

LEGAL, NOT SANCTIFIED OR HOLY

Ed Dye

I. INTRODUCTION

1. We must recognize that something may be lawful or legal according to civil law and yet not be moral or scriptural. It may be legally right but morally and scripturally wrong; therefore, sinful and evil in God's sight.
2. In spite of the thinking of some, there is no way to take the sin out of things that are sinful, things that are contrary to the holy, righteous, perfect law of God.
3. Legalizing sinful practices does not take the sin out of them nor make that holy, pure, right or acceptable in God's sight no matter how wide spread or common the practice of them may become.
4. Our study of this matter will deal with two different phases of our subject.
 - a. The Biblical principle of the relationship between civil law and God's higher spiritual law.
 - b. Various examples of sinful things legalized by civil law.

II. DISCUSSION

A. FIRST, CONSIDER THE TRUE BIBLICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CIVIL LAW AND GOD'S HIGHER SPIRITUAL LAW.

1. Civil government and civil law are ordained of God, and demands our respect, support and obedience, Rom.13:1-7; 1Pet.2:13,14; Cf. Dan.4:28-32.
2. Though such is the case, when civil laws made by civil rulers conflict with God's higher spiritual law, we must respect and obey the latter, or "obey God rather than men," Ac.4:13-20; 5:17-29.
 - a. This explains why many Christians, men of faith, have died for their faith. See Rev.2:10,13; 12:11.
 - b. This also explains why many of God's faithful have suffered at the hands of evil civil rulers. Examples:

- (1) The Hebrew children and the king's food, Dan.1:8-20.
 - (2) The three Hebrew children in the fiery furnace, Dan.3:19-30.
 - (3) Daniel in the lion's den, Dan.6:16-28.
3. Next, we consider various examples where civil government has legalized sinful things in spite of God's higher spiritual law's condemnation of them as sinful – soul condemning!

B. CIVIL GOVERNMENT HAS LEGALIZED INTOXICANTS FOR GENERAL AND/OR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES.

1. This has been done in spite of the fact that the inspired Scriptures condemn such use.
 - a. Prov.20:1 and 23:29-35 contain strong, urgent warnings against such use of strong drink (i.e., intoxicating drink).
 - b. Isa.31:4,5 says that civil rulers err grievously through strong drink.
 - c. 1Pet.4:3 condemns every practice of its use from “drunken debauchery” to “social drinking” all in one verse.
 - (1) In this verse there is a **descent** or **degression** in the strength of **three words** used by Peter in reference to drinking intoxicants.
 - (2) The first word is “**oinophlugia**”, which is the original for “excess of wine” and refers to “**drunken debauchery**” according to recognized lexicographers.
 - (a) It refers to habitual intoxication, but to more than that; “it marks a step in advance of drunkenness (methe)” of Gal.5:21.
 - (b) Here it is the staggering, stumbling drunk, or one who even sleeps in his stupor, as the “wino” in the gutter.
 - (3) The second word is “**komos**” which is the original “**revellings**” and refers to a lesser degree of drunkenness than that of “excess of wine” or oinophlugia.
 - (a) Thayer, “...half-drunken...”

- (b) There is a level of drunkenness in **komos** or “revellings” which is distinguishable from *oinophlugia* or “excess of wine.”
 - (c) One who practices **komos** is a “live wire”; “he is the life of the party”; “he is flying high”; “he is feeling no pain.”
 - (d) He is intoxicated, but not so debauched as to miss all the fun.
 - (e) **Komos** combines intoxication with merry-making.
 - (1) “Wine, women and song” might be the modern way of saying or describing **komos**.
 - (2) “The happy hour” is another appropriate way.
- (4) The third word is “**potos**,” which is the original for “**banquetings**” and suggests the next level of drinking condemned and refers to “drinking parties” or drinking without reference to excessive amounts.
- (a) Be careful not to read that “drunken parties.” Drunken would be **komos** or **methe**, not **potos**.
 - (b) It is “tippling” or “sipping of intoxicants.”
 - (c) This might be your modern-day cocktail hour, party, or drinking or sipping of wine, or “have a few drinks with the boys,” or social drinking or moderate use of intoxicants in a social setting.
 - (d) H.A.W. Meyer, the great German exegete: “Chiefly applied to social drinking at the banquet.”
- (5) For emphasis, note that Peter condemns all three and classifies them as sinful and of the lust or sinful desires of the flesh, Vv.1-4. All three refer to things which Christians do not do.
- d. 1Tim.5:23 reveals one legitimate, scriptural, righteous use of strong drink – for medicinal purposes.

