



Why I Believe Homosexuality Is Wrong

Reverend Clenard H. Childress, Jr. is the senior pastor of the New Calvary Baptist Church in Montclair, New Jersey.

The twenty-first century has offered new challenges to the faith community and society. We are faced with social issues that have become increasingly more complex due to ever-shifting perceptions of behavior and relationships. In 1954, Dr. Martin Luther King, in his sermon “Rediscovering Lost Values,” warned the country of a disturbing trend he perceived among its citizens—Moral Relativism. In the ‘60s it came under this guise: “If it feels good, do it! If it doesn’t, do it anyway...” In the ‘70s it was “I’m Okay. You’re Okay.” And these days our children are inculcated with “I Am Lovable and Kind!” Moreover, they are told it matters more that you feel good about yourself and your choices than what is right. Right and wrong is being educated out of our children, leaving them in a disconnected region of undefined blurry greys. With great prophetic insight, Dr. King believed that if Moral Relativism was not dealt with, we might lose the nation he had come to love. That was in a sermon he wrote 57 years ago.

The book in the Bible most reflecting this trend of Moral Relativism would be the Book of Judges, for it succinctly relates a season in the history of Israel where “Everyone did what was right in their own eyes.” To say that something is wrong implies that there is a standard or a moral code of ethics or absolutes superseding an individual’s desires. What we have forgotten as a nation, and particularly as African Americans, is what the champion of the Civil Rights Movement related in the above-mentioned sermon. His tenants were that the Ten Commandments and the principles of the Scriptures are *right*, and that to deviate from them will cause havoc if not attended to. If you sow to the wind, you reap the whirlwind. In light of this, any cursory search of the Bible regarding homosexuality reveals it is wrong, not only biblically, but also physiologically and sociologically, and it even violates secular Natural Law (it is biologically wrong).

The biblical warning refers to the obvious natural indicators to deter mankind from indulging in such behavior. Leviticus 18:22 clearly warns against men indulging in sexual relationships with other men, and what God thinks about it. It reads:

You shall not lie with a man as with a woman; it is an abomination.

The Apostle Paul writing in his letter to the Romans is even clearer, for he not only warns men and women about the practice of homosexuality and lesbianism, but he points out that it is against nature, and that there would be terrible consequences for those ardently committed to this lifestyle. Romans 1:26-27 says:

For this reason God gave them over and abandoned them to vile affections and degrading passions. For their women exchanged their natural function for an unnatural and abnormal one, And the men also turned from natural relations with women and were set ablaze (burning out, consumed) with lust for one another—men committing shameful acts with men and suffering in their own bodies and personalities the inevitable consequences and penalty of their wrong-doing and going astray, which was [their] fitting retribution.

Amazingly enough, and in spite of all the evidence to the contrary, there are clerics today—false prophets, as it were—who say that the Bible does not repudiate homosexuality. When Jesus was threatening a group of religious hypocrites, and said to them that it was going to be worse for them than Sodom and Gomorrah, all those of the Jewish culture understood and knew of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah which was destroyed by “fire and brimstone,” and they knew *why* it was destroyed. As Christians, should we suppose and can we believe that all of a sudden God has changed his perspective on homosexuality as false prophets would have us believe? Are we that stupid? Remember, Jesus said in the last days it would be as in the days of Lot.

So, what was it like in the days of Lot? Homosexuality was demanding and imposing itself upon the righteous to capitulate, to yield, to give way to its predominance. Genesis 19:1-5 says:

It was evening when the two angels came to Sodom. Lot was sitting at Sodom’s [city] gate. Seeing them, Lot rose up to meet them and bowed to the ground. And he said, “My lords, turn aside, I beg of you, into your servant’s house and spend the night and bathe your feet. Then you can arise early and go on your way.” But they said, “No, we will spend the night in the square.” [Lot] entreated and urged them greatly until they yielded and [with him] entered his house. And he made them a dinner [with drinking] and had unleavened bread which he baked, and they ate. But before they lay down, the men of the city of Sodom, both young and old, all the men from every quarter, surrounded the house. And they called to Lot and said, “Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us, that we may know (be intimate with) them.”

Jesus said prophetically that in the last days the homosexual community will demand that their lifestyle be accepted as right in society. And now we are even seeing homosexuality bandied about as a “Civil Right” that should be guaranteed under the Constitution similar to some of the rights being sought through the modern “Civil Rights Movement.” They are not the same, but be that as it may, Jesus condemned Sodom and Gomorrah for their lifestyle.

Physiologically speaking, the male body is not designed to be penetrated. Anal sex is the overwhelming practice for gay men. Quoting from Dr. John Diggs, an African American doctor who has done extensive studies on homosexuality:

Yet human physiology makes it clear that the body was not designed to accommodate this activity (anal sex); the rectum is significantly different from the vagina and with the regard to suitability for penetration by a penis. The vagina has

natural lubricants and is supported by a network of muscles. It is composed of mucus membrane with a multi-layer stratified squamous epithelium that allows it to endure friction without damage and to resist the immunological actions caused by semen and sperm. In comparison, the anus is a delicate mechanism of small muscles that comprise an “exit-only” passage. With repeated trauma, friction and stretching, the sphincter loses its tone and its ability to maintain a tight seal. Consequently anal sex leads to leakage of fecal material that can easily become chronic.

