

Homosexual Marriages Part One of Four – Protestant Gender Hypocrisy

(9.20.14)

A friend who as an educator found himself challenged with the statement: “I am a homosexual, this is how God made me.”

Grace Community International conforms to the uncompromising Biblical teaching that there are only two genders – male and female, and that there is only one normal, acceptable and God-created sexual attraction – that between a male and a female. That all other sexual attractions, whether acted upon or not, are not only sinful but depraved in nature. As such, we reject as sin active homosexual behavior, so-called celibate homosexuals, so-called bi-sexual behavior and transgender or cross-dressing. GCI will not allow anyone to teach, to serve or to hold a position of fellowship in our ministry who deviates from the clear Biblical standard by embracing, participating or condoning any of the aforementioned behavior. GCI will not knowingly minister or co-labor with any church or ministry that does not share this Biblical standard.

I. Scriptural Gender Hypocrisy

The problem the church faces on this issue is that, in the modern protestant, charismatic and Pentecostal churches, their opposition to homosexuality and homosexual marriages simply comes across as arbitrary and mean-spirited to the homosexual community, the liberal religious community and the secularists. This is because of their own inconsistency and hypocrisy in applying gender-specific passages of Scripture to their own heterosexual community.

What I mean by this is that the modern Protestant church (and especially Pentecostal, charismatic and para-church movements) have arbitrarily abandoned heterosexual gender distinctions and roles based on culture. Passages concerning gender distinctions in appearance and clothing have long been discarded. (Example: 1 Corinthians 11:14-15 “Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her? For her hair is given to her for a covering.”) Gender distinctions in roles in the family are either openly discarded, explained away by “cultural context” or simply ignored. (Example: Ephesians 5:24 “But as the church is subject to Christ, so also the wives ought to be to their husbands in everything.”) Gender roles in the church have either been openly discarded or are slowly being encroached upon. (Example: 1 Timothy 2:12 “But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet.”) None of the compromises in these areas have been done by a deeper study and exposition of Scripture. They have been accomplished by subjecting clear Scripture to culture and psychology. The teachers simply say that these passages and others were given because of the cultural and historical circumstances of the time of their writing and are not meant to be imposed upon the modern, 21st century Church. They do this with no Biblical authority which links Holy

Scripture to the passage of time. They do this with no Biblical authority which explains Holy Scripture in this area as specifically linked to the immediate circumstances of the passage. Rather they do this out of their own desire to free heterosexuals in the church from these Biblical constraints and to make the 21st century church more acceptable to 21st century western culture.

Having submitted heterosexual gender standards and roles to culture, they now want to enforce literally, across time and culture, all passages dealing with homo-sexual gender roles.

For instance, in I Corinthians 6:9 God condemns both homo-sexuality and the feminization of men in dress and action: "Or do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals,".

You will find evangelicals using this passage to condemn homosexual behavior, transgender behavior among men, homosexual marriages and more. Yet in the very same book of the Bible, written to the same church in the exact same context of culture and time, you find a heterosexual passage which is simply set aside by the modern church: 1 Corinthians 11:8-9 "For man does not originate from woman, but woman from man; for indeed man was not created for the woman's sake, but woman for the man's sake." And 1 Corinthians 11:14-15 "Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her? For her hair is given to her for a covering." These passages are just two of a number of passages in I Corinthians dealing with heterosexual marriage, divorce, heterosexual roles and appearance which are routinely explained away by the evangelical church, while holding staunchly to the literal interpretation and enforcement of passages dealing with homosexuals in the same book of the Bible.

As such, modern evangelicals come across to the secularists and liberals as mean-spirited, arbitrary and bigoted. The evangelical Church will not be able to do this. They cannot at mid-point arbitrarily submit all homosexual gender roles and standards to a literal Biblical interpretation, while freeing heterosexuals in standards of dress, appearance, behavior and roles on the bases of the passage of time and the advancements of culture. Both heterosexual gender standards and homosexual gender standards take place in the context of Scripture in identical periods of time and culture. They are either all literal or they are all free from a literal interpretation on the basis of culture. We cannot arbitrarily select out and exclude heterosexuals while, at the same time, requiring homosexuals to submit to gender-specific passages.

