

A DEBATE ON
HOMOSEXUALITY

BETWEEN
THOMAS F. EAVES, SR.
AND
DR. PAUL R. JOHNSON

A Debate On
Homosexuality

Between
Thomas F. Eaves, Sr., Evangelist
and
Dr. Paul R. Johnson

T & P Bookshelf
P. O. Box 49036
Algood, Tennessee 38501

Copyright 1981
by
T & P Bookshelf

**No part of this book may be reproduced in any form
without permission in writing from the publisher.**

Preface

In the January 8, 1979, issue of *Time* Magazine it was announced that the American Psychiatric Association had created a new diagnostic category for homosexuals. This new category was called "Sexual Orientation Disturbance." Shortly after this announcement appeared, I wrote an article entitled "Sexual Orientation Disturbance" which was printed in the February 15, 1979, issue of the *Gospel Advocate*. (Appendix 1). After this article appeared in the *Gospel Advocate* I received a form letter with several pieces of literature from Dr. Paul R. Johnson, Director of The Lambdas. (Appendix 2). After receiving Dr. Johnson's letter and pamphlet several letters were exchanged until an agreement was reached on propositions for written debate. (Appendix 3). The propositions agreed upon appear in Appendix 4.

This written debate is an honest and sincere attempt to determine what the Bible, God's Inspired Word, teaches about homosexuality.

By previous mutual agreement manuscripts have been printed as submitted by each disputant correcting only spelling and punctuation.

Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

Thomas F. Eaves is a native of Chattanooga, Tennessee, and has been preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ for thirty years. He has preached for congregations in the Philippine Islands, Canada, Tennessee, Arkansas and Texas. For four years he served as director of the Bible chair of the Church of Christ on the campus of Sam Houston University. From July 1974 to August 1980 he taught and served as dean in the East Tennessee School of Preaching and Missions in Knoxville, Tennessee. Currently he is on the faculty of Tennessee Bible College in Cookeville, Tennessee.

Eaves received his B.A. in Bible from Harding University, his M.A. in Bible from Harding Graduate School of Bible and Religion, and is presently working toward his Ph.D. at Tennessee Bible College.

A veteran of the U.S. Air Force, he is married and has two children.

Paul R. Johnson

Dr. Johnson has pastored churches in New Jersey, Georgia, Illinois and Washington State. He has served on the Board of Directors of *Help, Inc.*, and the *Van Guards For Christ*. He is presently chairman of the Board of The *Lambdas* and General Moderator of *Fidelity*, an association of gay, lesbian and homophile fundamentalists.

Dr. Johnson has served on the Editorial Board of *Vector Magazine*, official organ of the Society for Individual Rights and has written a column for *Drummer Magazine*. His articles also appear in *The Advocate*, *Newswest*, *The Sun*, *The Forum* and other national and local Homophile publications.

Johnson has served as counselor of the Gay and Lesbian Community Center and Director of the Information Program. He is a teaching Elder of the Van Guards for Christ, teaching accredited College classes and lecturing at Churches, Colleges and Universities. He is the author of: *The Gay And the Bible*, *St. Paul and the Homosexual*, *The Real Sodomites*, *The Gay Experience* and *The Obscene Puritian*.

He is director of the Lambda speakers program which provides interesting speakers to groups, churches, etc., requesting more information about homosexuality. These speakers stand ready to defend their position in open discussions and debate at all times throughout the nation.

Contents

A Triumph For Truth, <i>Robert R. Taylor Jr.</i>	7
The Battle of the Decade, <i>Clay Garrison</i>	9
Eaves' First Affirmative.	11
Johnson's First Negative.	18
Eaves' Second Affirmative.	25
Johnson's Second Negative.	33
Eaves' Third Affirmative.	41
Johnson's Third Negative.	50
Eaves' Fourth Affirmative.	58
Johnson's Fourth Negative.	66
Eaves' Affirmative Rejoinder.	73
Johnson's First Affirmative.	75
Eaves' First Negative.	83
Johnson's Second Affirmative.	90
Eaves' Second Negative.	98
Johnson's Third Affirmative.	105
Eaves' Third Negative.	113
Johnson's Fourth Affirmative.	121
Eaves' Fourth Negative.	130
Johnson's Affirmative Rejoinder.	138
Appendixes.	140

A Triumph For Truth

During the spring of 1980, Brother Thomas Eaves requested that I read the written debate between him and Paul Johnson relative to homosexuality. It has been a *delight* to read Brother Eaves' able defense of Biblical morality and Scriptural purity; it has been *nauseating* in the extreme to read Johnson's material of where he has rewritten Scripture after Scripture and distorted passage after passage in his zealous attempts to find Biblical approval for one of the most degrading and dehumanizing vices ever thought up by depraved minds and practiced by morally degenerate and bankrupt humanity. The Scriptures are anything but safe in the hands of a gay activist like Johnson who claims Jehovah's approval for all homosexual behavior except what he designates as abusive gay love. To Johnson homosexuality is not just an *alternative* life style; it is an *attractive, admirable* and *approved* life style. One will detect no regrets in the Johnson material that he is a practicing gay and is *gayly* happy in his role with his male lover. Morally-minded and spiritually sensitive people will find his material revolting to their inner man and will recoil from any delight to be found in such infamous department.

Reverent believers in Biblical morality will stand aghast at his "Johnsonized" definitions ascribed to clear Hebrew and Greek terms which have been translated with crystal clear expressions in our reliable English Bibles. Johnson constantly muddies the clear Biblical waters in both testaments where sodomy, homosexuality and lesbianism are strongly condemned and forthrightly prohibited. Those who revere the beautiful and pure Biblical friendships between David and Jonathan, between David and Mephibosheth, between the

aged Eli and the youthful Samuel, between the aged Naomi and the gentle Ruth, between the honorable centurion and his dying servant in Luke 7 and Matthew 8, between Joseph and Potiphar or even between Jesus and John will be repelled to read the homosexual accusations that Johnson reads into these friendship and fellowship frameworks. Johnson appears to be wearing his homosexual goggles every time he reads of two males or two females who were friends. He wishes they were homosexual and the wish fathers the thought that they were in his perverted mind. To Johnson it appears there can be neither friendship nor fellowship between those of the same sex without homosexual tendencies as major motivations. Like Freud he sees sex—perverted as far as he is concerned—as about the only drawing power between human beings.

The reader of this debate senses how deeply entrenched homosexuality is even among religious people. It looms as no small battle to acquaint people with the full infamy of a long practiced sin in lascivious closets but is now in the open and with vocal proponents even appealing to so-called Scriptural arguments to make it palatable to society as a whole.

Brother Thomas Eaves deserves unstinted commendation for the tremendous defense he has made in behalf of Biblical morals. We have nothing but disdain for the sinful system that Paul Johnson has sought to galvanize into respectability in this discussion. What a dense jungle of human lusts and depraved acts we would live in all over the world if all were of Johnson's attitude and action. Sodom will never be far from our doorsteps while we have men of his views and practices as our vocal contemporaries.

The patent fact that Johnson all the way through refused to honor Brother Eaves' requests on how he (Eaves) should be addressed and not addressed really says much about what sort of person Paul Johnson really is at heart. But the main index of his heart is seen in what he says about homosexuality. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks or as in this case the hand writes!

November 18, 1980

Robert R. Taylor, Jr.
Ripley, Tennessee

The Battle of the Decade

Until now, homosexuals and Fundamentalists spoke different languages. The gay militants spoke of Human Rights—the Fundamentalist spoke of Divine Rights. This book is a dialogue between these two extremes.

Common ground can and must be found if peaceful co-existence is to be achieved in the 80's. Dr. Paul R. Johnson and Thomas F. Eaves examine these explosive historical, ethical and theological issues. They confront the problem head on in the arena of open debate. These men discuss the real issues that divide homosexuals and most conservative Christians. What do the gay and fundamental communities really believe about themselves and each other? What, if anything, do they have in common, and do they have similar fears and objectives?

Dr. Johnson examines the roots of homophobia, tracing the origins beyond Christian and Jewish traditions to ancient Persia. He examines the Sodom stories, the Holiness Creed of Moses and the Pauline passages as they relate to gay freedom in the 20th century. He claims that gay bigotry started not in Israel but in Iran. Christian intolerance of homosexuality came not from the first century disciples but from 5th century monastic schools. The original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, stripped of English puritanism and sexism reveal ancient acceptance. The Bible love stories between David and Jonathan, Ruth and Naomi, Jesus and John are presented in the light of today's understanding of homosexuality. The so-called "anti-gay" texts are re-interpreted in the light of modern medical discoveries regarding hermaphrodites, transsexuals and homosexuals. Is gayness pre-natal or post-natal? Medical authorities are uncertain, but they gingerly agree that sexual orientation is formed before the child reaches the age of free choice or accountability.

Dr. Johnson approaches this question as a Christian gay while still allowing his gay brothers and sisters free expres-

sion. He presents a definite gay ethic while recognizing that other gays have the right to hold different points of view.

Dean Thomas F. Eaves Sr. presents the cause for Fundamentalism. In debate form, he examines the position of Dr. Johnson and presents his own conservative concerns. He examines the theological and moral implications of homosexuality, standing with the traditional view that homosexuality is both sinful and criminal. Dean Eaves believes the lines are clearly drawn and the battle of the 80's has begun. Which position is right; or is neither position right? The gay militants claim theirs is a battle of human rights, the Fundamentalists claim the issue is a moral one. Which ideology will prevail? Will the religious world continue to be hopelessly divided or can a compromise be reached? Will a stalemate result? Will either side be victorious? The Anita Bryant fight and ultimate capitulation was only the opening battle. Since apple juice has now replaced orange juice as America's favorite fruit drink, will the Metropolitan Community Church replace the Baptist Church as the fastest growing religious group? We shall see.

With Christian love and proper respect toward Brother Eaves, Dr. Johnson proved in scholarly fashion that the Hebrew and Greek text disapproved of gay rape, parental incest, abuse and lust to the same extent that the Bible frowns upon heterosexual rape, parental incest, abuse and lust. Dr. Johnson also clearly established the Biblical, contemporary and historical meaning of two Greek terms, *arsenokoites* and *molekoites*. The logical and scriptural way in which he approached the love between David and Jonathan, etc., was enlightening to all. I personally appreciated the arguments made by Dr. Johnson regarding common gender which prove that the so-called "anti-gay" marriage texts in reality give approval for gay marriages. I shall never forget that "marriage is honorable in all."

Dr. Paul R. Johnson and Dean Thomas F. Eaves have both rendered a service to the Christian faith. The lines are clearly drawn. The reader must decide the proper attitude and action concerning the "homosexual question."

Clay Garrison
Houston, Texas

Proposition

Resolve: "I know that the Bible which is the inspired word of God, teaches that all sexual intercourse between human beings of the same sex is intrinsically sinful."

AFFIRM: Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

DENY: Paul R. Johnson

First Affirmative

By Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

Definition of Proposition

I know that the Bible—The 39 books of the Old Testament and 27 of the New Testament.

Which is the inspired word of God—God breathed and capable of guiding men into all truth, II Tim. 3:16-17; II Pet. 1:3.

Teaches—Instructs.

That all sexual intercourse between human beings of the same sex—Homosexual (men with men) relationships, Lesbian (women with women) relationships.

Is intrinsically sinful—In and of itself contrary to and a violation of the will of God for mankind, I John 3:4.

God's Plan

In the book of Genesis we learn that Jehovah God created man in His own image (Genesis 1:26), male and female created he them (Genesis 1:27). To the male and female God said, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; . . ." (Genesis 1:28). The second chapter of Genesis gives addi-

tional information concerning the creation of male and female. God, looking upon Adam's existence, saw that it was not good for man to be alone (Genesis 2:18). Adam was given the responsibility of naming all the animals which God had created (Genesis 2:20), but among all of God's creation there was not found a help meet for him. To furnish Adam's need God caused a deep sleep to fall upon him and from his side he took a rib (Genesis 2:21). Adam said, "she is bone of my bone" and "flesh of my flesh" (Genesis 2:23). From these passages it is evident that woman was created for man, to be his help meet. In the Genesis account the high estate of marriage is set forth as God says, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh," (Genesis 2:24). Marriage is for male and female and fills a basic need for both man and woman.

The Bible, which is the inspired word of God, governs every aspect of the husband-wife relationship. The questions of leadership, submission, sexual activities, who is to be the bread-winner, the keeper of the home, the rearing of children, and the permanency of marriage have already been determined (Ephesians 5:22, 23, 25, 28, 33; I Timothy 5:8; I Peter 3:7; Ephesians 6:1-4; I Corinthians 7:1-7; Matthew 19:6, 9; I Corinthians 7:39; Romans 7:1-4).

The sexual responsibilities of husband and wife are clearly defined in God's word.

Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote: It is good for a man not to touch a woman. But, because of fornication, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband. Let the husband render unto the wife her due: and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power over her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power over his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be by consent for a season, that ye may give yourselves unto prayer, and may be together again, that Satan tempt you not because of your incontinency. But this I say by way of concession, not of commandment. Yet I would that all men were even as I myself. Howbeit each man hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that. I Corinthians 7:1-7.

From this passage of scripture we learn that:

1. Sexual intercourse outside of the marriage relationship is sin. (Fornication).

2. To satisfy the God-given sexual drive Paul states that each **man** is to have **his own** wife and each woman is to have **her own husband**. (Note Paul is in harmony with God and Jesus Christ concerning the male and female relationship (Genesis 2:24; Matthew 19:4-5).

3. Husband and wife must render to each other "their due," *i.e.*, fulfill the sexual needs of each other.

4. In this God-given arrangement the marriage bed is undefiled **and God's** purpose for mankind's happiness and needs are fulfilled (Hebrews 13:4).

Man Departs From God's Way

As Israel of old, man many times turns from God's ways and, "every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judges 17:6). Some, as in Romans 1:25, exchanged the truth of God for a lie and followed after unrighteousness. Even today there are those who advocate homosexuality as an "alternate lifestyle." The wise man of the Proverbs stated that, "There is a way which seemeth right unto man; But the end thereof are the ways of death" (Proverbs 14:12).

Homosexuality (sexual relations between men) and lesbianism (sexual relations between women) is not now nor has it ever been an acceptable "life style" in God's sight. Notice carefully the teachings of God concerning this practice.

1. Leviticus 18:22-23, "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is **abomination** (23) and thou shalt not lie **with any beast** to defile thyself therewith; neither shall any **woman stand** before a beast, to lie down thereto: it is **confusion**."

2. Leviticus 20:13, "And if a man lie with mankind, as with womankind, both of them have committed **abomination**: they shall surely be put to death; and their blood shall be upon them."

3. Deuteronomy 23:17, "There shall be no prostitute [the word prostitute here as in Genesis 38:21-22 and Hosea 4:14 is the translation of a feminine form (*kedeshah*) of the form (*kadesh*) which is translated as sodomite, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature*, McClintock and Strong, Grand Rapids, Baker, Vol. IX, p. 858] of the

daughters of Israel, neither shall there be a sodomite of the sons of Israel." Neither the lesbian nor sodomite could enter into the assembly of Jehovah.

4. I Kings 14:24, "And there were also Sodomites in the land: they did according to all the abominations of the nations which Jehovah drove out before the children of Israel." (Leviticus 20:22-23).

5. I Kings 15:11-12, "And Asa did that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah, as did David his father. (12) And he put away the sodomites out of the land, and removed all the idols that his fathers had made."

6. I Kings 22:46, "And the remnant of the sodomites, that remained in the days of his father Asa, he [Jehoshaphat] put away out of the land."

7. II Kings 23:7, "And he brake down the houses of the sodomites, that were in the house of Jehovah, where the women wove hangings for the Asherah."

These passages from God's word clearly teach that homosexuality (sodomy) was not acceptable to God during the times of the Old Testament. It was an abomination, punishable by death, the sodomite was not to enter the assembly of Jehovah, and during the reforms of Asa and Josiah they did right in the eyes of Jehovah by putting away the sodomites out of the land.

The Cities Of The Plain

A very simple way to determine God's attitude toward homosexuality in the Old Testament is to read how he dealt with it. In Genesis 19 the inspired record reveals to us God's dealings with the city of Sodom. This city and its inhabitants (ten righteous could not be found in the city, Genesis 18:32) are referred to as, "wicked and sinners against Jehovah exceedingly" (Genesis 13:13) and, "because their sin is very grievous" (Gen. 18:20). Because of the sin of sodomy Jehovah God destroyed Sodom (Genesis 19:13; 19:24, 25). The sin of this wicked city is identified in Genesis 19:4-5, "But before they lay down, the men of the city, even the men of Sodom, compassed the house round both young and old, all the people from every quarter; (5) and they called Lot, and said unto him, Where are the men that came in to thee this night? bring them out unto

us, that we may know them." (Know them—have sexual relations with them. "That they might know them . . . Yoda is applied, as in Judges 19:22, to the carnal sin of paederasty, a crime very prevalent among the Canaanites (Lev. 18:22; 20:23), and according to Romans 1:27, a curse of heathenism generally." *Commentary On The Old Testament* by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, Vol. I, p. 233).

Lot refers to their intended activities, "And he said, I pray you, my brethren, **do** not so **wickedly**." The sin of Sodom is referred to by the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel (Isaiah 3:9; Jeremiah 23:14; Ezekiel 16:49-50, and Lamentations 3:9). In the **New** Testament the acts of Sodom are fully identified as sin.

And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, having made them an example unto those that should live ungodly; (7) and delivered righteous Lot, sore distressed by the lascivious life of the wicked (8) (for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their lawless deeds) II Peter 2:6-8.

Jude in his book also refers to the sin of Sodom.

Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, having in like manner with these given themselves over to fornication and gone after strange flesh, are set forth as an example, suffering the punishment of eternal fire (Jude verse 7).

Jesus Christ Teaches Against Homosexuality.

Through Moses God said, "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. (19) And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him" (Deuteronomy 18:18-19). In Acts 3:22-23 the apostle Peter speaks of the fulfillment of the prophecy in Jesus Christ. While still on the earth Jesus told his apostles that he would send the comforter, the Holy Spirit, to them (John 14:16; 14:26; 16:13). The purpose of this comforter was to guide the apostles in their work.

1. Teach them all things (John 14:26).

2. Bring to their remembrance all that Jesus had said to them (John 14:26).

3. Guide them into all truth (John 16:13).

4. Would declare unto them all things that are to come (John 16:13).

The Holy Spirit (Comforter) came upon the apostles on the first Pentecost following the ascension of Jesus. This event is recorded in Acts chapter two.

Paul the persecutor of Christians (Acts 9) became Paul the Apostle (Acts 9 and 22). Paul was born out of due season (I Corinthians 15:8) to take God's message to the Gentiles. (Peter recognized Paul's authority, Galatians 2:9-10). The apostle Paul spoke (I Corinthians 14:27) and wrote (I Corinthians 2:11-16) by the Spirit of God, therefore he revealed the will of God. All of the apostles revealed the will of Jesus Christ (II Peter 3:2), therefore when Paul condemned the sins of the Roman empire (including homosexuality) in Romans 1, he was revealing the truth of God. Likewise when Peter refers to the sin of Sodom (II Peter 2:6-8) he is pronouncing the judgment of God upon such abominable conduct. The conclusions are very simple to understand. Christ was the prophet God promised to send (the one who would speak as God commanded). This prophet sent the Holy Spirit to the apostles to reveal to them all truth. As the apostles spoke and wrote they taught the will of God (Matthew 10:40).

A summation of my basic position is expressed in the terms of the following argument.

Major Premise—The Bible, which is the inspired Word of God, teaches that homosexual acts are intrinsically (in **and** of themselves) sinful.

Minor Premise— If homosexual acts are intrinsically sinful, then there are **no** circumstances involving any individuals in which homosexual activity is approved of God.

Conclusion—Therefore, the Bible teaches that there are no circumstances involving any individuals in which homosexual activity is approved by God at any given time.

The argument form in symbolic form is hypothetical syllogism.

$$\begin{array}{l} B \supset H^I \\ \hline H^I \supset \sim H^{AG} \\ \hline B \supset \sim H^{AG} \end{array}$$

The conclusion is necessitated if the argument is valid and the premises are true. The argument is valid and the premises are true, therefore the conclusion must be true.

The evidence from God's word is indisputable, homosexuality is a departure from God's will and is sin. Those who engage in this practice should repent and turn to God as did the Corinthians (I Corinthians 6:11).

First Negative

By Dr. Paul R. Johnson

Dean Thomas F. Eaves, Ladies and Gentlemen. The crime that dared not speak its name has become the love that will not shut up. Gays are everywhere, we are your children, your teachers, your parents and your ministers. We are the nation's largest minority. We have lived through 4,000 years of repression as a people—but no more. Today we are demanding our freedom. We demand to be free from economic reprisal, free from political oppression and free from religious persecution and guilt. Years ago gays were the fuel (faggots) used to burn witches, but we survived. We have survived the Napoleonic Law and the Baltimore Catechism. We have survived Stonewall, Anita Bryant, John Briggs and Dan White, and we shall survive the last desperate attempt of fundamentalist church people to take away our freedom and deny us entrance into the church of the living God.

Thank God churches are changing. Even the Conservatives are now willing to set down and discuss differences. Our brother in Christ and friend, Dean Thomas F. Eaves, comes well qualified to defend the Conservative position regarding homosexuality and the Bible.

We do not wish to offend even the babes in Christ, however, we shall use plain words as the Bible uses plain words. May we both be able to speak with Christian modesty regarding human sexuality. Both Bro. Eaves and I have life-mates that we love very dearly. Naturally when my lover and I share a beautiful secret, neither of us would discuss that sweet love with others, except by mutual consent. With proper regard for personal privacy, I shall with modest words and

reverent heart share with you what I believe to be the will of God for my life as a gay Christian—or rather as a Christian who happens to be gay. May God help us both to love his word.

Dean Eaves definition of the proposition is incomplete. The affirmative needs to define "sexual intercourse." What terms in the Bible denote it? Is it possible for a person who is not homosexual to engage in same sex activity? Does the "dominant" party sin or does only the "passive" person sin, or do both of the persons always sin in a same sex act?

The Bible Condemns Same Sex Abuse, Not All Homosexuality

Minister Eaves has not produced one verse against homosexuality per se. Every scripture quoted speaks of same sex abuse, excess and/or inversion. There are five hundred verses in the Bible which speak of heterosexual abuse and only five verses which speak of homosexual abuse. Did the good Lord think that "hets" would have a hundred times more sexual hangups than gays?

Professor Eaves offered us a scripture which condemned same sex attempted rape (Genesis 19:9). What does that prove? I can list several verses which show that God equally condemns heterosexual rape. Next the good Dean tells us that males must not be "abusers of themselves with men" (I Corinthians 6:9). So what? St. Paul also warns of men who abuse themselves with women (Romans 13:13). If a person really wants to see how simple these so called "gay passages" can be understood, all he or she has to do is to change the gender of the passage. Just read the passage as heterosexual rather than homosexual and the true meaning will be clear. (See chart 1.)

CHANGE THE GENDER AND THE SCRIPTURES BECOME CLEAR

J-1

I Cor. 6:9. "Abusers of themselves with womankind shall (not) inherit..."
 I Tim. 1:10. "for them that defile themselves with womenkind (are evil)..."
 Gen.19:5-9. "And they called unto Lot and said unto him, wherefore are the women which came in to thee this night? Bring them out that we may know them... and they pressed...near to break the door."
 Lev. 20:13. "If a husband (YISH) also lie with womankind as he lieth with a wife (ISHSHAH), both of them have committed an abomination."
 Rom. 1:28. "And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the wife, burned in their lust toward other women, men with women working evil."
 II Kings 23:7. "He also tore down the quarters of the female shrine prostitutes, which were in the temple of the Lord..."

*The Sodom Story Condemns Attempted Same Sex Rape
And Angelic Sex*

In Genesis 19 the men of Sodom tried to sexually molest messengers of God (verses 5-9). Had these angels been female the rape attempt would have been just as evil and just as deserving of punishment. Jude 7 tells us that it was also sinful for humans to try to engage in sexual activity with heavenly beings. The "going after alien flesh" as the original Greek reads, was the desire for forced sexual contact between human and heavenly beings. This interpretation is substantiated by the apocryphal texts to which Jude refers. Also the Jerusalem Bible footnote for Jude 7 reads, "they lusted not after human beings, but after the strangers who were angels."

Genesis 18 declares that God had decided to destroy the city of Sodom months before the events of Genesis 19 took place. Other Biblical references and Jewish history inform us that Sodom was condemned primarily because of the way it treated people who were different and because of its own self-righteous pride (Isaiah 3:9; Ezekiel 16:49). Father John J. McNeil writes in his excellent book, *The Church and the Homosexual*:

We are dealing here with one of the supremely ironic paradoxes of history. For thousands of years in the Christian West the homosexual has been the victim of inhospitable treatment. Condemned by the Church, he has been the victim of persecution, torture, and even death. In the name of a mistaken understanding of the crime of Sodom and Gomorrah, the true Crime of Sodom and Gomorrah has been and continues to be repeated every day.¹

*Moses Condemned Both Homosexual and Heterosexual
Temple Prostitution*

Moses taught that no Israelite, man or woman, should become a Hierodule, that is a cult prostitute. Deuteronomy 23:17 reads in the N.I.V.:

No Israelite, man or woman is to become a temple prostitute. You must not bring the earnings of a female prostitute or of a male prostitute into the house of the Lord.

By a strange process of reasoning, Dean Eaves will have us believe that Moses is only condemning homosexuals in these verses. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Hebrew

word *kedeshah* means a female heterosexual temple prostitute and is so used several times in the Bible (see *I.S.B.E.*, Vol. II, p. 1337).² The affair between Tamar and Judah was certainly not lesbian in nature (Genesis 38). This term is translated in the various versions as "whore," "cult prostitute," "temple prostitute," etc. It was the men who visited these temples for carnal pleasure. The female priestess offered heterosex for pay, and the male priest offered homosex for pay. Both were equally sinful. Dr. Ralphale Pataio writes in his scholarly book:

It is remarkable that while both men and women are warned against the practice of bestiality, no reference at all is made to female homosexuality in the Levitical law, nor anywhere else in the Bible.³

In the book of Kings the rulers were just interested in punishing the temple prostitutes. The Hebrew terms used to describe these cultic shrine prostitutes have nothing whatsoever to do with ancient Sodom. It is interesting to note that King Josiah cleansed the temple of homosexual prostitution, he had nothing to say against gays who were not shrine prostitutes. He, like the other Kings, corrected homosexual abuse in the same way and to the same extent that heterosexual abuse had been corrected. Dr. Patai says:

The traditional Middle Eastern folk mores countenance homosexual love, as long as it is practiced in secret with no witnesses present, but they would never condone public orgies, whether of a homosexual or a heterosexual character. Public orgies, it is true, were a part of ancient Near Eastern cultures and religious cults, but they were first opposed by the Hebrew prophets and legislators.⁴

***Is "Marriage Honorable Among All" or
Only Among Heterosexuals?***

Dean Eaves claims that the Eden story, Jesus and St. Paul, all teach that sex is allowed only within a monogamous heterosexual marriage. A common practice among Fundamentalists is to take a text and add the word "only," thus changing the meaning. They read a text about the blood of Christ and conclude that salvation is only by the blood. The Calvinist finds a verse where one is saved by grace and concludes that salvation is by grace only. In the very same way Dean Eaves has found a verse which says that heterosexuals can marry and quotes it to prove (?) that only hetero-

word *kedeshah* means a female heterosexual temple prostitute and is so used several times in the Bible (see *I.S.B.E.*, Vol. II, p. 1337).² The affair between Tamar and Judah was certainly not lesbian in nature (Genesis 38). This term is translated in the various versions as "whore," "cult prostitute," "temple prostitute," etc. It was the men who visited these temples for carnal pleasure. The female priestess offered heterosex for pay, and the male priest offered homosex for pay. Both were equally sinful. Dr. Ralphale Pataio writes in his scholarly book:

It is remarkable that while both men and women are warned against the practice of bestiality, no reference at all is made to female homosexuality in the Levitical law, nor anywhere else in the Bible.'


In the book of Kings the rulers were just interested in punishing the temple prostitutes. The Hebrew terms used to describe these cultic shrine prostitutes have nothing whatsoever to do with ancient Sodom. It is interesting to note that King Josiah cleansed the temple of homosexual prostitution, he had nothing to say against gays who were not shrine prostitutes. He, like the other Kings, corrected homosexual abuse in the same way and to the same extent that heterosexual abuse had been corrected. Dr. Patai says:

The traditional Middle Eastern folk mores countenance homosexual love, as long as it is practiced in secret with no witnesses present, but they would never condone public orgies, whether of a homosexual or a heterosexual character. Public orgies, it is true, were a part of ancient Near Eastern cultures and religious cults, but they were first opposed by the Hebrew prophets and legislators.'

***Is "Marriage Honorable Among All" or
Only Among Heterosexuals?***

Dean Eaves claims that the Eden story, Jesus and St. Paul, all teach that sex is allowed only within a monogamous heterosexual marriage. A common practice among Fundamentalists is to take a text and add the word "only," thus changing the meaning. They read a text about the blood of Christ and conclude that salvation is only by the blood. The Calvinist finds a verse where one is saved by grace and concludes that salvation is by grace only. In the very same way Dean Eaves has found a verse which says that heterosexuals can marry and quotes it to prove (?) that only hetero-

sexuals can marry. What our brother needs is a text which says that marriage is only allowed between heterosexuals.



The Genesis story has been used to prove most everything. Thomas Aquinas tried to use Genesis to prove birth control unnatural. Protestants use the Eden story to disprove celibacy. A racist tried to prove from Genesis that only white people had the right to marry. Certain free-thinkers use the Eden story to try to prove that it is proper to go naked, commit incest and smoke grass! Our Brother Eaves interpretation is just as unreasonable. The Eden story simply says that heterosexuals should marry and reproduce, nothing more or nothing less. If Dean Eaves really believed what he claims to believe about Eden, he would disfellowship all the Christian couples who refuse to have a house full of children and he would deny equal rights to Christian singles.

Genesis 2:24 is quoted to prove that heterosexuals only have the right to enjoy sex: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife and they shall be one flesh." We wonder what Dean Eaves would do if he read the following announcement: "Therefore shall a lad leave the cub pack and join himself to the Boy Scouts and they shall become united." We would well imagine that Dean Eaves would not allow the cub to leave his pack to join the Y.M.C.A. Neither the Scout announcement or the Eden statement makes any such restrictions. Later, in my affirmative, I shall prove that the term "marriage" as used in the Hebrew and Greek scriptures is not limited to a heterosexual monogamous relationship.

Should Gay People Be Advised To Marry Heterosexuals?

