

STRAIGHT TALK ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY

September 21, 2014

Lufkin Civic Center

Max Dawson

(Please note that I have not inserted the text of Scripture into this document. I only give the references that I used in my lecture at the Lufkin Civic Center. I will leave it up to the reader to view the texts for himself. This document is essentially the same as was presented on September 21, 2015.)

INTRODUCTION

Almost everyone has an opinion or view about homosexuality—for or against. Yet, lots of folks are only repeating what they have heard others say without really exploring the evidence that would show why this is right or wrong.

Like many of you, I come to this discussion with a view about homosexual behavior. I want you to know that I bring five things to this discussion.

1. I come with a belief that there is such a thing as right and wrong, and that we can know the difference.
2. I come believing that right and wrong are determined by an ultimate and external standard. By ultimate, I mean there is no greater authority than this standard. By external, I mean apart from man himself. I believe that standard to be God, through His special revelation, the Bible.
3. I come with a belief that words have meaning. We cannot make the Bible mean just anything we want. Yet, for a long time that has been the consistent practice of much of the religious world. We cannot twist the words of the Bible to make them say what they do not say.
4. I come with a determination to stand with Jesus, [Mark 8:38](#). I am unashamed of the teaching of Jesus—the teaching of the Bible. We dare not shrink back out of fear or cowardice and refuse to say what God says about any issue. I stand with Jesus and hope you do too.
5. I come to this discussion determined to be honest with the issue. I hope you do the same. If you do not accept the Bible as the final and authoritative revelation from God, you may not like my presentation. If you say you do accept the Bible, you still may not like my presentation. But, regardless, I hope you will find that I am honest in dealing with God's book.

I begin with a quote from Phil Robertson.

“Our culture has accepted two huge lies. The first is that if you disagree with someone’s lifestyle, you must fear them or hate them. The second is that to love someone means that you agree with everything they believe or do. Both are nonsense.”

These lies have led to the use of terms like homophobia and homo-hatred. I present as evidence *After the Ball* (Doubleday, Kirk and Madsen, 1989. This book is out of print but a copy can be purchased [as

of September 21, 2015] at Amazon.com for about \$175.) The cover of this book has the following subtitle: *How America Will Conquer Its Fear And Hatred Of Gays In The 90s*. This book promotes name-calling against those who have convictions that homosexuality is not right before God.

I would assure you that I am a believer in the Bible, and that I hate no one and love all people. Furthermore, I have no fear of any person who practices homosexuality. And, I have compassion toward those with whom I disagree. I genuinely care about those who live contrary to God's standards. I am compassionate without compromising my convictions.

With that said, let us proceed.

OUR CULTURE HAS UNDERGONE A SIGNIFICANT TRANSFORMATION

Some folks may think that change in American culture came with Joe Biden's declaration that he was in favor of same-sex marriage, or Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan saying he was in favor of it, followed by President Obama's declaration that he had evolved to that point.

Rather than this being something that has just come lately, a re-education of America has been underway for some time.

After the Ball sets forth a three-point plan to transform modern culture to approve of homosexuality.

1. *Desensitization*: The process of getting Americans used to seeing homosexuals in everyday life as normal, ordinary people. Our culture would be inundated with "a continuous flood of gay-related advertising, presented in the least offensive way possible."
2. *Jamming*: A psychological method where they make those who oppose homosexuality appear to be bigots—as haters and fear-mongers. They would make those persons look bad before others and make them feel bad about themselves with emotions like shame, sympathy, or empathy.
3. *Conversion*: To get Americans to see homosexuality as being no different than heterosexuality. They said that they wanted "conversion of the average American's emotions, mind and will, through a planned psychological attack, in the form of propaganda fed to the nation via the media."

While it is not within the scope of this presentation to address those three techniques in any detail, those three points have been followed meticulously with the help of the media, education and government. They have been successful in fundamentally transforming American thinking to the point that our nation now *officially* condones homosexual behavior. (See addendum for more information.)

Add to this, the fact that America has gone through a long-term decline in morality. By that I mean a turning away from what the Bible says about marriage and the bounds of sexual activity.

