

## **Biblical Basis for Human Sexuality**

For the moment, let us lay aside the rationalizations and the defensiveness. Let us talk not of what is, what has been, or what likely will be. Let us not now deal in statistics, but in ideals and in the rational. Let us not deal in recent history, where scarcely a living American soul has avoided sexual contamination. Let us see what *ought* to be, and if in consequence we might alter our perspectives and perhaps our behavior. There are a few Biblical concepts that might go far toward eliminating sexual sin from the lives of those who will heed their several lessons.

Let us also put aside the dogma of Secular Humanism. Indeed, much of that sexuality people want today (without incurring a sense of guilt) can only be justified on the basis of the theory of evolution, the lap dog of Secular Humanism. Should we have homosexual marriage? Just believe in evolution and holler about human rights. (Never mind the fact that the rights we're hollering about, in the country in which we're hollering about them, are said to be "God-given rights.") According to the theory of evolution we're just animals running about on planet Earth, and not answerable to anyone. So what we do in our bedrooms is really our own business. Should we have abortion on demand? Just believe in evolution. According to the theory of evolution we are just animals, and that thing in the womb is "just a blob of protoplasm," and is no more important than a booger.

To today's culture, permeated as it is with the theory of evolution, nothing could be more hateful than to believe that God made woman for man, or that man and woman are to become one flesh. Nothing is quite so laughable to the Secularist as the Biblical notion that the purpose of the sexual union is the reproduction of the race, or that marriage was instituted for the protection of women and children. The Bible cuts through most of modern sexuality from homosexuality to new "modern" forms of marriage. For example, God did not produce Adam and Steve, and such unions as they have are roundly forbidden and condemned in the Bible. So one engages in such practices more easily in a world conditioned by the theory of evolution, so Secular Humanism is the defense mechanism of choice among today's Americans.

But here, we are concerned *not* to be infected with the diseases of the World, so we will present a Biblical view of things. The primary purpose of sexual relations is procreation. God expects sexual relations to be kept within the confines of marriage, because the primary purpose of marriage is the protection of the woman who gives birth, and the protection and nurture of the children born to the marriage. If sexual relations are *not* contained within marriage, who will protect and nurture the children born to such loose relationships? The government?

### **Sex as God Intended**

Let us note that God created Adam and Eve, not Adam and Steve. The creation of woman gave man "a help suitable for him" (Gen 2:18). Eve *completed* Adam emotionally and psychologically, and was the perfect physical (sexual) complement to him.

God ordained marriage between a man and a woman when He said "for this cause a man shall leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife" (Gen 2:24). By marriage, God sought to protect the woman and provide for the family.

God commanded the man to “be fruitful and multiply,” (Gen 1:28) something not possible without the woman. This shows that the *purpose* of sex is procreation.

Childlessness was bemoaned and viewed as a curse or a tragedy throughout the Bible. Think of Sarah, Naomi, and in the New Testament, Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist.

Levirate marriage was instituted to guarantee children and a legacy to the childless widow.

Apparently, all sexual unions which *may* not eventuate in pregnancy (*a la* union with a menstruating woman, as shown in Lev 18:19 or with a girl who is not yet past puberty, or with animals) and therefore mocks God, or deliberately circumvents His will, is considered sin. And homosexual intercourse has the additional odium of being called “an abomination” (Leviticus 18:22). Leviticus 18, in addition to forbidding sexual union with a menstruating woman, also forbids Homosexual union as well as bestiality (for both men and women). The penalty for committing these sins was death! Looking again at first Timothy 1:9 – 10 we read that the law was made for the disobedient “and if there be any other thing that is against sound doctrine.” No doctrine is more sound than the doctrine of marriage. And any sexual union which *cannot* result in “fruitfulness” is unclean and/or an abomination. This undeniably includes sodomy.

