

AD 109-9

(DF)

Andrews University  
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE NATURE OF  
HOMOSEXUALITY

A Term Paper  
Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Course  
Physician Minister Relationship

by  
Noel H. Thorpe  
December, 1970

Approval \_\_\_\_\_

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	1
Proposition . . . . .	1
Definition of Terms . . . . .	1
 Chapter	
I. SURVEY OF HOMOSEXUALITY . . . . .	2
Some Definitions . . . . .	3
How Homosexuality is Looked Upon by Society . . . . .	3
The Homosexuals Look at Themselves . . . . .	4
Belief of Homosexual - In Regard to Overcoming . . . . .	5
II. THE STATE OF THE HOMOSEXUAL IN LIFE . . . . .	6
Three Characteristics of the Homosexual . . . . .	6
The Suffering of the Homosexual . . . . .	6
III. THE MAIZE OF COMPLIMENT TO HOMOSEXUALITY . . . . .	9
Homosexuality Among Other Animals . . . . .	9
Views on Responsibility for Homosexuality . . . . .	10
Studies are Conflicting . . . . .	10
Allied to Emotional Problem . . . . .	11
Not Morality Problem . . . . .	11
Homosexuality Not Disease . . . . .	11
Man Imposes on Nature . . . . .	11
Man: The Creator . . . . .	12
Homosexuality Wrong as Overeating . . . . .	13
Bible Record of Homosexuality Questioned . . . . .	14
IV. GOD IS THE AUTHORITY . . . . .	16
Evidence of God's Disapproval of Homosexuality . . . . .	17
Evidence God Brought Judgment on Sodomy . . . . .	19
Proof of the Sin of Homosexuality . . . . .	19
Proof that God Destroyed Sodom . . . . .	20
Ellen White States Sodom Was Destroyed Because of Sin . . . . .	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CON'T.)

Chapter	Page
V. CONCLUSION . . . . .	22
The Bible is to be the Criteria . . . . .	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	27

## INTRODUCTION

### The Problem

We find homosexuality growing in our society today and with its growth comes its quest for recognition as a way of life. Is it a way of life? Is it questionable or wholesome? The question comes closer to society and to the church: Is homosexuality a diseased condition or is it a sin problem? How should the church and the state, each one, relate itself to the homosexual? The need for such a study arises from the controversy over the status and condition of the homosexual.

### Proposition

I propose to examine some philosophies on homosexuality and by comparison with the revealed word of God define homosexuality in terms of diseased condition or sinful condition.

### Definition of Terms

Scripture.--Scripture is a reference to the writings of the Bible.

Text.--The term "text" is used to mean a verse of the Scripture.

## CHAPTER I

### SURVEY OF HOMOSEXUALITY

What is homosexuality? This is the great question that is yet to be answered to meet the satisfaction of all who are concerned over the condition. If stated that it is a disease the homosexual does not enjoy the thought, and some portions of society would not want to accept it as such. The homosexual would not want to ascent to its being a mental or emotional problem, and most parents hate to think that they had any part or lot to do with such a condition in the formative stage of their child's life.

Is homosexuality a sin condition? Many may gladly accept this idea, but on the other hand there are "experts," if I may employ this term, who loathe the idea that "sin" should ever be mentioned in connection with homosexuality. Some homosexuals accept it as sin with its resulting complexity, and others just casually say it is a way of life. What then is homosexuality? Is it disease, an unhealthy condition, a good or questionable way of life? Must we look upon it as a sinful condition and action? Where shall we turn for the answer? I propose to present some views and philosophies on the subject including, of course, the Bible concept and references to the sin of Sodomy from the writings of Ellen G. White.

Some Definitions

Let me say at the outset that this is a subject on which there is rare scholarly agreement starting from definition to condition.

