

HOMOSEXUALITY

+

What

Does

The

Bible

Say?

+

by

G.I. Williamson

HOMOSEXUALITY

It is important at the beginning of this tract to state our presuppositions, since these will inevitably affect the outcome of our study. Let it also be stated at the outset that we do not intend to go into great detail. We believe the value of this study will be increased if it is as brief as possible. Here, then, are our assumptions.

- (1) *The Bible is our only ultimate authority.* By “the Bible” we mean the 66 books of the Old and New Testaments, as these are listed in the Reformed Confessions (commonly called The Canon of Scripture).
- (2) *The Bible is inerrant, and self-attesting.*
- (3) *In order to understand the Scriptures we must have the inward (in our hearts) testimony of the Holy Spirit.* It is not the case that understanding the Bible is a mere academic matter (so that the well educated can understand, and they only). Our Lord said God has “*hidden these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them to babes*” (Lk. 10:21).

In the Elders Handbook, Berghoef and de Koster make this statement to Elders: “Don’t let yourself be put down. Argument is not won just by somebody’s saying it’s so. Proof comes only in one of these three ways:

- a) By presenting the facts which support the argument.
- b) By quoting good authority, especially the Scriptures or the Confessions.
- c) Through plain reasoning which leads to sound conclusions.

“Don’t be bluffed by quotations from the Bible in Greek or Hebrew. What cannot be proved in English isn’t there. Remember that the Bible is perspicuous—that is, the Bible is clear on the basic doctrines of faith and life. Insist that positions which are said to rest on the Bible have that clarity themselves.” (p. 43)

We heartily agree with this statement. Elders of the Church are competent to judge whether or not a doctrine or ethical principle is taught in Scripture.

(4) *We believe that Scripture is consistent with Scripture.* This is because God Himself is the principal author of it.

We should, of course, read the Bible with as much “help” as we can get. Information from other ancient literature, from archaeology, and so on, can aid us in getting a right understanding of the text of Scripture. But we must realize that we are not allowed, because we come to understand the cultural situation which existed when the Bible was written, to dismiss what it teaches as irrelevant for us merely because we live in a different situation. For example, Biblical culture was much more patriarchal than our culture is today. But in spite of all cultural change the Bible clearly commands wives to be in submission to their husbands. The Bible does not permit us to set aside its commands as if they were a mere product of culture. After all, we too live in a particular “time bound situation.” But no matter what our particular situation may be this does not give us the right to set ourselves up as judges of the Bible. To the contrary, the Bible judges our “time bound situation” just as it does the culture of the time in which it was written. Much of the present confusion in the Reformed

Churches of the world can be avoided if we reject the false principle that we can set aside Biblical commands because *we* decide they were “time bound.”

The Biblical Data

We now give a resume of the Biblical Data, beginning our survey with the creation account. We do this because it is here that God defined man’s sexual nature. God made man “male and female...in his own image” (Gen. 1:27). But he created Adam first (2:7). And it was God himself who said it was not good for the man to be alone (v.18). Adam—who was sinless at the time—also recognized that there was no helper suitable for him among other creatures that God had made (v.20). This shows, already, that all sexual relations between humans and animals are contrary to the design of the creator. After this was made clear God then made the woman. He made only one woman, Eve, for Adam. He did this so that Adam would have a suitable sexual partner. And when Adam saw her he recognized this truth immediately (v. 23,24).

Does this not show clearly that monogamy is the creation order? Does it not show that sexual relations between one *man* and one *woman* is what God himself intended for us? Does it not teach us that sexual relations between man and beast are wrong? And does it not also indicate that sexual relations between two men (or two women) is contrary to the created order? As Paul said to the Corinthians, “does not even nature itself teach you...?” (1 Cor. 11:14) Let us be explicit. God made us male and female. Is it not self-evident from the very biology of the two sexes, that God made the one sex for the other? Is it not true that we must lie to ourselves about our own very nature as God created it, to follow the homosexual deviation?

It is our conviction that the creation account itself, by good and necessary inference, condemns all homosexual inclination and behavior.