### **Virginity is to be Prized**

Virginity was prized and enjoined in the Bible, and a Levite could marry none but a virgin (Leviticus 21:13-14). Wrongly bringing a bad name upon a virgin resulted in the husband having to keep her as his wife, without the possibility of divorce. If an engaged virgin was deflowered by force, the man was put to death. And a man who forced a virgin who was not engaged, was forced to pay a fine to her father and marry the girl (See Leviticus 22).

### **Male “Seed” is a Male Responsibility**

Perhaps more surprising, is the fact that men were held responsible for their seed. Just as the Levite was not to marry a profane woman, neither was he to “profane his seed” among his people, or sow wild oats among those he could not marry. It looks suspiciously like God was teaching that a woman not worthy of marriage to him was not worthy to receive his seed.

Man’s seed bears both God’s image and man’s nature; it is man’s seed which guarantees that any child born to him has half his genetic material and genetically is, therefore, half his father and half his mother. But he is also made “in the image of God.”

The “image of God,” passed on genetically, is important, because passing it on is a command of God (“be fruitful and multiply” – Genesis 1:28). Being fruitful is seen as *desirable* (and the *inability* to be fruitful as *tragic*) throughout the Scriptures (cf. Sarai, Rebekah, Ruth, Elizabeth) .

The material for this fruitfulness is the DNA in the ova and the sperm. The mechanism of human fruitfulness is the heterosexual union, i.e., a man inseminates a woman. There are significant consequences to this. The fact that the primary purpose of the sex act is *procreation* is a problem for moderns, because this alone marks the impossibility of “gay” marriage. There is, in fact, a “chicken or the egg” problem here. For woman was made for man, Sexual union was for

procreation, and marriage was for fostering procreation (and provision for the woman etc.). One cannot easily escape the conclusion, that men and women were made for each other, that they were to experience a unique union into which, and by means of which, they brought forth children who, even if fallen like their fathers, yet bore the Image of God, even if somewhat imperfectly.

In other words, because procreation is commanded by God and is only possible through heterosexual union, no other sort of sexual union can be considered normative. God's command to procreate implies the command to have heterosexual union. Beyond this, however God sets boundaries on his command to be fruitful. The man and woman are to be married and to "be fruitful" only with one another; i.e., the command of God involves marriage and monogamy. All other sexual unions are forbidden.

The reason this becomes a problem for moderns is that they have wrongly inferred that the purpose of sexual union is *pleasure*, and may have forgotten (or denied) that their DNA is their share in the next generation and their contribution to it of an example of "God's image."

It is true that sexual union is pleasurable. If it weren't, the human race would not have lasted five generations. But just because pleasure is *present* in something means neither that *pleasure is its purpose*, nor that *the act itself is good*. The purpose of eating is *nutrition* and prolonging of healthy life. Is eating pleasurable? Most of the time it is. But when we eat *because* it is pleasurable, the results of our mistaken notion usually show up quickly in terms of weight gain and *worse* health.

Does this mean that we should not indulge in heterosexual union except when we are certain that it will result in pregnancy? No. Only that when this act is performed, there cannot be any "unwanted" consequences and it *may* result pregnancy. Does this mean that sexual union must be avoided until children are wanted? No – only that when sexual union occurs, it is perfectly okay if pregnancy results. So, if one does not want children, i.e., if a child is an "unwanted consequence," he or she should forgo the pleasure of sexual union with the understanding that he is deliberately saying "no" to God's command to be fruitful. And so is any sexual union that *cannot* result in fruitfulness.

The Hebrew use circumlocution regarding sexual matters, explains why Biblical terms for sexual behavior sometimes seem vague to us. New Testament Greek can be similarly confusing. The Greek word "porneuo" (from which we get the word *pornography*) can properly be applied to virtually *any sex act not between a man and his wife*. Even the word "sodomy" is perhaps less explicit than moderns would like it to be, but it is enough that with *certainty* it applies at *least* to homosexual behavior. But, by extension, it may refer to the same sexual acts between a man and his wife that occur between two homosexual men. And it is condemned for the same reason, i.e. it *cannot* result in pregnancy.