Here for example are some views and definitions:

The Kinsey report states that: A homosexual is any one who has experienced a sexual contact leading to orgasm with a member of the same sex. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The majority defines it thus: "Deviant behavior and thus assumes that such behavior is not natural or normal. Sexual activity between persons of the same sex."<sup>2</sup>

Experts still cannot even agree whether a homosexual is 'ill' or 'aberrant' or perhaps 'deviant' or whether he has simply fallen into an 'adaptation' that happens to be different from the heterosexual norm dictated by current Western custom.<sup>3</sup>

One homophile group says this: "'Homosexuality per se is not a sickness, but is an orientation not different in kind from heterosexuality,' . . ."<sup>4</sup>

How Homosexuality is Looked Upon by Society

Society in its overwhelming majority frowns upon the idea of homosexuality. A lot of disdain and scorn is expressed. On the statute books of America it is considered felony.<sup>5</sup> Stringent laws are enforced

<sup>1</sup>Stanley E. Willis, Understanding and Counseling the Male Homosexual (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967), p. 27.

<sup>2</sup>R. O. D. Benson, In Defence of Homosexuality (New York: The Julian Press, Inc., 1965), p. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Peter and Barbara Wyden, Growing Up Straight (New York: Stein and Day Publishers, 1968), p. 15.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 25.

<sup>5</sup>Willis, p. 27.

against it over the various states of the United States. The major churches of America condemn it.

Society, however is becoming more tolerant of an homosexual society, due perhaps to publicity on radio, television and other news media. A study of 193 world cultures showed 28% accepted homosexuality, 14% rejected it, and 58% gave partial acceptance.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Homosexuals Look at Themselves

Gleanings from the Homophile movement reveal their frown upon certain assertions from society and study groups. It is painful for them to take such assertions that:

1. Homosexuality is indicative of immaturity.
2. Condemnation of certain family patterns not because they are bad but because they produce homosexual children. Father and mother love versus no love is folly to them.
3. The saying: Homosexuality is purely physical and devoid of love and affection.
4. The saying "these poor afflicted people" is not weakness, affliction, or suffering.
5. The idea of reformation.
6. The idea of improvement, recovery, successful therapy--homosexual only considered helped when he is helped to fulfill his role as an homosexual more completely.
7. The idea of conversion to heterosexuality is repulsive. He does not want to be converted.
8. The idea it is fear of opposite sex.
9. The term "queer"--they are on par as human beings.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ralph W. Weltage (Editor), The Same Sex (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1969), p. 4.

10. The idea that changing the law would not increase homosexuals--giving idea that homosexual society is not a society to be increased.
11. Sex education classes educating against homosexuality as a thing to shun.
12. Theorizing about causes of homosexuality.
13. Contempt, ridicule, derision, scorn, dispisal, and belittlement of self and condition.<sup>1</sup>

Belief of Homosexual - In Regard to Overcoming

Most of them believe they were born homosexuals.

. . . It is a fate over which they have no control, and in which they have no choice. It follows as a consequence that the possibility of changing to a heterosexual pattern is thought to be extremely limited. To fight against homosexuality is to fight against the inevitable since they are fighting against their own 'nature' in its sexual form, as they experience it. They believe that homosexuality is as 'natural' for them as heterosexuality is for others.<sup>2</sup>

Although homosexuals fight for an equal place in society they are beset by many a problem, as we shall notice, not because society conditions it so, but as they themselves incur problems.

---

<sup>1</sup>Weltage, pp. 131-137.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

## CHAPTER II

### THE STATE OF THE HOMOSEXUAL IN LIFE

Some advocates of homosexuality advance the idea that homosexuals can be as happy in their state as heterosexuals are and that relatively speaking they share the same fate of frustrations, pain, sorrow, success, joy, love and admiration. Yet a closer look and study reveal that this is not exactly so. One must of course bear in mind that reports are often based on who the person is and the premise he adopts. It is not necessarily due to the fact that the person wants to be subjective, but his philosophy in life tends to taint what could be an objective report.

#### Three Characteristics of the Homosexual

Three characteristics of the homosexual are here set forth:

1. Insecurity derived from feelings of low personal esteem. Damaged self-confidence. Strongly reinforced guilt feelings attached to body image, genitalia, and even body functions.
2. A basic and well-reinforced guilt and anxiety about sexuality in general and heterosexuality imprinted in early experience.
3. Continually reinforced adherence to a particular mode of orgasm.<sup>1</sup>

#### The Suffering of the Homosexual

The homosexual suffers social ostracism, archaic guilt and the denying of its existence, disguising or screening it from the attention

---

<sup>1</sup>Willis, pp. 44, 45.

