and great numbers cannot turn that arbitrary assertion or lie into the truth. The pile of manure remains a pile of manure.

of homosexual behavior in many states (prior to the 2003 decision of the Supreme Court, *Lawrence v. Texas*, which legalized homosexuality in all 50 States) greatly helped the AIDS epidemic spread, killing tens of thousands of sodomites. Only someone who is liberal and holds to a humanistic concept of life could argue that our laws are getting better.

#### Argument 4: Homosexual Orientation is Immutable

But what about the high court's argument that homosexual orientation is *immutable*? This argument is nothing more than homosexual propaganda. The fact that, in recent years, this view has become more popular among secular psychiatrists does not make the argument any better. The fact that many sodomites and lesbians have abandoned their lifestyle for heterosexuality does not matter to homosexual apologists, for they simply assert that such people were not true homosexuals to begin with. We are dealing with, not objective truth or assertions proved by careful scientific empirical examination, but with liberal dogmatism. If enough people repeat the lie, then we are expected to accept it as true.

In addition, the whole argument based on immutability (i.e. one is born that way and cannot help it) is built on the assumption that what a person is (or what he habitually feels or thinks) must be ethical. In other words, if one has homosexual lusts and believes he is a homosexual, then the right thing to do is to act upon those lusts and live the homosexual lifestyle. This existential theory of ethics is not only subjective and unopen to objective verification, but it could be used to justify all sorts of wicked, perverse lifestyles. For example, many child molesters claim that their lusts began from a very early age. Child molesters are also virtually never "reformed." Does this mean they should accept who they are and glory in it like sodomites? Of course not! What about serial killers? Most of them began as young children who tortured animals. They all claim that they simply could not stop it. Does this existential "fact" justify their abominable behavior? No. It most certainly does not.

We must understand that we cannot simply base morality on the way things are because we live in a fallen world. Everything has been corrupted by sin. All men are born with the guilt and pollution of sin due to the first man's sin (cf. Rom. 5:12, 17, 19). Therefore, it is wrong to say, "God made me a homosexual" or "I must accept what I am." Because of the fall and our sinful natures, all men are born with a proclivity toward sin. It is for this reason that we need the perfect redemption achieved by Jesus Christ. Moreover, if one accepts the argument, "I must accept what I am and it is wrong to condemn my actions that flow from my proclivities," then virtually all sins could be excused. Thus the homosexual "immutable" argument, *if applied consistently*, would be the destruction of social ethics altogether. God clearly rejects the immutability argument. He says that all men are born liars (cf. Ps. 58:30). Yet the Bible says that lying is a sin (cf. Ex. 20:16; Deut. 5:20) and that liars will not enter the kingdom of God (cf. Rev. 21:27). If many men have a proclivity toward lusting after beautiful women who are not their wives, does this excuse committing adultery? No. Of course not! If single men have lusts toward single women (and no one can argue that heterosexual desires are not innate) does this justify fornication or premarital sex? No. It most certainly does not. The man with homosexual desires must refuse to act on those desires because to do so is not only a serious sin but also (according to God's perfect and righteous law) a capital crime.

The man with unlawful homosexual desires must do what all sinners are required to do. He must accept what God says about his unlawful desires. They are wrong, immoral and sinful. If he has ever acted out those desires, he must acknowledge that his behavior was wrong, wicked, sinful and deserving of God's judgment. Then he must confess and forsake his unlawful behavior and embrace Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. Those who excuse homosexual behavior with irrational, unsound and

absurd arguments are the true enemies of the homosexual community because they are encouraging them in their spiritual blindness and sin. They are leading them down the broad path to destruction (Mt. 7:13). Only Christ and His salvation can give hope to homosexuals. After Paul says that homosexuals are excluded from the kingdom of God he says, “and such were some of you; but you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of God” (1 Cor. 6:11). The inspired and infallible Word of God says that Christ can redeem homosexuals and change them by the power of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the immutability argument is not only irrational, leading to the total acceptance of *all wicked proclivities*, but explicitly contradicts Scripture.

