

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

A1425 – June 22, 2014 – Romans 1:26-27
The Restraint Loosed

Last time in Romans 1 we dealt with vv 24 and 25. Let's review momentarily. In verse 24 God is giving over those who suppress the truth in unrighteousness to the penalty of heterosexual immorality or what is known technically as "fornication," sexual relations with a member of the opposite sex outside of a marriage relationship. What do we mean when we say marriage? We mean the divine institution of marriage as given in Genesis 1-2. What is a divine institution? It is a structure built by and defined by God so that if it is violated or re-defined then there is a serious price to pay in every area of life; socially, economically, legally, et. al. How does God define marriage? As a covenant between one man and one woman that pictures Christ and the Church. A covenant being a legally binding agreement before God to remain true and loyal to your marriage partner. So the radical attempts in our society to re-structure marriage by re-defining it as a legally binding agreement between two persons is rebellion against God. It is trying to live outside of the boundaries of the form that God has created. The consequences are slavery to sin and destruction of our society. God created the form and humans as made in God's image are designed to live within the form. When we live within the form there is freedom and balance. When we don't there is slavery. So God has given marriage between one man and one woman for our own good and within marriage He gave us an outlet for the normal desire for sexual relations. But any sex outside of marriage is destructive both to the individuals and to society. God will not be mocked.

We also pointed out that of all 21 dire consequences listed in vv 28-32 the only two highlighted and given special treatment were heterosexual immorality and homosexual immorality. The reason being that these two sins are special indicators that God has turned a society loose to self-destruction. He has set that culture for final judgment. The nation is coming to an end.

This has happened throughout history multiple times. All nations that have finally come to their end, whether it was the Assyrians or the Romans, were overrun with sexual perversity in their final days.

So last week we dealt with the special indicator of heterosexual immorality; this week we will deal with the second special indicator that God has turned a society loose to self-destruction. In verse 26 he begins just as he began in verse 24, **For this reason** or “Because of this...” **God gave them over.**

Because of what? Because they suppressed the truth in unrighteousness. Again this is turning them over because of their refusal to acknowledge Him and give thanks. But this time the penalty goes one step further.

Heterosexual uncleanness is terrible enough but homosexual uncleanness is degrading to the human body. Paul says it this way, **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.**

Let's exegete first. The Scriptures come first and then we reflect and apply. Verse 26 deals with females and females and verse 27 deals with males and males. It is interesting that Paul does not use the typical words for female and male, *γυνή* and *άνηρ* or *άντηρωπος* but *θηλυς* and *αρσην*. Vincent says “...these terms are used ‘because only the distinction of sex is contemplated.’”ⁱ Paul is referring to the physical differences between female and male that have a direct link to proper sexual orientation. In other words, design implies function. Yet their minds are so corrupted already that they are already entertaining behaviors that deny the design-function relationship. As a consequence God lets them loose to now act on their faulty thinking.

He addresses females with females first in verse 26. Comparatively speaking, who gets more attention? The females or the males? The males. Verse 27 is much longer than verse 26. Verse 26 is fairly contracted. Paul indicates by this contracted treatment and by the untranslated conjunction *τε* that it is especially horrendous that females would make this exchange of the natural for the unnatural. Correctly translated the verse should read, “for *even* their females exchanged the natural function for that which is contrary to nature,” as if to say this is a remarkable exchange that females would make as

compared to males. The reason apparently being that women tend to be more reserved than men and so for them to make this exchange and engage in a homosexual lifestyle is all the more astonishing.

When Paul refers to the **females** he does not merely say **females** but **their females** indicating the fact that a female belongs to a male in a complementarian relationship. That is to say, that a female and a male together complement one another, fill up one another, complete one another. The normal order of things as God originally designed them is for a female and male to be together, not a female and a female. God created Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve. But Paul is saying that the females who exchange the truth of God for the lie now make another exchange. This time they exchange **the natural function for that which is unnatural**. The word **natural** is often debated, particularly by those who claim the Bible is not opposed to same-sex marriage. Their argument is that the word **natural** means “what is natural to me,” or “how I feel.” However, no Greek lexicon in the world supports this subjective meaning. The word **natural** means “the regular or established order of things.” In many contexts it is used of that which is “determined by birth, natural endowment.” In other words, you are either born female or male and this is determinative of what is **natural** in a sexual relationship. When we see the physical differences between female and male it is sufficient to understand what is **natural** and **unnatural**. For example, two females cannot make a baby so it’s not natural. What is **natural** is for a female to be with a male. Now the NASB translation **unnatural** at the end of verse 26 is a little weaker than I would hope. Literally it says “their women exchanged the natural function for that which is contrary to nature.” So for a female to desire to be with another female or to be with another female is contrary to “the established order of things,” it is living contrary to who they are as God made them. This is why it is a degrading desire. They are trying to be someone they are not. At the heart of it they are angry at God for making them a female.