II. Three illustrations of this

- A. Para-church organizations: It has long been the practice of para-church ministries of allowing women to teach and exercise authority over men. This

includes classroom instruction of pastors and ministers in Bible colleges and seminaries. This includes conference speakers and small group leaders – not only of laypeople but of staff in the various organizations. It is not uncommon in so-called conservative para-church organizations for women to not only teach men but also to supervise and lead them spiritually. Direct organizational spiritual and administrative authority by women over men is common place.

- B. The practice of Pentecostal, charismatic and some evangelical churches of allowing women to be pastors, preachers and ministers over mixed-gender ministries is also the norm. So-called women apostles, prophets, bishops, pastors and Bible teachers are common.
- C. The dispute among mainstream liberal denominations over the ordination of homosexual ministers and bishops while, at the same time, condoning homosexuality as long as it does not entail church leadership is not only unscriptural but nonsensical.
- D. The root cause is the failure on each count to hold the line on clear gender theology from the point of creation and the Scriptural application of gender theology. Once gender theology is removed from the authority of Scripture and subjected to culture and psychology, then no one may make dogmatic argument concerning gender passages on the basis of these passages alone. The problem the protestants face is that the very arguments they have used for decades to excuse themselves from gender-based heterosexual passages are now being turned on them (and justly so) in the area of gender-based homosexual passages. What the Protestants will have to do, and what they will be unwilling to do, is to return to a strict adherence to gender-based theology and practice as taught in scripture . Because of this inability to conform to heterosexual Scripture, unless the church repents and returns to the Biblical standard, it is just a matter of time until all protestant churches succumb to the application of culture to homosexual marriages, just as they have to heterosexual.

I would, therefore, call upon all church boards, deacon boards, elder boards and ruling bodies of churches to review their standards of dress, behavior and appearance of heterosexuals in their congregation and ensure that their faith and practice in this area is based on a consistent adherence to a theology of gender as described in the holy, eternal, inerrant written Word of God. Then and only then, when they are accused of being bigoted in their treatment of homosexuals, they can give clear examples of consistent enforcement of Holy Scriptures to the heterosexual community. The church may still be viewed as archaic and even dangerous but it will not be viewed as filled with bigoted hypocrites. The Bible never condemns the church for suffering persecution and ill will for strict conformity to Holy Scriptures but there exists a multitude of Scriptures condemning bigotry and hypocrisy. If we are to be condemned, let us be condemned for the right thing.

Homosexual Marriages Part Two of Four - Gender Theology

The issue of homosexual marriage cannot be separated out from an overall approach to gender theology. Homosexual marriage and homosexuality cannot be dealt with independently from a total acceptance of all gender-based verses in the Bible – both homosexual and heterosexual, comprising an overall scriptural theology of gender. The real problem the protestant church and large para-church ministries face concerning homosexual marriages is an experiential-based theology, rather than one centered upon the Word of God. In the last thirty years there has been (as discussed in the previous blog) a pattern of setting aside heterosexual gender passages on the basis of experience. “God made me this way so it can’t be wrong...” has long been accepted.

The Bible says, 1 Timothy 2:12 “But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet.” But God made her a teacher, men benefit from her teaching, in fact she is a better teacher/leader than the men, therefore it must be all right for her to teach and exercise authority over men.

The Bible says, 1 Peter 3:1-2 “In the same way, you wives, be submissive to your own husbands so that even if any of them are disobedient to the word, they may be won without a word by the behavior of their wives, as they observe your chaste and respectful behavior.” But her husband does not want her to go to our church, yet she is an excellent witness and teacher in our church, at least if she comes to our church she will be ministered to by mature Christians--who knows, maybe her husband will come to Christ. After all, God did bring her to Christ through our church, she is blessed in her walk with God by our church, she wants to come to our church and serve--it must be God’s will for her to attend our church.”

The Bible says, 1 Corinthians 11:14 “Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him.” But God has given him such a wonderful ministry through his music. Many people will come to our church and worship if he performs and God has blessed many churches through his music ministry. After all, it is the norm in the music industry for musicians to have long hair and long hair allows him to relate to musicians and youth. Despite his long hair and, perhaps, because of it many hear the gospel, come to Christ and worship at his concerts, and God would not bless his ministry if his long hair were wrong.

