

Homosexual Marriage & The Law -- Common Objections & Responses

•Written by •

••Wednesday•, 17 •August• 2016 03:27• - •Last Updated•

••Saturday•, 20 •August• 2016 04:14•

Below are a few common objections raised regarding Christians who oppose and are working to ban homosexual marriage. I have provided some short responses to these objections

Objection 1. Should Christians really pursue legislation that bars homosexuals from marriage or really any legalized process?

Yes. Christians should pursue legislation that both conforms to the Law of God and is written well to address current public policy concerns. Violations of the Law of God are sin and always harmful. Christians should neither be advocates for sinful behavior, nor be neutral towards it.

A “homosexual marriage” is not a real marriage. This is true by definition. There is only one true kind of marriage ordained by God as part of the Order of Creation: Heterosexual, monogamous marriage. This is recognized both in Natural Law and in Biblical Law. To advocate for or tolerate anything but God’s view of marriage places one in a position of being against the revealed will of God. And this is a position in which the Christian should never find himself or herself.

Homosexuals are protected by the laws of the land just all other human beings (e.g., law against murder). However, legislation often distinguishes classes of people and “discriminates” against them. The Equal Protection issue is whether the government has a *good reason* to discriminate against a class of people. One example of this type of “discrimination” is the discriminatory distinction made between minors and those who have reached the age of majority. There are many things minors are not entitled to do, such as be bound by a contract, until they have reached the age of majority. And this is not an Equal Protection violation. The government, based on sound reasons, has good reasons not to allow this class of persons to engage in certain types of activities that are legal for other classes of people. And their “humanity” is not in question because of it.

Likewise, there are an abundance of excellent reasons for the government not to allow or endorse a particular behavioral group (i.e., homosexuals) with regard to marriage. The government, for excellent reasons, does not permit or recognize other groups or individuals to marry, such as child marriages, those who want incestuous marriage, those who want a polygamous marriage, *et cetera*. And none of these have ever been considered in any meaningful way a violation of the State or Federal Equal Protection Clauses or State or Federal Fundamental Rights.

•Written by •

••Wednesday•, 17 •August• 2016 03:27• - •Last Updated•

••Saturday•, 20 •August• 2016 04:14•

Objection 2. Some Christians assert that advocating for heterosexual marriage alienates the homosexual community, and disciples of Christ need to be less protective of their rights so that homosexuals will know that Christians see them as equal human beings.

Unfortunately, there are many popular notions within the Christian community that are patently unbiblical. This is one of them.

First, all sinners feel alienated (i.e., convicted and guilty) when confronted with their sin. The entire Bible is filled with the demand to repent of our sins and to receive the grace and mercy of God. Neither Moses, nor the Apostle Paul seemed to be concerned with the notion they might alienate the homosexual community by condemning homosexual sin (Lev. 18:22; 20:13; Rom. 1:18-27). Instead, they spoke for God, calling this particular sin an “abomination,” “indecent,” and “unnatural.” We should follow their inspired lead.

The most loving thing a Christian can do for someone engaged in an abominable, destructive lifestyle is to confront them. When they are confronted by God’s demand for holiness, this brings conviction and feelings of guilt. This is why the confronted homosexual will either suppress the truth (Rom. 1:18) or repent (1 Cor. 6:9-11). But in either case, it is a false dichotomy to state or imply that we must *either* love or confront. We must love homosexuals by upholding righteousness *and* confronting them with both God’s Law *th*
and God’s Gospel. It is love practiced *rough*
confrontation and accountability.

Next, regarding rights, there is a God-given right to marry if two persons meet the qualifications for marriage. Homosexuals, male and female, do not meet the qualifications if they desire to marry another of the same sex. Christians are not protecting “their” own right to marry in this debate. They are simply recognizing the obvious fact of Natural Law (i.e., “reality”) that there is no right to a homosexual marriage—just as there is no “right” to bestiality, pedophilia, incest, or polygamy. And as aforementioned, this has never been a legitimate issue in Equal Protection law—until recently. And we, as Christians, may not grant an alleged “right” to marry for homosexuals when God, the Author and Guarantor of all rights (See Rom. 13:1), has not granted the homosexual the right to marry.

Homosexual Marriage & The Law -- Common Objections & Responses

•Written by •

••Wednesday•, 17 •August• 2016 03:27• - •Last Updated•

••Saturday•, 20 •August• 2016 04:14•

The Christians and theists who signed the Declaration of Independence were 100% correct, “All men are created equal,” are “endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights,” and government exists to “secure these Rights.” The people and their government cannot create a right to anything. The government can only secure and protect God-given rights.

Finally, the “see us as equal human beings” pleading is simply the worst sort of red herring one could raise in this matter. As I stated earlier, the Equal Protection Clause does not require the government to permit homosexuality any more than it requires it to permit five-year-old children to drive automobiles or to permit men to enter into women’s restrooms—although that has changed in liberal states such as California. And last time I checked, we consider our children to be “equal human beings” even though they do not have the right to drive a car.

Objection 3. Liberals and homosexuals believe Christians are acting like Pharisees if they advocate legislation against homosexuals.

These kinds of statements are evidence of the intellectual bankruptcy of their views. When they cannot make a reasonable argument for their view, they begin to engage in name calling. This is simply an unsupported abusive *ad hominem* attack on a person, rather than a rebuttal of the viewpoint. Thus, the entire “Pharisee” assertion should be ignored.

Conclusion. The Bible believing church should continue to oppose homosexual marriage and seek to eliminate it where tyrannical courts have imposed it.

Soli Deo Gloria –Kevin Lewis