Some things that have contributed to this slow but steady rejection of Bible morality are pre-marital sex, adultery, divorce for any cause, unlawful remarriage and cohabitation. It is not just that these things are done, but that they are approved by more and more people. When you consider that all of these are an attack on God's standards regarding sexual conduct, the approval of homosexual behavior was only a short step for people to take.

Thus, in less than one generation, homosexuality has gone from being viewed as a perversion, to an alternate lifestyle choice, to a product of genetics that is even approved by God.

I would remind us all that our children and grandchildren will inherit an American culture that is very different from what you and I may have experienced. I cannot overemphasize that God wants our children to be taught the truth!

WHAT IS WRONG WITH HOMOSEXUALITY?

In answering that question, I will not make emotional arguments that are designed to prejudice anyone. As an example, I will not say to the homosexual, "Your mother would be so ashamed of your conduct." While, indeed, his mother might be ashamed, that proves nothing with respect to right or wrong.

Instead of emotions, I appeal to the facts. This is a fact-based presentation. I appeal to the facts God has given in His standard for mankind: the Bible. We will examine the facts about homosexuality that are found in the Bible.

As we look at the Bible, it is worthy of note that there was a time when those who practiced homosexuality typically openly rejected the Bible as a standard for living, as a standard for determining right and wrong. They knew the Bible condemned their activities and made no pretense or claim to follow it. They had a vocal bias and prejudice against God's Book. This, however, was a poor tactic if they wanted a "Bible-believing" culture to accept homosexuality.

Changing their tactics, they introduced a new prejudice. Claiming now that the Bible is on their side and supports their position. The new prejudice and bias is against the proper use of the Bible. Instead of careful study to learn what God says, they revise the meaning of all the verses that condemn homosexual behavior. And they strongly argue against those who demand that the Bible be treated with the dignity and careful study it deserves. Plainly said, they twist the Scriptures, and argue against those who respect the Scriptures.

It is my duty to do three things:

1. To examine with *fairness* the passages that address homosexuality.
2. To listen to the *objections* made by those who would justify homosexuality.
3. To show the *fallacies* inherent in their arguments.

The objections I will address are from a number of sources, much of which has come from a movie entitled *Fish Out of Water*, a clever production that attempts to show that there is no condemnation of homosexuality in the Bible, and that the Bible would actually approve of such activity. The movie interviewed supposed Bible believers.

Bible teaching shows homosexual behavior is in conflict with God's will. All Bible dispensations show homosexuality deviates from God's standard. We begin with the beginning.

In the beginning—heterosexual marriage is revealed as the norm.

The Patriarchal Age (before the Law of Moses, and well before the gospel was given) began with God revealing His standard for mankind, Genesis 1:26-27; 2:24. God created mankind to be heterosexual, a man and his wife, male and female. This is the natural order and natural state of humanity.

Objection: "Genesis 1-2 only shows God's procreational purposes for heterosexuals. But it does not condemn homosexuality. Since homosexuality was not specifically condemned, it is therefore allowed."

Answered: By this logic all sexual behaviors outside of married heterosexuality could be justified: homosexuality, bestiality, pedophilia and other deviations would be permitted because they are not specifically condemned in the beginning.

That "proves" what most homosexuals don't want to prove. That logic "proves" too much. And what proves too much, proves nothing! God's arrangement from the beginning does indeed condemn homosexuality if you understand that Genesis 1-2 reveal an exclusive arrangement—man and wife. That was the norm, the standard from the beginning.

There is a significant principle of logic that must be considered here when we talk about "proving" something. Whatever argument is made in favor of homosexual conduct, can equally be applied to other forms of deviant behavior. By whatever door someone brings in homosexual conduct, things like bestiality and pederasty come in by that same door.

In the Mosaic Age—God declared that homosexuality was an abomination.

In a chapter addressing laws of sexual morality, God said it was an abomination, Leviticus 18:22. The entire chapter is about violations of God's sexual order. See also Leviticus 20:13.

Objection: "This regulation was only for the Jews under the Law of Moses." (This is an argument made by informed objectors who understand that the Law of Moses ended at the cross.)