The worse possible advice any preacher, priest or parent can give is to suggest that a heterosexual marriage is a "cure" for homosexuality. Dean Eaves claims that the Apostle Paul taught that in order to avoid fornication, all men, even gay men, should have their own wives. I Corinthians chapter 7 teaches no such thing! Anyone who tries to force a gay into a heterosexual marriage commits a grievous sin against the gay, against the partner and against God. St. Paul knows better than to advise gay men to enter into a heterosexual union for any cause. The Apostle has just gotten through saying that many men should never marry women. St. Paul is only teaching that every man who has to touch a woman should find a wife. I agree completely with the Apostle. Any man who cannot keep his hands off the women should find a good woman and settle down. The Apostle teaches exactly the opposite from Dean Eaves. Paul says that heterosexual males should marry women. Paul's advise is sound, Eaves is not.

WHO SHOULD MARRY HETEROSEXUALS?	
EVERY MAN IN THE WORLD?	EVERY MAN WHO HAS TO TOUCH A WOMAN?
1. Jesus 2. Paul 3. Daniel 4. Elijah	Which is Bad Advice?
?	
(J-3)	

Dean Eaves seems surprised that gays believe the Bible. Yes, it's true, in spite of great persecution, many gay Christians have still not lost faith in God or the Bible, but we are losing faith in ministers who make claims and make laws not found in the Word of God.

I have answered every point that Dean Eaves has presented with which I do not agree. Our brother will never get anywhere in this debate until he addresses himself to the real issue. His syllogism remains unfinished and will remain so until he proves "the Bible, which is the inspired Word of God, teaches that homosexual acts are intrinsically sinful."

Questions For The Affirmative Speaker

1. If the attempted rape in Sodom had been heterosexual, would that prove that all heterosexuality was intrinsically sinful?

2. If a person commits one same sex act, does that make him a homosexual?

3. Since the creation of male and female humans "proves" that homosexual acts are evil between people, does the creation of male and female animals prove that homosexual acts between animals are also evil?

4. Since the husband and wife relationship equally involves "sexual activities" and "child rearing," is it a sin for anyone not married to rear children? Explain the difference.

5. Must a person agree with you on abortion, test-tube babies, divorce and birth control before she or he can be in fellowship with you?

6. Please explain Matthew 23:4, "For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders: but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers."

FOOTNOTES

1. John J. McNeill, *The Church and the Homosexual* (Kansas City: Sheed, Andres and McMeel, Inc., 1976), p. 50.

2. James Orr, *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans), p. 1337.

3. Ralphael Patai, *Sex and Family in the Bible and the Middle East* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1959), p. 168.

4. Patai, p. 175-176.

Second Affirmative

By Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

I will answer the negative arguments of my opponent, but my primary responsibility is to present my affirmative materials. In my second affirmative some of his negative remarks are answered.

Jesus Christ Teaches Against Homosexuality, continued

Jesus personally expressed his view on homosexuality in Matthew chapter nineteen.

He saith unto them, Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it hath not been so. (9) And I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery. (Matthew 19:8-9).

In this passage Jesus points out the sin of fornication. The Greek term translated fornication is *porneia* and is defined as: "Prostitution, unchastity, fornication, of every kind of unlawful intercourse." (*A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, p. 699, University of Chicago Press.)

The Apostle Paul on Homosexuality

The apostle Paul, who wrote by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 2:11-16 and 15:8), identifies the sins of the Roman empire in the first chapter of the Roman letter. Among the sins Paul has several things to say about lesbianism and homosexuality.

Wherefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness, that their bodies should be dishonored among themselves: for that they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

For this cause God gave them up unto vile passions: for their women changed the natural use into that which is against nature: and likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another, men with men working unseemliness, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was due. (Romans. 1:24-27).

Notice that Paul identifies the sin as vile passions. (Vile is from *atimia* which is defined as "dishonor, disgrace, shame." On Romans 1:26, "shameful passions," Arndt and Gingrich, p. 119).

1. Women changed the natural use into that which is against nature.

a. Natural use—*phusikan chrasin*

(1) *Phusikan* from *phuskos*—"Belonging to nature, natural, in accordance with nature." (Arndt and Gingrich, p. 877).

(2) *Chrasin* from *chrasis*—"Relations, functions, especially of sexual intercourse." (Arndt and Gingrich, p. 894).

Women changed the natural use, i.e., sexual relations belonging to nature, that which is in accordance with nature, male and female in accordance to God's instructions into that which is against nature.

b. Against nature—*para phusin*

(1) *Phusin* from *phusis*—"Nature, natural endowment or condition," and on Romans 1:26, "nature as the regular natural order." (Arndt and Gingrich, p. 877).

The actions of the women were against the regular natural order, i.e., male and female in accordance to God's instructions.

2. Men also, leaving the natural use (same as 1,a,(1) and (2)) of women burned in their lust one toward another, men with men working unseemliness.


a. L u s t . . . *orexei* . . . one toward another.

(1) *Orexei* from *orexis*—"longing, desire, in its only occurrence in our literature, it is used in an unfavorable sense." (Arndt and Gingrich, p. 583).

b. Men with men working unseemliness . . . *aschamosunan*.

(1) *Aschamosunan* from *aschamosuna*—"shameless deed," (Arndt and Gingrich, p. 118). Paul describes such conduct as following vile passions and working shameless deeds. Furthermore, how can homosexuality be acceptable to God when that (lust) which leads to the practice is condemned by God?

Many people in an unsuccessful attempt to get around Paul's teachings claim that the great Apostle was not condemning homosexuality but an abuse of it, i.e., promiscuity. (Please note the chart).



From this passage of scripture it is evident that Paul is condemning homosexuality (that which is opposed to the "natural order") not homosexual promiscuity. He refers to that which is against nature as, passions of dishonor, changing

natural to that which is against nature, unseemliness, and error. The Bible could not be clearer on the subject.

Again, listen to Paul as he writes to the Corinthian Christians concerning some of the same sins mentioned in Romans one.

Or know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God. (I Corinthians 6:9-11).

In verse nine he began by stating that the **unrighteous SHALL NOT inherit the kingdom of God**. Who are these unrighteous? He lists them as:

1. Fornicators, 2. Idolaters, 3. Adulterers, 4. Effeminate, 5. Abusers of themselves with men, 6. Thieves, 7. Covetous, 8. Drunkards, 9. Revilers, 10. Extortioners.

Paul states plainly that they shall not inherit the kingdom of God. In this list of the unrighteous who shall not inherit the kingdom of God is the effeminate and abusers of themselves with men. (Nos. 4 and 5).

4. The Effeminate—*malakoi*, "2. of persons, soft, effeminate, especially of catamites, men and boys who allow themselves to be misused homosexually." (Arndt & Gingrich, p. 489).

5. Abusers' of themselves with men—*arsenokoitai*, "a male homosexual, pederast, sodomite." (Arndt & Gingrich, p. 489).

Both the homosexual and his partner are condemned by God's Word.

In verse eleven Paul states, "and such were some of you: . . ." The Corinthians had changed their lifestyle, they had left the ways of sin and were walking according to the standard of God. Paul does not indicate that the church had accepted the homosexuals with their "lifestyle" but that the homosexuals had changed! The same is true today, those practicing homosexual activities need to repent (change) and be obedient to the will of Christ.

In, I Timothy 1:8-11 Paul once again speaks against the sin of homosexuality.

But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully, as knowing this, that law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for fornicators, for abusers of themselves with men, for menstealers, for liars, for false swearers, and if there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine; according to the gospel of the glory of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust. (Again the term "abusers of themselves with men" *arsenokoitais* is used. For definition see No. 5 above.)

Paul's conclusion is that, law is made for the lawless and unruly, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane and lists **homosexuality** among the other acts which are a transgression of God's will.

Conclusions of Material Presented in First and Second Affirmative

1. Homosexuality and Lesbianism is a departure from God's plan for man and woman and is not now nor has it ever been an acceptable way of life in God's eyes. It is the sin of sodomy.

a. Old Testament: Genesis 13:13; Genesis 18:20; Genesis 19; Leviticus 18:22-23; Leviticus 20:13; Deuteronomy 23:17; I Kings 14:24; I Kings 15:11-12; I Kings 22:46; II Kings 23:7.

b. New Testament: Matthew 19:9 (*porneia*); Romans 1:24-27; I Corinthians 6:9-11; I Timothy 1:8-11; II Peter 2:6-8; Jude 7.

2. The argument advanced on pages 16 and 17 of my first affirmative is therefore valid.

Dr. Johnson's Objections To My First Affirmative

In his introductory remarks Dr. Johnson states: ". . . and we shall survive the last desperate attempt of fundamental church people to take away our freedom and deny us entrance into the church of the living God." No man can deny anyone entrance into Christ's church. Remembering that it is his church (Matthew 16:18) of which he is the head (Ephesians 1:22-23), **only Christ** has the right to determine what men must

do to become a member of his spiritual body. Faith is necessary (Mark 16:16b), and leads one to repent of sins (Luke 13:3), confess Jesus Christ as God's Son (Matthew 10:32-33), and to be baptized into the death of Christ for remission of sins (Mark 16:16; Romans 6:1-6). God adds the forgiven (saved) to the church (Acts 2:47). If homosexuals of today would repent, as those referred to in I Corinthians 6:11, they could be members of Christ's church.

Sexual intercourse is the sex act between man and woman (vaginal penetration) in which children may be conceived (Genesis 4:1,17). It is the sex act (vaginal penetration) between husband and wife in which they grant to each other conjugal rights (I Corinthians 7:3-5). It is the sex act (vaginal penetration) between unmarried, married with another not his/her mate which is condemned as fornication in the Bible (Hebrews 13:4). It is an act in which those of the same sex cannot engage because they are not so equipped but must substitute other parts of their physical anatomy to achieve coitus. In Morton Hunt's book, *GAY—What You Should Know about Homosexuality*, (Farrar/Straus/Giroux. New York, p. 86), reference is made concerning fellatio offering a substitute for the vagina which males do not have, and cunnilingus providing a substitute for the penis that neither female possesses.

It is possible for one who is not a homosexual to engage in same sex activity, but the act itself would be sin. Both the "dominate" party and "passive" person sin in the homosexual act (I Corinthians 6:9, effeminate and the abusers of themselves with men).

Dr. Johnson says I have not produced one verse against homosexuality per se, but that every verse "speaks of same sex abuse, excess and/or inversion." Paul gives three which I have already discussed. Romans 1:27, I Corinthians 6:9, and I Timothy 1:10. I sincerely hope that Dr. Johnson will read these passages and realize that in the latter two Paul is not speaking of "abusers of homosexuality" but of men who abuse themselves with men, i.e. in the act of homosexuality, i.e. sodomy.

What Does I Corinthians 6:9 and 10 Condemn?

What Does I Corinthians 6:9 & 10 Condemn?		E-2
ABUSE OF HOMOSEXUALITY		HOMOSEXUALITY
ABUSE OF STEALING		STEALING
ABUSE OF COVETOUSNESS	OR	COVETOUSNESS
ABUSE OF DRUNKENNESS		DRUNKENNESS
ABUSE OF REVELLING		REVELLING
ABUSE OF EXTORTION		EXTORTION

In chart No. 1 Dr. Johnson wants us to read the passages as heterosexual rather than homosexual. Reading them as such does not change the fact that each passage still condemns homosexuality. What our friend misses is the fact that man can lawfully (i.e. with God's approval) become one flesh (husband and wife) with woman through marriage, but can not have sexual intercourse with one of the same sex without being guilty of sodomy. Obviously God's plan for man and woman in marriage can be (and often is) abused. Of course this abuse results in sin. God's word, as we have quoted previously, condemns homosexual activities, not just the abuse of such.

The Sodom Story

Dr. Johnson vainly attempts to dismiss the Genesis 19 account by talking of attempted same sex rape and angelic sex. In spite of his objections and explanations the facts remain:

Lest there be any doubt, the sin in question here is most certainly homosexual in character. The verb "to know," as used here and elsewhere, means "to have sexual intercourse with." Then we observe, 1. The angels in question were recognized as men. 2. The men of the city desired to have sex with these men—by force (rape) if necessary. 3. Lot generously offered them his virgin daughters to satisfy their sexual craving. 4. Note: The men of Sodom rejected the females in preference to the males. (*Shadow of Sodom*, Paul D. Morris, Tyndal House, p. 83).

3. Just because God declares he will destroy the city in Genesis 18, it does not necessarily hold that the men of Sodom had *not engaged in sodomy previous to the events of Genesis 19*:

Why Was Sodom Condemned?		E-3
Paul R. Johnson & John J. McNeil		Moses, Jude, Peter
1. "Sodom was condemned primarily because of the way it treated people who were different... and 2. ... Because of its own self righteous pride.	?	Genesis 13:13 - <u>Wicked & Sinners</u> Jude 7 - <u>Fornication & Going After Strange Flesh</u> Jude 7 - <u>Sexual Immorality & Perversion (NIV Translation)</u> II Peter 2:7 - <u>Lascivious Life of the wicked... lawless deeds.</u>

Dr. Johnson quotes Isaiah 3:9 and Ezekiel 16:49 in an effort to uphold his position. Note the passages.

For Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen; because their tongue and their doings are against Jehovah, to provoke the eyes of his glory. The show of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! for they have done evil unto themselves. (Isaiah 3:8 and 9).

In this verse it is simply stated that the sin of Jerusalem and Judah was as the sin of Sodom, i.e., public.

Second Negative

By Dr. Paul R. Johnson

After our brother's last speech, I am more convinced than ever before that the anti-gay position of church people cannot be sustained by the Bible.

Dean Eaves claims that homosexuals cannot engage in sexual intercourse. In order to sustain a crumbling position, the Dean was forced to say:

Sexual intercourse is the sex act between man and woman (vaginal penetration in which children may be conceived) . . . It is the sex act (vaginal penetration) between unmarried, married with another not his/her mate which is condemned as fornication in the Bible (Hebrews 13:4). It is an act in which those of the same sex cannot engage. . .

Dean Eaves now claims that gays cannot engage in sexual intercourse even though he signed a proposition that they could. According to the above quote, gay sexual intercourse is not sinful, it's impossible! The Dean also said that fornication is "all unlawful intercourse." Thus by the Dean's own reasoning, Jesus could not have been talking about homosexuality when he spoke of fornication. Our brother's chart E-3 claims that "Sodomy" is fornication. Thus, since "Sexual intercourse . . . is an act in which those of the same sex cannot engage," according to him, Sodomy is not homosexuality. I have shown that homosexuality is not fornication, but I have freely admitted that gay abuse, like het abuse, is fornication (i.e. "unlawful intercourse"). How can the Dean prove that something is sinful when it cannot be done?

Why read same-sex passages as heterosexual? Dean Eaves suggests that comparing same-sex verses with parallel het

statements does not prove that homosexuality is right. But this was not the intent of chart No. 1.1 simply wished to show that the "gay verses" can properly be understood when read as heterosexual. If St. Paul had written "abusers of themselves with women" a grammar school student would understand that the Apostle was not condemning all heterosex. If the angels in Sodom had taken on the form of females, a first year seminarian would get the point.

Paul condemns both homosexual and heterosexual abuse in I Corinthians 6:9 and I Timothy 1:10. Dean Eaves presents two lists in Chart E-2 and wants us to choose one or the other. But neither of the Dean's lists represent St. Paul. The Apostle does not say "abusers of stealing, etc." but he does say "abusers of themselves with men."

J-4

THOMAS EAVES LIST		E2		ST. PAUL'S TRUE LIST	
ABUSE OF HOMOSEXUALITY	OR	HOMOSEXUALITY		HOMOSEXUAL ABUSE	
ABUSE OF STEALING		STEALING			
ABUSE OF DRUNKENNESS		DRUNKENNESS			
ABUSE OF EXTORTION		EXTORTION			

Most English translations show clearly that gay abuse is condemned in I Corinthians 6:9. ***The Today's English Version*** reads: "People who are immoral, or worship idols or are adulterers, or homosexual perverts . . . or who slander . . . will not receive God's kingdom." Notice that only homosexual perverts, not all homosexuals, are condemned. Most all conservative translations show that gay abuse is under discussion.

"Abusers of themselves with mankind," *King James Version*.

"Abusers of themselves with men," *American Standard Version*


"Homosexual perversion," *New English Bible*

"Men who sin sexually with other men," *William Beck's Translation*.

"Homosexual offenders," *New International Version*.

Not only do these translations show gay excess but they also show that St. Paul just as often condemns heterosexual perversion and abuse. Perhaps the clearest English translation

is the *New Testament In the Language of Today*, "men who sin sexually with women or with other men." These verses equally condemn heterosexual perverts and abusers. The same root word for "abusers" (*arsen-okoites*) is also used in Romans 13:13 to denote general sex abuse. Certainly Romans 13 does not mean that all sex is evil. The only difference in the form of this Greek term is that one uses the antecedent (*arsen*) which limits the abuse to male. The other Greek word in I Corinthians 9:9 (*malakoi*) also refers to both heterosexuals and homosexuals (Matt. 11:8, Lk. 7:25). If this term proves that all homosexuals are evil it also proves that all heterosexuals are evil. It really refers to anyone who is soft or pampered. A description which does not escape the modern clergy.



The Dean should try to understand chart No. 5. For example, drugs are not completely condemned in the Bible even though it might appear so from a study of Revelation 21:8. The Greek for sorcery in this verse is pharmacist. Some Christians are not able to tell the difference between drug use and drug abuse. The same is true with riches, eating, drinking and homosexuality.

Same-Sex Inversion in the Bible is Not the Same Thing As Homosexuality

One of the most abused practices of ancient times was not homosexuality but sexual inversion. Psychologist C. A. Trip, an expert in the field, writes:

Only in popular thinking are homosexuality and inversion synonymous. For several decades biologist and experimental psychologist have recognized that they are distinctly different phenomena. . . . There are several serious contradictions in equating inversion with homosexual practices. . . . The most generalized forms of inversion are predominately heterosexual phenomena."

Sexual inversion in its most abusive form is when a "straight" youth gang seeks a little novelty by gang-raping any gay they can find. Such humiliation by violence is also

practiced in prison. Since there are no women in male penal institutions, certain dominant inmates try to make "women" out of the younger and weaker prisoners. Such forced sex has nothing in common with gay love, but is simply sexual inversion or role reversal in its worse forms. Gays suffer greatly by such heterosexual inverts. Several of the verses we have discussed refer to heterosexuals who engage in such inversion and have no reference at all to two people of the same sex who love each other. Biblical evidence suggests that the men of Sodom were heterosexual inverts, not gays.

The men of Sodom could not possibly have been exclusively homosexual in orientation in the sense that the term is used today. Quite likely, they were primarily heterosexual, out for novelty, and seeking to humiliate the strangers. . . . Among some ancient peoples, it was not unusual to flaunt one's triumph over enemies by treating them with the greatest possible contempt. Such contempt was demonstrated by forcing captive men to "take the part of women" and be passive recipients in anal intercourse.⁵

Like most rapists, their primary interest was not sex but violence and humiliation. They could have raped the women but they wanted at those strangers.

In Leviticus 18 and 20, Moses also condemned inversion abuse. To understand the Levitical Code, one needs to realize the low estate of women in that barbaric age. To force a male to be used "as a woman" was the most degrading thing possible.⁶ Moses said that it was wrong for a man to be used as a woman. Christ improved upon Moses by teaching that it was also wrong for a man to use a woman. The macho invert often tries to use another man as a woman. The truly gay male who respects himself, his own God-given sexual nature and the equal place of women would never use another male as a woman. When Moses said, "do not lie with a male as a woman," he was warning of the dangers of sexual inversion.

MOSES CONDEMNED:

J-6

Speaking to a King as a slave. Ex.6
 Talking to a father as a peer. Dt.5
 Working a slave as an animal. Lev.25
 Lying with a male as a female. Lev.18

Moses meant exactly the same as if he had said, "do not talk to a king as with a slave." It was not sinful for certain people to talk to a king, but it was wrong for anyone to talk to a king as a slave. It was not sinful for a gay to be with a male, but it was wrong for anyone to be with a male as a woman. Moses did not want any of his soldiers using the conquered males as females. Only heterosexual inverters would be interested in "a substitute vagina and a substitute penis." Writer Morton Hunt is thinking like a typical heterosexual. Gays do not think that way. Gay males do not use other men as substitute women and lesbians do not use women as substitute men. We are gay. We are sexually attracted to our own gender. We have been misread, misused and abused long enough by the inverters, the police and the preachers.

*St. Paul Condemns the Evil Inversion Practices
Of the Ancient Romans*

Dean Eaves treats us to a detailed and fairly accurate dissection of Romans the first chapter. Unfortunately he overlooks the one Greek term that explains Romans 1 (i.e. **Change**). The Dean has said, "It is possible for one who is not a homosexual to engage in same-sex . . ." Since both heterosexuals and homosexuals can engage in same-sex, which is being condemned in Romans 1? Is Paul speaking against homosexual love or is he speaking against heterosexual inversion?

In Romans one, the Apostle says nothing about homosexuals. This chapter speaks of heterosexual husbands who leave that which is nature for them in order to engage in same-sex. It cannot be said of a gay that he "leaves that which is natural for him," in fact many gays have never had sex with the opposite sex. Only heterosexual inverters leave women and try to change their nature. They end up hurting themselves and others. The heterosexual Romans were notorious for their inversion practices and St. Paul warns of some of these dangers. It was also favorable in Rome to try to change the sexual gender of slaves by involuntary castration. Looking closely at Romans chapter one, we find that St. Paul warns against making several changes. In verse 23 the Apostle says that the image of God must not be changed into an image of

man. Paul is not suggesting that a man's image is sinful per se only that we must not change God's image into man's image. Such a change would be unnatural and contrary to order. The same is true when heterosexuals try to change their natural order. Same-sex is not evil per se, any more than the image of man is sinful per se. Romans 1 warns against the extremes of heterosexual inversion, it says nothing against homosexuality, transsexuality, bisexuality or transvestism.

Sexual inversion in ancient Rome was quite prevalent. Emperor Nero, for example, was not a homosexual but he did practice all types of sexual inversion. The great philosopher, Will Durant, says:

Nero was so grieved at his wife's death having found a youth, Sporus, who closely resembled Poppaes, he had him castrated, married him by a formal ceremony, and "used him in every way like a woman."

Durant also says that Trajan, a respected heterosexual Roman General:

. . . engaged in occasional pederasty as if out of deference to the customs of his time. Rome thought it worthy of praise that he never disturbed his wife Plotina by making love with another woman.⁹

The ancient prophets knew what modern medical authorities are discovering; immoderate inversion practices may prove extremely harmful. Nathaniel Brandon writes: "When a person denies his real needs, the inevitable outcome is the creation of an unreal self."¹⁰ Dr. C. A. Tripp says "everyone's gender-identity at some private level of reality is treasured beyond all measure."¹⁰

St. Paul does, however, give both hets and gays a divine principle in Romans chapter one. He teaches that it is dangerous to try to change the sexual nature given by God. While St. Paul speaks only of heterosexuals who leave that which is natural for them, it could also be said that gays should not leave the sexual nature that is natural for them (i.e., homosexuality). Thus this scripture which has been used since 500 A.D. to try to get homosexuals to change their very nature, really teaches the exact opposite. It is very harmful for a truly gay person to try to act as a heterosexual. Karlen says: "trying to cure a homosexual of his innate drive is an attempt to pervert his true instincts."¹¹ Every person must be true to his own self.

Everybody from time to time practices some form of role reversal (inversion) and we must not be too judgmental of young people who are trying to find themselves. Mild inversion, such as practiced by husband and wife, might even be acceptable to our brother Eaves, but certainly he would agree that the abusive extremes practiced by the heterosexual Romans often lead to obscene worship, idolatry, blackmail, rape and murder.

TWO KINDS OF SAME-SEX ABUSE	
<u>Inversion Abuse</u>	<u>Homosexual Abuse</u>
Genesis 19:9	Lev. 18:7
Lev. 18	I Kgs. 14-22
Lev. 20	I Cor. 6:9
Romans 1:27	I Tim. 1:10
"It is possible for one who is not a homosexual to engage in same-sex." TFE	

(J-7)

I was glad that the good Dean said that only the Lord can put you in or take you out of the church. I wish he had been around to tell that to my Bishop! Be honest now, Dean, would you baptize a gay couple who had no plans to separate? Would you administer the sacraments to known gays? You probably would fellowship abortionists, militarists, the divorced and even gay sympathizers—but not gays. Dean Eaves confuses the Sacraments with the Savior. Not only is baptism "for remission" but so also is the Lord's Supper and church membership. But only Jesus is the Savior. Anti-gays may deny us the sacraments, but they cannot deny us the Savior.

Dean Eaves says that those of Sodom may have engaged in homosexuality when God decided to destroy the city in Genesis 18. Yes, and they might have been anti-gay inverters or poker players. The Dean deals in "maybes" and "perhaps." Paul Johnson and Father John J. McNeil are in good company because Jesus himself gave the same chief reasons for Sodom's fall (Matt. 10:14,15; Mk. 6:11; Lk. 10:8-12).

The Dean spent much time on points where there is no disagreement but had no time to give a Biblical definition of sexual intercourse. Why doesn't he admit that the Bible equally condemns heterosexual rape, shrine prostitution and

perversion? Does the Bible always equally condemn both persons in a same-sex act? Do animals go contrary to the natural order when they engage in homosexuality? What about Eden and I Corinthians 7?

FOOTNOTES

4. C. A. Tripp. *The Homosexual Matres* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1975). p. 27-31.
5. Letha Scanzoni and Virginia Ramey Mollenkott. *Is The Homosexual My Neighbor?* (San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1978), p. 55, 60.
6. Carly Meyers, "The Roots of Restriction," *Biblical Archaeologist* (Sept. 1978), 99-101.
7. Will Durant. *The Story of Civilization, III* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1944, Op. 282.
8. Durant, p. 408.
9. Nathaniel Branden. *The Disowned Self* (L.A., Nash., 1977), p. 23.
10. Tripp, p. 28.
11. Arno Karlen, *Sexuality and Homosexuality* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1971), p. 196.

Third Affirmative

By Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.


Dr. Johnson's Objections To My First Affirmative

My opponent quotes Ezekiel 16:49 in an attempt to set forth Sodom's sin as self-righteous pride. Note, however, that haughtiness wasn't the only problem: "and committed **abomination** before me: therefore I took them away as I saw fit." Considering the references already mentioned from Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jude and Peter the abomination is identified as the sin of sodomy.

The I.S.B.E., p. 1339, lists several words which are translated "harlot" and *kedheshah* is so listed. Further, on page 2821, under Sodomite, the I.S.B.E. tells us what form of immorality is involved. (*Kadhesh*, a male prostitute, i.e., sodomite and *kedheshah*, a female prostitute, i.e., sodomitess.) Further it states, "The English word is, of course, derived from Sodom, the inhabitants of which were in evil repute for unnatural vice." In Deuteronomy 23:17, Moses states that no *kedheshah* (sodomitess) could enter into the assembly of Jehovah. In 23:18, he further states that the hire of an harlot (Zahan) could not be brought into the house of Jehovah. Homosexuality is an abomination unto Jehovah God; if it was joined to idolatrous worship the sin was only compounded. Covetousness is sometimes associated with stealing; but the stealing does not remove the sin of covetousness, neither does idolatry remove the sin of sodomy.


Did the rulers in the book of Kings only punish the temple prostitute? No, the **sodomites** were put out of the land! If the **sodomites** were put out of the land there were none left (I Kings 14:24; I Kings 15:12 and I Kings 22:46).

The connection between Sodom (Genesis 19:1-11) and the sodomites referred to in the above passage is that they "were wicked and sinners against Jehovah exceedingly" (Genesis 13:13) and they did "abominations" (I Kings 14:24) before Jehovah. The traditional middle eastern folk mores, as Dr. Patai stated, may have countenanced homosexual love but God doesn't.



Where does Genesis (or God's Word) put men with men or women with women in "sexual union" without condemning such as sin?

In some passages of scripture the word "only" is appropriate. Concerning salvation from sin one cannot state that salvation is by grace only because the Bible teaches that salvation comes by other things as well.




In this case there cannot be an "only." When God declared that the priests were to come from the tribe of Levi, it excluded the other eleven and it was an only—Levi only. (Jereboam sinned when he did otherwise, I Kings 12:31). When God indicated the elements of the Lord's Supper it excluded everything but unleavened bread and fruit of the vine and it is an only. When God speaks many times about marriage and continually indicates man and woman (Genesis 2:18, 22, 23, 24; 4:17; 5: (begat children); Matthew 19:4, 5, 9; I Corinthians 7: 39; Romans 7:1-4; I Peter 2:7) you have an only! Unless the Bible teaches implicitly or explicitly that men may marry men or women may marry women with God's approval then Dr. Johnson has proof that only heterosexuals may marry.


Dr. Johnson's illustration of the Cub Scout is not a parallel to the point of our discussion. What would you do, Dr. Johnson, if the final source of authority stated, "Therefore shall a lad leave the cub pack and join himself to the Boy Scouts and become united"? Could he join himself to any organization he so desired? No, not without disobedience.

Should Homosexuals Be Advised To Marry Heterosexuals?

In using I Corinthians 7 in my first affirmative I was using God's word to show his plan for man and woman in marriage and noting that it involved male and female throughout.



Where did I state that in order to avoid fornication, all men, even homosexuals, should have their own wives? In I Corinthians 7 Paul is not speaking of those who have left the natural use of the woman and burned in their lust for one another (Romans 1:27). Paul is speaking of men and women marrying in harmony with God's plan and authority. Paul's admonition to the homosexual is to repent, 1 Corinthians 6:9-11.



I would never contend and never have contended that a homosexual should marry a heterosexual person. If married and they engaged in homosexual activities they are guilty of *porneia* (fornication) in God's sight. This would be a sin against God, their marriage partner, the homosexual partner and self.

I have addressed myself to the issue in showing that homosexuality is sinful in God's sight. The syllogism presented in my first affirmative stands.

Dr. Johnson's Questions

1. No, because God allows heterosexual relations according to His will while He does not allow homosexual relations. The heterosexual relationship may be abused (resulting in sin) but it can exist with God's approval.

2. No, but the act itself is sinful.

3. Animals are without morals (knowledge of good and evil) while man is created in the image of God. Animals are governed by the survival of the strong (when there is a balance they fulfill the male-female role), and man is governed by moral laws given by a Supreme Being.

4. God gives conjugal rights to husband and wife who have been united according to His will, but to no other. While child rearing is a responsibility of the parent (Ephesians 6:1-4) it is not limited to the married. A single person can fulfill their Christian obligation to an orphan child (James 1:27) as well as a married person.

5. For fellowship with God's people a person must abide in the teachings of Christ (II John 9; I Corinthians 4:6; failure to do so is sin, I John 3:4).

6. The Jews had many traditions which conflicted with God's instructions (Mark 7:8-14). Please note that Jesus said, "The scribes sit on Moses' seat: All things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe: But do not ye after their works, for they say and do not" (Matthew 23:2-3). They were to follow God's word but not the example of the scribes.

