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**Introduction**

A debate has arisen in American society as a result of the demands advocated by individuals who feel that homosexuality is a normal behavior of humans. Those advocates feel that homosexuals should be afforded the same rights that are given to those who choose heterosexuality. The Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender (commonly called LGBT) activists have been very successful in gaining public support for their arguments and have won legal protections for those who engage in the LGBT lifestyles. However, most who proclaim to be Christians have consistently opposed the LGBT agenda and are at work to reverse the privileges that have been provided to the LGBT advocates.

This paper will consider the objections that the LGBT community has asserted against traditional Christian viewpoints and then respond to those objections from the viewpoint of Christians.

**LGBT Assertion #1 - Homosexuality is normal**

Sociologists view homosexuality as a natural, recurring practice among humans.[[1]](#footnote-1) It has been a normal part of the human experience throughout history, as demonstrated by ancient records documenting homosexual practices.[[2]](#footnote-2) Homosexuality has been a widespread practice across many cultures rather than being localized to just one region throughout history. Similarly, homosexuality is common in our current day cultures.[[3]](#footnote-3) Thriving homosexual communities can be identified in almost all of today’s countries in which there is not a strong central government that punishes those who practice homosexuality.[[4]](#footnote-4)

Scientists have identified that homosexuality is not unique to humans, but is also found in the animal kingdom. Modern scientists have studied animal behavior and have asserted that up to 10% of the prevailing species in the world engage in homosexual behavior. [[5]](#footnote-5) Benefits to the animal communities have been observed as the homosexual pairs serve their communities by providing care for others’ offspring. Also, in populations where there are a limited number of one gender, same-sex pairing actually reduces the pressure on the other gender by allowing members to have more options in forming partnerships. This flexibility reduces competition for mates and strengthens social relationships. [[6]](#footnote-6)

Biologists Nathan W. Bailey and Marlene Zuk from the University of California, Riverside have investigated the evolutionary consequences and implications of same-sex behavior in animals, and their findings demonstrate benefits to what seems to be an evolutionary paradox. Their observations indicate that same-sex pairs in many species provide benefits to the population as they assisted in rearing the young, providing protection to the young members, and serving as surrogate parents when the original birth parents either abandon their young or are killed. These actions show that a species can actually benefit from non-reproducing pairs in the population. The evolutionary argument that a species would fail if homosexuality were the norm is not valid since these observations show that same-sex pairs actually strengthen the viability of the species.[[7]](#footnote-7)

**LGBT Assertion #2 - Homosexuality is a morally acceptable behavior**

The LGBT community asserts that the sexual relationships between two consenting same-sex adults is a generally accepted moral behavior that should not be classified any differently than a sexual relationship between adults of opposite genders. Sexual activity among adults presumes the mutual agreement of two or more adults to engage in sex with each other. As society has adopted a more permissive view of sexual relationships and no longer expects that adults should be married in order to engage in intercourse, the LGBT community believes that the free choice of partners, regardless of gender, is a right that each person should have. This right is regarded to be comparable to the other rights that all humans should have available to them. Certainly, in the United States of America, these rights are presented as being of the same nature as those specified in the Bill of Rights in the American Constitution. This argument contends that having a sexual partner of one’s choice is an “unalienable right” afforded by the language “pursuit of happiness” in the Declaration of Independence. These ideas were formally sanctioned on June 26, 2003, when sexual activity between consenting adults of the same sex, as well as same-sex adolescents of a close age, was made legal nationwide pursuant to the United States Supreme Court decision in *Lawrence v. Texas*.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The LGBT community contends that those who refuse to recognize their right of choice are exercising hateful and intolerant behavior. They have been able to challenge existing laws and get many amended to afford protections to them as they pursue their sexual preferences. The LGBT community has gained anti-discrimination protections in housing, employment, and access to medical treatment facilities. In addition, the federal government has added “sexual orientation” to the list of federally protected classes which are covered by hate crime laws.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The application of law at the federal level indicates that homosexual behavior is morally acceptable within the American culture. Moral is defined by the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* as “of or relating to principles of right and wrong in behavior.”[[10]](#footnote-10) The LGBT community would argue that since the highest courts in the land have ruled that homosexual activities are legal, their choices are validated, and therefore are right and moral.