of society implying that it is badness. Guilt feelings plague them but they feel justified to remain homosexuals and are unwilling to forego the sexual act which they enjoy. Dr. Hooker is convinced that homosexuality does not necessarily mean unhappiness, but she points out that society engenders such a condition for the homosexual. She states that :

Chances of being unhappy in our society are very great, . . . I am convinced that homosexuality and unhappiness do not invariably go together.<sup>1</sup>

Homosexuals in old age pose a problem not just to society but to himself. Speaking of homosexuals in this respect Dr. Rhoda Horand says:

They are the most miserable people--no children, no mate. Old age is a horror for them. You see rich old men with young boys. But old men without money usually have no one.<sup>2</sup>

In spite of the arguments that may be established in support of homosexuality and the desire of homosexuals to remain as they are it is evident they are not satisfied with themselves. They may say one thing with their lips to boost the ego, but their true expression is otherwise.

When 300 homosexuals were asked by a leader of the New York Mattachine Society, 'If you had a son, would you like him to be a homosexual?', only two per cent answered 'Yes'; fifteen per cent said they would leave the choice up to the son; 83 per cent said 'No'.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Wyden and Wyden, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 32.

Suffering as he does should not the homosexual submit himself for a "cure" or "change"? Dr. Willis points out that it is not that a cure is impossible but that resistance toward his changing are complex and multiple.<sup>1</sup> I would add here that this is not only applicable to homosexual but with the varied minds in general. If the following quotation is to be applied to the homosexual it would be well to apply it to every person who comes to us with a problem.

When we move toward a stereotyped approach, complete with clichés and glittering generalities, we move away from the individual's unique set of circumstances, and thereby mismanage the problem to the ultimate utter confusion of the patient.<sup>2</sup>

With sexual deviation, as with any emotional condition, there is no cure for its pain, no generally effective remedy, no universally applicable technique of psychotherapy that can be described in detail.<sup>3</sup>

And yet I foresee a cure which I will present further on. The question yet remains to be settled: Is homosexuality disease or is it a sin condition--an act of sin?

---

<sup>1</sup>Willis, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 14, 15.

## CHAPTER III

### THE MAIZE OF COMPLIMENT TO HOMOSEXUALITY

While society in the overwhelming majority censure homosexuality, there exists a variety of study groups and individuals who try to have a deeper understanding of the homosexual, as they put it. This second class invariably lend support to homosexuality. It must be borne in mind, however, that no stereotyped philosophy has of now been adopted to appraise this group of individuals in society. I may add that any one is at liberty to add to the maize of philosophies and views. I will now state a few findings and concepts.

#### Homosexuality Among Other Animals

When we examine other species of mammals, we find homosexual activity, sometimes to the point of ejaculation, in all the species studied. This is true of animals in the wild as well as animals in captivity. It is rare, however, for individual mammals to show an exclusive pattern of homosexual behavior. The majority have both heterosexual and homosexual activity, but heterosexual behavior predominates. Thus homosexual activity is 'natural' in the sense that it occurs commonly in nature.<sup>1</sup>

It is of interest to note that the homosexual animals are said to be also heterosexual. The animals which show such trait usually grow out of that stage and assume a life of heterosexuality. In this

---

<sup>1</sup>Weltage, p. 4.

sense the homosexual man is thought of as being immature for he does not grow out of the homosexual stage to the heterosexual. If homosexuality is to be considered a natural way of life why is it that more people are not homosexuals as the many heterosexuals in our world? Why is heterosexuality not disdained, but homosexuality is considered evil and dirty? How then are those right who say it is not evil nor dirty?

#### Views on Responsibility for Homosexuality

Some claim that the homosexual is responsible for his condition or for remaining in that condition. On the contrary the majority of experts feel that the homosexual is not responsible for being what he is.<sup>1</sup> Could it not be that he is truly responsible? The question still is, Is it an inherent condition or an environmental and cultivated tendency which becomes habitual and chronic? This is to be presented later in this paper?

#### Studies are Conflicting

Studies are truly conflicting and contradictory when it comes to the harmonial factor, body build, genetal anatomy and brain injuries. An example of this may be seen in one source stating that the homosexual has large wide penis and large hips while another source states the very opposite: small penis and small hips as the indication of homosexuality.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>John J. McNeill, "The Christian Male Homosexual," The Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 70:667-677, June, 1970, p. 674.

