

NOTE: This material was first published in a series of 5 articles and published in the August, September, October, December, and January, 1983 and 1984 issues of **The Apostolic Messenger** when I was living in Jackson, MS. — Walton Weaver

Homosexuality And The Bible

Response To Gay Advocates

Part Four

by Walton Weaver

Key Positive Argument

The most persistent mistake made by those who insist that homosexually oriented people are sinful is that gay people choose to be gay. We did not. We could no more change than heterosexual people could change and become homosexual. This is a fact acknowledged by Frued, Kinsey and the preponderance of subsequent sex research. . . .

To say that a practicing homosexual cannot change is to flatly deny what Paul says some of the Corinthians did do. We have seen in I Corinthians 6:9 that Paul mentions both passive and active homosexuals, along with a long list of others who shall not inherit the kingdom of God: fornicators, idolators, adulterers, thieves, the covetous, drunkards, revellers and extortioners. Paul says, “And such were some of you: but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God” (I.Cor. 6:11). Now if it is true that “Frued, Kinsey and the preponderance of subsequent sex research” have said the homosexual cannot change, then it is them against Paul. I think I know why Ken Martin prefers their company to that of Pau! Don’t you?

I do not wish to be unkind or unloving in what I say. I am sympathetic toward all people who are oriented in certain directions which make it much harder to live the godly life which the gospel message calls for. But to say that a person is inclined in a direction which it is impossible to change is to go too far, especially if we mean that he is born in that condition. As long as people are made to believe that they are in a hopeless situation they will do one of two things: (1) they will give up, thinking there is no way for them to be saved, or (2) they will be content with what they are, believing that they are not responsible for their condition and that God therefore accepts them as they are without change. The argument that Paul could not be speaking of the invert in Romans 1:26-27 because he has never been anything other than homosexual assumes that the homosexual is born with this orientation. But is this the case? For certain, this is not a necessary conclusion. And neither is the claim made by Ken Martin that the homosexual cannot change. Other options are possible.

Much study has been done in recent years about the *cause* of homosexuality. We are far

from having any kind of consensus among those who have made these special studies. There is no room for dogmatic statements—although we get them often from the gay advocates who have to rely on the studies of others. I am sure Ken Martin and I at least have this one thing in common: neither of us is a specialist in this field of study. We must rely upon the work of others when it comes to our investigation of possible causes of homosexuality. Please note the word “possible” in this sentence: Possible causes. Mr. Martin writes as though it is a settled issue: homosexuals are born as homosexuals and cannot change. But the truth is, there are possible causes of homosexual propensity that would involve choice on the part of the subject.

1. Psychic predisposition (traumatic learned behavior). Those who hold this view advocate that homosexuality is a chosen life-style, even though certain kinds of psychological trauma (an absent father, a dominating mother, etc.) at an early age causes homosexuality in an individual who would otherwise be heterosexual. Adolescence is the time when homosexual fixation takes place. The idea that such a fixation is necessarily irreversible is to be repudiated as a myth.

2. Non-traumatic learned behavior. Psychiatrist Charles Young (“Homosexuality and the Campus” **HIS**, Feb., 1966, p. 24) is representative of those who hold this view:

I am persuaded that homosexuality is mainly a learned condition, and that anything learned may be altered by further learning. I do not believe that anyone is damned from the time of his conception to become homosexual. I agree with Freud in his ‘Free contributions to the theory of sex’ that every person has the potential to become homosexual. If a person encourages and cultivates the deviant urges, which can be aroused in all of us, he is on the way to a life of sexual perversion.

3. Deliberate selection. Some people just want to be homosexual and therefore choose the gay lifestyle. If there is the possibility that some might justifiably lay claim to sickness, this person cannot do that. Nothing in his childhood and nothing due to sickness later in life caused this person to be homosexual. This person wanted to be homosexual, and for no other reason became homosexual.

The view that homosexuals are born homosexuals simply has not been proved. Much has been affirmed about biological derivation and genetic determinism, but the evidence is not unquestionably supportive of either as the only possible cause of homosexuality. A couple of examples will suffice to show that not a few researchers in this field have failed to be convinced that the cause of homosexuality is biological or genetic (**Cornerstone**, X11, Issue 65, 1). Edward Glover, **The Problem of Homosexuality** concluded that innate, childhood, and development factors played a role in developing the homosexual disposition. This means that in some cases Glover felt homosexuality was caused by innate factors, but other factors were the cause for others. Irving Bieber, **Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study** (1962), concluded that homosexuality developed in persons as “a pathological exchange related to fears and inhibitions associated with the opposite sex.” He said, “A heterosexual shift is a possibility for all homosexuals who are strongly motivated to change,” for they “do not bypass heterosexual

development stages and all remain potentially heterosexual.” C. W. Socarides, **The Overt Homosexual** (1968), held that there is nothing innate, inborn, or genetic in homosexuality, but that it is a learned and acquired behavior.

These statements are not given to prove that there are no cases of innate or inborn homosexuality. They are not given to prove anything, except that the gay advocates have no right to speak so dogmatically on the subject of causation, nor to affirm so confidently that homosexuals cannot change. One thing is certain: If homosexuality is a learned behavior (and some good studies have concluded that it is), then the homosexual must bear responsibility for any actions that follow homosexual propensity. Kenneth Gangel, **The Gospel and the Gay** (p. 127), has worded what seems to me to be a correct and fitting conclusion: “Homosexual propensity may indeed be a sickness. but homosexual practice and promotion is not physical illness. mental derangement, or an acceptable variant life-style -- it is sin.”