- e. When properly interpreted in context, neither 1Tim.3:3a, 8b; nor Tit.1:7c; nor Tit.2:3c; nor 1Pet.4:3b can be used as a proof text for social dinking.
 - (1) The expressions “not given to wine”; “not given to much wine”; and “excess of wine” do not prove only drunkenness, or drinking to excess, not moderate drinking, is condemned, or that “a little is fine or a little is approved by these expressions.”
 - (2) If so, then the expressions “not given to filthy lucre” in the same verses means “a little filthy lucre” (sordid gain; base gain; ill-gotten gain; questionable, dishonest money making) is also justified, just as long as it isn’t done to the excess, or as long as it isn’t “much”!
 - (3) If so, then the expression “excess of riot” of 1Pet.4:4 means “a little unbridled dissipation” is approved, just don’t do to the “excess” with it!
- 2. Legalizing intoxicants does not remove their sin, or their resulting shame and sorrow in the lives of people. Such as:
 - a. **Wasted money** – resulting in deprived families; man-hours, jobs, property and health loss, Prov.23:20,21; Isa.5:11.
 - b. **Lost manners** – the conduct of the drinker is often arrogant, uncouth, discourteous, boastful, loud, Dan.5; Psa.78:63.
 - c. **Destroyed morals** – drinking intoxicants loosens restraint and inhibitions; opens the door to all kinds of immorality, Dan.1:16-18; Amos 2:12; Prov.23:31-33.
 - d. **Damaged minds and bodies** – one’s judgment is often affected even by a few drinks; some have lost all mental faculties; bodies weakened and destroyed, Prov.23:35.
 - e. **Compromised modesty** – it causes one to say and do things one would be ashamed of under ordinary circumstances, because inner restraint and self-respect are weakened, Gen.9.
 - f. **Weakened manhood** – if pressured by peers to take that first drink, or weakened by friends to social drink, finally one may be a slave to the drug, Isa.28:1-8; Dan.1:5-16.
 - g. **Weakened motherhood** – can ill affect child before birth and leave it with life-long problems.

- h. **Murder and other crimes**—some drink to get courage to commit crime; it often leads to fits of anger and brawls resulting in bodily harm, even murder while under the influence; to say nothing of all the hazards of drunken driving.
- i. **Multiplied misery** – it multiplies the misery of the drinker who seeks escape from his misery by its use; it multiplies his trouble and sorrow; it causes multiplied misery to husbands, wives, children, parents, employers, employees, friends, society, state and nation.

C. CIVIL GOVERNMENT HAS LEGALIZED GAMBLING BUT CAN'T MAKE IT HOLY OR RIGHT.

- 1. “Gamble” defined.
 - a. Broadly, gamble is often defined to mean any game or any risk taking – not so used here.
 - (1) Gambling is more than taking a chance or doing something which involves a risk as some claim.
 - (2) Some say they see no harm or wrong in gambling because it is only taking a chance or a risk. After-all all life is is a chance or a risk. For we take chances in life every day.
 - (3) It’s true that driving an automobile, planting a crop, establishing a business, investing in stock, involve chance; but not one of these qualify in and of itself as gambling by definition.
 - b. Gambling is properly defined by various sources as follows:
 - (1) A specific category or game or risk causing illicit transfer of property: Put up money to entice others to put up money, in hope of taking their money without intending to provide them with any goods or services in exchange or in return.
 - (2) “To play games of chance for money or some other stake.” – Web. New World Dict. of American English, Third College Edition, pp.553.
 - (3) “To wager on a chance,” or “a wager made on the outcome of chance.”

