

What The Bible Says About Homosexuality & Lesbianism

By Dr. Dan Cheatham, www.devotional.net

I. THE FIRST BIBLE PASSAGE TO REMEMBER IS ROMANS CHAPTER ONE!

Whenever you are asked about what the Bible says about homosexuality, all you have to remember is "**ROMANS CHAPTER ONE.**" That's easy, isn't it? "ROMANS 1." Then you can take a few seconds to find the verses and read them to the one asking the question. The verses are 26 and 27, but it would help to read the entire context of this chapter as well.

***Romans 1:26-27 New Living Translation:** "That is why God abandoned them to their shameful desires. Even the women turned against the natural way to have sex and instead indulged in sex with each other. And the men, instead of having normal sexual relationships with women, burned with lust for each other. Men did shameful things with other men and, as a result, suffered within themselves the penalty they so richly deserved."*

No matter what Bible translation you use, these two verses basically say the same thing: Homosexuality & Lesbianism is grotesque SIN! It is WRONG! It is EVIL! It DESTROYS people! It DESTROYS society! It DESTROYS children! Below are words used by five different translations of these two verses (KJV, NIV, AMP, NLT, MSG). They paint a dismal picture:

Shameful Lusts
Against Nature
Unseemly
Vile Affections
Error
Unnatural Relations
Indecent Acts
Perversion
Shameful Desires
Abnormal Sexual Relationships
Penalty
Abandoned
Degrading Passions
Inevitable Consequences
Fitting Retribution
Wrong-Doing
Going Astray
Abnormal Function
Sexually Confused
Abused and Defiled

The Good News is that God loves all people, but hates the sin that destroys them and those around them. A person can change... by the grace of God! A homosexual or lesbian can repent to God from their sinful lifestyle, receive Jesus Christ as personal Lord & Savior, and get gloriously delivered from perversion by asking forgiveness while calling on the Lord Jesus! Then that person should follow up their decision to receive Christ by getting help and counseling from a Christian leader. This is because whenever a person's background has involved an addiction to a certain sinful lifestyle, that person should seek to develop one or two "accountability partners" with other trusted believers of the same sex who is stronger and more established, and who can pray for them and help them grow in the Lord, lest they succumb again to their previous weakness.

II. THE SECOND BIBLE PASSAGE TO REMEMBER IS LEVITICUS 18:

Leviticus 18:22 NLT - Do not practice homosexuality; it is a detestable sin.

Leviticus 18:22 KJV - Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination.

Leviticus 18:22 NIV - Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable.

Leviticus 18:22 MSG - Don't have sex with a man as one does with a woman. That is abhorrent.

Now lets read a larger portion of this chapter that includes the above scripture, since one thing leads to another:

Leviticus 18:22 - "Do not practice homosexuality; it is a detestable sin. 23 "A man must never defile himself by having sexual intercourse with an animal, and a woman must never present herself to a male animal in order to have intercourse with it; this is a terrible perversion. 24 "Do not defile yourselves in any of these ways, because this is how the people I am expelling from the Promised Land have defiled themselves. 25 As a result, the entire land has become defiled. That is why I am punishing the people who live there, and the land will soon vomit them out.

THE ABOVE PASSAGE STATES THAT HOMOSEXUALITY DESTROYS ENTIRE SOCIETIES!

Leviticus 20:13 reads, "If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable. They must be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads."

III. Other Bible Verses About God's View on Sexual Perversion:

Ge 13:13 But the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the LORD exceedingly.

Read Genesis Chapter 19

De 23:17 KJV There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel.

1Ki 14:24 KJV And there were also sodomites in the land: and they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the LORD cast out before the children of Israel.

1Ki 15:12 KJV And he took away the sodomites out of the land, and removed all the idols that his fathers had made.

1Ki 22:46 KJV And the remnant of the sodomites, which remained in the days of his father Asa, he took out of the land.

IV. Here is a quote from Baker's Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology on the topic of "Homosexuality.":

It is significant that the word "homosexuality" did not enter the English vocabulary until the early twentieth century. The word, and with it the concept of lifelong primary sexual orientation toward members of one's own gender, was unacknowledged and probably unknown in the biblical world. Some today will therefore argue that what the Bible appears to condemn can be distinguished from homosexuality. They maintain that the homosexual orientation, to the extent that it develops in early childhood or even before birth, is not consciously chosen and is therefore not sinful. As long as this form of sexuality is expressed monogamously, it is argued, homosexual relations merely constitute an expansion of the biblical view of marriage. In order to assess the

legitimacy of this approach, it is important to begin with an understanding of the view of same-gender sex in the ancient world.