<sup>2</sup>Willis, p. 13.

Allied to Emotional Problem

"The same sex" is also placed alongside emotional problems.

Stanley Willis categorizes thus:

As with any emotional condition, there is no radical cure for the pain of homosexuality, no general effective means for its remediation, and no universal applicable technique of psychotherapy that can be described in detail.<sup>1</sup>

Some clinicians insist they are neurotics if not psychotic and that they will be better off if cured of their homosexuality.<sup>2</sup>

Not Morality Problem

Homosexuality can not be considered a problem of morality . . . it should be recognized as a major medical problem, says Dr. Charles W. Socarides of New York City. Some 2.5 million to four million Americans are homosexuals, he writes in The Journal of the American Medical Association.<sup>3</sup>

Homosexuality Not Disease

Homosexuality is not a disease but a pattern of behavior. Like all other patterns of behavior, it can have multiple causes. . . . There may be many reasons for tears. . . . It is presumptuous to assume that the complex behavior of sex has only one cause--an assumption which lies behind so many unitary 'explanation' for the 'cause' of homosexuality.<sup>4</sup>

Man Imposes on Nature

An argument is set forth in the respect that man imposes on nature and does what he esteems worthwhile with the laws he finds existing. "Nature is not the guide for man's actions; instead, man imposes on nature his values, his norms, his dreams, and his ideals."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 182.

<sup>2</sup>Weltage, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup>Today's Health, American Medical Association (Publisher), August, 1970.

<sup>4</sup>Benson, p. 88.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

To illustrate this examples are given:

1. Flying--Man cannot fly but we do not ignore this. Instead we find a way to fly in the aeroplane way.
2. Rattle snakes exist. This is truth. Do we say that they were made upon the earth and should not be destroyed.
3. Pain in child birth. Is the woman allowed to bear her pain or is she given help?

Man tampers with and changes existing conditions so why should the homosexual not be justified in setting aside heterosexuality for homosexuality?<sup>1</sup>

#### Man: The Creator

The evident fact is that man is constantly changing, modifying, tampering, . . . with the laws of nature. He is constantly using one law to modify another. Man is constantly making his universe. Man is creator. Although the raw materials may not have been made by man, he can and does shape these raw materials into the complexity which is his life. Man has been called homo Faber, the man who creates, who makes. Man is incessantly striving to create the universe into a pattern of his own choosing. We can see that no one really accepts the belief that 'What is should always be.' Man daily pits one law of nature against another law, and only man decides which law of nature shall be dominant. Every man in our culture wishes to change the 'is' into something which he believes is better. The proponents of 'It's against the laws of nature' may realize that the statement has no logical or factual basis.<sup>2</sup>

The proponent of this philosophy continues to say that "Using values as a guide, man the creator can choose to create man, the bisexual, or man, the heterosexual, or man, the homosexual. . . ."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 57.

Surely man is a free moral agent with the power of choice, but what he chooses to do surely shapes his life destiny to a great extent. He truly has the choice to create death for himself at any time while he lives. He may jump the Golden Gate bridge. A few have chosen this way, but is it the good way? Or is there such a word as "good" since there is so much relativism to consider? If there were no natural and or moral law to be respected, loved and obeyed, this world would be chaotic. I would not want to awake in the morning and face a world in which there were no natural and moral laws to guide those especially who have sociopathic tendencies.

#### Homosexuality Wrong as Overeating

Benson's argument in defense of homosexuality refutes itself, unintentionally I suppose, in the following quotation:

We are now ready to examine the argument whether or not homosexuality is against the laws of nature. At the onset, it is important to stress that homosexuality is a way of behaving just as overeating is a way of behaving.<sup>1</sup>

Then is it wrong? If overeating is wrong and homosexuality is a way of behaving like overeating then it too would be wrong as overeating is wrong. The next question would be is overeating sin and if it is then would homosexuality be sin also? It stands to reason that it would be. But what is it really?

We are not to be creators of laws to impose upon nature or the laws of God. Rather man should work harmonious with the laws that he found when he came into being and or at the age of comprehension of

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 13.

such laws. Can we justly impose on the law that says "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor," or the one that says "Thou shalt not kill?" Should one engage in the sport of killing as many men as possible in a life time? Should he impose on or set aside the law against killing with his law of lawness or be laws unto himself because he chooses killing as his competitive sport? Would anyone justify this philosophy? No more should justification be given to the philosophy or argument that man as "creator can choose to create man, the bisexual, or man, the heterosexual, or man, the homosexual."