- c. But gambling is even more than this.
 - (1) It is staking a chance at another's expense.
 - (2) And is the outward sign of the inward malady known and condemned as covetousness, which is a work of the flesh that will keep one out of the kingdom of God. See Gal.5:19-21. Also Eph.5:5; Col.3:5.
2. Legalizing gambling can be and is often done by civil authorities, but they can't sanctify it in God's sight nor remove the sinfulness of it.
- (Even though the Bible does not specifically mention it by name, it is a vice which is condemned by numerous scriptural principles.)
- a. It violates God's Law of Labor (Physical and Mental), and contradicts the work ethic established by God, where one actually earns the money he receives by time and energy expended, Gen.3:19; Eph.4:28a; 1Th.4:11,12; 2Th.3:7-12; 1Tim.5:18; Jas.5:4; Cf. 2Cor.11:8,9; 1Cor.9.
 - b. It violates the God-ordained, scriptural Law of Exchange in which a commodity is exchanged for its value in money or other valuables, such as practiced by the common business man. Cf. Ac.16:14; 18:3; Jas.4:13-15.
 - (1) In gambling the idea of something for nothing is the law of exchange; hence, it is sinful.
 - c. It violates the God-ordained, scriptural Law of Love, in which something is given out of love without any desire or expectation of receiving anything in return, Eph.4:28; Ac.20:33-35; 11:29,30; Rom.15:25-27; 1Cor.16:1-3; 2Cor.8:1-5; 9:1-15.
 - d. It is contrary to the very spirit of Christ and Christianity, Ac.20:33-35; Phil.2:3-5.
 - e. It is not an honest, just, pure, lovely thing to think on, Phil.4:8.
 - f. It demonstrates contempt for the "golden rule" of Mt.7:12, thus destroying brotherhood and brotherly love.
 - (1) The gambler practices the "iron rule" instead of the "golden rule."
 - (2) Cf. Mt.22:39; Rom.13:10.
 - g. It violates the principle of stewardship.

- (1) Christians are obligated to operate as good, faithful and wise stewards, Lk.12:42,43; 1Pet.4:10; 1Cor.4:2; 1Tim.6:17-19.
 - (2) We and all we possess belong to the Lord, to be used to his glory, Psa.24:1; 50:10-12; Hab.2:8.
 - (3) No one has the right to abuse the goodness of God and to foolishly risk that which is rightly his by the evil practice of gambling; nor to waste and squander one's possessions by riotous living as did the prodigal son, Lk.15:13.
- h. It erodes the power of self-control resulting in intemperance because it is highly addictive. See 1Cor.6:12.
- i. Gambling sets a bad example violating the principle of Christians being "the salt of the earth" and "the light of the world."
- (1) Christians must be concerned about their influence for truth and righteousness. Cf. Mt.5:13-16; Rom.1:18 (contradicting their profession by their conduct).
 - (2) Christians must provide things honest, not only in the sight of God, but also in the sight of all men, Rom.12:17; 2Cor.8:21; Cf. 1Tim.4:12.
 - (3) We must "given no occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully," 1Tim.5:14; Tit.2:5,10.
 - (4) Tertullian (160-220 A.D.) is reported to have said: "If you say you are a Christian when you are a dice player, you say what you are not, because you are a partner with the world."
- j. Gambling is a sin against society, for it is destructive of the very elements which are most desirable, and which make society stable – things such as respect for law and order.
- (1) Therefore gambling is a sin against God because whatever a man does that is a sin against himself or others is in reality a sin against God, Gen.39:9; 2Sam.12:13; Psa.51:4; Ac.5:1-4; 9:4.

