

1-1-1981

An Overview of Homosexuality

Imo Smith

Recommended Citation

Smith, Imo, "An Overview of Homosexuality" (1981). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 262.
https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/262

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

AN OVERVIEW OF HOMOSEXUALITY

BY

IMO SMITH

WESTERN EVANGELICAL SEMINARY

1981

Approved by

William H. Vermillion Ph.D.

Department

Counseling

Date

April 3, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	ii
Chapter	
INTRODUCTION	1
1. "WHAT'S IN A WORD?"	4
Definitions	4
Terminology	11
2. "FACT OR FICTION?"	19
Generalizations	19
Causes	27
3. "WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?"	36
Genesis	37
Leviticus	42
Romans	46
I Corinthians and I Timothy	49
4. "TO TREAT OR NOT TO TREAT?"	55
Cure	55
Control	60
Prevention	64
Tolerance/Acceptance	67
CONCLUSION	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74
APPENDIXES	
A. THE HETEROSEXUAL-HOMOSEXUAL RATING SCALE	81
B. CHURCH STATEMENTS ON HOMOSEXUALITY	83

PREFACE

The tension in today's society over the acceptability of a homosexual orientation was the motivating factor behind this presentation of an overview of homosexuality. The knowledge and understanding gained during the formation of this study will enhance the effectiveness of my present position as an ordained minister and my future position as a U.S. Army chaplain. The purpose of this overview was to personally gain a realistic perspective of the basic issues of homosexuality and the diverse opinions concerning those issues.

As a result of this overview it is my conclusion that a homosexual orientation is not an acceptable alternative sexual orientation. Therefore, a homosexual orientation should be prevented and controlled until cured.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Dr. William Vermillion for his patient guidance and constructive criticisms which have contributed to the presentation of this overview of homosexuality.

INTRODUCTION

Homosexuality is becoming a topic of conversation which is no longer taboo. This is partially due to the prominence which the Gay Liberation Movement tends to receive from the media. Society is struggling with whether or not homosexuals should be considered a minority group which should receive protection and benefits similar to the ethnic minorities. Like the society in which they function, churches and religious leaders are attempting to come to a better understanding of the homosexual community. As a result both society and churches have re-considered their stances on homosexuality. Some churches have re-worded their doctrinal stances on homosexuality in an attempt to clearly state their position.¹

Today, if one desires to have a viable ministry, it is important for the minister to not only be able to clearly state the church's stances, but to also be able to state one's own stance, as clearly as possible. This can best be achieved through an examination of reliable sources. There are several issues which need to be considered. One issue is the need of a proper definition of the term, "homosexuality". The definitions of homosexuality are inconsistent not only in church circles, but also in society. One suspects that the definition espoused can be traced back to the philosophy and presuppositions of the individuals. After one examines these definitions and the terminology which is distinctive of the "gay" lifestyle, the stage is set for consideration of the issue of homophobia vs. real homosexuality. Common generalizations about the gay community need to be examined for elements of truth and falsehood. This will open the way for rational responses and communication between heterosexuals and homosexuals. Just as definitions and terminology are suspect of being based on the

1

Appendix A, Edward Batchelor, ed., Homosexuality and Ethics (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1980).

Just as definitions and terminology are suspect of being based on the presuppositions of the individual, so are generalizations about gays and theories as to the causes of homosexuality.

A third issue centers on the controversial interpretations of five Biblical passages which are used as a basis for developing presuppositions about homosexuality. These passages are sometimes used as supportive evidence that homosexuality is an "unnatural" sexual orientation. One needs to examine these passages when re-examining one's presuppositions concerning the "naturalness" of homosexuality. The conservative Evangelicals interpretation of these scriptures tends to be "anti-gay", "unnatural". The more liberal interpretations tend to be "pro-gay", "natural". These passages are sometimes used as supportive evidence that only unnatural homosexual behavior is condemned.

The presupposition of homosexuality being "natural" or "unnatural" brings a final issue to the forefront. This issue centers on the therapeutic treatment of homosexuals. It involves those who are "anti-gay", who feel that homosexuality should be cured, controlled or prevented. It also involves those who are "pro-gay", who feel that homosexuality should be tolerated and accepted with no limitations differing from those put on heterosexuals.

The influence of the cry for tolerance and acceptance is being observed in society's willingness to not only listen but also in the continuous sympathy being offered by the mass media. Although it seems unfair, it is often the voice which cries loudest and most persistently that becomes the most successful in achieving its goals. This is of significance for the minister who needs to be listening to these crying voices. One needs to determine one's own position on human sexuality in the area of homosexuality before offering any counsel to the ones who are being vocal or to those who

are being the listeners.

This paper should assist one in clarifying one's own position from an objective, Biblical perspective. This paper is only representative of the wealth of information available. It should be considered only as an overview of the four basic issues examined. It is not a detailed study of all aspects related to homosexuality.

Chapter One

"WHAT'S IN A WORD"

The ostracization which most homosexuals have experienced from society and the church has encouraged them to bind together and form their own community. They have a distinctive lifestyle from that of the heterosexual community. This lifestyle is rarely observed or understood by the heterosexual community. Their typical response to homosexuals has been alienation and rejection. This is usually coupled with a fear of association and discussion. Due to the prominence of the homosexual community in society today, it is important for the heterosexual community to understand that homosexuals think, act, and experience sex differently than they do themselves. One does not have to visit the homosexual community or to observe first hand the behavior of a gay couple in order to being to understand these differences of lifestyle. By examining the vocabulary which typifies the homosexual community, one is presented with a true panorama of these differences.²

This vocabulary can be separated into two main categories. The first category encompasses one's philosophy and definition of homosexuality. The second category centers on terms which are common to both the homosexual and heterosexual communities. Some of these words are terms which the homosexual community has changed the meanings of, denoting their own lifestyle: actions, thoughts, and sex experiences.

Within the first category, the most elusive terms to define are the two most critical to understanding the homosexual community. These two words are "homosexuality" and "homosexual". The inconsistency of their

²

Tim LaHaye, The Unhappy Gays (Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1978), pp.21-23.

definitions is perceived in the difficulty of presenting a definition which is common to most sources that this author researched.

Definitions by these sources can be separated into one of the four following positions: 1) sexual attraction to the same sex, 2) sexual activity with the same sex, 3) sexual attraction to and sexual activity with the same sex, and 4) degrees of sexual attraction and sexual activity with the same sex.

The first position refers to those sources which define a homosexual as someone who is sexually attracted to someone of the same sex. John McNeill determines his definition of a homosexual in the following manner:

"The prefix 'homo' in the word homosexual is derived from the Greek word meaning 'same', and not from the Latin word for 'man'. Consequently it designates anyone who is sexually attracted to someone of the same sex and includes both male and female homosexuals, or lesbians ..."³

Bernard Oliver in his book, Sexual Deviation in American Society, agrees with McNeill and carries the sexual attraction theme into his definition of homosexuality. Oliver writes on page 122, "... homosexuality refers to sexual attraction of an individual for the same sex; and a homosexual is an individual whose sexual drive is directed toward his or her own sex."⁴ Gordon Westwood in his book, Society and the Homosexual, synonymously calls these attractions "affections". On page 23 Westwood writes the following definition:

"... homosexuality refers to an attitude of mind in which the affections are turned towards a member of the same sex... In this sense, homosexuality arouses the same emotions and desires as in heterosexuality

3

John J. McNeill, The Church and the Homosexual (Kansas: Sheed Andres and McHeel, Inc., 1976), p. 40.

4

Bernard J. Oliver, Sexual Deviation in American Society: A Social-Psychological Study of Sexual Non-conformity (Connecticut: College and University Press, 1967), p. 122.

in which the affections are turned toward members of the opposite sex."5

McNeill who was quoted earlier used several sources in support of his own definition. One of these sources was D.W. Corey who McNeil says " ... defines the homosexual as 'any person who feels a most urgent sexual desire which in the main is directed toward gratification with the same sex.' "6

Another source is John Cavanaugh, who in speaking of homosexuality makes the following remarks:

"It is important to accept the concept that homosexuality is a way of thinking and feeling, not merely a way of acting. The performance of homosexual acts is, therefore, not in itself evidence of homosexuality."7

A synopsis of this compilation of sources on the definitions of homosexuality and a homosexual would centralize on the sexual attraction of an individual or individuals for a member(s) of the same sex.

The second position refers to the sources researched which define a homosexual as someone who participates in sexual activity with a member of the same sex. LaHaye defines a homosexual as an individual " ... who engages in sexual activity with another member of the same sex. Such activity usually leads to an orgasmic experiences."8 A second resource which agrees that sexual activity is the determining point in declaring whether an individual is or is not a homosexual is the organization Exodus. Kent Philpott based his book, The Gay Theology, on this definition. On page 133 Philpott writes:

5

Gordon Westwood, Society and the Homosexual (New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1953), p. 23.

6

McNeill, p. 41.

7

Ibid.

8

LaHaye, p. 23.

"... accepted by EXODUS, a coalition of individuals and groups nationwide who are actively involved in ministry to the homosexual. This definition reads: 'Homosexuality is a sexual object choice characterized by an ongoing erotic preference for partners of the same sex.' "⁹

Some individuals who consider themselves to be homosexuals would have difficulty accepting this definition. The word "choice" implies a willful decision, whether conscious or subconscious has been made. Many homosexuals would disagree that they make a willful choice. Philpott emphasizes the word "ongoing". The reason for this emphasis reveals the behavioristic tone of this definition. It classifies an individual as homosexual who is actively practicing his/her "erotic preference". Philpott suggests then that if one is no longer practicing this "erotic preference", then that individual is no longer to be considered a homosexual. The logical conclusion is that if one presently does not actively participate in homosexual acts then there is hope and clarity of thought for that individual who fears that he may be homosexual and for that one who has been previously labelled homosexual for
¹⁰
life.

The third position refers to the sources which define a homosexual as an individual who has a sexual attraction to a member of the same sex and/or is involved in sexual activity with the same sex. Gangel defines homosexuality as "... Having a preference for intimate relationships with
¹¹
persons of the same sex." Greg Bahnsen gives a clearer, more precise definition of both a homosexual and homosexuality. He defines a homosexual as:

"... any person, male or female (thus including lesbians),

⁹

Kent Philpott, The Gay Theology (New Jersey: Logos International, 1977), p. 133.

¹⁰

Philpott, The Gay Theology, p. 134.

¹¹

Kenneth Gangel, The Gospel and The Gay (New York: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1978), p. 19.

who engages in sexual relations with members of the same sex or who desires to do so. Homosexuality is an affectional attraction to or active sexual relation with a person of the same sex."¹²

McKain uses the following definition:

"... a homosexual person is an individual who is motivated in his or her adult life by a definite preferential erotic attraction to members of the same sex and who usually, but not always, engages in overt sexual relations with persons of the same sex."¹³

McKain makes it clear that he is not including adolescent experimentation in his definition. Neither is he including situations where heterosexual opportunities are almost impossible.

14

Only these two exceptions separate Bahnsen and McKain. I would not make the same exclusions that McKain has made. I would only make two exclusions from the label of homosexual. The first exclusion would be individuals who because of development (age or congenital) or mental capacities are unable to distinguish right from wrong. The second exclusion I would make are those individuals who are "recovered" from their homosexual orientation. Therefore, I support Bahnsen's definition that a homosexual is an individual who has a sexual activity with members of the same sex or who desires to do so.

In contrast the Switzers appear to support McKain's definition over Bahnsen. The Switzers in their book Parents of the Homosexual quote the following definition of homosexuality as it was published in a pamphlet by the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States: "' Homosexuality refers to emotional attachments involving sexual attraction and/or

12

Grey L. Bahnsen, Homosexuality: A Biblical View(Michigan: Baker Book House, 1978), p. 5.

13

Charles W. Keysor, ed., What You Should Know About Homosexuality (Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979), p. 186.

14

Ibid.

overt sexual relations between individuals -- male or female -- of the same sex.' "¹⁵ The Switzer's use several other sources to support this theme.

One of these sources is a Public Affairs Pamphlet. The Switzers quote two portions from this pamphlet, "Changing Views of Homosexuality," in order to further clarify the above definition. They write:

"... says, ' Homosexuality means sexual attraction to persons of the same sex as oneself whether male or female,' ... the second paragraph seems to sharpen this statement considerably by saying that the term refers 'to persons who are exclusively or primarily attracted to members of their own sex, and who enter into sexual and affectional relations with them.' " ¹⁶

The point that the Switzers were attempting to emphasize with the addition of this second definition is found in the second paragraph of the pamphlet. The implication is that there is a possibility that some homosexual feelings or activity may be due to "temporary, situational forces." These should¹⁷ not brand an individual as homosexual.

The Switzers suggest that two important things need to be taken into consideration before labelling anyone a homosexual. These are the age of the person and the stage of development of the person. In support of this premise they use a supportive quote which includes in its definition of a homosexual the words "in adult life". They conclude that there is a line that can be drawn between heterosexuals and homosexuals. But, upon examination, they are really implying that there are degrees of heterosexuality. Upon reaching the lowest degree of heterosexuality, one totters on a fine¹⁸ line which separates homosexuals and heterosexuals.

¹⁵

David K. and Shirley Switzer, Parents of the Homosexual (Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press, 1980), p. 39.

¹⁶

Switzer, p. 40.

¹⁷

Ibid.

¹⁸

Ibid.

In contrast, Churchill would disagree that people can only be classified as homosexual verses heterosexual. Churchill is representative of the last position which is held by sources that define a homosexual by the degree of sexual attraction and sexual activity with member(s) of the same sex. In comparison with the Switzers, Churchill would agree that there are degrees of heterosexuality, but he would also emphasize that there are then degrees of homosexuality.

Usually anyone who does not belong to the exclusively homosexual classification or who does not belong to the exclusively homosexual classification has been labelled a "bisexual". This attempt to neatly categorize misrepresents the phases of transition between the two extremes. Churchill, like Boswell, uses "The Heterosexual-Homosexual Rating Scale" by Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin to clarify these phases of transition. On this continuum individuals are classified into one of seven positions on the scale with 0 being the exclusive heterosexual and 6 being the exclusive homosexual. Each of the following positions are listed in detail in Appendix B:

- 0 -- "Individuals are rated as 0s if they make no physical contacts which result in erotic arousal or orgasm, and make no psychic response to individuals of their own sex..."
- 1 -- "Individuals are rated as 1s if they have only incidental homosexual contacts which have involved physical response, or incidental psychic responses without physical contact. The great preponderance of their sociosexual experience and reactions is directed toward individuals of the opposite sex..."
- 2 -- "Individuals are rated as 2s if they have more than incidental homosexual experience, and/or if they respond rather definitely to homosexual stimuli. Their heterosexual experiences and/or reactions still surpass their homosexual experiences and/or reactions..."
- 3 -- "Individuals who are rated 3s stand midway on the heterosexual-homosexual scale. They are about equally homosexual and heterosexual in their overt experience and/or their psychic reactions. In general they accept and equally enjoy both types of contacts and have no strong preferences for one or the other..."

- 4 -- "Individuals are rated as 4s if they have more overt activity and/or psychic reactions in the homosexual, while still maintaining a fair amount of heterosexual activity and/or responding rather definitely to heterosexual stimuli."
- 5 -- "Individuals are rated 5s if they are almost entirely homosexual in their overt activities and/or reactions ..."
- 6 -- "Individuals are rated as 6s if they are exclusively homosexual, both in regard to their overt experience and in regard to their psychic reactions."¹⁹

It is Churchill's suggestion that this continuum can best replace the varied definitions of the "homosexual". He states that these definitions "... prove to be dependent upon criteria that are quite arbitrarily set up by people who wish to emphasize different aspects of homosexuality."²⁰ He himself has to define the term "homosexuality" for clarity of discussion in his own book, Homosexual Behavior among Males. He uses the word homosexuality:

"... to refer to all sexual phenomena, overt or psychic, that involve like-sexed individuals... the sexual nature of the response and the fact that it involves another individual of the same sex define the response as homosexual, rather than the context in which the response occurs."²¹

Churchill's desire for clarity is representative of the need for a consistent definition of homosexuality and homosexual.

The determination of a clear definition which can be supported is very important. It is also essential to be aware of the influences of one's own philosophy and presuppositions before determining that definition. To have examined the wide variety of definitions represented here by these four positions is to have begun the road toward a proper understanding of the "homosexual" issue.

Besides the two terms, homosexuality and homosexual, there are other terms which need to be understood so that one does not become sidetracked.

¹⁹

Wainwright Churchill, Homosexual Behavior Among Males: A Cross-Cultural and Cross-Species Investigation (New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1967), pp. 324-325.

²⁰

Churchill, p. 38.

²¹

Churchill, p. 35.