The first place that explicitly mentions homosexual deviation is Genesis 19. In this account we read that the men of Sodom surrounded the house of Lot. They called to Lot, saying, *“where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may know them”* (v. 5). Some who now seek to promote the homosexual life-style try to argue that these men only wanted to meet these guests of Lot. But the context, and the Biblical usage of the terms found here, refute such a notion. The word “know” which is used here is the common term for sexual intercourse in the Bible (as, for example, when the Bible says *“Adam knew his wife Eve, and she conceived”* and so on). The New American Standard Bible therefore translates this term correctly when it reads: *“bring them out to us that we may have relations with them”* (v. 5). That this is the meaning is also clear from the context. We see this clearly in the counter-offer of Lot. *“Please, my brothers, do not act wickedly. Now behold, I have two daughters who have not had relations (again, this is same word “know” in Hebrew) with man; please let me bring them out to you, and do to them whatever you like; only do nothing to these men, inasmuch as they have come under the shelter of my roof”* (vv. 7,8).

No doubt it is true that in that day it was regarded as a sacred duty to protect one’s guests. Yet it is crystal clear that Lot understood the men of Sodom to be after sex with the angels they took to be men. We may be offended by the fact that Lot would offer his virgin daughters to these men. But still, the main thing is perfectly clear; these men wanted to have a homosexual relationship with these strangers. Lot regarded

this as such a wicked thing that he preferred the obnoxious choice of giving them his daughters as the lesser of two evils. This is further confirmed by Jude's comment, in the New Testament. He describes these men as those who "*indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh*" and for this reason "*are exhibited as an example in undergoing the punishment of eternal fire*" (Jude v. 7). We observe, then, that the epitome of wickedness, after the flood, was exhibited in homosexual behavior. We therefore affirm that God made it very clear, from the beginning, that he regarded this as an abomination.

Later on, in the law of Moses, we again find explicit mention of this subject. For convenience sake we list them here.

*"You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is **an abomination**" (Lev. 18:22).*

*"If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed **a detestable act**; they shall surely be put to death. Their bloodguiltiness is upon them" (Lev. 20:13).*

*"You shall not bring the hire of a harlot or the wages of a 'dog' (margin: 'male prostitute / sodomite') into the house of the lord your God...these are **an abomination** to the Lord" (Deut. 23:18).*

It is sometimes argued, today—by those seeking to promote a tolerant attitude toward this vile practice—that homosexual behavior was only condemned in the law of Moses because of its association with the pagan religions.¹ But the con-

¹ We do not deny, of course, that pagan religion and homosexuality are closely related. Indeed, it is precisely because America is becoming more pagan that it is also becoming more open to this evil.

text in which the above texts are given will show that it is not only condemned because of these associations, but also because these activities are wrong in themselves. For example, in Leviticus 18, various kinds of sexual sins are condemned including incest (sexual relations with a close relative), and bestiality (*“you shall not have intercourse with any animal or be defiled with it, nor shall any woman stand before an animal to mate with it, it is a perversion”* Lev. 18:23). In the midst of statements such as these the people of Israel were warned not to defile themselves with these things (v. 24) because (a) it was due to such that the land had become defiled, and (b) because of such that God had cast out the nations and given the land to his covenant people. It is the vileness of all these acts, *per se*, which is emphasized in these texts. In no way is it suggested that these acts are “not so bad” in and of themselves, but that God only cast the Gentiles out of the land of Palestine because they attached such things to their false worship.

In any case, there is no doubt that religion and ethics are interdependent. It is not surprising that today, in the present moral and spiritual climate of the Western World, homosexual behavior is “justified” by men. This is precisely what happened in the ancient world when men departed far from the true God. This is exactly what these passages in the law teach.

It should also be noted that in certain cases of heterosexual sin, the penalty is not death (for example, Lev. 19:20, and 20:21). For sins such as bestiality, and homosexuality, on the other hand, the death penalty was mandatory (Lev. 20:13,15,16). Clearly this is intended to teach us that *“some sins in themselves, and by reason of several aggravations, are more heinous in the sight of God than others”* (Shorter Catechism, Q. 83). One these ‘more heinous’ sins, is the sin of homosexual behavior.