D. LEGALIZED FORNICATION AND ADULTERY DOESN'T CHANGE THE SINFUL CHARACTER OF SUCH ACTS.

1. The Scriptures affirm that:
 - a. God will condemn fornicators and adulterers, Heb.13:4.
 - b. Adultery and fornication are works of the flesh and that those who practice such things “shall not inherit the kingdom of God,” Gal.5:19-21; 1Cor.6:9-11.
 - c. Sexual intercourse outside scriptural marriage is fornication, 1Cor.7:2.
 - d. Sexual intercourse between persons of the same sex is fornication, Jude 7.
 - e. Marriage to another while still bound to a living spouse constitutes living in adultery, Rom.7:1-3; Mt.19:9; Lk.16:18.
 - (1) Yes, one can live in fornication and adultery. See Col.3:5-7.
 - f. God hates divorce, Mal.2:16; permits is by the innocent party only for the cause of fornication on the part of the guilty party, Mt.19:9.
2. Though civil rulers have legalized “no fault” divorce and remarriage without violation of civil law, and even “living together” without benefit of marriage, such legalization doesn’t remove the sin and make it right in God’s sight.
 - a. Premarital sexual intercourse is sinful even if legal, 1Cor.7:2.
 - b. Permanent separation of husband and wife for various reasons is sinful even if legal, 1Cor.7:2-5.
 - c. Extra-marital sexual relations are immoral before God even legal, Prov.6:29,32; Heb.13:4.
 - d. “Living together,” what ever the purpose, without the benefit of scriptural marriage, even though it is legal and little or no social stigma attached to it, is still fornication in God’s sight, 1Cor.7:2.
3. Prostitution is sinful even if legalized.
4. Homosexual relations are sinful even if legalized, Jude 7.
 - a. Rom.1:21-29,32 associates homosexual sins with such things as:
 - (1) Being fools.
 - (2) Idolatry.
 - (3) Moral uncleanness.
 - (4) Dishonor to one’s own body.
 - (5) Vile affection.

- (6) That which is against nature or unnatural.
- (7) Unseemly conduct.
- (8) Fitting recompense of their error.
- (9) Not retaining God in their knowledge, or not acknowledging God.
- (10) God giving them over to a reprobate mind (a mind void of judgment).

E. LEGALIZING ABORTION ON DEMAND DOESN'T MAKE IT RIGHT IN GOD'S SIGHT – DOESN'T TAKE THE SIN OUT OF IT!

1. Prior to Jan.22, 1973, either procuring or performing an abortion, except for very limited and specific purposes:
 - a. Was illegal, unlawful or a criminal violation of civil law in this country.
 - b. Was sinful and evil because it was a violation of or a transgression of divine law – God's holy will; God's holy and righteous law.
2. On that date the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 7-2 decision, struck down state anti-abortion laws (Roe Vs Wade) and okayed abortion virtually on demand (Doe Vs Bolton).
3. On that date God's holy law didn't change and still regards abortion on demand as the unlawful, sinful taking of human life. For God still recognizes a living person while still in the mother's womb and that life begins at the moment of conception. **As proof take notice of:**
 - a. Gen.25:21,22, referring to Isaac and Rebekah.
 - (1) "His wife conceived," V.21.
 - (2) "The children struggled together within her," V.22 – the twins – two nations – Jacob and Esau, Vv.23,24.
 - (3) Upon conception there were children and then there was movement or life within her.
 - (4) The Hebrew word for children here is "ben" (bane) and is the same word in Gen.25:4 for Keturah and Abraham's born children: "and there were the children of Keturah"
 - (5) Thus these unborn children of Rebekah, wife of Isaac, merited the same designation as the born

children of Keturah, wife of Abraham, in Gen.25:4.