We can see now why homosexuality seems worse among men and is not an issue for women. It is because man can physically *direct, misdirect* or *refuse his seed* (e.g., Onan "spilling his seed on the ground" instead of as a means of saving his dead brother's wife, Tamar – Genesis 38:8-10), and women cannot do so with their ova. The most likely thing women might do is to expose their ova to fertilization by the wrong man (adultery), or under circumstances unfavorable to a child she may have as a result of such union (i.e., being unmarried – fornication).

Men, on the other hand, can do a great variety of things with their seed. Of those involving sexual union, all of them are wrong except that union with one's wife which may, at God's good pleasure, result in fruitfulness.

Put differently, women have no control over the location or placement of their ova, only to whom they are exposed for fertilization. Men can put their seed virtually anywhere. Hence, the strong commandments regarding the male stewardship of his share of God's image.

It is interesting that the modern gay rights movement could never have arisen except the greater culture had first forgotten God and subsequently come to regard the primary purpose of sexual union to be *pleasure*. Even after pastors quit teaching the truth on this topic, there were still practical obstacles such as STDs and inconvenient pregnancies to slow the movement. Once birth control and medical treatments (and the required secrecy of treatment) were available, sexual union became nothing more than a game. And everyone wanted to play

To modern ears, the Biblical notion of sexual union will seem stultifying and narrow. There will not be very many who wish to guide their sexuality by God's precepts. But, the love and soul-melting intimacy possible for a man and a woman who have not previously diminished themselves, is unbelievable and undeniable. And at its full strength it is unavailable to those who have.

Let men once again properly understand themselves to be stewards of their seed, and women seek only the soul warming intimacy that is available in no other way than by means of virtue.

### **Sex that God Forbids**

Sex, in the Bible is condemned as either sinful or an abomination in all contexts where a "partner" is involved, but in which it is impossible for pregnancy to result.

### **No Bestiality**

Bestiality was forbidden to both men and women. The reason a woman was not to have sexual relations with an animal was because "it is confusion." Those who engaged in sex with an animal was stoned to death along with the animal involved (Leviticus 18:23; 20:15). It is interesting that in the case of the woman, the reason given for the act's extreme offensiveness is that "it is confusion (KJV ASV. "Perversion," the rendering of the modern versions, is a mistranslation). The woman, whose duty it is to bring forth children, "confused" the issue by accepting seed from an animal. This was not the issue with the man, who would not bring forth anything. But the man in such a case was guilty of being irresponsible for his seed – and it was deemed by God to be a capital offense.

### **No Homosexuality**

There are several disputed verses in the Bible both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament regarding homosexuality. We have seen people use the texts to indicate that David had a homosexual relationship with Jonathan (2 Sam 1:25). They deny that anything blameworthy was happening in Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen 19:1-21). And their casuistry is such that they claim that even straightforward statements like that found in Lev 18:22 do not apply to today's homosexuality.

Even such passages as 1 Corinthians 6:9 – 11 and 1 Timothy 1:9 – 10 are denied to be “anti-gay.” This is pure blather, of course. All these “anti-gay” verses are indeed anti-homosexual. But if someone wants to create a tempest in a teacup and refuse to believe what is written (i.e., “to suppress the truth in unrighteousness” – Romans 1:18) he will do so, and nothing we can say will alter that. And that is okay. These words are directed only to those who would do God’s will.

A person can flap like a bird, roar like a jet or spin like a helicopter. But until his efforts result in unaided motion through the sky, he is not flying, no matter how vehemently he may claim that he is. And so it is with homosexuality. For marriage is, was, and always will be the legal arrangement for the protection of women and the children of the marital union. It is in fact the established union specifically instituted for the propagation of the human race. For as long as there has been marriage, there have also been homosexual alliances. When homosexuals are finished and leave one another, so what? But when a father leaves his wife and children, a grave hardship is placed on family, friends, or government. Hence, something called marriage is in place to protect the women and children and the law which establishes marriage must be enforced. We scarcely need to explain how, like standing on a corner flapping our arms and calling ourselves “flying,” homosexuals calling themselves “married” is simply word magic or delusion. There simply is no such thing as homosexual marriage, and no law can change the fact that homosexual unions do not propagate the species.