Verse 27 turns to the lengthier treatment of males. Paul expected this behavior more readily of males because of their unreserved nature. **And in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman**. It is clearly **natural** for a male to be with a female. Here, instead of saying the men exchanged the natural for the unnatural he says they **abandoned the natural function of the woman**. We haven’t commented

on this word **function** though it was used v 26. This word refers to “a state of intimate involvement with a person” and clearly refers to the proper usage of a person. There is a proper and improper use of a person. Paul is saying males abandoned the proper use of the female and turned to the improper use of another male. It is not proper to do that. It is degrading to the human body.

Note that the males not only **abandoned the natural function of the woman** but they in turn **burned in their desire toward one another**. The word **burned** is prefixed by a preposition. The preposition intensifies the burning. The expression is terrible in its intensity. It means that males were in an all-out endeavor to satisfy their totally depraved lusts. We would say they attended establishments such as gay bars that are intended to meet the desires of those who have such cravings. The word for **desire** is not the typical word used for “lust” but is a word that refers to “appetite, eager desire.” These males eagerly desire to be with other males and they will do anything they can to satisfy that desire. Listen to Socrates when he saw the teenage boy Charmides, he “[Charmides] gave me such a look that I was helpless...and all those in the palaestra gathered around us in a circle, then indeed, my good man, I saw inside his [Charmides’] cloak and I was on fire and no longer in control of myself.”ⁱⁱ I’ll be commenting on Greek culture later and how ubiquitous degrading behavior was among the philosophers and cultural elites but for now it is enough to say that to be inflamed with such appetites is entirely degrading and evidence of a darkened mind under the just wrath of God.

Paul states quite clearly, **men with men committing indecent acts**. But the word translated **indecent**, again, is weak. Paul literally says “men with men committing the shameless deed.” It is articular, pointing out its uniqueness as a deed committed without shame. The public ‘coming out’ of active homosexual men is a sign of the large extent of deterioration that has occurred in a society.ⁱⁱⁱ Yet it is merely a manifestation of their hatred for God who created them as males. Interestingly, the word could also be translated “the disfiguring deed.” If this is the sense then the verse would be saying that the act itself is a disfigured picture. The picture is all wrong and that is what the Duck Dynasty guy who got kicked off the show was getting at.

But the act is not without consequence. God will not be mocked. There is a divine law that says that if a male chooses to be with another male then there is a penalty that he incurs within himself. Paul says, **And receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error.** Male practitioners would like to think that they can engage in whatever sexual arrangement they want without consequences. But Paul insists that by committing such deeds they inevitably receive in themselves a penalty. It is due them because they earned it. We are not told what this penalty is but it is within themselves and I suspect it is guilt. I think that is why they are trying to legislate their own behavior as valid, they think it will relieve this penalty of guilt that they carry with them and some report that to some extent it does but they cannot escape the consequences, they suffer in their own persons the due penalty of their error.

Philosophically, what is Paul teaching in verses 26 and 27? That design is determinative of function. That is, if you are a female then your sexuality is designed and determined for a specific manifestation and if you are a male the same is true. There is no other proper orientation or expression of sexuality. To behave contrary to your design is to deny the connection of design and function.