Militant homosexuals will regard these biblical, rational and historical arguments against the Supreme Court’s insane ruling as “hate speech.” But we cannot love and help homosexuals unless we ourselves are willing to recognize sin as *really sin*. If we arbitrarily redefine wicked behavior away and minimize it to the point where homosexuals believe they are behaving righteously and have no need of repentance or the saving blood of Christ, then we are not loving homosexuals biblically, but rather are hating them by helping them go to hell. Solomon says “a faithful witness does not lie” (Prov. 14:5). Those who justify homosexual lust and perversions with all sorts of clever and manipulative arguments are nothing but liars. They are extending a false and destructive compassion and a phony, antinomian, pseudo-love. This explains why Solomon says, “...the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel” (Prov. 12:10). If, out of a desire to cater to our current culture and fit in with the popular way of thinking, we ignore, redefine, water-down or misrepresent the teaching of God’s holy and perfect moral law, then we are not only liars and false prophets (who preach peace when there is no peace [cf. Jer. 6:13-15]) but are misrepresenting God Himself. We would not only be exposed to God’s wrath for lying about Him and His law but we would have the blood of homosexuals on our hands because instead of loving them by giving biblical warnings, we have deceived them and given them a false sense of security. If we are to love our neighbor as ourselves, then we must tell them about their sin face-to-face and warn them to flee the wrath to come. If we fail in our Christian responsibility because we fear our wicked civil government or popular opinion more than God, then we are not really confessing Christ before men. If we reject the biblical view of homosexuality for the modern secular view, then we are an abomination in God’s sight. As Solomon says, “He who justifies the wicked, and he who condemns the just, both of them alike are an abomination to the LORD” (Prov. 17:15). This is precisely what the liberals on the Supreme Court have done.

God, speaking in the Scriptures (read Lev. 18:22, 20:13; Gen. 19; Rom. 1:24-32; 1 Cor. 6:9-10; Jude 1:7; 1 Tim. 1:8-10; etc.), says explicitly and repeatedly that homosexuals are responsible for their sexually perverted activities. Therefore, God does not regard the small percentage of mankind who claim to be innately homosexual from birth as exempt from His moral law. His law says their way of thinking and acting is very unnatural and totally unacceptable. Biblically, a person is no more “naturally” a homosexual than he is “naturally” a murderer, fornicator, child molester, thief, liar, adulterer or animal abuser. “Like any sin, homosexuality is a set of attitudes, desires, and actions that are forbidden by the law of God... The issue is simply this: What does the Word of God say? Even if it means calling every man on earth a liar, we must maintain that God’s Word is always true (Romans 3:4). I can say that homosexuality is unnatural on the basis of the central fact: *Whatever is against God’s revealed law is unnatural.*”<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, 37.

## Argument 5: Laws against Homosexuality Demean Homosexuals

With biblical ethics and the teaching from nature in mind, what should we think of the Supreme Court's argument that "holding...laws making same-sex intimacy a crime 'demea[n] the lives of homosexual persons.' *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 575" (p. 8)? The word "demeaning" means that they are lower in standing or dignity. This argument, which presupposes that homosexual "intimacy" (e.g., anal intercourse and fisting) is just as normal, natural and moral as married heterosexual intimacy (i.e. vaginal intercourse), is an arbitrary assertion contrary to fact and biblical law. It is no different than arguing that laws against theft and murder must be eliminated because we do not want to demean thieves and murderers. When the highest court in the United States vigorously defends one of the most immoral, despicable, grotesque, perverted sexual acts on earth with their assertions, irrational nonsense and sentimental musings equivalent to that of an ignorant 12-year-old, our nation is in serious trouble. Our nation will be judged for the sin and foolishness of our leaders (especially the United States which elected a pro-abortion, pro-sodomite, habitual liar as president not once but twice; a president who appointed two apparent lesbians to the Supreme Court). We should listen very carefully to R.J. Rushdoony's warning:

Wherever a society refuses to exact the required death penalty, there God exacts the death penalty on that society. The basic fact of God's law-order is that, from Adam's fall on, the death penalty has been effective. Societies have fallen in great numbers for their defiance of God and they shall continue to fall as long as their violation of God's order continues. Every state and every society thus faces a choice: to sentence to death those who deserve to die, or to die themselves. But all they that hate God choose death. Certainly, the sin of presumption is total revolution against God and man; all who permit it have chosen death whether they recognize it or not.<sup>10</sup> ...When a people reaches a certain level of moral depravity, punishment ceases to be particular and becomes national. The civil order has lost its ability to act for God, and God then acts against that order. In other words, there is punishment, but the punishment is from God and the people or nation shall fall.<sup>11</sup>