### **No Heterosexual Sin**

Although not characterized as abomination, more ink is spilled on heterosexual sin than on the abominations. Heterosexual sin includes rape, fornication, and adultery – anything not with ones husband or wife. So although the manner of sexual engagement was “natural,” the rights of the woman were violated, when she was treated as an object of sexual gratification, and any children who might come from such a union were left to whatever winds were blowing. No marriage, no licit sexual behavior!

### **Summation: The Purpose of Sex**

The *purpose* of sex is procreation, but its ultimate psychological trajectory and result is the falling in love of the couple. Analogies are difficult to find, but the basic fact of the matter largely explains both how arranged marriages worked for centuries and why modern *sexuality*, as such, is a dismal failure. The beauty of the man and woman seemingly “becoming one flesh” in the act of love, resulting in the “one flesh” of a beloved child is sweet and innocent and to be cherished. On the other hand the behavior of two people behaving like dogs in order to ease their raging hormones and possibly producing what is now termed a “product of conception,” to be discarded as easily as a worn handkerchief can scarcely be called sweet or innocent.

If sex is allowed to become the goal (conquest, seduction, cheating, multiple partners, mismatched lovers, divorce, etc.) rather than a means to an end (love, intimacy, children and having no sexual ghosts in the closet) it carries the seed of its own destruction. And such sexual misconduct

produces images, liaisons, and memories, to say nothing of behavioral tendencies, that take a lifetime of attention and discipline to guard against. This attention saps the psychic energy that might otherwise be enjoyed as happiness.

This whole mechanism is flawed and its exercise damages one's psyche for life. A person's soul is maimed by reducing sexual unity to animalistic, materialistic, means of achieving selfish pleasure. The psychological bonding meant to happen in the sexual union within marriage either does not happen, is defective, or works with a poorly suited mate.

Both the expression that "a tree is known by its fruit" and "appearances can be deceiving," are true, and this causes some difficulty. Often, by the time the differences between appearance and reality are noticed, it is too late to make meaningful corrections. Particular kinds of behavior may appear to be "right," but if they are animated by "wrong" ideals, they are counterfeits, and like all counterfeits may deceive for a very long time.

Nowhere is this truer than in the biggest problem of our age – sexual misbehavior. The sex act can be animated by deep, true, committed love. Or, It can be motivated simply by overactive glands. In either case, the acts themselves may appear to be the same, but they are not. One is selfless, the other selfish. One of the oldest tricks in the book is to make the selfish act appear to the "partner" as the result of genuine love. It can be years before the "partner" discovers he or she has been used. The advice columns are full of exactly this complaint and related ones. But it gets worse.

For when practiced long enough, selfish sexual practice becomes completely impersonal. It is no longer a form of communication, it is simply an impersonal use of another person's body for what is nothing more than masturbation. The advice columns feature these complaints as well, but you can hear such viewpoints expressed openly and honestly in men's locker rooms and women's spas and beauty salons. In such conversations, the people discussed (husbands, girlfriends, whatever) are spoken of neutrally, impersonally, as simply being inanimate devices used for one's sexual gratification. Eventually, the people are not even discussed, and they are referred to simply by their genitals, as "a cock," or as a "piece of pussy," or even "a hole." Do you want to be thought of as nothing more than "a cock," or "a hole?" This is as far from "special," or "one and only," as it is possible to get. Most sexual liaisons are somewhere in between the extremes of the chaste, "one and only," and "a hole." One cannot always tell from the behavior, where on the spectrum a person's perspective lies. But once one has departed from the "one and only" extreme which God created, commanded, and blessed, one can never completely reclaim that position, for his guilt will have imparted to him a firsthand knowledge of selfish, animating features (instantiations) foreign to God's pure gift. This is nothing less than a personal, moral "fall." And he will ever be haunted by the ghosts from other bedrooms.