That is the exegesis. Now it is time for some explanation and application. First, it is clear that this behavior is a penalty in itself in that God is letting go of His restraint and letting them practice unnatural desires which they have only mentally entertained until this time. It is also clear that the presence of this behavior in a society is evidence of a present form of the wrath of God, that God is letting that society go to self-destruction. This is nothing new. The ancient world was replete with a variety of sexual perversions including pederasty, homoeroticism and sodomy, some of which were cultural norms and others culturally acceptable, but all of which led to their ultimate downfall. For example, pederasty, the practice of an older man courting an attractive teenage boy was a cultural norm among the Greeks. In this cultural practice the boy was to resist advances, play hard to get, and eventually give in and play the passive role in intercourse with the older man. When he grew to be a man he would change roles and do the same thing. Why was this socially acceptable? Because the Greeks considered women to be less than human. How do you like that ladies? Most ladies don't realize the oppression women faced under the Greeks and in the ancient

world in general. And consequently they don't realize how much freedom Jesus Christ gave women. But the Book of Acts deliberately reports the large number of women relative to men coming to Christ. Why? Because they were gaining freedom in Christ. Contrast that with perverted Greek thinking that didn't even consider women to be human. Thus, for a male to pursue a woman was to pursue something less valuable than a man. Marriage only continued because of the necessity of a woman in childbearing and the need for her to take care of the home and to raise the children. So what was at the root of the Greek practice of pederasty? False Greek thinking about the nature, constitution and value of the woman. Consequently it was widespread, especially among the educated aristocracy. Socrates we already mentioned. Plato also was a pederast in his earlier years as a man. Later he seems more cautious showing the effect of his conscience. Alexander the Great was a well-known homosexual and some Greek writers thought that the greatest militaries would be those full of soldiers given to homosexuality. In the ancient context homosexuality was distinct from pederasty in that it was a practice engaged in by two mature men. It was a practice less commonly accepted than pederasty but still fairly common. But according to the apostle Paul it is a practice that indicates that the practicing members of that society have been given over to a darkened, depraved mind. In other words, immorality is related to wrong thinking. Bad behavior is connected to bad thinking. So the thinking of those involved in these behaviors is corrupt.

As an aside, but an important one, this is why we don't turn to the Greeks for knowledge; they had completely embraced bad behaviors and this evidences that they had gone wrong in their thinking. So I'm not interested in classical education because classical education is Greek philosophy. It's starting with man and man's reason as autonomous and ultimate. So if I thought Greek philosophy had something to offer I would teach you that man is not so bad, that his reason is still intact and able to come to truth. If there is a god who has spoken then whatever he or she has said is an addendum to human reason. So I'm not interested. What I'm interested in is starting with divine revelation and submitting my human reason to revelation and using it as a tool to organize revelation, not as a standard above it. Nor am I interested in Roman Catholicism because what is Roman Catholicism? A combination of Greek philosophy or human reason and the Bible or revelation. It's trying to bring the two together. In earlier Church times it was a combination of the Neo-Platonism of Augustine plus the Bible. In the medieval times it was a

combination of the Aristotelianism of Thomas Aquinas plus the Bible. Today, if I put any stock in Greek philosophy I would follow Thomas Aquinas. Aquinas wrote the *Summa Theologica* which is the standard work behind all modern Roman Catholicism. It's Aristotle plus the Bible and Aristotle is the true authority. If Aristotle was a Greek and the Greeks exalted pederasty then are you surprised that you find pederasty in the Roman Catholic Church? You shouldn't be. Priests and little boys is a natural outworking of Greek philosophy. You see, this is not just about morality or immorality, it is not just about a bad doctrine of priestly celibacy, it is about the Greek thinking that is going on in that system of thinking. Roman Catholicism said that human reason is still intact and able to come to truth and so this is our method and then when our human reason reaches its end we bring in divine revelation from the Bible so that our knowledge can be brought to completion. In other words, the Roman Catholic epistemology, or way of knowing starts with human reason as autonomous or self-directed and ends with revelation or the Bible. And who were the greatest reasoners? The Greeks. So Roman Catholicism is nothing more than Greek philosophy warmed over with some Scripture. And if we are to analyze Greek thinking as Paul does here and especially in 1 Cor 1, it is trying to bring together foolishness and wisdom, it is trying to bring together the proposition that there is no answer with the proposition that there is an answer, it is irrationality and rationality at the same time. So if I get anything across to you as the Bible teacher of this church, get this, Greek philosophy that so pervades our educational system, both public and private, gave no answers. They only talked about things. Talk, talk, talk, talk, talk. Paul even says this about Greek philosophy in Acts 17:21, "(Now all the Athenians and the strangers visiting there used to spend their time in nothing other than telling or hearing something new.)" It's a bunch of talk and people think they know something if they can talk about all sorts of ideas and come up with their little philosophy. It's arrogance. The Greeks never answered one iota of any major issue. The one philosopher who talked the most was Plato. Plato is the greatest Greek philosopher. Guess what he was? A pederast, he played with little teenage boys, and what did Plato do intellectually? He tried every conceivable worldview. The English philosopher Alfred North Whitehead commented that the whole of western philosophy is a footnote to Plato. In other words, nobody said anything novel after Plato. They've just repeated what Plato said. Every conceivable answer was already tried before the time of Christ and the bottom line was there is no answer for life and there is no meaning. And if