These words have commonly accepted definitions. Upon examination these words appear to fall under four vocabulary listings. The first listing focuses on the general, "Types of Homosexuals". The following terms are compiled in alphabetical order:

22

GENERAL TYPES OF HOMOSEXUALS

Effeminate	"... is defined by Webster's <u>New Collegiate Dictionary</u> ... as 'having feminine qualities... inappropriate to a man; not manly in appearance or manner'. It is extremely important to note that an effeminate person is not necessarily homosexual, though frequently the society tends to make that connection."
Episodic Homosexual	"One who engages in both homosexual and heterosexual behavior"
Exclusive Homosexual	"One who exclusively engages in homosexual behavior"
Gay	"Being free from shame, guilt, misgivings, or regret over being a homosexual"
Genuine Homosexual	Sexually attracted to adults of own sex as naturally as one would be to the opposite sex.
Infanto Homosexual	An attraction for young boys/sometimes an attraction for young girls
Latent Homosexual	"... refers to the person who has homosexual impulses but does not engage in homosexual behavior."
Lesbian	"A woman homosexual. She usually brings her female partner to sexual climax by manipulation of the clitoris with either her finger or tongue."
Overt Homosexual	"... refers to the person participating in homosexual acts."
Pseudohomosexual	"... the person convinces himself that he is homosexual because he has failed in some vocation or social task which is supposed to fulfill certain masculine requirements of our society."

Pseudosexual	"A person who possesses certain superficial characteristics that causes people to erroneously label them gay when in reality they are not."
Sadomasochistic Homosexual	An individual who brings brutality and torture to sexual activity.

23

SPECIFIC TYPES OF HOMOSEXUALITY

This second listing is of specific male and female homosexual "types".

It is also an alphabetical listing.

Female

"Adolescent"	A female who "...sometimes forms a deep crush or emotional attachment for an older female or peer-group individual, but these sex-play affairs are of highly temporary origin and do not usually lead to homosexual adult behavior.
"Athlete"	A female who specializes in developing male interests in sports identifying so closely with the males as to desiring a female partner.
"Bull-dagger" "Caretaker"	usually hostile, dominant, aggressive towards females. She tends to be cruel and brutal towards her partner who is usually weak, participating in prostitution in order to support her "caretaker", who may "keep" more than one partner. The partner(s) usually have masochistic tendencies.
"Call-girl" Lesbian	This female operates ... "by putting advertisements in the papers, indicating secretarial services, massage parlors, or answering service for models. Some of these ads are placed by agencies... If the Lesbian answers a call and the person wants some service other than sexual, she may quickly attempt to take part in non-sexual activity, or make a referral to someone who is available."
Camouflaged-Married	A pseudo-heterosexual married female who uses her marriage as a front and who is a practicing homosexual at the same time.
Careerist	A female who is usually independent, highly efficient in business who distrusts men and seeks a passive woman companion.

"Husband-wife Team"	More common among females due to their tendency to stay together longer. The husband is more aggressive, active. The husband earns the support and provides the home. The wife is the passive member who may refer to her partner as "boss" or "daddy".
Roommate Temporary	Females who share an apartment with a girlfriend or as roommates in college who take part in spasmodic, temporary sex play, but without any deep involvement with each other or any lasting relationship.
"Spurious"	A female who fears her homosexual tendencies but who may rarely participate in some sex play. Usually these feelings are suppressed and inhibited. Her outlet is often masturbation, resulting in frigidity or mechanical love-making with her husband.

Male

"Bisexual"	A male who has "listless and unenthusiastic coitus with a female", but prefers a homosexual experience over a heterosexual experience.
"Fantasy Only"	These males "... in conscious fantasy are neurotics who revert to overt homosexuality through their masturbatory sex life. These individuals take part in fantasy outlet which attempts to exclude the thought that they may be homosexual."
"Lesser crime"	"... an individual may try to deny attachment intraphysically to his mother by temporarily turning to a man for sexual activity."
Perversion	These males acknowledge publically that they are homosexual and assert that they are happy. They feel persecuted wrongly by society.
Spurious	"innocent milquetoast"; this male sees his passive'feminine behavior as a tendency toward homosexuality. He labels himself and is often masochistic.
Transitory	A phase of adolescent boys, sometimes as an initiation or other social pressures, i.e. employer

The third section is an alphabetical listing of words which have hidden meanings. These words are common to both the heterosexual and homosexual communities. The homosexual community has formed a different meaning

to these ordinary words. Like most subcultures they have developed colloquialisms all their own.

24

"DOUBLE MEANINGS"

Baths	"Special baths frequented by gays when looking for sex. Gang sex often occurs in such places."
Butch	"A masculine or super-masculine homosexual. Many wear boots, leather clothing, or extremely tight-fitting clothing that show off their muscles and emphasize their genitalia."
Chicken	"A young homosexual"
Chicken Hawk	"An older homosexual who seeks to pick up a 'chicken' "
Closet Gay	"A homosexual who, for personal or professional reasons, hides or covers his homosexuality."
Closet Queen	"An effeminate man who practices homosexual acts when he can but who keeps his practice a closely guarded secret for personal reasons."
Cruise	"A sexually stimulated gay out looking for a partner."
Drag	"Female clothes used by a male to impersonate a female."
Drag Queen	"A queen dressed in drag on the prowl."
Faggot	"The stereotyped homosexual; a limp-wristed, feminine acting homosexual often looked down upon by other gays."
Gay Bars	"The places in which gays congregate for dancing, pickups, and sexual contacts."
Hustler	"A male prostitute."
Lavender Ladies	A club of the Metropolitan Community Church which is a society of male transvestites. They publically wear the drag.
Leather	A subculture in direct opposition to transvestites. Ultra-masculinity, attire of leather jackets, pants, and boots with chains. No effeminate behavior is tolerated in their bars.

Leather (con't)	Often connected with sadomasochistic activity.
Old Queen	"An old, effeminate homosexual male, usually no longer desirable as a sex partner, who often experiences extreme loneliness and has the highest unhappiness quotient and suicide rate."
Queen	"An effeminate male homosexual (also called 'nelly' or 'fairy')."
Sadist and Masochist or "Slave Master"	"One who adds brutality or cruelty to sexuality. Some punish their partners; others prefer to be punished or tortured themselves."
Trouble	"Butch that may cause trouble".

The final section is a group of miscellaneous terms. These terms are necessary for clarity in research as well as understanding the social and behavioral aspects of the homosexual community. A couple of these terms will also portray the homosexual community's perspective of the heterosexual community.

25

OTHER IMPORTANT TERMS

Ambisexual	A synonym for bisexual which refers to a homosexual's ability to take part in both heterosexual and homosexual activity.
Bisexual	A person's ability to be "... equally or relatively equally interested in both heterosexual activity and homosexual activity."
Fellatio	"Oral copulation when one homosexual puts his penis in the other's mouth, where it is sucked until orgasm occurs."
Homophobia	"... the fear of homosexuals or the fear that one might be homosexual ...'The homophobic person is so revolted by the notion that persons of the same sex might relate to one another sexually, that he constantly seeks to reassure himself that no such tendencies exist in himself, or in his children. At the same time, he is suspicious of any behavior that bears the remotest resemblance to his personal

concepts of homosexuality and he is ready to apply the label 'perversion' to anything and everything from nonconformity to gender-role stereotypes to a deep friendship between two men or two women.' "

Invert	Classically used to refer to "... an individual who desires or seeks homosexual relations but at the same time tries to adopt the role of a member of the opposite sex."
Misogamy	" 'the hatred of marriage' "; often mistaken for homosexuality or homophobia; "... is the extreme fear or mistrust of members of the opposite sex to the extent that marriage would seem an impossibility."
Sodomy	"Anal intercourse between males."
Straight	"A heterosexual person"
Transsexuals	Individuals "... who want to become, physiologically and psychologically, members of the opposite sex. Such transformation is usually achieved by means of sex-reassignment surgery. Most transsexuals deny being homosexual."
Transvestite	"A person who likes to wear one or more pieces of clothing of the opposite sex. Contrary to popular opinion, most of these people remain heterosexual, marry, and raise a family (if the spouse can overlook this idiosyncrasy)."

The four listings of vocabulary and jargon common to the homosexual community present one with an introduction to the lifestyle, thought patterns and behaviors of those within the homosexual community. The section on the four positions held by those attempting to form a proper definition for "homosexuality" and "homosexual" introduces one to the complexities within both the heterosexual and homosexual communities which obstruct their understanding of their own sexual identity. These positions also reveal the difficulty of attempting to label the sexual identity of another individual. Further investigation into the generalizations about homosexuals and causes of homosexuality will help one to avoid homophobia. It will also show the

patterns which have encouraged an individual to deviate from the heterosexual community.

Chapter Two

"FACT OR FICTION"

The homosexual community has a legitimate complaint against the majority of the heterosexual community. Stereotyping and sweeping generalizations are characteristic of the straights communication about and to gays, and vice versa. The homosexual community needs to guard itself from this same reactionary behavior that it has legitimately accused the heterosexual community of instigating. Both the straights and gays need to examine their fears. They need to develop a realistic understanding of each others sexual orientation. Due to the lack of objective examination of the homosexual orientation and due to learned homophobic reactions, the straights have formed misconceptions about the gays. By attempting to objectively examine some of these common generalizations about gays and some of the theories concerning the causes of homosexuality, the straights will enhance their chances of developing a more rational response and communication with gays.

Some of the most familiar generalizations about gays center on misconceptions about the physical appearance and mannerisms of gays. They also focus on the behavior and mental attitudes of gays. The generalization which is common to most sources, that this author examined, is the idea "... that there is an intimate and regular relationship between an individual's sexual preferences and his personality, character, and even his physique and physical mannerisms." ²⁶ The tendency has been to label any effeminate behavior by a male and any masculine behavior by a female as being homosexual. This misconception is exemplified by a belief that is widely accepted. Churchill describes this belief:

²⁶

Oliver, p. 39.

"It is commonly believed... that such males tend to be physically weak and that their body structure resembles that of the female, especially around the hips and thighs. They are supposed to have delicate skins, fine complexions, and high-pitched voices, along with obvious hand movements, peculiarities of gait, and other effeminate mannerisms. Artistic interests are ascribed to all these males and they are also said to be temperamental, emotionally unbalanced, oversensitive, difficult to get along with, and undependable."²⁷

These males have been branded with such names as "fairy", "faggot", "pansy", and "queen". These terms are also a part of the homosexual jargon which is used to describe the effeminate male homosexual. However, just because a male has effeminate mannerisms which are characteristic of a minority of gays, this does not necessarily mean that he is gay. Unfortunately, the misconception that effeminate males are at best latent homosexuals has permeated the heterosexual community. Churchill claims that until quite recently this misconception has been supported as fact by most psychiatric literature. He cites an excerpt from Karpman in The Sexual Offender and His Offenses:

"The homosexual male shows a feminine carrying angle of arm; long legs, narrow hips, large muscles, deficient hair on face, chest and back, feminine distribution of pubic hair, high pitched voice, small genitals, scrotal fold. Often he has excess fat on shoulders, buttocks, abdomen. Occasionally the penis is very large, the hips unusually wide."²⁸

Upon examination of Karpman, one discovers that he has been misrepresented by Churchill. Churchill may have discerned a basic flaw in Karpman's presuppositions concerning gays; however Karpman continually states that there is no set rule or distinctive by which one can recognize a homosexual. He does give some descriptions of possible characteristics of male and female homosexuals. The underscoring of the following statements of Karpman denotes his opinion that it is impossible to make a rule that one can look at an individual and determine his/her sexual preference solely by physical appearance or mannerisms whether or not he/she is gay:

²⁷

Oliver, pp. 39-40.

²⁸

Oliver, p. 40.

"The normal woman has wide hips and narrow shoulders. Homosexual women, some of them at least, may have narrow hips and wider shoulders, approaching the masculine type. The normal male has wide shoulders and narrow hips. The male homosexual is likely to have wider hips and narrow shoulders, but again there is no set rule about it. Much of the popular opinion notwithstanding, it is not, as a rule possible to recognize by sight a male homosexual or a woman homosexual though in a relatively small number of cases the man may give himself away by his particular behavior."²⁹

Karpman strongly asserts that one's sexual preference is not necessarily related to one's physique or mannerisms. It is only true of a minority of homosexuals. It should not be used as a rule of thumb for determining whether an individual is gay.

Jamison and Enroth give further insight into this generalization that homosexuals are either "hyper-masculine" females or "limp-wristed" males. They agree with Karpman that only a minority of homosexuals can be legitimately stereotyped by some similarities between their sex preferences and their behaviors or mannerisms. Jamison and Enroth state that: "Effeminacy is not a highly valued trait in the gay world; masculinity is." This masculine behavior and mannerism preference is observable within the male homosexual community more readily than in the female homosexual community. This is generally attributed to the lack of available data on lesbians. Jamison and Enroth suggest that one reason for this lack of available data concerning the lesbians is that lesbians are more reticent about disclosing their sex preference. Lesbians appear to be less dependent upon the gay community or even a lesbian subculture, than her male counterparts. Plus, very little data has been recorded concerning lesbians in comparison to the wealth of material on male gays. Jamison and Enroth suggest that this lack of data may also be due to the fact that there is less of a homophobic reaction to female-female

29

Benjamin Karpman, The Sexual Offender and His Offenses: Etiology, Pathology, Psychodynamics, and Treatment (New York: The Julian Press, 1954), p. 308.

relationships than to male-male relationships. Therefore, the lack of emphasis has resulted in a lack of examination. It may be that with more data, what is now accepted as facts about lesbians may need revision.

Another generalization that is directly related to the assumption that one's behavior and mannerisms are a sign of one's sexual preference is associated with the practice of transvestism. According to common definition, a transvestite is anyone who wears the clothing of the opposite sex. The generalization is that all transvestites are homosexuals. Jamison and Enroth state that "... 96% of transvestism occurs among heterosexuals. Nor is it limited to men". They also suggest that this reasoning stems from the assumption that all male homosexuals want to be women and all lesbians want to be males. This reveals a prior assumption that the homosexual individual does not know which sex he/she is. Transvestites are often confused with transsexuals. Transsexuals are individuals who desire to be members of the opposite sex. In order to counteract the assumption that all homosexuals are confused about their sexual orientation, Jamison and Enroth quote Peter Fisher in The Gay Mystique as saying:

" '...The vast majority of male homosexuals see themselves as men and the vast majority of female homosexuals see themselves as women. Few would have things any other way...

Male homosexuals are attracted to other men, not because they see themselves as or wish to be women, but simply because they find other men sexually exciting. The feeling of sexual attraction is the same, whether one is heterosexual or homosexual.' "32

Fisher asserts that the homosexual individual knows what his/her sex identity is.

There are other generalizations that are related to the behavioral

30

Enroth and Jamison, pp. 14-16.

31

Enroth and Jamison, p. 15.

32

Enroth and Jamison, p. 14.

habits of gays. One of these generalizations is that homosexuals want to flaunt their homosexuality publically. Oliver negates this assumption by stating: "The person who publicly displays his homosexuality is very rare."³³ The realistic picture is that the majority of gays are closet gays. Even their development of a subculture with jargon all their own and their high value on masculine traits tend to negate the assumption that gays desire the public eye.

Another generalization is that gays are actively recruiting children. Scanzoni and Mollenkott describe this as "...the belief that homosexuals are out to catch small children, either for purposes of recruitment into the gay lifestyle or for purposes of seduction and even rape."³⁴ They insist that the stereotype "homosexual child-seducer" is a homophobic response of straights to the sensationalized, isolated cases of sexual perversion. They do acknowledge that child seduction does occur, but they point out that it is not strictly a homosexual phenomenon. Scanzoni and Mollenkott conclude that children have no more to fear from homosexuals than they do from heterosexuals. This conclusion is not supported by scientific data. It appears to be based on Scanzoni and Mollenkott's presupposition that the average homosexual is sincere, a good moral person.³⁵

Another generalization that Scanzoni and Mollenkott included as resulting from homophobia is the belief that deep friendship of like-sex individuals are evidence of a tendency toward homosexuality and/or evidence of "closet" homosexuality. They stress that affectionate feelings toward an

³³

Oliver, p. 126.

³⁴

Letha Scanzoni and Virginia R. Mollenkott, Is the Homosexual My Neighbor? (Another Christian View) (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1978), p. 95.

³⁵

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, p. 97.

individual of the same sex does not mean that one is a latent homosexual or that one necessarily has erotic feelings toward the other like-sex individual. The human tendency to be suspicious and to insensitively gossip are suggested as being the basis of this generalization. Scanzoni and Mollenkott state that deep friendships are "gifts from God":

"We are denying ourselves choice gifts of God if we let homophobia rob us of the joy of telling friends we love them and hearing them speak of their love for us, or of holding a friend who needs a shoulder to cry on, or of clasping a hand to show we care, or of hugging in a way that simply expresses a sense of affection and kinship. Similarly, we need to take care that we do not attribute homosexuality to others simply because we observe a deep and close relationship or see two persons of the same sex sharing a home".³⁶

Scanzoni and Mollenkott suggest that the Ruth/Naomi friendship and the David/Jonathan friendship are Biblical examples of such "gifts from God". Within the increasing single population of Western society the need for an answer to loneliness is often resolved by warm, intimate friendships and the development of a sense of family. One needs to be very careful how they judge and talk about another individual's sex preference, especially when they observe or³⁷ hear about deep friendships between same-sex individuals.

A final generalization that is related to the behavior of gays is the idea that all gays stick together. The main objection to this generalization is the word, "all". Some gays stick together, but the majority are closet gays. Due to the social stigma and condemnation which is aimed at gays, the majority still do not desire to make their sex preference a known fact. Some have heterosexual marriages. Many have friends who are straight who have no knowledge of their homosexuality. Another objection to this generalization is that there is an antagonism between the male and female homosexuals.