**LGBT Assertion #3 - Homosexual marriage is an appropriate institution**

The LGBT community rejects the traditional view that marriage is an institution meant to be entered into by a male and a female. They promote that two consenting same-gendered adults can have committed affection for each other and choose to live in a manner that is equal to heterosexual marriage partners. They contend that the refusal to allow homosexuals to enter into a legal validation of their love for each other is an immoral behavior, and that homosexuals should be protected from this kind of discrimination. They have advocated for legal protection for gay marriages and insist that those marriages be afforded the same rights and privileges as heterosexual marriages. On June 26, 2015, the United Supreme Court ruled in *Obergefull v. Hodges* that states must license and recognize same-sex marriages.[[11]](#footnote-11) This ruling provides federal protections to married homosexual couples and removes the legal barriers that many states had established to restrict marriage to heterosexual relationship.

The viewpoint of Christians who have continued to resist this granting of equal legal status is labeled hostile and intolerant behavior by the LGBT community, and LGBT activists feel this situation should be addressed by the protections provided by federal laws.

**Christian Assertion #1 - Homosexuality is not normal**

Homosexuality has been presented to be a behavior that is engaged in by approximately 10% of the adult population.[[12]](#footnote-12) Even though the practice is observable, the measurable numbers indicate that it is a behavior that is engaged in by a significant minority. The advocates of this behavior assert strongly that because there are large numbers of participants who engage in homosexual behavior, the behavior is automatically defined as normal.

The argument which asserts that homosexuality has been observed for centuries, and therefore is normal, fails to overcome the fact that this behavior has been considered to be outside of normal behavior by the majority of humans throughout those centuries. Merely stating otherwise does not change the prevailing attitude. As societal mores have become more liberal, a greater number of people have experimented with alternative lifestyles. These alternatives are, by their definition, different from what are considered societal norms. If we assume that only 10% at most pursue these alternatives, we can conclude that these behaviors are only chosen by a small minority of the population. This observation establishes that homosexuality is not normal.

The LGBT community commonly refers to the scientific observations of homosexual behavior in the animal kingdom to conclude that homosexuality is normal in the animal kingdom. This assertion relies upon an observance of 10% of species demonstrating homosexual behavior. This study does not assert that 10% of all animals engage in homosexual behavior, but that same-sex behavior was observed at least once in the species observed. This significantly lowers the “generality” of homosexual behavior in the animal kingdom and is a misrepresentation of the actual statistics. This analysis undercuts their conclusion. The minority behavior can be more easily understood as an aberration rather than a normal behavior.

The logic asserted by the LGBT community is that since man is an animal and homosexual behavior is observed in the animal kingdom, then homosexual activity amongst humans is normal. This assertion is based upon a definition of normal that equates existence of an action as a validation of the action as normal. This logic could be utilized to assert that sexual abuse of another is normal because the behavior occurs and has been witnessed. Few would agree with this premise; therefore, it is a weak position to take.

Similarly, the argument that non-reproducing pairs strengthen a species and as such refutes the idea that evolution would eliminate any species that encouraged homosexuality is an over-reaching argument. This ignores the possibility that un-paired individuals in a species could provide benefit as well as paired, or that sterile individuals could be of benefit to the community. The fact that a homosexual pair exists and provides beneficial behavior dues not validate the behavior or change its character from un-natural to natural.

Christians believe that all life was created by a Creator, who designed male and female intentionally. They also believe that God has given direction as to how males and females are to relate to each other socially and sexually. This direction establishes what is normal and it is still confirmed by the actions of the vast majority of humans, whether they are Christian or not.

**Christian Argument #2 – Homosexuality is not morally acceptable behavior**

The laws that have been enacted to legalize homosexuality and provide legal protections for homosexual behavior do not establish that this lifestyle is morally acceptable. There are numerous examples of laws that were established, but which upon further review were found to be flawed and were subsequently reversed. Laws that supported slavery, unfair monopolies, and harmful medical practices are a few examples of laws that were ultimately overturned as their negative impacts upon society were recognized. The current legal victories gained by the LGBT community can be viewed as a generous granting of rights by a humanist leaning society. This attitude can be explained as allowing anyone to do anything that makes them happy as long as it doesn’t negatively affect others. This generosity does not make homosexual behavior morally acceptable, but it does create space for people to pursue their desires without interference from those who would like to protect them and the greater society from the negative outcomes that are certain to result.