- (a) Therefore, if the one were children, so were the other.
- (6) Therefore, to have terminated her pregnancy by abortion would have been killing children, the same as killing the born children of Keturah would have been!
- b. Gen.38:24-30 – Tamar, daughter-in-law to Judah, “is with child” – V.24, three months.
- c. 2Kgs.19:3: “for the children are come to birth.” They were children before they were come to birth.
- d. Job 3:2,3: “And Job spake and said...(speaking of himself; i.e., of his own conception)...there was a man child conceived.”
 - (1) The Hebrew word translated “conceived” never means “born after a nine month pregnancy;” it always refers to the life of the fetus from the time of conception in the womb. See Gen.4:1,17; 16:4,5; 21:2; 25:21,22.
 - (2) Therefore, this text teaches that this fetus is considered by God to be a man, a child, and a human being made in the image of God while still in the womb, even at the point of conception!
- e. Psa.51:5, “...in sin did my mother conceive me.” When she conceived, she conceived David.
- f. Isa.44:24a: “Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb;” 49:5: “And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant;” Jer.1:4,5: “Then the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.
- g. Lk.1:36-44, Elizabeth and John: “she...conceived a son in her old age” – not just a piece of tissue!
 - (1) V.36, “this is the sixth month with her.”
 - (2) Vv.41,44, “the babe leaped in her womb,” V.41; “the babe leaped in my womb,” V.44.

- (3) The movement (leaped in the womb) indicates life before birth.
 - (4) He was called a “babe,” from the Greek **brephos**, which is defined as “a child; whether unborn, an embryo, fetus, Lk.1:41,44; or just born, an infant, Lk.2:12,16; Ac.7:19; or partly grown, Lk.18:15.” – Analytical Greek Lexicon, Bagster, p.73; Thayer, 105
 - (a) Lk.2:12: “Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in the manger.”
 - (b) Lk.2:16: “And they came with haste and found...the babe lying in a manger.”
 - (c) Lk.18:15: “And they brought unto him also infants (babes) that he would touch them.”
 - (d) Ac.7:19: “...so they cast out their young children (their babes).”
 - (5) Cf. Ac.7:17-19 with Exo.1:15,16 and see that if John’s parents had secured the services of an abortionist during her pregnancy, they would have been doing the same thing Pharaoh wanted to do in Exo.1:15,16 – i.e., kill or murder children – shed innocent blood.
- h. Psa.139:13-16.
- (1) “Thou has covered me in my mother’s womb.” Or I was covered in my mother’s womb, V.13.
 - (2) Note Vv.15,16:
 - (a) “My substance (strength or body) was not hid from thee.”
 - (b) “When I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth.”
 - (1) “Lowest parts of the earth” here is a Hebrew expression to describe the dark interior of the womb.
 - (c) David was regarded as having been a self even before he was conscious of himself.
 - (d) This is probably the most complete Biblical description of the growth of the fetus.
 - (e) by describing his fetal life with such words as “I” and “my,” the Psalmist shows the

human personality in every fetus who is conceived.

- (f) These verses stress the fact that the embryo, as he grows in the womb, is the product of the loving and mighty power of God.
 - (g) The Lord himself was at work even in the womb of the mother. So the fetus does not belong exclusively to the mother. He belongs to God, the giver of all life.
 - (h) Think of this when you think of abortion.
 - (i) Cf. Eccl.11:5: “As thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child: even so thou knowest not the works of God who maketh all.”
- i. For further proof there is life before birth and that life is human life, consider the oft used Bible expression “**with child**,” Gen.16:11; 19:36; 38:24,25; Exo.21:22,23; Isa.4:19; 2Sam.11:5; 2Kgs.8:12; 15:16; Eccl.11:5; Isa.26:17,18; Jer.30:6; 31:8; Hos.13:16; Amos 1:13; Mt.1:18-25; 24:19; Mk.13:17; Lk.2:5; 21:23; 1Th.5:3; Rev.12:2 – twenty one different passages.
- (1) “With child” is one of the most common expressions used in the Bible to describe a pregnant woman and that which dwells within her as a separate, independent human being.
 - (2) It is an expression used of women who have conceived:
 - (a) And are in the very early stage of pregnancy, 2Sam.11:5.
 - (b) And are at least 3 months pregnant, Gen.38:24,25.
 - (c) And are near the time of delivery, Exo.21:22,23; 1Th.5:3; Rev.12:2.
 - (d) But are not identified as to how far along they are, 2Kgs.8:12; 15:16; Eccl.11:5; Hos.13:16; Amos 1:3; Mt.1:18-25; 24:19; Mk.13:17; Lk.21:23.
 - (3) Therefore, the time factor in the life of the fetus is not that important; for the Bible is clear in its