you can get that through your thick skull you will be able to realize the vanity of the world and the richness of what we have in the text of Scripture. We have in the Bible a clear revelation of God's mind, the only mind that is not fallen and thinks correctly. And I don't know why some of you spend your time reading what I don't hesitate to label trash. Do you realize the high value of what you hold in your hand? And sadly this may be the only day you hold it in your hand each week. But Psalm 138 says that He exalts His word as high as His name. As high as His name! And some of you don't even read it. You aren't honoring Him. And then to go around and take some ideas from the culture and combine them with the ideas of Scripture as if this is some kind of buffet where you build your own religion, that's a heinous crime, it is a corruption of truth.

We don't start with human pederasts to get knowledge. That immorality is a sign that they have rejected the God of creation. How then, according to Paul, could they ever hope to come to truth? Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Epicurus, Zeno...Heidegger, Sartre, Wittgenstein, they were all fools! And until you can say that without hesitation you are still clinging to some vestige of hope in paganism. Paul knew all this. Everything I'm telling you about Greek philosophy is right here in the pages of the NT. Paul knew Greek philosophy. He grew up in Tarsus, a university town, he was well acquainted with Greek ideas. He deliberately slaughters Epicureanism and Stoicism in Acts 17. It's a total annihilation of Greek philosophy as it was being discussed in NT times and what he's doing here in Romans 1 is showing how the degrading practice of homosexuality is a direct product of the futility of Greek philosophy.

So don't revere the Greeks, revere the God of the Bible because this is your only hope intellectually and morally. Everything else is futility. In all truth, from our culture you have very little to learn, except for the stark realization that what is being pawned off as knowledge is knowledge falsely so-called, the product of many darkened minds. I realize that not everyone can accept this. But the Scriptures teach that only those to whom it has been given can accept the Scriptures as their sole authority. The Scriptures forthrightly and powerfully denunciate knowledge falsely-so-called. But I am calling it to your attention because accepting this denunciation is necessary to realizing the depths of the depravity of man and to arousing in us a compassion for lost man's condition both morally and intellectually so that we might proclaim to them the gospel which saves us in every area of life!

How are we to do this? I want to say a few words about the widespread homosexuality in our culture. People increasingly come to me frustrated with their friends or family members who are practicing homosexuals. How do you handle it? I would suggest two principles; grace and truth, both illustrated by Jesus' confrontation with the adulterous woman in John 7-8. In that chapter Jesus showed grace to the woman who had been caught in adultery but He also showed truth in that He told her to go and sin no more. We have to use the same grace and truth principles in balance in dealing with homosexuals. Grace meaning you never withdraw the offer of God's so great salvation by pushing them away and isolating yourself; truth meaning you never compromise the truth of the word of God. These must be kept in balance. Usually people are all grace or all truth. If they're all grace they tolerate it and redefine homosexuality as a Christian behavior. If they are all truth then they obliterate it and mock it. I don't think either approach by itself is Scripturally warranted. Both have a place and must be kept in balance. When you talk to them I don't think it is a helpful strategy to single out and attack the sin of homosexuality. If you do that you are going to be branded as a homophobe and intolerant and they are going to cut you off from having any influence in their life. Then you will have no opportunity to win them to Christ, which should be your ultimate aim. You are not trying to force them to change their behavior. People who are not Christians do not have a new nature or the Holy Spirit to enable them to live a new life according to the new nature. They are the walking dead, dead in their trespasses and sins, walking according to the culture of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air. Among them we too all formerly lived in the lusts of our flesh, indulging the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest. But God is rich in mercy, because of His great love and even when we were dead in our transgressions He made us alive together with Christ by His matchless grace! So then, do not make issue of one sin or one troubling societal practice, make issue of the fact that they have sinned and fall short of the glory of God. Keep that door of grace open. At the same time there is the truth and in this vein I can say that I am just as set against homosexuality as I am against lying, deceit, theft and murder. The former is not determined by biology any more than lying, deceit, theft or murder are determined by biology. No scientific literature has ever been published that showed a genetic link to homosexual pre-disposition.^{iv} It is a lifestyle choice that people make in the same way that some people choose to

