

**"Homosexuality," from Jack Crabtree, MSC series "Sodom and Sexual Purity,"
February 25, 2003**

Outline by R.L. Stollar, May 10, 2014

Outline notes:

- You can download and/or listen to this presentation for free via Gutenberg College's iTunes account: <https://itunes.apple.com/us/podcast/08-homosexuality/id556066017?i=119763857&mt=2>
- This is an outline of Jack's thoughts alone. I do not endorse the ideas contained herein. Any personal commentary by my own person is prefaced with "RLS."
- Direct quotations by Jack are marked by "". The rest are personal paraphrases, in which I strove to be as accurate as possible.
- I believe the universal use of the phrase "homosexual" through this presentation and outline is derogatory; however, I am keeping it to give an accurate statement of Jack's language and ideas.

Presentation Outline:

*"I would treat [gay people] just like any other human sinner... They're not weird. They're just human beings."
~ Jack Crabtree, 2003*

1. Jack begins by talking about a conversation he had with "two lesbians" over a ballot measure to ban same-sex marriage. Jack says it didn't go over well when he said to them that it was far more important to him that the laws of our land define homosexuality as perverse than that we deny homosexual people rights.
 - a. "To me, to call homosexuality perverse is, ok, yeah, right. But I call lots of things perverse. Lying is perverse. [etc] Our whole lives are a perversity."
 - b. "To call something perverse is fairly ordinary, fairly mundane."
 - c. "The whole idea...to call homosexuality perverse has been lost today."
2. Homosexuality has always been there, even in times of tremendous moral virtue.
 - a. Many of the Greek city states had laws on the books against homosexuality.
 - b. In the modern world, we used to take it for granted that homosexuality was

immoral until...

i) The modern world was persuaded that homosexuals were genetically determined to be homosexual

"It no more significant to be oriented towards a member of the safe sex as it was to be left-handed." If that is true, it would be "cruel" and "bigoted" to discriminate. But "if we're just a matter of natural forces determine... where do we get off calling anything wrong?"

ii) The 60's sexual revolution ultimately overthrew any moral restraints on sexuality. "The freedom they wanted was freedom from morality." (Jack mentions the "how could anything that feels so good be so wrong" song from the 60's.) But still, back then, sex and love went together. You should still have sex in the context of relationships.

iii) "We have rejected the whole idea that anything in the cosmos is teleological."

- "It used to be common place in the ancient world, it has been common place through Christian philosophy," etc., "to think of the universe as operating as a structure that's been designed."
- Today, philosophically, our culture has abandoned that. Today there's no structure or purpose to our sexuality. "All we are are the animals we are and we can do whatever we want with our sexuality. There's no right or wrong... It's all valid and it's all ok."
- Sex has been converted into a drug, a form of recreation, that is completely and totally disconnected from relationship. Having sex with someone because you love them has become old-fashioned.

3. The widespread practice of bisexuality "gives the lie to" the idea of a "gay gene." "What is there, a third gene?" It is about choice, individual choice. "We do what we want to do."

4. What is the truth?

a. Christianity is true, the Bible is true, and the biblical perspective on homosexuality is true, and that is:

"It is indeed a perversion of what the designer of human sexuality intended."

b. Natural law is a valid perspective.

i) We are able to take certain cues from nature and know what God

intended just by looking at the structure of nature itself. We can learn something from human sexuality simply by studying the nature of human sexuality.

ii) Nature suggests heterosexuality is intended, and homosexuality is an aberration that does not fit with nature.

c. Sexuality is something that needs to be restrained for moral reasons (which has implications not just for homosexuality, but all of our sexuality).

i) Biblical case:

Leviticus 18:22

Leviticus 20:13

ii) Rejects temple prostitution/idolatry interpretation

"It is as clear as possibly as they could make it [in the Leviticus passages]."

iii) Rejects rejecting Mosaic covenant, e.g., "eating pigs and all kinds of stuff"

"We have to look at each prohibition and make a determination *why* something is prohibited."

iv) Well, murder isn't just cultural. So 3 tests:

First, we "just know," as rational human beings, what is natural and good. One way of determining morality — a litmus test — is "do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Second, we can draw conclusions from natural law -- like, is it unnatural?

We can determine God's morality via human anatomy and human physiology is that God had something very specific in mind for human sexuality. It's intended for reproduction on the one hand, and it's very distinctive and different from animal sexuality . Everything about our anatomy suggests man and woman were made for each other.

Third, how did the New Testament look at it?

The apostles don't say the homosexuality prohibition was just for the Jews. They *affirm* and *ratify* the prohibition in two passages:

Romans 1:26-27

1 Corinthians 6:9

"Homosexuals will not inherit the kingdom of God."

