

Biblical Perspective and Discussions on Homosexual Relationships and Marriage

by Chuck Bland

God's Word is my standard for what I believe. I believe in absolute truth and that this truth can be known.

I am not interested in condemning anyone. My standard for what I say and how I say it is found in 1 Peter 3:15-16:

But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience, so that those who speak maliciously against your good behavior in Christ may be ashamed of their slander.

There are two factors, speaking the truth, and doing so with gentleness and respect. Neither are easy.

- When truth is spoken, some will be offended no matter how hard I try.
- Even though I speak with gentleness and respect, I am told my intent is hateful simply because I disagree.

But I will not forsake truth simply because of someone's feelings. I believe in absolute truth. It comes from the very character of God and His Word. It shows God's design and intent. God's standards are not diluted in any way by any modern understanding of biology, psychology, sociology, or attempts to redefine what has been clearly stated in His Word. God's Word has stood far longer than any recent cultural idea and continues to do so long after those ideas fade again.

God's Word is not interpreted through any knowledge from our culture. Rather, such knowledge must be tested by virtue of God's Truth, not the other way around. This Truth does not change because it is based on the very character of God, who does not change (Malachi 3:6, James 1:17)

Is Homosexuality Within God's Purpose and Permission?

Genesis chapters one and two are the first answers for the question *what was God's purpose in creating human sexuality?* In there we see two primary functions:

1. The first is procreative. "Male and female He created them. Then God blessed them, and God said to them, Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it" (Gen. 1:27b-28). Through the sexual union of male and female, the human race could reproduce. There is no ambiguity in this and there is no hint of there being other options. It was God's purpose in how he created humanity and there is no other way that the imperative to be fruitful and multiply can be fulfilled or understood.
2. In the detail of the creation of man and woman in chapter 2, we see where God wants to make a suitable helper for Adam. He creates the animals and brings them to Adam to name. The fact that no suitable helper was found was not a surprise to God. Adam is the one that gets the education that something in his world was missing; there was no one like him. So God fills this need by creating the "suitable helper". Adam rejoices in this companion because of the fact that she was made by God to fulfill a need in him that NOTHING else in God's creation could fulfill. Adam recognizes how they will relate to one another in all ways, including the uniqueness of their sexuality: "Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, and they shall become one flesh" (Gen. 2:24-25). This becoming of one flesh is the unitive function of human sexuality. It has been there from the very beginning and no other options are presented.

When you look at these passages as a whole and the purposes they express, human sexuality is seen as a matter not simply of *satisfaction* but *completeness*. This completeness cannot be had in the homosexual

relationship because the physical design of humans from a sexual perspective shows that human anatomy only provides for sexual completeness between those of opposite genders. There is no true and completing physical union in any other genital expression of sexuality.

Moving from purpose to prohibition, scripture is clear that homosexual relations are prohibited.

1. "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman. It is an abomination." (Lev. 18:22)
2. "If a man lies with a male as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination. They shall surely be put to death." (Lev. 20:13)
3. "For God's wrath is revealed from heaven against all godlessness and unrighteousness of people who by their unrighteousness suppress the truth, since what can be known about God is evident among them, because God has shown it to them. From the creation of the world His invisible attributes, that is, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what He has made. As a result, people are without excuse. For though they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God or show gratitude. Instead, their thinking became nonsense, and their senseless minds were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man, birds, four-footed animals, and reptiles.

Therefore God delivered them over in the cravings of their hearts to sexual impurity, so that their bodies were degraded among themselves. They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served something created instead of the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.

This is why God delivered them over to degrading passions. For even their females exchanged natural sexual intercourse for what is unnatural. The males in the same way also left natural sexual intercourse with females and were inflamed in their lust for one another. Males committed shameless acts with males and received in their own persons the appropriate penalty for their perversion." (Romans 1:18-27)

4. "Do you not know that the unjust will not inherit God's kingdom? Do not be deceived: no sexually immoral people, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, homosexuals, thieves, greedy people, drunkards, revilers, or swindlers will inherit God's kingdom." (1 Corinthians 6:9-10)
5. "We know that the law is not meant for a righteous person, but for the lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinful, for the unholy and irreverent, for those who kill their fathers and mothers, for murderers, for the sexually immoral and homosexuals, for kidnappers, liars, perjurers, and for whatever else is contrary to the sound teaching based on the glorious gospel of the blessed God that was entrusted to me." (1 Timothy 1:9-11)

There is no ambiguity in these passages. God calls homosexuality an abomination and sin.