³⁶

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, p. 95.

³⁷

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, pp. 94-95.

Oliver states: "Male and female homosexuals usually show considerable mutual antagonism toward each other."³⁸ Enroth and Jamison also note this obstacle within the gay church as well as the gay community. They write:

"Another problem unknown to straight churches, but prevalent in the gay church, is an inherent antagonism between the male and female members of the congregation, or as one individual phrased it, 'gay girls don't like gay boys'. In heterosexual churches, male-female bonds often form the backbone for operation of church programs. In the gay world, however, the same-sex orientation and the gap between sexes seem firmly entrenched."³⁹

In spite of these objections, one does have to realistically acknowledge that in the recent past that a minority of "militant" gays are banding together. The Homophile Movement, the Gay Liberation Movement, and The New Alliance for Gay Equality are resultant from the "militant mood" that is still on the rise.⁴⁰ Today one may not be able to generalize that the majority of gays do not desire public attention.

Besides the previously examined generalizations about the behavior of gays, straights have also made generalizations about the mental attitudes of gays. One generalization is that all homosexuals have a fear of physical injury. This idea is supported by Dr. Storr in Sexual Deviation. There Storr writes: " ' an excessive fear of physical injury is more commonly found in male homosexuals than in heterosexuals.' "⁴¹ Churchill objects to Storr's assertion due to the fact that Storr did not document any research to support it. Plus, Churchill maintains that only Bieber's psychoanalytic research even closely represents the scientific evidence available to base this

³⁸

Oliver, p. 138 .

³⁹

Enroth and Jamison, p. 82 .

⁴⁰

LaHaye, p. 170 .

⁴¹

Churchill, p. 40 .

presupposition on. In Bieber's research, including his colleagues', this fear of physical injury was found to be characteristic of the majority of the 106 homosexual psychiatric patients examined. Churchill concludes his discussion of Storr's assertion with the reiteration that one cannot generalize about the homosexual community based on such limited supportive scientific research. 42

Another generalization that is made about gays is that they have an underlying fear of the opposite sex. Churchill describes this idea as being: "... that the 'homosexual' is an anxiety-ridden, shy person who, because he has some deep fear of the opposite sex, uses his homosexuality as a 'defense' against heterosexuality or as an 'escape' from it." 43 While Churchill agrees that this mental attitude may be true for certain individuals, he asserts that there is little statistical evidence to prove it common to all gays. If one agrees with the Kinsey heterosexual-homosexual continuum, one acknowledges that this is not true of those who are rated 1, 2, 3, and 4. These individuals are defined as ones who participate in heterosexual and homosexual activity in varying degrees. Even if one does not agree with the continuum, it is common knowledge that some gays marry, have children, and date the opposite sex in order to hide their sex preference. It is also known that some gays, especially males, "... may be involved in both heterosexual and homosexual activities in the same year, or in the same month or week, or even in the same day." 44 One is not able to make a valid generalization that gays have a great fear of the opposite sex.

Another generalization that straights make about gays is that gays have an insatiable desire for hasty, recurrent gratification of their homosexual

42
Churchill, p. 40.

43
Churchill, p. 44.

44
Ibid.

urges without any consideration of the end results. Many gays fear the loss of employment, the loss of reputation and the loss of personal dignity. Plus many gays fear entrapment by the police. Churchill claims that there is no evidence that can conclusively prove that this generalization is true of gays other than evidence from studies done with offenders of other laws of society. He implies that homosexuality does not necessarily make one an insatiable seeker of homosexual fulfillment. Churchill states:

"For every 'homosexual' observed on the prowl by the police or some other person 'in the know' there must be any number of others sitting alone in their rooms or searching for some means to sublimate their urges,... Those who manage to cope... and apparently they are in the vast majority--never come to the attention of the authorities or of other more promiscuous males."⁴⁵

Although Churchill is representative of most opinions in his denial of this generalization about gays, one observes the words, "must be" and "apparently", in the previous quote. These do not signify scientific data to support his objection. He appears to use one generalization to counteract another.⁴⁶

A lack of supportive data appears to be common to both homophobic reactions. These reactions manifest themselves in broad generalities about each other's point of view. Most homophobic responses center on the appearance, the life-style, and the mental attitude of gays. They also manifest themselves in the theories concerning the causes of homosexuality. In order to have a realistic perspective about gays, one needs to examine the theories of the origin of homosexuality, as well as the major generalizations about gays.

These theories of the origin of homosexuality can be divided into two categories. These categories are separated into those theories which suggest a causal origin of homosexuality and into those theories which suggest

⁴⁵

Churchill, p. 55.

⁴⁶

Churchill, pp. 54-55.

a learned origin of homosexuality. According to most resources, the congenital, causal theories are being abandoned in favor of the psychogenic and learned theories. Churchill describes the historical trends concerning homosexuality as follows:

"Thus, in the Dark Ages and during medieval times, when homosexuality was thought to be a supernatural state of mind, it was attributed to possession by devils... A few hundred years ago, when it was regarded a vice, it was attributed to depravity, excessive 'self-abuse', satiation, and the search for new sensations... Seventy years ago, when homosexuality was regarded as a form of moral and neurological degeneracy, the cause was attributed to the 'bad seed' of one's ancestors... Twenty-five years ago, when endocrinology was all the rage, homosexuality was thought to be a glandular disease... Today... homosexuality is regarded as an emotional ailment, and is attributed to complicated psychodynamic conflicts that arise during childhood."⁴⁷

Churchill reveals the progression of causal theories of the past (the supernatural, the depravity of mankind, heredity, and a physiological, bio-chemical imbalance) to the learned theories of the present (mental illness and a pathological childhood).

The causal theories which persist in some circles today are that homosexuality is the result of the depraved and perverse nature of man, that homosexuality is the result of an inherent, genetical structure, or that homosexuality is a biological abnormality. Churchill attributes the theory of homosexuality stemming from the perverse nature of mankind to the concept that the homosexual has a conscience devoid of a knowledge of the difference between right and wrong. Homosexuality was considered the natural end for those who had become unsatisfied with the scope of heterosexual experience in which they participated.⁴⁸

The second causal theory stems from the concept that homosexuality is inherited. Jamison states that this theory is proposed by the majority

⁴⁷

Churchill, p. 89.

⁴⁸

Churchill, p. 91.

49

of gays, including the gay church. Churchill claims that the persistence of this theory is due to a few clinicians and many male homosexuals who assume that they were born with the homosexual preference. When one examines the genetical sex research of today, Karlen states that the resulting evidence "... is overwhelming that the genes do not cause homosexuality." People have wondered for centuries how parents transmit traits to their children. It was assumed that the sex genes were responsible for one's homosexual or heterosexual preference. One study resulted in the conclusion that the presence of a male homosexual in a family was really a female whose bodily development had been reduced. This study when scientifically repeated was discredited by a lack of proof. Another study conducted by F.J. Kallmann resulted in the "twinship theory" which persists today. He concluded that identical twin males have a 100 per cent homosexual activity rate and are 86 per cent predominantly or exclusively homosexual. Kallmann's study has not been confirmed, although a number of scientific studies have been conducted. Kallmann did not show that the fathers or other male relatives of identical twins are homosexual which would be resultant if genetic causes were the determinant. In recent years, genetic research has proven that homosexuality is not consequence of a genetical defect. Karlen states that: "Genetics had shown that the idea of homosexuals as a 'third sex' did not hold; that in fact there is a genetic 'third sex', and its members are not markedly prone to homosexuality. The third sex that Karlen refers to are the males who are considered to be true genetic intersexuals and the females who are considered

49

Enroth and Jamison, p. 17.

50

Churchill, p. 92.

51

Arno Karlen, Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1971), p.337.

to be the closest to a human neuter. He concludes that many genetic variants have been found and that most individuals have a mosaic of genetic design in their sex chromosomes. A genetic variance in one's sex chromosome does not necessarily mean an individual is inherently homosexual as first was concluded
52
by geneticists.

The third causal theory of the origin of homosexuality is related to the previous theory, in that both theories involve the physiological make-up of the individual. The third theory is that homosexuality is caused by a glandular, bio-chemical imbalance. Most resources agree that there is no conclusive evidence that homosexuality is a hormonal, glandular disease. It was believed that homosexuality was the consequence of a biological-chemical imbalance, especially due to glandular secretions or lack of the proper ones. Male homosexuality was thought to be the result of a preponderance of female hormones (estrogens) and a lack of male hormones (androgens). The falibility of this theory was made obvious when the treatment of these homosexuals by injections of hormones only served to increase their sexual drives and their desire for homosexual contacts. LaHaye on page 63 states that some tests concerning the hormonal level in male homosexuals have resulted in the disclosure that usually the hormonal balance in homosexual males is the same as in heterosexual males. Plus, LaHaye states that sometimes the male hormonal level is higher in homosexuals than in heterosexuals. LaHaye concludes as many others have that homosexuality is not caused by a glandular, hormonal imbalance. Instead of a congenital origin of homosexuality LaHaye supports
53
the theory that homosexuality has a psychogenic origin.

This theory involves the belief that homosexuality is learned rather than caused. LaHaye states that one can develop a predisposition towards homosexuality without becoming a homosexual. This is in keeping with his definition

52

Karlen, p. 337-345.

53

LaHaye, p. 63 .

that it is continued homosexual activity that makes one a homosexual. LaHaye uses the following chart from page 75 to denote the development of a predisposition towards homosexuality:

THE COMPONENTS FOR DEVELOPING
A HOMOSEXUAL DISPOSITION

Melancholy Temperament

+

Permissive Childhood
Training

+

Insecurity
about Sexual Identity

+

Childhood
Sexual Experiences

+

Early Interest
In Sex

+

Youthful Masturbator
and Sexual Fantasizer

A Predisposition toward Homosexuality

LaHaye identifies the term "melancholy temperament" as: "... the sensitive, introvert-perfectionist." This temperament is one of four possible inherited temperaments that influence an individual's learned behavior. LaHaye maintains that these temperaments were first proposed by Hippocrates 2400 years ago. LaHaye states that he is not attempting to brand all melancholics as gays, rather he claims to have observed a primary or secondary melancholy tempera-

in all gay clients.

LaHaye continued his theory that homosexuality is learned by developing a chart on page 91 which builds upon one's disposition towards a gay lifestyle as the foundation for the development of a homosexual. The chart is as follows:

THE FORMULA FOR
PRODUCING A HOMOSEXUAL

+

A Predisposition
Toward Homosexuality

+

That First
Homosexual Experience

+

Pleasurable and Positive
Homosexual Thoughts

+

More Homosexual
Experiences

+

More Pleasurable
Thoughts

A Homosexual

LaHaye emphasizes that one may skip the predisposition level and still become homosexual. This is due to the development of a cyclical behavior that becomes more habitual as it is experienced.

55

One of the influences which contributes to the theory that homosexuality is learned is the patterns which are common in the homosexual's childhood.

The Switzers list the nine following family influences which are thought to contribute to an individual's learned sex preference:

- "1. A powerful mother figure who is both feared and needed and a father who is passive and ineffectual, often absent.
2. An overprotective mother who is possessive and controlling with a father figure who is controlled and withdrawn.
3. A hostile, aggressive, rejecting father with a seductive but sexually inhibited mother who needs the attention and dependence of her son for her own self-worth.
4. Both parents passive, overprotective, and afraid of aggression.
5. Both parents critical, demanding, aggressive, perfectionistic.
6. Consistent devaluation or idealization of either men or women generally, often by a single parent, either in an intact family or a divorced person.
7. Sibling rivalry in which one child is consistently dominated and his or her sexuality is devalued.
8. Seduction or erotic exploitation during childhood by an older sibling, parent, or other extended family member over a period of time. This can be the same or opposite sex family members.
9. An all-female-dominated environment with emasculating behavior. The entire locus of power in females is seen as possibly causative for both males and female homosexuals."⁵⁶

The importance of family dynamics and their influence on an individual's sex preference has manifested itself in psychological explanations of homosexuality in clinical literature and research. One such study and report was made by Bieber and others in relation to their work and therapy of 106 homosexual patients. They concluded that the homosexual patients were victims of the psycho-pathology of their mothers and fathers.⁵⁷ This conclusion is often used as an excuse for gayness which alleviates any personal responsibility for sexual preference.

Another theory which denies the personal responsibility of the homosexual is the belief that homosexuality is a mental illness. In times past, most studies of homosexuals have been done of psychiatric patients. Deep-seated emotional conflicts are characteristic of both heterosexual and

⁵⁶

Switzer, p. 80 .

⁵⁷

Churchill p. 94 .

homosexual psychiatric patients. Most sources agree that medical and psychiatric literature should remove the label of "mental illness" from homosexuality. However, they do not deny that severe emotional stress accompanies the decision to transfer from heterosexual to homosexual behavior.

The concept of a transference or transition between heterosexual and homosexual tendencies lends to a theory that homosexuality is learned and therefore a matter of choice. Oberholzer observes that this transition can be traced to four areas where choices must be made. He lists these on page 29 as being:

- "1) the interpretation of one's identity,
- 2) the interpretation of one's values and interest,
- 3) the interpretation of one's intended and completed action, and
- 4) the interpretation of one's situation in relation to others."

It is inferred that if an individual learns the proper pattern of interpretation of one's sexuality then heterosexual preferences (choices) will be made instead of homosexual preferences. This is based on the presupposition that individuals know which sex they are but prefer homosexual activity over heterosexual activity. However it lacks conclusive, supportive data.

Just as there was a lack of scientific data to support the broad generalities concerning homosexuality, there also appears a lack of scientific data which conclusively supports one theory of the origin of homosexuality over another. Most sources of the present day emphasize the psychogenic, learned choice theory lending it their verbal and written support. Even gays who once emphasized the congenital theory, now speak out for the "choice" theory. This may be due to the present push to make homosexuality palatable and a normal choice response rather than an illness or physical abnormality. 58

It will be note-worthy in the future to examine further scientific research

Causes

data which will expand the present knowledge of the real causes of homosexuality and the true patterns of the life-style of the homosexual.

Chapter Three

"WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?"

If one concurs with popular opinion that homosexuality is psychogenic, a learned sexual persuasion, then one must distinguish between what should be considered a "natural" and an "unnatural" sexual persuasion. Most sources include either a reaction to Biblical texts or a reaction to interpretations of Biblical texts when attempting to support their presuppositions concerning the appropriateness or lack of appropriateness of a homosexual persuasion. Since the Bible appears worthy of examination by other sources on this subject, one would be wise to consider the Biblical texts and interpretations of those texts before forming one's own opinion about the naturalness or unnaturalness of the homosexual persuasion. Based on my personal examination of the implications of the Biblical texts, I propose that homosexuality is unnatural and therefore sinful. Thus I would not support homosexuality as an appropriate, alternative sexual preference.

Homosexuality is a Latin word which was introduced in later translations of the Bible. There are only a few texts which refer to what would be described as "homosexual" behavior. The silence of the Bible seems to magnify the few texts which do explicitly consider homosexual behavior to be unnatural and inappropriate sexual behavior. Instead of becoming involved in idle speculation concerning this silence, one needs to examine the form in which the available Biblical texts have been transmitted. Plus, one needs to critically examine the interpretations of each passage. All scripture texts referred to will be from The Open Bible: The New American Standard Translation of 1977.

Genesis 19:1-11

Genesis 19:1-11 is the Biblical text which is the most controversial. It is the account of the angels' visit with Lot at Sodom and Gomorrah. The angels in the form of men were hospitably received by Lot; however the male population of the town demanded that Lot surrender the angels to them that they might "know" them. The male population rejected Lot's offer of his virgin daughters and were intending to turn on Lot, when the angels pulled Lot back into the house. The angels then struck the male population with blindness which resulted in such confusion that they could not find the door of Lot's house.

It is generally agreed that this account has traditionally been interpreted by biblical scholars as being related to homosexuality. Skinner, in The International Critical Commentary on Genesis emphasizes that all the men of Sodom were involved in the attack on Lot's house. He interprets this emphasis as representative of the widespread moral corruption of the Sodomites. Skinner also notes that the intention of the Sodomite males was unnatural and a sign of the depth of their moral corruption. Skinner also makes reference to Lot's hospitable gestures concerning the angels. One can't help but wonder if Lot was passing through a test which would determine whether he had become morally corrupt like the Sodomite males. If it was a test, Lot like Abraham was willing to sacrifice even his own children in order to be obedient to what he considered to be the will of God. Lot obviously thought that the sacrifice of his female children was preferable to the sacrifice of the angels.

