

Bible God Requires Death Penalty for Homosexuals

Christian doctrine is that though man wrote the Bible it is equally God's. It is what God would write if he was sitting at the writing desk. The idea that the Bible is the word of God is meaningless if understood in any other sense. If God allowed grammar mistakes or whatever that is fine but the information has to be accurate for the Bible is not a school essay.

Many are alarmed at how the book commands that gays be condemned as sinners for gay lovemaking and not only that they are to be stoned to death. The Bible God describes that as purging the evil from the community - its seen as removing a cancer. That rescues him from the charge of hatred though we understandably find that unconvincing.

Capital punishment is seen as an act of just and unavoidable war by a state against its own citizens who need destruction for being so dangerous and for killing others. That is the belief of the Church even though it may now say that there is too much injustice to risk allowing capital punishment for it will be abused. The principle is still maintained. You can be sure that if the Church visualised a world where gay men were continually giving killer diseases to each other it would have gay men put to death. It already dwells on the alleged harm that homosexuality does.

Does the Bible Require the Death Penalty for Homosexuals?

This is a Christian answer to this question:

The Old Testament Book of Genesis mentions no sin of Sodom and Gomorrah but homosexuality. Abraham begged God to spare the cities if enough good people resided there. But there were none and God burned the cities up. Abraham and God clearly agreed with the cruel and savage destruction of the wicked. Abraham was not condoning or forgiving the sins.

The Old Testament theocratic law required the death penalty for incest in Israel (Lev. 18:7-17, 29; 20:11-12). In the fullness of time (Gal. 4:4), the Messiah came and brought forth His catholic or universal church from its Jewish swaddling bands, necessitating a change in the law (Heb. 7:12). The apostles and prophets, whom God used to write the New Testament, set forth the will of Jesus Christ for His catholic church (Eph. 2:20; 3:5; 4:11).

When a man committed incest in the church of Corinth (I Cor. 5:1), Paul did not require the death penalty for him. Instead the apostle required excommunication from the church and kingdom of God, unless the man repented (I Cor. 5:4-7). Both terrible divine judgements—execution in the Old Testament theocracy and excommunication in the New Testament church—preserve the holiness of God's church, a reflection of the holiness of God Himself.

Leviticus 20:13 ("If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.") required the death penalty for homosexuality in Israel. Some say that this ban was done away by Jesus when he banished the ceremonial law like when the ban on eating pork was removed. But the same chapter condemns incest, bestiality, adultery and rape. Are we to believe that he doesn't forbid them anymore? Nowhere does the Bible teach that the ban on homosexuality is just based on ceremonial law or tradition. It teaches it is banned because it is wrong and not even God can make it right. The law gave a mild punishment for eating pork. But with homosexuality it required that the sinners be put to death by stoning. Leviticus 18:24 says that the people of God must not defile themselves by practices such as homosexuality like the nations around them have defiled themselves. So God regards it as sinful for the non-Israelites too. Read Leviticus 18:22, 29. Similar to the example of incest, the New Testament does not require the death penalty for homosexuals. There were converted homosexuals in the church of Corinth (I Cor. 6:9-11)! The execution of homosexuals in Israel (the Old Testament church) is equivalent to excommunication from the New Testament church. Thus it is a contradiction in terms to speak of gay church members or gay church office bearers or gay Christians. Any churches, therefore, that receive or tolerate impenitent homosexuals as members are therefore false churches in rebellion to the will of Christ.

<http://www.catholicintl.com/qa/2004/qa-aug-04.htm#Question%2026>

Note: The Same Source says that the Church has the right to use torture to destroy heresy. Question 41.

My reply is this.

A change in the Law of God is referred to in the New Testament's Hebrews 7:12. That does not imply that the moral rules of the Old Testament, such as the duty of the God fearing state to destroy gay people are wrong or changed or obsolete.

When Judaism was only a temporary religion that was meant to evolve into Christianity (its supposed fulfilment) it doesn't

necessarily imply the law had to be changed except in the sense that it was made tougher or more explicit. It is worse to sin when you have experienced the fulfilled faith than the preparatory one.