In addition, no knowledgeable, thinking, Bible-believing Christian would deny that homosexuals are human beings who have dignity as rational beings created in the image of God. A homosexual may have integrity as a plumber, artist, farmer, electrician or doctor but homosexual lusts and sexual activities are an explicit denial of human integrity. Integrity means a soundness of and adherence to moral principle and character. It refers to people who are moral, upright and honest. If someone who had homosexual desires had integrity, they would refuse to dwell on those lusts, act upon or seek to excuse them. They would acknowledge that they are sinful, wicked and inappropriate. The liberals tell us what they, along with relativists and secular humanists, believe and treat it as a substantial argument. It is akin to saying that the moon must be made of green cheese because there are an increasing number of people who believe the moon is made of green cheese. This is an amateur and incompetent argument but we should expect such nonsense. What else is left when objective criteria for the evaluation of morality is set aside?

---

<sup>10</sup> Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, 326-327.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, 425.

## Argument 6: It Would Deny Human Autonomy

The majority of the Supreme Court argued that the right to choose a marriage partner of the same sex flows from the premise “that the right to personal choice regarding marriage is inherent in the concept of individual autonomy” (p. 12, cf. 3). This is then supposedly supported by the court’s ruling permitting interracial marriages. While the United States civil government has no authority to tell an African-American that he cannot marry a person of the opposite sex who is Irish, English or German, the principle of choice obviously has limits. People do not have the right to marry a brother, sister or parent. At the time of this writing, people are not permitted to marry more than one wife or husband. They are not allowed to choose a goat, cow, horse or cat as a marriage partner. Thus we see that the right of choice is limited by what is regarded as right or wrong, moral or immoral, proper or improper. The right of personal choice would apply to homosexual marriage if homosexual relations were moral and natural. But we have clearly demonstrated that they are immoral, perverse, unnatural and abominable. No court has the authority to declare that something which is wrong is now right. But, as we have seen, all the sub-arguments of the liberals on the court are based on the presupposition that homosexual intimacy is normal, natural and moral. The liberals on the court assume that biblical ethics and thousands of years of religious and civil laws were all wrong, homophobic, bigoted and against human liberty and dignity. Thus we see that they are not only spiritually blind and ethically incompetent but supremely arrogant.

## Argument 7: Laws Against Same-Sex Marriage Harm and Humiliate Children

Another key argument of the liberals on the court is the assertion that laws forbidding same-sex marriage cause the children of homosexual couples to suffer harm (e.g., the stigma of knowing their families are somehow lesser). This argument presupposes (once again) that homosexual behavior is moral and normal and that children do not need both a father and mother. Like other arguments, it builds on previous decisions and precedents that are immoral, wicked and harmful to society. Regarding this argument, we need to note the following observations.

First, there are no good reasons ethically, logically, biologically or socially why homosexual couples should have children in the first place. Men who have sex with men and women who have sex with women *cannot produce offspring*. That is an undeniable fact of nature. Sodomite apologists attempt to circumvent this obvious fact by pointing out that some heterosexual couples are unable to have children while others choose not have any children. This observation does not negate our point for three reasons. (1) The fact that some heterosexual married couples cannot have children is a rare exception due to *abnormalities* that are a result of the fall. One should not appeal to abnormalities or rare exceptions as if they are normal or natural. (2) The fact that some couples choose not to have children does not negate the fact that they could if they wanted to and biblically they should. But homosexual couples can never give birth or bear children *under any natural circumstances*. Therefore, the reality that rare abnormal exceptions among heterosexual couples exist and must not be used to forbid a lawful marriage between these heterosexual partners does not logically carry over to homosexual couples. To do so is to compare apples to oranges. (3) That men cannot produce offspring by having anal sex with other men proves that God did not design two men (or two women) to have children or families. If we drove the sodomite apologists’ argument to its logical absurdity, then the fact that men could not bear offspring with other species (chimpanzees, orangutans, gorillas, goats, chickens, etc.) is not a natural indication that marriages should not be performed between separate species.