60

There are a couple of reasons which may have contributed to Lot's decision to offer his daughters to the Sodomites. One reason may have been that Lot felt that the sacrifice of his daughters was the lesser of two evils. Simpson notes that an unmarried daughter was considered the property of her

father similar to the married woman being considered the property of her husband. Another reason may have been that as a host he was under "sacred obligation" to protect his guests. One wonders if Lot would have then offered himself had the visitors not intervened. Simpson and Skinner not only emphasize Lot's offer to sacrifice his daughters for the angels, but they also emphasize the unnaturalness of the male Sodomites' intention, the depth of moral corruption in Sodom, and the impending judgement due to the moral corruption of the Sodomites.⁶¹

In contrast to this traditional view one finds those who would propose a modern view. Scanzoni and Mollenkott are representative of one of the modern views concerning the interpretation of this incident. They propose on page 57 "... that rather than concentrating on homosexuality, the Sodom story seems to be focusing on two specific evils: (1) violent gang rape and (2) inhospitality to the stranger." It is their premise that the male population was not exclusively homosexual, but rather that these males were perverted heterosexuals who were intending sexual assault rather than consensual gay activity. Depending upon one's definition, this could have been considered a homosexual act in spite of whether either party considers themselves to be gay or whether they are exclusively gay. If homosexuality is sexual activity between like-sexed individuals, then the major theme of this Sodom account could have been the intent to commit a homosexual act.⁶²

Insofar as the inhospitality theory is concerned, both McNeill and Boswell support it as the major theme of the Sodom passage. Boswell on page 93 lists the four following themes as possibly supportable from the Genesis

61

George A. Buttrick, ed. The Interpreter's Bible, Volume I (New York Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), pp. 626-630.

62

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, pp. 55-58.

nineteen account:

- (1) the Sodomites were destroyed for the general wickedness which has prompted the Lord to send angels to the city to investigate in the first place;
- (2) the city was destroyed because the people of Sodom had tried to rape the angels;
- (3) the city was destroyed because the men of Sodom had tried to engage in homosexual intercourse with the angels...
- (4) the city was destroyed for inhospitable treatment of visitors sent from the Lord."--

The second theme is a reference to heterosexuals performing gang rape as an attempt to degrade the angelic beings. The third theme refers to a homosexual rape motivation rather than a heterosexual rape motivation. Boswell supports the fourth theme: that Lot transgressed the custom of Sodom by entertaining the strangers without official permission of the "town fathers".

McNeill acknowledges that there is a suggestion of intended sexual mistreatment of the strangers in the Hebrew term "yādha" which is used in verse seven where Lot offers his virgin daughters in place of the strangers. McNeill states that this term "clearly and unambiguously implies sexual knowledge..." McNeill concludes, however, with the suggestion that instead of the word "know" having one meaning in this passage, that in reality it has two meanings: the meaning of hospitality in regards to the angels and the meaning of sexual intercourse in regards to Lot's daughters.

63

Both McNeill and Boswell support their theory of inhospitality with scriptures which talk of the fall of Sodom and Gomorrah. It is interesting to note that both refer to Jesus' statement in Luke 10:10-13. Jesus makes a reference to the fact that the towns which reject the disciples will be judged more severely than Sodom. When one considers this passage in light of the surrounding context in chapter ten, one concludes that inhospitality was only one reason for such a harsh judgement. The main reason for the judgement being so severe appears to be because of the city's rejection of God's message of

righteousness which includes his design for expression of one's sexuality. The lack of proper hermeneutical approach to Scripture makes one wonder if Boswell and McNeill are guilty of not examining this passage personally. In contrast to Boswell and McNeill who support Scanzoni and Mollenkott's theory of inhospitality is Lovelace.

Lovelace critically examined the proposals of Mollenkott and Scanzoni. His conclusion is that the argument of inhospitality is unreliable and that the argument of exclusive heterosexual rape is unconvincing. Lovelace asserts on page 101 that there are at least three other portions of Scripture which "... reinforce the conclusion that homosexual practice was part of the pattern of sin which brought down the judgement of God upon Sodom." The three supportive Scripture texts that Lovelace uses are Judges 19:1-30, II Peter 2:1-22, and Jude 3-23. The Jude passage is often dismissed as meaning that the Sodomites desired to rape the angels of God, because they were more desirable than a woman. One must remember that the Genesis 19 passage says that the angels were in the likeness of men. Lovelace concludes that the licentious behavior of the Sodomites, which included homosexual practice, was the main reason for Sodom's downfall. Once again, one has to remember the such a conclusion may be dependent upon one's definition of the practice of homosexuality being sexual activity between like-sexed individuals.

64

Both Gangel and Oswalt are supportive of Lovelace's conclusion that homosexuality was one of the practices of sin for which Sodom was judged. Oswalt uses the same scriptural support as Lovelace. He also arrives at the same conclusion that it is essential to consider all scripture passages in context rather than isolating texts or words within a text. Gangel on pp. 64-74 makes a comparison of the parallel texts of Genesis 19 and Judges 19 accounts.

65

64

Richard Lovelace, Homosexuality and the Church (New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1978), pp. 98-102.

65

Keysor, pp.71-75.

He begins with establishing the historical, geographical and cultural settings. Gangel then compares the reasons for God's harsh judgement against both cities. On page 67 Gangel lists the five following comparisons:

- "1. Both Sodom and Gibeah were inhospitable cities.
2. The streets of both cities were unsafe.
3. The primary sin of both cities was the practice of homosexuality.
4. The homosexuals in both cities used the technique of gang rape.
5. The so-called righteous men of both cities were willing to substitute women to avoid what they considered to be the worse crime of homosexual relations."

He concludes with a comparative exegetical study of the passages. Although Lovelace, Oswalt, and Gangel arrive at the same conclusion, Gangel is suspect of committing the same error that he accuses his opponents of on page 68:

"Any denial of this simple fact can only be a result of premeditated prejudice." One must be careful not to fall in the same trap as one's opponent, especially if one desires an objective conclusion.

The term "Sodomite" originates from the Genesis 19 account. Boswell considers it to be mistranslated in the King James Version for the Hebrew term for temple prostitute. He asserts that this Hebrew term in no way implies homosexual practices. He also states very emphatically that there is only minimal evidence in history that such practices might have taken place. Boswell claims that the mistranslation of "kadesh", meaning temple prostitute, goes back to the earliest translations of the Septuagint into Greek. He states that six different Greek words were needed in order to translate this one Hebrew term. Boswell proposes that although the mistranslation can be traced back to the Septuagint, it was only after the mistranslation of "Sodomite" into English that passages which contained the term were used as supportive evidence for the condemnation of gay behavior.

66

Oswalt presents a limited explanation of the term "Sodomite" which is

in direct opposition to Boswell. He states on page 65 that "... it has been customary to see the strongly negative view of the Old Testament toward male cult prostitution as one more indication of the wrongness of homosexual behavior." Oswalt then interacts with Derrek Bailey who is aligned with Boswell's perspective. In discussing the translation of the Hebrew term Oswalt suggests that the reason for the different Greek terms being used to explain one Hebrew term was the desire for the most literal translation possible. Oswalt states on page 65 that these variant terms do not deny the gay connotations and one of them translates as " ' one who changed his nature.' " Oswalt concludes his explanation of the term Sodomite and its relationship to male cult prostitution on page 66 as follows: "... while the Hebrew word does not technically mean sodomite, there is every reason to believe that the functions of male cult prostitutes involved homosexual practices." Oswalt traces this homosexual implication back to Jerome's Latin Vulgate and references in the Greek Septua-
67
gint.

Unger in his Bible dictionary traces the homosexual implication of male cult prostitution to several geographical locations: Assyria, Babylonia, Phoenecia, Phrygia, and Syria. Unger states that Ashtaroth, the Greek Astarte, was its primary object of worship. Unger also notes that this term was specifically used in reference to the Galli, the priests of Cybele. Unger's explana-
68
tion of "sodomite" would tend to support Oswalt's conclusions.

Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13

Other Scripture passages in the Old Testament which refer to homosexual practices are found in the Levitical law. Both Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 explicitly judge homosexual behavior as an abomination. These are often

67

Boswell, pp. 100-104.

68

Merrill F. Unger, Unger's Bible Dictionary (Illinois: Moody Press, 1957), p. 1035.

dismissed as being only culturally relevant to the Israelites.

Micklem in *The Interpreter's Bible* states that many countries have
69 considered homosexual behavior as unnatural and inappropriate behavior.

Guindon would agree with Micklem. He aligns himself also with Marvin Opler who said: "'Homosexuality in practically all cultures is regarded as a devia-
70 tion from the majority values and norms of conducts'..." Often the Greeks

are used as an example of a "civilized" people who permitted homosexuality.

Guindon denies that the Greeks practice of homosexuality was accepted as an alternative sexual orientation. Even the practice of pederasty, the most common

✓ type of homosexuality practice by the Greeks is revealed through its own

definition as unacceptable. Guindon notes that the Greeks referred to pederasty

"... in terms meaning 'a dishonor', 'an outrage', 'a shameful act', 'an in-
71 famous conduct', 'an impurity', 'a despicable habit'." It is Guindon's conclus-

sion that the Greek example of homosexuality was not a universally accepted
72 cultural distinctive.

In opposition to Guindon, Boswell considers homosexuality as universally accepted with the exception of the Israelites. Boswell interprets the 18:22 passage as one of a list of distinctives which are given in order to keep the Jews' culture separate from the Pagans' culture which surrounded them. The passage in chapter 20 is parallel to 18. Boswell notes that these passages link homosexual behavior with idolatrous behavior. He therefore concludes that homosexual behavior is prohibited for the Jew in order that he might be culturally distinct and because it was related to idolatrous behavior and a

69

Buttrick, p. 103 .

70

Andre Guindon, The Sexual Language: An Essay in Moral Theology (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977), p. 326 .

71

Guindon, p. 328 .

72

Guindon, pp. 325-330 .

transgression of ceremonial law. It was not prohibited because it was inherently evil. Boswell misses the point that the Jews were called to be a distinctively "holy" people. This passage is considered a part of the "holiness code" which was to be taught to the people. The theme of holiness is characteristic of the Old and New Testaments.

73

It is Boswell's presupposition that the New Testament has voided the cultural distinctives and ceremonial laws of the Old Testament; therefore the prohibition of gay practices would also be voided. It is also Boswell's opinion that the creation account in Genesis and the total emphasis on heterosexual marriages throughout Scripture do not imply an anti-gay persuasion. He dismisses the creation-procreation assumption as insupportable of exclusively heterosexual relationships for two reasons. First there has been no strong argument in its favor. Secondly, there is no need to talk of gay relationships in an account which relates the procreation story where heterosexuality would be the focus.

74

Lovelace presents an organized, viable discussion on these Levitical passages with a conclusion directly opposite of Boswell. It is Lovelace's opinion that these passages forbid homosexual behavior and that they are applicable for the modern Christian. This opinion is evidenced by Lovelace's interaction with the three main arguments for Boswell's position. The first interaction is over the concept that gay practices are taboo as a cultural distinctive for Jews. Using Hebrews, Lovelace suggests that the ritual and religious practices of the Jews were but a foreshadowing of what God intended to do through Christ and of what God intended for in the life of Christians. The Jews were to be an example to their pagan neighbors of the True God's will and desire

73

Boswell, pp. 100-104.

74

Ibid.

75

for mankind.

The second interaction is over the explanation of why these acts are forbidden. Rather than being limited into a particular historical context, Lovelace contends on page 89 that the main theme of both Levitical passages is "... the warning against God's people gradually becoming used to the depravity of surrounding cultures and finally legitimizing and adopting their practices." Lovelace does agree that there is one act in these passages which should be considered cultic or symbolic. This is the act of intercourse between male and female during menstruation. He contends that since gay practices are included in the context of adultery, bestiality, and child sacrifice that gay behavior should not be considered just a cultural distinctive.⁷⁶

The third area of interaction is over the relevance of these Levitical passages in light of the premise that Christians are free from the Law. Lovelace is of the opinion that Christ's coming did not void the Law, but that the Law and the culture of Israel were appropriate during Israel's infancy due to their provision of security and protection from the defilement of the liberal, neighboring cultures. Lovelace asserts that some of the Old Testament Law is still endorsed by the Holy Spirit as signs of God's will for the religious and moral behavior of believers. He acknowledges that some will challenge this assertion. To answer this challenge he suggests, on page 90, two objective methods of determining which of the Levitical laws still point to God's will: "... the severity of the penalty assigned by God, and the repeated endorsement of the New Testament." Lovelace's second "objective" criteria, the endorsement of the New Testament, will be challenged for there are those who offer an interpretation of the New Testament passages on homosexual behavior contrary to

⁷⁵

Lovelace, pp. 87-88.

⁷⁶

Lovelace, pp. 88-89.

Lovelace's interpretation.

Romans 1:24-28

The first New Testament passage that one finds referring to homosexuality is found in Romans 1:24-28. Sanday and Headlam in The International Critical Commentary emphasize that the homosexuality mentioned here is one of several forms of moral corruption. This moral corruption is a result of the idolatrous nature of men who want to have their own way. Sanday and Headlam note that God's punishment for the defector is the natural consequence of one evil leading to another.⁷⁸

John Knox in The Interpreter's Bible emphasizes this point also. He states that God does not directly intervene with offenders of his moral law, but allows the natural results of their offenses to become their punishment. Knox notes that the offender not only faces the results of the present offense, but finds oneself vulnerable to the next opportunity. Knox separates these offenses into two types, those of uncleanness (such as homosexuality) and those of social corruption. These are considered as natural offenses for the one who reverses the place of the creature and the creator. Therefore Knox would conclude that homosexuality is a sign of an idolatrous spirit. Plus Knox would define it as an unclean and dishonorable sexual orientation. Therefore,⁷⁹ this passage would denote that homosexuality is a sin.

Lovelace is also of the opinion that this text is proof of the sinfulness of homosexual activity. He also concludes that the desire for such a relationship is sinful due to Paul's description of these desires as being "dishonorable". Lovelace maintains that homosexuality and lesbianism are included in

77

Lovelace, pp. 89-90.

78

William Sanday and Arthur Headlam, The International Critical Commentary: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903), p. 45.

79

George A. Buttrick, Ed., The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. IX (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952), pp. 400-401.

the Romans list because they are signals to denote that reason and nature have been transgressed. He does not consider "nature" to be the "natural orientation" of an individual. Lovelace describes nature on page 92 as being "...God's intention for human sexual behavior which is plainly visible in nature, in the complementary function of male and female sexual organs and temperaments." Lovelace also interacts with the idea that Paul is only condemning perverse heterosexual behavior, but not exclusive homosexual practices. Lovelace argues that if proper exegesis is applied to Romans 1, then one must logically conclude that the theme of the text is that homosexuality is the result of rejecting God and His will.⁸⁰

Besides presenting his opinions about the text, Lovelace examines the opposing perspectives on the text. One of these views is that the term, "nature", is the same as "custom" as in I Corinthians 11:14,15. This would remove from gay practices the sting of being considered only worthy of condemnation. Instead Paul would just be reprimanding individuals for committing acts forbidden to Jews. Lovelace disagrees with this explanation based on the placement of homosexuality, "sexual inversion", at the top of the list of moral transgressions of God's will and based on the harshness of Paul's language.⁸¹

Another view that Lovelace makes a focal point is the idea that only idolatrous homosexual practices are being considered in this Romans text. Lovelace states on page 93 that "... this is an overliteral and individualistic reading of the text". It is his opinion that the homosexuality in this text is not necessarily idolatrous, but rather a result of the moral decay of an idolatrous society. Continuing along the theme of idolatry, Lovelace discusses the theory that this text could be referring to those who make a deliberate,

⁸⁰

Lovelace, pp. 91-92.

⁸¹

Lovelace, p. 93.

volitional choice to practice idolatry and uncleanness. Due to his presupposition that homosexuality is a result of a psychopathological childhood, he concludes that no conscious, voluntary decision is made. Lovelace contends that all human sexuality is depraved due to original sin and the idolatrous nature of a morally decadent society.

82

One final interpretation of this Romans text that Lovelace disagrees with is the emphasis that this passage is speaking about perverse gays rather than about the responsible, Christian gay. Lovelace is weak in his critique of this suggested interpretation. He would say that gay believers is a contradiction of terms. Lovelace is of the opinion that gay believers do not focus on Christ as their salvation; instead they focus on the freedom they have found by recognizing the "goodness" of their sexual orientation. Lovelace also implies that gay believers have seared consciences due to their abandonment of sexual acts which are contrary to God's revealed will. Therefore they would experience pseudo-freedom due to their lack of conscience.

83

Gangel agrees with the implication that homosexuals have a seared conscience. He contends that homosexuality is a transgression of the heterosexual norm that is God's will. Gangel does not consider any form of homosexuality to be legitimate, acceptable sexual behavior. After a lengthy discussion, he concludes that heterosexuality is the Biblical norm and that the violation of that norm by homosexuality is due to the depraved nature of mankind.

84

Both Gangel and Greenlee stress in this Romans passage the terms "leaving", "changing", and "God gave them over". These terms are used as support for their premise that homosexuality is a violation of the heterosexual norm.

82

Lovelace, pp. 93-94.

83

Lovelace, pp. 94-95.

84

Gangel, pp. 89-94.

It is Greenlee's opinion that the inclusion of the term akatharsia, meaning uncleanness, brings a connotation of sexual immorality to the interpretation of the text. Greenlee concludes his discussion of this Romans 1 text by labelling all homosexual acts as immoral and by labelling all heterosexual acts out of marriage as immoral.

