

LGBT REVISIONISM OF RELIGIOUS TEXTS CONDEMNING HOMOSEXUALITY IS SIMPLE PROPAGANDA

The attempts to get around the texts in the Bible condemning gay sex are embarrassing and provoke even allies to rage. Its propaganda. And the LGBT who end up doing that end up limiting approval only to relationships that look like heterosexual marriage.

Divine accommodation is the doctrine that God has such mysterious ways and is a mystery himself and unlike us that he has to communicate with us like a mother simplifying things and using different ways to get a message to her baby. Jesus said that his followers were babies and that it was hard to get information to them for they were not ready to understand. The doctrine makes all attempts suspicious that seek to explain away the anti-gay sex texts.

QUOTES: MAIN PRIDE OBJECTIVE MARRIAGE EQUALITY IS INDIRECTLY SLAMMED BY JESUS

Courtesy Graham Veale saints and sceptics website

The gospel writers do not shy away from describing Jesus' disputes with the religious authorities; indeed, these conflicts are at the centre of many of their narratives. Yet the gospels also casually reveal that Jesus expected his followers to make sacrifices at the Temple (Matthew 5 v 23-24; Mark 1v 43-44) and to obey the Jewish scriptures (Matthew 5 v 17-20). Jesus was Jewish; he did not tear down the faith of Israel to build the kingdom of God. Jesus tore savagely at self-righteousness, legalism and hypocrisy.

...

Modern readers might be shocked that Jesus opposed the more tolerant attitudes of his Jewish contemporaries. Teachers like the great rabbi Hillel had interpreted the law liberally, so that a divorce could be obtained for practically any reason. Instead, Jesus taught that God opposed all divorce. While there is a great deal of debate about the meaning of the exception clause in Matthew's gospel (Matt 19v9) it is clear that Jesus believed that marriage ought to be a permanent union between one man and one woman.

...

At the risk of stating the obvious, first century Palestinian Jewish teachers did not condone homosexual acts and every single scrap of evidence indicates that Jesus was not an exception to that rule. Unlike most of his peers he rejected polygamy, teaching that marriage was for one man and one woman. He was even more controversial when he insisted that God intended the union of one man and one woman to be permanent. When it came to marriage, Jesus argued for higher standards, not greater licence or tolerance.

A TOP SCHOLAR SPEAKS

"The practice of same-sex relations as a sign that the human world in general is out of joint" according to Bishop Wright.

"This out-of-jointness is the result of God allowing people to follow lust wherever it leads—once they have lost their grip on God's truth and, like Adam and Eve in the garden, listened to the voice of the creature rather than the voice of God..."

As early as 2002, in a paper shared at a conference in Oxford, Wright wrote:

"It is, of course open to anyone to say, on the basis of my argument so far, that they regard the distinction between homosexual and heterosexual behaviour as one of those cultural distinctives which are irrelevant in the gospel; that homosexual behaviour simply is part of some cultures today, and that the church must respect, honour and bless it. You will not be surprised to know that I do not share this view. I am not an expert on current debates, and defer to two splendid books: Richard Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament*, and Robert Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Texts and Hermeneutics*. But I may perhaps, as a long-time specialist on the letter to the Romans, put in my small contribution.

Paul's denunciation of homosexual practice in Romans 1 is well known but not so well understood, particularly in relation to its place in the argument as a whole. It is too often dismissed as simply firing some Jewish-style thunderbolts against typical pagan targets; and it is regularly thought to be dealing only with the deliberate choice of heterosexual individuals to abandon normal usage and indulge in alternative passions. It is often said that Paul is describing something quite different from the phenomenon we know today, e.g. in large western cities.

This is misleading.

First, Paul is not primarily talking about individuals at this point, but about the entire human race. He is expounding Genesis 1-3, and looking at the human race as whole, so here he is categorizing the large sweep of human history as a whole – not, of course, that any individuals escape this judgement, as 3.19f makes clear.

Second, the point of his highlighting of female and male turning away from natural usage to unnatural grows directly out of the text which is his subtext, here and often elsewhere: for in Genesis 1 it is of course male plus female that is created to bear God's image. The male-plus-female factor is not of course specific to humanity; the principle of 'male plus female' runs through a great deal of creation. But humans were created to bear God's image, and given a task, to be fruitful and multiply, to tend the garden and name the animals. The point of Romans 1 as a whole is that when humans refuse to worship or honour God, the God in whose image they are made, their humanness goes into self-destruct mode; and Paul clearly sees homosexual behaviour as ultimately a form of human deconstruction. He is not saying that everyone who discovers homosexual instincts has chosen to commit idolatry and has chosen homosexual behaviour as a part of that; rather, he is saying that in a world where men and women have refused to honour God this is the kind of thing you will find."