The Ancient World. Because there is so little evidence of same-gender sex before the New Testament period, our view of "the ancient world" must focus more narrowly on the Greco-Roman period. Writings during this period demonstrate familiarity with sexual Acts between members of the same gender, but these were not understood to result from an "orientation." Sexuality was important in the ancient world only in terms of male progeniture. It appears that the rape of other males and the use of boys for sexual pleasure (pederasty) were performed as Acts of dominance, violence, or experimentation by otherwise heterosexual men. As a phase or as an occasional act, sex between males did not detract from male progeniture. In some circles, most notably those of the intellectual elite philosophers and poets, relationships between men and boys were lauded as the highest expression of romantic love. These relationships were not reciprocal, however. Males who were (willing or not) the receiving partners in these Acts, especially on a repeated basis, were socially outcast. Boys were bought as slaves and discarded when they reached puberty. Lesbians, who were by definition reducing the possibility of male progeniture, were scarcely mentioned but consistently condemned. Thus the modern supposition of a tolerant pagan society subsequently oppressed by Judeo-Christian taboos is a complete myth. It was, rather, a culture almost empty of regard for the sexual rights or desires of anyone but the small ruling class of men, who commonly exercised their almost limitless privilege at the expense of those young women and men in their power.

The Old Testament. Into this world of ruthless sexuality came the biblical message of restraint, justice, and sexual complementarity, which was revolutionary in its implications. From the beginning it is acknowledged that humankind is created in two genders that together bear God's image (Gen 1:27) and together constitute a unity of flesh (Gen 2:24). The reaffirmation of these two notions in key New Testament passages on sexuality (Matt 19:1-12; 1 Cor 7:12-20) demonstrates the continuity and importance of sexual differentiation in the construction of a normative biblical sexuality. More simply put, humankind is created to find human completion only in the (marital) union of two sexes. While there may be legitimate conditions under which this union will not occur (e.g., celibacy), there are no conceivable conditions in which the union can occur fully without sexual differentiation. More specifically in terms of homosexuality, then, same-gender partners can at best pretend to effect a differentiation that is physiologically (and perhaps psychologically) impossible.

Some theologians have suggested that to be created in the image of God according to Genesis means to be in social fellowship with other persons. Others deduce that homosexual relations are merely an expansion of the category of marriage under this rubric of fellowship; that is, intimacy and not biology is the appropriate measure of conformity to the Genesis marriage model. But apart from the debatability of this notion of the image of God in Genesis (dominion is the probable focus of the term), the definition of marriage cannot be limited to the meaning of the image of God. However important the social and spiritual aspects of marriage may be, the physical aspect is no less fundamental to its definition. Sexual differentiation (1:27) intends physical union, the becoming of one flesh (2:24). Because a homosexual relationship cannot produce a unity of sexually differentiated beings, there cannot be a marriage.

Condemnations of sexual sin in the Old Testament focus on heterosexual Acts, but it is important to note that all sexual sin, including homosexuality, is prohibited in relation to the positive model of marriage presented in Genesis. Thus, while the Old Testament describes homosexual activity as intrinsically unjust or impure, these condemnations do not differ qualitatively from condemnations of heterosexual deviations from the marriage model.

The first and most familiar Old Testament passage is the account of intended male rape at Sodom (Gen 19). References to the city later become common extrabiblical Jewish euphemisms for sexual perversion in general and homosexual practices in particular (in the New Testament, see 2 Peter 2:6-7; and Jude 7). Some modern revisionists point to the subsequent Jewish tradition condemning Sodom for inhospitality and argue that the passage does not have homosexual rape in view. In this view, when the Sodomites demand to "know" Lot's

visitors, they want to interrogate them, and Lot considers this breach of hospitality as so objectionable that he offers to distract the men with sex, offering his own daughters. The major obstacle to this interpretation is the Hebrew verb "to know" (yada [[:d"y]]), which, while not often used in a sexual sense, is used in just that sense in verse 8—only two verses after its occurrence expressing the desire of the men of Sodom. Clearly the Sodomites desired sexual relations with Lot's guests. The later references to inhospitality in relation to Sodom are not due to a misunderstanding of the sin of Sodom on the part of the Jews, but to their habit of speaking indirectly of sexual matters out of modesty.