As God designed it, human sexuality was meant to be, as we see in retrospect, a means of communication at the very deepest and most intimate, personal level. It was intended to express love and support and concern for a single other person of the opposite sex. Every person was meant to have a unique and permanent sexual relationship with a husband or wife. In fact, we wrongly think of "cheating" as possible only when we are "in a relationship." But whoever has indulged in premarital sex, even with a person he or she later ends up marrying, has already cheated on his or her mate.

Real love is not that little sentiment we sang about in the 70s and 80s. For that kind of love is here today, gone tomorrow, and back again next week. Nothing can be built on anything so

ephemeral, fickle, and malleable. By “love,” we mean *committed dedication* to another person. Two facts are relevant here. First, a person does not even need to *like* his mate in order to “love” his mate. Second, wimpy, sentimental love will not likely be absent from such dedicated love for very long. Sexual love, physical intimacy, is to be the expression of *committed, volitional* love, not some silly, evanescent sentiment.

Herein lies the first instructive example of counterfeit. Sentimental love is often mistaken, in our culture, for genuine, dedicated love. But any relationship built on the ephemeral sentiment will partake in its ephemeral nature. Such “love” will be felt today, gone tomorrow, and back again next week – maybe. That is if the personal sacrifices and responsibilities do not mount up too high or too quickly.

This fact alone goes a long way in explaining a couple prevalent features of our culture, i.e., our high divorce rate, and the deliberate reduction of the sex act to a temporary game on the level of charades or checkers. The more honest (but misinformed) properly see that marriage based upon such “love” is a sham. But because they do not know any other kind of love, they throw the institution of marriage out with their faulty notion of doomed “love.” They are consistent, they are just wrong.

Marriage, in order to be genuine, must be based upon commitment and dedication – the high ideal of “come what may,” of “till death do us part.” In such a marriage, wimpy love might appear, disappear, and reappear as it may. And it will always be welcome. But it must *never* be expected to bear the weight of trials, for it cannot do so.

To return to the principles with which we began, let us compare the behavior of genuine love with that of its popular counterfeits. First, genuine love is *permanent*. Its counterfeit is not. Genuine love, the dedicated commitment of one for another, is *selfless*. Its counterfeit is selfish. So how do these two kinds of love manifest themselves in behavior? Genuine, dedicated committed love, desires to be with its object – or not, if it believes there is another person better suited for the object of his affection. (One thinks of Sydney Carton in Charles Dickens’ *Tale of Two Cities*.) The welfare of the other is clearly more important than his own “desire.” Genuine, dedicated commitment love can wait to express itself sexually – in fact its own expression is not even at the top of its list. That is why in times past people were expected to wait, and usually did wait until marriage before expressing love sexually. Such marriages rarely failed. They were built upon a permanent commitment, not on a passing fancy or a fickle sentiment. It is worth noting that such marriages are a function of the *will*, not of desire, nor yet of some sentimental titillation. That is why arranged marriages worked and merely sentimental connections do not. Only *a failure of will*, and *not the absence of a sentiment*, can threaten a marriage based on true love.

So, when marriage became a matter arranged by the parties themselves, the likelihood of selfishness entering the mix were greater than marriages that were arranged by parents, or even when the “blessings” of the parents were still a matter of some importance. Indeed, over the years following World War II, divorce rates increased, gradually at first, drastically later. It is said that 50% of today’s marriages end in divorce. That is a lot of misery and misunderstanding.

One might be forgiven for thinking that, in order to avoid social catastrophe, we again would have cultivated genuine marriage. But we didn’t. By the time we recognized the fact that our

marriages were flawed, we no longer knew what genuine marriage was<sup>1</sup>. Even those of us whose parents enjoyed genuine marriage were ill-equipped to analyze the facts of the case. The “Boomers,” in order to continue their desire for momentary gratification, continued to pursue sentimental love, and put their trust in penicillin and condoms, in “the pill,” and when these failed, in pharmaceuticals and abortion.