#### Bible Record of Homosexuality Questioned

Should truth be decided by a majority vote we could by this time rule homosexuality in favorable standing, never to be questioned for its purity, at least from the views of those who advance theories in its behalf.

Robert E. Buxbaum in an article "Homosexuality and Love" quotes O. S. Bailey in his book Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition as follows:

The story does not in the least demand the assumption that the sin of Sodom was sexual, let alone homosexual--indeed, there is no evidence to show that vice of the latter kind was prevalent there. Then he quotes again thus: It is clear that the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was an historical event, and that it was due to natural and not supernatural causes. The tradition that divine judgment fell upon the cities because of their wickedness may have been nothing more than a superstitious inference to the awful character of the disaster. . . . Then Buxbaum states that the result of Baileys incisive examination is that it is no longer permissible to take refuge in the contention that God Himself pronounced these acts 'detestible and abominable' above every other sexual sin, nor to explain natural catastrophies and human disasters as His vengeance upon those who indulge in them. If homosexuality is condemned, it must be condemned on other grounds. If the homosexual

is punished, we cannot transfer the causal justification for the punishment onto God. . . .<sup>1</sup>

Buxbaum follows the same argument and throws out the New Testament as being an authority against homosexuality. His statement follows:

Those who would turn to the passages in the New Testament that are often cited as pronouncing the judgment of God upon the homosexual must remember that these were written within the context of the misunderstanding of the Sodom and Gomorrah story.<sup>2</sup>

John J. McNeill, in reference to 1 Cor. 6; 1 Tim. 1; Romans 1 states that "although homosexual practices are condemned in the Old and New Testament, there is no place where they are singled out as particularly offensive."<sup>3</sup>

In the following chapter I will answer the criticism here set forth by these men.

McNeill continues to be quite liberal to the homosexual. He mentions Marc Oraison as saying that "all mankind is so sexually immature and so dominated consciously or unconsciously by passion that in practice, and as a general rule, we must presume sexual sins to be only materially grave."<sup>4</sup>

True all are immature due to the fall of man, but this does not justify the condition as to warrant it sinless if it does fall in the category of sin.

---

<sup>1</sup>Buxbaum, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>McNeill, pp. 672-673.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 675.

## CHAPTER IV

### GOD IS THE AUTHORITY

The Bible is to me the inspired word of God. The Book speaks for itself: "All scripture is given by the inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."<sup>1</sup>

There may be, and indeed, many, who hold the Bible as a book full of tales and fables of old, a book with stories for children, but not a book to be taken seriously nor accepted for its teaching, with the exception of a few ethical stories and lessons. A book, it asserted, written by ordinary men. It would be well for such minds to ponder well the following verses from this book: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is any private interpretation.

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."<sup>2</sup>

I will not attempt to present proof in this article that the Bible is all that the two texts quoted declare. There are many books written that adequately treat on that subject. And though an angel should come down from God's throne in the heaven men would not be

---

<sup>1</sup>2 Timothy 3:16, 17.

<sup>2</sup>2 Peter 1:20, 21.

persuaded to believe what He has given through Bible revelation. His Son came down and many did not believe Him. Many would rather be "creator" of his own universe. What I will endeavor to do is to present the Biblical answer to the question: Is homosexuality sin or disease condition?

#### Evidence of God's Disapproval of Homosexuality

When God created man he looked upon His creation and said "it was very good." (Gen. 1:31). As an ideal "help meet" God made another man, or was it a woman? It was a "woman" named Eve.<sup>1</sup> Jesus referring to this in Mark 10:6-12 mentions that "from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female." He further states that they both should be one flesh, and in verse nine He says "What therefore God hath joined together let no man put assunder."

Men who happen to become homosexuals after marriage usually create an atmosphere of incompatibility in the home to the point of separation and divorce. From the standpoint that homosexuality separates the man from his wife there is evidence that an act contrary to God's will and law of love is violated.

