

## Top Ten Excuses to Excuse Homosexuality

---

### 1. WE ARE BORN THIS WAY

The appeal to homosexual birthright is a gross error that removes human sexuality from the moral realm. The effort to legitimize homosexual acts based on inborn tendencies is plainly a hostile take-over of the very foundation of the ethical standards of our nation. The moral question must not be ignored or all of society will soon sink to levels we never intended or even thought possible.

We live in a fallen world and we are fallen creatures. It is incorrect to say, “God made me this way, therefore, it must be right.” Just because we may have certain inborn desires is no reason to declare these desires a gift from God. Inborn dispositions are no excuse to declare something right. Many people have the inborn urge to steal things that belong to others. Common moral law tells us that stealing is wrong. Behavior must be addressed on moral grounds. The homosexual activists have stymied our nation on this point because few people will address the moral issue.

Also, lost in this discussion is the fact that many people with same-sex urges have been able to change their inmost desires with the help of others who have found change possible. The fact that many have left the homosexual lifestyle is curiously absent from the debate. Below is a partial list of resources that are available to help people who wish a change in their behavior:

<a href="http://joedallas.com">joedallas.com</a>	<a href="http://exodus-international.org">exodus-international.org</a>	<a href="http://jonahweb.org">jonahweb.org</a>
<a href="http://lovewonout.com">lovewonout.com</a>	<a href="http://syrogers.com">syrogers.com</a>	<a href="http://desertstream.org">desertstream.org</a>
<a href="http://pfox.org">pfox.org</a>	<a href="http://drthrockmorton.com">drthrockmorton.com</a>	<a href="http://narth.com">narth.com</a>
<a href="http://oneby1.org">oneby1.org</a>	<a href="http://venusmagazine.org">venusmagazine.org</a>	<a href="http://livingstonesministry.org">livingstonesministry.org</a>
<a href="http://TheEvidenceMinistry.org">TheEvidenceMinistry.org</a>	<a href="http://gaytostraight.org">gaytostraight.org</a>	<a href="http://loveinaction.org">loveinaction.org</a>

Homosexual activists do not want morality to be addressed. Our nation needs to wake up to the moral side of this debate or the safe boundaries of the expression of human sexuality will crumble. Also, missing from the debate are the testimonies of the many people who have escaped the homosexual lifestyle. Don't be fooled by the “we are born this way” excuse.

### 2. THE BIBLE CONDONES SLAVERY

Don't blame God for this fallen world. Slavery was practiced by every people group in the ancient world. Slavery was a way of life and business as usual for the whole world. Slavery was just one in a multitude of institutions representing fallen humanity. Therefore, it is in the context of redemption that God placed specific laws and limits on slavery. These stipulations on slavery in no way meant that God approved of slavery, but more that God was adding humane decrees into an already sinful human culture. Correction would come in time.

Skeptics fail to consider the fact that people have free will. Suppose God simply gave a decree ending all of the cultural ramifications due to sin. Who would obey? God could speak from heaven and command all evil to cease. Who would obey? No one would listen, just like few listen today. We live in a fallen world.

God's plan of redemption was to be worked out in the context of human history and in the context of human time. The evil aspects of slavery would disappear through change in human nature working through culture in the context of the gospel of Jesus Christ. As we look over the span of human history we see that it was the force of the Judeo-Christian ethic that made abolition of slavery possible. The abolition of slavery is a concrete example of God's redemptive plan working itself into human history slowly over time.

Furthermore, the word "slavery" must be defined. There were many types of slavery. There were no governmental welfare programs like we have today. People could sell themselves as a slave to repay debt. A person could opt for slavery simply as a means of survival and to be assured of food and shelter. It is a mistake to take the evil institution that we know as American slavery and superimpose that idea onto the biblical text.

God placed many limits on slavery. Hebrew slaves were to be set free after six years and all slaves freed on the year of Jubilee (every 50<sup>th</sup> year). God's word pronounced the death penalty for capturing people for the purpose of making them slaves (Exodus 21:16). Slave traders were condemned in the New Testament (1 Timothy 1:10; Revelation 18:13). In Paul's letter to Philemon he makes a plea to a slave owner to show love to a runaway slave and that he be treated as a dear brother. Such an appeal would be impossible without the radical work of the gospel.

Ultimately, the evil human concept of slavery is completely reversed by the God's plan of redemption. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave or free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28). The Bible does not approve of slavery, but merely recognizes the reality of slavery (along with the reality of sin). Do not be fooled by "the Bible condones slavery" excuse.

### 3. SODOM WAS CONDEMNED FOR INHOSPITALITY NOT HOMOSEXUALITY

Ezekiel 16:49-50 mentions the condemnation of Sodom in terms of social sins, not homosexual behavior. What is overlooked in this approach is that there is a phrase used that very adamantly refers to immoral acts. In verse 50, God states that "they did detestable things before me." The word has also been translated as "abomination." This same word is used to describe same-sex relations in Leviticus 18. It can be argued that homosexual acts are included under this term in Ezekiel 16.