The list goes on, marriage, marriage vows, divorce, remarriage, gender roles in marriage, gender roles in appearance, gender roles in the church-- all of these have been set aside by heterosexuals based upon simple arguments of experience. Since good is happening, then the Bible must not be saying what it says, it must instead be saying something else. We don’t know exactly what that is but we do know good is happening, so it must be OK.

Here, then, is the problem. The Bible clearly states in the area of gender that God created male and female (Genesis 1:27); that this is God's design for marriage (Genesis 2:24) and that the desire for same sex marriage and same sex sexual intimacy is a sin and a personal decision (Romans 1:26-32). Now the problem that the protestant and para-church organizations face is that the homosexual community uses the same reasoning to arrive at their decisions that the heterosexuals have used for decades. "I know the Bible seems to say this but - I was born with this desire, it is how God created me, I cannot be happy with the opposite sex - only with my same sex, we are faithful to each other, we go to church and are more faithful to each other than heterosexuals, we do not sin in other sexual ways, we are in every way a well-behaved, model couple, we tithe, serve, worship and are in every way a good church member, God would not bless us if this were sin. We do not know all that these verses mean but they are written to pagans living a debauched lifestyle. We, however, are good Christians, so there is no reason to condemn us or refuse to marry us. Your aversion to us is no different than your previous aversion to other minority groups." The heterosexual community has nothing to reply to these arguments, since they themselves use them. Their choice of strict Biblical enforcement of homosexual passages is inconsistent with their cultural and experiential application of heterosexual passages. What is needed is a clear scripture-based gender theology that will be applied uniformly in all situations - heterosexual, homosexual, bi-sexual, transgender and all situations to come in the future, which the church can neither imagine nor anticipate.

I. Gender Theology is clear

A. First - by creation there are only two genders and one application *Genesis 1:27 & 5:2*

1. The Bible differentiates between sexual practices or acts and gender. Because one commits adultery, polygamy, fornication, bestiality, homosexuality, pedophilia, cross dressing, etc. - does not make him/her doing those things by creation but sinful acts by heterosexuals.
2. There exist only two genders and one acceptable application of this theology in terms of sexual practice. One male, one female, joined in marriage, engaging then, and only then in sexual intimacy. This may be done for mutual pleasure and excitement or for procreation.

B. The Bible clearly presents a gender-based heterosexual theology and practice

1. Gender-based equality in terms of creation and worth Genesis 1:27 and Galatians 3:28
2. Gender-based roles are rooted in creation Genesis 2:18 and 1 Corinthians 11:8-9
3. Gender-based roles in appearance 1 Corinthians 11:14-15 and Deuteronomy 22:5
4. Gender-based roles in marriage Ephesians 5:23-24 and I Peter 3:1 & 2
5. Gender-based roles in the Church 1 Timothy 2:12 "But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet."

(In worship and in mixed-gender fellowship, women may freely share and participate, Colossians 3:16 "Let the word of Christ richly dwell within you, with all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with thankfulness in your hearts to God." Women may freely exercise and express their gifts in relation to other women and children - Titus 2:3-5 "Older women likewise are to be reverent in their behavior, not malicious gossips nor enslaved to much wine, teaching what is good, so that they may encourage the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sensible, pure, workers at home, kind, being subject to their own husbands, so that the word of God will not be dishonored.")

- C. Beyond this, the Bible acknowledges and condemns a multitude of deviant and sinful practices outside this single biblical standard, but these are practices of choice and not a result of differing gender creations. Those who engage in these sins are always viewed in the Scriptures as participating or committing an act of sin. Biblical passages never class them as an aberration of creation nor as a created class of people but as a class of people who practice the same sinful actions. Some sinful practices render one so obsessed with the practice that the individual, in many cases, becomes indistinguishable from the practice itself -- it is as if it is their very nature. The practice may become uncontrollable and the desire for change, not only lost but painful to experience--this is not unusual or unbiblical. It may be sexual deviance, drug addiction, violence, demonic possession and worship or any number of sinful life decisions which seem to take on a life of its own, which causes this. It does not, however, change the origin of man or woman by creation.
- D. Comparative study - gender-based heterosexual passages and gender-based homosexual passages appear in the same books of the Bible and in the same time period. As such, they cannot be separated out for literal vs. cultural interpretation. What follows are but a few of many examples:
1. Example: The Law
The law declares homosexual behavior a sin in Leviticus 18:22.
The same Law condemns a loss of distinction in heterosexual dress in Deuteronomy 22:5. If the church is going to make an appeal to the law to condemn homosexual behavior, then it will also have to condemn the men in the church who are wearing women's jewelry, make up, hair coloring and the women who fail to dress in a feminine but, instead, a masculine manner.
 2. Example: Romans
Romans declares that homosexual intercourse is a grievous sin Romans 1:26-27. This same epistle also condemns unfaithfulness in marriage in Romans 2:22, as well as, the sin of divorce Romans 7:2-3.