In Judges 19 an incident is recorded which supports the understanding of Genesis 19 which we have stated above. We are told that in those days in Israel “every one did what was right in his own eyes” (17:6). So, in the city of Gibeah “the men of the city, worthless fellows” surrounded the house of a man who was showing hospitality to a stranger (v. 22). They virtually repeated the sins of the more ancient residents of Sodom as they “*perverted men, surrounded the house and beat on the door*” saying to the owner of the house “*bring out the man who came to your house that we may have relations with* (Hebrew: ‘know’) *him*” (v. 22). To prevent this wickedness the man offered his virgin daughter and his concubine. Since the men would not listen, he finally seized his concubine and brought her out to them, “*and they raped her and abused her all night until morning*” (v. 25). Is it not perfectly clear that these men were seeking homosexual relations? Is it not also clear that this man, like Lot, considered it the lesser of two evils to offer his concubine to them rather than to allow them to engage in an even greater abomination? We will not comment here on the horrible injustice done to this woman, since that is not a point that we can pursue in this brief tract. Suffice it to say that it confirms the meaning of “know” in the Genesis account, and shows that homosexual deviation was viewed with great horror by at least one older man—extreme horror, we might well say—even in the degenerate time of the judges

The teaching of the New Testament is in clear agreement with the Old. We see this first of all in the first chapter of Romans. In this well-known passage the Apostle traces the history of the moral and spiritual decline that took place in the Roman Empire. It began with a turning away from the true God (1:18-23). It culminated in a radical and pervasive moral or ethical degeneration. And it clearly shows us how any cul-

ture which exchanges the truth of God for a lie—coming to worship and serve the creature rather than the creator—will be given over by God himself to a reprobate mind, and to degrading passions (v. 28). When this happened in the Roman Empire, homosexual behavior became an acceptable—yes, even a desirable thing—to many (vv. 28,29). And it is our contention that this is precisely what we are seeing today in Western Culture? And it is quite clear that the reason for this shift is the same today as it was in the ancient Roman Empire?

One interesting fact here is this: these passions are said to be “*degrading*” (v. 26). They reduce men to a level that God did not intend. These passions are also “*unnatural*” (vv. 26,27). It is against nature because it is God who, by creation, determined the heterosexual expression as the one intended for our sexual nature. In this current debate it is often said that “for some people homosexual is natural” or, again, that “some people can’t help it because that is just the way they are made.” The answer to all such arguments is simply this: they are contrary to Scripture. Man’s nature was defined by God in creation. No human being can rightly say ‘God created *me* homosexual.’ He cannot say that any more legitimacy than the child-molester can say ‘God made *me* a child molester’ or than an unfaithful husband can say ‘God made *me* an adulterer.’

It is also true, however, that man’s nature is now a fallen nature. In principle, the ‘natural man’ is utterly depraved. We believe this condition is rightly called ‘total depravity.’ By this we do not mean that people are as bad as they could possibly be. What we mean is that they are—by (inherited, fallen) nature—sinful and defiled in all the aspects of their being. But this is not true of some people only. (It is not the homosexual only who is inherently vile by nature). No, this is true of all

people who are not yet regenerated. And this means that all men who are outside of Christ are, in principle, utterly at war with their own created nature as well as with the ordinances of God. Our Lord himself said that all iniquity comes out of man's fallen sinful nature (Mk. 7:21,22). This is the real explanation of all sexual deviation. The man who wants to have sex with animals is 'that way' because he is evil by nature. It is the same with the man who desires to sexually molest little children. It is likewise with the man who lusts after his neighbor's wife. And it is true of the man who desires to have sex with other men. All of these arise from man's depravity. And the Bible does not allow anyone to make excuse by saying 'I can't help it—it isn't my fault—that's just the way I was made.'

It is our view that *all* of Adam's descendants are, in principle, potential homosexuals. The only thing that prevents it in you or me is God's common and special grace. But when a culture follows the pattern of Romans 1—as our culture is most certainly doing, today—then God gives up on more and more people, so that they will follow out their own depraved inclinations. When that happens homosexual deviation becomes a life style that is not merely accepted, but even justified—yes, even celebrated as a great good.²

That the above is the correct view is confirmed by the teaching of 1 Corinthians 6:9-11. We quote it here in full:

"Or do you not know that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexu-

² This is a common theme that gays and lesbians use in seeking to be called Christians while they continue to engage in this vile sin.

als, nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you; 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."

Clearly, the Apostle Paul looked upon homosexual behavior as sin, per se. Those who practice it, and do not stop, will not enter God's kingdom. But Paul did not put homosexuals in a special category (as many today try to do). He did not see them as people who could not change. No, he saw them—as he saw all other sinners—as people who could know the mighty saving power of Jesus. As a matter of fact there were some members in the Apostolic Churches who were at one time homosexuals. But they did not remain such. No, they were washed, sanctified, and justified. How contrary to Apostolic teaching, then, when homosexuals are told that (a) they are just made that way through no fault of their own, and (b) that there is nothing that can be done to change their homosexual 'nature.' The truth is that we are all sinners, by nature, and it is our fault (even though it is Adam's fault too). And thanks be to God it is also true that Jesus Christ has the power to save homosexuals *from* (not 'in') the guilt and grip of their sin.

