

Omnisexual

Don Quixote lives! In every generation of believers, there are chimeras we seek to preserve. That is, we fight for things that cannot be, and what we should have struggled to keep is left in the dust. We add whole battle fronts on issues that are inherently false, while allowing the Enemy of souls too much victory in the real battles. For example, the Christian Right will publish reams of blather about homosexual activity as “unnatural.” First of all, that’s answering the wrong question. Secondly, it’s the wrong answer to the wrong question.

It’s natural for you to defecate in your shorts. It’s also a health problem, so we train our children to wait until they can make such deposits in appropriate disposal facilities. It becomes a mark of our humanity that we control the urge, and is one of the first things torturers try to break down in dehumanizing someone. In this fallen world, what comes naturally to humans is hardly grounds for saying something is good or bad. Thus, to claim gay sex is “unnatural” is both false and missing the point.

Our world is under the Fall. Nature itself is not a thing nor a state, but a tendency and a potential. God made this world to live and prosper under our management, but we ditched our divine capabilities for something far less – mere human reason. Now we worship our reason instead of God, so we have no clue how things really work here. We think we do, but we don’t. Instead, under our mismanagement, nature has run wild in the sense of completely lacking the moral guidance God intended we apply to it. We were supposed to be the living connection between God’s divine moral character and the created world. We have the potential to know that moral character instinctively and take its guidance, but the mind is not capable of it. All it knows is what it can sense directly and process cerebrally. Our moral faculties are asleep, so revealed morality from God makes no sense.

This goes so far back in human existence that we cannot put a date on it. Read ancient literature, and you will find the underlying assumption that men would be omnisexuals. That is, they would desire to have sex with just about everything. This wasn’t just in a handful of Canaanite tribes, but everywhere. No one would have questioned this; it had little to do with the concept of “sex partner” because it was more about use – or abuse, if you will. A man might well take pleasure in his wife, but primarily she was for bearing heirs in the tribal atmosphere of keeping property within the family. For the man to seek other sexual outlets was “natural.” Slaves of both sexes and even some animals were a part of the collective resources for this, along with prostitutes and such outside the household. It was about indulging the man’s appetite and was a mark of dominance. However, men having sex as equals would have been disturbing, and out of norm. For men to be feminine was depraved in many cultures.

In the ripeness of time, God began the redemptive process of revealing something about our intended moral existence. The Law of Moses was a grand promotion of the wife. It demanded a man keep it all for her. His natural desire for sexual expression was her property, just as

hers was his. Sex with anyone or anything else was flatly forbidden. Just how radical a change this was is hard to show. Read between the lines of Scripture and you realize that the created order of things places sexual pleasure within the boundaries of the marriage covenant. To spread it around was to dilute the commitment, and commitment was the central issue. Thus, sex without a life-long commitment, and without some expectation of procreation, was altogether wrong, a giving in to the petty desires of the self. Sex could properly be only a celebration of two-become-one. Any other outlet was selfish. We note in passing this was not entirely legalistic as Westerners view such things, but a fundamental expression of how God made things.

The destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was not specifically about homosexual behavior, but a whole range of degrading self-indulgent sin. Men having sex with each other was pretty wide-spread, considered about average. Men forcing social equals to have sex was evil almost everywhere else, but that's what the Pentapolis (the cluster of five cities, of which Sodom and Gomorrah were the largest) was all about. They had a cult with initiation rites that demanded humiliation as an offering to their demonic gods. To rape a man as social equal was a religious act. To rape a superior was an even greater offering. The men of Sodom discerned that the angels were somewhat above them at least. Abusing them until they died would have glorified their demonic heathen god. Demanding Lot remove his protection from them was a hideous breach of protocol, and they knew it. Notice the opprobrium against the Benjamites of Gibeah, who had resurrected this ancient cult (Judges 19:22ff). There was, of course, a whole range of self-indulgent behaviors that helped earn the Pentapolis God's wrath. Mere homosexuality was probably not even central, but rather the most obvious symptom of a much deeper evil.

The old saw that Jesus never addressed homosexuality is a diversion. While arguing from silence is weak enough, it's obvious that there is a difference in context here. Jesus spent most of His time preaching and teaching against Judaism in the sense that Judaism was a perversion of Old Testament religion. What He addressed were things the Jewish leaders were doing wrong as departures from the Law of Moses. He would hardly have bothered to address the whole catalog of things done right. Jews rejected homosexuality (at least officially), and there was no need to comment on it. While there were plenty of problems with hypocrisy and compromise, it was generally the case that Jews had this one issue right.

The Apostles following Jesus were not bringing the Law of Moses, but of Noah, which applies to all humanity not under Moses. The Covenant of Noah also condemned homosexual relations; the business with Ham was a figure of speech for anal rape (Genesis 9:22-23). So the Apostles did address homosexuality because it was an issue they faced outside Judea.

Clearly then, the argument is not about natural versus unnatural. It's not about whether gays are born that way. It's not about whether there is homosexuality in the animal kingdom. It's not about whether gays deserve to have sex their way, too, as if Western moral traditions bear any resemblance to God's revelation. It's a question of cosmic moral understanding. Same sex relations are sin, a violation of God's moral character and a threat to everything He said we

could have if we embrace His ways. The Law Covenants were all about social stability as God defined it. For us to ignore the sins of adultery or fornication while decrying sodomy is hypocrisy. Any sex outside the bounds of a marriage covenant is sin because it threatens the social stability God demands of us. You aren't permitted by God to enjoy that release any other way.

Nor is it a matter of civil legislation. Legalizing gay marriage is not a real issue and is no worse than round-robin heterosexual marriages. We sin by letting the state get involved in licensing the marriage covenant. It's futile in a fallen world to regulate sexual activity among adults. It is the self-destructive, profligate pursuit of self-gratification that we rightly address, in whatever form it takes. Appetites are not in themselves sinful; without them we would all die of starvation, among other things. There is in Christ a right way to satisfy every appetite, and lots of wrong ways. Not only is nature unguided by God's moral character, but so is human nature. The real threat in public policy is the demand that we let our children choose, as if they were morally free from parental guidance, which is just an excuse to open them to predatory manipulation. That is an abomination to God because it destroys the one form of government He revealed as appropriate – tribal. The argument that we should tolerate public displays of sexuality – of any flavor – is wrong for too many reasons to name. That it should be taught as normal is particularly wrong. It may well be completely natural in some sense, but it is sin, not a matter of law.

Don't be worldly. Don't let the world sucker you into debating this as a matter of civil law. The secular mind cannot make sense of holiness and God's promises. Don't chase rabbits and destroy the focus. We have a command from God to call sin "sin" and withdraw as much as possible from the fallen realm of secular politics. Human political wrangling is just an excuse to sucker us in and corrupt us. Even if we muster a "moral majority" of voters, it serves only to make it a matter of politics, not moral persuasion. At some point, the political pendulum will swing back against us.

We simply do not have the leverage to keep it out of public schools, but we should never hand over our children to Caesar in the first place, any more than we would render them to Molech. We must assert our duty from God to call it sin and not back down. Refuse to take the worldly approach. Harassing someone for it is also a sin. Queers are sinners in need of redemption; you don't redeem by oppression and harassment.

Ed Hurst

08 May 2005, revised 19 April 2015

COPYRIGHT NOTICE: People of honor need no copyright laws; they are only too happy to give credit where credit is due. Others will ignore copyright laws whenever they please. If you are of the latter, please note what Moses said about dishonorable behavior – "be sure your sin will find you out" (Numbers 32:23)