Sodom's claim to fame was its immorality. "Now the men of Sodom were wicked and were sinning greatly against the LORD" (Genesis 13:13). God's angels visited Sodom as recorded in Genesis 19 and then God destroyed the city. However, God had already decided to judge the people of Sodom before there was any "inhospitable" interaction with the angelic visitors. Genesis 18 has the account of Abraham's intercession for the city which dramatically proves this point.

Furthermore, there are references to the immorality of the people of Sodom in the New Testament. The Apostle Peter mentions the men of Sodom as living “...filthy lives...” (2 Peter 2:8). Jude 7 refers to the citizens of Sodom and Gomorrah as a living lives of “sexual immorality and perversion.” Even non-biblical writings have references to the character of Sodom. The book of Jubilees speaks of the men of Sodom as being “unclean” (16:6) and the book of 3 Maccabees mentions Sodom as being “notorious for their vices” (2:5).

The use of one questionable portion of Scripture to justify an already universally condemned sinful act should sound the alarm that something other than an honest search for the truth is taking place. One verse of Scripture should not be used to cancel the clear teaching of the Bible taken as a whole. Don't be fooled by the “not homosexual acts, but inhospitality” excuse.

#### 4. JESUS SAID NOTHING ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY

This argument is like the little child being scolded by a parent for playing in the street and then arguing back, “You said not to play in the street, but you said nothing about the center median!” The argument is nonsense. The argument is an insult. The argument is childish and irresponsible.

Jesus did not lay down the law concerning every conceivable human behavior. The biblical warrant against same sex relations is clearly taught all through Scripture. Jesus said that not the least stroke of the pen will disappear from the law until all things were fulfilled (Matthew 5:18). Jesus represented the whole law.

When Jesus was asked about marriage he upheld God's design and intent for human sexuality and marriage. Jesus referred all the way back to creation itself. He began his answer with, “Haven't you read...?” (In other words, “Where have you been?”) “Haven't you read that at the beginning the Creator ‘made them male and female,’ and said, ‘For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh’? So they are no longer two, but one. Therefore what God has joined together, let man not separate” (Matthew 19:4-6).

Jesus added his own emphasis to the creation account by giving the command that we are not to separate what God has ordained. The homosexual activists are doing just that. They are like the little child sneaking across the street to play in the tree-lined median as a way to countermand a clear command of a parent not to play in the street. Don't be fooled by the “Jesus said nothing about homosexuality” excuse.

#### 5. NO ONE IS HURT BY SAME SEX MARRIAGE

This argument bypasses the most important issue as to whether or not homosexual behavior is moral in the first place. We may as well be asked, “Where may I spend the money I have just stolen?” There are no moral grounds to ask this question. Are we to legitimate thievery? I don't think so. Therefore, the person asking about the stolen money has no moral authority to have the question answered until the larger question of thievery is addressed first.

If we ignore the moral principles behind the historical aversion to homosexual behavior and grant the privilege of “marriage” we will be abandoning the Judeo-Christian moral foundation of our nation. It will be replaced with the moral foundation based on the convenience of humanism. A quick survey of human history should reveal to us where that inevitably leads. This is not about religion, but about common sense, decency and historical precedent.

“Who is hurt by same sex marriage?” is a mirage and an illusion. It is a trick question. We are led to believe that no one is hurt by sexual immorality. The case record and historical evidence in all of human history proves otherwise. Don’t be fooled by the “no one is hurt by same-sex marriage” excuse.

## 6. IT IS HOMOPHOBIC TO OPPOSE HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIORS

The homosexual community wants a free pass from opposition. Name calling is used as a weapon to hide behind rather than presenting credible arguments. Here are some examples we hear often: INTOLERANCE (in other words) “You have no right to oppose us.” HATE (in other words) “You have no right to oppose us.” PHOBIA (in other words) “You have no right to oppose us.” BIGOT (in other words) “You have no right to oppose us.” By name calling, anyone who happens to disagree with the agenda set forth by the homosexual activists become labeled as being intolerant, hateful, phobic (sick in the head) and bigoted.

Phobia is the Greek word for fear. People with a phobia have an irrational fear that prohibits them from functioning normally. The homosexual community wants a free pass from opposition, yet they will bully the rest of society with name calling. In perfect Orwellian double-speak, dissenters are labeled as having a phobia. Open and honest debate is feared. The homosexual activists do not want debate, but rather a hostile take-over. They are the ones with a phobia. Perhaps they are truth-phobic.

It is homophobic to remain silent. The value of an argument can be measured by the amount of name-calling used to bolster the argument – the weaker the argument, the more name calling. Every time you hear those who object to homosexual behavior being labeled as homophobic there should be the sound of a loud gong to mark yet another round of name calling. Don’t be fooled by the “homophobic” excuse.