proclamation that the fetus is a “**child**,” whether the fetus has just been conceived or whether the child has been in the womb several months.

- (4) By using the phrase “**with child**,” the Bible proves once and for all there is a “child” in the womb who is a separate and independent human being, and not simply a fetus that is only a piece of tissue or which is merely a part of the mother’s body.
 - (5) The Bible use of the expression “**with child**” leaves no doubt that God recognizes that with and in the mother’s body lives a human being – her child; that two lives are existing: a mother together with a child.
 - (a) With God it is always a child, a human being.
 - (b) With man:
 - (1) If it is wanted, it is child, a human being.
 - (2) If it is unwanted and to be aborted, it is just a fetus, only a piece of unwanted tissues.
 - (6) Always, in God’s sight the fetus is a live human being formed in the image of God, and is entitled to all the right to life that any other human being has.
 - (7) So the question is not, is there human life before birth? But do the mother and the doctor have the right, even if civil authorities legalize it, to take that life by abortion on demand?
- j. Therefore, what many people, in the name of civil law, so often call aborting a fetus, which they think of as no more than a glob of protoplasm or a piece of tissues, with no real, actual life, and therefore utterly expendable, God in his word calls “shedding innocent blood” or “murder” because it is “the unlawful taking of a human life;” the unlawful killing of a human being.
4. Legalizing abortion on demand does not remove the sin from the practice.
 - a. It is often done simply for the convenience of the parties involved with no regard to human life.

- b. It is often simply an attempt to cover up fornication, which results in adding sin to sin. Cf. Isa.30:1: “Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel, but not of me; and that cover with a covering, but not of my Spirit, that they may add sin to sin.”
 - c. Disregard for human life in one stage creates contempt for it in other stages – if we have contempt for life in the womb, and that’s what abortion on demand is – then perhaps contempt for it in old age; in the infirm; the permanently afflicted. If not, why not?
 - (1) Where do we draw the line?
 - (2) After all, life is life and respect for the sanctity of all human life is demanded by God. Cf. Gen.9:5,6; Exo.20:13; Mt.26:52.
5. We are not discussing or denying the choice of saving one life rather than losing two in a medical case, which rarely happens. Saving one life, when only one can be saved, is mercy –not murder!

F. SAME-SEX MARRIAGE, THOUGH LEGALIZED BY SOME CIVIL AUTHORITIES, IS NOT SCRIPTURAL NOR HONORABLE MARRIAGE.

- 1. Two states (Mass. and Calif.) have legalized same-sex marriage. In time, it’s possible all fifty will do so.
 - a. The forces behind and pressing the homosexual agenda are gaining ground, getting more political clout each year, with their influence being felt in more and more areas of our society.
- 2. But civil law changing marriage laws due to pressure from whatever source it may come doesn’t change nor alter in any way God’s unchangeable marriage laws ordained from the beginning of man’s earthly existence. Cf. Mt.19:3-6; Mk.10:2-9
- 3. Thus we shall compare man’s unauthorized tampering with God’s will in the matter of heaven’s marriage laws in order to demonstrate the sinfulness of the one and the holiness of the other.