The relationship of man to woman is so sacred that Christ likens himself as the groom and the church He calls the bride, the "lamb's wife".<sup>2</sup> Is it possible that any person could be a homosexual who has the slightest insight into Christ's loving relationship to the church, and who is in sacred relationship with Christ, whom he recognizes as his redeemer?

---

<sup>1</sup>Genesis 2:15-25.

<sup>2</sup>Revelation 19:7; Ephesians 5:22-32.

On becoming a homosexual he breaks his relationship with Christ and with the church. We must never equate "love" with the perverted passion for sexual pleasure.

God has not asserted in the writings of the Bible that a man should be head of any other man, but it is definitely stated that the man is the head of the woman.<sup>1</sup> The apostle Paul mentions "men leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, . . . they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness. . . ." <sup>2</sup> Incidentally "all unrighteousness is sin:" and "sin is the transgression of the law" of God.<sup>3</sup> It may truly be said here that men going with men for sexual pleasure is not in harmony with God's plan in His creation.

In the law which God gave Moses for Israel, it was forbidden for a man to lie with his neighbor's wife and along with that is placed the sin of homosexuality in the same context: "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman: it is an abomination."<sup>4</sup> God never changes, His law remains the same where morals are concerned. If it was sin for Israel, His people, it is still sin for us, His people, today.

---

<sup>1</sup>Eph. 5:22-32.

<sup>2</sup>Romans 1:18-32.

<sup>3</sup>John 5:17; 3:4.

<sup>4</sup>Leviticus 18:20-22 (Revised Standard Version).

Interestingly, homosexuality is set alongside other sins as unrighteousness:

Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither the immoral, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor the drunkard, nor revilers, nor robbers will inherit the Kingdom of God.<sup>1</sup>

There are those who say that homosexuality should not be labelled in the statutes of the land as an unlawful act. Well to take this approach is also to take the stand that stealing, killing, and falsehood should not be punishable by the law of a country, and if they should why should homosexuality be singled out as separate from other transgressions when the Bible does not? It must be remembered that the laws of our land are largely based upon the moral laws given in the Bible.

#### Evidence God Brought Judgment on Sodomy

There are individuals who argue that Sodom was not destroyed because of the sin of homosexuality nor was it destroyed by God.

#### Proof of the Sin of Homosexuality

The story of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah as recorded in Genesis 19 gives evidence of the involvement of homosexuality. The men did not come to the door of Lot's house to take the life of the visitors. They gathered there to abuse the strangers sexually or Lot would not have offered his daughter instead. It shows also that Lot

---

<sup>1</sup> 1 Corinthians 6:9, 10.

20  
looked on the natural act of sex as being between man and woman and not man with man. Thus he said "do not so wickedly."

There is a parallel act recorded in Judges 19. It tells of the incident of an old man of Ephraim coming from his field late in the evening, and seeing a wayfarer he invited him to lodge with him for the night. Evidently the men of the place were Benjamites and must have been guilty of the sin of Sodom. When they were in the house the men of the city came upon the house and asked the old man to bring out the man who came into the house. The old man used the same words as Lot used "do not so wickedly."

The old man gave them his concubine and it is evident that they used her sexually to the point where she died. In this case the men of Israel went to war with the Benjamites and destroyed them, which showed that Israel was displeased with their action. They would have done with the man the same as they did with the woman. There is no question but that the act of homosexuality was involved in both cases.

#### Proof that God Destroyed Sodom

"Higher criticism" may rule out the story of Sodom because it is found in Genesis but if the Bible is accepted in part for what it is we need to accept the whole on the same basis that we accept a part, lest we do as Marcian did by cutting out the portions of the Bible that he did not agree with or accept as God's word. This policy could be followed to the point where only the two covers are left in our hands. Then we become a law unto ourselves--creating indeed our own laws and living as we please in an imperfect way as we are.

The record of Genesis 19 states that Lot testified that "the Lord will destroy this city" (verse 14) and verse 24 states that "the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven." The text tells who rained it, and the place the fire came from. Nothing could be more plain.