Answered: Remember, Leviticus 18 addressed a variety of sexual sins. Were those a sin *only for the Jews under the Law of Moses*? I use these texts *primarily* to show that under every dispensation God teaches homosexuality is sinful. And thus, we go to the Gospel Age.

In the Gospel Age—God declared that homosexual behavior will keep a person from heaven.

Paul addresses a number of sins in 1 Corinthians 6:9-10. By the way, all of the things in this text are sinful. We do not merely focus on homosexuality, though some people may make that mistake! Further, this text uses two terms for homosexual conduct—one passive, the other more aggressive.

Objection: “1 Corinthians 6 is a reflection of two things. (1) Paul’s personal bias against homosexuals. (2) The bias of first-century culture against homosexual activity.”

Answered: Paul wrote what the Lord commanded (1 Corinthians 14:37). Those who try to defend homosexuality while claiming to believe the Bible deny the inspiration of the Scriptures in saying this is bias from Paul.

As to cultural bias, first century culture was rampant with homosexuality—and paganism approved of it!

While we have shown that in all three Bible ages homosexuality was disapproved, there are other arguments from the Bible that we must yet address. One of those is found at Sodom.

The cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were condemned because of sexual immorality.

Genesis 18 and 19 tell the sordid story (this again, was during the Patriarchal Age). The two visitors to the city of Sodom were sought by the men of the city for immoral purposes, Genesis 19:4-5. Lot had invited the two visitors into his house. The sordid story that follows is one of terrible sin. Lot tried to save his two visitors by the awful act of offering his two daughters to this wicked rabble. After fleeing from the city—and its destruction—Lot’s daughters committed incest with their father. Sin upon sin, but the city was destroyed because of sexual immorality. Those men who tried to assault the two visitors wanted to engage in homosexuality with them. The text is clear.

Objection: “Rather than homosexuality being condemned, it was rape, non-consensual sex that was wrong. And you people don’t condemn the actions of Lot and his daughters. And beyond that, the real sin was lack of hospitality to the visitors of the city.”

Really? Who can believe it? That is the argument made by religious teachers in “Fish out of Water.”

Answered: Hospitality was not at issue. Lot had already provided hospitality for the men by inviting them into his house. And do you believe God destroys whole cities because people fail to offer hospitality?

Secondly, I would understand that Lot did wrong by offering his daughters.

The daughters did wrong by committing incest with their father. We excuse no sin! From those incestuous relations came the two nations of Moab and Ammon.

Jude 7 dispels that the sin of Sodom was inhospitality. It was sexual immorality!

(A special note might be added here: Some point to [Ezekiel 16](#) in an attempt to identify the sin of Sodom as “pride,” “idleness,” and a failure to help the “poor and needy” [verse 48-50]. A careful study of this text will reveal that it may not even be the literal city of Sodom under consideration, but rather the two nations that came from Lot’s daughters—namely Moab and Ammon. That seems to be the case from [Ezekiel 16:53](#), where it appears that God speaks of how captives of Sodom would return to their land. [Jeremiah 48:47](#) and [Jeremiah 49:6](#) speak of the return of Moab and Ammon following the Babylonian Captivity. That’s when Cyrus would allow captive peoples to go home. However you might look at [Ezekiel 16](#), remember that [Jude 7](#) identifies the sin of Sodom!)

Let’s return to the New Testament.

Paul uses strong terms to condemn homosexual behavior.

Read [Romans 1:24-28 \(NKJV\)](#). As Paul speaks of homosexual conduct, He uses terms like “unclean-ness, dishonor, lie, vile passions, against nature, leaving natural use, shameful, and debased mind.” How could it possibly be plainer? What stronger language could be used? Yet, objections are made.

Objection: “This text only condemns behavior that is against nature. But for the homosexual this is not against nature. For him it is natural.” Also, “This only condemns the acts of homosexuality that was associated with idolatry. Idolatry was the real issue.”