Johnson's Comedy of Errors in His Second Negative

1. In his second negative Dr. Johnson quotes me as saying, ". . . It is an act (sexual intercourse) in which those of the same sex cannot engage . . ." and then draws some of the wildest conclusions ever read. If the reader will turn to my second affirmative and read the entire statement the meaning is quite clear. ". . . Because they are not so equipped, but

must substitute other parts of their physical anatomy to achieve coitus." They can indeed engage in same-sex and the Bible calls it sodomy.

2. Another partial quote, "It is possible for one who is not homosexual to engage in same-sex. .TFE." But the readers know that I indicated that the act itself would be sinful. (I wonder whose position is crumbling when misrepresentation becomes necessary?)

3. Dr. Johnson, *malakoi* in Matthew 11:8 and Luke 7:25 refers to clothing, **NOT** men. (Reader should note that he admits that *malakoi* in I Corinthians 6:9 refers to homosexuals).

4. My opponent's statement that "everybody from time to time practices some form of role reversal (inversion). . ." is a generalization and an unproven assumption.

5. The statement concerning Sodom is presented as fact. "Biblical evidence suggests that the men of Sodom were heterosexual inverts, not gay." This Biblical quote is from Letha Scanzoni and Virginia Ramey (???). Jude 7 doesn't agree.

6. Dr. Johnson has repeated Romans 13:13 to prove that the abuse of heterosex does not make all sex evil. This is correct, but it is not parallel with his contention that not all homosexual activity is condemned. Romans 13:13—*koitias*—illicit sexual intercourse (certainly this is sin) but there are many passages which prove that heterosexual activity is God approved (Genesis 2; I Corinthians 7; Hebrews 13:4, etc.).

I Corinthians 6:9—*arsenokoitai*—Sodomites or act of sodomy (not abuse, Dr. Johnson, just plain *arsenokoitai*—sodomy).

a. Dr. Johnson, list one passage of scripture which indicates homosexuality is God approved.

7. First negative quotes McNeill to show Sodom's sin was inhospitality. In second negative quotes Scanzoni and Ramey to show Sodom's sin was inversion. (?)

I Corinthians 6, Again

E-8

What Paul Condemns in I Corinthians 6:9-11

CONDEMNNS		NOT
1. ARSEKOKITAI	- Sodomy	Abuse of Sodomy
2. KLEPTAI	- Thieves	Abuse of Stealing
3. PLEONEKTAI	- Covetousness	Abuse of Covetousness
4. METHUSOI	- Drunkenness	Abuse of Drunkenness
5. LOIDOROI	- Revelers	Abuse of Revelling
6. HARPAGES	- Extortioners	Abuse of Extortion

THE ACTS THEMSELVES ARE SIN - NOT THE ABUSE!

I understand his Chart No. 5, I only wish he did.

KINDS OF ABUSERS

NOT

BUT SIN OF

E-9

"Abusers of themselves with alcohol"	- Alcoholic Abuse	- Drunkenness
"Abusers of themselves with drugs"	- Drug Abuse	- Drunkenness & Slavery (I Cor.6:12)
"Abusers of themselves with women"	- Heterosexual Abuse	- Fornication
"Abusers of themselves with men"	- Homosexual Abuse	- Sodomy

His four examples are not equal. There is Biblical approval of alcohol, drugs (as medicine) and heterosexuality, but not of the sin of sodomy, and all the charts Dr. Johnson may draw will not change this Biblical fact.

Romans One

Concerning the passage my opponent assumes that Paul in verses 26 and 27 is speaking of heterosexuals who were married and further assumes that they change their sexual orientation. This passage does not speak of their changing sexuality (from heterosexual to homosexual) but of changing God's "natural use" into that which is "against nature." Paul was not speaking of a person's previous sexual orientation but of the natural God-approved function.

"Change" in Romans One

E-10

Change	To
Glory of incorruptible God	Likeness of Corruptible Man
Truth	Lie
Worship of God	Worship of creature
Natural use	That which is against nature
Natural use	Working unseemliness

Inversion

Dr. Johnson's argument on inversion can be summed up in the following:

Proposition "A", If a person is homosexual by nature, he is not condemned by God.

Proposition "B", Then God approves at least some homosexuality.

"B" is false—I Corinthians 6:9-11; therefore "A" is false as well.

Homosexual By Nature?

"We have included five of our lives so that you may see us as we see ourselves as real people. We weren't born lesbians. Coming to think of ourselves as gay was part of a process. We went through social conditioning, had experiences with men and women, and made choices, conscious or not. We have always loved some women—friends, mothers, sisters—but that did not make us gay. At some point our love for our women friends found expression in sexual feelings, and we acted on those feelings. For Clyde this happened when she was nine; for Nell, not until she was thirty-seven, married and the mother of three children." (*Our Bodies, Ourselves—A Book By and For Women*, 2nd edition, The Boston Women's Health Book Collective, Simon and Schuster, New York, (c) 71, 73, 76. Article—"In America They Call Us Dykes." (Since the *Gay Collective* insisted on complete control over the style and content of this chapter, the Health Book Collective has not edited it. Because of length limitations, however, the Gay Collective has had to leave out much material that they feel is important.)

This statement was made by gays about gays.

Homosexuality Is Learned

"In an article in the *Journal of American Medicine*, Dr. Charles Socarides, M.D., says that homosexuality is not 'innate or inborn' but an acquired or learned process. This is confirmed by the pro-homosexual SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S. Inc.) which says in its pamphlet on homosexuality that "Genetic, constitutional or glandular

factors play little role in the causation of homosexuality." This book is written by Isadore Rubin, Ph.D.—who approves of homosexuality—and his authority for the statement is other "authorities in the field." (*There's Nothing Gay About Homosexuality*, by Murray Norris).

"There is no evidence that homosexual preferences are genetically determined." (Virginia E. Johnson and William H. Master, quoted in *Knoxville News-Sentinel*, April 17, 1979).

"But is Society any more justified in discriminating against gays than it is in showing bigotry toward blacks? After all, some psychologists believe a man has no more control over his sexual preferences than a black has choice of his skin color. . . .

"The major problem with the theory that being gay is like being black is that most psychologists believe homosexuality is conditional, not congenital." (*Time*, June 20, 1977).

Born That Way Or Seduced?

"According to Cahn, the group had been operating for ten years with at least 45 members—adults and boys aged seven to 17 seduced into homosexuality. . . . Club members supposedly got together on such outwardly innocent enterprises as fishing trips, and then swapped boys, generally fatherless youngsters who had been coaxed into the ring with gifts. . . . The group had even drafted a 'Bill of Rights' for each boy. The key clause: 'every boy has a right to a loving relationship with at least one responsible male adult after whom he can pattern his life'." (*Time*, June 5, 1972).

The Sin of Sodom

Dr. Johnson in his first negative quotes John J. McNeil as he sets forth the sin of Sodom as inhospitable treatment. In his second negative he lists Matthew 10:14-15, Mark 6:11 and Luke 10:8, 12, as the "chief reasons for Sodom's fall." These passages of scripture reveal the instructions given to his apostles as they went to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 10:6). Jesus stated, "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, as ye go forth out of that house or that city, shake off the dust of your feet" (Matthew

10:14). In the next verse our Lord states, "Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city" (Matthew 10:15). Does this teach that the cities which rejected the apostles were guilty of the same sin? No, it simply points out that the wrath of God will be poured out against those who reject Christ and his message. The inspired writer Jude in verse seven indicated the sin of Sodom. Fornication—illicit sexual relationship with strange flesh.

Homosexuality A Practice Of Ungodly and Sinners

E-11

In I Timothy 1:10 Paul Condemns

PORNOIS	Fornicators	NOT	Abuse of Fornication
ARSENOKOITAIS*	Sodomites	NOT	Abuse of Sodomy
ANDRAPODISTAIS	Men Stealing	NOT	Abuse of Menstealing
PSEVSTAIS	Liars	NOT	Abuse of Lying
EPIORKOIS	Perjurers	NOT	Abuse of Perjury
ANY OTHER THING CONTRARY TO SOUND DOCTRINE		NOT	Abuse of Any Other Thing Contrary to Sound Doctrine.

* (ARSENOKOITAIS Defined: "A male homosexual, pederast, sodomite - I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10..." A Greek-English Lexicon of The New Testament and Other Christian Literature)

Questions for Dr. Johnson

E-12

1. () True, () False. A gay male never uses another male as a woman.
2. () True, () False. Gay males are sexually attracted to other males.
3. () True, () False. There are sexual relations (coitus) when a gay male and his "lover share a beautiful secret."
4. () True, () False. It is wrong for heterosexuals to leave heterosexuality to practice homosexuality.
5. () True, () False. It is wrong for a gay to leave homosexuality to practice heterosexuality.
6. () True, () False. There are no sexual relations (coitus) when a gay male and his "lover share a beautiful secret."
7. () True, () False. A male could with God's approval leave the natural use of women (his wife) and take a male lover if he determined he was, by nature, gay.
8. () True, () False. A gay male or gay female would never enter a heterosexual union. (Marriage)

Third Negative

By Dr. Paul R. Johnson

In his last speech my opponent surrendered almost every argument that he set out to establish. It seems like I am now debating a different person.

The Dean admits the Sodom story, standing alone, does not condemn all gays. We asked Dean Eaves, "If the attempted rape in Sodom had been heterosexual, would that prove that all heterosexuality was intrinsically sinful?" After much coaxing he finally answered "no" but he said that other places in the Bible would prove which was right. He has finally understood chart No. 1. The story by itself only condemns attempted angelic rape, either homosexual or heterosexual.

Professor Eaves admits and correctly explains my point regarding "only"? He says that my argument on "only" is valid if gayness can be established in the Bible. He further admits that all the heterosexual scriptures on marriage mean nothing if gay union can be proven. This is my position exact-

The Dean admits that the Greek word "koite" means illicit sexual union. Pastor Eaves confesses that *Koite* does not condemn all heterosexuals in Romans 13:13. He also admits that it would mean the same in I Corinthians 6:9 unless there is contrary proof elsewhere. This is my position. The Dean's so-called "anti-gay verses" do not condemn all homosexuality standing alone. If St. Paul had condemned female *koites* rather than male *koites* in I Corinthians 6:9, the Dean would be drawing my charts. If Paul had condemned "abusers of themselves with women" the Dean would have no trouble at all understanding the verse.

THE DEANS CHART E-11 CORRECTED FOR PARALLELISM

J-8

PORNOIS	Sex abusers (Gay or Het)	Not abuse of sexual abuse
ARSENOKOITE	Male Prostitutes (Gay or Het) etc.	Not abuse of prostitution
ANDRAPODISTAIS	Men Stealing (Gay or Het)	Not abuse of men stealing
PSEVETAIS	Abusers of the truth (Gay or Het)	Not abuse of truth abuse
ARSENOKOTAIS	DEFINED A male sex abuser, KJV, "male prostitute" ISBE	

Paul Roberts wrote in *Vector Magazine*, October 1975:

The Greek word Arsenokoite means "sexual abuser" not homosexuality. By breaking this late Greek term down, one is able to see the correct meaning. The Greek word ARSENO means "male" and the Greek word KOITE means "sexual abuser." Our standard English versions translate the term correctly.

The Greek word ARSENOKOITES always carried this general meaning of abuse from the time it first appeared in the Imperial Greek Period. In *Oraculat Sibyllina 2:27* the definition of the word is given. The unknown author writes: "A male sexual abuser (ARSENOKOITES) is one who wrongfully extracts money (prostitutes) and sometimes even murders." Theophrastus in his *Historia Plantarum* describes these abusers as "course and tough." The word included the idea of forced sex, blackmail, murder, etc. Even the early church Fathers used these Greek terms in this general way (see Polycarp to the Philippians 5:3). Five hundred years after Christ, the organized church took this general term and changed its meaning. Thus the fifth century church was able to claim that St. Paul had listed homosexuality as a vice. Certain modern religious authorities have taken this fifth century definition as the first century meaning. All who closely trace the Greek word in its original form will arrive at the proper definition. Scholars, Greek poets of the first century, and the early church Fathers agree; the word means "sexual abuse."

***Professor Eaves Admits That Only Heterosexual Males
Should Marry Women***

After my rebuke the Dean admitted that only non-gays can form a heterosexual union. My position has always been that it is according to the "natural use" for heterosexual males to marry women (Romans 1:28; I Cor. 7). The Dean said in Chart E-1 that the Romans at first were following "God's decree," even quoting Matthew 19:4-6 which speaks of marriage. He said that these men at first had the proper "life style." He rebukes me for teaching the same. But married or unmarried, they were heterosexuals who inverted to same-sex, not gays!

***Dean Thomas F. Eaves Admits That "Sodomite"
Means A "Male Prostitute."***

He defines "*kadesh*, a male prostitute, *i.e.*, sodomite." He quotes the I.S.B.E. to prove that the Sodomite is a male prostitute, then he promptly denies his own definition by claiming that Sodomite does not mean "male prostitute" but that it means "all homosexuals." He had rather depend on some modern English definition rather than the Biblical definition. The I.S.B.E. has an obligation to define both modern and Biblical meanings, but the Dean has a written obligation to accept the Bible meaning. Will the Dean accept the modern meaning of Priest, church or baptism? If he will accept his own Biblical definition of Sodomite (one who practices Sodomy) then I will gladly accept charts E-8 and E-11. Sodomy means male prostitution, and all the Sodomites (male prostitutes) were driven out of the land. We should love and decriminalize prostitutes as did Jesus, pointing them to a better life (John 8).

***The Dean Admits That Gays Are Not The Only
Objects Who May Be Malakos.***

He says that *malakos* sometimes refers to clothing. Was the clothing homosexual? *Malakos* refers to anything or anyone (gay or het) that is soft. I said that I Corinthians 6:9 referred to both gays and hets. The classic writers used the word to describe various heterosexuals as well as certain Catamites. (Diog. Laer. vii. 5:4. Xenoph. Mem. iii. 7.1; Ovid. Fast. iv. 342).

The Greek word *malakoes*, really means "voluptuous." Any good Greek Lexicon will prove the point. . . . *Malakoes* in I Corinthians 6:9 denotes people who give themselves up to a soft, luxurious and emollient way of living, who make self-indulgence the grand object of living. Roberts, p. 9.

***Dean Eaves Admits That Romans One Does Not Speak
Of Changing Orientation***

This passage does not speak of their changing sexuality from heterosexual to homosexual but changing God's "natural use" into that which is against nature. Paul was not speaking of a person's previous sexual orientation, but of the natural God-approved function. — Thomas F. Eaves.

This is what I have been saying all along. The Dean also admits that only hets engage in God's natural use for reproduction (chart E-7). Why doesn't he also say that only heterosexuals can change this natural use into something against nature? In the animal and human kingdom it is natural for heterosexuals to mate with the opposite sex and reproduce. For homosexual animals or humans to try to fill this function would be going contrary to their nature.

It is as natural for the homosexual to act homosexually as it is for the heterosexual to act heterosexually. In each case there is the possibility of fulfillment in love. — Dr. Norman Pittenger, *Christianity And Crisis*. Aug. 5, 1974.

Minister Eaves begs me to affirm. I challenged the Dean to prove that the Greek and Hebrew terms for marriage in the Bible always referred to heterosexual union, but he refused to even discuss this. All he would do is quote verse after verse to prove that heterosexuals could marry, a point that no one denies. He now begs me to shift into the affirmative and disprove that which he must prove! I shall establish my affirmative at the proper time. Though in the negative I am happy to answer his questions. All eight of the questions must be marked "false" because if any part of a statement is untrue or if the statement could be untrue then the answer would be negative (even No. 3 and No. 6).

I wish the Dean would be as fair with my questions. What are the Bible words for sexual intercourse? What does the word "marriage" mean in the Bible? Do both persons always sin in a same-sex act? Why do you fellowship Christians who advocate abortion, artificial insemination, war, divorce, and birth control? Just claiming not to fellowship sin does not answer this question.

He still claims that gays cannot physically engage in sexual intercourse. The Dean's proposition reads, "All sexual intercourse between human beings of the same sex is intrinsically sinful." He got in deeper water by trying to deny that sexual intercourse means coitus. However, he tops this by denying that drunkenness is alcoholic abuse or that fornication is heterosexual abuse (Chart E-9). He says that homosexual abuse cannot exist but turns around and says that

the Bible condemns "not just the abuse of" homosexuality (p. 46).

The Dean's desperate charts mean nothing if the compound word *arseno-koite* is literally translated "male illicit sex" (this way he cannot play on the word "abuse"). If drunkenness is translated alcoholic abuse, his chart falls.

HOMOSEXUAL AND HETEROSEXUAL SINS ARE EQUALLY CONDEMNED IN THE BIBLE.

EPITHUMEO	= Lust (Heterosexual or Homosexual) Galatians 5:17	J-9
AKATHARTOS	= Uncleaness (Heterosexual or Homosexual) Ephesians 5:5	
PORNEUO	= Sex Abuse (Heterosexual or Homosexual) Galatians 5:19	
KOITE *	= Illicit sex (Heterosexual or Homosexual) I Cor.6:9.Rm:13	
MOICHAO	= Adultery (Heterosexual or Homosexual) Galatians 5:19	
MALAKOS	= Soft (Heterosexual or Homosexual, etc.) I Cor. 6:9	

What are the causes of homosexuality? The article from the *Gay Collective*, misapplied by the Dean, distinguishes between the homosexual condition (completed in infancy) and a "lesbian" (i.e., a liberated, self-accepting, open gay woman). Certainly we are not born with these mature qualities. Masters and Johnson devote an entire chapter in *The Homosexual Perspective to* the non-genetic prenatal causes. If gayness is hereditary, we would have died out long ago. Psychiatrists generally agree that homosexuality is complete and irreversible on or before the child's fifth birthday. If it is "learned" at all, it is "learned" very early before the infant reaches the age of confirmation or accountability. SIECUS and other authorities really believe:

No one who was programmed by five years of age to be heterosexual can be seduced to become homosexual, any more than the reverse. SIECUS Report 6.

The many studies of homosexuality cannot agree on the source of homosexuality, but whether homosexuality comes from one's genetic makeup or from early conditioning, a homosexual is a homosexual through no fault of his own. Father Henry Fehreu, *U.S. Catholic*, 1972.

American geneticist F. K. Kallman studied 85 gay men in New York who had twin brothers. By 1952 he was able to find 26 of the non-identical twin brothers, they showed no unusual amount of homosexuality. But of the 37 identical twin brothers, all had had homosexuality activity, and 28 were exclusively or almost exclusively homosexual. Arno Karlen, *Sexuality and Homosexuality*, p. 340.

Sex identity is learned by eighteen to twenty-four months; it is irrevocably set by thirty months. . . . Behavior studies show no great increase in homosexuality over seven decades, yet it is spoken of more

and more.... In 1947 Dr. Stanley Jones had written in England that the goal of change was not only futile but "quite indefensible when regarded in the light of absolute morality. Attempted treatment or alteration of the basic personality of an inborn homosexual can only be described as a moral outrage." Arno Karlen, p. 487.

Forcing a homosexual to become heterosexual is not possible any more than forcing a heterosexual to become homosexual. Scanzoni, page 178.

Great numbers of teenage boys recognize they are homosexual long before they have ever met another homosexual. *Sexuality and Health*, p. 90.

Most of the Dean's Arguments May Be Applied Against Birth Control Also

Chart No. 10 shows that most arguments used by anti-gays against the "unnatural vice" of homosexuality may equally apply against artificial birth control.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST BIRTH CONTROL ARE ARGUMENTS AGAINST HOMOSEXUALITY	J-10
1. God destroyed Sodom and Onan because of unnatural vice (Gen. 19, 38)	
2. Both these unnatural vices are departures from God's plan for man.	
3. The Creator's design for reproduction proves both unnatural.	
4. PORNEIA means every kind of unlawful intercourse (unnatural vice).	
5. Where does Genesis (or God's word) put either without condemning such.	
6. The English meanings of both terms prove they are evil.	
7. The "natural use of the woman" for reproduction isn't present in either.	
8. Conjugal needs must never cancel the command to "be fruitful & multiply".	
9. If either "were joined to idolatrous worship or covetousness the sin was only compounded." Onan's sin was not just covetousness.	
10. All who practice either violate laws of many States, should be denied human rights, denied fellowship or ordination and fired from teaching.	
11. Arguments <u>for</u> birth control may also be used <u>for</u> homosexuality.	

The Dean's errors are not comic but pathetic. Dean Eaves chastens me for claiming that the cities of the plain were destroyed for several reasons, then teaches the very same thing himself. He tries to use Genesis 4:7 to prove that those in Holy Union are allowed to have children "as they desire" (Chart E-4) but the verse really teaches they may have sex as they desire. Every time the Dean sees the term "abomination" he thinks gay, that is his assumption. In my Cub Scout Story the Scout Master's announcement was the final authority. My illustration stands. The amoral nature of animals is not the point of my question No. 3. The point is that the creation of "male and female" does not nullify the naturalness of gayness in the animal or human kingdom. Please answer the question.

The Dean's logic will not allow him a scripture for a baby-sitter (James 1:27 speaks of orphans). The Pharisees are not the only ones to advance man-made traditions. As evil men rejected the messengers of God in Genesis 19 they also rejected Christ's message (Matt. 10). . . . It is the **affirmative's** duty to prove that the citizens of Sodom were homosexuals rather than invert. History and the Bible suggest that the city was not a gay ghetto. . . . Mild inversion such as meekness, etc., is a universal trait (see Tripp, p. 13) but inversion sex abuse as practiced by the heterosexual Romans (Rom. 1:28) is wrong. If the Dean knew anything about the definition of inversion he would accept my axiom. . . . The Dean dismisses two of my arguments because I used few words when quoting him. But I did not misquote or misrepresent his position. Certainly it is unnecessary to list all the reasons when I point out what the Dean believes. He quibbles because he can't answer. 34 words after the Dean criticizes me he partially quotes me and that's O.K.

Child molesters are mostly heterosexual. Dean Eaves had to go back many years to find a case of same-sex teenage molestation. Because of common occurrence heterosexual teen molestation seldom makes the news (I did recently hear of a group of cops molesting teenage girl scouts). The same-sex case presented in *Time* magazine was probably a case of heterosexual inversion of kids.

According to Alan Bell of the Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University, child-seduction and child-molestation are usually heterosexual phenomena. — Scanzoni, p. 22.

Karlen says on page 560 that child molesters are almost always heterosexual. Dr. Kurt Freud of the Clark Institute of Psychiatry in Toronto proved in extensive tests that Gays are less prone to child molestation than are heterosexuals. — *The Advocate*, December 29, 1976, p. 6.

Choice is always limited by constitutionality. A person's choice is always limited by prenatal and postnatal infantile development. A diminutive can't play with the Dallas Cowboys, an "eunuch" can't beget. A number one heterosexual on the Kinsey Scale could never have a meaningful relationship with another man. Roger Walson wrote in *Q.Q. Magazine*, April 1978, page 30:

One's sexuality is a gift of nature, to be enjoyed naturally, according to one's choice. . . . Bryantologists and other anti-gay crusaders have twisted the word "choice" to mean that gay guys choose that form of sexual behavior as you choose to have lobster instead of corn beef at dinner. Sexual behavior actually is shaped by a number of factors outside the control of any individual, and it is this shaping of orientation that results in ultimate choice.

We gays have the choice of using or abusing our God-given orientation, just as heterosexuals have the choice of acting in a responsible heterosexual way. What this world needs most is responsible love (I Cor. 13). May God help us all to find that love. I am praying for the Dean, that God may open his eyes in love to all homosexuals who seek an ethical and moral life.

Fourth Affirmative

By Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

(Statements from Dr. Johnson's third negative numbered in order given.)

1. ***"The Dean admits the Sodom story, standing alone, does not condemn all gays"***—Johnson. I do not admit what Johnson has attributed to me. The Sodom story condemns homosexuality, and every passage of scripture in the Bible which refers to homosexuality condemns it. The Bible teaches that all homosexual activity is sinful whereas only the abuse (adulterating) of heterosexual relations is condemned as sinful. The Sodom story is dealing with the sin of homosexuality, not the abuse of heterosexuality. (Dr. Johnson, what happened to your inhospitable argument advanced in your first negative? See chart E-3.)

2. ***"Professor Eaves admits and correctly explains my point regarding 'only' "***—Johnson. "When God speaks many times about marriage and continually indicates man and woman (Genesis 2:18, 22, 23 and 24; 4:17; 5: (begat children); Matthew 19:4-5 and 9; I Corinthians 7:1-7; Romans 7:1-4; I Peter 2:7) you have an only! Unless the Bible teaches implicitly that men may marry men or women may marry women with God's approval, then Dr. Johnson has proof that only heterosexuals may marry." (Third affirmative, TFE). Since the Bible doesn't teach that men can marry men and women can marry women, then only heterosexuals can marry. Dr. Johnson says I correctly explained his point regarding only (???). Every argument I made shows the exclusiveness of

God's instructions. Priests from the tribe of Levi (excluded all other tribes). Build ark of gopher wood (excluded all other wood). Marriage is for male and female (excluded other unions).

3. *"The Dean admits that the Greek word 'koite' means illicit sexual union."* — Johnson. Romans 13:13 condemns an abuse of the heterosexual relations as approved by God, so it obviously doesn't condemn those who are living in a heterosexual union as approved by God. Johnson says, "If St. Paul had condemned female *koites* rather than male *koites* in I Corinthians 6:9, the Dean would be drawing my charts," and "If gayness can be established." (If $2+2=5$ then $2+2+2+2=10$, but $2+2=4$ and then $2+2+2+2=10$ is incorrect.) Fact is, Dr. Johnson, while Paul condemns female *koites* in Romans 13:13 he is not speaking of this in I Corinthians 6:9, but as you have correctly stated he condemns homosexuality, i.e., male *koites*. We are not talking about what if Paul had said, but what Paul did actually say!

4. Dr. Johnson quotes Paul Roberts' comments on *arsenokoite*. Since we are speaking of Bible terms, Dr. Johnson, let's define the words of the Koine Greek by the acknowledged standards, the Greek Lexicons. What is the meaning of *arsenokoite* as used in the Bible?

ARSENOKOITES

E-13

1. ARSEN. Male as opposed to female

3. Paul's use of ARSEN is interesting in that it exhibits a tension between the creation ordinances and their abolition in the Gospel Age. By contrast the ungodly have abolished the creation ordinances for sexual relations in a way which can only bring judgement. p.568

(a)...Paul uses the noun ARSENOKOITES, a male homosexual, pederast, sodomite as one who is excluded from the Kingdom (I Cor. 6:9) and condemned by law (I Tim. 1:10...)p.568

KOITE. Bed, marriage bed, intercourse.

Frequently the word KOITE reflects a distinctly metaphorical use of the Heb. MISKAB as a surrogate for sexual congress as in Lev. 18:22; 20:13, where the word occurs in the plural construct state with ISSAH, woman. (p.587)

(The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Colin Brown, General Editor)

2. ARSEN. Male, Arndt & Gingrich, p.109.

KOITE. 1. bed- a. generally, b. esp. marriage bed.

2. EUPHEM. for- a. sexual intercourse. b. seminal emissions. Arndt & Gingrich, p.440. (bed, Luke 7:11; Marriage Bed, Hebrews 13:4; Chambering, Romans 13:13)

3. ARSENOKOITES - male homosexual who engages in sex, seminal emission with another male.

(Not the sexual union approved as in I Corinthians 7:)

Johnson's and Roberts definition of these words DO NOT STAND! Let the reader note that the passage in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13 forbids homosexuality even as I Corinthians 6:9.

Mr. Roberts says that our "Standard English versions translate the term correctly." Just what do the English translations say?

How Do The Translations Render ARSENKOITAI?		
TRANSLATION	I CORINTHIANS 6:9	I TIMOTHY 1:10
Charles B. Williams The N.T.	Guilty of unnatural sexual vice	Men who practice sodomy
New International Version	Homosexual Offenders	Perverts
New American Standard	Homosexuals	Homosexuals
The Living Bible	Homosexuals	Homosexuals
The N.T. Translated from the Latin Vulgate	Sodomites	Sodomites
Berkley Version in Modern English	Partakers in Homosexuality	Sexual Perverts
N.T. of the Jerusalem Bible	Sodomites	Immoral with boys or men
N.T. in English, R.A. Knox	Sinners against nature	Sin against nature
New Berkley version in Modern English	Partakers in Homosexuality	Sexual Perverts
King James	Abusers of themselves with men	For them that defile themselves with mankind
American Standard	Abusers of themselves with men	NOT abusers of themselves with men.
Revised Standard Version	Sexual Perverts	Sodomites
Good News for Modern Man	Homosexual Perverts	Sexual Perverts
The Amplified N.T.	Nor those who participate in Homosexuality	Those who abuse themselves with men.
The N.T. in Modern English, Phillips	The Perverts	Perverted
The N.T. an American Translation Goodspeed	Unnatural vice	Men sexually perverted
The New English Bible	Homosexual Perversion	Perverts
The N.T. Kliest & Lilly	Homosexualist	Homosexualists
Beck	Men who sin sexually with other men	men who sin with other men
The Interlinear Greek English New Testament - Marshall	Sodomites	Paederasts

From these twenty translations it is evident that homosexuality is a perversion and the homosexual is a pervert. Homosexuality is condemned by God's Word and those who partake in such are classified as unrighteous and "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 6:9,11).

Thayer, p. 75—"ARSEN a male; KOITE a bed), one who lies with a male as with a female, a sodomite: I Corinthians 6:9; 1 Timothy 1:10." (*A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament*).

Arndt & Gingrich, p. 109. "a male homosexual, pederast, sodomite: I Cor. 6:9; I Timothy 1:10." (*A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*).

These authorities define the word as used in the Bible. Dr. Johnson has a written obligation to accept the Bible meaning.

5. "*Professor Eaves admits that only heterosexual males should marry women.*" — Johnson. Johnson says, "after my rebuke the Dean admitted that only non-gays can form a heterosexual union." Dr. Johnson assigned this position to me, rebuked me for holding a position I did not advocate then puts a feather in his hat when I supposedly changed. (Reader is encouraged to read my statements at chart E-6 and E-7 in my third affirmative.)

6. "*Dean Thomas F. Eaves admits that 'Sodomite' means a 'male prostitute'.*" — Johnson. The Bible condemns **all** homosexuality. Old Testament, Genesis 19:1-11 (men who desired men sexually) and Leviticus 18:22; 20:13. If this practice was connected with temple worship and/or prostitution it simply compounded the sin. Commenting on Deuteronomy 13:18-19, S. R. Driver stated, "The renderings 'harlot' and 'sodomite' are both inadequate: in neither case is **ordinary immorality** intended, but **immorality** practiced in the worship of a deity, . . ." (*The International Critical Commentary*, Deuteronomy, p. 264.) In the New Testament Paul uses terms which point out without a doubt that homosexuality is an abomination to God (I Corinthians 6:9 and I Timothy 1:10). The Bible teaches that homosexuality is condemned by God regardless of the **environment** you put it in.