The church cannot condemn the sin of homosexuality while turning a blind eye to acts of adultery and divorce.

3. Example: I Corinthians

Homosexuality in appearance or act is clearly condemned in 1 Corinthians 6:9. Yet in the same epistle, 1 Corinthians 7:10-11 teaches clearly on the sin of divorce and remarriage, as well as distinctive appearance in hair length 1 Corinthians 11:14-15.

The church cannot continue to use I Corinthians to condemn homosexuality, while turning a blind eye to heterosexual sins such as divorce, length of hair, adultery and immorality among their youth.

4. Example: 1 Timothy

1 Timothy 1:10 describes homosexual acts as clearly contrary to the Word of God. Yet in the very next chapter of this epistle, women are forbidden-- by nature of their position in creation, to teach and/or exercise authority over men 1 Timothy 2:12-13. If churches and para-church ministries are going to continue to turn a blind eye in chapter two to women in their ministries teaching and exercising authority over men, they will have great difficulty in appealing to chapter one concerning the sin of homosexuality.

- E. The sin of homosexuality does not exist apart from a theology of gender. God created two distinct genders – male and female. There are no other. All activities outside these two roles fall under the category of acts of sin and not acts of creation. Homosexuality is a sinful activity carried out by an act of the will and not a lifestyle determined by creation or birth. The call of the church for homosexuals to repent cannot be done apart from the teaching on gender theology and the call for all men and women to conform to the holy, eternal, inerrant written Word of God. The church cannot continue to single out homosexual actions as sin and ignore heterosexual gender specific passages. The church cannot continue to use passages of Scripture condemning homosexual behavior, while ignoring passages in the same books and context that define heterosexual gender roles, actions and appearance.

Homosexual Marriages Part Three of Four – Homosexual Marriages – Secular Determinism vs. Christian Freedom

Romans 1:26-27

26 For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, 27 and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.

I. Hard Science, Bad Science

First things first--in terms of black and white hard established scientific facts/laws, there is no scientific evidence of the existence of predestined, irreversible homosexuality by chromosome or genetics. Secondly, in terms of classifications of people, there exists only the X & Y chromosome. There exists no scientific gender other than male or female. In other words, there is no "Z" chromosome, creating another classification of people apart from male and female. To declare that, as a homosexual, one is a separate classification of existence by birth is to step outside the realm of science. Homosexuality, so far as biological science is concerned, is a choice and not a predetermined existence based on genetics, chromosome or biological makeup.

Having said this, there is considerable research on this subject. This research, however, cannot be viewed as totally objective for, in my opinion, much of it is done looking for the "Holy Grail" of genetic proof, rather than simply researching the universal genetic commonalities of all homosexuals as opposed to the heterosexual population.

A. Implications for Homosexual Research Findings

1. Some recent studies do suggest some biological plausibility or predisposition towards homosexuality, but this research is much more nuanced than a simple "homosexual gene" and deals with epigenetics (the manner in which a gene interacts with its environment) and cascades triggered by said interactions.
 - a. It's worth noting that just because such a predisposition might exist (since this has not been proven), does not mean that the resultant action (or in this case lifestyle) is inevitable. Many studies evaluating epigenetic factors and alcoholism, sexual aggression and anger have found links between the two.
 - b. But this does not mean that those persons with this biological composition MUST by nature become alcoholics, a rapist or a murderer. Rather, it suggests a tendency towards this behavior, which can be overcome, and offers encouragement towards those who struggle with this predisposition (or "disease" as it's referred to in scientific literature.) One being predisposed to a certain behavior more than others is true in many areas. For those who are predisposed, the fact that there is a very "real" explanation and that one's fate (so-to-speak) is not sealed, should be a great encouragement to resist, not an enabling excuse to indulge.
 - c. This level of predisposition is in complete compatibility with holy Scripture, particularly the doctrine of imputation. The Fall of man entailed, not simply man's moral nature but also his physical nature, including possible fallen genetic material. We accept many difficulties

