

## Same Sex Marriage

A rebuttal of Ted Olsen's court statement in favor of gay and lesbian marriage. From the standpoint that (1) this is God's world, (2) that He is the supreme sovereign administrator of it, (3) that He makes the rules by which man is to live, and (4) judges their actions according to His declared standards of righteousness.

But, because many people do not believe in God, as the reason for not submitting to his authority, they therefore deem that man can specify the kinds of marriage they want, as well as deciding upon any other questions, or assumed options in life.

But, not believing does not remove the fact that there is a bible which many do believe is the word of God, and which sets forth His will for man in every area of life—including the institution of marriage, which is complete in its details, that are to be followed by all mankind.

Scriptures related to the subject of marriage are, first Gen. 2:18-25: which tells us that God created woman to be a companion, or a "help meet" for man, so that he would not be alone. That particular reason would not, of itself, disqualify same sex companionship, but the fact that God created a different, or opposite sex person, establishes the man and woman relationship he intended. This is attested to by every scriptural reference to the subject.

Deviations from the established norm, whenever discussed in the bible, are always exceptions to God's purposes and intentions in the institution of marriage. Even the variations of practices under the Mosaic law, were not approved by God as acceptable relationships—but were allowed because of the "hardness of hearts" of Israel under the dispensation of law. Under the principles of grace supplanting that legal system, marriage is only advocated for one man, and one woman. And, it was so in the age of innocency, before the law period, as well.

Further specific reference in Gen. 2:24, defines the particular elements that constitute marriage, when God says, "Therefore, (because woman, in the preceding verses was created for that purpose) shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh (in the sense of spiritual unity)." Parenthetical portions added by commentator.

Man is further commanded by God to "be fruitful and multiply and, replenish (populate) the earth.....etc." Obviously, procreation can only be accomplished by physical union of man and woman, or, in today's scientifically "advanced" world, by using the combined reproductive organisms, in such methods as in-vitro fertilization, or other laboratory techniques developed—the realm of which is seriously questionable as to whether God would approve any of it..

But, of course, a primarily secular, even nominally religious world feels no compulsion to adhere to God's requirements, which they either don't personally believe, nor, are constrained to be guided by the obvious logic of the biological and physical factors involved, by which conclusions may be determined-- regarding normal and abnormal differences in the species.

The scriptures also define such abnormalities as homosexuality to be sinful behavior, and of course, God would not approve of any such practice of their lives, nor the misguided idea that they could legitimize it by any form of marriage. 1 Cor. 6: 9-11.

These scriptures and others refer to fornicators, effeminate (men and, by implicit extension, masculine women), abusers of mankind (sodomites, etc.) as among those who, if not spiritually converted to Christians, will not “inherit the kingdom of God.”

Another passage of scripture (Rom. 1:24-27) tells us that God castigated, and executed a judgment of uncleanness upon, those who “through the lusts of their own hearts dishonor their own bodies between themselves.” If that is not specific enough, he adds, “for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature.” And, “likewise the man leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lusts one toward another; men working that which is unseemly (not morally right, or chaste), per Web.. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Dict..”

In reference to the foregoing, the following comment was made by a respected bible commentator in the 1700's, John Gill , who wrote: “of which nothing like it is to be observed in the brutal (animal) world.” While it may not be without rare exception, is worth taking note of..

How does one like Ted Olsen who, among other associations, has been an officer in the Christianity Today ministry (albeit a heterodox, liberal gospel organization) justify his defense of the biblically specific immorality of homosexual perversion, whether he is of that orientation, or bisexual, or an ultra-liberal Christian on the subject—and not really a true conservative believer, as he is reported to be?

Nevertheless, he, and all other proponents of same sex marriage, cannot cite any scriptural reference to the subject of marriage that, rightly interpreted, would ever support such a perverted concept. Advocacy has to strain the illicit relationship beyond credulity (which makes it a lie, no matter what argument is made) to ascribe it to God, or claim his approval—when it is nothing but sinful, and thus abominable to Him.

A Christian who believes such a distortion of truth, and proclaims it publicly, ought to fear being subject to God’s wrath, and some form of retributive judgment.

A look at constitutional equality rights, per the Declaration of Independence, says “We hold .....that all men are created equal.....and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights.....”, i.e., life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”—none of which gives license to engage in any conduct of life, not conforming to applicable scriptural principles, and commandments.

A distinction should be made between absolute laws, or principles, and relative ones. God makes absolute laws, or declares principles—which he never changes, nor should people ever change them.

People establish relative laws, or principles which they do change, according to customs, culture, government authority, popular will, etc. Such is the attempted effort to repeal the traditional marriage law, which recognizes only gender-specific (heterosexual male and female) persons to be eligible to participate in biblically legitimate marriage.