7. "*The Dean admits that gays are not the only objects who may be malakos.*" — Johnson. The word *malakos* appears in the New Testament four times, Matthew 11:8 (two times), Luke 7:25, and I Corinthians 6:9. Three times it refers to clothing, and one time it refers to the catamite. The Greek Lexicon states "1. of things: clothes and gives Luke 7:25 and Matthew 11:8 a & b. 2. Of persons soft, effeminate, esp. of catamites, men and boys who allow themselves to be misused homosexually." I'm sure Dr. Johnson will give us the Bible passage where *malakos* refers to **both** gays and hets. (Surely he can do this to substantiate his claims without getting into the affirmative. Remember, Dr., that you have a written obligation to accept the Bible meaning (not classical Greek, but Koine—Bible Greek).

8. "*Dean Eaves admits that Romans one does not speak of changing orientation.*" — Johnson. Check chart E-10 with ac-

companying comments and the reader will see that Paul is talking about men and women who had changed God's plan which is natural (the heterosexual relationship) and were participating in the homosexual life style. Dr. Johnson assumes they were heterosexual who had changed to the homosexual way of life.

9. "*Minister Eaves begs me to affirm.*" — Johnson. The Greek *gamew*—marry—appears 29 times in the New Testament. In Matthew 5:32; 19:9,10; Mark 6:17; 10:11; 10:12; Luke 14:20; 16:18 a & b; I Corinthians 7:36, 39; 7:10, 33, 34; I Timothy 5:11, 14, the marriage involves man and woman. In Matthew 22:30, Luke 20:34-35, and Mark 12:25 it speaks of marriage and the question posed by the Sadducees (to tempt the Lord) identifying it as marriage between man and woman. Matthew 22:25; Mark 12:20; and Luke 20:29. In Matthew 24:38; Luke 17:27; I Corinthians 7:9 a & b; 7:28 a & b and I Timothy 4:3, it speaks of the act of marriage.

I didn't beg Dr. Johnson to shift into the affirmative, I asked him to give one (1) passage of scripture to uphold his false claims _____ 2 _____

Concerning chart E-12 Dr. Johnson states, "Though in the negative I am happy to answer his questions. All eight of his questions must be marked false because if any part of a statement is untrue or if the statement could be untrue then the answer must be negative even No. 3 and No. 6."

Johnson vs. Johnson

E-15

(Questions I ask are numbered (1) - (8) marked false as he indicated.)

JOHNSON - "Gay males do not use other men as substitute women..." (2nd negative)
 (1) () True (X) False A gay male never uses another male as a woman.

JOHNSON - "We are GAY. We are sexually attracted to our own gender." (2nd negative)
 (2) () True (X) False Gay males are sexually attracted to other males.

(3) () True (X) False There are sexual relations (coitus) when a gay male and his "lover share a beautiful secret."

(6) () True (X) False There are no sexual relations (coitus) when a gay male and his "lover share a beautiful secret." (The reader can figure this out.)

JOHNSON - "While St. Paul speaks only of heterosexuals who leave that which is natural for them, it could also be said that gays should not leave the sexual nature which is natural for them, (i.e. homosexuality).

(4) () True (X) False It is wrong for heterosexuals to leave heterosexuality to practice homosexuality.

(5) () True (X) False It is wrong for a gay to leave homosexuality to practice heterosexuality.

(7) () True (X) False A male could with God's approval leave the natural use of women (his wife) and take a male lover if he determined he was, by nature, gay.

(8) () True (X) False A gay male or gay female would never enter a heterosexual union (Marriage).

10. *"He still claims that gays cannot engage in sexual intercourse."* — Johnson. Gays cannot "know": (have sexual intercourse) as heterosexuals, the union of man and wife sexually from which children are born (Genesis 4:1). A gay cannot "render due benevolence" to his wife (I Corinthians 7:3-5) as Paul taught because Paul speaks of man and woman. Gays can engage in same sex and it is condemned by God in I Timothy 1:10. (Check Johnson's answers to questions (3) and (6).

11. *"What are the causes of homosexuality?"*—Johnson.

Johnson's Admissions In His Third Negative*

E-16

1. "...Distinguishes between the homosexual condition (completed in infancy)..."
2. Gayness is not hereditary.
3. Homosexuality can be learned very early in life.
4. If programmed to be homosexual by 5 years of age one can be seduced to become heterosexual.
5. "...but whether homosexuality comes from one's genetic make up (Johnson says homosexuality is not hereditary) or from early conditioning..."
6. "Sex identity is learned by eighteen to twenty-four months.

(Underlining is mine for emphasis - TFE)

*Read carefully his material, "What are the causes of homosexuality."

Compare these admissions with his statement in his second negative. "St. Paul does however, give both Hets and Gays a Divine principle in Romans chapter one. He teaches that it is dangerous to try to change the sexual nature given by God." According to Dr. Johnson God gives man a homosexual nature (doesn't receive it by heredity) but his homosexuality must be learned very early in life, or he must be programmed, or conditioned to this way of life. What you are saying, Dr., is that man becomes homosexual because of choice, influence or environment—not because God made him that way! God has created man with the freedom to become many things: liars, thieves, prostitutes, murderers, and homosexuals, but God expects man to walk according to His will and learn to be His servant. Man chooses his eternal destiny by the life he lives on earth (Romans 6:12-18; I Corinthians 1:6-11). When you talk to a thief, prostitute, drunkard, homosexual who wants to be what they are, obviously there is no way they can be influenced to serve God because they are happy fulfilling the desires of the flesh.

12. *"Most of the Dean's arguments may be applied against birth control."* — Johnson. The debate is not over birth

control, Dr. Johnson, and as far as I know the Bible says nothing against husband and wife planning the growth of their family or limiting it. Onan died because he disobeyed God to raise up seed to his brother (Genesis 38:10).

13. *"The Dean's errors are not comic but pathetic."* — **Johnson.** No, Dr. Johnson, they only seem that way to you because you haven't read my statements. Case in point is Chart E-4. The chart states, "3. Husbands and wives (Men and Women) in natural sexual union produce children as they desire—4:1 and 4:7." Dr. Johnson, "natural sexual union" is having sex as they desire and it is from the sex act that children are conceived and born. Usually children are born when parents desire to beget children.

If the Scout Master's announcement was the final authority, then the Cub scout violated (transgressed) the authority of the Scout Master by disobeying his instructions. Genesis 2:24 doesn't say that everyone has to marry but when marriage takes place it involves male and female and to do otherwise violates (transgresses) the authority of God.

The creation of male and female humans does not "prove" that homosexual acts are evil between human beings, the law of God which governs them declares that such activities are sin. The creation of male and female animals does not prove that homosexual acts between animals are evil because animals are not governed by God's moral law. Where there is a balance animals fulfill the male/female role. Dr. Johnson has assumed that animals are born gay and that their gayness is natural but he has not given proof that animals are born gay. We are debating man's relationship to his God and fellow man, not the animals' relationship to animals. If Johnson could prove that animals were born gay it would not help his position because he has admitted that man is programmed or learns his gayness.

Does God Approve Some Homosexual Relationships?

Writing by the guidance of the Holy Spirit Paul makes no distinction between homosexuality which some claim is "approved" and that which is "not approved."

First, Paul knew that in the Greco-Roman culture certain types of homosexuality was approved and he would have told the Romans "if any homosexual behavior was approved." "How would it be possible for Paul, who knew of the philosophically justified homosexual practice of the time, not to distinguish that from the 'unnatural relations' he speaks of in Romans 1:26 if he intended such a distinction?" They overlook the fact that Paul condemned the homosexual 'lust' that inflamed them to the homosexual act. Second, Paul would have overthrown the entire teaching of the Old Testament against all kinds of homosexuality if this argument be true. (*The Home As God Would Have It and Contemporary Attacks Against It*, Thomas B. Warren & Garland Elkins, Editors, "The Threat of Homosexuality To Our Society," by James Meadows, p. 354, National Christian Press, Algood, Tennessee.)

The concept that God approves some homosexuality makes Him the creator of a relationship which he calls an abomination (Leviticus 18:22) and one which will keep men and women out of heaven (I Corinthians 6:9-11).

The Bible gives mankind God's plans for men and women in sexual union. This plan can be obeyed or abused. When men and women are united (heterosexually) contrary to God's laws the result is fornication. When men are united sexually with men (or women sexually with women) contrary to God's laws the result is homosexuality (Romans 1 and I Corinthians 6). It is not the abuse of fornication condemned by the Bible, but fornication. Likewise it is not the abuse of homosexuality that is condemned but homosexuality.

Fourth Negative

By Dr. Paul R. Johnson

As this debate closes, I have made every effort to answer each and every point the Dean presented. In contrast to my opponent, I have answered every question openly and without delay. Because of this debate, I have come to believe more strongly in lesbian and gay male love than ever before. Dean Eaves couldn't even define marriage, sexual intercourse, homosexuality, or set the limits of Christian fellowship. He failed to establish one scripture.

DEAN EAVES HAD NO ANSWER TO MOST OF THE MAJOR ARGUMENTS

J-11

1. Jude 6,7 & Apocrypha shows that "strange flesh" means "alien flesh".
2. Standing alone, the Sodom story shows attempted angelic rape (inhospitality).
3. No evidence that gays were the reason for Sodom's judgment in Genesis 18.
4. No evidence that men of Sodom were homosexuals instead of inverters.
5. No answer to chart #6 that Moses condemned inverters, not homosexuals.
6. No discussion of Aquinas, my Eden point, or the command to multiply.
7. No discussion of Times report being rare or being heterosexual inversion.
8. No discussion of the greater danger from heterosexual child molesters.
9. Silence concerning the Dean's teachings that the Roman inverters were married.
10. Silence to the parallels between birth control and anti-gay arguments.
11. No reference to equal rights for gays, divorcees, atheists, Jews, etc.
12. Silent to the fellowship question of abortionist, Hawks, het oralist, etc.
13. No answer to the age of accountability and early homosexual causes.
14. No answer to I Cor. 6:9 speaking of "het" MALAKOS as well as gay MALAKOS.
15. No confessions of misquotes from Gay Collective, Masters & Johnson, SIECUS.

Dean Eaves refuses to even attempt answers or discuss these vital points but he takes time to copy from a concordance a long list of references on marriage. *Dean Eaves continues to misquote the authorities.* I proved from many sources that the word "Sodomite" means male shrine prostitute and thus exposed the Dean's misquote of the I.S.B.E. The Dean's quotation from the *International Critical Commentary* is misapplied also. Notice what the Dean tried to say:

Commenting on Deuteronomy 13:15-19, S. R. Driver stated, the renderings 'harlot' and 'sodomite' are both inadequate; in neither case is ordinary immorality intended, but immorality practiced in worship of a deity. TFE

The above "quote" has S. R. Driver saying that "ordinary immorality" should be shown in the translations (i.e., regular prostitution). Driver really wrote:

No Israelite, of either sex, is to become a temple-prostitute nor is the gain derived from any kind of prostitution to be offered in payment of a vow. . . . The renderings 'harlot' and 'sodomite' are both inadequate, in neither case is ordinary immorality intended, but immorality practiced in the worship of deity, and in the immediate precincts of a temple. . . . *kadesh* and *kedeshan* are, respectively, the Mas. and fern, of the same adj. (Lit. sacred).

Instead of Driver upholding my opponent, he really proves my position. Sacred prostitution, not gay love, is called an abomination in the Old Testament.

The Dean claims Johnson is on both sides of the postnatal cause theory. I stated early that I agree with the medical authorities who claim that homosexual genesis is before birth and non-genetic (p. 38, etc.). Dean Eaves tried to side with authorities who believe that gayness is caused after birth. I quoted from his authorities only to prove that even they believed that homosexuality was caused before the child reached the age of free choice (Chart E-1). I only quoted the Dean's authorities to show that even if homosexuality is caused by postnatal factors, it is still caused when the person is an infant. A mature adult chooses whether or not he wishes to be a thief. An adult does not choose whether he or she will be heterosexual or homosexual. Sexual orientation is determined before one reaches the age of accountability (free choice).

It is sad when the Dean is so confused that he reverses my quotes:

The Dean quotes me this way: "If programmed to be homosexual by 5 years of age one can be seduced to become heterosexual."

What I really said was: "No one who was programmed by five years of age to be heterosexual can be seduced to become homosexual, any more than the reverse. SIECUS, Report No. 6 (pg. 54).

The Dean will accept only parts of certain lexicons. Regarding the definition of *arseno-koites* (sexual abuser) the

Dean does not trust the Greek poets, the early church Fathers or even St. Paul's definition in Romans 13:13. Dean Eaves wants only to accept the definition presented by the Greek Lexicons. It is true that one or two Lexicons gives "homosexual" as one of the possible definitions of *arseno-koites* but I have already proven that this is a fifth century definition and we need a first century definition. Even these Lexicons suggest that *arseno-koites* could also mean a "Sodomite" (male sacred prostitute) or a "pederast" (male child molester). If one accepts only the Dean's Lexicons, he or she must still decide by the context whether St. Paul is referring to child abusers, the Corinthian sacred prostitutes or the homosexual condition. The great majority of Greek Lexicons, like the majority of translations, show clearly that *arseno-koites* in the days of the Bible refers to the *Kadesh Inverts* (See Lampe, Robinson, Ungar, Thayer, Divry or the other Greek Lexicons).

The standard English Versions show that arseno-koites means "male abusers." Even the Dean's own translation chart (E-14) shows that in most cases the Greek term is translated as "homosexual offenders," "perverts," etc. The Dean's list of translations denote gay abuse, just as het "offenders," "perverts," etc., would denote het excess. The small number of "modern" translations which half-way support the Dean, are nothing more than paraphrased, loose, liberal versions. The Dean doesn't really believe these translations either because they condemn the homosexual condition, not just the homosexual act! Just as a person can be a heterosexual without having sex or lust, so may another (such as a gay priest) be a homosexual without sex or lust. Any attempt to translate *arseno-koites* as "homosexual" is to teach that a celibate person who never lusted or had sex in his or her life is lost just because of his or her orientation. Even the Dean doesn't believe this and neither does the Pope.

Of the forty translations in the Dean's own list (E-14) the only one that translates the word *arsen-koites* according to the Dean's belief is *the Berkley Version*, which reads "partakers in homosexuality." Even this Version translates the word correctly in I Timothy 1:10. My position regarding the word *arseno-koites* is found 31 times in the Dean's own list of trans-

lations, and the Dean finds his real position only one time (and, that in the *Berkley Version*). (Note: The *Amplified* is a commentary and the *New Berkley* is just like the old.)

Does St. Paul make a distinction between same-sex sin and gay love? Reverend James Meadows asserts that St. Paul makes no distinction between gay love and male abuse in his Biblical list of sexual sins. For that matter, St. Paul makes no distinction regarding birth control, abortion, artificial insemination, or a hundred other specifics. A much better question should be posed. Since St. Paul knew the Greek terms for gay love, why didn't he include one of these words in his list of sins? Instead, he deliberately chose the word male *koite* which was a term used among the Corinthians to denote gay and het shrine prostitution. I have proved in this debate that St. Paul and all the prophets condemned same-sex attempted rape, inversion, gay shrine prostitution, and gay paternal incest (Lev. 18:7) in the same way and to the same extent that they condemned heterosexual rape, shrine prostitution and maternal incest.

The Dean still demands a verse upholding the gay life style. I gave him one in my very first speech but he refused to respond to it. In the Dean's first affirmative (pg. 13) he tried to use Hebrews 13:4 to prove that marriage was honorable only among heterosexuals. On page 21 I answered by saying, "Is marriage honorable among all or only among heterosexuals?" The Dean wouldn't touch that question with a ten foot Astarte. The Bible does not say that marriage is honorable only among heterosexuals, instead it says, "Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge" (Heb. 13:4).

The Bible teaches that sexual union in marriage between any two lovers is honorable. The only exceptions would be specific marriage prohibitions revealed in the Biblical text. The Dean does not believe Hebrews 13:4.

The Dean gave us another verse which establishes gay union. In fact, he presented this scripture in both his third and fourth speeches. I wasn't planning to use Genesis 4:7 but since the Dean continues to bring it up as an example of a God-approved sexual union, I suppose I will have to go along with

the Dean. Dean Eaves did make one minor mistake as he presented Genesis 4:7 again and again as an acceptable sexual union. This relationship is between two males, not between a male and a female! (oops, he did it again).

The Dean doesn't want to talk about birth control. We don't blame him. Our brother says that Onan was killed because he was commanded to raise up seed for his brother. Doesn't the Dean know that Onan was equally commanded to raise up seed for himself (Genesis 1:18)? Even though Onan was covetous the Dean has well said that if covetousness is associated with other sins, the two sins are only compounded. Most of Dean Eaves arguments against gays are the very same arguments that Jewish and Christian traditionalists have been making against birth control practices for centuries.

Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same thing. (Romans 2:1, KJV).

MY ANSWERS TO THE DEAN'S QUESTIONS EXPLAINED FOR HIM	J-12
#1. FALSE, because a young gay male, not sure of his sexual orientation, might, for a short time, use another boy as a woman. I really taught on page 36, "The truly gay male who respects himself (and) his own God-given sexual nature... would never use another male as a woman," etc.	
#2. FALSE, because a gay Priest, etc. is not sexually attracted to anyone.	
#3,6 FALSE, because both statements could be untrue in some cases. For example, my lover and I shared many beautiful secrets during our lengthy courtship without having sexual intercourse. But now my lover and I would have to mark #6 false, I am proud and happy to say.	
#4,5,7 FALSE, because when a het changes to same-sex the results are inversion, not homosexuality (and vice versa), Romans 1:27; Leviticus 18:22; 20:13.	
#8. FALSE, A gay or het male may sinfully enter a heterosexual union as a third party, thus adulterating the relationship of the two married hets. (I Cor. 6:16)	

Odds and ends. The Dean cancelled out his creation argument (page 12) when he finally admitted, "The creation of male and female humans does not "prove" that homosexual acts are evil. Eat your heart out, Anita. That was all I wanted from question 3. . . . The Scout Master's final authority did not prohibit other options. . . . The Dean now denies that "only heterosexual males should marry women" (page 61). Previously he said he would never, but he did:

I would never contend and never have contended that a homosexual should marry a heterosexual person. . . . Who should marry heterosexuals? Those who are qualified to marry in God's sight. T F E , p. 43.

Silence is not golden. The Dean has ignored so many issues that it is pathetic. For example, what did he say about gay freedom? He grants equal rights to atheists and "war hawks" but not to his Christian gay sisters and brothers. In Virginia we violate the law if we assemble in a church building for prayer. Over a dozen states still have laws against anal and oral sex, though they are never enforced against heterosexuals unless rape is present. Neither does Dean Eaves condemn oral and anal sex between married people. Gays can lose jobs, homes, church membership and children, just for speaking up. Dozens of our churches have been burned to the ground and dozens of gay Christians have lost their lives in arson fires in America over the past ten years. An ex-cop gets a few months in jail for murdering a gay city Supervisor and a mayor who is a friend of gays. We recently had more attendance at a gay march in Washington, D.C., than did the Pope, but the media did not mention it. All American women (gay or het) are treated like "faggots" in our churches and in employment. Lesbians and gay men are used for fuel to burn nine million witches. The Religionists stopped burning the witches, but they still "kill queers for Christ."

Dean Eaves ignores our contributions to society. He ignores our freedom revolution. We are getting inside churches, legislative bodies, political parties, etc., and we are changing people's attitudes. We support equal rights for women, minorities, the poor, the old, the handicapped, the young, aliens, third world, etc. There are all kinds of lesbians and gay men from atheist to believers, but we are united on the concept of equal rights. If the Dean cannot join us on the morality issue, he should certainly speak up for our human rights. But he remains silent and wonders why many think religion shallow and spineless (*malakos*). Such silence allowed Hitler to start with gays.

Summary: The Dean agrees that the creation act did not suggest that gayness was evil. He also agrees that we do not know for sure if homosexuality was practiced in Sodom when God first decided to destroy the city in Genesis 18.

Dean Eaves says that if the angels had taken on the form of females the Sodom story would not suggest that all heterosexuality was evil. I showed that the same was true with the same-sex attempted angelic rape (Genesis 19). It was even shown that the men of Sodom were heterosexual invert, not gays.

The Negative also proved that Moses outlawed heterosexual inversion (Lev. 18) and shrine male prostitution (Deut. 13).

St. Paul condemned for his day the changing of the wife's natural use of reproduction in any way (even by inversion). The Apostle never referred to homosexuals in Romans 1, but spoke only of married heterosexuals who according to the Dean, had the "proper life style" and were "married." St. Paul's use of the term *koite* in Romans 13:13, I Corinthians 6:9, etc., denoted sexual abuse, not all male sexuality or not all female sexuality.

A Note to the Readers: To any gay Christians who may be reading this debate, let me encourage you in the Lord. There is no reason for you to give up your religion. Contact the Metropolitan Community Church, P. O. Box 5570, Los Angeles, Calif. 90055; Dignity, P. O. Box 6161, Los Angeles 90055; One, 2256 Venice Blvd., Los Angeles 90006. Local churches and synagogues are often listed in *The Advocate*, a national gay magazine available at larger newsstands. ***Parents and Friends of Gays*** may be contacted at 201 West 13, New York 10011.

God has a plan and purpose for each of us. Do not lose your faith in God or the Bible. Do not stop believing in Jesus because some homophobic, with hate and bitterness, has condemned you without a hearing. Use the Bible to prove the truth. Churches are changing, and those individuals and churches who are not changing are learning to keep quiet. Gay Christians are ready and willing to defend their beliefs anywhere at any time. We are not afraid any more. We are everywhere and we are taking a stand. May God bless every reader. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

Affirmative Rejoinder

By Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

Clarification: First line under Chart E-9 reads, "There is Biblical approval of alcohol, drugs (as medicine) and heterosexuality, . . ." Should read, "There is Biblical approval of alcohol (as medicine), drugs (as medicine) and heterosexuality."

Correction: Under No. 13 in Fourth Affirmative referring to Chart E-4. "3. Husbands and wives (men and women) in natural sexual union produce children as they desire—Genesis 4:1 and 4:7." Chart E-4 No. 3, and reference to No. 13 above should have references—Genesis 4:1 and 4:17.

In his fourth negative Dr. Johnson stated that he has come to believe more strongly in lesbian and gay male love than ever before. I do not doubt this for Dr. Johnson is so wedded to his gay life-style that he will not accept the authority of the Bible. He has consistently denied that Paul condemns all homosexuality in I Corinthians 6:9 and I Timothy 1:10 and insists that Paul only condemns an abuse of homosexuality.

Johnson chides me for not believing in the all of Hebrews 13:4, "Let marriage be had in honor among all, " then proceeds to make exceptions only two lines later. Homosexuality is a specific marriage prohibition revealed in the Biblical text.

Summary—(Scriptures Listed In First Affirmative).

In the Old Testament sodomy (homosexuality) was condemned by Jehovah. Sodom was destroyed because of their homosexual practices. The men of Sodom refused Lot's daughters in preference to men. . . . They desired men, "Where are the men . . . bring them out to us," Genesis 19:5). Dr. Johnson says they were invert, the Bible declares them to be

sodomites (homosexuals). The New Testament clearly indicates that homosexuality is a transgression of God's desire for man. Romans 1; I Corinthians 6; I Timothy 1; Jude 7.

Dr. Johnson answered my questions in Chart No. 13 and true to the nature of a false position again contradicts himself.

E-17

QUESTION #1 - () True () False. A gay male never uses another male as a woman. Johnson's answer in fourth negative.

#1. False because a young gay male, not sure of his sexual orientation, might, for a short time use another boy as a woman.

QUESTION: If as Dr. Johnson stated in the close of his Third Negative, "We gays have the choice of using or abusing our God given orientation...How could one not be sure of his sexual orientation?"

GOD GIVEN, Dr. Johnson or "LEARNED"?

In a one page rejoinder Dr. Johnson's inconsistencies in Chart No. 12 can't be dealt with. However his answers will haunt him while he is in the affirmative for I plan a chart of questions for him concerning this chart in my first negative.

I am looking forward to Dr. Johnson's first Affirmative.

First Affirmative

Dr. Paul R. Johnson

Resolved: I know that the Bible, which is the inspired word of God, teaches that sexual intercourse between certain human beings of the same sex is not sinful.

Definition of Proposition:

The Bible: The plenary, verbal inspired Word of God. II Timothy 3:16,17.

Teaches: Instructs, implicitly or explicitly.

Sexual Intercourse: Sexual connection, coitus, coition, vaginal penetration, fellatio, cunnilingus, anal penetration, etc., having sex, sexual union. Often in the Bible: "to know" (Gen. 4:1; 19:5); "Uncover the nakedness" (Lev. 18:7); "To come unto" (II Sam. 9:6); "To approach" (Lev. 18:14); "Go into" (Gen. 29:23), etc.

Certain Human Beings: Hermaphrodites, transsexuals, lesbians and gay men.

Same: Equal, equivalent, comparable or similar.

Sex: In this proposition either of two divisions distinguished as male or female. Male: a human that produces sperm and/or that can be marked for circumcision (*zakab*), and/or one who is capable of having an erection (*arsen*). Female: a person who is not able to produce sperm and is unable to be marked for circumcision and is unable to have an erection; a non-male.

Is Not Sinful: Is not contrary and does not violate the teachings of Scripture.

It is very important for the Dean to either accept my definitions or suggest changes in his very first speech. I shall

assume he agrees unless he objects immediately. Other words which may need defining are as follows:

1. Homosexual: A person who has either conscious or sub-conscious sexual preference toward a person of the same sex. He may or may not engage in sexual acts.

2. Heterosexual: A person who has either conscious or sub-conscious sexual preference for one of the opposite sex. He or she may or may not engage in sex.

3. Practicing Homosexual: A homosexual who engages in same-sex.

4. Inversion: The term as used in this debate will mean a heterosexual who engages in some same-sex or a homosexual who engages in male-female sex.

5. Holy Union: A contract relationship, designed to allow love, a family unit, and/or sexual union which is accepted by God. A Holy marriage.

6. Gay: A homosexual who accepts himself or herself and is happy about his or her sexual orientation.

7. Sexual Condition: The natural orientation (either heterosexual or homosexual) which is formed early in life, before the age of five (probably pre-natal). It is God-given, just as God gives us all our talents and graces. A young person often takes years to understand and comprehend his genuine sexuality. Just because a young person is not certain of his heterosexuality at the age of twelve does not mean that he doesn't have it! The same may be said also of a young homosexual.

8. Sodomy or Sodomite. According to all the authorities, "A Sacred Temple Prostitute." The Dean does not like for me to call him "Holy Reverend" and out of respect for his wishes I have not done so, and I do not want anyone calling me a sacred temple prostitute (Sodomite). If the Dean doesn't stop calling me that I am going to start calling him "Holy Reverend Eaves" even if I have to put it in quotations. We ought not to call each other names, we ought to answer each other's arguments. Let the Dean first prove I am a Sodomite (temple prostitute).

***My Proposition is True Because the Lord Accepts
'Non-Ideal' Sexual Unions***

Chart No. 13 shows many types of marriages which might not be considered by some to be ideal or complete. God recognizes and tolerates many sexual relationships which do not measure up to the Bible's ideal rules. Thank God, the Lord accepts us even in our imperfections (Romans 14:1). If this were not true then no one since Eden would have the right to marry. Would the Dean fellowship a sister who married an

WHICH NON-IDEAL MARRIAGE	J-13
DOES THE DEAN FELLOWSHIP?	
a. Remarriage Matt. 19:9	
b. Imperfect love Eph. 5:25	
c. Mixed, Young I Cor. 6 & 7	
d. Polygamous I Tim. 2:2	
e. No sex, handicapped, etc.	

unbeliever, or who because of physical problems was able to have only anal or oral sex? Would he allow a marriage where the husband did not love his wife as much as Christ loves the church? (Ephesians 5:25). I had rather live in my home where limerent love is freely given than in some of the homes that the Dean accepts into church membership. Who gave Thomas F. Eaves the right to decide which non-perfect marriage he would fellowship? He needs to read Romans 2:3 again prayerfully. The Bible says marriage is "honorable among all" and there is no place in the Bible where God outlaws homosexual marriage. Maybe my marriage is not perfect by the Biblical standards, but neither is the Dean's.

***My Proposition is True Because Sexual Intercourse
Is Not Evil Per Se.***

If gay sex is evil, in and of itself, then a heterosexual or homosexual rape victim is guilty of sin. The victim is innocent because a sex act is amoral. The sin depends on the heart of the individual. Jesus taught in Matthew 15:19, "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." Contrast this text with the Dean's statement that both the 'dominant' party and 'passive'

person always sin in the homosexual act. (p. 30). **Rule No. 1: God does not hold a person responsible for a same-sex act over which he or she has no control**, Romans 2:14; Matthew 19:11; Luke 12:48. I just hope none of the Dean's brothers ever gets raped and murdered by some crazy invert. The poor man wouldn't have time to repent.

My Proposition is True Because An Hermaphrodite Male May Marry a Male.

The Klinefelter hermaphrodite male is a legal man, born with small infertile testes. This person has cells which show a feminine Barr Body. In addition, he has feminizing X chromosomes, marked XXY or XXXY. The Klinefelter male is classified as a genetic intersexual as described by Ulriches, Krafft-Ebing and others (Karlen, p. 345). Klinefelter males have the sexual desires (sexual orientation) of regular females. They think of themselves as women and most often dress as women. They are not homosexual, but their inward gender is not their legal external sex. In some cases, the penis of the Klinefelter male atrophies without surgery. Sometimes relief is obtained by surgery.

If the average Klinefelter hermaphrodite male is to find happiness and normal sexual union, it will be found with a male. If a Klinefelter male marries a regular male, same-sex union would legally exist. Both of these people would be of the same sex, recognized in law, in Judeo-Christian tradition and Biblically.

It needs repeating that most hermaphrodites are not homosexuals. As in the general population only about ten percent of hermaphrodites are gay. On those rare occasions when a feminine Klinefelter male is homosexual, then the person would be attracted to another of the same inward gender. Dean Eaves is put in the untenable position of upholding only gay relationships for androgenital hermaphrodites! What scriptural principle will allow a Klinefelter male hermaphrodite to marry a regular male? **Rule No. 2: The Lord is a God that wishes for all his children happiness and love (even people that do not conform to the average)**, John 9:2; 3:16; Luke 22:10; 7:2; Matt. 24:40.

***My Proposition is True Because Two Hermaphrodites
May Marry Each Other.***

Recent dramatic discoveries deal with hermaphroditism which is helping to solve the complex way sex is determined. Even though hermaphrodites have anatomical traits of both male and female, in ancient Israel if an hermaphrodite had a penis, or what appeared to be a penis, and was able to be marked for circumcision, he was considered a male. He is still so recognized in most nations today. The XXY hermaphrodite is an external male (androgenital) but with female chromosomes, gonads, hormones, and female internal sex organs. Externally and thus Biblically he is male, but he exhibits maternal instincts and female gender identity. A different kind of hermaphrodite is one who is primarily male internally and externally, but having a few female physical characteristics. These people function better as males. If two of these completely different hermaphrodites meet and fall in love, the feminine androgenital would assume the maternal role and the other would assume the paternal. These two people are Biblically male, but if one wishes to get technical, they are both of the hermaphrodite sex, thus they are both of the same sex. My proposition is established either way. ***Rule No. 3: God does not expect people who cannot contain to live sexless lives (even people who do not measure up to the physical standards suggested in the Bible)*** Matthew 19:12. Hermaphrodites should marry according to their inward gender drives, and not according to their external sex. And who is to say that they are not normal and that their sex life is not normal for them? Only the Dean would presume to judge.