EXCERPT FROM GALATIANS 1, WHERE PAUL SAYS HE LEARNED HIS GOSPEL FROM JESUS INSIGHTS

Paul stresses that his teachings are not human opinion and don't care about human opinion

Its a clear revelation so you cannot turn to Romans 1 and say Paul condemned only a type of homosexual misconduct

You cannot call Romans 1 wrong without calling Jesus wrong.

Galatians 1:1 starts off with,

Paul, an apostle—sent not from men nor by a man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead—

2 and all the brothers and sisters[a] with me,

To the churches in Galatia:

3 Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ,

4 who gave himself for our sins to rescue us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father,

5 to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

6 I am astonished that you are so quickly deserting the one who called you to live in the grace of Christ and are turning to a different gospel—

7 which is really no gospel at all. Evidently some people are throwing you into confusion and are trying to pervert the gospel of Christ.

8 But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let them be under God's curse!

9 As we have already said, so now I say again: If anybody is preaching to you a gospel other than what you accepted, let them be under God's curse!

10 Am I now trying to win the approval of human beings, or of God? Or am I trying to please people? If I were still trying to please people, I would not be a servant of Christ.

11 I want you to know, brothers and sisters, that the gospel I preached is not of human origin.

12 I did not receive it from any man, nor was I taught it; rather, I received it by revelation from Jesus Christ.

LIBERAL BISHOP RICHARD HOLLOWAY TELLS THE TRUTH

He quotes Paul railing against men who "burn with lust for one another; males behave indecently with males, and are paid in their own persons the fitting wage of such perversion." We can try to torture a liberal interpretation out of that text by claiming that Paul did not understand same-sex relations in the way we now do, so his strictures, which seem to be based on fear of idol worship of some sort, cannot apply to our time. The really honest way for us to deal with the question is to ask: even if Paul would have opposed what we mean by same-sex relations, why should his opposition be normative for us today? In other parts of Pauline theology we make choices. We might find his metaphors for explaining the power of Christ's death suggestive, and his doctrine of God's justifying grace liberating; we are no longer likely to make much of his expectation of the imminent return of Jesus, and some of us find his certainty that all rulers get their authority from God dangerous as well as unconvincing. Sensibly, we make choices here, we take what still has authority for us, because of its self-evidencing power, and reject the rest. In fact, we no longer treat an injunction from scripture as having moral authority over us simply because it is in scripture. It has to have moral force independent of its scriptural context. We judge scripture by our own best moral standards, not the other way round. We now do this in most areas except the area of sexual behaviour. We must find the honesty and courage to apply this criterion of authenticity to the tangled area of human sexuality.

WALTER WINK - PRO-GAY SCHOLAR ADMITS BIBLE BANS GAY SEX

"Whatever the rationale for their formulation, however, the texts leave no room for manoeuvring. Persons committing homosexual acts are to be executed. This is the unambiguous command of scripture" - Wink, Homosexuality and Christian Faith.

"No doubt Paul was unaware of the distinction between sexual orientation, over which one has apparently no choice, and sexual behaviour, over which one does. He seemed to assume that those who condemned were heterosexual who were acting contrary to nature". Wink, Homosexuality and Christian Faith.

Note the SEEMED TO ASSUME. Wink is only guessing.

Even if there was a chance the Bible did not condemn gay sex, that means there is a chance that it does so the gay man should consider living celibate.

ON A BISHOP WHO QUOTES MURDEROUS TEXTS TO SHOW GAY SEX IS A SIN

The bishop will not take responsibility if somebody goes out and kills gay people because of the quotes from the Bible. If the bishop says he does not believe in killing gays today and that it was a law for the past that does not get him off the hook for he is saying, "It's only my opinion". That opens the door to people to disagree and think the killings would be endorsed by God at best or understandable at worst.

While it is good that decent people oppose the Church saying that gay sex is a serious sin, the problem that Jesus said it is the main problem.

If Jesus really set up Roman Catholicism to teach the truth and be the only right religion then he is to blame for the pope's anti-gay teaching.

The Old Testament teaches that God commanded that certain sinners must be stoned to death without mercy.

Jesus stated that he had no intention of relaxing any law of God in the Old Testament. "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not - not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished. Therefore anyone who sets aside one of the least of these commands and teaches others accordingly will be called least in the kingdom of heaven".

Jesus told the Jews off for giving people who cursed their parents a light penalty and not the death penalty as required by God's law (Mark 7).