Please note: God's Word does not classify this sin as being unique or worse than any other. Thus, they are cleansed by the Blood of Christ, where all find His grace and forgiveness. The book of Romans spends much time dealing with how people were lost in their sin but the Blood of Christ cleansed them from all unrighteousness. There is no hated or eternal condemnation in these passages, but reconciliation to God.

"But now a righteousness from God, apart from law, has been made known, to which the Law and the Prophets testify. This righteousness from God comes through faith in Jesus Christ to all who believe. There is no difference, for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, and are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that came by Christ Jesus." (Romans 3:21-24)

No other case can be honestly made from scripture except that:

1. Homosexuality is not in God's design for human sexuality,
2. Homosexuality is sin and an abomination before God,
3. Homosexuality is like any other sin in that reconciliation to God is possible through Jesus Christ.

Advocates of gay relationships hold that romantic attraction has been proven by science to not be a matter of choice.

This is not as proven and clear as these advocates would have us believe.

The preliminary findings released in 1991 by Dr. Simon LeVay from the Salk Institute in San Diego discussed a study of 41 cadavers, including 19 homosexual males. He found that the hypothalamus was less than half the size in gay men compared to the heterosexual men. This observation by itself was lauded as “proof” that homosexuals were born gay. But none of the real questions were answered, such as “was the difference prenatal, neonatal, during childhood, puberty?” This one detail was simply taken in isolation and is not the product of complete scientific study.

Additionally, the study had other problems:

1. Nineteen of the gay men had died from aids, which researchers believe could have accounted for the difference.
2. The sexual history of the men was not known, so there was no way of knowing such things as how long they had been gay, etc.
3. There was no way to determine if the smaller hypothalamus was the cause or result of homosexuality.
4. Dr. LeVay admitted his study was not entirely dispassionate because of his own gay lifestyle.

You can look into this background yourself in these sources:

- Charlene Crabb, "Are Some Men Born to Be Homosexual?" *U. S. News & World Report*, 9 September 1991, 58.
- David Gelman, et al., "Born or Bred?" *Newsweek*, 24 February 1992, 48.
- Simon LeVay on *The Phil Donahue Show*, "Genetically Gay: Born Gay or Become Gay?" 3 January 1992.

The point is that the only folks saying that this is cut and dried from a scientific perspective are the folks with the agenda, and not the scientific community. The purpose of such an argument is to be able to make the case that homosexuality can't be sin if it is "the way God made me". If this argument could hold water, then the next step would be to make the case that the Bible isn't a legitimate standard of Truth. But the argument doesn't hold when you question it and take an honest look at the science. And God does not make people to behave in such a way that they have no choice but to disobey Him.

You can easily find much discussion on this subject within the scientific community that does not have any religious agenda. One of the more interesting is the history of the American Psychiatric Association's 1973 declassification of homosexuality as a mental disorder. Most commentary I've found leads back to these two sources:

- Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 101-54
- William Dammeyer, *Shadow in the Land* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1989), 24-39.

There is also a well written and footnoted article from the Christian perspective.

<http://www.equip.org/PDF/DH055-1.pdf>

When you look at the information from dispassionate sources, it becomes clear that no one has a proverbial “smoking gun” that homosexuality is genetic and not a matter of behavioral choice.

What About Gay Marriage?

From this perspective, the subject of gay marriage becomes a moot point. Since the homosexual relationship is clearly prohibited by God, the marriage of a homosexual couple is also prohibited.

However, proponents of gay marriage raise issues regarding God's design for marriage as well as other issues used as justification for gay marriage. So let's look at what scripture says about God's design for marriage and then explore the issues raised.

There are no references in the Bible where marriage is discussed in any way but in terms of a heterosexual relationship.