II. DISCUSSION

A. THE UNCHANGEABLE, HOLY MARRIAGE LAW GOD ORDNED FROM THE BEGINNING.

1. God ordained the joining together of one **man** (a male) and one **woman** (a female) to become one flesh in marriage for life, Gen.2:18-24; Mt.19:3-6; Rom.7:1-3; 1Cor.7:39.
2. Man (both male and female) is a sexual being with holy sexual desires to be lawfully and scripturally fulfilled and satisfied as God ordained with partners of the opposite sex within, and only within, the bounds of scriptural marriage, 1Cor.7:2-5; Heb.13:4.
3. Marriage is not commanded or demanded of all or of anyone; neither is it forbidden of any one or any certain group. All men and women are free in God's sight to marry one of the opposite sex as long as they are free to marry; that is, as long as they are scripturally qualified to meet the conditions of God-ordained marriage. Cf. Mt.19:9; Rom.7:2,3; 1Cor.7:10,11; 7:39; 7:2.

B. HOMOSEXUAL RELATIONS OF ANY KIND, WHETHER CONTRARY TO CIVIL LAW OR RECOGNIZED BY CIVIL LAW, ARE CONDEMNED AS SINFUL, AN ABOMINATION IN GOD'S SIGHT

1. Under the law of Moses, Lev.18:22 declared: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is an abomination." Cf. 20:13.
 - a. Who can fail to see that same-sex sexual relationships are here condemned and classified as an abomination. See Prov.6:16 for abomination or hate.
 - b. Strong,8441: something disgusting, abhorred, hated, unlawful in God's sight.
 - c. Lev.18:23, the very next verse, as far as the sin involved, places homosexual behavior in the same category as bestiality, or having sex with animals.
 - d. God, of course, doesn't hate the homosexual who is the sinner; but he hates the sin they practice!
2. Both O.T. and N.T. identify homosexuality or same-sex sexual relations with the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah, in fact it is called "sodomy" for that reason.
 - a. O.T.: Gen.19:4-15; Gen.13:13; (Cf. Judg.19:2-25); Ezek.16:44-46.

- b. Jude 7.
 - (1) The sin of Sodom and Gomorrah is here identified as:
 - (a) “giving themselves over to fornication”
 - (b) “and going after strange flesh,” Cf. Lev.10:1 for “strange” or “unauthorized”
 - (c) They “are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire” because of their sin!
- c. Rom.1:26,27 declares homosexuality as a sin among sin “worthy of death.” See V.32.
 - (1) This N.T. passage declares the sin of homosexuality to be “against nature,” “unnatural,” and “unseemly.”
 - (2) “Against nature” means it is against or contrary to the regular law or order of nature, or what God ordained to be lawful in sexual relations between the sexes.
 - (3) “Leaving the natural use of the woman” in sexual relations is to leave that which is according to nature; it is to do that which is against nature.
 - (4) “Men with men working that which is unseemly”
 - (a) Strong, 808, “an indecency; shameful.”
 - (b) Thayer,82: “an unseemly deed; shame.”
- d. 1Tim.1:9,10 and 1Cor.6:9 teach that to practice homosexuality is to “defile themselves with mankind,” or to be “abusers of themselves with mankind,”
 - (1) Strong, 733: to “render oneself unholy, unclean.”
 - (2) Thayer, 75: “one who lies with a male as with a female, a sodomite, 1Cor.6:9; 1Tim.1:10.”
- e. Also, in 1Cor.6:9, used of males, even being “effeminate” is condemned as sinful.
 - (1) Strong, 3120: “a Catamite”
 - (2) Thayer, 387: MALADOS, “metaph. and in a bad sense: effeminate, of a catamite, a male who submits his body to unnatural lewdness, 1Cor.6:9.”
 - (3) Vine, II,19: “(b) metaphorically, in a bad sense, 1Cor.6:9, ‘effeminate,’ not simply of a male who practices forms of lewdness, but persons in

general, who are guilty of addictions of sins of the flesh.”

- (4) Web. Dict.: “1. A boy kept for homosexual practices; 2. the passive partner in sodomy.”

