

An Open Letter to Matthew Vines

Please note that all Scripture references are King James Version, 1769 Edition

Mr. Vines,

It quite plainly appears that you think you have a case for seriously contending that Scripturally there is nothing wrong with sodomy and “long-term” same gender physical relations. You also believe you have proved that someone can be a sodomite and be a genuine, Bible-believing Christian as well. I would like to address those issues with you, and point out to you that you have been less than honest in your interpretation of what the Scripture states.

But before addressing those issues, I would posit to you that perhaps attempting to overthrow 4000+ years of Scriptural teaching is likely not a good idea. Perhaps the arrogance and ignorance of youth is at play here, but that really doesn't matter. You are an “adult” and you should know better. I read the [transcript of your presentation](#), and it amounts to a screed (that is all I can properly call it). I state that about this presentation where you spoke at a Methodist church in Kansas, as the transcript is full of illogic and supposition, half-truth and some outright lies. What was presented contains such understanding as the following:

“The second problem that has already presented itself with the traditional interpretation comes from the opening chapters of Genesis, from the account of the creation of Adam and Eve. This story is often cited to argue against the blessing of same-sex unions: in the beginning, God created a man and a woman, and two men or two women would be a deviation from that design. But this biblical story deserves

closer attention. In the first two chapters of Genesis, God creates the heavens and the earth, plants, animals, man, and everything in the earth. And He declares everything in creation to be either good or very good – except for one thing. In Genesis 2:18, God says, “It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make a helper suitable for him.” And yes, the suitable helper or partner that God makes for Adam is Eve, a woman. And a woman is a suitable partner for the vast majority of men – for straight men. But for gay men, that isn’t the case. For them, a woman is not a suitable partner. And in all of the ways that a woman is a suitable partner for straight men—for gay men, it’s another gay man who is a suitable partner. And the same is true for lesbian women. For them, it is another lesbian woman who is a suitable partner. But the necessary consequence of the traditional teaching on homosexuality is that, even though gay people have suitable partners, they must reject them, and they must live alone for their whole lives, without a spouse or a family of their own. We are now declaring good the very first thing in Scripture that God declared not good: for the man to be forced to be alone. And the fruit that this teaching has borne has been deeply wounding and destructive.”

“This is a major problem. By holding to the traditional interpretation, we are now contradicting the Bible’s own teachings: the Bible teaches that it is not good for the man to be forced to be alone, and yet now, we are teaching that it is.”

So you believe that when it teaches in Genesis, chapter 2, verses 18-24 that it is “not good for man to be alone,” it is actually the teaching of ‘not having someone to share a life with?’ Moreover, you assert that the “traditional interpretation” creates a conflict in Scripture because “gay people” are forced to be alone contrary to what the LORD stated when He made man.

The Creation of Man

While you focus on the aspect of woman being an help meet, (proper) for man, and then argue that this is not true for sodomites – you do so totally and willfully ignoring actual issues in the passage. While the traditional interpretation of the passage is correct, and that is what you are arguing against, traditional teaching about the passage never really gets to the “why” of it all.

It comes across that your thinking is as follows: After the LORD God made man, He suddenly realized that man really shouldn't be alone. After all, that is tantamount to what you argue. Consider the following passages and the bearing they have on the situation on earth, after Adam is created, but before Eve is brought out of Adam:

And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. (Revelation 13:8)

And again:

...(As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, *even* God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were. (Romans 4:17)

So when did the Lord Jesus Christ die on the cross? In the minds of men it was 2000 years ago. But not in the heart and mind of the LORD God. In the heart and mind of the LORD God, Christ died on the cross in eternity past. Just as Abraham has always been the father of many nations – even before Abram was ever conceived. You should notice that “be not” is future tense, and “as though they were.” is past tense. By this, the LORD God made plain that His view is not the same as ours, and there are no surprises for Him.