Second, the only way homosexual couples could obtain children would be through unnatural or unlawful means: fornication (e.g., between a sodomite and lesbian or a liberal, immoral heterosexual volunteer and lesbian), artificial insemination, or adoption. The fact that the state allows homosexuals to adopt and act as a family is just as perverse and immoral as allowing homosexual marriages. God created Eve (a woman) to be a helper suitable to Adam (a man) and then presented her to Adam in marriage (Gen. 1:26-27; 2:18-25). The Lord commanded the man and his wife to be fruitful and multiply (Gen. 1:28). Marriage between one man and one woman is the God ordained way to populate the earth and have families. The distinction of the sexes in humanity was for the development of a completely unique relationship, namely, holy marriage. The fruitfulness of the male-female marriage relationship is the means used to fill the earth and develop it to the glory of God. The statement used to describe what the marriage relationship accomplishes, “they [Adam and Eve] became one flesh,” is especially significant. As Wenham notes,

This does not denote merely the sexual union that follows marriage, or the children conceived in marriage, or even the spiritual and emotional relationship that it involves, though all are involved in becoming one flesh. Rather it affirms that just as blood relations are one’s flesh and bone (cf. *Comment on v 23*), so marriage creates a similar kinship relation between man and wife. They become related to each other as brother and sister are. The laws in Lev. 18 and 20, and possibly Deut. 24:1-4, illustrate the application of this kinship-of-spouses principle to the situation following divorce or the death of one of the parties. Since a woman becomes on marriage a sister to her husband’s brothers, a daughter to her father-in-law, and so on, she cannot normally marry any of them should her first husband die or divorce her. (See G.J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, 253-61, and *idem*, *JJS* 30 [1979] 36-40). The kinships established by marriage are therefore not terminated by death or divorce.<sup>12</sup>

The fact that the apostate, secular humanistic courts in America have legalized homosexual sex acts and have allowed them to form “families” tells us that their redefinition of marriage was inevitable. When one arbitrarily redefines the family in an unbiblical, perverted manner, what is there to restrain them from redefining marriage as well?

Third, the idea that two sodomites (or two lesbians) raising children is normal and healthy for children contradicts both Scripture and history. Children need a father and a mother, not two fathers or two mothers. The liberals on the Supreme Court repeatedly expect us to accept their arbitrary assumptions without a shred of empirical evidence. They uncritically adopt slogans and propaganda of homosexual activists and apologists and expect us to accept them, apparently because they have grown more popular in our own culture over the last 25 years. We do not deny that a father can love and nurture a child. But a father can never love and nurture a child *in the same way a mother can*. For example, a father cannot carry and bear a child and then breastfeed him for two and half years. Virtually everyone knows that a child who gets hurt will run immediately to his mother, not his father. Further, a woman cannot replace a father. Children raised without fathers, especially boys, are much more likely to be dysfunctional and go to prison. Sodomites can make up lies and propaganda but they cannot alter God’s created reality.

The homosexual lobby attempts to circumvent this argument by noting that divorces occur and spouses die in heterosexual marriages leaving children without a father or mother; yet, they argue, such situations do not remove the status of a genuine family from those remaining. This observation is true but does not support homosexual arguments. Families can be reduced by death or divorce but these events are the result of the fall and sin. No sane person would argue that such things are good or a blessing. The children in such cases come into being during a normal, lawful heterosexual marriage.

---

<sup>12</sup> Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1-15* (Waco, TX: Word Book, 1987), 71.

The fact that a tragedy has occurred does not mean that situations which are intrinsically unnatural and sinful, which could never result in children (no man has ever become pregnant through anal sex), are somehow natural and justified. Paul, speaking by the Holy Spirit, tells younger widows to get married because it is the right thing to do ethically and practically: “I desire that the younger widows marry [a man], bear children, manage the house, [and] give no opportunity to the adversary to speak reproachfully” (1 Tim. 5:14). The assumption here is that young wives need husbands and children to avoid falling into the sins of idleness, gossiping and meddling in other’s affairs (cf. 1 Tim. 5:13). In addition, it is the proper, biblical way to carry on the dominion mandate. The key to mending families that have the tragedy of an unexpected death or divorce because of an adulterous spouse is to marry again and form a heterosexual nuclear family. Paul does not seek to redefine the heterosexual nuclear family; but, rather, tells us to heal it. Once again we see that the arguments of homosexual apologists and their supporters are irrational, unsound, invalid and totally contrary to nature and Scripture.