C. FROM 1COR.6:9-11 WE LEARN THAT THE HOMOSEXUAL, EVEN AS OTHER SINNERS, CAN BE FORGIVEN, WASHED, SANCTIFIED AND JUSTIFIED WHEN AND IF THEY TURN FROM THE PRACTICE OF THEIR SIN.

1. “Such **WERE** some of you, but...”
2. No one can continue in sin of any kind and be saved, forgiven, washed, sanctified or justified while still practicing the sin.
3. Repentance, a change of attitude toward, and a turning from the practice of sin, the sin, any and all sinful practices, is necessary, Lk.13:3,5; Ac.3:19; 2Cor.7:8-11.

D. YES, THE HOMOSEXUAL HAS HIS RIGHTS JUST LIKE ANY OTHER SINNER. HOMOSEXUALS HAVE THE RIGHT:

1. To know that their sin if unrepented of and ceased to be practiced will keep them out of heaven, 1Cor.6:9,10; Cf. Gal.5:19-21 (Jude 7).
2. To know they will suffer in their own bodies and personalities the consequences of their sin. Cf. Rom.1:26,27.
 - a. See Moses E. Lard and Bryan Vinson Commentaries.
3. To know God calls practicing homosexuals “dogs” because of their sins, Deut.23:17,19.
 - a. Strong, 3611: “a dog; hence (by euphemism) a male prostitute.”
4. To know their companions in marriage (their husband or wife) have a scriptural right to divorce them because of their sin leaving them, as the guilty party, with no scriptural right to marry another. Mt.19:9; Jude 7.
5. To know they were not born homosexuals, and that homosexuality is not to be accepted as a normal or an acceptable alternate lifestyle before the God of heaven, Rom.1:18-26; 1Cor.6:9-11; Gal.5:19-21; Heb.13:4.

6. To know that God didn't make them that way and then turn around and condemn them as sinners for being what he made them to be and for practicing what he doomed them to do!
7. To know that a homosexual lifestyle is not an irrevocable, fixed, hopeless situation, but a sinful way of life that can be changed by genuine faith and repentance and obedience to the gospel of Christ, 1Cor.6:9-11. Cf. Rom.1:18-27; 3:19-26; 1:16; 6:16-18.
8. To know they, like all sinners, have a Savior who died for them; that they have a right to hear, believe, repent, confess their faith in Christ, then to be baptized in his name for the remission of sins, Mk.16:15,16; Ac.2:36-38.
9. To know that even the angels in heaven, along with the saved here on earth who witness their action, rejoice when they repent and obey the gospel, Lk.15:7,10.

III. CONCLUSION

1. What should we do in view of the nation's decline seen in immoral people, leaders, and civil laws?
2. Should we collectively organize political programs for the local churches of Christ to work for change of laws and leaders? No! The church's mission and message is to convert lost souls with the gospel.
3. Should we as individual Christians make it our first priority in life to engage in political struggle, elect new leaders, organize protest campaigns, run for political office, and change laws? No!
 - a. Some may assign such meaning to Mt.5:13-16 (salt and light) and 13:31,33 (mustard seed, leaven). However, these passages refer to converting lost souls, not to possible subsequent social and political changes.
 - b. Political views and participation in political matters are not wrong, but not the Christian's first priority.
4. Child-like trust in God's providence over nations (Dan.4:25; Rev.1:8) is what we need, always. Saints must never be turned from the work of saving the lost, 1Tim.2:1-4.

5. We need always to “stand born of God” and spread the gospel message to a lost world seeking security and primary citizenship in heaven, Phil.3:20.
 - a. If the nation is salvaged it will be by elevation of moral fiber as a result of saved and changed individuals who make up the nation.
 - b. If the nation falls, no matter how terrible its destruction, by this means we will have saved our own soul and all who hear and obey.
 - c. As we strive toward heaven and to take others with us, we must honor civil government for it’s God-given purpose. But always honor God’s word above the laws of the land if and when those laws conflict with God’s holy law.