***My Proposition is True Because A Transsexual May
Marry According to Gender.***

In 1966 twenty-six-year-old George Jorgensen went to Denmark for a sex change operation, returning to this country as Miss Christine Jorgensen. I have had the privilege of meeting this marvelous woman. A transsexual is not a homosexual or a transvestite. Transsexual concepts often occur with lobe epilepsy or other physical "abnormalities" which need medical correction. "Some hidden drive in their nervous system tells them . . . despite all evidence to the

contrary" (Karlen, p. 388K Authorities such as Magnan, Chevalier, Kraft-Ebing and Fisher believe that there often exists a "female mind in a male body." Transsexuals are only relieved by surgery. The *Gender Identity Clinic* at John Hopkins and the *Minnesota Medical Schools*, etc., have helped thousands of transsexuals establish their corrected gender. I have had the privilege of counselling a number of transsexuals, both "pre" and "post." They are remarkable people.

The Judeo-Christian tradition and the Biblical text would still classify a post-operative transsexual woman as male. However, religious and civil authorities are beginning to recognize the transsexuals inward identity and even issue civil and religious marriage licenses. Dean Eaves disagrees. He would classify every transsexual born with a penis as a male. And even if a transsexual undergoes painful surgery and obtains a legal marriage license, the Dean would still condemn her for practicing same-sex. Regardless of the belief of fundamentalists, transsexuals have proven to be good wives and make excellent adoptive mothers. Dr. Renne Richardson is a credit to her sex. Transsexual females who become men are also proving their point. Phil Donahue recently had a married couple on his program that had changed sex. They married as husband and wife and later changed to wife and husband. Would the Dean accept these two into membership at his congregation? What Biblical principle would allow transsexuals to marry? *Rule No. 4: Since marriage is honorable in all and no specific prohibitions are given in the Bible regarding transsexual marriages then God accepts them (Hebrews 13:4).*

***The Proposition is True Because Anal and Oral Sex
Are Not Evil Per Se.***

Heterosexuals do the same thing that gays do in bed, plus other things, says Kinsey. The majority of psychiatrists believe that males engage in oral-genital sex with their wives not to enhance the woman's pleasure but because they are excited by the act (*Human Sexuality*, 10/78, p. 45).


Anti-gays talk about the immoral, unclean things gays do, and then go home and do the same thing with their female partners. Surveys prove there are more heterosexuals doing more "unnatural sex acts" than there are gays doing them.

Years ago the churches condemned heterosexuals who practiced anal sex, oral-genital sex, birth control, mutual masturbation, sex during menstruation or pregnancy, in vitro fertilization, etc. Today, the majority of the clerics including Dean Eaves "not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." The great majority of anti-gay preachers enjoy some or all of these "unnatural sex acts." Since heterosexuals engage in more types of "unnatural sex" than do gays, then heterosexuals must be greater "sinners" and less "normal" than gays. If the religionists were really concerned about the "perverts who go against the natural order of creation" they would try to clean up their own act.

Practically all gay couples who stay together do so because they love and need each other, not because some civil law or court forces them. Can the same be said of each and every family that attends the Dean's church?

***The Proposition is True Because It Is Not Always Possible
To Identify Sex.***

In the gynandry hermaphrodites, the external sexual characteristics are of the male aspect, but female internal genitalia are found. In the androgyny hermaphrodite, the external characteristics appear female, but with undescended testes. Money and Hampson list at least seven methods of sex determination (Chart No. 14). The Dean accepts only the fifth



definition. His theology demands that no other definition exist. Since the Bible and true science do not disagree, then the Dean's interpretation must be faulty. He has much in common with the "flat world brethren."

Since the definition and determination of the correct sex for marriage is often difficult and sometimes impossible for the clergy, how can the Dean still hold to his creed? How can the Dean know that his last marriage ceremony was correct? Did he examine the bride's hormones or the groom's chromosomes? We suppose he goes by faith and not by sight when a young couple asks him to officiate. The Dean must not condemn that which he cannot define. He may have, without knowing it, given his marriage blessings to more than one gay couple. Even though hermaphrodites, transsexuals and homosexuals are variants, they still have the right to enjoy the blessings of Holy Union (I Cor. 7:39). So also do those with Turner's Syndrome, Trisomy, Bilateral, lateral, quatesticular, genotypic, phenotypic and countless other variable phenotypic patterns.

First Negative

By Thomas F. Eaves

1. Sexual Intercourse: Dr. Johnson may use his terms but I do not accept all of them as God-approved acts. Included in his definition are some which are acceptable by Bible standards and some which are perversions.

2. According to the apostle Paul in Romans 1:27, Dr. Johnson's No. 6 (gay) and No 3 (practicing homosexual) are guilty of No. 4 (inversion).

3. Sexual condition. God's plan from the beginning is seen in Genesis 2:22. The natural orientation is God-given and it takes environment, teaching, influence, etc., for it to be changed to that which is against nature (i.e., homosexuality). As Dr. Johnson quoted from Roger Walson (p. 57), "Sexual behavior actually is shaped by a number of factors outside the control of any individual, and it is this shaping of orientation that results in ultimate choice." Dr. Johnson's next statement is, "We gays have the choice of using or abusing our God-given orientation . . ." One sentence is sexual behavior is shaped by a number of factors—the next, it is God-given. The statements are not equal and the position is false!

4. Sodomy or Sodomites. "According to all authorities, a sacred temple prostitute." The sodomites of Sodom and Gomorrah came to Lot's house, "both young and old, all the people from every quarter." If homosexuality or sodomy was joined with idol worship it only compounded the sin. Deuteronomy 23:17-18 condemns that practice, but Leviticus 18:22; 20:13; Romans 1:27; I Corinthians 6:9, etc. condemns homosexuality or sodomy.

Johnson's Arguments

" I . My proposition is true because the Lord accepts 'non-ideal' sexual unions." His chart No. 13 asks the question, "Which non-ideal marriage does the dean fellowship?" a. Remarriage, Matthew 19:9. What makes this remarriage non-ideal? God says that the innocent individual who puts away a mate who is guilty of adultery can remarry without being guilty of adultery. (Not talking about the tragic sin which resulted in the putting away of a guilty party but the remarriage.) b. Imperfect love, Ephesians 5:25. A couple may not possess a complete, fully mature, perfect love, but love is still present to the extent that the husband and wife can fulfill their responsibilities to God and each other. Love grows year by year. By whose standards is the marriage non-ideal? Not God's, c. Mixed marriages, young, I Corinthians 6 and 7. True, some tragic circumstances result from those who marry young (and are immature), and from Christians who marry those who care nothing for spiritual things. Does God recognize these marriages? Yes, but is it his desire? No! His desire is for men to marry women and fulfill the responsibilities he has set forth for his creatures that happiness might result, d. Polygamous, I Timothy 2:2. I fail to connect the passage with the statement. Such a union would be sinful and God would not accept it. f. No sex, handicapped. If there are those who cannot fulfill the responsibilities given by God, how can they function in the area which has specific requirements, those which they cannot fulfill. A husband is to provide for his family, I Timothy 5:8. Dr. Johnson, can he marry if he can't fulfill this obligation? Paul said in I Corinthians 7:1-7 that husband (male) and wife (female) were to fulfill the sexual needs of each. Dr. Johnson maintains if this cannot be accomplished they can turn to perversion. The most important thing on earth is to prepare for heaven, and some are eunuchs for the kingdom of God because of this. The context of Romans 14:1 deals not with an individual's weakness of faith in God, but with his own faith in the matter of eating meat. (The context shows that the strong eats meat [v. 2—all things] but the weak faith eats herbs. The key verse is v. 23.) Marriage is honorable among all—Hebrews 13:4, "Let marriage be had in honor among all, and let the bed be undefiled." (How? By following the teachings of God's

word). "For fornicators and adulterers God will judge." (Why? Because they have not honored God's teachings.) My marriage may not have reached perfection, but it began with and continues with God's approval.

Dr. Johnson states, "The Bible says marriage is 'honorable among all' and there is no place where God outlaws a homosexual marriage. I invite the readers to take a complete concordance and read the scriptures listed under marry, marriage, husband, wife, etc. You will find that at least once under every Hebrew and Greek term the Bible in the passages given will indicate union of male and female. (Some words will only appear one time.) For example the Greek word *gameo* appears 29 times in the New Testament. Twenty-seven times it clearly indicates a male-female union. (Two times it is used in a general sense.) Notice Genesis 1:27; 2:22; 2:24; 2:25; 3:6; 3:20; 4:1; Matthew 19:4; 19:5; 19:9; I Corinthians 11:9; Romans 7:2; I Corinthians 7:39; Ephesians 5:22; I Peter 3:7; 3:1; 3:5; Moses, Jesus, Paul and Peter put man and woman, male and female together. Dr. Johnson, since you are in the affirmative give the scripture which authorizes homosexual unions, and please give examples within the Bible of God approving these relationships.

"The proposition is true because sexual intercourse is not evil per se." Yes, Dr. Johnson, both the "dominant" and "passive" person sins in the homosexual act (I Corinthians 6:9). But, Dr. Johnson, you never even hinted that rape was involved. Now you vainly try to make me say that a rape victim is guilty of sin. When man sins against God, does that make God a sinner? No more than it makes one who has been violated sexually a sinner. There is a vast difference in being forced into a relationship and deciding or being influenced to follow a lifestyle that leads into a sinful relationship.

Johnson's Reasoning

A. "My proposition is true because an hermaphrodite male may marry a male." Under this section he states, "The Klinefelter hermaphrodite male is a legal man . . ." Beginning the next paragraph he states, "If the average Klinefelter hermaphrodite male is to find happiness and normal sexual union, it will be found with a male." B. "My proposition is true

because two hermaphrodites may marry each other." In this paragraph he discusses the hermaphrodites and speaks of those who function better as "males" or "females." He states, "If two of these completely different hermaphrodites meet and fall in love the feminine androgenital would assume the maternal role and the other would assume the paternal. These two people are Biblically male, but if one wishes to get technical, they are both of the hermaphrodite sex, thus they are both of the same sex." In both of these instances Dr. Johnson has united "male" with "male" and stated it is permissible. Dr. Johnson, you have assumed what you have set out to prove, i.e., male may marry male or that a homosexual relationship is God-approved.

Dr. Johnson's Use of Scripture

In support of "A" above Dr. Johnson gives rule No. 2, "The Lord is a God that wishes for all his children happiness and love (even people that do not conform to the average.)" He then lists these passages from the Bible. John 9:2; 3:16; Luke 22:10; 7:2; Matt. 24:40. In John 9, a moral issue is not involved, and 9:3 gives answer to question in 9:2. John 3:16, God loves all and Christ died for all, but the one who does not obey will receive the wrath of God (John 3:36). I must confess that I see no connection between Dr. Johnson's rule No. 2 and Luke 22:10, Luke 7:2, or Matthew 24:40. (Maybe he will make the connection.)

In support of "B" above he gives rule No. 3, "God does not expect people who cannot contain to live sexless lives (even people who do not measure up to the physical standards suggested in the Bible) Matthew 19:12."

Since Dr. Johnson has mentioned Matthew 19:11 and 12 in his first affirmative let us note the passage in context. In Matthew 19:1-12 the Pharisees try Jesus by asking him, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? (v.3). Instead of becoming involved in the Rabbi's debate (Hillel—divorce for trivial reasons—and Shammai—divorce for unchastity) the Master went back to God's original plan. He answered their question three times, "No." Matthew 19:4-6; 19:7; 19:9. The apostles realized that the Son of God had set forth a very stringent standard concerning marriage. Their

reply was, "If the case of the man is so with his wife [i.e. if a man can only put away his wife for the cause of fornication, Matt. 19:9], it is not expedient to marry." Their reasoning was simple, a life of celibacy was desired over married life if you were bound by such a stringent rule. Jesus now corrects the misconception or misunderstanding of the disciples and further instructs them. Replying to their statement, "it is not expedient to marry," Jesus replies, "Not all men can receive this statement" (Matt. 19:11). Celibacy is not God's original plan, and as Lenski states, "The disciples show, not that they are in favor of the asceticism of celibacy, but are reluctant to give up the Jewish ease of getting rid of a wife." Jesus does not alter his teaching because of the objection but names some who could receive or to whom it had been given not to marry.

The Master mentions three classes of eunuchs. The first are those who are born with a physical defect and the second class are those who have been made eunuchs by men. Both of these groups are eunuchs for life because they are incapable of sexual activity. The third group mentioned by Jesus are those who have made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the Kingdom of God. This third group is a spiritual, not a physical, condition. God's plan for man is reflected in Genesis 2:18, "it is not good for man to be alone." However it may be wise for some to be eunuchs (for the kingdom's sake, Matthew 19:12, and under some conditions, I Corinthians 7:26, "by reason of the distress that is upon us"). This celibacy is not a forced one, but is for those who can receive it or make room for it. If we do not choose to receive the apostle's saying, "it is not expedient to marry," and choose to marry, then we are to be guided by the teaching of Jesus concerning marriage. It is not God's plan for man to put away his wife for every cause, and the only reason as stated by Jesus in Matthew 19:9 is sexual unfaithfulness.

Johnson says, "The proposition is true because anal and oral sex are not evil per se." His proof? 1. Kinsey says, 2. The majority of psychiatrists believe, 3. Surveys prove. Dr. Johnson, just give Book, Chapter and Verse.

He attempts to justify the sin of homosexuality by pointing the finger at others who sin. He accuses anti-gays,

majority of clerics, anti-gay preachers, hets, and me of engaging in unnatural sex acts. This is a generalization and an assumption. When you can't prove your proposition accuse everyone else. Our proposition isn't what hets do, but does the Bible approve homosexual relationships? Unnatural sex acts are sin regardless of who engages in them. Dr. Johnson says that religionists ought to clean up their own act. This is exactly what all gospel preachers are trying to do—get man to turn to God and follow His Will! (I Cor. 6:11—and such were some of you).

Questions for Dr. Johnson

1. From the Bible differentiate between acceptable "gay" behavior and homosexual abuse. 2. The Bible gives the acceptable roles for heterosexual relationships. Where does the Bible give the guidelines for gay behavior? 3. According to some in the gay community there were a few prominent "gays" or gay relationships in the Bible. Dr. Johnson, will you please indicate your conviction concerning the chart below?

Were the following "gay" or "gay relationships?"		
	YES	NO
1. Cain & Abel		
2. Ruth & Naomi		
3. Jonathan & David		
4. Paul & Timothy		
5. Jesus & John		
6. Jesus		

E-18

Dr. Johnson has repeatedly declared that marriage is honorable in all (Hebrews 13:4).

I am amazed at Dr. Johnson. His proposition is, "I know that the Bible, which is the inspired Word, teaches that sexual intercourse between certain human beings of the same sex is not sinful. His proof? (1) An hermaphrodite may marry a male, (2) Hermaphrodites may marry one another, (3) Transsexuals may marry according to gender. That's Bible proof? No! It's Dr. Johnson's opinion. Now, Dr. Johnson, give proof of these assertions from the Bible.

E-19

Dr. Johnson, according to Biblical standards can the following marry?	YES	NO
1. Those divorced for reasons other than fornication? (Matt. 19:9)		
2. The mentally deficient?		
3. The inverts? (Your definition)		
4. Those incapable of fulfilling marriage vows		
a. Mentally (can't understand role)		
b. Physically (can't care for mate)		
c. Sexually (can't provide due benevolence)		
5. Everyone - All - No Reservations.		

He works hard to get the same sex together and says that it is all right—but he has not established the "rightness" from the Bible.

It is also unfortunate that Dr. Johnson would appeal to the Klinefelter Syndrome to try to establish a basis and authority for homosexuality. Under the topic of "Human Sex Anomalies," G. W. Burns in his book, *The Science of Genetics*, MacMillan, New York, 1976, on page 212 states;

The Klinefelter Syndrome. One in about 500 "male" births produces an individual with a particular set of abnormalities known collectively as the Klinefelter syndrome. These persons have a general male phenotype; external genitalia are essentially normal in gross morphology. Although there is some variability in other characteristics, testes are typically small, sperms are usually not produced, and most such men are mentally retarded.

In addition to dealing with a small segment of society, Dr. Johnson then says, that "most hermaphrodites are not homosexual."

Again I point out to the reader that Dr. Johnson has assumed what he is to prove, that homosexuality is approved by God.

Dr. Johnson—"Homosexuality is right." Paul the Apostle—"Homosexuality is sinful." (I Cor. 6:9-11).

Second Affirmative

By Dr. Paul Johnson

Dean Eaves is a nice fellow and we admire him greatly above those who refuse to discuss these issues. But the Dean does have two problems, (a) he thinks that if he just quotes and requotes three or four scriptures often enough that my arguments on those scriptures will go away. Anyone who thinks, will see through this clever strategem. (b) The Dean has a terrible habit of denying his own signed propositions. Believe it or not, Dean Eaves is now trying to affirm my proposition. In the first debate, he denied his proposition by claiming it was impossible for gays to engage in sexual intercourse. He tops that by now saying that certain people experience same-sex without sinning (i.e., rape victims, children and the extremely retarded). Well, he was the one that signed the negative, I didn't.

Eaves agrees that Hebrews 13:4 is limited only by specific exceptions. He says:

Johnson chides me for not believing in the All of Hebrews 13:4. "Let marriage be had in honor among all," then proceeds to make exceptions only two lines later. Homosexuality is a specific marriage prohibition revealed in the Biblical text. p. 73.

Overlooking the Dean's faulty conclusion, we agree that since Hebrews 13:4 grants the rights of marriage to all, then any exceptions must be clearly presented in the Bible. The Dean said nothing about my argument that hermaphrodite and transsexual marriages are not prohibited in "the Biblical

text." His type of birth controlled Nuclear Family cannot be found in the Bible either, yet he tries to get authority for this modern form of marriage from Hebrews 13 (See chart No. 10).

The Dean is afraid to even discuss most of the four rules I gave. He can only take pot shots at a few supporting verses. Let him either deny or affirm:

Rule No. 1. God does not hold a person responsible for a same-sex act over which he or she has no control. Rule No. 2. The Lord is a God that wishes for all his children happiness and love (even people who do not conform to the average). Rule No. 3. God does not expect people who cannot contain to live sexless lives (even people who do not measure up to the physical standards suggested in the Bible). Rule No. 4. Since marriage is honorable in all and no specific prohibitions are given in the Bible regarding transsexual marriages, then God accepts them . . . p. 78ff.

Does the Dean believe or disbelieve these rules? When he takes a stand, then we will be happy to discuss the support verses he doesn't understand.

The General rule of Hebrews 13:4 also allows lesbian marriages. Religious leaders from various denominations agree with Dr. Raphale Patai who says, "No reference at all is made to female homosexuality in the Levitical law, nor anywhere else in the Bible." ***Sex and Family in the Bible and in the Middle East***, p. 9. A friend of mine (P. L. whose dad pastors a Church of Christ) pointed me to the following quote from one of the Dean's respected church leaders:

Romans 1:27: For the women changed the natural use into that which is against nature. What the special form of this unnatural perversion of woman's lust was, we are not told. — David Lipscomb, *Commentary on Romans* (Nashville, Gospel Advocate Co., 1935).

Lipscomb then says it may have been bestiality that these women practiced together. Since scholars agree that specific lesbian exception is not revealed in Romans 1, or in any other text, then Rev. Eaves should admit that marriage is honorable among lesbians (Hebrews 13:4; I Corinthians 7:39).

The real reason many clerics have been against gay men for centuries is that we are considered "part female," and since all women are believed inferior, then gays and all women are denied responsible church office (Galatians 3:28). Gays are happy to support the women's movement. **Rule No. 5. God**

accepts lesbian and hermaphrodite marriages because there is no specific Biblical prohibition.

My position is true because the family unit is allowed great flexibility in the Bible. We read on page four of *The Gay Home* (Lambda Publications, 1979):

The home is the oldest institution in the world and one of the reasons for it's survival is that God allows it diversity in structure. When advantageous, God allowed the family to be built on sibling incest (Genesis 4:17; II Samuel 13:13). Even polygamy is allowed for the laity (I Tim. 3:2). At times, God tolerated Endogamous, Patriarchal, Beena, Cadket, Matriarchate, Concubina, Polygyny, Captive, Baal, Slave, Levirate and Homosexual homes.

The one type of family that is discouraged most in the Bible is the kind that the Dean advocates. The modern Nuclear Family, with its birth control, is never promoted in the Bible (Psalm 127:5; I Timothy 2:15). It is much easier to prove from the Bible that David and Jonathan formed a sexual love unit than it is to prove Rev. Eaves' type family (II Samuel 1:25). Even the Dean's Nuclear family is probably allowed by Hebrews 13:4, and also because of the great need for restricted population in our day. The Dean admits that the word "marriage" in the Bible is a very broad term, often used to denote various male-male relationships, general relationships, owner-slave relationships, etc. The Bible idea of marriage is much broader than my use or the Dean's use, so why should the Dean insist that his restricted use of the term is the only proper use?

The Dean does not want his inconsistencies exposed. Rev. Eaves is against anal and oral birth control but for most every other kind. He is guilty of "unnatural acts" such as mutual masturbation and artificial birth control. The Lord struck dead anyone who practiced birth control in Moses' day, but the Lord never struck dead anyone who practiced gay love (Genesis 38). If the Lord should strike again, like He struck back then, we are still wondering what the Dean would like for us to write on his tombstone. Instead of complaining about me, let the Dean criticize Jesus who stopped the Pharisees by showing their inconsistencies. Shall we arrest the Dean for his "unnatural acts": deny him employment, run him out of town, revoke his passport, deny him a marriage license, stir up hate against

him, execrate him, "kill that queer for Christ," unchurch him, tax him extra, deny him the right to worship with his peers, burn down his churches, make jokes about him, take away his children, deny him army enlistment, deny him government clearance and never let him appear on the six o'clock news to air his grievances?

The Dean's Fifteen questions answered. No. 1. Acceptable gay or het behavior is often found in the same verse (Hebrews 13:4, etc., see chart No. 9). No. 2. Same as No. 1. Incidentally, most of the Dean's so-called "male-female" marriage verses really use the Greek and Hebrew terms which means "human being," not "male" in contrast to "female." Since Jesus said, "a **man** must be born again" (John 3:3) the Dean's logic would assume that a female gets saved some other way. Who can believe it?

Questions 1-6 (Chart E-18). All Biblical evidence available says they were all gay relationships, but some did not involve coition. Our Lord never engaged in any type of sexual intercourse because he denied himself this right. However, he must have experienced sexual feelings without being lustful, because all humans (even infants) have such feelings. Can the Dean prove that Jesus never had a wet dream and that he was a heterosexual? We think not. What about a neighbor who:

. . . went around kissing, embracing and living only with men, who loved a younger male in a very special way, even allowing him to lay on his lap in public, who advocated pacifism, never legally married, wore a dress and longer hair, used expensive perfume, stayed up all night, was very close to his mother, advocated decriminalization of non-violent sex crimes, often had clashes with the law and the Church, and even spoke up for all kinds of eunuchs, "Canaanite dogs" and gay rulers.
The Gay Home, p. 2.

No, this quotation isn't about our beloved Rev. Troy Perry, it is about the Lord. What would Rev. Eaves think about such a neighbor's sexual orientation!

The Dean's seven questions in Chart E-19 must all be answered "no" and to this "no" list we could add the Dean's own Nuclear marriage. No couple in this world has a right to marry if the Biblical standards (ideals) must be met. Less love than perfect love does not meet the Biblical standard of Ephesians 5:25 (Ch. No. 13). *Rev. Eaves' impossible and*

arbitrary laws are his own invention. In order to outlaw gay marriages, the Dean has set up impossible marriage laws for himself and his flock. The Dean claims marriage cannot exist where there is impotency, unemployment, senility, etc. When the Holy Reverend gets too old, should he be defrocked, unchurched and unwedded? The Dean wants to annul marriage at the first sign of senility. The way the Dean has been forgetting what he has said in this debate, we wonder if he "is now, or has he ever been" correctly married.

Dean Eaves admits that he does not love his mate as Christ loves the Church, but he's going to live with her anyway because he is able to supply her conjugal needs, etc. Well, so shall I live with my mate, because he says I am well able to supply his conjugal needs. This is my point exactly. The Bible standard (ideal rule) is not met by either me or the Dean. He admits that mixed marriages are "recognized by God" though not "desired by God." We wonder where he found that in his Bible. If mixed marriages are recognized by God though not desired, then God must accept other marriages which are not desired also. The vast majority of married couples have never comprehended, much less fulfilled the Dean's requirements for a valid marriage. When the Dean converts his next married couple, he had better get them properly wedded before they go home and "fornicate" again. The Dean needs to learn that Deuteronomy 24:1-4 allows both of the divorced persons to remarry and that Jesus was talking to people who were under the same law. Our Lord was simply upholding the teachings of the School of Shammai in St. Matthew 19. The Dean really believes in many reasons for divorce and remarriage. How often do disappointed mates say, "Well, she was frigid and we really weren't married anyway." The Dean seems ready to grant 99 percent of the population annulments on the grounds that they have never met the Biblical standards in the first place. On this issue, he is more broad-minded than the agnostics. The Dean can't even define marriage, how in the world is he going to show its limitations?

Please answer my questions completely and in the next speech (as I have done). No. 1. Answer "yes" or "no". Will you accept into fellowship het married Christians who voluntarily engage in or advocate the following: (a) Anal sex Y__

N__ (b) Abortion Y_ N__ (c) War Y_ N_ No. 2. Please give a Biblical definition to each of the following words or ideas: (a) Marriage, (b) Sexual intercourse, (c) Age of accountability, (d) *kadesh*, (e) Male, (f) Adultery. No. 3. Please answer "True" or "False": (a) Hets who engage in private consensual "unnatural acts" should be arrested as are gays, T_ F__ (b) The infants of Sodom were Sodomites, T_ F__ (c) Jesus was a heterosexual, T__F__, (d) Small children and unaccountable retarded adults engage in same-sex without sinning, T__F__ No. 4. When a person's sex determination is medically uncertain, how can he or she know which sex to marry? No. 5. How is it possible for two people who are not scripturally wedded to anyone else to commit adultery with each other?

Odds and Ends. The Dean believes heterosexuality is innate, yet he moves heaven and earth to teach everybody how to be heterosexual. . . . Does the Dean really believe that "Celibacy is not God's original plan"? If so, then Jesus Christ did not come to the earth to fulfill God's original plan. The Dean should join the Cults. . . . Our confused brother takes needed space to criticize me because I said that a person's sexual orientation is both God-given and yet involves human factors. A small child's "daily bread" comes from both divine and human sources, one does not cancel out the other. Even the production of the Bible involved human factors, yet it was God-given. Rev. Eaves is having great difficulty counteracting his own Medical authorities who believe that homosexuality is complete and permanent before the child reaches the age of free choice (accountability). Even Thomas Aquinas (the Father of Homophobia) admitted in *Suma Theologian* 1-11, q. 37.7, that in certain persons (such as homosexuals) there is a "breakdown" of some natural principal of the species and thus what is contrary to the nature of that species becomes, by accident, natural to the individual. It is as natural for gays to act gay as it is for hets to act h e t On page 83 Dean Eaves still asserts that there is no difference between gayness and inversion despite his admission that hets can engage in same-sex without becoming gay and that the Romans in chapter one were at first "married" and had the het "lifestyle." He would hardly say a word about inversion when I was discussing it.

. . . Not one of the twenty-seven references or any of the Apocryphal text to Sodom condemned homosexuality per se. Even in Jude we see same-sex assault on angels, yet Reverend Eaves continues to refer to gays as Sodomites. . . . The Dean seems unconcerned with "small segments of society." A dose of Christian charity will help the Dean to "despise not small things." Why should the Dean have to worry about substitute sexual expression? After all, he was exempt from the military and didn't come back from Vietnam paralyzed from the waist down. Let him present his creed to the paraplegics in our Veterans' hospitals. The Dean says all those with sexual limitations must become "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake." Jesus said many individuals could not go that route (St. Matthew 19:11). The Dean says they can and must, even if they are not responsible for their condition. Then he turns around and says he would never force celibacy on anyone. He first says they can, then he says they can't.

My position is true because the Bible only condemns the abuse of same-sex. The Bible warns against the abuse of homosexuality (Chart No. 9). The very fact that the scriptures warn against the mis-use of something implies that there is a proper use. Men may mis-use wine, money, drugs or gayness. These very warnings show there is a proper use of the same. Horner says in ***Jonathan Loved David:***

The only homosexual practitioners who were singled out and given labels were the extremely effeminate men who turned homosexuality into a profession. These were the catamites—the homosexual prostitutes of ancient Greece, the so called "dogs" of the Canaanite shrines and the eunuch followers of the goddess Cybele. pp. 21, 22. (Tom Horner, *Jonathan Loved David, Homosexuality in Biblical Times*, Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1978).

In Moses' day, homosexuality was so widely accepted that it was only condemned in the most extreme situations. For example, the Jews and their neighbors had a law that forbade a son to seduce his father as well as his mother (Leviticus 18:7). Moses outlawed the use of a male as a woman (Chart No. 6). Moses did not outlaw the love toward a male as a man. The Jewish tradition against male love was borrowed from the Zoroastrian holy books, not the Bible:

This is the man that is a Daeve (devil) . . . whether he has lain with mankind as mankind, or as womankind. *Send-Avesta: Vendidad, Chapter 8. Section 33ff.*

In that ancient culture, there was a vast distinction between a man who lay with males as a man, and a man who lay with males as women. The Zoroastrians were against both, the Prophets of Israel were only against inversion. Heterosexual men may use other men as women (inversion), but satisfied gays do not.

In my counseling with hundreds of gay men and lesbians, I have never known anyone who chose to be homosexual. Because of persecution, at some times in their lives gays have chosen not to be homosexual, many for years, only to discover that despite persecution, abstinence, prayer and fasting, they remain homosexual. No one knows what exactly causes homosexuality, however, professionals do know one thing that does not cause this condition, and that is accountable choice.

Sexual orientation is a very small part of the total person. Christ came to give life to both homosexuals and heterosexuals, and the Lord can give each who asks, a life-mate, to love and to grow close in Christ Jesus.