A parallel account of sexual violence occurs in Judges 19-20, where the men of Gibeah rape a man's concubine to the point of death in substitution for the man himself. There can be no doubt that this is fundamentally an act of violence, but the initial desire for the man coupled with the sacrifice of the concubine to avoid "such a disgraceful thing" (19:24) suggests that same-gender sex, and not only inhospitality, is seen in a very negative light.

More obscure reference to same-gender sex may be found in Genesis 9:20-27, where the statement that Ham "saw his father's nakedness" may be a euphemism for rape. There may be a connection here to two additional references to sexual sins involving one's father (Lev 18:7; Deut 23:1), since Ham is the father of Canaan, the nation traditionally associated with same-gender sex and whose impure practices are condemned in detail in the context of these references.

Explicit condemnation of same-gender sexual relations occurs in two Old Testament passages. Leviticus 18:22 reads, "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable." Leviticus 20:13 reads, "If a man lies with a man as one lies with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable. They must be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads." The wording here is ambiguous with regard to rape or manipulation versus mutual consent; instead, the focus is on the act itself as a mutual defilement. Modern revisionists often dismiss these strong passages on the grounds that they are part of the Old Testament purity code and therefore irrelevant to a gospel that frees believers from the constraints of Jewish cultural taboos. But the surrounding verses, which involve such concerns as care for the poor and respect of property show that it is impossible to make a simplistic distinction between purity laws and permanent moral principles. The reaffirmation of sexually differentiated marriage in the New Testament, as noted above, suggests that this levitical condemnation of the violation of differentiation retains its force throughout the entire biblical period.

The New Testament Message of Liberation. Some revisionists maintain that the message of Jesus is fundamentally a message concerning the liberation of captives (Luke 4:18-19). These captives, it is argued, are to be understood not in individual terms as sinners, but in corporate terms as those who are forgotten or oppressed by the proud and powerful. In this view, the place to begin a truly Christian consideration of sexual ethics is not with Genesis and the legal code but with Exodus and freedom from law proclaimed by Jesus. The homosexual community, with its long history of persecution, naturally sees itself described in the Beatitudes and other offers of hope to the downtrodden. It sees analogies to modern "heterosexism" in the historic subjugation of women and of blacks. There are, however, many problems with an approach that so simply makes biblical material a vehicle for experience. One objection is that the choice of one kind of sexual proclivity as "oppressed" is arbitrary: there is no definitive reason to exclude pederasty or sadomasochism or adultery. Furthermore, the analogies to other modern liberation movements are dubious. In the case of slavery, for example, the biblical message is ambiguous; in the case of homosexual Acts, on the other hand, what little material we have is all decidedly negative. Finally, it is impossible to evaluate a behavior by means of its perception, as if disapproval by the majority automatically constitutes legitimacy on the part of a persecuted minority. At some point the behavior itself must be held up to a light other than the fire of its own passion. The light of revelation in the New Testament message offers liberation, but explicit in this offer is the provision of power to conform individuals to full humanity as God created it. In order to exercise responsibility in relation to such an offer it is essential for believers to take seriously both the construction of full humanity as the Scriptures describe it, and deviations from that full humanity as the Scriptures warn against them.

The Gospels. There is no explicit reference to same-gender sex in the Gospels, but there may be an echo of a reference in Mark 9:42-10:12 (cf. Matt 5:27-32). A passage in the Talmud (b. Niddah 13b) links masturbation and pederasty together as violations of marriage, and in so doing makes reference to harming children, offending with the hand or the foot, and cutting off offending limbs rather than going down to the pit of destruction. These similarities of wording to the Gospel passages may suggest a common understanding in the first century that "putting a stumbling block before one of these little ones" involved sexual sin against them.