Answered: The larger context speaks of those who reject God, who “suppress the truth in unrighteous-ness.” See [Romans 1:18](#). This may well describe some in the homosexual movement; they do not want the real truth to be known—that homosexuality is against God’s will. They suppress the truth by twisting the Scriptures to make them say what they do not say.

And if this is really about what is “natural for the homosexual,” and thus he is approved, is it also about what is natural for murderers, malicious haters—and that is allowed? See [Romans 1:28-32](#) where Paul lists a large number of other sins.

And if this really is only about condemning homosexuality related to idolatry, are all the others sins condemned only when they are related to idolatry? (See verses 29-31.) That “proves” more than most homosexuals want to prove. And what proves too much, proves nothing. By whatever door this move-ment brings in approval of homosexuality through the use of [Romans 1](#), the approval of all these other sins comes in by the same door.

ATTEMPTS TO USE THE BIBLE TO JUSTIFY HOMOSEXUAL CONDUCT

An argument is made from Matthew 7:1.

Argument: “Jesus said, ‘Judge not,’ so you have no right to judge another’s conduct. All judging should be left to God.”

Answered: This fallacious argument has been repeated over and over by professed Bible believers to condemn all judging. It is an erroneous argument. In context, Jesus condemns harsh, hypocritical judging (Matthew 7:2-6). In context, Jesus actually requires judging (Matthew 7:15-20). We are required to make judgments about false teachers, ravenous wolves. See also John 7:24 where Jesus demands that we judge--righteously!

An argument is made from Matthew 22:37-39.

Argument: “Jesus only gave two commands: ‘love God and love your neighbor.’ God never condemned any loving relationship. Thus, there is no basis for condemning loving homosexual conduct.”

A sub-argument is also made to this: “Passages condemning homosexual conduct are about uncontrolled lust or violence—not about loving relationships.”

Answered: Jesus did not give only two commands. Rather, these two, “loving God and loving your neighbor,” are the fundamental commands upon which all others hang (Matthew 22:40). Furthermore, God defines how those two commands are to be obeyed. That’s what the rest of the New Testament revelation is about—how to love God and love your neighbor.

It should also be noted that this perverse logic of the homosexual movement would allow any kind of sexual behavior—as long as it was “controlled and loving.” Would it allow bestiality, pederasty or pedophilia? Unfortunately, some would say yes.

A generic argument is made from the silence of Jesus.

Argument: “Jesus never condemned homosexuality. So it is wrong for you to condemn it.”

Answered: The Old Testament condemned homosexual conduct; and Jesus endorsed the Old Testament (Matthew 5:17-18). Jesus affirmed heterosexual marriage (Matthew 19:4-6). He made it clear that marriage was to be between a man and a woman, a male and a female—that relationship excludes other kinds of sexual interaction; it is an exclusive relationship.

There are many sins that Jesus did not directly condemn; however, His apostles addressed those sins (1 Corinthians 6:9-10; Romans 1:24-28). To argue against those passages because they are “not in the red,” or that Jesus did not personally utter them, denies inspiration (2 Timothy 3:16-17).

Remember also, that Jesus did not speak directly about pedophilia or bestiality. Would someone say then that we cannot condemn those sins? Once more, whatever arguments are used to justify homosexual practices will justify these other practices also.

An argument is made in the form of a charge against Bible-believers.

Argument: “Only bigoted, insensitive people oppose homosexuality; they are haters and fear-mongers.”

Answered: Christians should neither be bigoted nor insensitive. This is not really an argument; it is only name-calling. Opposition on biblical grounds does not make a person a bigot.

Would you charge someone with bigotry or hatred if they spoke against the sinful conduct of “drunkards” or “pedophiles”?

Furthermore, those who truly follow Jesus are sensitive and compassionate toward all people, because Jesus makes us that way.

Approval of homosexuality is argued from genetics.

Argument: “I am a homosexual because I was born that way. Just like you were born as a heterosexual, God made me a homosexual.”

Answered: First, it seems inconsistent with the character of God to make people homosexuals and then order that they be executed for doing what God made them to do (Leviticus 20:13).