Ellen White States Sodom Was Destroyed Because of Sin

In reference to the men who visited Lot's house Ellen White wrote: "In the form of men, angels are often in the assemblies of the righteous, and they visit the assemblies of the wicked, as they went to Sodom, . . ."1

She also states that "Sodom and Gomorrah were visited with the curse of the almighty for their sins and iniquities."2

"The vilest and most brutal passions were unrestrained."3

Allusion is made to Luke 17:28, 29 thus: "The Redeemer of the world declares that there are greater sins than that for which Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed."4 Here again she alludes to the sin of Sodom. The sins of Sodom may fall into various categories of sin, and one thing is certain homosexuality was one of those sins.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellen G. White, The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan (Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1950), pp. 631, 632.

<sup>2</sup>Ellen G. White, Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 4 (Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948), p. 191.

<sup>3</sup>Ellen G. White, Patriarchs and Prophets (Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1958), p. 157.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 165.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

In summary a fitting statement of Stanley Willis is worthwhile quoting. He states that "A complete knowledge about homosexuality simply does not exist, since the sequence and context in which this behavior arises varies uniquely with each affected individual. . . ."<sup>1</sup> In using this statement I should not want to go along with all that he may want to read into it, but the thought that more knowledge needs to be gained in this area is worthy of recognition and study.

I object to the idea that homosexuality is altogether a psychological and environmental problem. There could be a psychological condition with added environmental circumstances to lead a person to adopt a homosexual role, but there is more to it than just that. I will present a statement here from a proponent of the psychological view:

Jewish families appear to rank high among those who are most unlikely to produce homosexuals. This is sure to surprise people who are acquainted with the proverbially warm and loving but also close-binding, overconcerned Jewish mother. The evidence is hardly airtight, but some scientific studies suggest either that the 'typical' Jewish mother does not carry her possessiveness to heterosexuality--inhibiting extremes or that perhaps other factors within her or within most Jewish fathers neutralizes the 'babying' of her children.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Willis, pp. 12, 13.

<sup>2</sup>Wyden and Wyden, p. 91.

There is valid reason for Jewish families not ranking high in the production of homosexuals. Jews believe in the God of the Old Testament and invariably they bring their children up with the moral teaching in that setting. They are evidently educated that homosexuality is sin hence it is not thought of in the light of children who grow up in homes where "relativism" plays the dominant role. I would be most interested in a survey of Seventh-day Adventist families for they believe that the Bible is God's written guide for all wholesome living.

I would follow Donna L. Farnsworth in her view that homosexuality is "sexual aberrations."<sup>1</sup> It is a departure from the natural way of sexual experience. It becomes so to a great extent because of the various media of communication: environmental, radio, television, newspaper, magazines, and person to person contact. It is of interest to note that homosexuality grows where its proponents assemble most. San Francisco is a good example. Police estimate San Francisco has 80,000 to 90,000 homosexuals or 10% of 790,000 people there.<sup>2</sup>

Environmental and cultivated tendencies to wrong are definitely at the top list of the causes for homosexuality. By beholding we become changed. Visual aids and the repetition process are very great factors in the art of learning. Like the habits of smoking and drinking, homosexuality could be an acquired habit, and in all probability is an

---

<sup>1</sup>Donna L. Farnsworth, "Sexual Aberrations," Journal of Religion and Health, October, 1968, pp. 350-357.

<sup>2</sup>A. D. Dennison, "Wanted More Man Power," Christian Life, October, 1970, pp. 44-45, 59.

24

acquired habit, which when it becomes chronic needs outside aid to help the individual to break the habit. In this sense it could be considered sickness, and at this point the individuals who are thus held by the sexual appetite of the "apples of Sodom"<sup>1</sup> that are offered by Satan would do well not only to depend on the psychoanalyst and medical physician, but to seek divine help from the great healer of the body and soul--Jesus Christ. Very many habits are established through the violation of nature's laws.

Homosexuality is not based on love but on feeling that of the satisfaction of one's lustful desires. Love is not merely a feeling. It is based upon principle--a divine principle. Homosexuality is contrary to God's standard of sex relationship. Men can have no excuse for this questionable type of relation when women remain in a great majority. I would think it is lack of love for the fair sex that would drive men to such selfish and lustful way of behavior. Let men learn to love God and they will love this perfect way which leads to happiness.

I place homosexuality among one of the unnatural tendencies to wrong, in that it is not generally possessed by all men. However it is classified among the tendencies to wrong that humanity inherit because of the fall from a perfect character as man came from the hand of His maker.