live a lifestyle of theft or murder. Laws are made to govern certain behavior choices; to discriminate between what are good choices and what are bad choices. Laws that condemn the choice of theft and murder are good laws because they provide security and stability for societies and laws that condemn the choice of homosexuality are also good laws because they protect marriage, family and children. The attempt to legalize homosexual marriage is a direct attack on the Judeo-Christian worldview of marriage and family. And it is this worldview that has brought all the stability, economic progress and nurturing of children to our civilization. The homosexual marriage agenda is designed to change the structure of marriage and family. Yet these structures are embedded deeply in the fabric of who we are as human beings. Divorce, fornication, homosexual lifestyles, children outside of marriage, etc... all have huge negative effects on the economy. Ancient history tells the story over and over and over. It didn't work then and it isn't going to work now. This is the truth and we can't compromise the truth. But we also have to display grace. So in the end the goal is to keep a balance of grace and truth in dealing with our unbelieving friends and family that endorse or practice homosexual behavior.

Paul evidently followed this procedure. He did not make the issue homosexuality; He made the issue sin, homosexuality was one of those sins that has especially horrid consequences. But Paul knew that unbelievers could not just change their lifestyle. He knew that they needed a change to their being. They needed to become new people. That can only be effected through the regenerative work of the Holy Spirit. He said to those at Corinth, "Do not be deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards... nor swindlers...will inherit the kingdom of God. Such were some of you;" they were in Paul's audience when he was preaching the gospel! "But you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." People were healed of homosexuality through the truth of the gospel. They no longer behaved that way. And yet what do many so-called Christians do who come to this Scripture in Romans 1 that is ? They re-interpret it!

I want to address the two interpretations of this passage given by Christians who are pro-same sex marriage. These arguments are sweeping over Christian denominations. Just yesterday someone sent me an article titled,

“Presbyterian assembly; Gay marriage is Christian.” The article explains how the top legislative body of the Presbyterian Church (USA) denomination voted by large margins Thursday to recognize same-sex marriage as Christian in the church constitution, adding language that marriage can be the union of “two people,” not just “a man and a woman.” They cited this as an answer to prayer.^v I’m sure you’ve seen news report after news report of denominations openly embracing same sex marriage and how it’s valid as a form of Christian love and so on and so forth. The question is how do they interpret these verses that appear to be Paul’s condemnation of homosexuality? There are two approaches. First, the not natural TO ME interpretation. In this interpretation the words in verse 26 “exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural” are interpreted to mean “that which is a person’s “natural disposition” and something that comes “instinctively” to them.” So the real sin Paul is condemning in this view is acting differently than your natural disposition. If you are a woman and you’re natural disposition or instinct is to have sex with another woman then to have sex with a man would be sin, or vice versa. The problems with this interpretation are many. First, the claim that natural function refers to one’s own natural disposition is contrary to what the Greek words actually mean. No Greek lexicon supports their claimed meaning of a personal disposition. The word means “in accordance with the basic order of things in nature,” that is, in accordance with the way we are by design. A woman with a woman simply is out of order, it does not fit and the same is true for a man with a man. The design features in both body and spirit are one-sided and have no complement. Second, in verse 26 God is giving them over to something unnatural because they did not worship Him. The context is a judgment. In their view this would mean that God gives a person over to the opposite of their “natural disposition.” So if a woman’s “natural disposition” was to have sex with another woman then God would give her over to have sex with a man. That is what would be unnatural to her and a judgment. But that doesn’t make any contextual sense to their view. Third, in verse 27 Paul explicitly states that “men with men” is an indecent act. Very simply the Greek word means “a behavior that is the shameless or disfiguring deed.” So there is no possibility that Paul is saying by natural function ‘not natural to me.’ He is saying what is natural according to God’s design. It is not natural for a woman to desire to have sex with another woman and it is not normal for a man to desire to have sex with another man. Yet these desires manifest a deeper problem in the soul of the individual, the theological problem of

worshipping the creation rather than the Creator and thus being given over to this filthy behavior.