Paul's Epistles. Two brief references in Paul's letters, where same-gender sex is mentioned in lists of prohibited activities, are important especially for their link to the Old Testament. In 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1:10 *arsenokoitai* [ajrsenokoivth"] are condemned. The word, a compound of "male" and "coitus" or "intercourse," does not occur prior to the New Testament. Some modern writers have attempted to narrow its meaning from homosexual Acts in general to male prostitution, solicitation of male prostitutes, or (coupled in 1 Cor 6:9; with *malakoi*, another obscure word possibly meaning "the effeminate") the active partners in homosexual relationships. These suggestions, however, ignore the Greek Old Testament (LXX) versions of Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, which use both *arsenos* [a [rjrJhn] and *koiten* [koivth], the latter passage placing them side-by-side; literally, "whoever lies with a male, having intercourse (as with) a female." This is the obvious source of the compound word. Perhaps Paul himself, who knew and used the Septuagint extensively, or some other Hellenistic Jew not long before Paul's time, derived from the passages in Leviticus a compound word that described homosexual Acts in general. This drawing in of Leviticus to Paul's letters is also significant in that it provides further demonstration that he perceived a moral and not merely purity-based prohibition of homosexual Acts in the Old Testament.

Romans 1:26-27. The remaining passage appears to be an unequivocal condemnation of homosexuality. While many modern revisionists simply disagree with Paul or discount his proscription as applying only to prostitution or pederasty, some have attempted to reinterpret the passage as tacit approval of homosexuality. The argument is that Paul portrays homosexual Acts as impure but carefully avoids the language of sin; he intends merely to distinguish a Gentile practice considered by Jews to be "unclean" in order to draw Jews (or "weaker brethren") into his subsequent explanation of the gospel. Careful investigation of the passage, however, shows this explanation to be untenable.

Paul's general purpose in the context (Rom 1:18-32) is to show the need for the gospel in the Gentile world. As a result of idolatry, God "gave them over" to all kinds of sinful behavior. The trifold structure of the passage is a rhetorical device to drive home the point: a general complaint (vv. 24-25), consideration of a specific vice (vv. 26-27), and a culminating list of various vices (vv. 28-32). The distinction between the second and third sections may follow another Greek-styled distinction of sins of passion and sins of the unfit mind.

Paul is accused of everything from extreme prejudice to repressed homosexual urges for choosing same-gender sex as his focus in verses 26-27. But the scarcity of other references and the use of impersonal, rhetorical language here suggests, on the contrary, considerable detachment. The choice of homosexuality in particular is due to Paul's need to find a visible sign of humankind's fundamental rejection of God's creation at the very core of personhood. The numerous allusions to the creation account in the passage suggest that creation theology was foremost in Paul's mind in forming the passage.

Paul's terminology in the passage clearly denotes sin and not mere ritual impurity. The context is introduced by the threat of wrath against "godlessness and wickedness" (v. 18). Those in view in verses 26-27 have been given over to "passions," a word group that elsewhere in Romans and consistently in Paul's writings connotes sin. Words like "impurity" (v. 24) and "indecent" (v. 27; cf. "degrading," v. 24) had in Paul's time extended their meaning beyond ritual purity to moral and especially sexual wrongdoing. To do that which is "unnatural" (vv. 26-27) or "contrary to nature" was common parlance in contemporary literature for sexual perversion and especially homosexual Acts. Paul uses several expressions here that are more typical of Gentile moral writers not because he is attempting to soften his condemnation but because he wishes to find words peculiarly suited to expose the sinfulness of the Gentile world in its own terms.

The substance of Paul's proscription of homosexuality is significant in several respects. First, he mentions lesbian relations first and links lesbianism to male homosexuality. This is unusual if not unique in the ancient world, and it demonstrates that Paul's concern is less with progeniture than with rebellion against sexual differentiation or full created personhood. Second, Paul speaks in terms of mutual consent (e.g., "inflamed with lust for one another," v. 27), effectively including Acts other than rape and pederasty in the prohibition. Third, the passage describes corporate as well as individual rebellion, a fact that may have implications for modern discussions of "orientation." In other words, although Paul does not address the question here directly, it is reasonable to suppose that he would consign the orientation toward homosexual Acts to the same category as heterosexual orientation toward adultery or fornication. The "natural" or "fleshly" proclivity is a specific byproduct of the corporate human rebellion and in no way justifies itself or the activity following from that proclivity. On the basis of any of these three implications, it is legitimate to use the word "homosexuality" as it is conceived in the modern world when speaking of Romans 1 and, by cautious extension, when speaking of the related biblical passages.