So, what does this have to do with “an help meet” for Adam? Perhaps the following will enlighten the situation somewhat:

Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. (Matthew 22:28-30)

So, what is the great distinction between man and angels other than angels are soul and spirit, and man is soul, spirit and body? Perhaps you should consider that all the angels were created all at the same time? Should you not also consider that the angels do not procreate – that they do not produce offspring? It is quite plain in Scripture that there are no successive generations of angels. Hence, marriage is neither necessary nor appropriate for angels – they are genderless.

But it is not so with man. Rather, man is unique. Whereas animals are spirit and body (as everything is spiritually driven), [*Hebrews 1:1-3; Luke 19:38-40; Ecclesiastes 3:21* – KJV, please] and angels are soul and spirit, man is made in the similitude of God and is a tri-unity of parts to make a whole (The LORD God is a tri-unity of Persons, yet one God – which is far beyond what man is or can be.) Howsoever, not to get off point, man has a component that is like the animals in that he is physical and hence, like the animals, must reproduce in successive generations.

Of course, you should now realize that the LORD God knew all this in eternity past.

Since it is patently obvious that angels are strictly spiritual and cannot manifest physically unless the LORD God commands them and enables them to do so, it is impossible for angels to be an “help meet” for man. Hence, that leaves the animals, which are physical. But, is any animal really a suitable companion and help proper for man? After all, man is made in the image and likeness of God in five identifiable aspects:

1. Man is a tri-unity of parts: *Soul, spirit* and *body*. The LORD God is a tri-unity of Persons: *the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost* (Though there are orders of magnitude difference here, the pattern is the same.)
2. Man has Free-will.
3. Man has the innate ability to Judge.
4. Man is Creative. Man creates out of that which already exists (*ex-aliquid* (which is out of something or pro-creation)) (the LORD God does it *ex-nihilo* (out of nothing) – again orders of magnitude difference, but the same pattern – a shadow of the power of the LORD)
5. Man has the moral imperatives: *Grace, Mercy, Compassion, Forgiveness and Love*

This gives rise to several questions about why an animal was not chosen as an help proper for man:

1. Which of the animals have any of these readily identifiable aspects?
 - a. Which animal has free-will? (this is best illustrated by the animal's ability to defy its instinct and act differently from the expected, normal response.) (I do know you will point to the rare cases of supposed "same gender" behavior among animals to justify your behavior and say it is "normal" while ignoring the fact that animals are driven expressly by hormones and instinct.)
 - b. Which animal has the ability to discern what something is, not just what it appears to be?
 - c. Which animal is creative? Where are the inventions of animals?
 - d. Which animal has and expresses the moral imperatives?
2. Hence, what species of animal would prove a suitable and proper help for Adam?

And the LORD God said, *It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.* And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him. (*Genesis 2:18-20*)

It is apparent that no animal was created on the same order as man. Though physically, man shares some common traits with all other living things, the order in which those things are arranged makes all the difference. After all, helium and lead share all the same particles in their respective atoms, but I don't think you want to have trace amounts of lead in your lungs, whereas you breathe in trace amounts of helium daily with no discernable harm. Moreover, in its normal state lead is a very heavy metal, while helium is a very light gas. They are radically different in physical characteristics, but made of the very same particles, just differently arranged.

That understanding comprehended, we must consider that for man to exist beyond the person of Adam himself, two things must happen:

1. There must be a means of reproduction, of successive generations.
2. That help must be proper for Adam, that is, complementary to him.

Hence, no animal was or is, suitable. Now, it is manifest that Adam, of himself, cannot produce successive generations. Moreover, the law of procreation is to bring forth "after their kind," meaning only of the same species:

And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the

earth after his kind: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that *it was good*. (*Genesis 1:24-25*)

This 'order of things' is ordained of the LORD God for the reproduction of the species, originally to populate the earth, and after the fall, to have successive generations. Physically, this is the only way it can be. Hence, by this design, there exists a male and female of each higher order of species. This is amply illustrated when the LORD commanded Noah to build the ark for the preservation of life during the Deluge.