## 7. HETEROSEXUAL DIVORCE RATE NULLIFIES ANTI-GAY MARRIAGE STANCE

Standards regarding marriage are there for a reason. They set a standard. We don’t jettison standards simply because they are broken. Shall we get rid of the laws regarding speed limits on our freeways because there are speeders among us? If we transfer the logic of the homosexual activists onto our freeways then our freeways will become death traps. Some people will fall short of the standard for marriage, but the standard remains.

Furthermore, without certain guidelines there would be no measure for correction. If we lower the standard it will affect all of society, not just marriage. It will affect the moral standards in all areas of society. What is to stop us from lowering the standard more and more as time progresses? The Judeo-Christian ethic is the only standard that transcends culture and allows for correction.

If the protective barriers are removed and the fences of protection are destroyed, then there will be no precedent left to stop the next assault on moral standards. And there WILL be another assault. We will have given away any moral authority to halt further deterioration of the Judeo-Christian ethic that has been the foundation of this nation. Our children will be left to fend for themselves as the government yields its responsibility to act in the best interest of its most vulnerable members. The precedent of 4,000 years of the Judeo-Christian ethic carries infinitely more weight than the precedent of a few years of social rebellion.

The Judeo-Christian ethic has the power to protect, to preserve and to bring correction to a society. The new social ethic of the rebellion lacks the power to protect or preserve and the chances for correction spiral ever downward. Don't be fooled by the "divorce rate" excuse.

## 8. IT'S ALL ABOUT LOVE

Love must be defined. Is it love to tell vulnerable people that they are born with something that cannot be changed? Is it love for a government to pass laws forcing the majority of its citizens to accept behavior that has been commonly held as immoral since the dawn of civilization? Laws not only proscribe, but laws also describe, that is: laws teach. Is it love to proscribe and teach immorality to our children? Is it love to nullify the Judeo-Christian ethic that has been the foundation of this nation and that has served as a powerful corrective for every social ill? Is it love to replace an ethical standard that has stood the test of time and replace it with an ethic based on convenience and that could collapse around us at a moment's notice?

Love requires that decisions be based on the greater good. All we have to do is to look back 30 years to see how much we have fallen, and continue, to fall. Love also demands that we must project into the future to see where we might be heading. Once certain decisions are made they are difficult to reverse. Then other decisions must follow based on precedent. It is no exaggeration to say that, in view of the current trends, there is trouble ahead if true love – for the greater good of all society – is not addressed.

People who love each other can still do bad things. A father and a daughter might love each other, but that would not justify incest. A man or woman may love someone other than their spouse, but that would not justify adultery. Behavior is not justified by love, but by moral principle. Don't be fooled by the "love" excuse.

## 9. IT'S ABOUT EQUAL RIGHTS

The appeal to homosexual birthright is a gross error that removes human sexuality from the moral realm. Once homosexual behavior is cut loose from the arena of right and wrong the next logical step is to declare it as a right. Rights must be protected. Laws must be passed to protect rights. Suddenly, anyone questioning the moral principles behind homosexual activity becomes eligible for censure by the law. It will become illegal to teach our children otherwise. This will be extremely harmful to our children and all of society. Those holding to the Judeo-Christian ethical standards will be forced to accept blatant immorality or suffer the consequences.

The homosexual community is not a suffering minority. They are not kept from voting. They have equal housing. They have all of Hollywood pulling for them. They are not poor and down-trodden. If they are granted the rights for which they are lobbying they will be receiving special rights, not equal rights. The legal implications for those opposed on moral grounds will be devastating. It's not about rights, but about debasing the moral foundation of our nation. Don't be fooled by the "equal rights" excuse.

## 10. THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS SIN – WE ARE A LAW UNTO OURSELVES

Adolf Hitler did not like having any laws telling him what to do. The transcendent Judeo-Christian moral laws troubled him the most. Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf*, "With the appearance of Christianity the first spiritual terror entered into the far freer ancient world."<sup>1</sup> Once he freed Germany from the moral terror and restrictions of the Judeo-Christian ethic he began to solve the "Jewish problem." After the war he promised to solve the "church problem."

He wrote *Mein Kampf* in 1924. It took only ten years for his ideas to unhinge a nation from its foundations. What Adolf Hitler was able to do during his reign has been a cultural puzzle to many people. How could a whole nation be so easily swayed into gross error? The answer is simple: once the "terror of the transcendent" (as Hitler labeled the Judeo-Christian moral ethic) is removed, the rest is history.

The homosexual activists are terrified by the transcendent Judeo-Christian ethic. They will do all they can to keep this point from being considered. The most dangerous message in this hostile moral take-over is that underneath it all is the unspoken truth that we as a nation must no longer desire the transcendent moral laws of the Judeo-Christian ethic. Once this is accomplished there is nowhere to go but down. C. S. Lewis wrote an essay on the nature of morals and the concept of natural law which are founded upon transcendent biblically-based ethics. He said that history shows us that once a nation steps outside traditional morality the power gained has never been used for good. The title of his essay is "The Abolition of Man." If we do not fight this war currently being waged the moral foundation of our nation we will prove him right.

<sup>1</sup> Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, tr. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1943) p. 454.