Second Negative

By Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

If I have denied my proposition by the statement, "rape victims, children who have not reached the age of accountability and the extremely retarded are not held accountable for same-sex experiences," and if this justifies homosexuality (as Dr. Johnson keeps implying), tell us, Dr. Johnson, in which category do you place yourself? In my statement I indicated that sin is present in a rape situation but the violated is not guilty. In the situation of children and the extremely retarded their actions may very well be sin, but God does not impute this to them because of their mental state, i.e., the inability to discern right from wrong.

Johnson still maintains that Hebrews 13:4 grants the right of marriage to all but still makes his exceptions. The fact of the matter is the Hebrew writer makes two exceptions in the passage itself, (1) fornicators and (2) adulterers God will judge. While contending the all have the right to marry, Johnson denies the right of marriage to those listed in chart E-19, and states further that, "no couple in this world has a right to marry if the Biblical standards (ideals) must be met." I appreciate the fact that Dr. Johnson acknowledges "Bible standards (ideals)" do exist for marriage.

Dr. Johnson next maintains that Hebrews 13:4 grants the right to all and "any exceptions must be clearly presented in the Bible." He then ignores the Bible exceptions. One

exception to Hebrews 13:4 is a woman who has a husband being married to another. (Romans 7:4—she becomes an adulteress), a second is homosexuality, I Corinthians 6:9, and a third is marrying one who has been divorced for reasons other than fornication, or putting a mate away except for fornication and marrying another. (Matthew 19:9ff).

Johnson's argument about hermaphrodite and transsexual marriages indicated that there would be a uniting of two of the same-sex, (p. 79). This being true it would constitute homosexuality and I Corinthians 6:9 condemns it.

Dr. Johnson's Rules — If he had read my material he would have found my answer to his rules, but to remove his objection here they are. (1) In the case of rape God would not hold the one violated guilty. (2) God is a God who wishes his children to have abundant life on earth (John 10:10) and eternal life with him (John 14:1-4). Not only does he desire it, he has given us directions which will allow us to achieve his wishes (II Timothy 3:16-17; II Peter 1:3). (3) I do not have the authority to make exceptions to the revealed will of God. Jesus plainly states that his word will be the standard of judgment (John 10:48) and the apostle John (II John 9) and Paul (I Corinthians 4:6) indicate that we cannot go beyond the teachings of Jesus. In this "rule" Johnson makes an interesting admission, i.e., that these individuals would not be living up to the standards of the Bible. (4) See answer to question No. 4 under Johnson's questions, p. 4.

Johnson says that Hebrews 13:4 allows lesbian marriages. Please note carefully his authority: (1) Religious leaders, (2) Dr. Ralph Patai, (3) David Lipscomb, (4) Scholars. The proposition is, "The Bible teaches." Concerning this line of reasoning, please consult charts E-1 and E-10 and their explanations.

Johnson's Position And The Flexibility Of Marriage

Johnson quotes from the Gay Home which allows that the home survives because God has allowed it diversity in structure. While I do not agree with the statements these questions are applicable. (1) Who allowed the diversity in structure? (2) Diversity to whom? (3) Under what conditions? (4) Does this grant man the authority to re-structure it today?

(5) Note Acts 17:30-31. At one time God allowed a Levitical priesthood, animal sacrifices, polygamy but not today. Christians are priests (I Peter 2:9), Jesus Christ is our sacrifice (Hebrews 10:12), and man is to have one wife, and woman one husband (I Corinthians 7:1-2; Romans 7:1-3). And, Dr. Johnson, II Timothy 3:2 says the bishop is to be the husband of **one** wife, **not many** wives.

Johnson's Non-answers To My Questions

(1) *From the Bible differentiate between* acceptable "gay" behavior and homosexual abuse. Johnson's answer—"No. 1. Acceptable gay or het behavior is often found in the same verse (Hebrews 13:4, etc . . . see chart No. 9)." (2) The Bible gives the acceptable roles for heterosexual relationships. Where does the Bible give the guidelines for gay behavior? Johnson's answer—"No. 2 same as No. 1." (??) Following this dodge Johnson pulls a classic blunder, he states as fact what he wishes were true, "Incidentally, most of the dean's so called "male-female" marriage verses really use the Greek and Hebrew terms which means "human beings," not "male" in contrast to "female." Not so, Dr. Johnson, let's note all the New Testament passages I listed.

E-20

PASSAGE	WORD - From - Meaning	CONTRASTED WITH	WORD - From - Meaning
Matthew 19:4	ARSEN- ARSEN - MALE		THĒLU - THALUS- FEMALE
Matthew 19:5	ANTHRŌPOS - MAN		GUNAIKI -GUNĒ - WOMAN
Matthew 19:9	AUTOU-pronoun- HIM mas. gen.		GUNAIKA -GUNĒ - WOMAN
I Cor 11:9	ANDRA- ANĒR - MAN		GUNĒ - - WOMAN
Romans 7:2	ANDRI- ANER - MAN		GUNĒ - - WOMAN
I Cor. 7:39	ANĒR - ANER - MAN		GUNĒ - - WOMAN
Eph. 5:22	ANDRASIN- ANER - MAN		GUNAIKES-GUNĒ - WOMAN
I Pet. 3:7	ANDRES-ANER - MAN		GUNAIKEIO-GUNĒ - WOMAN
I Pet. 3:1	ANDRASIN- ANER - MAN		GUNAIKES - GUNĒ- WOMAN
I Pet. 3:5	ANDRASIN- ANER - MAN		GUNAIKES - GUNĒ- WOMAN

These terms, Dr. Johnson, are specific, male and female. Only one in Matthew 19:9 uses the broader term and in the same verse it uses a masculine pronoun and the specific term for

woman just as we would expect. My point stands, male-female united in marriage is God's plan.

Johnson Says That God's Son Was Homosexual

In answer to chart No. E-18, Dr. Johnson indicates that Cain and Abel, Ruth and Naomi, Jonathan and David, Paul and Timothy, and Jesus and John were all "gay" relationships. Johnson states that all Biblical evidence available says they were all gay relationships. But instead of giving us the evidence all we get is a statement from *The Gay Home*, p. 2. The most amazing thing is not a single solitary thing in the paragraph, or all of them put together, would constitute homosexuality or a homosexual relationship. Too, I must say that the paragraph is the most warped, ignorance revealing statement I ever read. I thought Dr. Johnson's knowledge of the Bible was on a little higher level than this. Note some of the absurdities: (1) Living only with men. Jesus had other associates, Mary, Martha and Lazarus (John 11). (2) Used expensive perfume. Mary anointed him against the day of his burying (John 12:7). (3) Stayed up all night. He did and on occasion prayed all night (Luke 6:12). (4) Close to his mother. And Jesus said whoever doeth the will of God is my brother, sister, and mother (Mark 3:35). By what standard is one not to be close to a mother? (5) The statements concerning his clothing, custom of greeting, are so ridiculous that they do not merit attention.

Dr. Johnson, where in the Bible does God say a man and woman's love must be perfect before they marry? If a husband's and wife's love can't grow, deepen, how could the older women teach the younger to love their husbands? (Titus 2:4). A husband loves his wife as Christ loved the church; realistically, sacrificially, purposefully, willfully, deliberately, voluntarily and absolutely.

Johnson's Questions. No. 1 (a) No—it is a perversion of God's revealed conduct for man. (b) No, it is murder, (c) Although I served four years during the Korean conflict and believe that one can serve without transgressing God's will, I have great difficulty with the act of taking life for the government. This is my honest answer. No. 2 (a) Marriage—It is a

God-ordained relationship for man and woman (governed by God's will) to provide companionship (Genesis 2:20-25), to propagate the race of man (Genesis 1:28), to prevent immorality (I Corinthians 7:1-2), to develop and nurture an atmosphere of love in which children can be reared, to provide men and women with such experiences as will help each of them to develop spiritually (Ephesians 5:22-23; I Peter 5:7) and to give man a model of his relationship with Christ (Eph. 5). (b) Sexual intercourse—defined in second affirmative, (c) Age of accountability—Place in time when God holds the individual responsible for his actions because he knows right from wrong, (d) *Kadesh*—defined in affirmative material, (e) Male—*aner*—man—as distinguished from female, woman. (f) Adultery—where *porneia* condemns all unlawful sexual activity, adultery, *moicheus* involves the illicit sexual relations of one married with a "strange" partner. No. 3 Please answer "True" or "False" (a) Yes. (b) Genesis 19:4. (c) Yes. (d) If they commit acts of same-sex, God does not impute sin to them. No. 4 In this question, Dr. Johnson asks, "When a person's sex determination is medically uncertain, how can he or she know which sex to marry?" Medically if the individual has the "y" chromosome that individual is a male, if the "y" chromosome is absent then the individual is not a male. Dr. Johnson has focused in on the genetically and anatomical abnormalities in an attempt to justify homosexuality. The Bible clearly teaches that these precious souls have a Savior as all of mankind, but if they are males and sexually unite with males they transgress God's word.

I am sure that the reader has been impressed with Dr. Johnson's attempt to justify same-sex relations by appealing to (1) rape, (2) unaccountable children, (3) the extremely mentally retarded, (4) transsexuals, (5) hermaphrodites. Dr. Johnson, what about those in the world who have been blessed with normal anatomy, how are their sexual members designed to be used? Where in the Bible (now that you are in the affirmative) does it place men with men or women with women in a situation described in some circles as "marriage"? (with God's approval). No. 5. They would be guilty of *porneia*, i.e., unlawful sexual relationship. This would be true for single man with single woman or homosexual or lesbian relation-

ships. It also describes illicit sexual relationship between one married with another who is not his or her marriage partner (Matthew 19:9).

Johnson's Odds And Ends — Heterosexuality is God's approved way for sexual expression. One does not have to marry but everyone has the right to (if they follow God's will). The apostle Paul indicated that he had the right to lead about a wife (I Corinthians 9:5). The production of the Bible was God-given and it involved man, but man was not able to alter it. Our daily bread comes from God but we operate according to His laws of nature. I have never been unconcerned about "small segments of society" but was simply indicating that Johnson was appealing to a small segment to attempt to justify his proposition.

If I had been married and returned from Vietnam paralyzed it would not have excused me nor my wife from the vows we made before God when we were married. There is more to marriage than sex, regardless of what Johnson believes. Marriage involves the physical, mental, emotional, and the spiritual relationship (Eph. 5 and I Peter 3:7). The child of God has the promise, "There hath no temptation taken you but such as man can bear: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, but will with the temptation make also the way of escape, that ye may be able to endure it" (I Corinthians 10:13, also Philippians 4:13).

Johnson's chart No. 9 does not stand simply because heterosexuality is God's plan and upheld in the Bible while homosexuality is condemned as I have previously indicated from scripture. To say "that the scriptures warn against the misuse of something implies that there is a proper use" (p. 96) will not stand unless you first prove the act is acceptable to God. The scriptures say it isn't. (See Charts E-2, E-8, E-9 and E-11).

Johnson's Gay Relationships — (1) Cain and Abel—it was not Abel who desired Cain but sin which desired him (Genesis 4:7). (2) Ruth and Naomi—Naomi had a full heterosexual relationship with her husband giving birth to two sons. Ruth had two husbands in succession and gave every evidence of being a normal woman. (Dr. Johnson, if what you indicate is true,

Ruth was married, entered a lesbian relationship with Naomi, then later married Boaz. Was this an "acceptable gay relationship"—your definition—and if it was how do you classify Ruth when she married her second husband? Is this one of your cases of heterosexual inversion and if it is how does this "supposed" relationship help your false position?) (3) Jonathan and David—Any astute student of the Bible recognizes that David was married to Saul's daughter, I Samuel 18:28, and that one of David's problems was that he related to the fairer sex a bit too well (II Samuel 11). (4) Paul and Timothy—It is strange that the gay community would make this argument since they indicate that Paul did not like homosexuals. (5) Jesus and John—It is very true that John was the disciple whom Jesus loved. However, when love exists between two individuals it does not necessarily mean "sexual" love (John 13:34-35; Hebrews 13:1; James 2:8). It is interesting to note that John's Gospel is the Gospel of love but it is *agape* love, the love of the will (John 3:16; I Corinthians 13). The translators of the LXX translated the Hebrew word, describing David's love for Jonathan, into the Greek *agape*.

Johnson maintains that Moses outlawed the use of a male as a woman but that it is all right for a male to lie with males as men. His proof of this is chart No. 6. In chart No. 6 he gives four scripture references. Will you be so kind, Dr. Johnson, to list the verses for our readers which substantiate your statements?

Questions for Johnson: 1. From the Bible differentiate between acceptable "gay" behavior and homosexual abuse. 2. The Bible gives the acceptable roles for heterosexual relationships. Where does the Bible give the guidelines for gay behavior?

Third Affirmative

By Dr. Paul R. Johnson

The day is coming when "liberty and justice for all" will not be something just mouthed at anti-gay rallies. I was shocked at the answer the Dean gave regarding jailing everyone who commit unapproved "unnatural acts" in private. Rev. Eaves believes that both gays and hets who engage in such consensual acts should be imprisoned (p. 102). According to Kinsey and others, over 95 percent of the married population would then go to jail, including probably some of the Dean's own members. The Inquisition did not go as far as the Dean wants to go. I'd rather live under Hitler. The Dean had better watch out, he may lose his freedom. Both Rev. Eaves **and** I are against unnatural **and** unhealthy sex. We disagree as to what constitutes unhealthy sex. The Dean believes that all same-sex is unnatural and sinful. I believe homophobic sex and attitudes are unnatural and unhealthy. Onanism (birth control) is as unnatural as gay sex. The Bible teaches that male-male sex and male-female sex are unnatural if either involves rape, parental incest, shrine prostitution, etc. It is Biblically unhealthy and inconsistent to commune with Onanists, War Hawks, Nukes and the remarried, while at the same time denying fellowship to gays. Religious people who take away the civil rights of those who do not agree with their creeds, violate the plain teachings of the Bible and American law. No church has a monopoly on morals. Jesus had nothing to say against gay love but he had much to say against abnormal judging. Dr. Stephan Morin of California State University

suggests that it is more important to find the causes of homophobia (fear of gays) than it is to find the cause of gayness.

Hebrews 13:4 still authorizes marriage for all, not just heterosexuals. The Dean's charts (E-1, E-10) provide no rebuttal whatsoever to Hebrews 13. These charts only point out that it is wrong for het males to try to change their God-given nature. The Dean will not accept his own quotes and his own authorities, such as Rev. Lipscomb, etc., when it comes to Hebrews 13:4 and I Corinthians 7:39. Rev. Lipscomb admits that lesbianism is not mentioned in the Bible [*Commentary on Romans*, p. 40). Since marriage is honorable in all and there is no prohibition in the Bible regarding lesbianism and transsexualism, then these types of marriages are honorable. A specific male passage (*arsen*) cannot refer to females in I Corinthians 6:9, etc.

The Dean's own statements uphold gay males. The Dean said on page 43, "I would never contend and never have contended that a homosexual should marry a heterosexual person." In other words he does not believe that heterosexual marriage is honorable among homosexuals.

Major Premise: Marriage is honorable in all (Hebrews 13:4).

Minor Premise: Heterosexual marriage is not honorable for gays (TFE, p. 43).

Conclusion: Homosexual marriage is honorable for gays.

Major Premise: Gays should not marry heterosexuals (TFE, p. 43).

Minor Premise: Some gays cannot live single lives (Matt. 19:12).

Conclusion: Some gays should marry homosexually.

Desertion, prostitution (i.e. fornication), adultery (i.e. mate stealing) etc., either gay or het, are not exceptions to marriage but threats to existing marriages. True exceptions to marriage are such things as age limitation, choice, rejection, priesthood, etc.

Many Types of Homes Are Upheld In The Bible And Recognized By God

The Supreme Court of California (5/15/80) recognized and protected the right of unrelated persons to live as an "alternate family" group. **The President's Commission on the Family** recognized gay homes on June 6, 1980. The government is finally catching up with the Bible.

IDEAL HOMES	RECOGNIZED OR TOLERATED HOMES	QUESTIONABLE HOMES
Spiritual Homes	Monogamous, Gen. 2:24 Youth, I Cor. 7:36	*Onanist, Gen. 38:9
Matt. 12:50	Transsexual, Heb. 13 Baal, Hos. 2:16	*Sterilized, Deut. 23:1
I Cor. 7:1, 32	Levirate, Matt. 22:25 Cadkat, Jd. 14-16	Inverts, Rom. 1:28
Platonical Homes	Hermaphrodite, Heb. 13 Gay, I Sam. 1:25	Parent Incest, Lv. 18
I Cor. 7:36	Concubine, Mk. 6:18 Captive, Ps. 45:3	Adulterous, Matt. 19
Eden Homes	Adoptive, Heb. 13:4 Slave, Gen. 16:2	*Insemination, Lev. 15:16
Perfect Eph. 5:25	Lesbian, I Cor. 7:39 Caric, Gen. 39	*Abortion, Prov. 6:17
Natural sex Gen. 1	Polygamous, Tit. 1:17 Beena, Gen. 31:43	(*probably o.k.)

The Greatest Love Stories In The Bible and Other Ancient Literature Were Gay.

The most beautiful love song ever written was composed by one woman to another and is still sung at weddings (Ruth 1:16). Joseph's respect and love for Potiphar, Daniel's lasting love for Nebuchadnezzar and David's love for Jonathan have rightly been compared to the loves of Socrates, Phadrus, Ganymede and Patroclus.

King Saul persecuted his very own son, referring to Jonathan's love for David as a perversion. He screamed, "You are an intimate lover to that son of Jesse." Jonathan made a beautiful love covenant with David, promising undying devotion. In I Samuel 18:3 these two young men took the *Bereeth* love oath, used in ancient marriage vows (Mai. 2:14). These two lovers secretly met in the bushes, kissed, embraced and performed *gadal* (sexual intercourse). They were even married to each other (*laeuach*, I Sam. 19:2). David publicly declared: "Jonathan, beloved and lovely, very pleasant have you been to me, your love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women" (II Sam. 1:23). This statement is exactly the definition of a homosexual according to Sigmund Freud. David also led the young men in dancing naked and after Jonathan's death developed a love relationship with Jonathan's only son.

Because of the great need for children during this critical time, David was compelled to have sex with many females. His polygamous unions were prolific though not successful in other ways. While the Levitical Code outlawed inversion to same-sex (Lev. 18:22) it allowed gays to invert when necessary to replenish the earth (Ruth 4:5). Often gays have risen to the occasion of such emergencies. This even seems to be the reason nature produces homosexuality among the lower animals.

Gayness is nature's emergency back-up system for the survival of each species. God has reserved about ten percent of each group of the higher animals as homosexuals. During natural calamities, the male and female gay animals are not as burdened by family ties and thus more able to survive. They will invert only when forced to do so by group survival instincts. Paul Johnson, *The Gay Experience*, Lambdas, 1978, p. 7.

If Jonathan had been Joanna the Dean would be using the above facts to prove that David and Joanna experienced holy wedlock. If the Dean is trying to prove that *agape* love never involved sex, he is dead wrong (Col. 3:19). David claimed that his love for Jonathan was like the love he experienced with his women—only much better. David did not say Jonathan's love was better than a brother's love or a parent's love (non-sexual). David compared his love for Jonathan with the sexual love of women!

There are many examples of same-sex love in the Bible. Rev. Eaves begs me to give Biblical examples of God approved same-sex unions, yet all through these two debates he has been unable to give one example of his type of Onanist home (birth controlled). I make this challenge, every time the Dean produces one example of his kind of home, I will produce ten examples of my kind of home. I will go first.

The Jewish leaders referred to homosexuals as "dogs" but Christ taught that even the "dogs" have a right to eat at the Lord's table.¹ Jesus also taught that a gay should be allowed to hold a government job and deserved tax support.² Our Lord, speaking in Aramaic said in St. Matthew 5:23, "Anyone who calls a person who is really his brother a 'queer' is in danger of hell."³ The man who assisted Jesus in the Last Supper in St. Mark 14:13 was a homosexual."⁴ Jesus approved of the centurion and his male companion in St. Matthew 8 where the Greek word *pais* is used to describe this same-sex relationship. Pais is the word that any gay male in Greek culture would use in referring to his younger lover.⁵ In the Bible a caric (eunuch, KJV) was any male who did not beget, including all bachelors, gays, impotent, sterile, etc. Isaiah prophesied that the day would come when the nation would accept caries into the congregation.⁶ Daniel was a kept caric of the homosexual king Nebuchadnezzar.⁷ The Jewish Talmud claims that the caric Potiphar purchased the young Joseph from the Ishmaelites for homosexual purposes.⁸ The Bible warns males in a sexual context, not to defraud either a female or a male partner.⁹ The Bible upholds a man who lies with a male, but condemns a man who lies with a male as a female.¹⁰

The Dean may feel that some of these examples are incomplete, but if he will produce one example of his kind of Onanist home we will accept it, complete or not. It took the Dean three speeches before he realized that Genesis 4:7 was not a good example of a "proper" marriage. He even quoted from it and made arguments on it, but when I showed him that this union involved two males, he recognized his mistake and has now started picking at the verse. Sin does not exist in the abstract, it exists through persons (See Gen. 4:7).

***Biblical Condemnation of An Abuse Implies A Proper Use
Without Extra Proof***

The Dean recognizes this principle for drugs but demands extra proof for homosexuality. I believe that if God says something once, that ought to be enough. Eaves said,

To say "the scriptures warn against the mis-use of something implies that there is a proper use" will not stand unless you first prove that the act is acceptable. T F E , p. 103.

This quote invalidates the Dean's own type home. He tries to get his birth controlled Onanist marriage from Genesis 38 but now he says this "will not stand."

The Bible words for "man" used in marriage passages means "male or female." Just as in English, the Greek words for man used in the Dean's chart E-20 (***aner, anthropos, auto***) means "human being, an individual, either male or female." The Dean asserts that only ***anthropos*** has this broader meaning. He is again wrong. Everyone of his Greek terms for man, in his chart means "male, and/or female" (I Cor. 3:15; Rom. 4:8, etc.). According to Rev. Eaves, a female Christian cannot build her life upon the solid rock from St. Matthew 7:29, because the word is ***aner*** (man). The Dean wants to take these broad general terms for man (meaning all humans) and make them specific, but he wants to take the one specific term in the Bible (***arsen***) which does mean "male only" and make it general. ***Arsen*** is used in the so-called "gay passages" in the New Testament and in these verses female homosexuality is excluded. I Corinthians 6:9, etc., says nothing about females. But the Dean's marriage passages use the broad general terms meaning men and women. The National Council of Churches is

planning a new translation to excise sexism from our English Bible. They report:

It is both possible and proper to apply with more consistency the principle of using such words and phrases as "the one" for "he" and "human beings" for "men" . . .

Let us literally translate the Dean's favorite texts:

I Cor. 7:39, A woman is bound by the law as long as her male or female mate lives, but if her mate be dead she is free to marry whomever she will, but only in the Lord.

Eph. 5:25, Men or women, love your own wives as Christ loved the church.

Matt. 19:4, 5, God created male and female sex, thus a man or woman should leave mother and father and cleave to a wife.

Eph. 5:21, 22, Brothers, submit yourselves one to another in the love of Christ. Sisters, submit yourselves to your own male or female mates.

Rom. 1:28, Males only working with males only that which is unseemly. . .

I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10, "Abusers of males only. . ."

The Dean demands that certain lesbians marry each other.

Rev. Eaves tells us that all persons who have the Y chromosomes are males, and sin if they have sex with a "regular" male (p. 102). Russian doctors have recently found that many of their otherwise regular female athletes are really unobserved Klinefelter hermaphrodites with at least one Y chromosome. According to the Dean, two lesbians may marry, provided one has a Y chromosome and both enjoy face to face, toe to toe sex. Is the rumor true that the Dean is now forcing his members to take chromosome tests to make sure that each are properly married? What if Rev. Eaves' own wife comes up with a hidden Y factor?

Major Premise: A "Y" person with an outward appearance of a woman must act as a male. TFE.

Minor Premise. A lesbian without a Y factor could marry the above person.

Conclusion: The Dean would be happy to perform the ceremony.

Odds and Ends. The Dean finally admits that I was not inconsistent in referring to a person's sexual orientation as "God-given" while at the same time suggesting that human

factors may be involved. But he tries to save face by saying that we should not try to alter that which is God given. I agree (see Romans 1:28). . . . In I Corinthians 9:15, St. Paul is really speaking in a general way. He is saying both men and women "have a right to lead about a mate, a believer." If the Dean is correct in restricting this verse to Apostles leading about females, then the Dean is approving lesbianism because at least one of the Apostles was a female (Rom. 16:7). The Dean is saying that brother Paul claimed that sister Junia had a right to lead about a wife. . . . Dean did not deny the facts of Jesus' unorthodox customs, he just got mad and showed his homophobic aversion. . . . Is the Dean saying that Jesus bedded down with Mary and Martha just as he did with Peter and John?. . . Rev. Eaves can't even compose or sign a proper proposition, yet he accuses me of being warped, ignorant, low-level and absurd. . . . I had rather place myself in the category of the downtrodden, feeble-minded and variants than to be classified with the Dear Dean and his type of normality that wants to jail most everybody and declares that 99 percent, of married Americans are fornicators. . . . It is true that God makes a way of escape for the tempted who cannot engage in regular heterosex, but that way is not celibacy for all (Matt. 19:12). . . . The Dean criticizes me because I have a normal male anatomy. How does he know, we haven't even been properly introduced! Some Y chromosomed persons have a normal external female anatomy, but the Dean says they must not use their sex organs in the "normal" way. If he doesn't want these people to act like ladies, why should he want me to act like a gentleman? . . . Sexually abused children are not sinners, either imputed or unimputed. They have not transgressed the law, and that's what sin is (Matt. 15:9; Rom. 4:15). . . . The Dean doesn't like the kinds of homes I found in his Bible, and so he gives up all his arguments from the Old Testament and is now hinting at situation ethics: . . . Of all people, Rev. Eaves should not accuse anyone of dodging questions. He will not even discuss my dodges! . . . Who says the gay community is mad at the Apostle Paul? We love Paul. Properly understood, he stands with gay and women's liberation. . . . My five rules still stand. The Dean wants to keep these rules for himself, but deny them to me. Let him make up

his mind, does he, or doesn't he! . . . Can't the Dean understand that all his marriage rules are ideal, not absolute? Will the Dean next claim that orphans must not marry because they can't "leave father and mother"? . . . Anita Bryant has finally come out of the closet and confessed that even her marriage is far from ideal. If there is hope for Anita, maybe there is even hope for Rev. Eaves. . . . The Dean likes to pick and choose his absolute laws. Mixed marriages—"yes", hermaphrodite marriages—"no", birth controlled marriages—"yes", transsexual marriages—"no", unemployed marriages—"no", Y to X chromosome marriages—"yes" . . . Does the Dean really think for a moment that we believe he disfellowships every Christian who does not think exactly as he thinks on the subject of war, abortion, sex variation in marriage, birth control, etc.? Dear Lord, I'm glad the Dean doesn't make our laws—so many Americans would be in jail that it would take all the rest of the citizens to be prison guards. . . . We love you, Rev. Eaves, we just hate your unloving, unAmerican, inconsistent and unChristian doctrines. May God bless all who read and obey the scriptures we have given in love.

FOOTNOTES

1. Patai, p. 150, Matt. 15:27. 2. Matt. 21:21. 3. George M. Lamsa, *Gospel Light*, J. Holman Co., Philadelphia, 1936), p. 36. 4. Morton Smith, *The Secret Gospel* (Harper & Row, 1973). p. 114. 5. J. Martignc, "La Centurion de Capernaum" *Arcadie*, March 1975, p. 27. 6. Matt. 19:12, Kama Sutra 11, xi, Isa. 56:3. 7. Dan. 1:21, Herodotus, 3:97. 8. Babylonian Talmud, Sotah 136, Gen. 39:1 NEB. 9.1 Cor. 7:5; I Thess. 4:3-6.10. Lk. 17:34; Ec. 4:11; Lev. 18:22; James B. Nelson, "Homosexuality and the Church," *Christianity and Crisis*, Vol. 37:5, April 4, 1977, p. 63-69. Johnson, p. 8.

Third Negative

By Thomas F. Eaves, Sr.

Questions for Johnson: (1) From the Bible differentiate between acceptable "Gay" behavior and homosexual abuse. (2) The Bible gives the acceptable roles for heterosexual relationships. Where does the Bible give the guidelines for gay behavior? (Still unanswered.)

Johnson uses Hebrews 13:4 to authorize marriage for **all** but denies that it is for **all**. In response to chart E-19 Johnson states on page 93, "The Dean's seven questions in chart E-19 must all be answered "No" and to this "No" list we could add the Dean's own nuclear marriage." Chart E-10 is a clear rebuttal of Johnson's position on Romans 1:26-27 and he knows it! Johnson accuses me of rejecting "his own authorities, such as Rev. Lipscomb . . ." The authority we are concerned with is the Bible which is God's word. I would suggest that Johnson take a closer look at Romans 1:26-27. Verses 26 and 27 constitute one sentence, the statement concerning the perversions of women is connected with the statement concerning the perversions of men with *Homoios Te Kai* which indicate that the females—they "as well" in these sins of dishonor "as also" the males. Both men and women had changed the natural relationship ordained by Jehovah and perverted it into that which is against nature, i.e. the sin of homosexuality. Notice Lenski's comments on the language construction.

Note the connectives TE-TE, "as well-as" or "both-and," which put the females and the males on the same base level. Both practiced homosexual vices. Paul does not say "women" and "men," he says THELEIAI and ARSENES, "females" and "males" to say that this is done in order to denote sex is too weak, for "women" and "men" would certainly fully denote sex. When women and men are called females and males in a connection of the lowest vices such as this, the terms are degrading. They descend to the brutish level of being nothing but creatures of sex. (Commentary on Romans, R.C.H. Lenski, p. 113).

Johnson says, "The Dean's own statement upholds gay males." (What wishful thinking.) He attempts to twist my statements that a homosexual should not marry a heterosexual to prove that they should marry another of the same sex. If a homosexual married a heterosexual you only have the sin compounded. To the sin of homosexuality (involving the homosexual and his partner) there would also be an adulterated union between the two who married. A homosexual could not keep vows to the heterosexual. (Johnson also realizes this in his chart No. 12 in his answer to question No. 8). Just because the homosexual can't marry a heterosexual it does not follow that he can marry a homosexual (I Corinthians 6:9). If the homosexual repents and becomes as some of the Corinthians (such were some of you) they could marry with God's approval. As a forgiven sinner (cleansed by the blood of Jesus) they could marry according to the directions of God's word.