So marriages based upon sentimental love and the sexual relationship within such marriages were doomed (unless somewhere along the way the partners discovered and adopted the attitude of commitment). Soon, sexual gratification *outside* marriage became commonplace and eventually came to be accepted (with some minor reservations) as a permissible means of dealing with “raging hormones” and (duh!) “loveless” (now how did *that* happen?) marriages.

Marriage became a casualty of the “sexual revolution,” with couples mating like animals, experimenting with various sexual behaviors, and accepting whatever means consenting people (no longer mere “couples” and no longer necessarily “adults”) chose to employ in order to “get off.” Now, “sexuality” or being “sexually active” often begins as early as junior high school, and is never even thought of as a means of expressing love, even of the sentimental variety. It is now no more than “hooking up” briefly in order to “get off” and perhaps boost one’s ego in the process. What animates this behavior? Is it dedicated commitment? Hardly. It is two takers either seeking fleeting relief or hiding ulterior motives.

So real marriage, based on true love, and expressed sexually within the bonds of marriage, and the wonderful psycho-sensual intimacy of experiencing the mystery of “being one flesh,” is almost nonexistent today. People today ridicule such conservative notions, but haven’t a clue concerning the blessings they have forfeited. They feel that they have all the answers and that living in a modern (or postmortem) culture produces situations conservative behavior cannot address. Such folks are unaware that *they* are the failures according to how consistently they apply counterfeit realities to their lives.

Before we get away from notions of right and wrong, it is essential that we pause for a moment to reflect on a couple of facts. Many, *perhaps most*, of today’s sexual practices are immoral, wrong, bad, obscene or almost any other negative characterization one may choose to apply. But this is not so because they have bad results. They are not bad because they result in disease, abortion or destroyed lives. They are wrong because *God said they were wrong*. Abortion, diseases and destroyed lives occur because something wrong has been done – these are the *results* of having done something wrong. God has made things in such a way that if we follow His instructions, blessings follow. If not, various inconvenient consequences follow, ranging from Aids and abortion to psychological starvation and perversions. But disobeying God is what is wrong, the rest is just His judgement. Just so, following God’s dictates is right. The blessedness that follows is the *reward*, not the *definition*. When a child is punished, it is not the punishment that makes his behavior wrong. The behavior was wrong, hence it brought on the punishment. During the 50s and 60s pastors got it wrong. The great horrors of illicit sexual union was what made the behavior wrong. So when people thought that contraceptives and penicillin vanquished the evil, they felt free to indulge in

---

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the majority today no longer remember real art, true worship, meticulous science, genuine education, and other things. These things have been missing too long to merely have been forgotten – they are now unknown!



those (still illicit) behaviors. They had not been told that fornication was wrong because it was not according to God's revealed character, command, or plan, but that the results made it evil.

Yet today we have overwhelming proof that neither contraceptives nor penicillin have kept our society from the brink of national judgment. Far too often today, people do not have true love, intimate marriages, and intertwined lives. Too often they have "unwanted pregnancies," abortions, life-changing venereal diseases, and relationships based upon nothing more than the frequency with which they feel compelled to relieve their sexual tensions.

If the only thing wrong with today's understanding of sexuality were its shallowness and lack of substance, it would be merely calamitous. But it is worse than that. Today's attitudes are the deliberate adoption of counterfeit love – evolutionary thought's denial of right and wrong, and counterfeit marriages, and result in *the forfeiture of even the possibility* of experiencing the genuine in its fullest glory. Having cast their lots with the counterfeit and fake, they now have a vested interest in denying, suppressing or subverting the Truth.

Today's "sexually active," as a class, cannot acknowledge the truth of the old values, for not only do they not remember the, but to do so is to admit either gross foolishness, brazen willfulness, or both. The only remaining option is, in accordance with the theory of evolution, to redefine sexual normalcy to include every deviant behavior imaginable in order to gain adherents and drown out the truth. It would seem impossible to look at today's sexual culture and *not* remember Romans 1:17 – 32.