- Genesis chapters one and two show us that God made a woman, not another man, to meet Adam's needs for completion, companionship, and human procreation. It is true that the marital relationship is not the only relationship humans have, but in the context of a discussion of marriage, no other type of relationship is presented.
- Jesus Himself quotes Genesis and re-enforces the notion of heterosexual marriage: "Have you not read, that He who made them at the beginning 'made them male and female,' and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'? So then, they are no longer two but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let not man separate" (Matt. 19:4-6) Notice that the man and woman leave their heterosexual parents ("father and mother") to create a new union and family.
- In Ephesians 5:25-33, Paul discusses the Godly relationship between husbands and wives.
- In 1 Corinthians 7, Paul discusses marital relations as between a husband and wife.
- In 1 Timothy 3, Paul discusses the qualifications of church leaders. He mentions the marital qualifications in terms of a heterosexual marriage.
- There are so many more references to married couples in the Bible. There is no mention of homosexual marriages, and certainly not in terms of the homosexuality being accepted or not problematic.

In short, the Bible simply makes no allowance for marriage to be anything but a union of heterosexual partners and you will find no places where God defends homosexuality or such a marriage in any form.

Here is a collection of points that gay marriage proponents put forth.

"I believe that had homosexuality (and I'm talking about loving, monogamous relationships) been socially acceptable at the time (as they are now, for most of the younger generations at least), God would have set laws in order for the governing of those kind of marriages as well."

Homosexuality has been around for thousands of years. I find it highly unlikely that the kinds of relationships and couples you mentioned would not have existed. Stated another way, I find it likely that those relationships have existed through those centuries.

Consider these citations from the Bible and history of known homosexual activity and awareness:

- Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 19
- The people of Gibeah in Judges 19
- The Greek Civilization, where homosexuality is well documented

- The Roman Empire, where homosexuality is well documented
- The writings of the Apostle Paul in Romans and 1 & 2 Corinthians addressing the issues of homosexuality.

If God was going to make an opportunity to accommodate homosexuality and gay marriage as stated above, it would have happened here.

The point being made is that in all those centuries, homosexual couples have existed and God HAS NOT set laws in on order for the governing or allowing of those marriages, nor has He changed His mind in any way. His Word stands and God's outlook toward homosexuality has not changed.

On the subject of polygamy.....

“Look back in the old testament and you can see God giving commands to his people regarding the legal practice of polygamy. Obviously most Christians today do not support polygamy, but excuse it because of cultural "customs" of the time period.”

Often, the issue of polygamy in the Bible is raised in an effort to state that God's design for marriage is not just one man and one woman; God allows one man and several women as well as part of the culture of the times. Thus, since our culture allows for homosexual relationships and marriages, the Bible really doesn't have a prohibition on either.

First, I again refer to God's design for marriage as first found in Genesis two and echoed throughout the Bible. On that foundation, it is clear polygamy was not part of Gods plan for marriage.

That outlook is further re-enforced in scripture:

- Deut 17:17, where God dictates that the Kings “must not take many wives, or his heart will be lead astray.”
- 1 Timothy 3:2, 12; Titus 1:6, where elders and deacons are instructed to be “the husband of but one wife”. Now, I know that there is some discussion as to whether this is a reference to polygamy or divorce and remarriage. From my perspective, this eliminates the case of polygamy no matter what.

The overall point to be made is leaders set the standard for morality and spirituality, so they demonstrate for all what God requires. Thus, this passage does not just apply to Kings, elders, and deacons, but to all. Old Testament to New Testament, God makes it clear polygamy is not his design for marriage.

Often, those that make the case for biblical sanction of polygamy cite 2 Samuel 12, specifically verses 8-9 where God says through the prophet Nathan:

“This is what the LORD, the God of Israel, says: 'I anointed you king over Israel, and I delivered you from the hand of Saul. I gave your master's house to you, and your master's wives into your arms. I gave you the house of Israel and Judah. And if all this had been too little, I would have given you even more. Why did you despise the word of the LORD by doing what is evil in his eyes?’”

My research of this reveals two very key points.

1. The word translated as “wives” in verse 8 is a Hebrew word for woman and does not carry the idea of wife.
2. Rendering this word as woman and not wife is consistent with the fact that Saul's wives did not become David's wives. Consider this outline of details.

- The only two wives Saul had were "Ahinoam, the daughter of Ahimaaz" (1 Samuel 14:50) and mother of Michal (David's wife); and Rizpah (2 Samuel 3:7). The penalty for marrying one's mother-in-law was to be burnt alive, Leviticus 20:14, so we may be sure David did not commit that crime.
- As to Rizpah, David delivered her two sons, after the death of Saul, with five others, to be hanged (crucified) at Gibeah, on the demand of the Gibeonites. This woman has been famous in art, as guarding the seven bodies, for months, from the vultures. It is not credible that David should have treated his own wife thus.
- David's wives are enumerated several times over (see 2 Samuel 2:2, 3:2-5; 1 Chronicles 3:1-9, etc.), and that after Saul's death, but Saul's wives are never in the list. David, to be sure, had also a wife by the name of Ahinoam, but she is distinguished from Saul's wife as "Ahinoam of Jezreel," and David had her as his wife during Saul's lifetime (1 Samuel 27:3).