and challenges faced by individuals as a result of fallen genetic material, encompassing both physical and behavioral outcomes. While the expression of some of these traits is beyond an individual's control (e.g. Down's syndrome), modern science asserts that there are many behavioral tendencies encoded in our DNA over which we still have the power to exert influence (e.g. alcoholism). When discussing the epigenetic basis for behaviors, we ought not to arbitrarily separate homosexuality apart from said science, as this does justice neither to modern science nor to the biblical doctrines of the Fall and imputation."

2. There is evidence of homosexual behaviors in animals in nature.
 - a. To emulate or replicate animal moral behavior has always been viewed by God as a descent into moral depravity. *2 Peter 2:12 "But these, like unreasoning animals, born as creatures of instinct to be captured and killed, reviling where they have no knowledge, will in the destruction of those creatures also be destroyed,"*
 - b. Some argue that, since homosexual behavior is manifested in other species in nature, it proves genetic link determinism in humans. This, however, is a very slippery slope in terms of the descent into moral chaos. Simply because homosexuality is found in nature, does not mean that we accept it as a human behavioral norm (e.g. various species of animals birth their young and then abandon them shortly thereafter, others eat their young, still others eat their mate.) If animal sexual behavior justifies human sexual behavior, then the fact that most, if not all, procreation by animals is forced-- this line of logic would offer a compelling excuse for rape. Christians, however, reject animal behavior from that of humans, both in creation and in moral accountability. There are many aspects of animal social and sexual behavior which would be criminal if practiced by man. Society does not condone these same actions in humans and, to separate out and justify homosexual behavior as justifiable because of the actions of animals, is inconsistent with the distinctions society makes in other areas of sexual and social behavior. We ought not to be surprised to find fallen behaviors exhibited in the natural world as the Fall did not only impact humanity. And even in these instances in nature, it's observed as unnatural, as these interactions don't result in the furtherance of life.
 - c. I can think of a clear example of this which occurred in my ethics course for my Masters at Moody Graduate School in Chicago. (This Masters program was composed of full time ministers in their respective churches and spanned the denominational spectrum.) The subject of a genetic link or predisposition to homosexuality was brought up. I was surprised to hear one of the men speak up on this subject. He was extremely effeminate in his physical make up (not in dress). He had high cheek

bones, he had virtually no facial hair, he had very soft white skin, he had long feminine fingers, he had a high voice, he was slender-- in fact I had often wondered if he were not a closet homosexual or bi-sexual. He used himself as an example, saying that his body, as created by God, gave the first impression of homosexuality and, as a result, he was often approached by them from his early years. He affirmed, though, that this was not an excuse for him to be homosexual, bi-sexual or bitter at God. He was happily married, had four children and was in every other respect an all-American male. He went on to affirm that no genetic anomaly - either physical or mental, was an excuse to be sinful. It may make obedience harder, but it was not an excuse to sin.

- d. This frees the homosexual from both the determinism of false science - "This is who I am and I can do nothing about it" and from the cruelty of the evolutionary model of procreation. For the evolutionist, the height of Nature's good is the advancement of the gene pool through propagation of the species. To say that homosexuals are genetically predetermined is to say that Nature/evolution is weeding them out of the gene pool and that they are destined for extinction. You cannot have it both ways-- either there is no hard scientific proof of genetic homosexuality as a separate class of humanness, or, there is such proof and that means homosexuals, as a class, have been set aside by nature to be eliminated from the gene pool.

- II. The Christian approach is far less cruel than that of the secular evolutionist/determinist. For the Christian, homosexuality is a choice, a decision.

The Christian view that homosexuality is a wrong choice is much more compassionate than the humanist model, which makes homosexuals victims of the evolutionary model and doomed to the stigma of being eliminated from the gene pool.

Next Week: **Homosexual Marriage Part Four of Four - Application**

Homosexual Marriage Part Four of Four - 7 Applications

- I. **Submit your own values to the Word of God.**

Romans 1:26-27

26 For this reason God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, 27 and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.