### *True Love Vs Antinomian Love*

Homosexual couples should not be allowed to have children through fornication, adoption or artificial insemination because their behavior is grossly unnatural, immoral and their so-called marriage or family life is an abomination in God’s sight. This does not mean that Christians, or anyone else for that matter, ought to demean children who, through no fault of their own, have become part of such households. Bible believing Christians do not believe that godly dominion comes through insulting people or, even worse, through personal violence. No one has the right to assume the role of the state by wielding a sword or gun or any form of violence against such people. Our job as believers in Jesus Christ and the Bible is to accurately convey what the Word of God has to say about homosexuality, human sexuality, the family and marriage. As wicked sinners who have been saved from sin, death and hell, we are to speak the truth in love, praying and hoping that many homosexuals repent of their wicked lifestyle and embrace Jesus Christ and His infallible, authoritative Word by faith. But we must keep in mind that speaking the truth in love *does not mean* that we should water down or compromise the very strong condemnation of homosexual behavior found throughout the Bible. To do so (as noted above) is not honest or really loving but dishonest and hateful. We are fully aware that our biblical message will be interpreted as hate speech and as personal insults but such thinking is based on an atheistic, antinomian, sentimental, humanistic concept of love. Such views of love lead multitudes straight the pit of hell.

### *True Compassion Vs Tyranny*

This point is important because most arguments for the legalization of homosexual behavior and same-sex marriage are based on a false concept of compassion. Most Americans do not want people to be mistreated. But the average person in this country is not well informed on all the various aspects of homosexuality, either ethically or medically. Therefore, when he hears all the various arguments by homosexual apologists regarding personal discrimination, human dignity, harassment or harsh treatment, he is inclined to come to the conclusion that the homosexual should be left alone—that what he is doing is his own private business. But, while this argument for their social acceptability sounds fair, it is foolishness and socially dangerous for a number of reasons.

First, solid, well-informed, Bible believing Christians do not believe that people have the right to attack homosexuals and hurl insults at them. They simply want the state to adopt the ethics and civil laws related to homosexual behavior that are found in the Word of God. This would close the bathhouses, “gay” bars, clubs, associations and “churches” and drive the homosexual community deep

underground where it has been in most nations for thousands of years. This would reduce homosexual behavior, greatly reduce venereal disease and protect young men and boys from homosexual predators. More importantly, it would protect our nation from the judgment of God for tolerating and encouraging sexual perversion.

Second, the issue is not the abuse of people who have inner lust for the same-sex, for one cannot really tell if a person is engaging in homosexual behavior *unless he identifies himself as a homosexual* and/or engages in perverted behavior in a *public* place and is seen by two or more witnesses (Deut. 17:6). The real issue is that homosexuals want to force society and anyone who disagrees with their behavior to accept it as normal and ethical and thus not discriminate against what has been *publicly made known*. If a homosexual wants to buy gasoline or doughnuts or flowers or cake, no one knows his heart or mind. He will be served just like anyone else and no one has a right to ask him what kind of lust he has been having lately. (Inner lusts are sins but they are not crimes. If they were, many men would be in jail for lusting after women who are not their wives.)

What homosexuals really want is to force (by the coercive power of the civil magistrate) Christians (and all those who believe homosexuality is immoral) to explicitly and publicly accept homosexual behavior as moral and good in violation of their religious faith and conscience. They want to force Christian bakers to bake explicitly sodomite or lesbian wedding cakes. They want to force Christian florists to make explicitly sodomite or lesbian flower arrangements. They want to force caterers, photographers, service providers and so on to participate in or sanction the homosexual's unethical, abominable lifestyle. We know from recent history that this assertion is true because of the many lawsuits filed against Christian bakers, florists and photographers by sodomites and lesbians who are pretending to get married. Even though homosexuals could easily find secular business owners who would provide the things necessary for their alleged marriage ceremony or reception, they find it necessary to sue Christian business owners and drive them out of business. So we see that raising the issues of compassion, tolerance and fairness is nothing but a smokescreen for intolerance, state coercion, hatred and tyranny.

