

A Biblical View of Homosexuality?

In the March 2 edition of *The Collegian*, Sally Ryan Burgess presented a call for tolerance of homosexuality. It is rather unfortunate that this would even be considered to be acceptable, not simply on moral grounds, but on rational grounds as well. The entire piece, which purportedly presents a defense of homosexuality, is not only riddled with subjective pontifications about morality, but also blatant contradictions and straw man arguments.

One might first of all notice the many ad hominem attacks in this piece. It is necessary to call into question the name-calling function of "bigot," "homophobia" and the sarcastic use of "Christian." Unfortunately, it seems that the lack of any rational defense for homosexuality has made such rhetoric necessary.

If Burgess truly believes in the God of the Bible, then one would ask why she would pray, asking for God's response, concerning a question that has already been thoroughly addressed. One might notice the order of prayer and action in her article: act first, pray later. Jeremiah 17:9 says, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" Indeed, Did God create Burgess gay, as she suggested? 1 Corinthians 14:33 states, "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace."

Despite Burgess' claims to the contrary, the Bible is clear and explicit about homosexuality. Ironically, she mentions Romans

1:26-27, makes a poor interpretation and fails to recognize the broader message of it. The argument that Paul is making in Romans 1 is that those who have rebelled against God, "Professing themselves to be wise... became fools," and "served the creature more than the Creator" (verses 22, 25). As a result, "God gave them over to a reprobate mind," (verse 28) one of whose consequences are the vile affections of verses 26 and 27. "And [like the women] the men... burned in lust toward another, men with men working that which is unseemly" (verse 27).

Leviticus 20:13 states, "And if a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination." There is not much room for subjective pontification here. In 1 Corinthians 7, especially verses 2 and 8-9, the Apostle Paul condemns all extra-marital sexual relationships and states who is involved in a marriage: a man and a woman. There are of course many other passages which speak to the point I am making, and perhaps reading through the Bible before deciding to go ahead and live for one's self is wise. Are my interpretations "literal and shallow," or are they "ignorant literal interpretations?" Maybe. However Burgess saying so doesn't make it so.

Further compounding the irrationality of her treatise, "Furthermore, anti-gay 'Christians' are imposing a 21st century theological viewpoint on scripture written before Freud, the scientific

revolution, the industrial revolution, the development of psychiatry and psychology as disciplines, and before the creation of the Christian church." One need only refer again to the Bible passages I quoted to answer this. The fact that Burgess makes a point of suggesting that there are authorities besides God in whose light Scripture can be interpreted simply denies outright who God is, and would lead ultimately to a rejection of God. To those who think I am denouncing science, I'd simply say that, despite popular opinion, science divorced from an acknowledgement of God's authority is irrational.

Burgess even quotes an American Psychological Association statement, "Homosexuality is neither a mental illness nor moral depravity." This statement simply says that God doesn't have authority on what's moral, the APA does. Of course, if the APA has moral authority, then why can't any other group of purportedly scientific persuasion lay claim to moral authority? Why is scientific persuasion even necessary? Why can't Nazi Germany under Hitler decide what is moral? Ultimately, Burgess has simply attempted to supplant God's authority with man's authority, in order to rationalize her way of life. Ultimately, this leads one farther down the road of moral depravity.

To understand the scope of her demands for tolerance, we need only look at her final statement concerning what "Christians," who incidentally appeal to God and not the APA,

should do: "Disarm your Bibles and stop using them as weapons against gay people." The simple answer to this is, "No." Christians need not deny God's word, and in effect God, in order to allow people to rationalize the behavior that even their consciences tell them is evil. Christians need not make God over in their own image in order to deny the fact that the God of the Bible is not a tolerant God. God does not tolerate evil, and to suggest that he does is simply to say that the suffering of Christ on the cross was pointless. Perhaps it's most ironic that Burgess never once quotes the Bible, and yet seems to think that God says it's OK for her to live for herself. One need only ask, is it really the God of the Bible speaking, or is it Burgess' own heart?

I am not God, nor do I know Burgess' heart: it is not my place to judge whether she is a Christian or whether or not she will go to heaven. One must not mistake my point that her appeals are irrational and inconsistent for a judgment of her as a human being. However, as a Christian, I cannot stand idly by and watch the word of God being so blatantly distorted. The good news, however, is that the Bible is readily available to all, and everyone can read it. As Proverbs 1:7 says, "The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge: but fools despise wisdom and instruction."

Jeffrey Clark, RC '00