Later on in this paper, a word will be said about the way in which the Church should deal with homosexual sinners. Here let it simply be emphasized that a faithful Christian Church may not act as if homosexuals are either "untouchables" or "unreachables." They are neither. They, like others in bondage to other sins, are such as Jesus shed His blood to make into new creatures. To deny this, in our judgment, is nothing less than a denial of the gospel of Christ.

Let us then, briefly summarize the data of Scripture.

- (1) *Homosexual behavior contradicts the data of the creation account.*
- (2) *Homosexual behavior is uniformly condemned in both the Old and the New Testament Scriptures.*
- (3) *Homosexual behavior is shown to be a consequence of men turning away from God, and God abandoning men to their depravity.*
- (4) *The Bible does not allow that inclination to homosexual behavior can be defined as innocent (i.e. a condition for which men are not fully responsible as sinful).*
- (5) *Nothing is said in the entire Bible which would in any way open the way for a favorable attitude by the people of God toward this abomination.*

The Reformed Confessions

The same conclusion is required, also, by the teaching of our Reformed Confessional Standards. In this section of our report we will simply summarize briefly the relevant data.

The Heidelberg Catechism says it is the teaching of the 10th commandment that *“even the slightest inclination or thought contrary to any of God’s commandments”* is wrong, and should not *“ever rise in our heart”* (Q. 113). Clearly, then, it is against our Confessional Standards to suggest that a homosexual inclination can be morally neutral. Homosexual inclination, like adulterous inclination, is evil, sinful. The Catechism also teaches that all of us are *“inclined to all evil”* (Q. 8). This means

that the homosexual person may not claim to be “*a special case.*” His inclination is his responsibility just as much as the adulterer’s inclination is.

If it is argued that it is too much to ask the homosexual to be free of this ‘inclination’ the Catechism again has a clear answer. “**Q.9** - *Does not God, then, wrong man by requiring of him in His law that which he cannot perform?* **Ans:** *Not at all; for God made man capable of performing it; but man, through the instigation of the devil, by his own willful disobedience, deprived himself and all his posterity of these gifts.*”

The seventh commandment teaches us “*that all unchastity is accursed of God; and that we must, therefore, detest it from the heart*” (Q. 108). Since homosexual deviation is defined in Scripture as an abomination to God, surely we must detest it from the heart. As the catechism says, “*He forbids all unchaste actions, gestures, words, thoughts, desires, and whatever may entice one thereto*” (Q. 109).

Little wonder that true conversion therefore requires “*the mortification* (‘putting to death’) *of the old man, and the quickening of the new*” (Q. 88) And there is no ‘quickenning of the new man’ unless there is a new-found “*love and delight to live according to the will of God*” (Q. 90). It is certainly true that the homosexual, like all other converted sinners, will have “*only a small beginning of this obedience,*” yet it is also true that they will “*with earnest purpose...begin to live, not only according to some but according to all the commandments of God*” (Q. 114). One of the commandments they will begin to keep—in inclination as well as behavior—is the one forbidding “*all unchaste actions, gestures, words, thoughts, desires, and whatever may entice one thereto*” (Q. 109). One cannot agree with the Heidelberg Cat-

echism and at the same time say that some Christians may have to remain homosexual in inclination and behavior. The homosexual—like all other sinners—will not be a finished product ‘over night’ But he (or she) will not be left under the dominion of homosexual inclination either—not if he (or she) is truly in union with Jesus.

The other Confessions teach the same thing both explicitly and by way of implication. Man was not created homosexual (Westminster Confession of Faith [WCF] IV,ii). Man is now depraved (WCF VI). It is out of this depravity that all sin proceeds (WCF VI, iv). But this is no excuse (I,i) God’s law makes it clear that God still requires moral perfection in man as His creature (XIX). And this law is still of use for today “*to regulate our life in all honorableness to the glory of God*” (Belgic Confession, XXV).