This should be expected because, when it comes to ethics and civil law, there can be no neutrality. When a court rules that the Christian world and life view including its ethical system is not only in error but is unfair, uncompassionate and unloving and that it denies sodomites dignity and denigrates their character, that court has declared the Bible and Christianity to be evil. That court has explicitly rejected the Christian law-order for a purely secular and arbitrary law-order.<sup>13</sup> It is saying that all the laws founded upon the Bible and Christianity on this topic are immoral and must be rejected. It is for this reason that the courts have consistently sided with sodomites and lesbians against Christian business owners who simply do not want to violate their biblically informed conscience. The persecution of Christians by the state, which is siding with sex perverts, has begun. The ultimate goal of the homosexual militants is anti-hate speech laws that would forbid Christian ministers and layman from teaching what the Bible says about homosexuality in public. Ironically, in the name of fairness, love and compassion, Christians will be treated as wicked criminals by the state. Homosexual activists

---

<sup>13</sup> What the court has done is simply the culmination of the "Enlightenment's" rejection of Christian sexual morality. It is a return to old pagan sexual ethics of the worshipers of the Baals and Ashteroths. They believed that order arose out of chaos and thus that their sexual perversions and ethical anarchy reenacted this evolutionary process from chaos, which in their mind would produce fertility and prosperity. What the secular humanistic nations have done is in fact much worse than the old heathenism because they are self-consciously rejecting Jesus Christ, the Bible, the law of God and the Christian world and life view. Unlike the old pagans who were suppressing the knowledge of God they had from nature, modern secular humanists are suppressing the truth of God, Christ and His will as revealed in *special revelation*. They reject the *clear* light of God's written word, which shines 1000 times brighter than natural revelation. Consequently, the coming judgment on these nations will be deserved and exceptional.

are experts at appealing to compassion and fairness when the reality is that they hate God, Jesus Christ, the Bible and Christians who take the Bible seriously. These hateful, wicked sex perverts now have the civil government behind them. It is only a matter of time before their perverted understanding of the 14th Amendment supersedes the 1st Amendment.

Third, homosexual activists have been able to pull off this anti-Christian change of law-order because their arguments are primarily based on pity, compassion and love which are set forth as essentially undefined feelings or emotions. Modern Americans are largely anti-intellectual and untrained in ethics and logic. Thus, they are inclined not to think objectively or rationally when their emotions are aroused. While sodomite arguments are easy to disprove, their use of emotion and subjective feelings has been brilliant and effective.

## What Went Wrong in America and What Needs To Be Done

The main reasons why our nation has lost its moral direction and has embraced an unnatural – wicked lifestyle is primarily the fault of professing Christian churches. There are the liberal (mainline) Protestant churches that long ago abandoned the Bible as the Word of God. They attempted to appeal to the world by becoming the world. They have abandoned Christianity altogether for secular humanism dressed up with religious terminology which has been stripped of all its biblical meaning. For them, to love someone means to accept all their sins as normal. It means telling them not to repent but to accept what they are and glory in it. This behavior, ethically, is comparable to guards in Nazi prison camps who patted Jews on the back and told them everything would be okay as they sent them off to the gas chambers.

Then we have the many evangelical churches who teach that God's Old Testament law is bad and that we live in an age of grace. They have forgotten that Jesus came to justify His people from their guilt by His blood so that they would live in habitual obedience to His moral law. They neglect the crucial biblical teaching that justification is always accompanied by sanctification. We are not saved by our repentance or sanctification but these things *always accompany* true faith. (In other words, if you have not repented of your sin, then you do not really believe in Christ.) Coupled with their antinomianism is their unbiblical pietism which refuses to apply the whole Bible to all of life including politics and civil laws. They have an effeminate Christianity that does not speak boldly to society's problems. They have also abandoned the primacy of the intellect and the crucial necessity of learning biblical doctrine and ethics in favor of an emotional and personal experience-driven concept of Christianity. Consequently, the American church has lost its vitality and has become feminized and impotent. The church's message has been "become a Christian and lose your masculinity, and by the way, check your brain at the door." Pietistic, anti-intellectual, anti-law evangelicalism has created a vacuum in our culture that has been filled by aggressive anti-Christian secular humanists.

