

**"Homosexuality," by Jack Crabtree, from MSC series "Love, Sex, and Marriage,"
May 31, 2005**

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/10-homosexuality/id539249466?i=117254344&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:

"The problem with trying to do a bible study on homosexuality is that there's really not a whole lot to say, other than to recognize that everywhere you turn in the Scriptures it is — homosexuality — is portrayed as one of the indications, one of the evidences, of the brokenness of human beings and the brokenness of our sexuality."

~ Jack Crabtree, 2005

1. The 1960's was the first time in world history that we really began to embrace homosexuality as something more than an aberration.
2. There's no way that we can look at the biblical perspective and come to any other conclusion other than that God intended sexuality for marriage and intended marriage to be between male and female. That's the only picture that the Bible knows, as far as I'm concerned.
3. There's something wrong in the human heart that takes us in the direction of homosexuality.
 - a. That's what Paul argues in Romans 1. He talks about the "degradation" into which we have fallen — and specifies homosexuality. And it's not that homosexuality is the lowest point of degradation; Paul uses the example of homosexuality because it's the most *obvious*, not the *lowest*. It's not the lowest.

It's simply wrong.

b. The problem with messing with sexuality is that you have biology against you.

4. We see what God has intended by looking at natural laws.

a. Incest is clearly wrong. But if you stop to ask the question, "Why is incest wrong?", it's very hard to come up with an argument. So just because you can't say *why* something is wrong doesn't mean it's *right*.

(RLS: This is a funny point, because I vividly remember when Jack explicitly argued around this same time period that incest is not *inherently* wrong.)

b. "I may not be able to come up with an air-tight convincing case for why homosexuality is wrong, but *that* it is wrong seems completely clear to me from nature and the Bible."

c. But let me speculate about why, according to the Bible, homosexuality is a problem.

- * Sexuality is *for* marriage.

- * Marriage is the given, sexuality is meant to serve marriage.

- * Male and female were created to enter together into marriage.

- * Marriage is *two* people.

- * Marriage is two *different* people — and that's the key to understanding why homosexuality is wrong. The most profound and far-reaching difference is between male and female. We are two different creatures. We perceive the world differently, we react to the world differently, etc. The difference between male and female is more profoundly different than race and culture when it comes to communication and relationships.

- * Marriage is supposed to be a profound commitment between two people that are *that* radically different — as different as male and female.

- * Homosexual marriage is "marriage-lite," marriage without the difficulties and challenges that God intended for it.

d. Jack insinuates that gay men "opt" for homosexuality because connecting with females is "just too hard" for them. And God *did* intend marriage to be "profoundly hard."

e. Being gay comes down to, "having the sex I want, without the challenges of a relationship."

f. Jack rejects that homosexuals are just "born that way," and that that means they can engage in homosexual acts. That's not what the Bible says. It never

says, "Because you are sexual, therefore, don't let anyone keep you from having sex."

5. Sex is a "tool" God gave us for the purpose of being "the language of marriage." "If there is no context in which to affirm a relationship, then there's no function for sexual intimacy in my life. And then the Bible's perspective is, Don't. Don't practice sexual intimacy if there's no purpose for it in your life."

a. If celibacy is required for an unmarried heterosexual Christian, then why isn't celibacy required for an unmarried homosexual Christian?

6. Homosexuality isn't immutable.

a. (Race as an example ["black people"] this time, rather than left-handed — as examples of what homosexuality is not.)

b. I read a book by a radical lesbian feminist Marxist something or other, called Exploding the Gene Myth, I highly recumbent you read it. She's hardly a Christian... But she was desperately afraid that the argument being made by the homosexual culture was going to backfire on them. ...Oh I didn't mention, she was a geneticist by profession...

(RLS: This is completely untrue. "Exploding the Gene Myth" was written by not by a radical activist but a respected geneticist, Ruth Hubbard. Furthermore, she was not a lesbian. She was married twice, both to men. Her argument is also quite different from how Jack portrays it. A quick Google search will reveal these basic facts that Jack gets wrong:

- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ruth_Hubbard
- <https://www.kirkusreviews.com/book-reviews/ruth-hubbard/exploding-the-gene-myth/>
- <http://www.amazon.com/Exploding-Gene-Myth-Information-Manipulated/dp/0807004316>
- <http://www.solidarity-us.org/site/node/2412>)

c. Her concern was that America would turn on gays and "eliminate the genes." She wanted to make the case how "It couldn't possibly be genetic." "The bottom lines is that genes don't do nothing. They just make proteins."

e. Another book that I just picked up recently... Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth. This guy is a psychiatrist.

(RLS: Satinover from NARTH? Seriously? Again, let's do a quick Google search:

- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeffrey_Satinover
- <http://www.amazon.com/Homosexuality-Politics-Truth-Jeffrey->

Satinover/dp/080105625X

- <https://www.truthwinsout.org/opinion/2009/11/4813/>

f. APA changing DSM had "nothing to do with science"

g. "If homosexuality is indeed biologically determined (and I do mean determined, such that we have no choice in the matter), if homosexuality is indeed biologically determined — then I think that's a challenge to the whole biblical worldview. I don't think we can have it both ways. The Bible's just flat out wrong if homosexuality is biologically determined. We'd have to rethink everything about our faith."

h. "The other problem today is that it's just becoming cool."

i. (Bi-sexuality once again is a challenge to homosexuality movement, to Jack. It's his trump card yet again.)

Concluding thought: To what extent is sexuality a tool and to what extent is it for our recreation? That's going to be the biggest challenge people are going to face, making that decision.

Notable Q&A:

Audience Q: "God could make someone a sinner, even predisposed to a certain type of sin, but that wouldn't challenge my worldview."

Jack's A: "What I'm saying is that people *do* have a choice in the matter [e.g., whether they're gay]."

Jack argues that the predisposition towards same-sex attraction in itself is a sin, like the man who commits adultery "in his heart."