It will be seen, then, why the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (OPC) was not satisfied with the weak stand on this issue that was taken by the Reformed Ecumenical Synod (RES). In 1980 the Reformed Ecumenical Synod spoke on the issue of homosexual sin. After many hours of discussion (in committee, and plenary session) Synod reached an 8 point decision. All of these points were important, but we quote two here in connection with our brief survey of Biblical data. These are points 2 and 3 which read as follows:

*“In accordance with the traditional Reformed understanding of Scripture, the RES states that all homosexual **practice** is sin (Lev. 20:13, Rom. 1:26,27, 1 Cor. 6:9, and 1 Tim. 1:10).”* [Emphasis our’s]

“The RES further states that any advice or counsel that weak-

ens the resistance to sin does not help but actually harms both the struggling person himself and others who might be affected through him” (Man. 18:6).

It will be noted that this statement warns against any counsel that would weaken resistance to homosexual sin. To this extent the statement is certainly in accord with the teaching of our Lord who not only condemned adultery, but also the *inclination* to adultery (Matt. 5:28). If Jesus calls the inward desire for another man’s wife adultery, condemning that desire as sin, then surely we can conclude by good and necessary inference that our Lord would also condemn all inward desire for homosexual relations.

But—in spite of the strong plea of the OPC (and others) that it do so—the RES was not willing to follow the Scripture at this point. It was willing to say that all homosexual practice is sin, but it was not willing to go on to say that all homosexual *desire* is sinful also. It is our conviction that the 1973 report of the Christian Reformed Church in North America (CRCNA) was a primary source of the weak stand taken by the RES. In this 1973 CRCNA report it was said that “Homosexuality (male and female) is a condition...for which the homosexual may himself bear only a minimal responsibility.” It also went on declare that there are at least some homosexuals “who cannot be healed and who must accept the permanent limitations of their homosexuality...” This is nothing less than to claim that some homosexuals constitute a special category. For him—or her—(on this view) it will not be possible to say with Paul the Apostle: “I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me” (Phil. 4:13), or that “if anyone is in Christ, he [or she] is a new creation: old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new” (2 Cor. 5:17) [Emphasis our’s]. The Scripture

says the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation (Ro. 1:16). And it also tells us that this is true—not just for some—but for *everyone* who believes. This primary gospel truth is, in effect, denied by the CRCNA report of 1973.

There is no way that homosexuality—by which we mean the disposition to desire a sexual partner of the same gender—can be made acceptable in any church without fatal consequences. Little wonder, then, that the once great Reformed Churches in the Netherlands now have homosexuals—both male and female—even in the ministerial office. And small wonder, also, that the CRCNA consistently opposed efforts by the OPC (and others) to exclude this unfaithful denomination from the Reformed Ecumenical Synod. Even worse is the fact that (by adopting the above mentioned position) the CRCNA has failed to give homosexuals the hope that the true gospel offers such sinners..

The homosexual perversion—whether in outward act or only in inward lust—is an abomination to God. It is therefore clear that no church can remain a true church of Christ that accommodates this perversion.



An Appendix

The following is based on an unpublished study by
Dr. Cornel Venema entitled

“The Abandonment of Discipline in the CRC”

We quote here the section dealing with:

THE 1973 CRC REPORT ON HOMOSEXUALITY

1. In 1970: the CRC appointed a committee with the mandate “to study the problem of homosexuality and to delineate the church’s position in this matter” (Acts, p. 121). The occasion for Synod’s concern was an overture from the Council of Christian Reformed Churches in Canada (Overture 23, Acts 1970, p. 540). They became involved in this problem because legislative changes regarding homosexuality were under consideration by the Government of Canada. The Council’s advisory committee on “Contact with the Government: re Homosexual Acts” supported with Council approval the proposed changes in the laws of Canada. To be specific it supported “*the proposal that homosexual behavior between consenting adults in private should no longer be considered [a] criminal offence*” (Acts 1973, p. 610). The report of this committee came before the 1973 Synod (Ibid. pp. 609-633).
2. The report begins with a review of (a) the background of the mandate and a description of the present situation in society. (b) It then goes on to lay down a definition of (male and female) homosexuality. After saying a “*precise definition of homosexuality is impossible*” (p. 612) it goes on to insist that “*An important distinction that must be made is the difference between homosexuality as a condition of personal identity and homosexuality as explicit homosexual behavior*” (Ibid.) It further insists that “*there are people who...are constitutionally (by either biological or psychological conditions or both) predisposed to homosexuality...*” (p. 613).
3. The report refuses to speak dogmatically when it comes to a definition of homosexuality. But it becomes very dogmatic

in making sweeping assertions about the condition. It admits for instance, that *“Experts are not agreed on what the causes of homosexuality are”* but then, quite dogmatically, insists that *“homosexuality is not the result of any conscious choice or decision on the part of the person...”* (p. 613). And then, on the basis of this assertion it makes another: *“Whether a person becomes homosexual because of some innate condition or because of his early environment and his response to this environment, or because of a combination of these, the fact is that he is not responsible insofar for his resulting homosexuality”* (Ibid., italics mine).