As Christians who really believe what God teaches in His Word about reality, including human sexuality, we must boldly, clearly and unapologetically preach the whole counsel of God regarding homosexuality. This is the only hope for homosexuals and it is the only way (in the long run) our wicked politicians and judges will be replaced. The following things need to take place for homosexuals and their supporters to change.

(1) The objective, unchanging, absolute, righteous requirements of God's moral law must be taught. Homosexual beliefs, attitudes and behaviors are wicked and sinful under all circumstances and in every time and place. Without the authoritative standard of God's Word, all ethics are arbitrary, evolving and relative. There can be no conviction of sin and a corresponding repentance without first knowing what sin is.

(2) Everyone guilty of sin must stop making excuses and take full responsibility for his wicked actions. When people say, “I was born a homosexual. I am not responsible for my actions. That’s just the way I am,” they’re rejecting the infallible truth of God’s holy Word and they are violating their own conscience (see Rom. 1 and 2). Deep down homosexuals know their behavior is perverted and wicked. That is one reason why they are attempting to force society (especially Bible believing Christians) to accept their unnatural, abominable behavior as righteous.

(3) There must be a change of mind that leads to a change of life. The homosexual lifestyle must be abandoned, not merely because a person sees it as a dangerous, unhealthy way to live or merely because one wants to please relatives and associates, but because one sees it as a sin against God and one’s neighbor. One must acknowledge one’s guilt and the sinfulness of one’s sin and then confess those sins to God. Simultaneously, one must look solely to Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. In other words, trust in His once for all, sufficient, perfect, efficacious, atoning death on the cross as well as His sinless life and glorious resurrection from the dead. Confess and forsake your sin because you want to please your Redeemer, follow Him in every area of life and obey His standard of righteousness. Paul says, “God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were still sinners Christ died for us. Much more than, having now been justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if when we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life” (Rom. 5:1-10). “If you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you will be saved. For with the heart one believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture says, ‘Whoever believes on Him will not be put to shame’” (Rom. 10:9-11).

(4) There must be a radical lifelong commitment to being a disciple of Christ or progressive sanctification. Repentance is only the starting point of a life of faith, commitment and obedience. This involves a continual putting off of the old man (the former unconverted lifestyle of serving unlawful lusts and sin) and habitually putting on the new man in Christ. This involves a number of crucial things:

(a) One must look to Christ’s sacrificial death and victorious resurrection as the efficacious source for a life of godly service and progress in holiness. Our new life of sanctification is by the grace of God and not by autonomous power.

(b) One must abandon all worldly connections or social situations that lead one into temptation. A person who goes to sodomite bars, clubs or bathhouses obviously has not eliminated every influence that might lead him back into a homosexual lifestyle. Old boyfriends and homosexual acquaintances must be left behind to avoid ungodly associations, bad examples and solicitations to sin. One must follow Jesus’ symbolic teaching of radical amputation where He orders His followers to cut off the right hand, foot or eye if it presents a temptation to commit sin (cf. Mt. 5:19, 18:18ff; Mk. 9:42-48). This is a matter of common sense, for we are known by the company we keep. A crack addict does not go to a crack house to pray but to find and smoke crack.

(c) In conjunction with the forsaking of people or social situations that would lead one into temptation, there must be a strong commitment to Christ’s church and Christian fellowship. The church of Christ is the God-ordained body where the whole counsel of God is to be taught and training in righteousness is to occur. The church possesses the Word, sacraments and discipline which are crucial in restructuring one’s behavior and the reprogramming of a person’s life in the image of Christ. By joining ourselves to a faithful Bible believing church, we place ourselves in a situation where we can receive teaching and counsel from men who are much more knowledgeable and mature than ourselves. We have mutual support through prayer and through fellowship as iron sharpens iron. We have godly examples that help us to fight off temptation and walk uprightly. In the church, there is a great diversity of gifts, all of which are designed by God to benefit the whole body. If God enables you to repent of

your homosexual behavior, you must set aside your community of darkness and join yourself to the community of true light and love.