Second, though claims are made that there may be a “gay gene,” the definitive proof of that appears to be lacking. But, let us assume for a moment that a person seems to have an inclination toward one of the same sex. Would that be the same as someone who seems to have an inclination toward sex with children; is he too “born that way”? If not, why not?

Once again, what proves too much, proves nothing. Would that be the same as a man who has an inclination toward many women; that is, he is not satisfied with one woman in a monogamous marriage; is he too “born that way”?

Whatever may be said about our inclinations and desires, God expects us to control our passions; that is the point of Romans 1:18-32; 1 Corinthians 6:9-11; Colossians 3:5-6.

HOW SHOULD CHRISTIANS RESPOND TO HOMOSEXUALS?

Like all people, homosexuals are in need of the gospel.

In the context where homosexual conduct is condemned in Romans 1:18-32, the apostle talks about the need for salvation on the part of all people, Romans 1:16-17. God—through His gospel—has the power to save and to make a man righteous.

In the context of 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, where God says homosexuals, adulterers and drunkards will not go to heaven, is found a text that teaches deliverance, 1 Corinthians 6:11. Paul actually knew these people because he had preached in their very city, Acts 18:8.

In the context of 1 Timothy 1:9-10, where the conduct of sodomites is condemned along with murder and kidnapping, there is offered the very real hope of salvation through Jesus Christ, 1 Timothy 1:15.

With these passages in mind, Christians recognize that the practicing homosexual is just like we ourselves once were, in that he needs to repent and find salvation in Jesus Christ. We are all part of the sin problem. We are all in need of Jesus Christ.

We, then, following the example of our Master, minister to sinners, Matthew 9:10-13.

Rather than shunning the homosexual, we reach out to him, just like we do to the adulterer, the drinker or the thief. We reach out, just like someone reached out to us.

Some people think they are taking a powerful, biblical stand when they refuse to speak to the homosexual. They will not shake his hand or even acknowledge his presence. They will “have nothing to do with those kinds of people.” That is not a biblical stand at all. And that is not standing with Jesus!

While we do not just pal around with them and keep silent about their sin, we treat them as those in need of the gospel. We do not hate them or personally fear them.

We are compassionate toward them knowing that they are sheep without a shepherd (Matthew 9:35-38). Thus, we treat them the same as Jesus treated sinners.

Our goal is not merely to denounce sin, but to deliver the sinner.

Philip Strong said: “It is easy to tell someone they are wrong—if you don’t care whether or not they become right.”

We care because we follow Jesus. We care because we stand with Jesus. We care because the love of Jesus has turned so many of us away from the degradation of our own sins. We care. We seek the deliverance of the sinner. We stand with Jesus.

CONCLUSION

As we draw to a close we remind ourselves of the statement from Phil Robertson.

“Our culture has accepted two huge lies. The first is that if you disagree with someone’s lifestyle, you must fear them or hate them. The second is that to love someone means that you agree with everything they believe or do. Both are nonsense.”

No one is justified in leaving this place tonight saying that fear or hatred was preached. Tonight, you have heard the truth preached in love. You have heard compassion without fear.

I am convinced that there are people in this audience tonight who need to stand with Jesus. Perhaps your life has even been marked and scarred by the kind of conduct we have talked about tonight. You need to know that Jesus invites all men to come to Him through faith, repentance and baptism. (See John 8:24; Luke 13:3; Mark 16:15-16; Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16; 1 Corinthians 6:9-11.)

I will close my part of tonight's event with a prayer, but I will remind you that I am willing to talk to you about your salvation after we are dismissed. Others are also ready to study with you.

Prayer.

ADDENDUM ONE: *A Brief Timeline of the Homosexual Movement*

There has been a steady progression of how people, laws, and our society view homosexuality and same-sex marriage. Consider some of these major events.