And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female. Of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after his kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee, to keep them alive. (*Genesis 6:19-20*)

Thus, it is quite apparent that only another of the race of man, yet able to produce offspring with Adam, is necessary, as it is part of our physical design. Moreover, this "help meet" (help 'proper') must be complementary to Adam. This the LORD God knew in eternity past. Yet, the LORD did this exercise with Adam for two distinct and clear purposes:

1. To demonstrate to all, that though man shares a basic commonality with the animals, man is not an animal, but is far beyond the animals, being made in the image of God. ((There is a curiosity here. It pertains to the whole issue of using animals to justify human behavior, seeing that animals are not made in the image of God, but man is. Why is it that those promoting same-gender relationships cannot use reason to understand that man's iniquity and sin have adversely affected the animals as well? Just as man cannot reproduce using same-gender

relations, neither can the animals. The instances of such in nature are not endemic to any species and are prejudicial to the continuance of the species, just as it is with man.))

2. Adam has dominion over the earth. It is his. Hence, his first act of dominion is to name all creatures under his dominion. This is a basic right and prerogative of kingship.

Nonetheless, man is also subject to the limitations of the physical, and must fill the earth with his kind, and like the animals, produce successive generations. After the Fall, this becomes critical to the survival of the species of man, as Adam's generation will pass (death being introduced by the transgression of Adam), as will all successive generations. If no offspring are produced for only one generation, the species ceases to exist. Thus, the LORD God performs an act of procreation, that is, producing out of an existing kind. The following passage provides the detail of the event for our understanding of the order of things, that is, how they are to be.

And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; And the rib, which the LORD God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.
(Genesis 2:21-24)

Here we plainly see that the woman was formed out of the man, and thus shares all characteristics of being made in the image of God, being made out of a portion of the man. Genetically, this difference is expressed in that males have a Y chromosome, and females do not. Moreover, the woman being made out of the man, is not the dominant individual, though she

shares many characteristics which would allow her to become dominant. To this, the Scriptures speak expressly:

For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels. (*I Corinthians 11:8-10*)

And again:

But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. (*I Timothy 2:12-14*)

Hence, the woman fulfills several vital and important roles in the order of things, being formed expressly for the purpose of assisting Adam in the administration of the earth. Hence, this basic understanding also grasped, we should then understand the import of the command given to Adam by the LORD God:

So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. (*Genesis 1:27-28*)

Now, I have to ask, seeing the LORD God repeated this same command to Noah and his family:

And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. (*Genesis 9:1*)

How precisely do sodomites (same-gender intimate relations) fulfill the command of the LORD God to “be fruitful and multiply?”

Moreover, though the LORD God could have brought another male

out of Adam, He didn't. Why is that, seeing He knew that man would fall into iniquity and sin?

Doesn't this give rise to questions about turning over the order of things the LORD God set in place? Yes, I have read what you claim – that the Fall changed everything:

*“But not only are they all negative, from the traditional viewpoint, they gain broader meaning and coherence from the opening chapters of Genesis, in which God creates Adam and Eve, male and female. That was the original creation – before the fall, before sin entered the world. That was the way that things were supposed to be. And so according to this view, **if someone is gay, then their sexual orientation is a sign of the fall, a sign of human fallenness and brokenness.**”*

While you do not expressly state this in the above quote, you clarify what you mean later on in your presentation:

*“But that is not what we are talking about. **Gay people have a natural, permanent orientation toward those of the same sex; it's not something that they choose, and it's not something that they can change.** They aren't abandoning or rejecting heterosexuality—that's never an option for them to begin with.”*

Strange you should make that argument, seeing that it is manifestly impossible for procreation between those of the same gender to take place, either pre- or post-Fall. Even among the animals it does not happen that an entire species turns to same gender procreation. Since the LORD God reiterated the command to Noah and his sons after the Deluge, it is very apparent this command and decided order of things did not change with the Fall, but remained consistent and constant. Therefore, I will submit to you that what you claim as “natural” is actually an elective. There are an number of individuals who abandoned “same-sex orientation” when they

were actually born-again in Christ, the testimony of one of which can be found here:

[TESTIMONY FROM AN EX-GAY\[1\]](#)

This counters your argument in its entirety. Howsoever, what you interpret as 'natural and normal' is manifestly impossible for fulfilling the continuing command of the LORD God to "be fruitful and multiply." But I will remind you that "the natural man receiveth not the things of God..." (I Corinthians 2:14) and that the normal, default end of man is an eternity of suffering in Hell.