This shows why considering all contexts of a passage, including the rest of scripture, is key to a proper understanding of any passage.

Exodus 21:7-11 is interesting, especially verse 10.

7 "If a man sells his daughter as a servant, she is not to go free as male servants do. **8** If she does not please the master who has selected her for himself, he must let her be redeemed. He has no right to sell her to foreigners, because he has broken faith with her. **9** If he selects her for his son, he must grant her the rights of a daughter. **10** If he marries another woman, he must not deprive the first one of her food, clothing and marital rights. **11** If he does not provide her with these three things, she is to go free, without any payment of money.

Like any other passage, if it is taken by itself, ignoring scriptural contexts, then errors can arise.

There is no doubt, polygamy is seen throughout scripture and in the lives of many significant characters. That fact, by itself, does not mean that God condones polygamy. Furthermore, Exodus 21 is the start of the detail of the Ceremonial Law (not to be confused with the Moral Law). It represents rules and ceremonies that are pointers to the promised Messiah, serving an entirely different purpose.

That being said, I believe that there is a proper approach and use of this passage. It does not allow the compromise of God's standard for marriage. Here's my explanation.

I see this passage and the issue of polygamy to be comparable to that of divorce:

First, the standard of marriage, as I've already discussed - one man, one woman.

In both cases, there are "concessions".

- For polygamy, Exodus 21:10.
- For divorce, Deuteronomy 24:1-4
- For divorce, Matthew 19:3-9. There are some interesting aspects to this passage. In verse 4-6, Jesus refers to the standard in Genesis, affirming it and in no way diminishes it. Also note in verse 7, the Pharisees asked why did Moses "command" that a man give his wife a certificate of divorce. Jesus corrects them by saying it was "permitted" (supported in the original Greek as well) and then goes on to say it was done so because "their hearts were hard". In other words, people were determined to use divorce against the design and will of God. This is nowhere near making it part of God's design for marriage.

- For divorce, 1 Corinthians 7:12-16 details concessions for when situations arise from one person in a marriage being a believer and another is not. Even then, Paul qualifies them by saying that they are his words, not the Lord's.

Neither of these passages show any condoning of the action by God. Rather, they are at best concessions to the sinfulness of man brought about by evil in the world.

Note that neither of these are imperatives or revocations of the original design. I call them concessions for a reason.

In both cases, there are proscriptions against these issues.

- For polygamy, Deuteronomy 17:17, 1 Timothy 3:2, 12; Titus 1:6. As I mentioned earlier, this set the standard for the leadership, as they set the standard for others to follow.
- For divorce, Malachi 2:13-16, God judges Israel for taking marriage for granted. He makes His feelings about divorce **very clear** in verse 16 where He says "I hate divorce". Clearly, divorce is not something God wants which would mean it is not part of His design.
- For divorce, 1 Corinthians 7:10-11, Paul instructs his readers of the command from the Lord that they must remain married. Context supports that this passage is addressed to couples who are both believers.

Finally, we see where those with multiple wives had some kind of difficulty, some large and some small, and their lives were not enriched. This makes the even better case that, because of consequences, it is better to avoid polygamy.

- Consider King David, who had a man murdered in order to add a woman to his harem. This mention of polygamy is hardly a scriptural endorsement. The result of his sin was that the sword never left his home.
- Consider King Solomon, whose wives led him from faithfulness to the Living God and to the false gods of the region, whose worship include the torturous fire sacrifice of infants. The result of his sin was the division of Israel and its ultimate demise as a great and powerful nation.

I like the perspective of Hank Hannegraf on why we see the mention of polygamy in the lives of the kings and patriarchs:

"Furthermore, reading the Bible for all its worth involves recognition that the narratives of Scripture are often descriptive as opposed to prescriptive. The fact that Scripture reveals the patriarchs with all their warts and moles and wrinkles is to warn us of their failures, it's not to teach us to emulate their practices."