Furthermore such sexual sins as have enticed one to their fulfillment, destroy a pure mind and soul and conscience. Such people will carry with them to their graves the memories of past illicit sexual liaisons. Such future relationships as might have been pure must, of necessity, now be less so, for they will find their bedrooms invaded, from time to time, by the unwanted ghosts of sexual liaisons past.

But not only do illicit sexual relations produce bedroom "ghosts" for the guilty party, they provide invisible, even if only *imaginary*, competitors for the innocent party. We know how self-conscious women are about their figures and how worried men can be about "size." These worries, rational or not, are of necessity magnified in the mind of one whose partner has had "experience" with someone else. Such "experience" provides the partner with a competitor against whom he may feel compelled to compare himself by such means as wondering "am I good enough?" or "am I doing this right?" or perhaps "I hope she's not 'faking it'." Such self-defeating and judgmental images are invited into the bedroom for the rest of a person's life the first (and every subsequent time) he engages in an illicit sexual liaison.

Why, after all, do we feel that infidelity is wrong? Why does it hurt so much? Why do people keep it a secret if they can? It is not merely the physical contact, but the *spiritual and emotional importance* of that contact that poisons one's partner. It is not like shaking hands; it is a betrayal of intimacy. It is cheapening one's sexuality and deepest intimacy and parading it around like a show pony. Instead of being a "one and only," one is reduced to "one of a collection," a notch on the bed post. What one shared in intimacy has been pulled out and compared like stamps in a stamp collection. No person wants to endure comparison to others, particularly in the area of sexual "equipment," or performance, and they should not have to. Each partner should be able to rest in the certainty that he is literally his partner's "one and only," his "everything." This knowledge is absolutely necessary to build perfect intimacy.

## How to Proceed

But what shall those guilty of sex sins do now? Once the genie is out of the bottle it is unlikely he can be squeezed back in, and in any case, the damage, physical, emotional, or psychological, has been done.

It is true that forgiveness can absolve one of the guilt. It is also true that long times spent doing things right eventually dull the memories of sins once indulged. But the soul is still stained; the knowledge that there is an enjoyable counterfeit readily at hand, and the possibility of running into old partners in sin prevent the complete cleansing of the soul in the here and now.

Are you engaged in illicit sexual relations? Or have you ever been? You can never know the pleasures of perfect and pure intimacy, but you can make a reasonable approach. By following His instructions from now on, one can eventually arrive at a satisfying state that *may be* is almost as good as if one had never messed things up in the first place. Here are the options:

Continue what you are doing. Use the defense mechanism of denial. Simply bow to the theory of evolution and deny that you are doing wrong, or that your chosen means of sexuality is seriously flawed. There are lots of convincing (but fallacious) ways to justify yourself – “we are in love” (no, true love waits – you are merely *in lust*); “everyone else is doing it” (the day the majority opinion *really* defines right and wrong is the very day we can vote God out of heaven!), *et cetera ad nauseam*; or

Stop doing wrong, explain to yourself and your partner why, and seek forgiveness. Do things right from now on, and life will surprise and amaze you with the value and beauty of what you lacked the patience to wait for in the first place.

So far as your contribution to your culture, your options are these:

1. Continue to rationalize your behavior by normalizing it for others, including any children you may have. (Again, Romans 1:14-32 confronts us.) Or,

2. Do not berate what God declared is good and normal, but defended it. Teach your children that *good* is what God says it is, not what *everybody is doing*. Perhaps the most subtle, but dangerous area where this is so, is in the area of sexuality.

3. Do not be afraid to admit you have been *wrong*. It is your only hope of ever getting it right.

4. Hardest of all, do not sit in judgment of others, especially if you feel their sexual misconduct is worse than yours. Condemning others in order to feel better about ourselves is nothing less than *relativism*, and that belongs outside the Church, and outside the Christian’s thought. Do not imagine homosexuals are somehow worse than your are. Perhaps they are, but what is that to you? You are a far cry from perfect, and that ought to be your main concern so far as morality and judgment are concerned.