85

Basically, Greenlee, Gangel and Lovelace represent the anti-gay interpretation of the Romans text; whereas Mollenkott, Scanzoni and Boswell represent the pro-gay interpretation. There are three key points that Mollenkott and Scanzoni emphasize. The first point surrounds the idea that the passage could not be talking about a "sincere" gay Christian; instead it would have to be describing a perverse, idolatrous homosexual. They use the terms "lust", and "unnaturalness", and the concept of the rejection of the knowledge of God to support such a conclusion. Mollenkott and Scanzoni presuppose that gays can experience the same kind of love, "oneness", as straights do.

86

This presupposition brings one to the second point that Mollenkott and Scanzoni discuss. This point emphasizes that this passage does not prove that homosexual love is unnatural. From their exegetical study of the passage, they support the opinion that when Paul uses the term "against nature" he is referring either to the accepted social customs of the Greek and Roman culture or to the violation of Jewish customs and law. Mollenkott and Scanzoni reject the premise that heterosexuality is the norm for human sexuality. This rejection is based on a two part presentation. First they present the fallacies of the inconsistent stance on the part of some Christian straights who make a distinction that only homosexual acts are sinful, not a homosexual orientation. Secondly, they present the fallacy of the stance that homosexuality is a

 85

Keysor, pp. 104-106.

86

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, pp. 61-63.

transgression of "nature" by reference to documented evidence of homosexual behavior amongst animals and seagulls.

The third point that Mollenkott and Scanzoni discuss is their conclusion that this Romans passage in reality refers to the perverse heterosexual. They propose that here the straight individual has not only turned from God, but also from the opposite sex to indulge in gay behavior which is not natural. They state that the homosexuality that took place during Paul's day was usually adultery where men turned from their wives to male prostitutes and lovers. Therefore, if this passage speaks of homosexuality, Scanzoni and Mollenkott would say that it is not speaking of sincere gay behavior but of perverse, ⁸⁷unnatural gay behavior.

Boswell agrees with both Scanzoni's and Mollenkott's presupposition that homosexuality is a natural orientation for some people. Boswell also agrees with their interpretation of this text. Boswell states that in this passage Paul is condemning homosexual acts that heterosexuals have committed. Since this is unnatural for the heterosexual, it is condemned. On the other hand it does condemn the homosexual whose orientation is natural. Although Boswell's presuppositions and conclusions are contrary to the conservative, anti-gay presuppositions and conclusions, he recognizes the validity of the ⁸⁸translation of this passage. Boswell disagrees with the translation of the two other New Testament texts which are usually used to indicate the sinful nature of homosexuality.

I Corinthians 6:9 and I Timothy 1:10

These passages are I Corinthians 6:9 and I Timothy 1:10. The dissension arises over the traditional translation of the words malakoi and

⁸⁷

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, pp. 65-66

⁸⁸

Boswell, pp. 107-110

arsenokoitai. Gangel presents the traditional translation of malakoi as being "soft" and "weak" with the implication of effeminacy, morally loose behavior and the practice of pederasty which is the willingness of males to participate in homosexual behavior. This term is usually used in reference to the passive participant in homosexual activity.⁸⁹

Greenlee as well as Gangel accepts the traditional translation of malakoi. Greenlee bases his support on the same authority as Gangel -- Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Greenlee presents a fuller picture of the traditional translation of this term. He suggests that malakoi had homosexual connotations throughout the first three Christian centuries: "... from the Hibe Papyri of the late B.C. and early A.D. period, and from the writings of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Dio Chrysostom, Vattius Valens, and Dogenes Laertius..." Greenlee translates malakoi as male prostitutes who allow themselves to be misused sexually. Greenlee concludes that the theme of the I Corinthians 6:9 passage in which this word is found is that liberation by Christ is possible for those who commit the sins listed in the passage, including malakoi.⁹⁰

Lovelace would agree with Greenlee's conclusion concerning the theme of I Corinthians 6:9. Lovelace contends that practicing homosexuals not only lack of liberation of Christ but also that they are unregenerate souls who are denied entrance into the Kingdom of God. In making his point Lovelace presents Scanzoni and Mollenkott as implying that one should not take the list of unrighteous behavior in this passage seriously. Upon examination of Scanzoni and Mollenkott one has to disagree with the accuracy of Lovelace's presentation.⁹¹

⁸⁹

Boswell, pp. 106-107.

⁹⁰

Gangel, pp. 99-100.

⁹¹

Lovelace, p. 96.

When one takes Scanzoni's and Mollenkott's discussion of the list of unrighteous behavior and the nature of unrighteous behavior out of the context of their total presentation, it is easily misconstrued. Scanzoni and Mollenkott present the overlying theme of this Corinthian passage to be that all unrighteous behavior separates one from the kingdom of God. They define the homosexual behavior here to be those acts which are perverse and unnatural to the homosexual's "natural" orientation. They clearly state their position on page 71:

"After conversion, just as the heterosexual has the old ego-nature to contend with, so does the homosexual convert retain the old ego-nature. Therefore, homosexuals must certainly learn to cease from unloving abuses of sexuality, as heterosexuals must; and all of us must struggle against idolatry and other manifestations of the ego-nature. But Paul is telling us that all unrighteousness or wickedness or ego-centeredness separates us from God;s presence and that inclusion comes only through acceptance of God's grace, 'by the Spirit of our God.'"

Scanzoni and Mollenkott also suggest in this statement that one becomes free from the bondage of unrighteous behavior, but that one does not become incapable of sin. Scanzoni and Mollenkott do not conclude that one should not take unrighteous behavior seriously. The issue that Lovelace could have more accurately interacted with that is contrary to his position is their concept that only perverse, deplorable same-sex behavior is unrighteous.⁹²

Although Lovelace doesn't take issue with Scanzoni and Mollenkott over this position, he does take issue with Boswell and McNeill over it. He notes Boswell's contention that the early church did not use malakoi as supportive evidence against homosexuality. Lovelace also makes reference to the fact that Boswell's work is unpublished at the time of his own work. This may be the reason that Lovelace inaccurately reiterates Boswell's translation of malakoi and arsenokoitai.⁹³

92

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, pp. 69-71.

93

Lovelace, p. 97.

Lovelace reports that Boswell translates these terms as "... those who are self-indulgent and homosexual prostitutes."⁹⁴ Boswell actually gives several possible translations for the term malakos. He eventually settled for a very broad meaning of "unrestraint" or "wanton" behavior, but in no way would he suggest that this term is applicable to homosexuals. Boswell states that malakos has traditionally been translated by the church as meaning masturbation until the twentieth century. Boswell concludes that the change from masturbation to homosexual-connotations was not due to a change in the moral stance of the church. It is Boswell's conclusion that malakos has historically⁹⁵ been mistranslated by the church.

Boswell also contends that the church has historically mistranslated the term arsenokoitai. He acknowledges that due to the rarity of this term's usage it is easy to understand why it might become linked with homosexuality. Boswell does not actually state what the proper translation of arsenokoitai should be. He only makes the passing comment that until the fourth century it had always been translated "male prostitute". It was after this that it became frequently associated with homosexuality. Boswell states that the most valid evidence asserts that arsenokoitai was not linked to homosexuality in the lifetime of Paul. Boswell would not agree with Lovelace's statement that⁹⁶ he (Boswell) translates arsenokoitai to mean homosexual prostitutes.

Lovelace dismisses both Boswell and McNeill's views as strictly a minority exegetical opinion. Although Lovelace alligns McNeill with Boswell, he does not interact specifically with his work. Instead Lovelace presents four other sources which translate arsenokoitai as having homosexual

⁹⁴

Lovelace, p. 97.

⁹⁵

Boswell, pp. 106-107.

⁹⁶

Boswell, p. 107.

connotations: Donald Williams, Bailey, Treese, and Gingrich. Lovelace agrees with Donald Williams in reference to the translation of arsenokoitai in I Corinthians 6:9 and I Timothy 1:8-10. Williams' translation is as follows:

"... 'While arsenokoitai by the sixth century may mean 'male prostitutes', here it certainly has a wider reference, 'male homosexuals, sodomites'--literally, 'male bedmates for males.'"⁹⁷ Arsenokoitas is associated with the aggressive male participant in homosexual acts. Lovelace considers his translation to⁹⁸ be in the majority opinion of exegetes.

Greenlee would also fit into this group. He maintains that the term arsenokoitai in the New Testament refers to males going to bed with males for sexual reasons. Greenlee traces the etymology of arsenokoitai back to arsen meaning 'a male' and koite meaning 'a bed'. The suffix implies the agent of an action. When Greenlee put it all together, he concluded that the term means "a male-bed-person". He contends that the term definitely denotes homosexuality.⁹⁹

Due to this opinion, Greenlee's translation is contrary to Boswell's. Greenlee interacts with Boswell's conclusion that arsenokoitai carries no connotation of homosexuality. Greenlee's chief point of dissention is over Boswell's apparent assumption that since the English term "homosexuality" originated at a late date, then the idea of homosexuality was either unknown or undistinguishable from heterosexuality. It is Greenlee's opinion that Boswell is accurate about the formation of the term "homosexuality". It is also Greenlee's contention that any lack of knowledge or distinction by early writers was due to the degrading, shameful, adominable nature of homosexual acts. Upon examination of Boswell's work of 1980, this appears a very minor

97

Lovelace, p. 97.

98

Ibid.

99

Keysor, pp. 97-101.

implication, if it can be read into his work at all. Greenlee appears to have been interacting with an article in a Methodist publication of 1975. This was written five years before his own work. By 1980 Boswell may have considered this line of thought no longer a point for major emphasis.

Greenlee and Boswell are two examples of the opposing thought when translating Biblical texts concerning homosexuality. In the anti-gay division one finds Gangel, Lovelace, and Greenlee. They appear to stress the following three points in their exegetical studies and interaction with opposing views: 1) that heterosexuality is the norm, 2) that homosexuality is unnatural, and therefore inappropriate, and 3) that all homosexuality is equated with sin. Facing this position is the pro-gay division where one finds Mollenkott, Scanzoni, and Boswell. They also stress three specific points in their exegetical studies and interaction with contradictory views. These points are as follows: 1) that homosexuality is a natural sexual orientation, and therefore appropriate, 2) that there are two kinds of homosexuality (the righteous and sincere versus the unrighteous and sinful), and 3) that biblical references to unnatural acts refer to heterosexuals who commit homosexual acts -- i.e. gang rape. It is doubtful that these two sides will ever agree. It is best to examine both positions carefully before agreeing with either position.

Chapter Four

"TO TREAT OR NOT TO TREAT?"

There are four basic responses offered to the homosexual in regards to treatment. The first response is that homosexuality is curable. This is achieved through psychotherapy and/or pastoral ministry. The second response is that homosexuality is incurable, but controllable. This is achieved through psychotherapy. The third response is that homosexuality should be prevented. This is achieved through education and laws. The fourth response is that homosexuality should not be cured, controlled or prevented. This is achieved through tolerance and open acceptance.

Curable

The response that homosexuality is curable implies a presupposition that homosexuality is not normal sexual behavior. It also implies that there is hope for the homosexual who desires to change. He is not doomed to a life of abnormal sexual expression and desires. The cure is seen as a change from the abnormal gay life to the normal straight life. Gross captures the essence of this presupposition in his description of the "cure":

"Cure may be taken to mean such a complete change in the patient's mode of living that he will as a result thereof, find his sexual satisfactions with women...behave in ways that commend themselves to the social order...gain proficiency and satisfaction from conventional modes of sexual activity....not only physical but also emotional gratification, and a sense of fulfillment...he hopes to be able to marry, have children and found a family."101

There are two means by which this cure is proclaimed successfully achievable.

The first means by which one can be cured of homosexuality is through psychotherapy. Gross describes the effectiveness of this means as follows:

"...it would appear that psychotherapy can successfully abort a homosexual way

101

Alfred A. Gross, Strangers in Our Midst: Problems of the Homosexual in American Society (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1962), p. 74.

of life and help the patient to make the changes whereby he can find sexual satisfaction in the socially approved ways of deriving it."¹⁰² Oliver would agree with Gross' conclusion, but he qualifies his conclusion by adding that certain conditions help to insure the successfulness of psychotherapy. One such condition is suggested by Ellis. This is that the homosexual must come willingly to the therapist's office, rather than as an involuntary rehabilitation effort forced on the individual. Ellis' condition of voluntarism on the gays part is Bergler's proposal that the acknowledgement by the homosexual that a cure is truly possible is a pre-requisite for effective therapy. Dr. Bergler lists the following eight prerequisites as insurance for successful therapy treatment for homosexuals:

- "(1) inner guilt feelings that can be put to therapeutic use,
- (2) voluntary acceptance of treatment,
- (3) not too extensive amount of self-damaging tendencies,
- (4) therapeutic preferability of reality to homosexual fantasy,
- (5) no real experience of complete psychic dependency upon the mother,
- (6) no persistence or reasons for maintaining homosexuality as a pseudo-aggressive weapon against the hated family,
- (7) no authoritative assertion of incurability,¹⁰³
- (8) the analyst's knowledge of newer therapeutic procedures."

Oliver agrees with Dr. Bergler that certain conditions do enhance the possibility of psychotherapy being a viable means of treatment for the homosexual.¹⁰⁴

The other means by which a cure is achieved for the homosexual is through the pastoral ministry. Gross sees the pastoral role towards homosexuals as being supportive, offering practical help, and initiating contact with gays -- such as in prison chaplaincy. The successfulness of the pastoral ministry to gays is dependent on the availability of the pastor and on the

¹⁰²

Gross, p. 75.

¹⁰³

Oliver, p. 146.

¹⁰⁴

Oliver, pp. 135-146.

receptivity of the ministry of reconciliation by the homosexual. Gross also implies that success is dependent on the genuineness of the church's ministry of reconciliation, of acceptance and incorporation of the homosexual into the church fellowship. Gross states that there are four ways in which the church can prove beneficial for the homosexual: through pastoral care, by public education about homosexuality, through meeting the crises of the homosexual life, and by providing an atmosphere conducive for healing and change to take place. Gross asserts that it is not the church's responsibility to approve homosexual conduct when it is offensive, but it is the church's responsibility to make every effort possible to help the willing, but handicapped gay become a socially and spiritually useful member of the body of the church.

105

In comparison to Gross' description of the church's ministry to the homosexual, Bahnsen takes a hard line approach. He proposes that the church has a three-fold ministry to the gay. First, he claims that it is the church's responsibility to teach the concept of God's judgement on the perversity of homosexuality by proclamation and exclusion of the unrepentent from the church body. Secondly, Bahnsen sees the church as responsible for announcing the transforming power of the gospel of God unto salvation, which is available even to the homosexual. At this point, one cannot help but wonder how long a homosexual will be receptive to such a church. One also wonders whether the church would even be offered an opportunity to live up to the third obligation that Bahnsen places at its door. The third responsibility of the church is to be supportive of the gay's transformed lifestyle.

106

Philpott's view of the pastoral ministry's role and the church's responsibilities tends to parallel Gross's view more than Bahnsen's. Philpott

105

Gross, pp. 119-124.

106

Bahnsen, p. 96.

suggests a four point message to the homosexual from the church. This message is the assurance of forgiveness, the fellowship of acceptance, the love of Christ, and the power of the Holy Spirit. Philpott considers this message essential for the church to have a viable, lasting ministry to the homosexuals.¹⁰⁷

Gangel presents a view of the essential pre-requisites for the successful ministry by the church to the homosexual which is similar to those previously mentioned, yet uniquely different, in his emphasis on the competency of the counselor. Gangel presents four pre-requisites:

- "1. Recognition that homosexuality is not genetically caused.
2. Repentance on the part of the homosexual.
3. Responsible counseling by a competent Christian. 108
4. Receptive Christians who practice acceptance and love."

Gangel places great emphasis on the need of a "competent Christian counselor". He highly recommends Adam's nouthetic counseling. Gangel also recommends Dolby's psychotherapy and Crabb's congregational approach. It is his premise that homosexuals can respond to therapy and eventually be cured.¹⁰⁹

McNeill surprisingly defines the goal of the clergyman-counselor's task similar to Gross. McNeill is a Catholic priest with a liberal interpretation of scripture. He supports tolerance and acceptance of those who cannot make a heterosexual adjustment. McNeill makes the following statement: "Practically all authorities agree that the first goal of counseling should be to guide the person with a homosexual problem to a heterosexual adjustment whenever possible."¹¹⁰ The surprise of McNeill's position is due to the fact

¹⁰⁷

Philpott, pp. 96-101.

¹⁰⁸

Gangel, pp. 165-167.

¹⁰⁹

Gangel, pp. 127, 162-168.

¹¹⁰

McNeill, p. 160.

that the previous sources who have agreed that homosexuality is curable through either counseling or pastoral ministry were all from the conservative, evangelical side of the Church.

With the McNeill's counseling goal in mind, the counselor should first discern whether the individual is truly homosexual or suffering from homophobia (pseudo-homosexual). McNeill agrees with Gross that the counselor/minister should be open to professional assistance and supervision if the counselor/minister's training is limited. McNeill recognizes that in some of the most serious cases which have unfavorable conditions there is a possibility that therapy will only provide improvement rather than a cure. McNeill attempts to stress the fact that a failure of therapy is not always due to a weak-willed individual. McNeill also cautions against advising the homosexual to live a life of total abstinence when therapy fails, unless the individual can undertake such a lifestyle without great suffering, guilt or mental disorders. McNeill does not intend to set therapy up to fail, for he contends that both therapy and pastoral ministry are avenues by which the homosexual can be
111
cured.