We should also keep in mind that marriage is repeatedly used as the analogy for the relationship that God has with His people, with the Church, His one and only bride. Polygamy and divorce run contrary to that relationship and illustration.

So, we start with a foundation for God's design, with concessions made because of sinful man, and the standard repeated in clear imperative by God. In no way are these concessions considered as encouragement to follow in the compromising practices, so no one can take from this that such activity is condoned, or that God's standard and design for marriage is eroded.

Discourse Buffet

This is the last section. I have gathered some other issues worth considering and offer responses for your consideration.

=====

“Do you believe that by legislating against gay marriage, homosexual relationships will somehow decrease or the family unit (by God’s design, as you see it) is benefited somehow?”

My first answer is no. I doubt that any legislation will decrease homosexual relationships. As I pointed out earlier, history shows they have been around for centuries. Since the Bible shows that homosexuality is a matter of behavioral choice, then there will be those who make that choice. The free moral agency given by our Creator is what allows us to freely choose to follow God’s way or, in sinful pride, ignore it.

I do believe as Christians we are to be salt and light to a dying world. That means we should stand for a culture that conforms to God’s standard and not allow the cultural sin and decay that comes from ignoring God’s way.

My second answer is yes, the family will benefit. God’s way is best for us. He is the Creator and knows better than we, the created, our needs for companionship, nurturing, procreation, and fulfillment. There is so much more to this particular subject than can be covered here, but this is the foundational principle. This is not just a matter of how I see it. It is clear that when God’s principles are ignored, consequences follow for our culture and world. That has been repeated for centuries.

=====

“God’s design for family and marriage is centered on one principle: love.”

This argument is frequently made, referring to the love being between two people of any gender is all that is required to establish a marriage and a family. Further, it attempts to make the case that such feelings justify behavior clearly not consistent with God’s commands or design. There is no precedent for such emotions over-riding God’s law and instruction.

Furthermore, consider the situation surrounding God providing Eve to Adam and his response of accepting Eve as his companion. How long did Adam date Eve before deciding to marry her? On what basis did Adam decide that they were compatible and ready for a life long relationship? Was it love? I doubt it, if for no other reason than there wasn’t time for such an emotion to grow. There was no need for those things to happen, because Adam trusted that God was going to take care of them and knew best what they needed. In other words, the basis of Adam’s acceptance of God’s provision of Eve as his wife was not the imperfect human emotion of love, but trust in God’s way and design.

I will leave this issue with a quote from an article I read. This could be an entire discussion by itself, though that is not my intent is sharing it with you. It does sum my thoughts on all this, since I do not see gay and heterosexual marriage as equivalent, and that there is a specific purpose behind God’s design of marriage, and that this is an issue of right and wrong.

“The issue is not that people of the same sex might love each other; the issue is whether society as a whole should be required to declare by law or through the imprimatur of marriage that homoerotic behavior is a necessary aspect of that love. The question, therefore, is not one of civil rights, but whether we will indoctrinate America’s children with the philosophy that marrying the same sex is equivalent to marrying the opposite sex — and catapult ourselves toward becoming a people

unwilling to discern left from right." Robert Velarde, Same Sex Marriage in Perspective, Christian Research Journal, Vol 27, #2, 2004

=====
"willing to legislate against equal treatment of a large portion of the human population."

Perhaps this was better addressed in the context of the section on homosexual relationships. At any rate, the arguments behind just how many gay people there are in America come from a 1948 study led by William Kinsey (Alfred C. Kinsey, et al., Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (Philadelphia: Saunders Company, 1948). Many have stated that this study shows that 10% of the US population is gay. There are several problems with this study. I will summarize them, then follow with some citations for your own review.

- The sample used in the report was not statistically valid for a proper study and, even more, were not representative of the US population.
- 25% of the 5300 individuals studied were prison inmates, who could not be having heterosexual intercourse.
- 44% of these inmates had had homosexual experiences while in prison.
- Several hundred male prostitutes were included in the study.
- The sample was collected by soliciting participation to participate in such a study. This further biases the results.

- Abraham Maslow and James M. Sakoda, "Volunteer Error in the Kinsey Study," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 47 (April 1952), 259-62.
- "The Ten Percent Solution, Part II," Peninsula 3:2 (October/November 1991), 7.
- Judith A. Reisman and Edward W. Eichol, Kinsey, Sex and Fraud (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1990), 23.

