

## CFBC-Gender and Sexuality

### Preamble to the CBMW Nashville Statement (2017)...

“Know that the LORD Himself is God; It is He who has made us, and not we ourselves...” –Psalm 100:3

***Evangelical Christians at the dawn of the twenty-first century find themselves living in a period of historic transition.*** As Western culture has become increasingly post-Christian, it has embarked upon a massive revision of what it means to be a human being. ***By and large the spirit of our age no longer discerns or delights in the beauty of God’s design for human life.*** Many deny that God created human beings for his glory, and that his good purposes for us include our personal and physical design as male and female. ***It is common to think that human identity as male and female is not part of God’s beautiful plan, but is, rather, an expression of an individual’s autonomous preferences.*** The pathway to full and lasting joy through God’s good design for his creatures is thus replaced by the path of shortsighted alternatives that, sooner or later, ruin human life and dishonor God.

This secular spirit of our age presents a great challenge to the Christian church. Will the church of the Lord Jesus Christ lose her biblical conviction, clarity, and courage, and blend into the spirit of the age? Or will she hold fast to the word of life, draw courage from Jesus, and unashamedly proclaim his way as the way of life? Will she maintain her clear, counter-cultural witness to a world that seems bent on ruin?

***We are persuaded that faithfulness in our generation means declaring once again the true story of the world and of our place in it—particularly as male and female.*** Christian Scripture teaches that there is but one God who alone is Creator and Lord of all. To him alone, every person owes glad-hearted thanksgiving, heart-felt praise, and total allegiance. This is the path not only of glorifying God, but of knowing ourselves. ***To forget our Creator is to forget who we are, for he made us for himself. And we cannot know ourselves truly without truly knowing him who made us. We did not make ourselves. We are not our own. Our true identity, as male and female persons, is given by God. It is not only foolish, but hopeless, to try to make ourselves what God did not create us to be.***

### The Chaos...

**Cisgender, agender, gender fluidity**—The sexual revolution has created a host of bewildering terms to describe the struggle for people to reconcile their internal desires with their bodies. What should Christians do with this new vocabulary? It can be overwhelming, especially if you’ve never heard these words before or experienced these

struggles. It's tempting to dismiss the new vocabulary as a postmodern attempt to restructure reality, rejecting both the Bible's terminology and basic biology.

Christians know that the Bible provides the solution to humanity's deepest needs, and we don't need to change any aspect of its message or vocabulary. Our greatest responsibility is to understand how redemption in Jesus Christ fulfills God's highest purpose for humanity and to know how to share this good news with others.

Yet God's Word also calls us to reach people with sensitivity and understanding. A dismissive, uncaring attitude won't help anyone.

Familiarity with modern terminology does not necessarily mean you accept these terms as descriptions of what should be. They simply allow you to talk accurately and sensitively about what people claim they are feeling.

***The most important concept to understand is the attempt to distinguish between (a) the “sex” a person is born with (physical characteristics of a male or female) and (b) the “gender” a person identifies with (their “lived role” as man or woman or other).***

**Gender dysphoria** is the general term to describe an individual's discontent with the gender “imposed” at birth based on visible physical sex characteristics. (This is referred to as “assigned gender.”)

Individuals who are content with their sex and gender at birth are referred to as **cisgender** (cis- means “on this side of”).

People who identify with a gender different from the one they were created with and had at birth are referred to as **transgender** (trans- means “on the other side of”).

These “other” identities can take many forms. Some individuals identify with different genders at different times (called **gender fluidity**) or no gender at all (called **agendered**).

The possibilities—and the vocabulary to describe them—are seemingly endless.

Christians must recognize that some people really do experience this range of desires and they will be offended if we deny the existence of those desires. We should be sympathetic and acknowledge that the issues are real, but then we need to point them to the deeper issues, which are covered in the Bible.