One final source that needs consideration is LaHaye's cure for homosexuality. Unlike McNeill, LaHaye is typical of previous conservative evangelicals. Contrary to McNeill, LaHaye places great stress on the will of the individual. Like Gangel and others, LaHaye is of the opinion that the homosexual will have to want to change. LaHaye extends the previously listing into eighteen steps that he considers necessary for a successful lifestyle change from homosexual to heterosexual. LaHaye's cure is as follows:

- "1) Accept Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.
- 2) Be continually controlled by the Holy Spirit.
- 3) Walk in the Spirit.
- 4) Face homosexuality as a sin and confess it.
- 5) Face and confess your basic anger problem."

- 6) Love and accept yourself.
- 7) Learn to control your mind.
- 8) Sincerely thank God for your sexuality.
- 9) Make absolutely no exceptions.
- 10) Avoid homosexual hangouts.
- 11) Become active in a Bible-teaching church.
- 12) Become active in a weekly Bible study.
- 13) Vigorously seek Christian companionship.
- 14) Find one or more intimate friends.
- 15) Give check-up privileges to one or more friends.
- 16) Believe God for an unlimited future.
- 17) Present your body formally to God.
- 18) Become a people-helper."¹¹²

Number nine is a reference to homosexual acts. LaHaye would disagree with McNeill that one should not advise a client to abstain from homosexual acts for any reason. Number fifteen refers to a people support group which holds the homosexual client responsible and accountable for their lifestyle. Number sixteen is a reference to the possibility that one might not become heterosexual. It deals with the idea that one might have to abstain from either homosexual or heterosexual activity, in light of the increasing rise of singleness in today's society. For LaHaye, the only cure for homosexuality is the total forsaking of its lifestyle. This is based on the premise that the homosexual lifestyle is an abnormal lifestyle.¹¹³

There are several presuppositions that appear common to the majority of sources who believe homosexuality to be curable. One presupposition is the heterosexual norm. Another is that homosexuality is a sin. Finally, the homosexual has to have some desire to change. The majority of these sources are anti-gay and are conservatively evangelical.

Control

In contrast to the previous response to homosexuals concerning treatment, this response negates the idea that homosexuality is curable. This

¹¹²

LaHaye, pp. 119-140.

¹¹³

LaHaye, pp. 119-142.

is based on the premise that homosexual behavior is controllable.

Doubts are raised as to whether homosexual behavior can become totally changed into a heterosexual behavior. The avenue which seems to have achieved the most success in controlling homosexual activity is through psychotherapy.

Westwood makes the most logical and organized presentation of the sources examined which fall into this school of response. He divides his presentation into three sections: self-suggestion, psychotherapy, and understanding and control. Westwood characterizes self-suggestion as acts of repression, sublimation, will-power, and resolution. The difficulty that he finds with repression is that instead of totally inhibiting the desires and impulses, it tends to heighten these now unconscious desires and impulses. Repression is usually the diagnosis for the sudden manifestation of homosexuality in the lifestyle of those who begin participating in gay activity for no apparent reason. Sublimation is also an unconscious process. This is the concept of diverting sexual activity into socially approved paths. The difficulty that Westwood finds with sublimation being the answer for the homosexual is that it tends to put the homosexual in the direct path of temptation. Westwood contends that the real difficulty lies not in self-suggestion, but in the fact that those who use self-suggestion are usually the ones who get caught. He states that these individuals usually find themselves at the mercy of the civil authorities and the rejection of society. ¹¹⁴

The second section that Westwood discusses as a possible avenue of controlling homosexual impulses is through psychotherapy. He makes several observations about the client in relationship to the success of controlling the client's homosexual behavior. Westwood considers that the experiences of the gay client influence the amount of control the client will achieve. He

suggests that the younger the client, the more hope there is of achieving control. Westwood also considers the eagerness of the client to control the homosexual behavior, the more chance there is of achieving it. Westwood considers the most difficult clients to treat are males with feminine characteristics. He judges this to be due to the influence of a female presence in the client's environment. His diagnosis would be to move the male client to a totally new environment, free of the old one. Westwood considers psychotherapy to be of value in teaching control to a gay client, although most of the factors influencing the gay orientation are beyond the control of the client.¹¹⁵

The third section that Westwood discusses is understanding and control. Westwood suggests using the ego as a controlling influence over the homosexual orientation. He implies that a weak ego accompanies a homosexual orientation. Psychotherapy is suggested as the proper shaping tool to conform the ego and to help the client understand himself. It is implied that acceptance of self will bring acceptance of sexual persuasion which will bring control. Westwood also makes reference to the possibility of using hormone injections to control the sexual drive. However, presently these are generally rejected as being of minimal help and outdated as a means of control. Westwood weakly concludes this argument with a summary statement that there is no specific cure for homosexuality.¹¹⁶

Churchill is of the same persuasion as Westwood. His opinion that homosexuality can only be controlled, but not cured is the premise on which he builds his theory of treatment for the homosexual. The goal of therapy is as follows:

¹¹⁵

Westwood, pp. 68-70.

¹¹⁶

Westwood, pp. 71-75.

"The treatment of the homosexual patient or any other patient, if it is to be worthwhile, must bring about a confrontation on the part of the individual with his attitudes toward sex and toward himself as a sexual being."¹¹⁷

Churchill's goal is to help the client to accept his sexuality. It is not to persuade the client to be either heterosexual or homosexual. It is the therapist's role to remain non-judgemental about homosexuality. Churchill considers it inhumane punishment to hold the hope of cure over the heads of gay clients. He states that some people are unable to change although they truly desire to do so. Churchill would say that control with the acknowledgement that reversals do happen is the most reliable treatment that psychotherapy can offer the homosexual client.¹¹⁸

Karlen also presents a discussion of the doubts concerning the possibility of cure. He interacts with the idea that the field of psychotherapy itself is suspect. Karlen suggests that most doubts are due to unrealistic expectations on the part of the client, to expense and availability of treatment, to ignorance of the therapy, and to behaviorist oriented therapists. Karlen maintains that most behavior can be explained in psychodynamical terms. He concludes that future studies will reveal the truth. For now he reiterates his position that psychotherapy offers the best means for the greatest degree of control for a homosexual, but he does not see it as a "cure-all" method.

Karpman would align himself with Karlen's conclusion. However, Karpman's own opinion is based on material dating 1938-1947. Karpman's own work was published in the 50's. This is not to say that the data is no longer valid, but that one must not rely on Karpman as sole support for a controlled homosexual orientation through psychotherapy. Karpman does make a note which refers to the credence that the U.S. Army gave to psychotherapy. When homosexual

¹¹⁷

Churchill, p. 252.

¹¹⁸

Churchill, pp. 252, 282-286.

activity was detected amongst the soldiers, a therapist was attached to the unit in an advisory role. With the recent court cases of homosexuals versus the Army, the present policies regarding homosexuals in the Army may have to be re-evaluated just as in society. Karpman does suggest that psychotherapy is the best option available for teaching homosexuals how to control their sexual orientation.¹¹⁹

Prevention

The third response to homosexuals in regards to treatment is the concept of prevention. This response is not to be considered an alternative treatment to the cure or control theories. It could accompany or parallel both of those theories. This is revealed in the fact that supporters of both the cure and control theories also support the idea that homosexuality should be prevented.

Churchill is of the opinion that prevention is the only treatment that is considered acceptable by our culture.¹²⁰ Both Churchill and Oliver stress the need to prevent pathological homosexuality through a change in the home environment.¹²¹ Westwood interacts extensively with the idea of prevention beginning at home. Westwood presupposes that there is a homosexual component in every individual. He concludes that since most psychosexual disturbances are traced to a child-parent relationship in early childhood, then prevention needs to begin at home. He proposes that an understanding of homosexuality should be taught to all parents. He considers education about homosexuality imperative for all professions which will influence the lives of other individuals in a developmental or teaching capacity, i.e. teachers,

¹¹⁹

Karpman, pp. 163-165.

¹²⁰

Churchill, p. 289.

¹²¹

Oliver, pp. 134-135.

physicians, and ministers. He also proposes that children should be taught sex education at the time that they begin manifesting inquisitive behavior or asking subtle questions about sex. A channel of communication needs to be kept open between parent(s) and child, so that the child will feel free to talk about sex and homosexuality with the parent(s). It is Westwood's contention that prevention of homosexuality can only effectively be done by the home environment.¹²²

A second area that Westwood interacts with as an obstacle to homosexuality is the law. He contends that it is a fallacy to consider the law an avenue of the prevention of gay orientation. Westwood's opinions are not new to the modern reader, but are minimal in comparison to the modern objections raised against the law being used as a preventive measure. Westwood considers laws pertaining to homosexuality to be out-dated, illogical, and unenforced.¹²³

It is Westwood's opinion that the existing laws are too ambiguous to be effective. Oliver agrees with Westwood that these laws are inconsistently enforced. Oliver notes that when the laws are enforced they result in a fee or the confinement of the individual rather than including some type of medical and psychiatric or psychological aid. This would not make the law a practical preventive measure, even for future acts. Oliver notes that the majority of cases where the law is actually enforced against sexually deviant behavior, including homosexuality, it is usually in regards to the involvement of a minor. It is Oliver's opinion that the laxity of law enforcement against homosexual acts is due to three things: the ambiguous wording of the charges, the sensational publicity of the prosecuted individual, and the lack

¹²²

Westwood, pp. 157-163.

¹²³

Westwood, pp. 164-171.

of rehabilitation offered the offender. Oliver concludes that our present
124
laws are inadequate and need to be changed.

In a discussion over possible future legal treatment for sex offenders, Oliver offers alternative views to the present "illogical" code of sex-offense laws. One view is espoused by Morris Ploscowe who proposes that laws prohibiting sexual deviant behavior should be re-classified into the following four categories:

- "1) heterosexual and homosexual acts in which force and violence are used to achieve sexual objectives,
- 2) heterosexual and homosexual acts involving children and adolescents,
- 3) heterosexual and homosexual acts which outrage public decency or give rise to public scandal, and
- 125
4) heterosexual and homosexual prostitution."

It is Oliver's opinion that the first two categories would apply to the most dangerous sex deviants. Besides the view that laws should be re-classified, Oliver suggests that psychiatric and psychological treatment of the individual should be mandatory. He concludes that the most dangerous sex deviants should be hospitalized rather than imprisoned. Both alternative views (reclassification of laws and mandatory psychiatric treatment) to our present laws are
126
based on the premise that our present system is inadequate and in need of change.

Although there is some truth in what Westwood says, Proctor presents an alternative view which is reluctant to change the present laws. Proctor admits that this is basically due to a fear that the lack of law or the generality of the language in laws might allow perverse homosexuals into positions

124

Oliver, pp. 205-212.

125

Oliver, pp. 214-215.

126

Ibid.

of authority over children. He also recognizes that most of the resistance to the changing of the present laws is initiated by the religious sector of society. Proctor contends that the future may likely reveal a lawful acceptance of homosexuals as a minority worthy of the same civil-rights protection that ethnic groups enjoy. Proctor does not conclude that the laws are a good preventative measure against homosexuality, but he calls for his readers to be aware of the future ramifications of totally discarding the present laws or indiscriminately changing terminology of the existing laws leaving loop holes
127
in the law due to ambiguity.

Tolerance/Acceptance

The fourth basic response to the idea of treatment for the homosexual is that a homosexual orientation does not need to be cured, controlled, or prevented. This view is in direct opposition to the three former responses. It calls for acceptance and toleration of the individual's normal homosexual orientation.

Scanzoni and Mollenkott propose that sincere, responsible gays should be accepted and allowed the same rights and freedoms of sincere, responsible straights. They recognize that the traditional church will have difficulty accepting such a proposal due to their traditional view of "God's Ideal for the Sexual Expression of Love." In Scanzoni and Mollenkott's chapter entitled "Proposing a Homosexual Christian Ethic," they present two alternative models for acceptable sexual behavior. These two models clearly and concisely depict the contrast between the traditional view and the proposed alternative view of the proper norm for sexual expression of love. The models also show the similarities between the traditional view and the proposed alternative view of the abuses of sexual expression. The models are on the following page.

MODEL I--The Traditional View¹²⁸God's Ideal for the Sexual
Expression of Love

Heterosexual, monogamous
marriage

Abuses

Fornication
Adultery
Promiscuity
Homosexuality

MODEL II--The Alternative View¹²⁹God's Ideal for the Sexual
Expression of Love

A covenantal heterosexual
relationship (marriage)

A covenantal homosexual
relationship(for persons
of homosexual orientation)

Abuses of God's Plan for
Human Sexuality for both
Heterosexual and Homosexual
Persons

Fornication(sex apart from
having entered the permanent,
committed, covenant relation-
ship)

Adultery(unfaithfulness to the
person to whom one is committed,
or causing another person to
be unfaithful to the one to
whom he or she is pledged)

Promiscuity(sex with a variety
of partners, casual sex based
on lust, exploitation of others,
etc.)

Where once the pastoral-counselor advice was abstinence from sexual activity,
the advise would now be for the homosexual to find a mature, compatable gay
with whom one could enter a covenantal relationship.

130

The call to accept a new view of covenantal sexual relationship, is
indicative of the support being asked of the traditional church. This is

¹²⁸

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, p. 123.

¹²⁹

Ibid.

¹³⁰

Scanzoni and Mollenkott, pp. 122-124.

based on the premise that homosexuals are not necessarily ethically irresponsible people. McNeill states that the only way that gays will accept help from the traditional church is if both themselves and their sexual persuasion is accepted by the church. If the church does not provide this environment gays will endeavor to form their own. McNeill quotes from the Weinberg and Williams Report:

"'Probably our most salient finding pertains to the beneficial effects (in terms of psychological adjustment) of a supportive environment--social relations with other homosexuals, their own institutions and publications.'" 131

The conclusion is that gays need a social and religious setting in which to realize their own "self-acceptance" as homosexuals. 132

Keane continues this theme that homosexuals should be accepted for who they are, rather than who someone else thinks they should be. It is Keane's opinion that gays are not personally responsible for their sexual orientation. He calls society to prove its acceptance of gays through insuring economical stability and "reasonable" legal treatment. Keane is in complete agreement with McNeill that the church is responsible for aiding the gay in developing a proper perspective of his or her responsibilities as one of God's people. This does not mean that one must become heterosexual in order to contribute one's gifts and talents to the work of the church or in order to participate in the sacraments or functions of the church. Keane also would agree with Scanzoni and Mollenkott's alternative view of a covenantal agreement between homosexual partners. He does designate that this covenantal agreement should not be called "marriage." This is due to the procreation aspect of heterosexual marriage. He does not offer a new term for this agreement, but insists that it should be considered "a viable union." It would be Keane's conclusion that this type of homosexual relationship

131

McNeill, p. 173.

132

McNeill, pp. 172-180.

should be accepted and not prevented.

The view that a "normal" homosexual orientation is a viable sexual preference that should be accepted is in direct contrast to the treatment proposed by the three previously discussed responses. The first response was that homosexuality is curable. This view implies that it should be cured. This view proposes that a cure can be achieved through pastoral counseling and/or psychotherapy. The second response was that not every homosexual can be cured, but that every homosexual can learn control. This view implies that the greatest degree of control should be the goal of therapy. This view proposes that control can be best achieved through psychotherapy. The third response was that homosexuality should be prevented. This view implies that control and/or a cure for the homosexual should be the goal of a counselor. This view proposes that prevention can be accomplished effectively through education and adequate laws.

CONCLUSION

Four basic issues related to homosexuality have been examined in this paper. The first issue concerned the vocabulary used in reference to homosexuality. Chapter one discussed the inconsistency of present definitions of homosexuality and the distinctive terminology used in reference to homosexuality. The first section of the chapter discussed four main positions concerning the definition of homosexuality. The first position defined homosexuality as sexual attraction to the same sex. The second position defined it as sexual activity with the same sex. The third position defined it as sexual attraction and/or sexual activity with the same sex. The last position defined it as degrees of sexual attraction and sexual activity with the same sex. The last section of the chapter presented four listings of terminology related to the homosexual orientation. The first list defined general terms used to "type" homosexuals. The second list defined specific terms used to "type" male and female homosexuals. The third list defined terminology which was strictly gay jargon which holds double meanings for the gays. The last list defined terms which are commonly found in a study of homosexuality, but are not necessarily common to the average heterosexual vocabulary. The study of the vocabulary that is used in reference to homosexuality is the beginning of developing a channel of communication with gays and an understanding of their lifestyle.

The second issue discussed lends to the formation of a realistic picture of homosexuality. The issue presented in chapter two focuses on the generalizations that are made about gays and on the theories as to the origin of homosexuality. This chapter is separated into two sections. The first section concerns specific generalizations about gays that are not characteristic of the majority of gays. The majority of these generalizations involve

misconceptions about the physical appearance, mannerisms, behavior and mental attitudes of gays. The last section of this chapter was a presentation of the two opposing schools which support either the view that homosexuality is caused or that it is learned. Some of the causal theories attribute the origin of homosexuality to the supernatural, the depravity of mankind, heredity, and a physiological, bio-chemical imbalance. The learned theories mainly attribute homosexuality to mental illness or a pathological childhood. From this study one realizes that one's basic presuppositions often affects one's philosophy, behavior, and attitudes towards other individuals and their philosophies, behaviors and attitudes.