(d) There must be a strong continuing commitment to personal growth in grace. There must be a continued reliance on Christ as Redeemer and High Priest, prayer, Bible reading and the development of godly habits. The old habitual sin patterns must be put off and replaced with habits of obedience to God's moral law. It is not enough to simply stop acting in an evil, rebellious manner, one must replace sinful habits with righteous counterparts. Paul says, "Put off, concerning your former conduct, the old man which grows corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and that you put on the new man which was created according to God, in true righteousness and holiness" (Eph. 4:22-24).

The homosexual who becomes a Christian must become a practicing heterosexual and seek sexual satisfaction solely through monogamous heterosexual marriage. Paul says, "Let [heterosexual] marriage [or marriage as defined by God] be held in honor among all and let the marriage bed be held as undefiled; but fornicators [i.e. the sexually immoral; the term is inclusive of homosexual behavior] and adulterers God will judge" (Heb. 13:4). It is because of such immorality, licentiousness and uncleanness says Paul that "the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience" (Eph. 5:6; see v. 5). Since heterosexual marriage is the ordinance of God, it is lawful and good. Sexual intimacy in marriage is not defiling and, because it is a gift from God Himself, it must not be defiled. Therefore, for Paul, the solution to sexual lusts is for a man to find a wife or a woman to find a husband: "Flee sexual immorality. Every sin that a man does is outside the body but he who commits sexual immorality sins against his own body...I say to the unmarried and to the widows: It is good for them to remain as I am [i.e. unmarried and celibate]; but if they cannot exercise self-control, let them marry. For it is better to marry than to burn with passion" (1 Cor. 7:8-9).

As a man seeks a wife (or a woman seeks a husband) he must remain celibate (i.e. there is to be no sexual activity [kissing, petting, first base, etc.] at all) and train himself to put off sinful lusts. Paul says, "For this is the will of God, your sanctification: that you should abstain from sexual immorality: that each of you should know how to possess his own vessel in sanctification and honor, not in passion of lust, like the Gentiles who do not know God; that no one should take advantage of and defraud his brother in this matter, because the Lord is the avenger of all such, as we also forewarned you and testified. For God did not call us to uncleanness, but in holiness. Therefore he who rejects this does not reject man, but God, who has also given us His Holy Spirit" (1 Thess. 4:3-8).

The Christian must struggle against sin and crucify the flesh daily. He must never give up by accepting the lies and excuses of this world. In addition, he must confess his sins daily and ask for the grace to really change and develop godly habits. The true Christian does not accept sinful tendencies and habits but wages warfare against them. The way to be justified by Christ is easy, for it only takes faith in His person and work. But following Jesus is often a struggle. It not only involves crucifying the flesh but also leads to persecution by satanic fools in our hedonistic, secular, anti-Christian society. Listen carefully to Paul's words: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service. And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God" (Rom. 12:1-2).

As Christians, it is important to understand that the political corruption and the wickedness of our judges stem from the fact that most Americans have forsaken the Christian world and life view for secularism and hedonism. Our politicians, judges, media outlets, universities and colleges will not change until the people change and demand men in office who believe in Jesus Christ and respect His laws. For this to happen, American Christians will have to forsake their commitment to personal peace, affluence and entertainment as well as their syncretism with secular Enlightenment concepts of civil

government. America's experiment with a secular constitution that does not explicitly acknowledge Jesus Christ as King or adopt orthodox, Bible believing Protestantism and the whole moral law of God has been a total disaster for families and society. The churches in America must be faithful and militant in their refusal to compromise and their preaching of the whole counsel of God or they will be judged and replaced by those who will.

From a purely human standpoint, things look hopeless. Our nation has been declining spiritually and ethically for over 150 years. But from a biblical perspective, there is great hope, for God has pronounced His resurrected Son victorious over the nations in time and on earth. Nothing is too great for Christ, who sits at the right hand of God and rules the nations with the rod of iron. Therefore, we must refuse to compromise, no matter what the civil laws are or how bad it gets. Failure only comes from unbelief, not from faithfulness. Times will get tough and our generation may not see any victory in the civil realm. But, if we are faithful, we are laying the groundwork for a Christian constitution and a supreme court of godly Christian men, not wicked lesbians and lawless humanists.

Copyright 2015 © Brian Schwertley

[HOME PAGE](#)