Paul even appeals to the natural law argument in Romans.

5. Often homosexuals will anecdotally say, "I cannot remember a time in my life when I was not attracted to members of the same sex." What they're trying to argue is, "This is natural *to me*." Behind that is the assumption that, "it's in my genes, don't be a bigot."

a. "The problem with that kind of evidence is, turn that to other things in our lives. I can't remember a time in my life when I wasn't a liar and a thief. I mean, can you back far enough when you wouldn't be tempted to steal that which wasn't yours?" etc. Don't both of those things come as naturally to us as anything else?

b. So I'm not sure what this is supposed to prove. It either proves that it's natural for me to be a homosexual, or that you've been perverse for as long as you can remember.

6. Distinctions between male homosexuality and female homosexuality:

a. Back in the beginning of the homosexual movement, "what drove male homosexuality was very different than what drove female homosexuality."

b. This evidence for the fact that males and females experience their sexuality differently.

c. Lesbian homosexuality was pretty much about relationships. It tended to be monogamous, long-term, downplayed the actual physicality of sexuality. Male homosexuality on the other hand was not long-term at all, it was incredibly promiscuous, the sex was anonymous, you didn't know your partners, 'cuz it wasn't about people, relationships, or connecting with another human being; it was about nothing other than the drug of sexual pleasure, the drug high.

d. That seems to be changing. This is particularly the impact of pornography in our culture. Everyone, male and female, are becoming more sexualized.

e. "Lesbianism is becoming less monogamous and less long-term" because of pornography.

7. What's the antidote to this "problem"? Two things we need to learn:

- a. The truth about the nature and purpose of human sexuality. Know it and believe it against all the mythology and lies coming at us everyday.
- b. Foster self-control. Even "the pagans of the ancient world" understood self-control. "I'm not an animal." We have impulses within us that are "animal-like," and thus just having an impulse doesn't mean something is good. We must ask, "Is this a rational behavior? And is it in line with what God wants me to be?"

Final thought: "[The sexual revolution] puts into perspective homosexual sin. I think it really is true that earlier in our culture homosexuals were looked on as — you know, I think the sting of the word 'perverse' for people, when they feel the sting of that, is it somehow implies to them 'sub-human' or you know different in some kind of way...so we need to get off our moral high horse and not look down on homosexuality as somehow a greater, graver, more heinous sin than the rest of them. The fact of the matter is, no, it's not more heinous than any other sin. It's just one more manifestation of our rebellion against God, our rebellion against truth, our rebellion against everything good. But it's just one more manifestation. But, but so is my self-centeredness and so is my pride and so is my self-righteousness and so is all that other garbage in my life. So I'm no better off than they are. We're all in need of the mercy of God. And I really need to be clear about that. So to try to raise that question and try to blunt the edge of the self-righteousness and hypocrisy with which much of Christian society has met homosexuality is one of the good things that have come out of this."

Notable Q&A:

Audience Q about a Christian celibate lesbian married couple with a five year old daughter. "How do you respond to people like that, where they acknowledge that the sex is wrong but not the relationship?"

Jack's A: "Hm. Wow. And... ok. It's difficult to answer that. It's difficult to know at what level they might be confused there. Um. The fact that they *choose* to define it as a kind of marital relationship suggests to me that it probably ultimately is wrong. It's to their credit that they've had enough scruples to make it not a sexual relationship, assuming that's true... But nonetheless it seems to me that part of this natural law and this revelation of the Scriptures means that they're rebelling against the Scriptures, is in fact a rebellion in itself. But I don't know what kind of pain is behind... There's a lot of pain in lesbianism that lies behind that."

Audience Q: How should Christians treat homosexuals and lesbians?

Jack's A: "I would treat them just like any other human sinner... They're not

weird. They're just human beings."

Audience Q: "Would it be ok to vote yes on these measures [to give rights to LGBT* people]? ...I want to see them get their rights. Would that be ok?"

Jack's A: "Well I think you could make a case for it. My problem with those measures is... I really don't have a problem if you mercifully want to grant health insurance to another person... there's no merit in punishing people for their rebellious choices against God... the real problem for me is that laws have a tendency to validate things... So that's why I'd vote no, just for the symbolic reality of those things. Not to punish anyone or hurt them."

After an Audience Q about whether to ostracize a gay brother, Jack condemns shunning or ostracizing people who "go the wrong way." You can gain "social conformity" by making the consequences so painful, but then all you get is "conformity" and not "sanctification."

Jack: "It speaks more and better to go ahead and love them and be silent about their choice."