The third issue discussed related to the support of one's presuppositions concerning homosexuality. This third chapter presented interpretations of five Biblical passages which are common to most discussion on homosexuality. These were located in Genesis 19:1-11, Leviticus 18:22, 20:13, Romans 1:24-28, I Corinthians 6:9, and I Timothy 1:10. Two conflicting schools of thought rise to the surface. One school concludes that homosexuality is unnatural and inappropriate behavior, that heterosexuality is the norm, and that all homosexuality is equated with sin. The other school concludes that homosexuality is a natural, appropriate sexual orientation, that there are two types of homosexuality like heterosexuality: righteous and unrighteous, and that Biblical references to unnatural acts refer to heterosexuals who commit homosexual acts in order to degrade their victim(s). Based on one's conclusions from scripture and one's presuppositions concerning homosexuality, then one has to determine how one will respond to homosexual friends and/or clients.

The fourth issue discussed in this paper focused on the four responses that are most often made toward gays in regards to possible treatment for their sexual persuasion. Two questions were implied in the fourth chapter. The first was related to whether treatment should be given to gays. The

second question was only relevant if the answer to the first question was positive. The second question was related to how treatment should be given. There were four areas of response to these questions. The first response was that homosexuality can and should be cured. This school of thought proposed that successful treatment can be achieved through psychotherapy and/or pastoral ministry. The second response was that homosexuality can only be controlled. It implies that treatment should be given. This school of thought proposed that control can be achieved through psychotherapy. The third response was that homosexuality should be prevented. It could parallel the first two responses. This school of thought proposes that prevention can be achieved through education and the law. The fourth response is that homosexuality should neither be cured, controlled, nor prevented. This response is in direct opposition to the previous three. This school of thought supports the concept that "gay is good". Some holding this view condemn "perverse" homosexual behavior. They propose that true homosexuality should be accepted and tolerated as a viable, alternative sexual orientation. These four responses to the issue of treatment give one an adequate background for understanding the struggle in society today between the "militant" gays who are attempting to change the laws and public opinion toward a more tolerant attitude of gays and the "militant" straights who are attempting to maintain the laws and public opinion which supports a restrictive, preventive attitude toward gays.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals

- Alexander, John F. "Homosexuality: It's Not That Clear." The Other Side. 14:6:8-16, June 1978.
- Angelino, Henry R., Reviewer. Masters, William H. and Virginia E. Johnson. Homosexuality in Perspective. Journal of Marriage and Family. 42:1: 228-230, February 1980.
- Banikiotes, Paul G. "Sex Role Orientation, Self Disclosure, and Gender-Related Perceptions." Journal of Counseling Psychology. 28:2:140-146, March 1981.
- Barnhouse, Ruth T. Homosexuality: A Symbolic Confusion. Rev. by Justin Miller. Journal of Religion and Health. 17:4:299, October 1978.
- _____. "Response to My Critics." Anglican Theological Review. 59:2:194-196.
- Braaten, Carl E. "Sex, Marriage and Clergy." Dialog. 18:3:169-175, Summer 1979.
- Charles, Guy. "The 'Gay Christian'?" LOGOS. 6:3:10-14, May/June 1976.
- Clark, Joan. "Coming Out: The Process and Its Price." Christianity and Crisis. 39:10:149-153, June 11, 1979.
- Clarkson, Margaret. "Singleness: His Share For Me." Christianity Today. 23:10:14-16, February 16, 1979.
- Conway, Jim. "Free to Be." HIS. 38:5:12-13, February 1978.
- _____. "'...I Think I'm Gay.'" HIS. 39:6:12-14, March 1979.
- Court, John H. and O.R. Johnston. "Psychosexuality: A Three Dimensional Model." Journal of Psychology and Theology. 6:2:90-97, Spring 1978.
- Cowles, H. Robert. "Gay: the Bible Calls It Sin." Wesleyan Advocate. 135: 20:13, October 10, 1977.
- Department of Army. "Ministry and Sexuality." Training Circular. pp. 1-24, January 1981.
- Farnsworth, Kirk E. "Christian Psychotherapy and the Culture of Professionalism." Journal of Psychology and Theology. 8:2:115-121, Summer 1980.
- Gobbel, A. Roger and Gertrude G. Gobbel. "Constructing Sexuality." Dialog. 18:3:186-192, Summer 1979.
- Hansen, John Wesley. "Homosexuality: A Conspiracy." Light and Life. 10:19: 6-8, 12.

- Hansen, Marty. "Love a Gay." The Other Side. 14:6:48-52, June 1978.
- Heath, L. Foster with Jeff Treder. "Addressing the Homosexual Rights Movement." The Alliance Witness. 115:14:8-10, July 9, 1980.
- Henken, Joel D. "Homosexuals and Heterosexuals: We Are All Apologists." Anglican Theological Review. 59:2:191-193, April 1977.
- Heyward, Carter. "Coming Out: Journey without Maps." Christianity and Crisis. 39:10:153-156, June 11, 1979.
- Hoksbergen, Alvin. "Is Anita Bryant Right?" HIS. 38:5:18-20, February 1978.
- "Homosexual ... and Christian." HIS. 38:5:1,2,4-7, February 1978.
- Hyde, Clark and Janet Shibley Hyde. "Homosexuality and the Theological Use of Social Science." Anglican Theological Review. 59:2:187-190, April 1977.
- Johnston, Robert K. "The Church and the Homosexual: Has Everything Now Been Said?" Crux. 15:4:10-13, December 1979.
- Jones, Alan W. "When Is a Homosexual Not a Homosexual?" Anglican Theological Review. 59:2:183-186, April 1977.
- Kantzer, Kenneth. "Homosexuality: Biblical Guidance Through a Moral Morass." Christianity Today. 24:8:12-13, April 18, 1980.
- Kleinig, John. "Reflections on Homosexuality." Journal of Christian Education. 59:32-57, September 1977.
- MacKlin, Eleanor D. "Nontraditional Family Forms: A Decade of Research." Journal of Marriage and Family. 42:4:905-922, November 1980.
- Maust, John. "The Episcopalians' Great Debate on Ordination of Homosexuals." Christianity Today. 22:24:38-40, October 19, 1979.
- Minnery, Tom. "Homosexuals Can Change." Christianity Today. 25:3:36-41, February 6, 1981.
- Newton, David E. "Homosexual Behavior and Child Molestation: A Review of the Evidence." Adolescence. 49:29-44, Spring 1978.
- Olson, Mark. "True Confessions." The Other Side. 14:6:17-24, June 1978.
- Orr, Kenneth. "Christians Take Another Look at Homosexuality: A Review Article." Journal of Christian Education. 59:10-31, September 1977.
- Phillips, Anthony. "Uncovering the Father's Skirt." Vetus Testamentum. 30:1:38-43, January 1980.
- Plowman, Edward. "Gays: Marching as to War." Christianity Today. 23:26:48,50, November 16, 1979.
- Probst, L. Rebecca. "A Comparison of the Cognitive Restructuring Psychotherapy Paradigm and Several Spiritual Approaches to Mental Health." Journal of Psychology and Theology. 8:2:107-114, Summer 1980.

- Siegel, Paul. "Homophobia: Types, Origins, Remedies." Christianity and Crisis. 39:17:280-284, November 12, 1979.
- Simon, William, Reviewer. The Journal of Homosexuality. Journal of Marriage and Family. 42:4:1042-1044. November 1980.
- Smedes, Lewis B. "Homosexuality: Sorting Out the Issues." The Reformed Journal. 28:1:9-12, January 1978.
- Smiley, Richard. "My Roommate is Gay." HIS. 38:5:22-23, February 1978.
- Steinbeck, A.W. "Of Homosexuality: Current State of Knowledge." Journal of Christian Education. 59:58-82, September 1977.
- Towner, Jason. "Single Men and Hasty Conclusions: A Story of Cruel Stereotypes." Eternity. 30:1:32-34, January 1979.
- Unsworth, Richard. "Human Sexuality." Theology Today. 36:1:58-65, April 1979.
- Urfer, Pamela. "Homosexuality and Childrens Books." Moody Monthly. 79:6:49-55, February 1979.
- White, John. "How Should We Then Love." HIS. 38:5:24-28, February 1978.
- White, Richard and Rosalee. "When Homosexuality Hits A Marriage." Christian Life. 40:2:24, 51-54, 55-58, June 1978.
- Williams, Don. "Shall We Revise the Homosexual Ethic?" Eternity. 29:5:46-48, May 1978.
- Wink, Walter. "Biblical Perspectives on Homosexuality." The Christian Century. 96:36:1082-1086, November 7, 1979.

Cassette Tapes

- Barnette, Dr. Henlee. "Homosexuality." Focus. Volume 5, Number 7. George W. Baskin Co. 1978.
- Dobson, James and Donald Tweedie. "Homosexuality." Focus on the Family. Number 7. Texas: Word Incorporated. 1978.
- Lutzer, Erwin W. "Developing a Biblical Ethic." Evaluation of Situation Ethics. Western Oregon. 1977.
- _____. "Focus on Ethical Issues." Evaluation of Situation Ethics. Western Oregon. 1977.
- Seamands, David. "Homosexuality." Christian Counselor's Library. Number 19. Texas: Word Incorporated. 1980.

Books

- American Medical Association Committee on Human Sexuality. Human Sexuality. Place of Publication unknown. American Medical Association, 1972.

- Bahnsen, Greg L. Homosexuality: A Biblical View. Michigan: Baker Book House, 1978.
- Barnhouse, Ruth Tiffany. Homosexuality: A Symbolic Confusion. New York: The Seabury Press, 1979.
- Batchelor, Edward, ed. Homosexuality and Ethics. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1980.
- Boswell, John. Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century. Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Bruce, F.F., ed. New Century Bible: I and II Corinthians. South Carolina: The Attic Press, 1971.
- Buttrick, George A., ed. The Interpreter's Bible, Volume I. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952.
- _____. The Interpreter's Bible, Volume II. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.
- _____. The Interpreter's Bible, Volume IX. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1954.
- Chambers, Talbot, ed. Epistle to the Romans. F. Godet. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1969.
- Churchill, Wainwright. Homosexual Behavior Among Males: A Cross-Cultural and Cross-Species Investigation. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1967.
- Cole, William G. Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Collins, Gary R., ed. The Secrets of Our Sexuality. Texas: Word Books, 1976.
- Davidson, Alex. The Returns of Love: Letters of a Christian Homosexual. Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1970.
- Davis, J.D. Illustrated Davis Dictionary of the Bible. Old Time Gospel Hour Edition. Tennessee: Royal Publishers, Inc., 1973.
- Enroth, Ronald M. and Gerald E. Jamison. The Gay Church. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974.
- Gangel, Kenneth. The Gospel and The Gay. New York: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1978.
- Ginott, Dr. Haim G. Between Parent and Teenager. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1969.
- Godet, F. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Volume I. Michigan: 1957.

- Gross, Alfred A. Strangers in Our Midst: Problems of the Homosexual in American Society. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1962.
- Guindon, Andre. The Sexual Language: An Essay in Moral Theology. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977.
- Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Introduction. 3rd ed. Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970.
- Horner, Tom. Jonathan Loved David: Homosexuality in Biblical Times. Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press, 1978.
- Jensen, Gordon D. Youth and Sex: Pleasure and Responsibility. Illinois: Nelson-Hall Company, 1973.
- Johnson, Alan F. Romans: The Freedom Letter. Volume I. Illinois: Moody Press, 1974.
- Jones, Clinton R. Understanding Gay Relatives and Friends. New York: The Seabury Press, 1978.
- Karlen, Arno. Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1971.
- Karpman, Benjamin. The Sexual Offender and His Offenses: Etiology, Pathology, Psychodynamics, and Treatment. New York: The Julian Press, 1954.
- Katchadourian, Herant A. and Donald T. Lunde. Fundamentals of Human Sexuality. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Keane, Philip S. Sexual Morality: A Catholic Perspective. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- Keysor, Charles W., ed. What You Should Know About Homosexuality. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979.
- Kidner, Derek. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries: Genesis (An Introduction and Commentary). Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1967.
- Kogan, Benjamin A. Human Sexual Expression. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanich, Inc., 1973.
- Kronmeyer, Dr. Robert. Overcoming Homosexuality. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company Inc., 1980.
- LaHaye, Tim. The Unhappy Gays. Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1978.
- Lederer, Laura, ed. Take Back the Night: Women on Pornography. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1980.
- Lief, Harold I. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality: 700 Questions Answered by 500 Authorities. Maryland: The Williams and Wilkins Company, 1975.
- Lovelace, Richard. Homosexuality and the Church. New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1978.

- McBirnie, S.W. Sex and Subversion. California: A Voice of Americanism Publication, Date unknown.
- McCary, James L. McCary's Human Sexuality, 3rd ed. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1978.
- McNeill, John J. The Church and the Homosexual. Kansas: Sheed Andrews and McHeel, Inc., 1976.
- Masters, William H. and Virginia E. Johnson. Human Sexual Inadequacy. Massachusetts: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.
- New American Standard Bible. The Open Bible Edition. New York: Thomas Nelson, Publishers, 1977.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson, ed. The Expositor's Greek Testament, Volume II. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, no date listed.
- Oberholtzer, W. Dwight, ed. Is Gay Good? (Ethics, Theology and Homosexuality). Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press, 1971.
- Oliver, Bernard J. Sexual Deviation in American Society: A Socio-Psychological Study of Sexual Non-Comformity. Connecticut: College and University Press, 1967.
- Petersen, J. Allan, ed. For Families Only: Answering The Tough Questions Parents Ask. Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc. 1977.
- Philpott, Kent. The Gay Theology. New Jersey: Logos International, 1977.
- Philpott, Kent. The Third Sex?: Six Homosexuals Tell Their Stories. New Jersey: Logos International, 1975.
- Pittenger, Norman. Love and Control in Sexuality. Pennsylvania: United Church Press, 1974.
- Scanzoni, Letha and Virginia R. Mollenkott. Is the Homosexual My Neighbor? (Another Christian View). New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1978.
- Smith, N.H., ed. The Century Bible: Leviticus and Numbers. South Carolina: The Attic Press, Inc., 1967.
- Somerville, Rose M. Introduction to Family Life and Sex Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Stenga, J. The Greek-English Analytical Concordance of Greek-English New Testament. Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1963.
- Switzer, David K. and Shirley Switzer. Parents of the Homosexual. Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press, 1980.
- Tollison, C. David and Henry E. Adams. Sexual Disorders: Treatment, Theory, Research. New York: Gardner Press, Inc. 1979.

- Twiss, Harold L., ed. Homosexuality and the Christian Faith: A Symposium. Pennsylvania: Judson Press, 1978.
- Unger, Merrill F. Unger's Bible Dictionary. Illinois: Moody Press, 1957.
- Vine, W.E. Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, Vol. I & II. New Jersey: Fleming Revell Company, 1940.
- Wenham, G.J. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament: The Book of Leviticus. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.
- Westwood, Gordon. Society and the Homosexual. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1953
- Witt, Elmer N. Life Can Be Sexual. Illinois: Concordia Publishing House, 1967.
- Wuest, Kenneth S. Romans in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955.
- Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971.

APPENDIX A

The Heterosexual-Homosexual Rating Scale

From Sexual Behavior in the Human Male by Alfred C. Kinsey,
Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin

- 0 - Individuals are rated as 0s if they make no physical contacts which result in erotic arousal or orgasm, and make no psychic responses to individuals of their own sex. Their sociosexual contacts and responses are exclusively with individuals of the opposite sex.
- 1 - Individuals are rated as 1s if they have only incidental homosexual contacts which have involved physical response, or incidental psychic responses without physical contact. The great preponderance of their sociosexual experience and reactions is directed toward individuals of the opposite sex. Such homosexual experiences as these individuals have may occur only a single time or two, or at least infrequently in comparison to the amount of their heterosexual experience. Their homosexual experiences never involve as specific psychic reactions as they make to heterosexual stimuli. Sometimes the homosexual activities in which they engage may be inspired by curiosity or may be more or less forced upon them by other individuals, perhaps when they are asleep or when they are drunk, or under some other peculiar circumstance.
- 2 - Individuals are rated as 2s if they have more than incidental homosexual experience, and/or if they respond rather definitely to homosexual stimuli. Their heterosexual experiences and/or reactions still surpass their homosexual experiences and/or reactions. These individuals may have only a small amount of homosexual experience or they may have a considerable amount of it, but in every case it is surpassed by the amount of heterosexual experience that they have within the same period of time. They usually recognize their quite specific arousal by homosexual stimuli, but their responses to the opposite sex are still stronger. A few of these individuals may even have all of their overt experience in the homosexual, but their psychic reactions to persons of the opposite sex indicate that they are still predominantly heterosexual. This latter situation is most often found among younger males who have not yet ventured to have actual intercourse with girls, while their orientation is definitely heterosexual. On the other hand, there are some males who should be rated as 2s because of their strong reactions to individuals of their own sex, even though they have never had overt relations with them.
- 3 - Individuals who are rated 3s stand midway on the heterosexual-homosexual scale. They are about equally homosexual and heterosexual in their overt experience and/or their psychic reactions. In general they accept and equally enjoy both types of contacts

and have no strong preferences for one or the other. Some persons are rated 3s even though they may have a larger amount of experience of one sort, because they respond psychically to partners of both sexes, and it only a matter of circumstance that brings them into more frequent contact with one of the sexes. Such a situation is not unusual among single males, for male contacts are often more available to them than female contacts. Married males, on the other hand, find it simpler to secure a sexual outlet through intercourse with their wives, even though some of them may be as interested in males as they are in females.