Responses to Paul's Proscription. The discussion does not end with the conclusion that Paul condemns homosexuality. Some argue that a modern understanding of "natural" differs from Paul's and requires that we absolve those who discover rather than choose a homosexual orientation. These, it is argued, should be seen as victims, or simply different, and our definition of allowable sexual activity expanded accordingly. The major problem with this response is that it shifts the meaning of "natural" from Paul's notion of "that which is in accord with creation" to the popular notion of "that which one has a desire to do." But deeply ingrained anger does not justify murder, nor does deeply ingrained greed justify theft or materialism, nor does the deeply ingrained desire of many heterosexuals for multiple partners justify promiscuity. Desire in all of these areas, chosen or not, must come under the reign of Christ. The action in question must be considered not in terms of its source in the person but in light of the relevant biblical principles. These principles often involve denial of deeply ingrained desires, for the heterosexual who desires multiple partners no less than for the homosexual who laments the option of celibacy.

There is considerable evidence that a homosexual orientation, and certainly the occasional homosexual experience, does not indicate a permanent state but an immature stage of sexuality that may be "fixed" at some point by physiological, psychological, or social factors, and by the individual will, all acting in combination. This has theological significance because it implies that movement toward completion or maturity will involve movement toward obedience to the biblical model. One need not conclude, then, that the homosexual orientation is an indication either of God's approval of the orientation or that the orientation is God's "curse" of the individual. It is, rather, a challenge to growth in discipleship, more or less difficult depending on individual circumstances, but accompanied by the promise of grace equal to those circumstances (Rom 5:19-21; 1 Cor 10:13; 2 Col 12:9).

12 Questions For Pro-Same Sex Marriage Presidential Candidates By Gregg Jackson, 08-23-07

1. To those who say: "Banning homosexual marriage is a form of discrimination, similar to the banning of interracial marriages, which makes homosexuals into second class citizens."

Anti-miscegenation (interracial marriage) laws were struck down by the Supreme Court in 1967 (*Loving v. Virginia*) because they frustrated the core purpose of marriage in order to sustain a racist legal order. Since the decision didn't change the fact that marriage was still between one man and one woman, how is banning "same sex marriage" discriminatory?

2. To those who say: "Homosexuality is a normal sexual orientation that God intended for some people and is not a perversion of normal sexuality."

I am not aware of a single place in the Bible where homosexuality is not condemned by God as unnatural, perverted, and sinful behavior. Can you point to any place in the Bible where homosexuality is not condemned by God? Also, if in fact homosexuality is genetic, how do you explain the thousands of former homosexuals who are now straight?

3. To those who ask: "Jesus preached tolerance, not judgment. Who are we to pass judgment on homosexuals to say that they cannot marry?"

What exactly did Jesus say? I'm not aware that the word "tolerance" even appears in the Bible. Jesus did say, "Do not judge according to appearance, but judge with righteous judgment." (John 7:24) In other words Jesus commanded His followers not to pass judgment based on how people look or perception, but He does command us to make "righteous judgments" based on God's righteousness. Do you think that -- considering Jesus' definition of "judgment" -- He would have condoned two males marrying one another when homosexuality is condemned throughout the Bible?

4. To those who ask: "How are two men or woman getting married threatening or damaging to a heterosexual couple's marriage or life for that matter?"

Because the legal definition of marriage would be significantly altered -- no longer an exclusive legal union between one man and one woman -- laws in virtually every other area of our society would change too. My children would be taught that homosexuality, along with a host of other "sexual orientations" such as bisexuality and "transgenderism" -- are both natural and healthy despite the evidence to the contrary. If, at some point in the foreseeable future, I taught my Sunday School class that the Bible teaches that homosexuality is immoral and self destructive, I could be charged with a "hate crime." If I, as a small business owner, refused to hire a cross-dressing homosexual, I could be sued and fined. Can you see how radically redefining the oldest social institution in history will impact many other areas of life for society as a whole?

5. To those who say: "Homosexuals didn't choose to be homosexual and should have the same rights that heterosexuals enjoy."

Those who are practicing homosexuals already have the right to marry. They just can't marry a person of the same sex, or two or more other people, or any of their family members, etc.... Since homosexuals can already legally marry, what specific "legal rights" are homosexuals being deprived of?

6. To those who say: "Fifty percent of all heterosexual marriages fail. It's hypocritical to talk about how 'sacred' the institution is when 50% of all marriages end up in divorce."

How will allowing homosexuals to marry "strengthen" marriage especially given the fact that most homosexuals have no desire to get married or stay in long term monogamous relationships?