The Bible clearly teaches that homosexuality is a sin and that this sin is a choice – homosexuals “exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural.” The Bible teaches that the sin of homosexuality is abhorrent to God. It is classified as “degrading,” “unnatural,” “indecent” and worthy of “due penalty” from God.

Romans 5:12 “Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned.”

Irrespective of the impact of the Fall on man’s nature, propensity to sin and genetic make-up, he is still held accountable to God for his sin. The fall of man and man’s inherent sin nature has never been a mitigating argument for the practice of sin, nor the judgment of sin.

II. Require a clear statement of gender from your church and para-church ministries with which you minister.

Matthew 5:37 “But let your statement be, ‘Yes, yes’ or ‘No, no’; anything beyond these is of evil.”

I can remember asking the director of a large para-church ministry about an issue of moral conduct among his staff. His response was, “I have no first-hand knowledge of behavior such as that.” Of course, that is institutional speak. An international director may not have “first-hand knowledge” but, at the same time, know for certain that such behavior does exist. Another example is when I asked the director about the stand of his organization on baptism. He responded, “I would rather not respond by email. It is a difficult subject, so perhaps we can talk face to face the next time you are in town.” Again, institutional double talk. Do not settle for ambiguous statements such as “we must love the sinner, yet hate the sin”; “we are all sinners and make mistakes,” “we want to help people as they work through their feelings in a non-judgmental way” and other such statements. Those who have chosen to rebel against God and sin through homosexual actions are involved in a willful and heinous sin. They are not working through anything--they are willfully sinning. A person who is a thief, who steals from the church or parishioners--this person is not working through his decision, he is practicing it. It is the same with the homosexual. There must be no ambiguity about the sin of the practice of homosexuality in the church.

III. You have a right to know if your church or parachurch ministry is reaching out to homosexuals, integrating them within the church body and allowing them unfettered access to the boys and girls in your church.

1 Corinthians 5:11

11 But actually, I wrote to you not to associate with any so-called brother if he is an immoral person, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or a swindler – not even to eat with such a one.

Ask up front and demand a clear answer – 1. Is your ministry fellowship open to homosexuals? 2. Does your ministry screen for homosexuals in terms of involvement in activities, retreats, etc.?

Many churches and para-church groups carry on clandestine ministries to homosexuals. They have practicing and so-called celibate homosexuals attending church or para-church activities. You have the right to know about this. I would not attend a church that reaches out and incorporates drug dealers, pornography dealers, pedophiles, prostitutes, rapists or homosexuals in the general children's, youth or young people's population. I did not say a church should not minister to these people, lead them to Christ and, once they are fully repentant and in control of their passions, introduce them to the general population--but before this, the church's mandate is to protect and nourish the Christians, particularly the children and youth. This is also true of para-church youth camps and college ministries. I would want a clear statement that individuals struggling with certain sins will not be sharing the same cabin, activities and events as my child.

I would not send my children to a church camp, church retreat or para-church camp that does not screen for homosexuals. Would you consider sending your child to any of the above if showers, cabins, dressing rooms, etc. were mixed in terms of the heterosexual population? Of course not. In terms of homosexuals, that is just what is occurring if attendance is not screened. Many naïve parents homeschool or send their children to private schools to protect them from just such a situation and then turn around and place them in church and para-church settings which are just as dangerous as a public school in terms of homosexual exposure.

IV. Do not support any ministry, either financially or as a co-laborer, that does not make a clear statement of gender, the sin of homosexuality and the rejection of the so called "celibate" homosexual.

2 Corinthians 6:14 Do not be bound together with unbelievers; for what partnership have righteousness and lawlessness, or what fellowship has light with darkness?

This is where hard decisions have to be made. A church or para-church stand on homosexuality is not the same as a difference of opinion on choir vs. praise band; on informal vs. formal attire in church; on organ vs. piano; or other minor side issues. This is a major issue which requires hard choices. Yes, it is true that we all sin, but it is not true that we all rape, commit incest or practice homosexual acts. You may have attended a church for years or sent your children to certain camps for years. You

may have supported certain para-church ministries for years. You may have a long history with these groups and activities but there can be no compromise on this issue.