A second interpretation is the orgy interpretation. In this interpretation much is made of the fact that “women” is plural” and “men” is plural. As one advocate says, “In this account there are a number of men and a number of women, both plurals. This would most definitely be an orgy...everyone filled with lust and “dishonorable passions” having sex with whomever however.” This they condemn but homosexual monogamy they endorse. From here they go on to discuss the importance of remaining faithful in your homosexual marriage. This view has more problems than the first. First, it assumes marriage as a divine institution is not between one man and one woman. However, Genesis claims that it is. God created Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve. It is very clear that God says a man should leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife. The words cannot be strained to say that a man should leave his father and mother and be joined to his husband nor could a woman leave her father and mother and be joined to her wife. The original design and God’s intent for marriage for all time is one man and one woman in a covenant. Second, this interpretation does not give adequate due to the distinctions inherent to male and female. Male and female are different in both body and spirit. A child does not need a woman and a woman as parents but a man and a woman. Each sex contributes something distinct to the child’s upbringing. Third, it maximizes one side of the human race. If two women marry then the feminine side is emphasized to the expense of the masculine. No matter how hard or what role a woman might play in such a relationship they are still a woman, they may be able to change their body but they cannot change their spirit. A maximization of one side of the human race to the expense of the other is detrimental to any children that might be artificially inseminated (not to even remark about the implied fornication of such a procedure). Fourth, it illegitimately uses the text. Plural though they may be it is arbitrary to say that what is happening here is only an orgy. If we were to follow this principle of interpreting then when we came to Ephesians 5:22ff where Paul says “Wives [plural] submit to your own husbands [plural], we would have to say that orgy marriages are appropriate, the very opposite of their interpretation here. The use of a plural does not by any stretch of the imagination mean that individuals are not being addressed and the context makes this clear!

In conclusion, verses 24-25, heterosexual immorality, is an exceptional indication of a society gone sour and God allowing it to self-destruct. Verses 26-27, homosexual immorality, is also an exceptional indication of a society gone sour. Ultimately, however, the problem is not the heterosexual immorality or the homosexual immorality, but the theological immorality being committed in their hearts. Therefore our focus should be on reaching people for Christ through evangelism and being always ready to give an apologetic to any who would ask for a reason for the hope that is in us. This involves the two-step procedure used by the apostle Paul in such a culture; preaching repentance toward God, or a change of mind about God as preparation for faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, believing the gospel which centers in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

ⁱ Wuest, K. S. (1997). *Wuest's Word Studies from the Greek New Testament: For the English Reader* (Ro 1:26). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

ⁱⁱ http://www.faculty.umb.edu/gary_zabel/Courses/Morals%20and%20Law/M+L/Plato/homosex.htm

ⁱⁱⁱ <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/magazine/news/20130429/jason-collins-gay-nba-player/>

^{iv} http://nationalblackroberegiment.com/latest-scientific-research-gay-gene/?utm_source=News+from+National+Black+Robe+Regiment&utm_campaign=9b1198689b-In+the+News+6+19+14&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_e1dba415b9-9b1198689b-230284633

“The genes were neither sufficient, nor necessary, to make any of the men gay.” One problem all along for gay activists is that even a cursory survey of sexual orientation among identical twins makes the “born that way” meme impossible to accept. “The flawed thinking behind a genetic test for sexual orientation is clear from studies of twins, which show that the identical twin of a gay man, who carries an exact replica of his brother’s DNA, is more likely to be straight than gay. That means even a perfect genetic test that picked up every gene linked to sexual orientation would still be less effective than flipping a coin.”

^v http://www.mercurynews.com/faith/ci_25995667/presbyterian-pastors-can-preside-at-gay-marriages

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2014