Nevertheless, when you argue that the LORD God is okay with you and others like you being engaged in sodomy, and that this 'way you are' is fine with Him, you are inasmuch as claiming that what you and others like you engage in is righteous:

*"Being different is no crime. **Being gay is not a sin.** And for a gay person to desire and pursue love and marriage and family is no more selfish or sinful than when a straight person desires and pursues the very same things."*

Hence, due to your argument, we need to look to the Scripture where the LORD God makes plain that He loves righteousness:

Thus saith the LORD, Let not the wise *man* glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty *man* glory in his might, let not the rich *man* glory in his riches: But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that **I am the LORD which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the LORD.** (Jeremiah 9:23-24)

Righteousness is defined in Scripture as the quality of being equal in all one's ways, as we find in Ezekiel 18:

Yet ye say, The way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel; **Is not my way equal? are not your ways**

unequal? When a righteous *man* turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die. Again, when the wicked *man* turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. Because he considereth, and turneth away from all his transgressions that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die. Yet saith the house of Israel, The way of the Lord is not equal. O house of Israel, **are not my ways equal? are not your ways unequal?** Therefore **I will judge you, O house of Israel, every one according to his ways,** saith the Lord GOD. Repent, and turn *yourselves* from all your transgressions; so **iniquity shall not be your ruin.** (Ezekiel 18:25-30)

And again in Ezekiel 33:

Yet the children of thy people say, The way of the Lord is not equal: but as for them, **their way is not equal.** When the righteous turneth from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, he shall even die thereby. But if the wicked turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby. **Yet ye say, The way of the Lord is not equal. O ye house of Israel, I will judge you every one after his ways.** (Ezekiel 33:17-20)

Note that the LORD God was accused of being unequal in His ways, and He countered that the people of Israel were indeed unequal in their ways. Moreover, the LORD would judge the people of Israel according to their ways (hence judging Israel itself), and He set forth that iniquity would be their ruin. By the close and immediate association of terms, it is clear that the quality of iniquity consists of being unequal in one's ways. Note here that the LORD does not state "doings" but "ways" which is the driver of "doing." In sum, the LORD is examining the motivation of the heart, not what someone does outwardly:

But the LORD said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: **for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart.** (*I Samuel 16:7*)

These things being the case, it is proper to ask you:

If everyone did what you are doing, what would be the result for the race of man?

If what you are doing is righteous, and springs from a righteous heart, then everyone ought to be able to do what you are doing with no ill effects to any individual, or the race of man as a whole.

Consider: If everyone engaged in same gender relationships, and this is equally valid as relations between a man and a woman, then men and men, and women and women exclusively ought to bring no harm to the race of man. After all, if it is righteous and equal, then everyone ought to be able to do it – and the next generation would come into being just like the current generation has.

But that won't happen, will it?

No, you choose rather to focus on the “suitable partner” aspect of the passage, ignoring what criteria might make up that “suitable partner” for Adam:

“And a woman is a suitable partner for the vast majority of men – for straight men. But for gay men, that isn't the case. For them, a woman is not a suitable partner. And in all of the ways that a woman is a suitable partner for straight men—for gay men, it's another gay man who is a suitable partner. And the same is true for lesbian women. For them, it is another lesbian woman who is a suitable partner.”