Johnson's abuse of the Word of God: (1) Claiming that the greatest love stories in the Bible were gay, Johnson refers to Ruth and Naomi. This supposed example of gay love places Dr. Johnson at odds with his previous line of reasoning. When we are introduced to Naomi she is a part of a heterosexual union (Ruth 1:1) and has given birth to two sons (Ruth 1:2). Likewise Ruth is married when she is introduced (Ruth 1:4) into the story. Ruth is then widowed (Ruth 1:5) and according to Johnson she and Naomi entered a homosexual relationship. Later Ruth married Boaz (Ruth 4:13). Johnson has here, by his own definition, a clear cut case of Inversion. (See his chart No. 12). Ruth was in a heterosexual union, went to a homosexual union. Johnson attempts to take a case of "gay" love which he says is not right (inversion) to substantiate his position. Question, Dr. Johnson: (1) What was Ruth's relationship with

Naomi after Ruth married Boaz? (2) Wouldn't a Ruth-Naomi-Boaz situation constitute a sinful relationship? If Johnson says he is talking about Naomi he has the same problem. Naomi was in a heterosexual union (Ruth 1:2), had given birth to sons (Ruth 1:2) and if she then entered a homosexual relationship you still have inversion. If Ruth and Naomi were homosexual to begin with why did they enter a heterosexual union? ("We are gay, we are sexually attracted to our own gender."—Johnson; second negative). It is tragic that Johnson can't understand that love can exist in a relationship between two males or two females without sex being involved.

(2) Bereeth Love Oath (I Samuel 18:3; Malachi 2:14).

Function. Covenants are established between individuals (Gen. 21:22f; 26:23ff; 31:44ff; 47:29 (chesedh ve'emeth, "loyally and truly"); 1 S. 18:3; 23:18), between states and their representatives (1 K. 5:26 (12); 15:19; 20:34; cf. also 2 S. 3:13, 21), between kings and their subjects (2 S. 5:3; 2 K. 11:17), between the (military) leader and his soldiers (2 K. 11:4), and between husband and wife (Ezk. 16:8; Mai. 2:14; Prov. 2:17). On the figurative level, we find a covenant between men and animals (Job 5:23; 40:28; 41:4); cf. Hos. 2:20 (18), and also a covenant with death (Isa. 28:15,18).

(*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, Eerdmans, p. 264), commenting on Berith-Covenant.

Dr. Johnson, you can't limit the word covenant (Berith) to the "Bereeth Love Oath" because the word has a wider usage.

(3) "Jonathan and David performed *gadal* (sexual intercourse)." Scripture reference?

(4) "They were even married to one another (*laqach*, I Samuel 19:2). This verse states, "And Jonathan told David, saying, Saul my Father seeketh to slay thee: now therefore, I pray thee, take heed to thyself in the morning, and abide in a secret place, and hide thyself." (Does this verse uphold Johnson's statement?)

(5) II Samuel 1:23 (reference is actually 1:26) Jonathan and David were close, I Samuel 18:1, but it cannot be established from the Bible that theirs was a homosexual relationship. (See No. 2 above.)

Comparison to the love of woman is expressive of the deepest earnestness of devoted love. (*Commentary on the Old Testament, Keil and Delitzsch*), p. 292.

(6) "David dancing before Jehovah"—II Samuel 6:14; 6:20-23.

(7) "Love relationship with Jonathan's only son." David restored Saul's possessions to Mephibosheth and granted him the privilege of eating at the King's table. II Samuel 9:1-8. This proves a homosexual relationship????

(8) "David **compelled** to have sex with many females." (a) David killed two hundred Philistines as a dowry for Michal's hand in marriage. I Samuel 18:25; 18:27-28. (b) David sent for Abigail to take her to be his wife. I Samuel 25:39-42. (c) II Samuel 11:2, David looked upon Bathsheba ("We are **gay**, we are sexually attracted to our own gender." Johnson, 2nd negative) sent for her, committed adultery with her (impregnated her) and after further sins married her. Johnson, it wasn't inversion to replenish the earth, David had two wives who could have fulfilled that purpose.

Johnson's Contradictions: (1) In chart E-12 I asked Dr. Johnson eight questions. Questions 4, 5 and 7 were concerned with moving from one "life style" to another. Johnson answers, "No. 4, 5, 7, False, because when a het changes to same sex the result is inversion, not homosexuality (and vice versa), Romans 1:27; Leviticus 18:22; 20:13." The vice versa statement would be, when a gay changes to heterosexual practice the result is inversion, not heterosexuality. Now, Johnson says it is all right for gays to invert to replenish the earth. Which is it, Johnson, you can't have your cake and eat it too? This inversion would result in an **adulterated union which is sin by Johnson's own definition!** (Union of two homosexuals plus heterosexual). **Question:** (1) What responsibility would the homosexual male have to the heterosexual female (his partner in replenishing the earth while inverted) in the area of fulfilling her continuing sexual need. (I Cor. 7:1f). (2) Would the inversion be for life or would the homosexual revert? (3) If the homosexual reverted wouldn't the unions (heterosexual plus homosexual) be sinful?

(2) Ruth 4:5 says nothing of a homosexual inverting to replenish the earth, it simply points out that a widow (female) was planning marriage to a male.

(3) Colossians 3:9 — Does *agape* love involve a sexual relationship? (Ephesians 5:25). Can't a husband love his wife in accord with I Corinthians 13 *agape* love)?

Johnson's Ten Examples (?) Of Same Sex Unions. (1) Matthew 15:27 (also Mark 7:26-30). Context of this statement (v. 24) reflects the relationship of Jews to Gentiles and the fact that Jesus came to the lost sheep of Israel. Dogs in this passage refers to the Gentile nation—not homosexuals. (What about Luke 16:21?) (2) Johnson says, Jesus taught that a gay should be allowed to hold a government job and deserved tax support (Matthew 21:21). I invite the readers to read the verse—it has absolutely nothing to do with Johnson's statement. (3) "Anyone who calls a person who is really his brother a 'queer' is in danger of Hell." Matthew 5:23. Greek word is *more* from *mows* and means foolish or stupid. (Greek-English Lexicon, Arndt and Gingrich, p. 533). (Johnson is assigning his meaning to words. (4) Johnson claims that "the man who assisted Jesus in the Last Supper in Mark 14:13 was a homosexual." Read the passage and you will see that that is all it is—a claim (Johnson's authority? Morton Smith, see Footnote). (5) Matthew 8:4, Again Johnson assigns his meaning to words as he stated, "Jesus approved the Centurion and his male companion in Matthew 8 where the Greek word *pais* is used to describe the same sex relationship." The word *pais* is defined as: "With relationship between one human being and another—1) From the viewpoint of age boy, youth, 2) from the view point of descent son, 3) from the view point of social position servant." (Greek-English Lexicon, Arndt and Gingrich, p. 609). (Word *pais* is also used by Isaiah of Jesus in Matthew 12:18). (6) Eunuchs—from Greek word *eunouchos* which means, "1. of physically castrated men, Matthew 19:12b, 2. of those without a physical operation, are by nature incapable of marrying and begetting children, Matthew 19:12a, 3. of those who abstain from marriage, without being impotent." (Greek-English Lexicon, Arndt and Gingrich, p. 323, 324). Johnson claims that an eunuch is any male who did not beget, including all bachelors, gays, impotent, sterile, etc.

If Johnson is going to use this point to substantiate his position he has destroyed his inversion of gays to replenish the earth. An eunuch is one who is castrated and cannot bear children, by nature can't bear children, or by choice abstains from marriage—and if gays fall under this description (as Johnson states) how can they invert to replenish the earth? (7) Johnson maintains, "Daniel was a caric of the homosexual (King Nebuchadnezzar) Daniel 1:21." This passage states, "And Daniel continued even unto the first year of King Cyrus." (More of Johnson's proof????). This passage just does not support the claim. (8) Johnson appeals to the Jewish Talmud for the claim that Potiphar bought Joseph for homosexual purposes. Where is the Bible proof? **Question:** 1) If Joseph was a kept slave and used for homosexual purposes how can you use this case of forced homosexual acts to substantiate your position of "God given sexuality"? 2) If Joseph was homosexual to begin with, he later married (Genesis 41:45) and sired children (Genesis 48:8). How do you classify Joseph after he moved from homosexuality to heterosexuality? Isn't this inversion? (9) Johnson teaches, "The Bible warns males in a sexual context, not to defraud either a male or female partner (I Corinthians 7:5). Consider with me carefully the text. I Corinthians 7:2-5, "v. 2, But because of fornications, let each man [*hekastos*—male gender] have his own wife [*gunaika*—feminine gender], and let each woman [*hekaste*—feminine] have her own husband, v-3. Let the husband [*aner*—masculine] render unto the wife [*gunaikei*—feminine] her due: and likewise also the husband [*anori*—masculine]." In verse five Paul tells the male-female partners not to defraud one another sexually. The only way Johnson can get his interpretation is to change the meaning of words and destroy the laws of language in regard to the gender of words. (1) Johnson gave chart No. 6 as proof that, "The Bible upholds a man who lies with a male, but condemns a man who lies with a male as a female." In chart No. 6 he lists six book and chapter references. In my last negative I asked for the verses—and I am still waiting.

Dr. Johnson, I await your ten examples of Biblically approved gay homes. As for my type of home it was defined and described in my first affirmative.

Johnson's "attempts" to rewrite God's Word The Bible was given by God through the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 2:1 If). Written in the Koine Greek, it was given for our guidance, that we might live holy and pure lives in God's sight (II Pet. 1:3). I now know how Johnson could sign the proposition, "I know the Bible which is the inspired Word of God teaches . . ." He simply rewrites the Bible to fit his proposition. Note Johnson's literal mistranslations. (1) I Corinthians 7:39, "A woman is bound by law as long as her male **or** female mate lives, but if her mate be dead she is free to marry whomsoever she will but only in the Lord." The Greek word **aner** is translated twice by Johnson (underlined> (1) male or female mate, (2) mate. The Greek lexicons point out that **aner** is a masculine noun and is translated man or husband (Greek-English Lexicon, Arndt and Gingrich, p. 65). (2) Ephesians 5:25, "Men **or** women, love your own wives as Christ loved the church." Greek word used here is **andres** (nominative plural of **aner** which is defined above. (3) Matthew 19:4-5, "God created male and female sex, thus a man **or** woman should leave father and mother and cleave to a

BIBLE		JOHNSON	
God Created	For this cause	God Created	For this cause
MALE (Masculine)	→ MAN (Masculine)	MALE (Masculine)	→ MAN OR WOMAN (Masculine & Feminine)
and	Leave parents and cleave		Leave parents and cleave
FEMALE (Feminine)	→ his → WIFE (Feminine)	FEMALE (Feminine)	→ his → WIFE (Feminine) or her (Feminine)

E-21

wife. (4) Ephesians 5:21-22, "Brothers, submit yourselves one to another in the love of Christ. Sisters, submit yourselves to your own male or female mates." The word brothers does not appear in the Greek text. It is literally "Being subject to one another in the fear of Christ." The text continues in verse 22, "Wives [*gunaikēs*—feminine gender] submit yourselves unto your own husbands [*andrasin*—masculine gender] as unto the Lord. (5) Romans 1:28, "Males only working with males only that which is unseemly" (verse 27 is the passage). See my comments on this passage earlier in this negative. (6) I Corin-

thians 6:9; I Timothy 1:10, "Abusers of males only." *Arsenokoitia* has been fully defined from reputable language authorities earlier in my affirmative materials.

The reader is acutely aware, I am sure, that Dr. Johnson is attempting to rewrite the Bible to uphold his position. I would urge you to read each passage of scripture given and make sure it says and teaches what the Disputants claim. For ages men have attempted to rewrite the Bible to justify their teaching or lifestyle and Dr. Johnson is no exception.

Dr. Johnson, answer one question. According to God's Word what is the spiritual state of the gays who were interviewed in San Francisco (reported on Gay Power—Gay Politics) who admitted engaging in homosexual acts with hundreds of different partners? (He won't touch this one!)

Fourth Affirmative

By Dr. Paul R. Johnson

Rev. Eaves and I will stand in judgment regarding this debate. I have tried to be open and honest, answering every point; but the Dean still accuses me of changing God's Holy Bible. It is apparent which of us has changed God's Word, engaging in omissions, leading questions, boffolas, mis-quotations, half-truths and name calling. For example, just look at the way my opponent "answered" I Corinthians 7:39. Though an honorable man, Rev. Eaves has allowed his creed to reduce him to a whipped *malakos*. As usual the Dean overlooked my main arguments, focusing on minor points in his last speech.

Is Johnson for or against inversion? I said early, that like incest, inversion is wrong; but during emergencies, God tolerated both incest and inversion when necessary to replenish the earth. Almost half the Dean's last speech crumbles with the admission of this one fact. It is sad that the Dean is reduced to such flimsy arguments. But what else could he say? He dare not face the real issues.

Cain was allowed both inversion and incest (Gen. 4:7; 17). Abraham practiced incest and slave sex without sinning. . . . Ruth's marriage to a male was illegal and only tolerated by God (Deut. 7:3; Gen. 6:2; Ezra 9:1, 2). Ruth's "arrangement" with a nice old rich polygamist was designed by Naomi for Levirate security for herself and her lover. Had Naomi been younger, she would have made the sacrifice herself. . . . Levirate sex (like inversion for reproduction) never required lifetime love. (See Jeanette Foster, *Sex Variet Women in Literature*. Diana Press, 1956, p. 22). Johnson, p. 4.

Does the Dean recommend that a destitute starving woman sleep first with a man before legalizing the relationship, as did Ruth? Eaves' model het example has vanished.

Pastor Eaves knows there is absolutely nothing in his First Affirmative establishing his type of modern, birth controlled sex. The Dean tried desperately to water down a few of my Ten Examples by taking the Greek and Hebrew words out of context and assigning them secondary meanings (a procedure that works just as well (?) against the Dean's heterosexual passages). With this type of logic, we could just as easily prove: the Sodomites were only trying to know something about the angels, Moses prohibited soldiers from lying down together for rest, the dog prostitutes sold statuettes and St. Paul spoke of men who were unseemly and bedded down in a non-sexual manner. What logic, what desperation! For a lengthy defense of David's one great love, *see Jonathan Loved David* by Rev. Tom Horner.

The Dean can quote English text and cry "Non-relevant" all he wishes, but the original language tells a different story. Doesn't Rev. Eaves know that English Versions often hide the complete sexual meaning and that translations have different verse divisions? The Dean leaves off the first half of my King James reference (I Sam. 19:2) and then complains that the verse does not "uphold Johnson's statements" Selah! This doesn't surprise me much because he also inverted a "no" in one of my quotes, misquoted many authorities, and even misquoted Arndt and Gingrich in his last speech (a personal summary is not a quote, dear Dean).

Notice how the following literal verses have been hidden in the English:

And Jonathan lusted greatly after David' . . . Then said Jonathan unto David, "Whatsoever you desire, I will even do it for thee." . . . The body of Jonathan was joined to the body of David and Jonathan loved him' . . . Then Jonathan and David made a marriage covenant because he loved him'. . . And as soon as the lad was gone, David fell on his face to the ground and bowed himself three times and they kissed one another and gave off drops, one to the other, while David twisted together with him'. . . "Thou shall be King over Israel and I shall always be by your side'. . . "Then come thou into me, for there is peace and no hurt." . . . And Jonathan went to David in the woods and sensually fell upon him.'

Saul screamed, "You are a shameful intimate lover to the Son of Jessie." . . . And David said, "Does the King of Israel think I am a dead faggot?" . . . "I am a worm, and not a man, a reproach of men." . . . "Jonathan, very pleasant have you been to me, your love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women". . . Then King David sent and married him."

The Dean finally admits from the *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* that the Bereeth marriage covenant had a wider usage than just between heterosexuals. In I Samuel 18:3 the context shows that the oath referred to a gay relationship. Keil and Delitzsch have more to say about David's love for Jonathan than the Dean's quote implies (the reference is really found on page 292.)

In English, Hebrew and Greek, the masculine form is used to denote common gender.

When a collective noun or an unspecified class is referred to as "he" or "man" it is of common gender (Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*. University of Chicago Press, 1961, p. 76). All masculine Greek terms for "man", etc., (except the specified word "male") are used to denote both sexes when the gender is unspecified elsewhere. Examples: John 3:3, "Except a man or woman be born again, he or she cannot enter the Kingdom of God." Romans 1:8, "Blessed is the woman or man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." I Corinthians 7:30, "If her man or woman dies she is free to marry whomsoever she will." Anderson, p. 5.

The Dean picks and chooses certain marriage texts for broad application and certain others for narrow application. The Dean interprets St. Matthew 19:9 as "whosoever shall put away a wife or husband . . . commits adultery." The Dean wants to eat his cake and spit it out too. St. Matthew 19:9 doesn't even use common gender, yet the Dean allows both male and female application. The Dean only wants to "rewrite" his part of the Bible. The Dean just cannot face the truth that his own marriage text when properly understood, can be scripturally used to establish my proposition rather than his.

The Bible does not speak of lesbians in Romans 1. The Holy Reverend is so desperate to counteract Hebrews 13:4 ("Marriage is honorable in all") that he puts Lenski above his own Dr. Lipscomb and above his own admissions previously.

Homophobic clergy try to prove that the women and men in Romans 1:26, 27, engaged in the same sexual act of "Sodomy." How can a female be a Sodomite (i.e., forced anal penetrator) unless perhaps, she is an hermaphrodite! St. Paul really teaches in Romans 1, that both males and females are equally (also, likewise) guilty of inversion. These heterosexual men inverted to other men and the women, in a group, either inverted to bestiality or heterosexual dominance. One thing is certain, the females did not engage in the same sex act as the men. Practically every church authority for the first thousand years believed that these women were not guilty of same-sex. Even St. Augustine did not believe they engaged in lesbian sex (*De Nuptiis et concupiscentia* 2:20). St. Anastasius wrote, "Clearly (the women) do not mount each other, but rather offer themselves to the men." (*Paedagogus of Clement*, pg. 85 on (margin). Anderson 2.

The Dean's Misuse of Authorities. Rev. Eaves castigates me for using sources which he, himself introduced, demanding that I use only the Bible. Yet time and again, the Dean "quotes" as his only proof, Arndt and Gingrich, a limited German work, rarely accepted by conservatives. Arndt and Gingrich ramble on for a page or two trying to define *pais*, not once mentioning the regular and popular definition of this gay term found everywhere in Greek literature. Even the Dean would find little credal agreement with this outdated, homophobic source. Why is the Dean so afraid to investigate more direct, more complete and more knowledgeable sources? Rev. Eaves refuses to even discuss the Aramaic (the very language Jesus spoke) to find out what Jesus really believed about gays in St. Matthew 5:23.

Jesus healed the Centurion's lover (*pais*) in Luke 7:7. The greatest modern scholar of Greek sexuality writes, "In many context and almost invariably in poetry the passive (gay) partner is called *pais*..." (K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, p. 16). Luke was a Greek Historian and knew what meaning the Greeks placed on the term. The Bible uses other Greek terms to denote regular servants or sons. The Greek term (*pais*) in the Bible is either used to denote a physical union between two humans or a spiritual union (marriage) between God and a human. Jesus, David and the prophets were married to God and were called *pais* because they were the more passive. Anderson, p. 8.

Why is the Dean so afraid to discuss Smith's evidence that a man carrying a water pot was a certain sign of gayness in the first century Western thought (Mk. 14:13)? Can the Dean explain how the great faith of Jesus in Matthew 21:21 went up against Jewish public opinion in supporting the homosexual

Tiberius (Lk. 20:22-25; Mk. 22:17). It was the Dean who first claimed that the evil dogs in the Bible meant homosexuals but now he refuses to accept the good dogs, claiming they were just Gentiles. Were David and Mephibosheth Gentiles (I Sam. 24:14; II Sam. 9:8)? The Canaanite dogs were known far and wide as homosexuals (Matt. 15:27).

It is Eaves, not Johnson, who encourages homosexual promiscuity.

Gays were the only ones to march in protest of the T.V. documentary, *CBS Reports: Gay Power, Gay Politics*, chanting that CBS misrepresented the vast majority of gays by showing only the fringe elements of gay society. CBS could have found a greater number of heterosexual odd balls. Hypocrites who criticize gays for promiscuity are like the Plantation Owner who outlawed all slave marriages, and then rebuked his blacks for "living in sin." Father James McNeal has charged that the church also encourages raw sex because it forgives gay promiscuity but never a gay love relationship. Laud Humphrey's research shows that most of the males who engage in rest room same-sex are married inverts with children. Karren shows that only one homosexual in twenty, of any age, gets as much sex as the average young married heterosexual. Scanzoni says, "By not allowing gay people to participate in healthy social activities, society is forcing us into the bedrooms, into the bar-rooms and even into the rest rooms" (Is the Homosexual My Neighbor?), Anderson, p. 6.

The spiritual state of the small gay fringe shown on CBS who committed bizarre sex with hundreds of people is as unhealthy as King Solomon with his thousand sex partners or as the Dean who pre-judges how I will respond (I Kings 11:1-4). By making gay love and gay abuse equal "sins," the Dean pushes Christian gays into promiscuity.

In almost every speech I have answered questions No. 1 and No. 2 (see chart No. 9). The same ethical principles apply to both gays and non-gays regarding love, union and fellowship. Gay couples are able to reproduce only by test tubes, surrogates, Levirates or insemination methods, but many heterosexuals do this, and they engage in the same sex acts as do gays, and more. But gays don't take the pill or have abortions! In the future gay males can bear their own children and lesbian couples will each have a biological part in giving birth.

The early Christian and Greek writers agree with Johnson regarding Greek words.

The word *malakos* (I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10) was a very common Greek term meaning "soft" or "cowardly." It takes more courage for the average gay to get up in the morning, than some preachers experience in a lifetime. This Greek term was never used by the early Christian or pagan writers to designate homosexuals as a group (K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, Vintage Books, New York, 1978, p. 79). From the 10th century through the 17th, the church thought it meant masturbation.

The word *arsenokoite* was never used by the early church Fathers, the early Councils or the non-Christians to mean "homosexual." Like its root word in Romans 13:13 it meant "prostitution." The early Latin and Greek fathers were all united in never applying I Corinthians 6:9 or I Timothy 1:10 to gays, even though they knew and sometimes used these verses in other ways. Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theodoret of Cyrus, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Marbod, Augustine, Cyprian, Felix, Clement, et al, discussed homosexuality at length (some were for it, and some were against it as well as most all sex, but they all knew that *arsenokoite* and *malakos* had no reference at all to homosexuality (Boswell, p. 349). Even in the 12th century, when Peter Cantor headed the first organized resistance to Christian gays, he dug up every argument he could find, but not once did he even attempt to use I Corinthians 6:9 or I Tim. 1:10. Anderson, p. 2.

The evidence is clear, I Corinthians 6:9, etc. does not condemn gays. *Arsenokoite*:

did not connote homosexuality to Paul or his contemporaries but meant "male prostitute" until well into the fourth century, after which it became confused with a variety of words for disapproved sexual activities. John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1980., p. 107.

Romans chapter one was looked upon by early Christians as unnatural acts of heterosexual inverters (Chryston, *Epistolam ad Romanos*, Homily 4). In Romans 1, St. Paul uses the same arguments from nature that were advanced by the Greek philosopher Aristotle, who also claimed that a man should never go contrary to his own innate orientation. It seems reasonable that St. Paul was well acquainted with this popular Greek concept (Acts 17:38, Dover, p. 168).

The persons Paul condemns are manifestly not homosexual; what he derogates are . . . acts committed by apparently heterosexual persons who have rejected their calling.... It would completely undermine the thrust of the argument if the persons in question were not "naturally inclined" to the opposite sex. . . . Not only does there appear to have been no general prejudice against gay people among early Christians, there does not seem to have been any reason for Christians to adopt a hostile attitude toward homosexual behavior. Many prominent

and respected Christians—some canonized—were involved in relationships which would almost certainly be considered homosexual in cultures hostile to same-sex eroticism. Anti erotic pressure from Government and more ascetic schools of sexual ethics was in time to achieve the suppression of most public aspects of gay sexuality. Boswell, p. 135.

Dean Eaves is an amazing man who says we are not now accountable for the laws of the Old Testament, yet makes most of his arguments there; who claims that grandfather Judah was a lesbian; who needs proof before he will believe it is right to treat a servant above an animal, etc. (Lev. 25:43; 19:3; 20:9); who believes no type of eunuch could ever father a child; who says it is impossible for gays to engage in sexual intercourse; who claims the abuse of drinking is not drunkenness; who declares that two unmarried people can commit adultery with each other; who claims to be against divorce, yet demands that millions divorce. This amazing man makes a chart condemning all gays, yet says that celibate gays are not condemned; thinks anyone who can't measure up to the Biblical standard of perfect love should not be allowed to marry; demands that a "Y" chromosomed woman perform sexually as a man even though she looks, functions and desires as a female; refuses to discuss eighty percent of my arguments, yet claims that Johnson is evasive. This man would jail all who engage in "unnatural" acts, except the kind he performs. This man is not sure about disfellowshipping mercenary soldiers or pro-abortionists, but is certain about two gays who love each other. This man thinks gays can never be tempted to engage in opposite sex and accepts alcohol upon a doctor's advice but not homosexuality upon a doctor's advice. Dean Eaves is a person who has no real understanding of Christian gays, human rights or Biblical sexuality. He should talk to us, invite us to his services and his discussion groups. He will find that we are not what he thinks we are.

Time and space prohibits discussion of many other issues such as, the Gilbeah account, Adam's hermaphroditism, the Watchers, the offense of Ham, the serpent in the wilderness, the Song of Songs, the Baaling, the Egyptian youth found by David, Mephibosheth, the eros and nudity of St. Peter, the naked dance of David and his young men, the acceptance of the Greek Gyms and Baths by St. John and St. Paul, Luke's naked

youth, the Alexandrian Rule, the Bestiary, Theodoret of Cyrus, the real objections of Clement, early pagan objections to Christian gays, Zeno, Chrysostom, gay Christian marriages and the Theodosian Code, etc. We of the Christian Lambdas Organization of gay and non-gay believers are dedicated to defending the truth in debate anywhere we are able to travel.

I wish I had time to give my personal testimony of salvation in Christ and how my Lord sustains me and my other half. More time should have been given to gay freedom issues, even gay freedom for those gays with whom we might not personally agree—they are God's children, too, often doing the best they can. We Christian gays have learned not to judge other gays. Our rules are for us, our ethics are our own. We should have spoken more of the rights of women and other minorities, the rights of gays to serve in the armed services and as teachers. The Dean's South Korean type "Social Purification" proves he has more in common with Hitler, the Iranians, Dan White and John Gracy than he is willing to admit. We should have spent more time warning of the grave dangers of the Dean's so-called "reformed homosexuals" advice to marry "straight." The Dean would change his mind fast if his own daughter wanted to marry an "ex-gay." Kinsey and Wolfgang have been searching for one such "changed" gay for decades. Even *Christianity Today* warns gays never to marry hets just because some religious "quack" claims they are cured (4/8/80). The Corinthians repented of abuse. They did not and could not repent of innate life styles (I Cor. 6:9).

May the blessings of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit be with everyone who reads this book. I have tried to preach the truth. If I am in error, the Dean must bear some responsibility because he has failed to point out where I am wrong. Study the Bible, pray, and God will help you to see the truth. Find out for yourself from your own Bible. Do not take my words for anything, but read the Bible and follow it. Pray for my ministry, to give gays hope in the Lord Jesus Christ. Here I stand, so help me, God. Thank you, Jesus.

FOOTNOTES

1. I Sam. 19:2, meaning proper sexual desire as in Gen. 34:19. 2 I Sam. 20:4. 3. I Sam. 18:1 as in Lev. 21:11. 4. I Sam. 18:3 as in Mai. 2:14. 5. I Sam. 20:41, *Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1957, p. I 11, 159. 6. I Sam. 23:17. 7. I Sam. 20:21 as in Gen. 36:18. 8. I Sam. 23:16. 9. I Sam. 20:30. 10. I Sam. 24:14 as in Deut. 23:18. 11. Ps. 22:6. 12. II Sam. 1:26. 13. II Sam. 9:5, *laqach*, as in Nu. 12:1,1 Ch. 2:2.

Fourth Negative

By Thomas F. Eaves

In his third negative Johnson charges, "According to Rev. Eaves, a female Christian cannot build her life upon the solid rock from Matthew 7:29 because of the word *aner* (man)." Matthew 7:24 states, "Everyone [pas—male and female] therefore that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them shall be likened unto a wise man who built his house on the rock." Verse 26 states, "Everyone" that heareth these words . . . "

Johnson asks, "Can't the Dean understand that all his marriage rules are ideal not absolute?" The Bible teaches that we are to love God with all our being (Matthew 22:37), to love neighbor, self, and enemies (Matthew 22:39; 5:43-44). Given Johnson's position these guidelines are ideal, not absolute—therefore we can pick and choose whom we love. Not so! To deviate from God's word is sin (I Jno. 3:4).

Johnson's chart No. 15, under the heading, "Recognized or Tolerated Homes" lists (a) Gay, I Samuel 1:25, "And they slew the bullock, and brought the child to Eli." (See I Samuel 1:11, 17, 20, 22, 25, 27 and 28). Where is the proof of a homosexual union? If Samuel was brought to Eli for homosexual purposes then a sinful union existed. Eh was a married man and had sons (I Samuel 2:12, 22-26). According to Johnson (chart No. 12, answer to question No. 8), this would have been a sinful union. Samuel was taken to God's house to serve Jehovah under the guidance of Eh (I Samuel 2:11). If homosexuality was involved was Samuel: (a) born homosexual, (b) forced into

the union, or (c) trained to that life style? Where is the scripture which substantiates: a, b, or c?

Johnson said that I did not deny the facts of Jesus unorthodox customs—unorthodox to whom? The society of Jesus' day or 20th century society? Johnson reads a lot into the scriptures he quotes.

His arguments on I Corinthians 9:15 (sic. 9:5), Romans 16:7 and a woman apostle. There were twelve original Apostles (Matthew 10:2-4) who met special qualifications (Acts 1:21-22); one was chosen to take Judas Iscariot's place (Acts 1:26). Paul was an apostle called out of due season and was a chosen vessel to the Gentiles (Acts 9:15; I Corinthians 15:5-8). These met specific qualifications. The word apostle means "one sent" and applied to those who were not of the twelve (Barnabas, Acts 14:14). If Johnson's interpretation is correct Junia or Junias in Romans 16:7 could have been "one sent" on a mission. Some understand that this person, while not an apostle, was well known by the apostles.

In Johnson's 4th affirmative he indicates that inversion was a sin, but tolerated by God to replenish the earth. According to Johnson, David: (a) married Jonathan (I Samuel 18:3). (b) Bible says David then married Michal (I Samuel 18), (c) Bible says David married Abigail (I Samuel 26:42). (d) Bible says David married Ahinoam (I Samuel 26:43). Note that, according to Johnson, David was in a homosexual union with Jonathan at the same time he was married to Michal; then (as Michal was given to Palti—I Samuel 25:44) while he was married to Abigail and Ahinoam. (Jonathan dies, I Sam. 31). Johnson says that (e) David marries Mephibosheth (Jonathan's son—I Samuel 9:5—4th affirmative), (f) The Bible indicates that David next marries Bathsheba. Johnson says that David's heterosexual unions constituted the sin of inversion but was allowed to replenish the earth. I remind the reader of my question in my 3rd negative, "What responsibility would the homosexual male have to the heterosexual female (his partner in replenishing the earth) in the area of fulfilling her continuing sexual need?" He didn't answer in his 4th affirmative. Just what would be his responsibilities in such a case?