This, by the way, only establishes the civil, or legal act of marriage. Technically, under the natural law of God, marriage is consummated by the initial sexual union of man and woman (the two becoming one in a human spiritual sense). This, of course, would not influence, or be recognized, by most people today, as mandatory for them.

It is little wonder that most non-Christians, or secular people are not compliant with God's law concerning marriage, or practically any other of his spiritual principles, and associated requirements—more than nominally.

And, then, for man to try to claim moral quality, or societal good in perverted marriages, is to make a mockery of the institution God established to be followed intact, perpetually, by all mankind.

Proponents claim the “right” to make such choices as being given by God to all, in the realm of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” But, there is no such thing as all-inclusive natural rights, by which God would ever violate his own established absolute principles, and allow them to be compromised, and corrupted.

God makes the rules, and sets the standards by which man is to live, in honor and obedience to Him. But, sad to say, even many Christians violate principles of marriage, by infidelity, wrongful divorces and remarriages, etc.

However, on a strictly human level, there is a comparative, or mutual equality, with the associated natural rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—relative to man's inherited non-spiritual condition.

Digressing further from the social subject of marriage, there is no right for one man to assume, or exercise authority, or control over another man, unless there is mutual consent. Natural rights cannot legitimately be taken from any man, but may be relinquished by man—though no one should ever do such a foolish thing under any circumstances. The New Hampshire state motto of, “Live free, or die” should be every human being's lifelong commitment—both to God, himself, and others.

Back to the subject of marriage, and whether it is a God-given right, the reference to God must include whatever God has revealed about his institution of it.

Which, in view of the question of the propriety of including same-sex individuals as rightfully entitled to marry, God's word automatically excludes them, and, in fact, allows no other

application of the act of marriage than what is clearly specified. That being, that it may only include one man, and one woman.

So, a liberalist allows the connection of “God-given”, but with no related scriptural qualifications, as if God’s word on the subject doesn’t exist, or is not absolute, or immutable—and therefore, not binding; per se.

It is the same as the secularists’ attitude toward the Constitution, regarding its relevance and application in today’s different culture, etc.—when in truth it’s principles are timeless, and just as appropriate now, and in the future, as they always were.

And, even if the Constitution may be subject to amendment under certain warranted circumstances, the bible (as correctly transcribed from original inspired manuscripts) is never subject to human revision, lest in any way it would become the word of man, instead of God.

As to the authority, and permanency of the bible, it is nothing less than audacity, and irreverence for man to tamper with the holy scriptures. We are to be respectful students and scholars of it, not editors and judges.

To wonder, or question something about God, and His ways and works, is alright in itself, if it does not result in negative thoughts, and moral judgments of God. Non-Christians can be expected to engage in that kind of thinking, because they do not have the spiritual cognition and understanding that Christians are endowed with in their regeneration. But, sadly, most Christians have for centuries misinterpreted fundamental gospel truth, and other doctrine, as well. Both cases are inexcusable, and culpable as disobedience and unfaithfulness to God—which will be judged by Him accordingly. Either here on earth, or in heaven-- now or later..

In fact, God says that “heaven and earth shall pass away (in a certain sense, judgmentally), but my words shall not pass away.” Matt. 24:25. And, he means intact, as he gave it, according to his meaning—not man’s variant opinions, and revisions.

So, in paraphrasing a scriptural quotation regarding the divine design, and execution of the human marriage relationship, where it says, “whom God has joined together, let no man put asunder”, we may rightly say, “what God has ordained, let no man alter, or subvert.”

And, again, the obvious physical, or biological factors are self-explanatory, so that the marriage or union of man and woman is the only conclusion one can come to, without perverting the institution’s principles.

Summary of Rebuttal of Ted Olsen’s Defense of Same Sex Marriage:

Per court statement, “Plaintiffs are being denied both the right (?) to marry, and the right to equality under the law.” Plaintiffs being same-sex couples.

Reply. Because the institution of marriage was established by God to unite man and woman in the relationship he ordained for them. That being:

- (1) A loving companionship.
- (2) Spiritual oneness.
- (3) Procreation of the race.
- (4) Family life, under God.

The obvious natural, complementary abilities and characteristics of both sexes, with which God created man and woman, are so fundamentally important in the fulfillment of their marital relationship, that the basic qualifications of heterosexual unions cannot be substituted for by any other human arrangement.. .

The idea of same sex marriage is contrary to the prescribed way, and will of God, and thus illogical to conceive of as an allowable alternative—being perversely unnatural, and immoral.

As for the right to “equality under the law”, whenever man-made law is contradictory to God’s laws, or principles, the “right” claimed is specious and only relative to human usurped authority.

If man passes a law favoring same sex marriages, or any other such strange, implicitly forbidden assumed right, the action defies God, and denies his sovereign authority to set particular rules, and standards by which man is to live.

Everett Falvey  
Email: [efal@comcast.net](mailto:efal@comcast.net)