The Bible time and time again says that the Old Testament is full of moral example. As for the incest case the Christians did try to execute the guilty man but by cursing him and urging God to destroy him in the hope that the suffering this entails might make him turn to God again. And the law to execute does not require one to execute where it is impossible. The rulers of Corinth would have destroyed the Church if it went and killed the man. If you can get away with executing you can do it. That is the New Testament doctrine for not once does it hint that the execution laws are done away. Perhaps more importantly, the Old Testament never says that gay people are to be destroyed for any other reason than that they are evil. In other words, its just right. The Law of Moses didn't make it right to kill these people. It said it only RECOGNISED that it was right. God told the people that the Law was in their mind and heart and whole being and how could it be if it didn't make sense or didn't claim to be rational?

However, the Catholic apologist Robert Sungenis argues that handing the man over to Satan for the destruction of his flesh does mean execution. The Christians saw secular and pagan states as the emissaries of Satan though God still used them to punish the wicked (Romans 13). Handing over to Satan may mean handing him over to the civil authorities and the destruction may be civil punishment, capital punishment. The fact that Paul sounds so certain the man will be destroyed indicates that he did mean execution. He wants the man put to death so that he may repent before he dies.

It is certain however that if a man lives with his stepmother as a lover that Paul wants him excommunicated or cursed if nothing else can be done to him. Now what the man was doing was hardly a huge scandal for few men would be doing what he did. For Paul homosexuality would have been a worse scandal. Paul handed him over to Satan by God's authority meaning God approved. That Christianity is so afraid of being loathed if it does that today that it won't obey God speaks of the duplicity of this religion. Paul decreed that for a believer to have sex with a prostitute was for him being part of Christ's body to unite Christ with evil and so must be a very great sin indeed. He would have seen a man having sex with a man like trying to fuse two toes together and breaking the organisation of the body of Christ.

The book of Leviticus in relation to sexual sinners who were put to death by stoning has God saying that they have nobody but themselves to blame for their deaths (20:27). In other words, it was the right thing to do. It is only if it is wrong or unnecessary to kill them that the question of who else is to blame for their deaths comes in. The Bible says it is both right and necessary to slay homosexuals and to do it with cruelty.

If it does not command us to kill gays today it certainly commands us to say the gays of yesterday deserved their bloody fate.

The Bible says that if a man takes his brother's wife that is incest and they will die childless (Leviticus 20:21). The will die childless bit would suggest that the man has his penis cut off or something by the God police. It is suggested that this means legal childlessness - their children will not be given any legal status. But that explanation is a bit stretched. God could have commanded that the genitals of homosexual people be cut off. He abhorred the sin so much that nothing less than the death penalty would suffice.

Jesus upheld the death penalty for adultery and by implication for homosexuality as well. He called for the accusers of the adulteress to cast the first stone to kill her if they were not implicated in adultery themselves (John 8:7).

The men about to kill the woman must have been a lynch mob. If they had been legally delegated, the woman would have been stoned and not allowed to go free. Jesus certainly was inferring that the killings of people caught committing sodomy and adultery by at least two people could be put to death righteously regardless of the legal consequences. This was justified for God is the real lawmaker and the countries are only trying to make laws independent of his rule. Jesus' logic about the non-relationship between divine and civil law in this case is correct.

Jesus did not stone her for it was a trap so that he would be punished for bypassing the judges. He told her she was a sinner and not to sin again and said that stoning was appropriate and a holy act that sinners had no right to perform. The implication is that he left it open for her to be stoned legally in the future.

Some Christians say that the death penalty for adultery and sodomy was only imposed if there were two or three witnesses of the sins taking place (Deuteronomy 17:6). They say that no law should then criminalise anybody for being gay for three witnesses are hard to come by. But those who promote adultery and sodomy and homosexuality and who practice these sins openly would be targeted. They say the death penalty does not cover men who sin consensually in private. If so the law of killing gay men has not been abolished but fallen out of use.

The letter to the Romans was written from Corinth by the apostle Paul. It clearly says that people who insult parents and commit certain sins deserve to die. It includes gay sex in this. Attempts to distort that are odd for surely a man who is that

harsh would hate gay sexual activity?

It is assumed that Paul was writing about pagan homosexuality. But he is clear he means people who believe in God and what he writes fits the kind of "Christians" who appeared at the time. He condemns not men with men or women with women but males with males and females with females. He keeps it simple and does not go into a discussion about promiscuity or anything like that. He warns that God can punish this by making the persons fixed in what they do.

We see that even without a mandate to stone today, those who really can interpret the Bible show how much hate it has. It stones us with words. Jesus stoned with words. That can be as bad as actual stones.