



The Body of Christ: Conclusions: Satanic Strategy & Divine Countermeasures; Polemic on Homosexuality Being Genetic Rather than Volitional

19. And he even has the chutzpah to promote their legitimacy by sponsoring the approval of homosexual marriages.
20. Such approval would open the door to legal legitimacy and result in same-sex marriages being recognized as morally equivalent to heterosexual marriages.
21. But as we have established in our study, marriage by definition is a relationship between one man and one woman for the initial purpose of sex and subsequently for procreation.
22. Following the fall, procreation was added as a natural result of the legitimate sexual bond of a man and a woman in marriage and became the process by which the Messiah's true humanity would enter into this world.
23. Recognizing the impact such a birth would have, Lucifer sought to destroy the ever-narrowing bloodline of Christ.
24. When this failed his post-resurrection strategy concentrated on delaying the enlargement of the Body of Christ by attacking the divine institutions of marriage and family.
25. No one can be elected into the Body of Christ if they are not selected at physical birth. No one can be selected at physical birth if they are not conceived.
26. The attempt to legitimize homosexuality as an accepted alternative to marriage is therefore a satanic attack on not only legitimate sexuality in marriage, it also assaults the divine institution of the family as well as the efficient amalgamation of the Body of Christ.
27. Because human free will is free to deviate from divine directive will, God permits it to go just so far. Finally, He puts a stop to these behaviors by means of His overruling will.
28. But in the meantime, human volition in concert with satanic propaganda and duplicity has contributed to a delay in the rapture by causing a large number of people who would have entered into this life to remain a part of iffy history.
29. This delay will go only so far as the events that surrounded the demise of the pentapolis demonstrate in Genesis 19. If our client nation continues with the historical trend of legitimizing sodomite marriages, we can expect the United States to eventually become the target of an equal demonstration of divine wrath.
30. Contributing to this trend is the propaganda that was introduced as scientific fact about ten years ago that homosexuality is genetically determined. In further refutation of this assertion we will now take a look at the fallacy of this claim.

IV. A Polemic to the Claim that Homosexual Behavior is the Result of a Genetic Predisposition Rather than a Volitional Choice:

The assumption under scrutiny is the subject of the *Time* magazine cover story of July 26, 1993 entitled, "Born Gay: Science Finds a Genetic Link." We start with a critique of this article by:

Benoit, Gary. "That Missing Link." *The New American*, 9 Aug. 1993, 42:

ITEM: The cover of the July 26 issue of *Time* magazine included the grabber lines "BORN GAY" and "Science Finds a Genetic Link." Inside, a boldface summary of the article explains, "Studies of family trees and DNA make the case that male homosexuality is in the genes."



CORRECTION: The case has not been made yet. In fact, the grabber on *Time's* cover overstates what the article itself says. While the cover statement makes it appear that science has already demonstrated a genetic link to homosexuality, the article itself is much more cautious.

For example, referring to research conducted by the National Cancer Institute's Laboratory of Biochemistry, the article states:

Before the NCI research is accepted as definitive, it will have to be validated by repetition. Moreover, the tight focus on pairs of openly homosexual brothers, who are only a subset of the total gay population, leaves many questions about other categories of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals. The NCI researchers concede that their discovery cannot account for all male homosexuality and may be just associated with gayness rather than be a direct cause.

The *Time* article also points out that Simon LeVay, "who won wide publicity for an analysis of differences in brain anatomies between straight and gay men, acknowledges that the brains he studied were of AIDS victims, and thus he cannot be sure that what he saw was genetic rather than the result of disease." And the article uses such open-ended terminology as: "Whatever is ultimate scientific significance..."; "The answer suggested by the new research..."; and "If homosexuals are deemed to have a fore-ordained nature." Although this *Time* magazine article certainly gives credence to the latest research *suggesting* a genetic link to homosexuality, it by no means claims that the results are definitive.

But putting *Time's* characterization of the research aside, an examination of the research itself is also revealing. For example, the NCI study of 76 homosexual men found that 7.5 percent of their maternal uncles and male cousins were also homosexual. Is this sample large enough to be representative of the population as a whole? And even if it is representative, could factors other than genetics explain the disproportionate incidence of homosexuality in a family tree? How about the effects of growing up in an environment with homosexuals?

Then there is the study of DNA samples from 40 pairs of homosexual brothers, which found that 33 of them shared a common piece of the X chromosome. But although this pattern was viewed as suggesting a gene related to homosexuality, the fact remains that seven of the 40 pairs studied did not fit the pattern.

Viewing homosexual behavior as predetermined would create much more pressure for accepting it as a normal lifestyle rather than as sinful activity. After all, how could a person be held accountable for something he is predisposed to do? For this reason, many homosexual activists hope that scientific studies will demonstrate a genetic link. But their wish does not make it so.

1. The body is a closed system which always produces sin in the human species. Sin is anything that is contrary to the expressed will of God:

Unger, Merrill F. *Unger's Bible Dictionary*. 3d ed. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1966), 1028:

The sinfulness of sin lies in the fact that it is against God, even when the wrong we do is to others or ourselves. Selfishness is at the bottom of all disobedience, and it becomes hostility to God when it comes into collision with his law.

2. Animals perform many of the functions prohibited by the Scripture but they are not under mandate—only humans are. Consequently, only humans can sin.
3. Sin is sponsored by the sinful nature which is in the cell structure of the body. Since all people sin, then it is the body which initiates the desire to sin. These desires are propensities to sin and vary with the individual.
4. To say that we all have trends is to state the obvious. Some individuals accommodate their sins into behavior patterns that result in facilitated wheel-tracks of wickedness.



5. Sometimes these wheel-tracks are so ingrained in one's thinking that they constitute flaws of character. These flaws work in concert with the stages of reversionism so that the person lives his life in the cosmic system.
6. That we all have trends is not the issue in the evaluation of people. It is how they manage these trends that accounts for their ultimate behavior.
7. Personal behavior is regulated by the conscience's inventory of ideas with reference to principles of right and wrong. This is accumulated by the inculcation of the laws of divine establishment and of Bible doctrine.
8. A person may be trained by parents to observe these standards but the ultimate outcome has to do with whether the youth is willing to submit his free will to the guidance of establishment or doctrinal absolutes.
9. Thus we all have trends, but they are initially expressed as only temptations and for a person to submit to them requires a volitional rejection of the guidance provided by the conscience.
10. A person may have virtue in almost every area but a tragic flaw can destroy his life. A tragic flaw is: a defect in the character of a believer who thinks he is positive, but the weakness hinders him from learning and/or applying doctrine.