In his book, *Straight and Narrow?,* Dr. Schmidt describes homosexual behavior as requiring an “almost compulsive promiscuity.” He relates that “75% of homosexual men report having more than 100 sexual partners during their lifetimes,” and fewer than 8% of homosexuals (men or women) report ever having a relationship that lasted more than three years.[[13]](#footnote-13) This finding is fascinating when one considers that only 10% of the population is believed to be part of the LGBT community. This number is actually a myth that has been propagated based upon a 1948 study by Alfred Kinsey, who used flawed methods to come to his conclusions. His sample was weighted with prison inmates, who did not represent the behavior of the general population. Schmidt remarked that the actual number of those who adopted a homosexual lifestyle was in the 5 to 7% range.[[14]](#footnote-14) If only 8% of the 5 to 7% are able to maintain an intimate relationship for more than three years, then we can conclude that this lifestyle is very unsettled and can be considered to lack stability for those who participate within it. Dr. Schmidt’s study showed that homosexual men were very promiscuous. He noted that male homosexuals average over twenty partners a year. The number of homosexual men who experience anything like lifelong fidelity becomes, statistically speaking, almost meaningless. Promiscuity is the norm among homosexual men rather than having committed relationships. Lifelong faithfulness is almost non-existent in the homosexual experience.[[15]](#footnote-15)

Our society still values long term relationships between individuals and frowns upon those who are unfaithful to those long term relationships. This viewpoint establishes a morality that considers promiscuity to be “wrong” behavior and something a wise person would avoid. In view of this morality, it is difficult to look at the homosexual lifestyle in total and see that it is “right” and should be recommended to all.

Christians highly value committed relationships and seek long-term monogamous relationships. The LGBT view of morality is in conflict with the super-majority of those who do not participate in homosexual behavior.

**Christian Assertion #3 – Homosexual marriage is not an appropriate institution**

The LGBT community has aggressively pursued legal protections and has sought the provision of services afforded to heterosexual couples by law. These provisions such as health insurance for homosexual partners and government support payments do provide financial support to those in homosexual relationships, but it also supports their argument that their relationships have equal standing with heterosexual relationships. Most of the laws that have been amended originally contained wording that defined a married couple as being a man and a woman. The definitions were in place to keep “transient” relationships from being afforded the same rights as married couples. Society benefitted from committed married couples who procreated and nurtured the next generation. This act of birthing new citizens and working to sustain, educate, and equip their children was the basis of government provision in tax law and other protections. Homosexuals are generally in short term relationships that will not be able to support children long-term. In addition, it is possible but extremely rare for homosexuals to give birth and nurture children. Since these relationships are statistically unlikely to be sustained, and therefore are very unlikely to have the ability to nurture children, these homosexual relationships should not be considered equal to heterosexual marriages and given the same rights.

It is true that our government can establish and define what is a legal marriage. This governmental act bureaucratically established the legality of homosexual marriages, but does not qualify these marriages as equal to heterosexual marriages, in the judgement of a significant portion of the population.

Christians view marriage as something that was established by God and is a covenantal relationship between the man, the woman, and God. This relationship is meant for the pleasure of the couple and for the blessing of children if God so ordains. The relationship is meant to be a lifetime commitment and one that deserves continued effort to maintain a healthy relationship with both the spouse and with God. Homosexuals cannot enter into this relationship as it does not meet the criteria established by God.

**Conclusion**

The LGBT community in the United States has worked diligently to seek legal protection and access to many of the rights and privileges afforded to heterosexual couples. Their success has been made possible by a prevalent secular humanist viewpoint, which allows adults to pursue whatever lifestyle they choose as long as it does not interfere with another person’s pursuit of happiness. They have been consistently opposed by the Christian community that does not view homosexuality as being good for any person. Time will tell whether the LGBT community will be able to reverse the negative consequences of homosexuality that impacts almost all of those who pursue this lifestyle. Christians are certain that the LGBT community will be unsuccessful, as their behavior is contrary to what the Creator declared is right and good for humans.
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