I must mention here some other tendencies to wrong that we inherit as a human race. These include falsehood, stealing, killing,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ellen G. White, Christ Object Lessons (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1941), pp. 232, 233.

disrespectfulness to parents, tendency to live a wild life with women and vice versa, smoking, drinking alcoholic beverages, drug abuse and more. All are born with tendencies to evil or wrong doing, but these may be overcome and should be overcome. Homosexuality is only one of the many tendencies to wrong, and this should be rooted up by every one in its possession. Many of the ills of society are suppressed by will power and culture, not to speak of the mighty power of Christ. Why not homosexuality? It is sin and must be rooted up by God's cleansing power.

Many of the like ills are punishable by the laws of the land, and my question would be why should not homosexuality be among the grave ills of society to be punishable by the laws of the land? Many of the various ills are not usually punishable until they become in effect harmful to others other than the law breaker himself. This evil is always harmful to a second person and many more and should therefore meet the penalty of the law.

The cities of today are fast becoming like Sodom and Gomorrah. The many holidays encourage idleness. The exciting sports--theatregoing, horse racing, gambling, liquor-drinking, and reveling--stimulate to intense activity.<sup>1</sup>

What then should be the church's attitude toward homosexuality? It should definitely condemn it as sin. It should work with the homosexual as a sinner to be brought to Christ. Should a homosexual be brought to Jesus He would have healed and forgiven him of his sin.

Love is based on principle, acceptance is another term to be considered. In love I accept the sinner not to keep him accept<sup>ed</sup> in sin,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 54.

but to accept him in the way that points out his sin and leads him from sin. Church fellowship should not be extended to the homosexual-sinner, nor any other sinner who gives evidence of remaining in and having fellowship with sin. "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?"<sup>1</sup>

The Bible is to be the Criteria

It is of interest to note that none of the sources read, outside of E. G. White, proclaim the Scriptures to be the ultimate and infallible guide to an interpretation or authority upon which to base their assumption, or conclusions. Because of my acceptance of the Bible as an infallible guide I label homosexuality as sin allowing that a sinful condition may become habitual to the point where the victim could be placed alongside chronic alcoholism and drug addiction. At this stage he may need clinical help and so could be associated with disease. Its ultimate cure will be based upon will power and to a very great extent upon divine power. This power is the source that so many fail to seek and call upon.

When God's word is studied, comprehended, and obeyed a bright light will be reflected to the world; new truths, received and acted upon, will bind us in strong bonds to Jesus. The Bible, and the Bible alone, is to be our creed, the sole bond of union; all who bow to this Holy Word will be in harmony. Our own views and ideas must not control our efforts. Man is fallible, but God's word is infallible. Instead of wrangling with one another, let men exalt the Lord. Let us meet all opposition as did our Master, saying, 'It is written.' Let us lift the banner on which is inscribed, the Bible our rule of faith and discipline.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>2 Corinthians 6:14.

<sup>2</sup>Ellen G. White, Selected Messages (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1958), p. 416.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benson, R. O. D. In Defense of Homosexuality. New York: The Julian Press, Inc., 1965.
- Bieber, Irving. Homosexuality. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962.
- Buxbaum, Robert E. "Homosexuality and Love," Journal of Religion and Health, 6:17-32, January, 1967.
- Dennison, A. D. "Wanted More Man Power," Christian Life, October, 1970, pp. 44-59.
- Farnsworth, Donna L. "Sexual Aberations," Journal of Religion and Health, October, 1968.
- Holy Bible, The. Authorized King James Version of 1611.
- Holy Bible, The. Revised Standard Version. Toronto, New York, Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- McNeill, John J. "The Christian Male Homosexual," The Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 70:667-677, June, 1970.
- Todays Health, American Medical Association (Publisher), August, 1970.
- Weltage, Ralph W. (editor). The Same Sex. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1969.
- White, Ellen G. A Solemn Appeal. Washington, D.C.: Property of the Ellen G. White Publications, General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Christ Object Lessons. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1941.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan, The. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press publishing Association, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Patriarchs and Prophets. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Selected Messages, Book 1. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Testimonies for the Church, Vol. 4. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1948.

Willis, Stanley E. Understanding and Counseling the Male Homosexual.  
Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.

Wyden, Peter and Barbara. Growing Up Straight. New York: Stein  
and Day Publishers, 1968.