V. **Do not allow the secular community to choose the playing field.**

The Christian view of homosexuality is far more compassionate than the evolutionary/determinist model. The Christian view emphasizes the worth of the individual and the freedom of choice. The evolutionary model condemns the homosexual to extinction (elimination from the gene pool) and offers no choice (made that way). It is time to hold the secularist to a consistent application to their arguments across the whole range of sexual conduct and behavior. The determinist view creates a moral madhouse--what about rape, pedophilia, bestiality, sadomasochism or sexual predators? What about other actions such as anger or murder? If there is a genetic propensity for these actions will they be allowed? If you cannot "regulate morals" will they be allowed? The "gender movement" has already arbitrarily classed cross-dressing and bisexuals as a race. Any sexual desire is said to be one's nature. By what authority does science limit race, class or people to homosexuals? Why not include rapists or murder? Contrastingly, Christianity labels all of these as decisions-- which can be made and from which we can repent. As Christians, we reject homosexuality, bi-sexuality and all other sinful choices of man. The evolutionary view also contains many pitfalls, both in the devaluing of the homosexual as a human with the right to propagate and in the moral conclusions which can and should be made to the evolutionary model of the propagation of the gene pool. It is the same with the argument of homosexuality within the animal kingdom. If homosexuality is argued as a genetic anomaly from the animal kingdom, then this should also be applied to the other sexual practices in the animal kingdom which secularists would find abhorrent.

VI. **Do not fall into the lie of satan that there are righteous "celibate homosexuals."**

2 Corinthians 7:10-11 "For the sorrow that is according to the will of God produces a repentance without regret, leading to salvation, but the sorrow of the world produces death. For behold what earnestness this very thing, this godly sorrow, has produced in you: what vindication of yourselves, what indignation, what fear, what longing, what zeal, what avenging of wrong! In everything you demonstrated yourselves to be innocent in the matter."

Thieves in a "holding pattern" are still thieves. Pedophiles in a "holding pattern" are still pedophiles. Adulterers in a "holding pattern" are still adulterers. Those who are not practicing but still desiring that which they

have ceased to practice have not fully repented. They are a moral time bomb in a "holding pattern." Many churches and Christian ministries, caught in the deception of false compassion, open their doors to the so-called "celibate homosexual." Demand a clear statement from your church on this issue.

On the surface, homosexual celibacy seems plausible, even noble. The heterosexual has urges, he controls those urges and that is victory over sin. It is important, though, to remember that the heterosexual urge or desire is from God. It is not sinful to be attracted to the opposite sex. This is where the breakdown occurs with the so-called "celibate homosexual," for the very urge is sinful. For the homosexual to simply pledge to not practice his depravity is not enough. The sin of homosexuality is not simply the action but the desire behind the action. Homosexuality is different from heterosexual sins in that, not only is the action a sin, not only is the desire a sin, but also the propensity to have this desire, the very nature is a sin. For the heterosexual, adultery (or fornication) is a sin; pornography is a sin; lust is a sin-- but the heterosexual desire, the nature that creates this propensity is not a sin. It is righteousness. It is a part of our creation. Contrastingly, for the homosexual to bring the desire under control is not righteousness--for the very propensity which results in this desire is depraved and a heinous sin. As long as the homosexual has the desire for sexual relations with his or her same sex, then the homosexual is in rebellion against God and must be ministered to as such.

VII. Decide now that you will never have this conversation...

Mark 9:42 "Whoever causes one of these little ones who believe to stumble, it would be better for him if, with a heavy millstone hung around his neck, he had been cast into the sea."

You are surprised to be asked to visit (the pastor, church counselor or Christian counselor) that your child has been seeing. You enter the room and you can cut the tension with a knife. Sitting on one side of the room is your adult child, face streaked with tears. It is obvious that there has been a great emotional catharsis taking place. The pastor/counselor begins, "Did you know that the (camp, youth group, church) in which you involved your child was ministering to homosexuals?" Then the next question: "Did you know that your child was repeatedly molested by a homosexual in that ministry setting?" That is a conversation you never want to have and the first step is to avoid at all costs any ministry which incorporates homosexuals into the general population. You ask, "But what if they have repented?" If they have truly repented then they are not homosexuals--but the thing you have to do is ask follow-up questions, because many well-meaning ministries will simply not be truthful with

you. This is for two reasons - First: Misplaced compassion on their part and Second: They know that if the truth of this ministry were known it would create a financial and attendance backlash (which it well should).