The potential for injury is exacerbated by the fact that the intestine has only a single layer of cells separating it from highly vascular tissue that is blood. Therefore any organisms that are introduced into the rectum have a much easier time establishing a foothold for infection than would in a vagina. The single layer tissue cannot withstand the friction associated with penile penetration, resulting in traumas that expose both participants to blood, organisms in feces, and a mixing of bodily fluids.

The vagina is the only part of mankind that is designed to receive the components of an ejaculation safely. The anus is not and is subject to an extraordinarily high infection rate.

The end result is that the fragility of the anus and rectum, along with the immunosuppressive effect of ejaculate, make anal-genital intercourse a most efficient manner of transmitting HIV and other infections.

The only epidemiological studies to date on the life spans of gay men have concluded that homosexual and bisexual men lose up to 20 years of life expectancy.¹

Sociologically speaking, the demand in our present day for homosexual marriage is a threat to the stability of our society, and without question, a detriment to children. Laws enacted by Congress during a century of struggle for equal rights for African Americans were intended to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, not on the basis of an individual’s sexual preference, proclivity, or personal behavior. As Richard Thompson Ford, a Stanford Law Professor, has aptly stated:

After all, traditional marriage isn’t just analogous to sex discrimination—it is sex discrimination: Only men may marry women, and only women may marry men. Same-sex marriage would transform an institution that currently defines two distinctive sex roles—husband and wife—by replacing those different halves with one sex-neutral role—spouse. Sure, we could call two married men “husbands” and two married women “wives,” but the specific role for each sex that now defines marriage would be lost.²

Marriage between a man and a woman, the fundamental building block of *all* of societies, not just ours, has stood the test of time for millennia. Monogamy is what we look for in the marriage institution. Conversely, 66% of homosexual couples reported sex outside the

relationship within the first year and 90% after the first five years. Unlike their heterosexual counterparts, 43% of all gay men have had sex with over 500 different male partners during their lifetime; 28% reported having over 1,000.³

Also, children need both parents and both roles to be lived out before them for their own healthy sexual orientation; to deviate from these norms will dramatically increase flawed orientations, and ultimately unnatural sexual preferences. It is the male component in a heterosexual couple which brings balance and determines much of the sexual identity of the child. I believe it is also the male spiritually that is crucial in the orientation process. I believe it is the father who speaks into the psyche of his child and ensures his or her successful orientation. A young man is edified by the affirmation and care of his father and the daughter is reminded of her beauty and how special she is to her father. Both receive loving hugs of admiration, not groping lustful touching by an imposing male gratifying his sexual urges upon the innocent. Unfortunately in our times, with the destruction of the African American nuclear family unit, 70% of households in the African American community are headed by a single parent.⁴ Historical data shows Black children were more likely to be raised by both parents during slavery than they are now.⁵

Biologically speaking, homosexuality violates secular natural law “derived from the physical, biological, and behavioral laws of nature as perceived by the human intellect and elaborated through reason” and observation which, simply says: Whether it be a homosexual male couple, or female, neither couple can procreate on their own. Some other process must be used, be it artificial insemination, surrogates, or adoption.

Homosexuality is wrong but we must love the homosexual unconditionally. Loving them does not mean condoning their actions and relinquishing our principles so “we all can get along,” leaving them in delusion and further deteriorating our society. Dr. King said it best in his address in front of the Lincoln Memorial after the Prayer Pilgrimage for Freedom in 1957 when he stated:

What we are witnessing today in so many northern communities is a sort of quasi liberalism which is based on the principle of looking sympathetically at all sides. It is a liberalism so bent on seeing all sides that it fails to be committed to either side. It is a liberalism that is so objectively analytical that it is not subjectively committed. It is a liberalism which is neither hot nor cold.

Dr. King’s reference to the lukewarm, “neither hot nor cold,” is extrapolated from the Book of Revelation’s account of the Laodicean Church. Jesus said that they were neither hot nor cold, and this approach to the moral issues of their day made him disgustingly sick. Some things are right and some things are wrong. Let us not lose our nation over trying to make what is clearly wrong, sociably right.

“Right is right even if everyone is against it and wrong is wrong even when everyone is for it.”

Notes

1. John Diggs, MD, Timothy Daily, A.P. Bell, and M.S. Weinburg. *The Health Risks of Gay Sex* (The Executive Summary). Online location: Catholic Education Resource Center <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/homosexuality/hoOO75.html> accessed 21 January 2011
2. Richard Thompson Ford. Analogy Lesson (Racism is the wrong frame for understanding the passage of California’s same-sex marriage ban). *Slate*—Jurisprudence: The Law, Lawyers, and the Court, Nov. 14, 2008. Online location: <http://www.slate.com/id/2204661/> accessed 21 January 2011
3. John Diggs, MD, Timothy Daily, A.P. Bell, and M.S. Weinburg. *The Health Risks of Gay Sex* (The Executive Summary). Online location: Catholic Education Resource Center <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/homosexuality/hoOO75.html> accessed 21 January 2011
4. Single-Parent families-Demographic. Online location: <http://family.jrank.org/pages/1574/Single-Parent-Families-Demographic-Trends.html>
5. Andrew J. Cherlin. “On Single Mothers ‘Doing’ Family.” *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 68, No. 4 (Nov. 2006), pp. 800–803.