4. The report then speaks of **“The Plight of the Homosexual.”** Here, again, sweeping assertions are made. *“It is one of the great failings of the church and Christians generally that they have been lacking in sympathy and concern for the plight of the homosexuals among them”* (p.614).
5. **The report finally deals with the Scripture. And it is interesting to note that even here, in the opening paragraphs, the report again makes sweeping statements without offering any proof.** It boldly asserts for example that **blaming** *“the homosexual for his condition can be just as cruel and unjust as to blame the cripple for his deformation”* (p. such Scripture passages as Genesis 19:4-11, Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13. While it begins by admitting that such texts “clearly forbid sexual intercourse between males” it almost immediately adds that the *“difficulty that confronts us with these texts is the question in what distinguishable respects they are normative for us”* (p. 617). It is admitted, says the report, *“that homosexuality is forbidden in the Old Testament”* but then adds: *“We must observe, however, that the Old Testament did not distinguish between homosexuality and*

homosexualism any more than it distinguished for example between kleptomania and stealing when it prohibited stealing" (p. 619). The New Testament data is handled in much the same way. The committee admits that "Paul does not make the kind of distinction we have made earlier between homosexuality and homosexualism," and therefore claims that "we need to ask whether the judgment of Paul applies to those who are homosexuals as we have defined them...Does the exchange from the natural to the unnatural which Paul deems dishonorable apply to such persons? A person who is homosexual, we have seen, has a disordered sex condition, so that what is 'natural' to him is to have sex relations with a member of his own sex, and what is 'unnatural' for him would be to have heterosexual relations" (p. 621). In 1 Corinthians 6:9-11 Paul "proclaims that those who had engaged in homosexual practices were also saved" and "we may believe that they were liberated...and became heterosexual...But it does not follow that if there were constitutional homosexuals among the saved in Corinth, that they were also liberated from their inversion and became heterosexual in their sexual propensity" (p. 627). No, says the report, "**to expect the means of grace and prayer to redirect a firmly fixed homosexual is to expect a miracle**" (Ibid.) So "the question is whether there are any circumstances in which the confirmed homosexual can have sexual relations as the heterosexual has relations in marriage...It is important for us to explore this possibility lest we do the homosexual brother or sister a serious injustice..." (p. 628). The report then makes a qualified statement, saying "obedience to God **appears** (emphasis mine) to require a homosexual unable to marry according to the divine ordinance to accept celibacy as his way of life and continence as his moral duty" (p. 631).

6. The report then went on to make 11 recommendations.

7. The Synod adopted the recommendation to submit the report to the churches “*as providing a background study for...understanding...the problem of homosexuality and the formulation of a Christian position*” (p. 51) It also adopted statements of pastoral advice including the following statements: (a) “*Homosexuality (male and female) is a condition of disordered sexuality which reflects the brokenness of our sinful world and for which the homosexual may himself bear only a minimal responsibility*” (Ibid., emphasis mine) (b) This statement goes on to speak of “*those who are not healed and who must accept the limitations of their homosexuality*” (p. 52, emphasis mine).
8. It is hardly surprising, in the light (darkness) of this report, that the CRC would not support our attempt to exclude the GKN from the RES/REC, nor is it surprising that an avowed homosexual minister (Rev. James Lucas) has not been subject to discipline. **When definitions which are not countenanced by the Bible are made regulative in the church then its authority is effectively eliminated. This is what has happened in the CRC. And it explains why it is only the vocal conservative who is disciplined, today, in this denomination.**

Dr. Cornel Venema then goes on to say this: “One thing more should be added: if I could accept the CRC definition as legitimate I would then argue that the GKN position is the only tenable result. After all, even the Apostle Paul was willing to grant that, for every man, *it is better to marry than to burn.*”