Johnson says Ruth's marriage to a male was illegal and only tolerated by God. He gives three passages to substantiate his claim. Deuteronomy 7:3; Genesis 6:2; and Ezra 9:1-2. Genesis 6:2 tells of sons of God who married daughters of men. (They all perished in the flood.) Obviously Deuteronomy 7:3 was not directed to them but to the children of Israel. If God tolerated the situation in Ezra 9:1-2 why did the people refer to their action as sin and put the foreign wives away? (Ezra 10:2, 3, 18, and 19).

He also says, "Ruth's 'arrangement' with a nice old rich polygamist was designed for Naomi for Levirate security for herself and her love." How's that for an ungodly motive for marriage. The Bible says that Boaz married Ruth to "raise up the name of the dead upon his inheritance." (Ruth 4:6 and 10). To this union was born Obed the father of Jesse, the father of David from whose lineage our Lord descended. In Levirate marriage the kinsman's wife was taken as wife to raise up seed in his brother's name. (Deuteronomy 25:5-10; Ruth 4:7-12). Note that Johnson gave no authority for his statement that Levirate marriage never required a life time love. No, I would not recommend a woman sleep at the feet of a man before marriage. The Levirate marriage custom does not exist in the New Testament period.

Using the American Standard version I missed Johnson's argument on I Samuel 19:2. (He also claimed that I inserted a "no" in one of his arguments. Had he pointed out where, I would have corrected it.) Since he refers to I Samuel 19:2 in his 4th affirmative I will consider it. The King James version says, "But Jonathan, Saul's son delighted [Hebrew—*chaphets*] much in David." Johnson renders it, "Jonathan lusted greatly after David, meaning proper sexual desire as in Genesis 34:9." This is an assertion—not proof. Note other passages where the same word is used (Numbers 14:8; Psalms 40:8; Proverbs 18:2; Jeremiah 6:10). Since the word is used in ways other than with a sexual connotation, Johnson must present proof for his argument. (In the first place Johnson's correlating (?) passage, Genesis 34:19, does not establish sexual desire or lust on the part of Shechem. One can take delight in an individual with absolutely no sexual feelings.

Johnson says, "I have tried to be open and honest, answering every point: but the Dean still accuses me of changing God's Holy Bible." Why would I do a thing like that? Let me give you a few reasons. (A) Johnson—"Then come Thou into me, for there is peace and no hurt."⁷ (I Samuel 20:21 as in Genesis 36:18). *The Bible*—" . . . Take them and come: for there is peace to thee, and no hurt, as Jehovah liveth" (I Samuel 20:21). The context is very clear, Jonathan was informing David what he should do concerning Saul's anger and attempt to kill him (vv. 12-16). (B) Johnson—"And Jonathan went to David in the woods and sensually fell upon him."⁸ (I Samuel 23:16). *The Bible*—"And Jonathan, Saul's son, arose, and went to David into the wood, and strengthened his hand in God" (I Samuel 23:16). (C) Johnson—"Saul screamed, 'You are a shameful intimate lover of the son of Jesse'."⁹ (I Samuel 20:30). *The Bible*—"Then Saul's anger was kindled against Jonathan, and he said unto him, 'Thou son of the perverse rebellious woman, do not I know that thou hast chosen the son of Jesse to thine own shame, and unto the shame of thy mother's nakedness'." (I Sam. 20:30). (D) Johnson—"And David said, 'Does the King of Israel think I am a dead faggot?'"¹⁰ (I Samuel 24:14 as in Deuteronomy 23:18). *The Bible*—"After whom is the king of Israel come out? after whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea?" (If a dog is a faggot what is the flea?). (E) Johnson—"Then King David sent and married him."¹¹ (II Samuel 9:5, *laqach*, as in Numbers 12:1, I Chronicles 2:2). *The Bible*—"Then King David sent, and fetched him out of the house of Machir." The word "fetch" (*laqach*) means to take or receive. It is translated four times as marry. Johnson wants to translate it in II Samuel 9:5 as marry. He fails to realize that in Genesis 19:14, Numbers 12:1 (2 times), and I Chronicles 2:21 it identifies whom they "took," "received," or "married": sons-in-law which married (*laqach*) his daughters; Ethiopian woman he (i.e. Moses) had married (*laqach*); Hezron . . . daughter of Machir . . . whom he married. Notice that men married daughters, women, females. Johnson used I Samuel 20:30 in his affirmative . . . let's go to verse 31 where the text reads, "Wherefore send and fetch [*laqach*] him unto me, for he shall die." No doubt Johnson would translate this, "Wherefore send and marry [*laqach*] him unto me, for he shall die." What

authority, manuscript evidence, translations does Johnson have for rewriting God's Word? His authority is his own life-style!

Other considerations: Psalms 22:6—Why was he so considered? Psalms 22:8ff. I Samuel 20:4, "Whatsoever you desire, I will do it for thee." The American Standard footnotes and Revised Standard Version translates, "Whatsoever you say, I will do for you." In verse 5 David then makes his request. Johnson says, "The body of Jonathan was joined to the body of David and Jonathan loved him." (I Samuel 18:1 as in Leviticus 21:11). The King James, American Standard, Revised Standard render the word *nephesh* as soul. "The soul of Jonathan was joined to the soul of David . . ." The word *nephesh* is also used in Genesis 2:7; 35:18; Deuteronomy 4:29; I Samuel 1:10 and refers to the inner man. Johnson again refers to the covenant between Jonathan and David and insists that it was a marriage covenant. (See my material on *berith* in my last negative.) Does the word covenant (*berith*—appears 279 times) mean marriage covenant each time it appears? By what authority can Johnson rule out a different kind of covenant between David and Jonathan? Johnson works on the false assumption that David and Jonathan were homosexual then interprets the Bible accordingly.

How do I know that both men and women are included in the teaching of Matthew 19:9? Because the passage states "whosoever" and Mark 10:11-12 states, ". . . and if she herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery." Let's just keep it as broad and narrow as the Bible.

I am not afraid to discuss Mark 14:13—I just want evidence. Governments are ordained of God (Daniel 4:17, 25, 32; Romans 13) and Jesus in upholding the government of Caesar as being God-ordained no more upheld his sin of sodomy than we uphold the immorality of government figures when we uphold the government of the United States.

Johnson's Chart No. 6—Speaking to a king as a slave. Exodus 6:? talking to a father as a peer. Deuteronomy 5:?, working a slave as an animal. Leviticus 25:?, I asked Johnson for the verses . . . he never gave them; therefore his chart falls and the arguments he attempted to substantiate with it.

Johnson on *pais*.—"The Bible uses other terms to denote regular servants or sons. The Greek term (*pais*) in the Bible is either used to denote a physical union between two human beings or a spiritual union (marriage) between God and a human . . ." Isaiah referred to Jesus as servant (*pais*), Isaiah 42:1 quoted in Matthew 12:18. In Johnson's own example (Luke 7:7) the sick man is referred to as servant (*pais*—v. 7) and servant (*doulon*—v. 10). Furthermore in John 4 the nobleman's ill child is referred to as son (*huion*—v.47); child (*paidion*—infant, v. 49); son (*huios*—v. 50), and son (*pais*—v. 51). According to Johnson every male child two years and under were united in a physical union. Herod killed all the children (*paidas*—accusative plural form of *pais*). Matthew 2:16. (Other passages where same form appears—Acts 20:12; Luke 8:5; 8:54; 12:45, etc.).

Johnson is still having trouble with the Greek genders. In Chart E-20 I pointed out that male and female were united in marriage. Johnson insists that the word *aner* in these passages means both men and women.

In his third negative (in reference to my chart No. 20) he says, "Everyone of his Greek terms for man, in his chart means 'males, and/or female' (I Corinthians 3:15; Romans 4:8, etc)." In the passages I used the reader will note that the term *aner* (man) is contrasted *with gune* (woman) I Peter 3:1 and 3:5 gives the terms in contrast and Peter even gives us an example in I Peter 3:6. Note, "For after this manner in the old time the Holy Women [*gunaikes* from *gune*] also who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands: [*andrasin* from *aner*], even as Sara obeyed Abraham . . ." (I Peter 3:5-6). Peter says women/husbands as Sarah/Abraham. Note the proof text given by Johnson in his 3rd and 4th affirmative (I Corinthians 3:15; Romans 4:8; John 3:3; Romans 1:8 (sic 4:8); I Corinthians 7:30). In I Corinthians 3:15 the word *aner* does not appear—it is *tinis* (anyone) and includes all. In Romans 4:8 *aner* is used but context makes it clear that the principle involved is applicable to male and female. Note that there is no contrast as in the verses used in my chart. (To the one, v. 4; of the man *anthropou* (mankind), v. 6; blessed are they, v. 7; and blessed is the man (*aner*), v. 8. In John 3:3 the word *aner* is not used. The text reads, *ean me tis*,

except anyone is born again and it includes all. I Corinthians 7:30 does not have the word *aner* but participles which are translated the ones weeping, the ones rejoicing, and the ones buying, etc. Perhaps the clearest contrast is found in Matthew 14:21, "And they that did eat were about five thousand men [*andres* from *aner*] besides women [*gunaikon* from *gune*] and children [*paidion*]." The same contrast is found in the verses in chart No. 20. Note these statements from the Greek Lexicons concerning *aner*.

Aner, Andros Ho, a man, Lat. Vir. The meanings of this word in the New Testament differ in no respect fr. classic usage; for it is employed 1. with reference to sex, and so to distinguish a man from a woman; either a. as a male: Acts 8:12; 17:12; I Timothy 2:12; or b. as a husband: Matt. 1:16; Mk. 10:2; Jn. 4:16 sqq; Rom. 7:2 .. . (Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 45).

Aner, andros ho, a male person of full age and stature, as opposed to a child or female, I Cor. 13:11, et al; . . . (The Analytical Greek Lexicon: Harper & Bros. Publishers, p. 29).

Aner, Andros Ho, (Hom.t, common in all the mngs, known to our lit. and LXX) man. 1. in contrast to woman . . . (Arndt & Gingrich, p. 65).

Chart E-20 shows the contrast. Males (men) married females (women).

Johnson declares a state of emergency. He stated, "I said earlier, that like incest, inversion is wrong; but during emergencies, God tolerated both incest and inversion when necessary to replenish the earth." Johnson boldly declares that Joseph and Potiphar, Ruth and Naomi, Jonathan and David, Eli and Samuel were united in homosexual relationships. Johnson stated the homosexuals can't unite with heterosexuals without being guilty of inversion. When it was pointed out that Joseph, Ruth, David, and Eh had rather obvious heterosexual unions Johnson declares a state of emergency. To cover the sin of inversion. Where does the Bible refer to these emergencies during the time of these men and women? If God tolerated such relationships (and He didn't) what of the responsibility of the homosexual sexually to the heterosexual partner? Was it continued—if so the homosexual lived two life styles. Or after children were born were the heterosexuals cast off? If they married—what of vows to the individual and God?

Johnson's misquotes—"David claimed that his love for Jonathan was like the love he experienced with his women—only much better." (3rd affirmative). II Samuel 1:26, ". . . Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women" (underlining mine—TFE). . . . In his third affirmative Johnson states, "In the Bible a caric (eunuch, KJV) was any male who did not beget, including all bachelors, gays, impotent, sterile, etc." Then in his fourth affirmative he attributes this statement to me. I had replied to his statement (underlining mine, TFE). Dr. Johnson accuses me of having no real understanding of gays . . . maybe . . . but I have pointed out God's plan for man and woman in the realm of sexuality.

Johnson states that if he is in error I must bear some responsibility because I have failed to point out where he is in error. I have pointed out numerous passages of scriptures only to have Johnson to completely "rewrite" them to agree with his life style. I won't accept the responsibility he attempts to assign to me—he will answer to the one who delivered the Word which we are to obey (John 12:48).

All men have the great opportunity to obtain freedom in Jesus Christ. The sinner must believe in Christ Jesus (John 8:24; Hebrews 11:6); repent of his sins (Luke 13:3); confess Jesus Christ as God's Son (Matthew 10:32-33; I Timothy 6:13) and appropriate the blood of Christ which was shed at His death (John 19:34). All are cleansed by blood (Hebrews 9:22). We contact the blood of Christ when we are baptized into Christ's death (Romans 6:1-6; Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38-47; Acts 22:16). As a Christian one must serve God completely (Phil. 1:21; Revelation 2:10; Romans 12:1-2).

Let no one think that a firm stand for the truth indicates a lack of love for the souls in error. It is a love for souls that demands a presentation of Truth (John 8:32), as it is the only hope of salvation.

Let the record show that in keeping with the teachings of the New Testament I do not wear religious titles such as Reverend, Father, etc., and requested (to no avail) that Dr. Johnson not use them in reference to me (Matthew 23:1-12).

Affirmative Rejoinder

By Paul Johnson

Rev.¹ Eaves loves gays about like Hitler did. I have said:

Silence is not golden, the Dean has ignored so many issues that it is pathetic. . . . The one type of family that is discouraged most in the Bible is the kind the Dean advocates. The modern Nuclear Family, with its birth control, is never promoted in the Bible (Ps. 127:5). It is much easier to prove from the Bible that David and Jonathan formed a sexual unit than it is to prove Rev. Eaves' type family (p. 127).. . . The Bible Standard (ideal rule) is not met by either me or the Dean. Who gave the Dean the right to require certain Bible Standards and water down others? . . . The Dean tried desperately to water down a few of my Ten Examples by taking the Greek and Hebrew words out of context and assigning them secondary meanings (a procedure that works just as well (?) against the Dean's text). PRJ

The only thing the Dean can find wrong with 28 scriptures in chart No. 15 is one misprint (II Sam. 1:25ff often listed correctly.)² The reason and logic of chart No. 6 required no support verses, but I did list three (p. 127). I did point out where the Dean changed a "no" passage but still no apology came (p. 67).

Scholars say that when an unspecified class is referred to as "man" it is of common gender, referring to any individual, male or female. Common gender does not require contextual support but specific gender must be identified elsewhere in the text (Eaves has this rule reversed,³ PRJ) . . . Ephesians 5:25 literally says "individuals shall love their wives." Such verses do not show gender difference (Eaves calls this "sexual contrast," PRJ) any more than the following: "Individuals shall love their mothers" or "Individuals shall love God." . . . The fact that God tolerated polygamous, Levirate, slave and certain incestuous unions in David's day (II Sam. 13:13) shows that God tolerated inversion for reproduction also at that time. . . . These alternate marriage types were not as binding or as obligating as "regular" marriage (Gen. 21:12; Deut. 25:6). Levirate, adoptive, inversion, A.I.D., or test tube babies often need no further help from the original sperm donor. . . . According to the Greeks, *pais* meant "gay" when describing a union between an older and younger male. Between any two humans it always meant a physical union in the Bible. . . . Infants were *pais* if they sucked their mother's breast (physical union). An adult was *pais* (gay) for obvious parallel reasons. St. Paul embraced a pats at Troas,

several young gays staged a protest in the temple and eunuch overseers were often gay (Acts 20:9, 10; Matt. 21:15ff; Lk. 12:45; Dn. 9:9). . . . The wonderful love between David and Jonathan (II Sam. 1:25, 26 uses the term *ahabah*. Between two humans this Hebrew form always meant sexual love in the Bible.⁴

Odds and Ends. Since Paul included himself as an "apostle," he was using this term in its broader sense, thus sister Junia still "has a right to lead about a wife" (I Cor. 9: 1-15). Ezra's divorce decree⁵ involved temporary ("now") action (10:3) but Deuteronomy 7:3 applied to both of Ruth's husbands. . . . Jesus criticized evil rulers but not the gay Caesar.⁵ . . . Pastor Eaves had rather uphold 20th century customs (I Cor. 11:16).... If Rev. Eaves can find "absolutely no sexual feelings in Genesis 34:19ff," he ought to find no sex in the verses he gave to support het marriages or condemn mine. If he sees no gay sex in I and II Samuel, he could just as easily do away with sex in his own text.⁶ . . . A flea is an animal that hangs on after all hope is truly gone. (The Holy Reverend Eaves must be the flea and I must be the dog!) God bless all the good fleas and all good dogs. Thank you very much, Rev. Eaves, you have unintentionally helped the cause of gay Christians. Jesus said "whosoever will may have life."

Footnotes. 1. There is a proper way to call preachers "Good," "Master," "Holy," "Reverend," and "Father" (I Cor. 4:15; II Pet. 3:4; Heb. 12:9). 2. There is no Biblical evidence that Eh or Samuel were gay. 3. Since the Dean has admitted that *anthropous, mia*, etc., means "male and female" then marriage text that use these terms establish same-sex unions (Matt. 19:5; Mk. 10:7; Eph. 5:31, etc.), thus do not even need *aner* (though Thayer and others really teach that *aner*, when unspecified means "persons of either sex" (Thayer, p. 46). For any of these words to show sexual contrast the word would have to be identified somewhere else as male only. Words such as "besides" (Matt. 14:21) properly show contrast but such terms are not found in the Dean's marriage passages. 4. Anderson, p. 5, 3, 8. 5. Dean Eaves calls most divorce and all homosexual inversion "repentance." People who practice such "repentance" go against the plain teachings of the Bible and are headed for all kinds of trouble. 6. Eaves is against anal and oral birth control (gay or het) but for most every other kind (Rom. 2:1).

"Sexual Orientation Disturbance"

Thomas F. Eaves

I was amazed to read in *Time* (January 8, 1979, p. 48) that the American Psychiatric Association has created a new diagnostic category, "sexual orientation disturbance," for homosexuals. The movement toward obtaining "normality" and "acceptability" for the homosexual way of life has been very militant in the past six years. From many quarters, including some religious (?) groups, the cry comes to accept homosexuality as just an alternate life style. The Presbyterian church of the United States voted in its General Assembly *against* a motion calling homosexuality a *sin*. (*The Knoxville News-Sentinel*, Friday, June 16, 1978.) Regardless of what you call it, how many religious bodies vote against calling it a sin, or how many defend it. . . it is still sodomy and a sin which God's word condemns. (Romans 1:26-27; 1 Corinthians 6:9-11.) Homosexuals *can* be saved if they turn from their sin as did some of the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 6:11), and obey the gospel of Christ.

Not only is homosexuality in complete opposition to God's way, but the so-called "homosexual marriages" or relationships cannot fulfill God's holy purpose for marriage. In Genesis we read: "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it. . . ." (1:27-28; see also 2:18-25.) Note that God's plan for marriage was for male and female, and they were to bear children or to replenish the earth. A New York *News* columnist (Jimmy Breslin) wrote in August that national lesbian leaders gathered at Illinois State University and called for 500,000 test tube babies to be delivered to lesbian "mothers" over the next four years. Nothing could be clearer, this relationship *cannot* fulfill one of the intended purposes of marriage. As John Leo stated in the *Time* article mentioned above: "Even though most heterosexual acts do not lead to reproduction, sex between a man and a woman has an obvious biological function. Homosexuality has no such function, and cannot ever have it." The continuation of the human race is geared to heterosexual relationships.

Regardless of what you call it or how many defend it homosexuality is not God's Way.—*Beaver Ridge Road, Route 22, Knoxville, Tennessee 37921.*

(Reprinted from *Gospel Advocate*, Feb. 15, 1979, by permission.)

Appendix — II



Dear Reverend Brother
In Christ Jesus

We are a snail group of Gay and non-gay religious people who are interested in informing our Christian and Jewish friends about the true nature of Homosexuality as it relates to the church of our day.

We have received a published article written or endorsed by you which is against the gay life style. We believe that you have made several serious mistakes as the enclosed literature points out.

We would not expect you to agree with our position, but we would expect you to correctly express our position. Please read our literature so that you may know exactly how we feel as Christian gays. Your anti-gay position is weakened when you for example try to make homosexuals out as child abusers, when the truth is that most of the child abuse cases are heterosexual. We recommend to you the new report by the Kinsey Institute entitled Homosexualities. You will find that gay people are no better or no worse than non-gay people when it comes to sexual abuse.

We know that you will not agree with the enclosed Quiz, but we suggest you take it anyway and please, please, please mail us your answer. We want to know how you really believe.

You may not agree with our position, but Christian charity demands that you study the real issues. Also we feel that you do us a grave injustice by denying us equal protection under the law, and equal job opportunities. You may feel that abortion, false religion, birth control, test tube babies, war, draft dodgers, the twice married, etc. are also immoral but would you try to deny them employment in schools, government and would you try to outlaw all people who do not live up to your moral concepts?

It will be easy for you to disregard the enclosed materials, and never answer. We seldom receive even attempts to answer. Will you defend what you believe or will you continue to publish articles without facing the real issues?

Yours Still In Christ


Paul R. Johnson
Director of Lambdas

prj/da

PUBLIC SPEAKERS AND DEBATERS PROVIDED

RELIGIOUS MEDIA PROGRAM: The Lambdas has a public speakers bureau which provides capable speakers to discuss its major positions. These speakers are available in major cities throughout the world. Up to 60 days may be needed to provide a speaker for your meeting or event. Ever effort is made to provide the exact type of speaker desired. Speakers are provided free of charge. The organization may or may not provide an honorarium.

NAME OF ORGANIZATION _____

ADDRESS _____

PERSON IN CHARGE _____ PHONE (____) _____

TYPE OF SPEAKER DESIRED: Male _____ Female _____ Age range _____

Gay _____ Homophile _____ Either _____

SUBJECTS TO BE DISCUSSED: _____

TYPE OF PRESENTATION : Lecture _____ Questions _____ Round-Table _____


Formal Debate _____ Other _____

Note: If a public debate is desired, please present signed propositions. We will affirm, for example, "Resolved: Homosexuality is amoral". He will deny, " Resolved: All homosexuality is Immoral".

LOCATION OF ENGAGEMENT: _____

Time and Date _____

OTHER INFORMATION:



Jesus Freak Quiz

by Paul Johnson

Do you have some religious quirk on your list, worrying you day and night with its or his her mis-quotations and condemnations? Does your great aunt Flory get all upped and downed as you with her Bible every time you attend a family reunion? If so, give her the following testy quiz. It may not change her but it will certainly dis-charge her.

So-called "borned againers" will melt away. Such people have their own definitions of love, mercy and justice and this quiz is designed to speak to them in their own language (so please excuse certain expressions used). Also, Jesus Freaks have nothing whatsoever in common with Jesus of Nazareth who taught love toward all, even his toward enemies.

Most gay people are at a loss to communicate with these fundamentalists. The more the gay mystic reacts, the more fast the fundamentalist has to use. These questions are designed to avoid this pitfall.

This article is from the *Chad to Canal '76*.

PART I: True or False

1. Since some child molesters are heterosexual, all gays should be denied the right to teach in public schools.
2. Since most child molesters are heterosexual, all neo-gays should be denied the right to teach in.
3. During the Second World War, some Germans quoted the Bible in defense of Hitler's action against the gays and Jews.
4. A large number of Fundamentalists still quote the Bible in defense of segregation.
5. At certain times, Americans have been denied the right to teach because they openly admitted outside the classrooms that they were atheist, socialist, humanist or divorcees.
6. In England, Catholics were once denied human rights because the ruling church labeled them homosexual.
7. In Spain, certain religious people were denied human rights because the majority claimed they were against the Bible.
8. In Russia, some Fundamentalists are denied the right to teach because they are said to be improper "role models."
9. High schools and college students should have the right to hear both sides of the gay civil rights issue.
10. Many gays believe that private schools should retain the right to set their own moral requirements for teachers in private schools.
11. Some communities would vote for segregation today if they were given the opportunity by the courts.
12. Gay teachers who led and try to conceal their homosexuality should be the only homosexuals allowed to teach in public schools.
13. Gay teachers who express their feelings and hide their gayness are less likely to develop emotional problems than gays who are open.
14. An open gay teacher is more likely to advocate homosexuality in the class more than a heterosexual teacher who believes strongly in gay rights.

Jesus Freak Quiz

PART II: General Discussion Questions.

Please answer on a separate sheet of paper. Give logical reasons for your answers.

1. There are 300 verses in the Bible condemning heterosexual abuse and only 5 verses condemning homosexual abuse. Why did the God Lord think "straight" would have a hundred times more sexual hang-ups than gays?
2. Does the word "Christians" mean one who follows Christ, why don't the anti-gays follow Christ by never saying anything against homosexuality?
3. During the time of Moses, anyone who practiced birth control was struck dead by the Lord (1). But so one was ever struck dead for practicing homosexuality. Since gays are not on the pill, and if the Lord should strike again like He struck back then, what would the "Jesus Freaks" like to have written on their tombstones?
4. During St. Paul's day, women were not allowed to speak in public (2). They had to stay in the closet. Since the freaks make no allowances for cultural changes, why are these commandments not binding on Anita Bryant?
5. If the angels who were attacked in ancient Sodom had been female instead of male, would such attempted rape prove that all heterosexuality was evil (3)?

6. When St. Paul taught against men who "abused themselves with men" (4), was that any worse than when he spoke of males who abused themselves with women?
7. When Moses condemned in the original Hebrew "Husbands who lie with mankind as with a wife" (5), was that any worse than when the prophet condemned a husband who lies with womankind, a few verses before?
8. Why did Jesus kiss and embrace only men?
9. What did King David mean when he said, "I am distracted for thee, my brother Jonathan, very pleasant hast thou been unto me; thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women." (7)?
10. Since most Fundamentalists believe that abortion is murder, why do they allow teachers who believe in, practice or advocate abortion to teach?
11. Since, at one time, the Bible commanded the death penalty for witches, sorcerers and heretics, why aren't these groups denied their rights also?
12. Zoologists have proven that some animals are homosexual. Since God created all the animals and pronounced them good, how among God's lower creation, is gay good and is gay natural?
13. Since Jesus warned more against the dangers of divorce than he did against gayness, why aren't Florio and Anita Bryant held up as role models (8)?
14. What would the freaks do if a 4000 year old religious law of ancient India was forced upon all Americans?
15. Since some Fundamentalists believe that Jesus taught against war (9), should we deny all veterans the right to teach? Is gayness worse than murder?
16. Dr. Margaret Mead claims that some kinds of homosexuality are caused by emphasizing sexual differences, and by proclaiming strong role models (10). If Dr. Mead is proven correct, should anti-gay teachers be fired because they might cause children to become homosexual?

17. Since the majority of Americans believe that the Fundamentalist interpretations of sexual passages are evil, should all Fundamentalists be fired from teaching in public schools and denied equal housing?
18. Why did Jesus and his Apostles teach that homosexual rulers and kings be given respect and honor (11)?
19. Why did God command Isaiah to go against for these years? (12)?
20. Why do the "Freaks" teach that marriage is honorable only among heterosexuals when the Bible says that "Marriage is honorable among all" (13)?
21. If all homosexuality is evil because gay rape was attempted in Sodom (14), then is all heterosexuality evil because straight rape was practiced in Gibeah (15)?
22. If all gayness is evil because St. Paul condemned men who "defile themselves with men" (16), then is all heterosexuality evil because St. Paul also condemned men who defile themselves with women?
23. If all gayness is evil because the Book of Romans condemns "men with men working unsexually" (17), then is all heterosexuality evil when the Bible condemns men with women working unsexually?
24. Must public school teachers abide by all moral judgments of the Fundamentalists?
25. Are heterosexual school teachers who believe in gay rights just as dangerous as gays? Should they be fired?
26. If a teacher (outside the classroom) advocates abortion, adultery, or the E.R.A., should he/she also be fired?
27. Because of idolatrous associations, the Bible condemns all surgeons, all undertakers, all pharmacists, along with some homosexuals (18). Since none of the above are now associated with idols, why outlaw any of them?
28. Give names and addresses of adult homosexuals who have been cured of their homosexuality. At least give the number of cured cases.

PART III: Check List.

Check off the types of Public School teachers who are against the Bible and thus are improper role models. Which of these teachers should be fired if they make public their beliefs outside the classroom?

- A. Abolitionists
- B. Libelators
- C. Abortionists
- D. All who lust in their heart
- E. Homosexuals who flaunt it
- F. Heterosexuals who flaunt it
- G. Asexuals who flaunt it
- H. K.K.K.
- I. E.R.A.
- J. M.C.C.
- K. American Nazis
- L. American Communists
- M. Gay sympathizers
- N. All who are divorced
- O. Unmarried
- P. Vegetarians
- Q. Marijuanaists
- R. Slave Baiters
- S. Teaching Women
- T. Night Vested Women
- U. Pags (cigarette smokers)
- V. Pags (English school teachers)
- W. Pags (the other kind)
- X. Singers (singing madhouses)
- Y. Singers (the other kind)
- Z. Swingers

PART IV: Multiple Choice

1. He who is without sin, let him
 - a. cast the first orange
 - b. judge himself
 - c. wake up tomorrow morning gay
2. Do a pe on you do
 - a. as they would do a pe onto you
 - b. only if it is a foam pie

3. Jesus said the way to love your enemies is to
 - a. take away their human rights
 - b. have them arrested
 - c. promote mob action against them
 - d. kill a queen for Christ
 - e. none of the above
4. Upon hearing that King Hechabadeezer was a homosexual (19), the prophet Daniel
 - a. loved the King all his life
 - b. decided he himself (Daniel) would never marry
 - c. asked the King to write part of the Bible
 - d. all of the above
5. In Genesis chapter 6, Cain received sexual advances from
 - a. his righteous brother Abel
 - b. John Briggs
 - c. the Devil
6. In St. John 8, Jesus taught that
 - a. a prostitute is not a criminal
 - b. no woman has the right to punish, condemn or sit between adulterers
 - c. only a person who has never sinned has the right to demand the death penalty
7. The famous madist in the Bible (St. Peter, King Saul and the prophet David) (20) should have been
 - a. charged with obscene exposure
 - b. charged with decent exposure
 - c. elected Pope
8. The Song of Solomon and the book of Psalms should be
 - a. banned in Boston
 - b. banned in Miami
 - c. torn out of the Bible
 - d. published in *Hunter Magazine*

FOOTNOTES:

- | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| 1. Genesis 38:12 | 9. St. Matthew 5:44 | 15. Judges 19 |
| 2. Timothy 2:12 | 10. Arno Karlen, <i>Homosexuality</i> , W.W. Norton, New York, 1971, p. 494. | 17. Romans 1:27, 13:13 |
| 3. Genesis 19:9 | 11. Corinthians 6:9 | 18. Leviticus 21:5, Numbers 19:11, Revelation 21:8 |
| 4. Corinthians 6:9 | 12. St. Mark 12:18 | 19. Daniel 4:10e also the historian Herodotus |
| 5. Romans 13:13 | 13. Isaiah 20:2 | 20. St. John 21:7, 1 Samuel 10:22. |
| 6. Leviticus 20:13 | 14. Hebrews 13:4 | |
| 7. 1 Samuel 11:26 | 15. Genesis 19:9 | |

