

Dear Friends:

We enjoyed your company and friendship this weekend. We were glad that we could host the birthday party. You are all welcome here anytime.

In line with our discussion, I did some research on homosexuality, especially “homosexuality” among animals and the genetic propensity to homosexuality.

The challenge was made that since there are “homosexual animals” it “proves” homosexuality is natural. But, given that a few animals seem to demonstrate what might be referred to as homosexual behavior, that in itself, certainly provides no conclusive or foundational basis for the acceptance of homosexual behavior in the human population.

It does not establish homosexual behavior as normal, healthy, desirable or even morally right. Animals can be born with two heads (my friend hatched such a snake a few years ago) and people can be born as Siamese twins, but such aberrations don’t make the condition normal, healthy, or desirable. In fact, both are considered as odd, things to be gawked at or corrected.

If one replies, as you did, that homosexuality is natural because it is found among animals, then we should notice that there are all sorts of activities practiced by animals that we as humans reject as repulsive. There is extreme cruelty among animals: mothers eating their young, mates eating their partners after mating (e.g., the Black Widow spider), animals eating their own feces and vomit (dogs and cats), or urinating on themselves (goats), etc.

Some animals have mates for a lifetime while others have sex with multiple partners indiscriminately. I could go on and on. What can we draw from these facts? That it is OK for people to practice such things because animals do? Heavens no! Just because animals do things that animals do does not make them our model of morality and behavior.

We are in sad shape if we look to the creatures to search for our origins or to find a model for our behavior. Even worse, if we begin to use animals as our model, we as humans can then justify *any* deviant behavior since every form of aberrant and repulsive behavior can be found among the animals that share our planet. St. Paul was no fool 2,000 years ago when he wrote:

For although they knew God, they neither glorified him as God nor gave thanks to him, but their thinking became futile and their foolish hearts were darkened. Although they claimed to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images made to look like mortal man and birds and animals and reptiles. Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another. They

exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator (Rom. 1: 21-25).

I would argue that human beings have a soul and are subject to a higher standard, based on rational and spiritual values which humans possess. Animals aren't subject to higher knowledge and the moral code which is part of *our* very nature. Even an evolutionist would have to agree that Man has attained to a higher level (even though he may simply reduce it to a complexity of hormones, molecules, electronics, and genetics).

The Jew and the Christian—and the brightest minds for over 4000 years and beyond—have explained this qualitative difference between Man and animal as the existence of a soul within Man—we are made in the image of God. Man shares physical being with the creatures, but Man alone among the creatures shares a spiritual nature with God which certainly sets him apart in the universe. To deny this truth reduces Man to a complex genetic machine which provides no ultimate meaning to life and existence.

When God finished his creation we are told he said it was “very good”. But creation is not what God originally created it to be. Man rebelled against the Maker and as such incurred the disaster which inevitably follows when one rejects the Instruction Manual. A *brokenness* appeared in the world which was never intended by the Creating Artist.

As the brilliant British writer C. S. Lewis wrote in his novel *Out of the Silent Planet*, the earth, because of its cosmic rebellion against the Maker, has suffered devastating damage and is “bent”, corrupted and quarantined from the rest of the universe. (Delightful science fiction trilogy, by the way!) Nature is no longer the unspoiled pristine paradise God originally created.

Following on this we go to the next step. We often hear that if a homosexual gene is found (and the jury is certainly still out on this matter), it will “prove” that homosexuality is “normal” or that “God made them that way”—supposedly establishing homosexuality as an involuntary orientation and behavior. But again I would argue that this is a fallacious argument, comparable to saying that cystic fibrosis, Duchenne muscular dystrophy, or Alzheimer’s, or any other inherited disease (conditions inherited via a specific gene), are “normal” or acceptable simply because they can be linked to a specific gene.

It seems to me that it would be foolish to say God made us with all these genetic flaws. It would make God either capricious or weak—neither of which he is. *Discrimination* has become a dirty word but the truth is that each of us discriminate many times every day. We chose one thing over another, we like some people and shun others, we accept certain behavior and reject others, we love people who respect us and turn from those who hate us. We eat one food while discriminating against another. Such activity is part of daily life. We discriminate, we make choices—and the wiser we are the more discriminating

we are. (If you don't believe that we discriminate, then ask yourself where you would rather eat: McDonalds or a fine Italian restaurant.)

But to argue that because there *might* be a gene (or genetic propensity) that makes some people homosexual we must accept the lifestyle and behavior as “normal” or “natural” or acceptable, doesn't follow because to be consistent we would have to concede that *all* genetic problems and deviations from the norm are acceptable. We would have to accept every genetic weakness or difference as determinative. So, should we simply accept Alzheimer's or cancer or alcoholism or other genetically assisted weaknesses as inevitable and morally acceptable simply because we inherited a certain genetic pattern?

Are we willing to accept some “genes” as flawed, resulting in physical or emotional deviation from the norm? Or do we have to consider such deviations as the norm? Why do we resist and fight one undesirable genetic flaw and then inconsistently say we should accept another behavioral flaw simply because it is “in their genes”? This is so obvious it may be easily overlooked, especially since we are so conditioned by the constant bombardment of homosexual propaganda which eventually begins to appear as the “Unquestioned Truth” by a gullible society. Too many in our society catch their moral and social values not by rational and conscious thought, but the same way the catch the measles or a cold—by proximity to a society infected by such things.

Usually when one who speaks against the homosexual lifestyle and conduct he is referred to as homophobic. I am certainly not homophobic though I consider the homosexual lifestyle immoral and destructive. I can certainly make the distinction between the person and the immoral activity. But accepting a person with same-sex-attraction does not demand I also accept their behavior any more than finding homosexuality among animals or a “homosexual gene” would demand I accept human homosexual behavior as normal or natural or desirable. But conversely, even though I reject certain behavior does not mean I cannot love or accept the person involved in the behavior. Remember that God loved *me* even when I was a sinner. He made a distinction between me and my sin.

We are responsible for our lives and actions and just because one might have a genetic propensity for an “unnatural” or destructive behavior does not make it acceptable, especially if that behavior is given entitlements and privileged legal standing in our society.

This is one reason I disagreed with the proposition that sex is only a small percentage of our life. If we are referring to copulation alone, then, yes, sex is a small part of our life. But, it is really much more since even though copulation may be a small part of daily life, we are sexual creatures and that sexuality effects our feelings, actions, conduct, and who we are. Plus sex is one of the biggest businesses on the planet.

And when it takes on a social and political dimension, sex is again much more than copulation—it is also a world view, a philosophy, a culture, and a whole body of legislation and adjudication which then effects us all on a societal level. Sex is not a small thing; it is huge.

Why am I so passionate about such things? Because I care about our country and our world. As Pippin said to the apathetic Ents in *The Lord of the Rings*, and I paraphrase, “How can you not be concerned? You *must* fight! You have to care and be involved! You are part of this world!”

The Ents eventually joined the battle for Middle Earth and helped turn the tide. I am passionate about morality and our society because I have studied history and know that when we reject basic morals our society will begin to decay and fall like others before it. Look at ancient Rome. I have children and grandchildren and out of love for them I have great interest and stock in the future. And, the future is based on the morals and choices we make today.

Steve