1. The Stonewall Riot. On June 28, 1969 police raided the Stonewall Inn, which was a popular gay bar in Greenwich Village, and a "handful of long-suffering New York drag queens, tired of homophobic police harassment picked up rocks and bottles and fought back." A few days later, *The Village Voice* proclaimed, "(gay) liberation is under way."
2. The American Psychological Association considered homosexuality a mental disorder until 1973. The World Health Organization removed the label in 1990.
3. In 1986, the Supreme Court ruled that the "right to privacy" applied to intimate, marital relations but specifically did not apply to intimate, homosexual relationships. This ruling upheld the rights of states to pass and uphold laws prohibiting homoerotic activity, such as sodomy.
4. The ruling from 1986 was overturned by a 5-4 decision by the Supreme Court in 2003. A year later, Massachusetts became the first state to legalize same-sex marriage.
5. In 1996, only 27% of the U. S. population supported same-sex marriage. That same year, President Bill Clinton signed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA). That law instructed all parts of the federal government to only recognize a marriage between a man and a woman. In 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down Section 3 of DOMA as being unconstitutional, and public approval for same-sex marriage jumped to 53% of the population, including 73% of 18-29 year olds.
6. The death of Matthew Shepard. Shepard was a homosexual and was killed in 1998 near Laramie Wyoming. Since he was a homosexual, the heinous attack was widely reported. This tragic event brought national attention to the gay rights movement and to hate crime laws.
7. In 2015 the Supreme Court of the United States issues a ruling that all states must recognize homosexual marriage.

ADDENDUM TWO: *After the Ball*

This is the book that moved America and fundamentally transformed our culture. Its full title is “*After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90’s*” (Doubleday, 1989, Authors: Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen).

This book reshaped how gays would help others view homosexuality. The changes in law didn’t happen by accident. Today, more and more people view homosexuality as “no big deal” or “an alternative lifestyle choice” or even that it is related to genetics. America’s current view of homosexuality was powerfully impacted by this book, though most people have never heard of it.

Authors Kirk and Madsen believed that the gay movement had failed. They said “practically everything so far done by gays to better their lot, though done with honesty and dedication, has been done incorrectly.” So they decided to offer another approach. They set out to make Americans see homosexuality as a normal way to live life. They said, “We’re fighting for a tomorrow in which it simply doesn’t occur to anyone that there’s anything more unusual about being gay than about preferring praline ice cream to double Dutch chocolate...”

The authors believed that many were uninformed about gays partially due to what they had seen in movies, media, etc. They believed that as long as the “limp-wristed,” feminized gay man or “male-hating,” homely lesbian stereotypes persisted, straight America would never see gays as productive members of society and would never come to their defense. They set out to get people to believe that gays don’t choose their feelings any more than heterosexuals do, and that their love is just as sincere and valid.

They wanted to dismantle all legal restrictions on sexual behavior between consenting adults, especially anti-sodomy laws. All discrimination against gays must be made illegal instead, including “all efforts to keep gays from speaking, fraternizing, organizing, working in the jobs and residing in the neighborhoods they would choose, marrying and acquiring property together, and parenting children.” And they also wanted to make sure that all vocal disapproval of gays would be eliminated from the public square. So how would they do all of this? They proposed three methods: Desensitization, Jamming, and Conversion.

1. **Desensitization:** This would be accomplished by providing a continuous flood of gay-related advertising, presented in the least offensive fashion possible. (pages 148-150)
2. **Jamming:** A psychological method where they would stop those who were bigots with competing emotions like shame, sympathy, or empathy. (pages 150-153)
3. **Conversion:** They wanted Americans to see homosexuality as being no different than heterosexuality. They said that they wanted “conversion of the average American’s emotions, mind and will,

through a planned psychological attack, in the form of propaganda fed to the nation via the media.”
(pages 153-157)

In *After the Ball*, Kirk and Madsen laid out eight rules to guide these strategies.

1. Gays had to improve their communication skills.
2. They needed to target skeptics.
3. They needed to talk about gayness until the issue became tiresome.
4. They needed to stay focused and on topic.
5. They needed to portray gays as victims of both circumstance (born this way) and discrimination (hatred from bigots).
6. Potential protectors needed a cause.
7. They needed to make gays look good.
8. Connect those who oppose gays with the villains of history.

These methods have been used to perfection. What we see in America in 2015 is the result of the effective use of these techniques.

Below is a cover shot of *After the Ball*.