7. To those who say: "Children need loving parents. Love can come from two men and two women."

Why not two men and one woman? What about three men? If marriage is not an exclusive arrangement between one man and one woman, then isn't it hypocritical for homosexuals to say that marriage is not exclusive in regards to traditional marriage -- one man and one woman -- but is exclusive in that it should also include and be limited to two women or two men? After all, if all children need are "loving parents" aren't three or four parents superior to two?

8. To those who say: "Children who are raised in same-sex homes turn-out as well, if not better, as children raised in divorced households or in households where the parent has re-married."

In one of the most comprehensive studies ever completed on the impacts of divorce, Dr. Judith S. Wallerstein,

an author, psychologist, and researcher with the University of California at Berkeley's School of Social Welfare and Dr. Mavis Hetherington, a professor of psychology at the University of Virginia, concluded that divorce impacts children more dramatically and for longer periods of time than most scholars and child psychologists ever conceived. They found in their 25-year extensive study on the effects of divorce on children, that "divorce is a long-term crisis that was affecting the psychological profile of an entire generation." Almost half of the children that they observed were "worried, underachieving, self-deprecating, and sometimes angry."

National studies show that children of divorce are more aggressive toward their parents and teachers, experience more depression, have more learning difficulties, are two to three times more likely to be referred for psychological help at school than their peers from intact families. More of them end up in mental health care clinics, have earlier sexual activity, have more children out of wedlock, marry with less frequency, divorce with greater frequency and experience more psychological problems than children of intact marriages.

Given this empirical evidence that the optimal environment for raising a child is a two parent male-female family, why do you condone intentionally depriving children of a mother and a father, as is the case when homosexual couples have the same legal rights as heterosexual couples, given how badly children fare in single parent or divorced families?

9. To those who say: "Children raised by homosexual parents adjust socially and psychologically as well as those raised by heterosexual parents."

Same sex marriage supporters cite the 2002 American Academy of Pediatrics' Report that states that "a growing body of scientific literature demonstrates that children who grow up with 1 or 2 gay or lesbian parents fare as well in emotional, cognitive, social, and sexual functioning as do children whose parents are heterosexual..." Yet, they often fail to acknowledge that the report concluded that, "the small and non-representative samples studied and the relatively young age of most of the children suggest some reserve," and that "[R]esearch exploring the diversity of parental relationships among gay and lesbian parents is just beginning." Aside from this "inconclusive" report, can you cite any study that substantiates your claim?

10. To those who say: "Preaching against homosexuality causes gay teenagers to commit suicide."

This claim is largely based on a debunked and discredited 1989 report by a special federal task force on youth and suicide authored by gay activist Paul Gibson. Dr. Louis Sullivan, the former Secretary of Health and Human Services officially distanced himself and his department from it. This report has been roundly criticized by many experts in the field of teen suicide such as Professor David Shaffer, a Columbia University psychiatrist who specializes in teen suicides who concluded that Gibson's numbers seemed "more hocus-pocus than math." A number of studies such as a 1986 University of California-San Diego study and one from Columbia University showed no link between preaching against homosexuality and gay suicides. Which studies can you cite that show a link?

11. To those who say: "We don't need to amend the U.S. Constitution to ban same sex marriage. It's something each individual state should vote on individually."

What about when voters are not given the opportunity to amend their own constitutions to legally define marriage as was the case in Massachusetts when the state supreme court arbitrarily usurped the legislative authority of the citizens to define marriage laws in the Commonwealth?

12. To those who say: "Homosexuality is a healthy and comfortable lifestyle."

Homosexuals die much earlier than heterosexuals and have significantly higher rates of suicide, rectal cancer, liver cancer, HIV, and other infectious diseases than heterosexuals.

A study in the Lancet showed that homosexuals account for 3-4% of all gonorrhea cases, 60% of all syphilis cases, and 17% of all hospital admissions in the United States. They make up only 1-2% of the population. Another study in the New England Journal of Medicine concluded the average homosexual has between 20 to 106 partners per year. The average heterosexual has 8 partners in a lifetime. According to the U.S. Congressional Record from 1989, homosexuals live unhealthy lifestyles historically accounting for the bulk of syphilis, gonorrhea, Hepatitis B, "gay bowel syndrome" (which attacks the intestinal tract), tuberculosis and cytomegalovirus. Given the plethora of empirical evidence that shows how destructive and dangerous homosexuality is, why do you claim it is "healthy?" Can you point to any evidence that shows homosexuality is healthy or normal?