You also ignore a whole lot of other teaching contained in the passage as well. This is what makes what you have done fraudulent. There is much more teaching in the passage, particularly concerning the issue of a man and woman becoming “one flesh” in the eyes of the LORD, which is the integration of what was separated before the fall (Why did the LORD not make another man out of Adam – though He could have easily done so?). I will not get into in those other teachings this letter, but suffice to say, they will not support your supposition either.

Leviticus 18:22

You practiced intellectual dishonesty throughout your presentation, with one of the clearest examples being your interpretation of Leviticus 18:22:

Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination. (*Leviticus 18:22*)

You explained the application of the verse with the following:

*“In the Gospels, Jesus describes himself as the fulfillment of the Law, and in Romans 10:4, Paul writes “Christ is the end of the law.” Hebrews 8:13 states that the old covenant is now “obsolete,” because Christ is the basis of the new covenant, freeing Christians from the system of the Old Law, most of which was specific to the ancient Israelites, to their community and their unique worship practices. Christians have always regarded the Book of Leviticus, in particular, as being inapplicable to them in light of Christ’s fulfillment of the law. **So while it is true that Leviticus prohibits male same-sex relations, it also prohibits a vast array of other behaviors, activities, and foods that Christians have never regarded as being prohibited for them. For example, chapter 11 of Leviticus forbids the eating of pork, shrimp, and lobster, which the church does not consider to be a sin. Chapter 19 forbids planting two kinds of seed in the same field; wearing clothing woven of***

two types of material; and cutting the hair at the sides of one's head. Christians have never regarded any of these things to be sinful behaviors, because Christ's death on the cross liberated Christians from what Paul called the "yoke of slavery." We are not subject to the Old Law."

And you continue in the following paragraph further justifying your interpretation:

*"There are three main arguments that are made for this position. The first is the verses' immediate context: Leviticus 18 and 20 also prohibit adultery, incest, and bestiality, all of which continue to be regarded as sinful, and so homosexuality should be as well. But just 3 verses away from the prohibition of male same-sex relations, **in 18:19, sexual relations during a woman's menstrual period are also prohibited, and this, too, is called an "abomination" at the chapter's close. But this is not regarded as sinful behavior by Christians;** rather, it's seen as a limited matter of ceremonial cleanliness for the ancient Israelites."*

Allow me to address the first thing you mention, which is the fact that the book of Leviticus is a book largely dedicated to the ceremonial law. However, the scope of Leviticus is not limited to only the ceremonial law, but does address issues outside the covenant in places. One of those places is indeed chapter 18. For the sake of clarity, we need to examine the issue of what is an abomination with one passage immediately following another:

Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: **it is abomination**. (Leviticus 18:22)

These shall ye eat of all that *are* in the waters: whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers, them shall ye eat. And all that have not fins and scales in the seas, and in the rivers, of all that move in the

waters, and of any living thing which *is* in the waters, they shall be **an abomination unto you**: They shall be even **an abomination unto you**; ye shall not eat of their flesh, but **ye shall have their carcasses in abomination**. Whatsoever hath no fins nor scales in the waters, that shall be **an abomination unto you**. And these are they which **ye shall have in abomination** among the fowls; they shall not be eaten, they **are an abomination**: the eagle, and the ossifrage, and the ospray, And the vulture, and the kite after his kind; Every raven after his kind; And the owl, and the night hawk, and the cuckow, and the hawk after his kind, And the little owl, and the cormorant, and the great owl, And the swan, and the pelican, and the gier eagle, And the stork, the heron after her kind, and the lapwing, and the bat. All fowls that creep, going upon *all* four, shall be **an abomination unto you**. (*Leviticus 11:9-20*)

If you will note, in 18:22 the phrase "it is abomination." is used. But distinctively, in chapter 11 of Leviticus, the phrases "an abomination unto you" and "ye shall have in abomination" are used, with one time "are an abomination" being used clearly in the context of the children of Israel. What this plainly demonstrates is a difference in the scope of the commandment. While the words "unto you" clearly restrict the scope of the commandment, they are reinforced by the phrase "ye shall have in." which limits applicability to the children of Israel. Conversely, verse 22 of chapter 18 has no such restricting or qualifying language attached to the statement "it is abomination."