The study is also misquoted.

- Kinsey did not say that 10% of the entire US population was gay. Rather, he said that 10% of white American males were "more or less" exclusively homosexual for at least three years of their lives between the ages of 16 and 65.
- The statistics for females was 5%. Percentages thought to be exclusively homosexual for their entire lives was 4% of men and 2-3% of women.

More recent and proper studies but the number much closer to 1%

- 1984 and 1987, David Forman, the senior staff scientist at the Radcliffe Infirmary (Oxford, England), found that only 1.7 percent of the sample study had ever had homosexual intercourse.
- Another study, conducted at the University of Chicago in 1989 and reported at the 1990 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, resulted in a figure "less than 1% exclusively homosexual."

So going back to your original comment, we are not talking about a large portion of the human population.

=====
"I do believe that the structure of marriage that best benefits society is two loving parents raising children in a moral and wholesome manner. Many straight couples do not achieve this."

I agree with the model you mention. Our difference is that I add that those loving parents are a male and female, engaged in a monogamous marital relationship as designed by God.

The comment about many straight couples not achieving this, while I agree with you on this point, is irrelevant. It does not mean that gay parents will be any better because gay parents are flawed people like the straight parents and will have the same issue. This does not justify gay marriage or parenting. This issue is a further illustration of the effects of sin in this world and does not justify gay parenting as an option.

=====

“Many couples are unable to conceive (of choose not to for whatever reason). It seems like this would mean that their marriage deviates from God's plan for marriage.”

God's design for marriage does not mean that all couples WILL have children. That was never stated nor commanded. His design is that they CAN have children.

Furthermore, it is God that opens and closes the womb. We see throughout scripture where God intervenes (either way) in childbearing for differing reasons. But the bottom line is children are a blessing from God and God blesses as He sees fit. We see examples where some are even given the gift of staying single and not having the opportunity to procreate. That gift of singleness is from God and God won't use it against someone if they don't have kids.

God does not consider couples that are unable to have children as being in defiance of His commands or design. It is also an entirely different discussion about couples that won't have children (birth control). But no matter how that comes out, it does not justify doing something else that clearly defies God's law.

The main point in this is that heterosexual couples CAN procreate (they are *able* to do so), thus participating in God's design and able to fulfill His directive to produce offspring that can know and love Him. Homosexual couples CANNOT procreate (they are *unable* to do so) BY GOD'S DESIGN and therefore cannot fulfill God's purpose in the design of human sexuality or marriage.

Malachi 2:15 brings focus to this.....

“Has not the LORD made them one? In flesh and spirit they are his. And why one? Because he was seeking godly offspring. So guard yourself in your spirit, and do not break faith with the wife of your youth.”

God's purpose for marriage and procreation? Godly offspring. People that will be godly and know Him. Notice the use of the word "wife". This is another clear reference to heterosexual marriage.

=====

Adoption and foster parenting are great things, but homosexual couples can do this also, so according to this view point, they can qualify a couple as "procreative" according to God's plan.

The issue of substituting adoption by gay couples in place of procreation only further illustrates how gay parenting comes up short. By God's design, children are born of a union of a man and wife and are raised by those same parents in the roles of father and mother. Much of those roles are defined by their genders and how God made us as males and females. Parenting couples that are missing one of those roles deprive the children of God's best.

Yes, I know that there are single parents out there. They do the best they can, and even more with God's help. Some would try to make the case that since single parents are not according to God's design and they

do OK, then why not gay parents? But that point misses that there are single parents either because of sin in this world (divorce, murder, etc) or some other act. That in no way justifies ignoring God's design or laws in other areas. I will even say that a given set of gay parents might be the best on the block, but that does not negate the fact that they are in defiance of God's design and law. It justifies nothing.

God's design is a father and a mother, committed for life to each other, living in a relationship with Him according to His Word and ways, and raising the children that God gives them to know Him as well. Anything less than that, no matter how workable, is a compromise and is less than God's best.

While you are correct that adoption or foster parenting does not, by itself, qualify as procreation, for a heterosexual couple, the commandment to raise godly offspring is still met. Furthermore, adoption is a pointer to the relationship Christ brings us into with Him (Ephesian 1, among other places). Heterosexual couples do nothing wrong or against God's design by parenting children they did not directly bring into this world. The point is irrelevant.