Jesus did not say that it was wrong to stone the adulteress to death. He said if you were any better than her it was okay to cast the first stone. So it is an honour. That is saying the death penalty is right in principle even if not always practical or possible. Obviously if it is not wrong in principle it is not the worst sin if you go out and murder an adulteress! Even worse, the episode was used not to save the woman but to get the accusers to see they deserved stoning themselves.

Jesus said he advocated love your neighbour as it was in the law of God - the law is clear that this law does not exclude killing adulterers or homosexuals. He was not taking the command out of context. He said he was using the commandment as the law gave it. The command comes from Leviticus 19 the most murderous book God ever allegedly wrote.

Jesus did not say, "I abolish the laws of the Old Testament commanding that homosexuals be put to death." You need that in

such a serious matter and if you want to say Jesus was all about peace and love.

Jesus never apologised for the deaths.

It is an insult to the people murdered as a result of the Leviticus law to say, "We don't do that now so it is okay".

Jesus even if he did not demand stoning to death of people made it clear that he is going to murder them himself. Vengeance is mine I will repay - Romans 12:19. Jesus keeping the law for us means the law is still in force. See also Romans 1:31 "God's righteous decree is that those who do such things deserve death". The decree refers to the death penalty in the law of Moses.

Jesus authorised Paul's teaching and Paul taught that gay sex is a serious sin and results in everlasting damnation.

Jesus claimed to have inspired the Old Testament. The Bible claims to have two authors, God wrote it as much as man did.

Christians who cherry-pick the Bible are giving the message: "My opinions are as good as God's. If I don't honour the whole Bible why do I honour any of it? Because it is sacred and I am just too stubborn, inconsistent and naughty to obey it all". Cherrypicking is paying homage to the Bible and the Bible should get no homage at all. It is bad advertising for the goodness of the Bible but still advertising.

Christians accepting the Jesus of the Bible and the Church that preaches the Bible as true and from God are indirectly and implicitly approving of their violent spirit and the barbaric deaths of those who faced that spirit.

If your empathy and decency are not tainted by faith, you will abandon faith in the Bible and in Jesus without hesitation. No religion with violent revelations from God should be adhered to.

Quoting murderous religious texts or any texts that reasonably can cause a reaction of obedience should be a crime and the intention to not cause a lynching is irrelevant. It is reasonable to assume there is an attempt to manipulate into violence.

A COUPLE OF BOOKS

From Fall 2016 • Vol. 13, No. 2 The Baptist Center for Theology and Ministry New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary

A Double Review of People to Be Loved and Living in a Gray World

1 People To Be Loved: Why Homosexuality Is Not Just An Issue. By Preston Sprinkle. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015. 223 pages. Paperback, \$16.99.

2 Living In A Gray World: A Christian Teen's Guide to Understanding Homosexuality. By Preston Sprinkle. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015. 155 pages. Paperback, \$12.99.

Sprinkle's handling of Ezek 16:49–50 seems to have been influenced by revisionist interpreters. In this passage, Ezekiel specifically notes that Sodom is unconcerned about the poor and needy. Many pro-homosexual interpreters have thus claimed that Sodom was not judged for sexual immorality, but for being unkind to poor people. Sprinkle affirms such an approach, remarking, "It's pretty sad when overfed, greedy Christians who perfectly fit Ezekiel's description run around hating on gay people" (PTBL, 45). Regrettably, Sprinkle fails to emphasize the strong sexual language used in the entirety of Ezek 16, as well as the fact the Hebrew word to'ebah ("abomination"), which occurs in Ezek 16:50, is also used to describe homosexuality in Lev 18:22 and 20:13. Furthermore, Jude 7 references Sodom's sexual immorality. Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed both for sexual immorality and injustice to the poor.

Romans 1:18–32 is adequately handled in both books. Sprinkle clearly states, "Romans 1 says both male and female homosexual acts are sin" (LGW, 55). Sprinkle rightly notes that Paul borrows terms from the LXX of Gen 1:26–27 in building his argument that homosexuality is a prime example of idolatry. Since Paul grounds his argument in creation, Sprinkle agrees the prohibition of homosexual acts is not culturally limited (PTBL, 93). Likewise, Sprinkle also correctly points out that the word arsenokoites in 1 Cor 6:9–11 is derived from the LXX of Lev 18:22 and 20:13 (PTBL, 109; LGW, 153). For Sprinkle, if God says having homosexual sex is wrong, then "it's actually unloving" to encourage people to engage in such behavior (LGW, 55).

LAST THOUGHTS

Revisionism based on advancing an ideology like this is intolerable because

It is lies

It is far-fetched

It is reading today's ideas that nobody agreed with five minutes ago into ancient texts

It makes pro-gay activists in the Church look like liars

It disempowers those of them who say that the Bible is simply wrong

The texts remain a call to homophobia and distortion and lies makes that call louder.