Hence, Leviticus 18:22, properly interpreted, is open-ended and unrestricted in its application. It applies to everyone, whether Jew or Gentile, regardless of time in history. We can find confirmation of this being the proper interpretation just a couple of verses further on in the chapter where it is plainly stated:

Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: **for in all**

these the nations are defiled which I cast out before you: And the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit any of these abominations; neither any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourneth among you: (For all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled;) That the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you. (*Leviticus 18:24-28*)

If it is, as you argue, that this proscription on behavior applies only to the children of Israel in the covenant, then please explain who the people were that the LORD God was casting out of the land so Israel could possess it? Please explain how the Canaanites defiled the land, if it is as you say, that these proscriptions only apply in the covenant, when the Canaanites are clearly Gentiles and not in covenant with the LORD?

I will submit to you that the LORD God held then, and still holds today, that sodomy is abomination. The reason for that assertion lies the previous evidence given and in the following two verses:

For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed. (*Malachi 3:6*)

And:

Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever. (*Hebrews 13:8*)

Moreover, you also claim the following as justification for your reasoning:

“in 18:19, sexual relations during a woman’s menstrual period are also prohibited, and this, too, is called an “abomination” at the chapter’s close. But this is not

regarded as sinful behavior by Christians;"

I will remind you of the following passage from Acts, which is extracted from a letter the Apostles wrote to the churches addressing the issue of the Law and its relationship to salvation:

For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you **no greater burden than these necessary things; That ye abstain** from meats offered to idols, and **from blood**, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well. (*Acts 15:28-29*)

Which came from their understanding of the covenant the LORD God made with Noah, which is still in force and effect:

And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth *upon* the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered. Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things. **But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.**(*Genesis 9:1-4*)

In your "interpretation" of things, you apparently have forgotten that what "other Christians" think is meaningless. Rather, what matters is what the LORD God states. He has plainly stated that profaning the blood is an offense to Him. Whether one eats blood, or lies with a woman in menses, the blood is being profaned and it is sin. Remember, that command fell under the auspices of "For all these abominations have the men of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled;" in Leviticus, chapter 18.

Conclusion

It occurs to me that you have fallen for the lies of both the

Devil and your own deceitful heart. You would do well to heed the implicit message of the following passage of Scripture:

The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it? I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings. (*Jeremiah 17:9-10*)

It is implicit in the above passage that our hearts lie to us. This is reinforced by the following from Proverbs:

He that trusteth in his own heart is a fool: but whoso walketh wisely, he shall be delivered. (*Proverb 28:26*)

You would also do well to understand that Satan is very good at putting thoughts into the minds of men, even those who truly belong to the Lord Jesus Christ:

From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. **But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan:** thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men. (*Matthew 16:21-23*)

And again:

And sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem. And when **his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them,** even as Elias did? But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, **Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.** (*Luke 9:52-55*)

Now, if Satan can adversely affect the minds of the apostles, and it is written that he takes the lost at his will:

And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all *men*, apt to teach, patient, In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will. (*II Timothy 2:24-26*)

Perhaps you should consider why it is that you think the way you do, and “feel” the way you do. How do you know what thoughts are yours? How do you know that what you feel is truly the way that it is?

I find it interesting that you have expended much effort to justify your position “biblically” and think you really need to do this. It reminds me of the following incident from Acts:

And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying: The same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, These men are the servants of the most high God, which shew unto us the way of salvation. And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour. (*Acts 16:16-18*)

Being a liar from the beginning, and the father of lies, Satan does not have a problem using someone to promote a false Christianity, and getting people to believe the LORD approves of those things which are an abomination to Him.

So I must ask: Where precisely do you stand? I really think you had better seriously consider where you are, because you are not standing in a good place.

In Christ,

Paul W. Davis