- 4 - Individuals are rated as 4s if they have more overt activity and/or psychic reactions in the homosexual, while still maintaining a fair amount of heterosexual activity and/or responding rather definitely to heterosexual stimuli.
- 5 - Individuals are rated 5s if they are almost entirely homosexual in their overt activities and/or reactions. They do have incidental experience with the opposite sex and sometimes react psychically to individuals of the opposite sex.
- 6 - Individuals are rated as 6s if they are exclusively homosexual, both in regard to their overt experience and in regard to their psychic reactions.

APPENDIX B

Church Statements on Homosexuality

From Homosexuality and Ethics edited by Edward
Batchelor, Jr.

The following are excerpts from church statements on homosexuality.

AMERICAN BAPTIST CHURCHES

We, as Christians, recognize that radical changes are taking place in sex concepts and practices. We are committed to seeking God's guidance in our efforts to understand faithfully and deal honestly with these changes and related issues. We recognize that there are many traditional problems of family and personal life for which the church's ministries have not been adequate, but we are committed to be used by God to strength and broaden these ministries. In this spirit we call upon our churches to engage in worship, study, fellowship and action to provide for meaningful ministries to all persons as members of the 'Family of God' including those who are homosexuals.

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH, Standing Committee for the Office of Research and Analysis, 1977.

The church need not be caught up in the conflicting theories as to how widespread homosexuality is, the factors which cause or foster homosexuality, and whether it is an illness, an arrested state of sexual development, a form of deviant behavior, or a sexual expression of human nature. These are matters for the various scientific disciplines to debate and resolve. The church, however, is concerned that some human beings created in God's image are involved in homosexual behavior, that many people are hurting because of their own homosexuality or that of a loved one, and that the Scriptures speak to the entire issue.

We believe that taken as a whole the message of Scripture clearly is that:

- a. Homosexual behavior is sin, a form of idolatry, a breaking of the natural order that unites members of the human community;
- b. Homosexual behavior is contrary to the new life in Christ, a denial of the responsible freedom and service into which we are called through baptism;
- c. God offers the homosexual person, as every other person, a vision of the wholeness He intends, the assurance of His grace, and His healing and restoration for the hurting and broken.

Nevertheless, we recognize the cries of our homosexual brothers and sisters for justice in the arena of civil affairs. We cannot endorse their call for legalizing homosexual marriage. Nor can we endorse their conviction that homosexual behavior is simply another form of acceptable expression of natural erotic or libidinous drives. We can, however, endorse their position that their sexual orientation in and of itself should not be a cause for denying them their civil liberties.

CHRISTIAN CHURCH (DISCIPLES OF CHRIST), General Assembly. Study Document, 1977.

... The standards of membership in the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) have always rested on confession of faith in Jesus Christ and baptism. Its standards have been "inclusive" rather than "exclusive." In support of these it has appealed to the relationships of Jesus which were inclusive, often, in fact, deliberately directed to those whom society had demeaned and cast aside. It has never acknowledged barriers to fellowship on the basis of dogma or lifestyle. By these principles, rooted in biblical faith, it is difficult to point to any basis upon which homosexual persons might be excluded from membership.

Acknowledging ... the wide differences of opinion, there does seem to be a minimal consensus to which the church can strive: homosexuals are persons whom God created, loves and redeems and seeks to set within the fellowship of faith communities to be ministered to and to minister. The church can affirm that God's grace does not exclude persons of differing life styles or sexual preferences, not does the church which is enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Homosexuals may be included in the fellowship and membership of the community of faith where they are to love and be loved and where their gifts of ministry are to be welcomes.

FRIENDS, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, 1973.

We should be aware that there is a great diversity in the relationships that people develop with one another. Although we neither approve nor disapprove of homosexuality, the same standards under the law which we apply to heterosexual activities should also be applied to homosexual activities. As persons who engage in homosexual activities suffer serious discrimination in employment, housing and right to worship, we believe that civil rights laws should protect them. In particular we advocate the revision of all legislation imposing disabilities and penalties upon homosexual activities.

GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH, Biennial Clergy-Laity Congress, 1976.

The Orthodox Church condemns unreservedly all expressions of personal sexual experience which prove contrary to the definite and unalterable function ascribed to sex by God's ordinance and expressed in man's experience as a law of nature.

Thus the function of the sexual organs of a man and a woman and their biochemical generating forces in glands and glandular secretions are ordained by nature to serve one particular purpose, the procreation of the human kind.

Therefore, any and all uses of the human sex organs for purposes other than those ordained by creation, runs contrary to the nature of things as decreed by God ...

The Orthodox Church believes that homosexuality should be treated by society as an immoral and dangerous perversion and by religion as a sinful failure. In both cases, correction is called for. Homosexuals should be accorded the confidential medical and psychiatric facilities by which they can be helped to restore themselves to a self-respecting sexual identity that belongs to them by God's ordinance.

LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA, Biennial Convention, 1970.

Human sexuality is a gift from God for the expression of love and the generation of life. As with every good gift, it is subject to abuses

which cause suffering and debasement. In the expression of man's sexuality, it is the integrity of his relationships which determines the meaning of his actions. Man does not merely have sexual relations; he demonstrates his true humanity in personal relationships, the most intimate of which are sexual.

Scientific research has not been able to provide conclusive evidence regarding the causes of homosexuality. Nevertheless, homosexuality is viewed biblically as a departure from the heterosexual structure of God's creation. Persons who engage in homosexual behavior are sinners only as are all other persons - alienated from God and neighbor. However, they are often the special and undeserving victims of prejudice and discrimination in law, law enforcement, cultural mores, and congregational life. In relation to this area of concern, the sexual behavior of freely consenting adults in private is not an appropriate subject for legislation or police action. It is essential to see such persons as entitled to understanding justice in church and community.

MORAVIAN CHURCH, Synod, 1974.

WHEREAS: the Christian Church has the responsibility of reexamining its own traditional sexual stance in the light of more recent interpretation and scientific evidence for the benefit of both youth and adults, and

WHEREAS: the homosexual has too often felt excluded from and persecuted by society, there be it

RESOLVED: (29) that the Moravian Church reaffirms its open welcome to all people by specifically recognizing that the homosexual is also under God's care, and be it further

RESOLVED: (30) that Moravian congregations will extend an invitation to all persons to join us in a common search for wholeness before God and persons, and be it further

RESOLVED: (31) that as Christians, recognizing our common sinfulness and the miracle of God's grace, accepting God's pardon, and together striving to help free each other from bonds of fear, despair, and meaninglessness, fitting us for lives of commitment, responsibility, witness, service and celebration in God's Kingdom, we will share in this venture as children of God and brothers and sisters in Christ toward wholeness.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, 117th General Assembly, 1977.

That the 117th General Assembly expresses love and pastoral concern for homosexual persons in our society and the need for the Church to stand for just treatment of homosexual persons in our society in regard to their civil liberties, equal rights, and protection under the law from social and economic discrimination which is due all citizens.

Although we confess our need for more light and pray for spiritual guidance for the Church on this matter, we now believe that homosexuality falls short of God's plan for sexual relationships and urge the Church to seek the best way for witnessing to God's moral standards and for ministering to homosexual persons concerning the love of God in Jesus Christ.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE U.S.A., General Convention, 1976.

Resolved, that it is the sense of this General Convention that homosexual persons are children of God, who have a full and equal claim with all other persons upon the love, acceptance, and pastoral concern and care of the Church.

Resolved, this General Council expresses its conviction that homosexual persons are entitled to equal protection of the law with all other citizens, and calls upon our society to see such protection is provided in actuality.

ROMAN CATHOLIC, Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1977.

At the present time there are those who, basing themselves on observations in the psychological order, have begun to judge indulgently, and even to excuse completely, homosexual relations between certain people. This they do in opposition to the constant teaching of the magisterium and to the moral sense of the Christian people.

A distinction is drawn, and it seems with some reason, between homosexuals whose tendency comes from a false education, from a lack of normal sexual development, from habit, from bad example or from other causes, and is transitory or at least not incurable; and homosexuals who are definitely such because of some kind of innate instinct or a pathological constitution judged to be incurable.

In regard to this second category of subjects, some people conclude that their tendency is so natural that it justifies in their case homosexual relations within a sincere communion of life and love analogous to marriage insofar as such homosexuals feel incapable of enduring a solitary life.

In the pastoral field, these homosexuals must certainly be treated with understanding and sustained in the hope of overcoming their personal difficulties and their inability to fit into society.

Their culpability will be judged with prudence. But no pastoral method can be employed which would give moral justification to these acts on the grounds that they would be consonant with the condition of such people. For according to the objective moral order homosexual relations are acts which lack an essential and indispensable finality.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH - Great Britain, Statement issued by the Archbishop of Westminster, 1957.

The civil law takes cognizance primarily of public acts. Private acts as such are outside its scope.

However, there are certain private acts which have public consequences in so far as they affect the common good. These acts may rightly be subject to civil law.

It may be, however, that the civil law cannot effectively control such acts without doing more harm to the common good than the acts themselves would be. In that case it may be necessary in the interests of the common good to tolerate without approving such acts.

It has, for example, invariably been found that adultery or fornication (which, however private, have clear public consequences) cannot effectively be controlled by civil law without provoking great evils.

Applying these principles to the question of homosexual acts between consenting males:

1. As regards the moral law, Catholic moral teaching is:
 - a. Homosexual acts are grievously sinful.
 - b. That in view of the public consequences of these acts, e.g., the harm which would result to the common good if homosexual conduct became widespread or an accepted mode of conduct in the public mind, the civil law does not exceed its legitimate scope if it attempts to control them by making them crimes.

2. However, two questions of fact arise:
 - a. If the law takes cognizance of private acts of homosexuality and makes them crimes, do worse evils follow for the common good?
 - b. Since homosexual acts between consenting males are now crimes in law, would a change in the law harm the common good by seeming to condone homosexual conduct?

Ecclesiastical authority could rightly give a decision on this question of fact as well as on the question of moral law, if the answers to questions of fact were overwhelmingly clear. As, however, various answers are possible in the opinion of prudent men, Catholics are free to make up their own minds on these two questions of fact.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION, Resolution on Homosexuality, 1976.

Whereas, homosexuality has become an open lifestyle for increasing numbers of persons, and

Whereas, attention has focused on the religious and moral dimensions of homosexuality, and

Whereas, it is the task of the Christian community to bring all moral questions and issues into the light of biblical truth;

Now therefore, be it resolved that the members of the Southern Baptist Convention ... affirm our commitment to the biblical truth regarding the practice of homosexuality and sin.

Be it further resolved, that this Convention, while acknowledging the autonomy of the local church to ordain ministers, urges churches and agencies not to afford the practice of homosexuality any degree of approval through ordination, employment, or other designations of normal lifestyle.

Be it further resolved, that we affirm our Christian concern all persons be saved from the penalty and power of sin through our Lord Jesus Christ, whatever their present individual lifestyle.

UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION OF CHURCHES IN NORTH AMERICA, General Assembly, 1970.

Discrimination Against Homosexuals and Bisexuals: Recognizing that

1. A significant minority in this country are either homosexual or bisexual in their feelings and/or behavior;
2. Homosexuality has been the target of severe discrimination by society and in particular by the police and other arms of government;
3. A growing number of authorities on the subject now see homosexuality as an inevitable sociological phenomenon and not as a mental illness;
4. There are Unitarian Universalists, clergy and laity, who are homosexuals and bisexuals;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the 1970 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association: 1) Urges all people immediately to bring an end to all discrimination against homosexuals, homosexuality, bisexuals, and bisexuality, with specific immediate attention to the following issues: Private consensual behavior between persons over the age of consent shall be the business only of those persons and not subject to legal regulations. Urges all churches and fellowships, in keeping with our changing social patterns, to initiate meaningful programs of sex education aimed at

providing a more open and healthier understanding of sexuality in all parts of the United States and Canada, and with the particular aim to end all discrimination against homosexuals and bisexuals.

UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, The Tenth General Synod, 1975.

Therefore, without considering in this document the rightness or wrongness of same-gender relationships, but recognizing that a person's affectional or sexual preference is not legitimate grounds on which to deny her or his civil liberties, the Tenth General Synod of the United Church of Christ proclaims the Christian conviction that all persons are entitled to full civil liberties and equal protection under the law.

Further, the Tenth General Synod declares its support for the enactment of legislation that would guarantee the liberties of all persons without discrimination related to affectional or sexual preference.

THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, The Quadrennial Conference, 1976.

Homosexuals no less than heterosexuals are persons of sacred worth, who need the ministry and guidance of the church in their struggles for human fulfillment, as well as the spiritual and emotional care of a fellowship which enables reconciling relationships with God, with others and with self. Further we insist that all persons are entitled to have their human and civil rights ensured, though we do not condone the practice of homosexuality and consider this practice incompatible with Christian teaching.

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A., 188th General Assembly, 1976.

The 188th General Assembly calls to the attention of our Church that, according to our most recent statement, we "reaffirm our adherence to the moral law of God ... that ... the practice of homosexuality is sin ... Also we affirm that any self-righteous attitude of others who would condemn persons who have so sinned is also sin." The 188th General Assembly declares again its commitment to this statement. Therefore, on broad Scriptural and confessional grounds, it appears that it would at the present time be injudicious, if not improper, for a Presbytery to ordain to the professional ministry of the Gospel a person who is an avowed practicing homosexual.

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH - MISSOURI SYNOD, Convention, 1973.

Whereas, God's Word clearly identifies homophile behavior as immoral, and condemned it (Lev. 18:22; 20:13 and Rom. 1:24-27); and

Whereas, The Law and the Gospel of Jesus Christ are to be proclaimed and applied to all conditions of mankind; therefore be it Resolved, That the Synod recognize homophile behavior as intrinsically sinful; and be it further

Resolved, That the Synod urge that the Law and Gospel of the Scriptures be applied to homophiles as appropriate with a view toward ministering the forgiveness of our Lord Jesus Christ to any and all sinners who are penitent.

UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS, General Assembly, 1977.

Whereas the UAHC has consistently supported the civil rights and civil liberties of all persons, and

Whereas the Constitution guarantees civil rights to all individuals,

Be it therefore resolved that homosexual persons are entitled to equal protection under the law. We oppose discrimination against homosexuals in areas of opportunity, including employment and housing. We call upon our society to see that such protection is provided in actuality.

Be it further resolved that we affirm our belief that private sexual acts between consenting adults are not the proper province of government and law enforcement agencies.

STATEMENTS BY PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, House of Deputies, 1973.

RESOLVED that the legislatures of the several states are urged to repeal all laws which classify as criminal conduct any form of non-commercial sex conduct between consenting adults in private, saving only those portions which protect minors or public decorum.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, Action of the Trustees, 1973.

Passed a resolution urging the endorsement of the Model Penal Code of the American Law Institute, which recommends to legislators that private sexual behavior between consenting adults should be removed from the list of crimes and thereby legalized.

AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION, Board of Trustees, 1973.

Unanimously voted for a resolution urging "the repeal of all legislation making criminal offenses of sexual acts performed by consenting adults in private", and another resolution urged sexual practices (including homosexuality) between consenting adults in private should be removed from the list of crimes. In another resolution, the Board of Trustees voted to remove homosexuality, per se, from its official list of mental disorders.

The Trustees also approved the following resolution:

Whereas Homosexuality per se implies no impairment in judgement, stability, reliability, or general social or vocational capabilities, therefore, be it resolved that the American Psychiatric Association deplores all public and private discrimination against homosexuals in such areas as employment, housing, public accommodation, and licensing, and declares that no burden of proof of such judgement, capacity, or reliability shall be placed upon homosexuals greater than that imposed on any other persons. Further, the American Psychiatric Association supports and urges the enactment of civil rights legislation at the local, state, and federal level that would offer homosexual persons the same protections now guaranteed to others on the basis of race, creed, color, etc. Further, the American Psychiatric Association supports and urges the repeal of all discriminatory legislation singling out homosexual acts by consenting adults.

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION, Board of Directors, 1975.

The American Psychological Association supports the action taken on 15 December 1973 by the American Psychiatric Association removing homosexuality from the Association's official list of mental disorders. The American Psychological Association therefore adopts the following resolution:

Homosexuality per se implies no impairment in judgement, stability, reliability, or general social or vocational responsibilities:

Further, the American Psychological Association urges all mental health professionals to take the lead in removing the stigma of mental illness that has long been associated with homosexual orientations.