***Ultimately, we should not follow the culture in separating sex from gender, which is really the crux of the issue.*** We don't have to change the Bible's vocabulary or apologize for what it says. God designed his Word so that it would communicate to all humans and clearly show them the way to be transformed into the

full and satisfying humanity—designed as male or female from the beginning—that God provided for us through Jesus Christ.

Owen Strachan is associate professor of Christian theology at Midwestern Seminary and the author of *The Grand Design* (with Gavin Peacock) and the forthcoming *Reenchanting Humanity: A Theology of Mankind*.

## **Cultural Confusion and Causation...**

In a rising new trend, more teenage girls than boys claim they aren't sure about their gender identity. Why?

***To the dismay of radical activists, Dr. Lisa Littman, a researcher at Brown University, conducted a new study that points to peer pressure. The backlash was instant and severe.***

Her research, gathered from 256 parents, reveals it's not uncommon for two or more girls in the same friendship group to begin to identify as transgender. And 87% of them come out as transgender after spending more time on social media. But as they age, that seems to change since only 0.7% of American adults ages 18–24 claim they're transgender.

Within days, Brown University pulled their website press release on Littman's research.

***Ray Blanchard, a professor of psychiatry at the University of Toronto who spent many years working in a gender identity clinic, explains the reason for the angry reactions. "The idea that social influences may be involved flies in the face of the 'born that way' or 'you are who you say you are' narrative."***

### **Are Gender Roles a Social Construct? (Excerpts)**

by Steve Golden on July 6, 2012 (Answers in Genesis)

*The biblical understanding of gender roles stems from the Genesis account of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden; however, cultural justification is sometimes used to support unbiblical behavior.*

***The biblical understanding of gender roles stems from the Genesis account of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. If we misunderstand what the Bible says about gender, then we will misunderstand issues like homosexual behavior, the roles of husbands and wives, and what it means to be male or female.***

***However, cultural justification is sometimes used to support unbiblical behavior, and the Bible is sometimes used incorrectly to justify a variety of insupportable concepts about gender roles.***

***We have to start with the Word of God...In Genesis 1:27 we read that God created man with distinct differences in the sexes:***

*So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.*

***God created man male and female—Adam and Eve—and He made males and females different physically and distinct in their roles.*** Genesis 2:18 makes Eve's role clear: "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him." Eve was from the bone and flesh of Adam, meaning she is equal in her standing before God and yet distinct from man (Galatians 3:28).<sup>1</sup> But God gave Adam the authority not only to name the animals but also to name his wife, indicating that she does not share equal authority with her husband. In the Bible's wording, she is his helper.

***If God's creation of Eve, a female, as a helper and companion for Adam, a male, is not clear enough to defend marriage as being reserved for a man and a woman, Genesis 2:24 clears up any confusion:***

*Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.*

***From the very beginning of God's Word, He makes no allowances for "alternative" lifestyles such as homosexuality, bestiality, polygamy, and so on.***<sup>2</sup>

A final point regards the Curse in Genesis 3. Here we see that Adam and Eve already had distinct roles, but as a result of the Curse, their roles became toilsome and painful. In verse 16, God graciously allowed Eve (and her female descendants) to bear children, but childbirth would be associated with a good deal of physical pain as well as concerns about bringing a child into this cursed world.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, God tells Eve, "Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you" (Genesis 3:16).<sup>4</sup> Christians differ over what this verse means, but two likely interpretations arise: (1) Eve will try to usurp her husband's role as head, but God is requiring Adam to keep her from doing so, resulting in conflict; or (2) Eve will try to usurp her husband's role as head, and he will exercise unbiblical male domination over her.<sup>5</sup>

***So what does gender as a social construct have to do with any of this?... People who specialize in the area of gender theory typically make it their aim to justify sexual and gender-related behavior that the Bible condemns as sinful.***

***Gender theory argues that men and women are different only on the physical level;*** in other words, they have the exact same capacities for everything except reproductive functions, such as childbearing (though there are increasing attempts among secularists to make it possible for men to carry unborn children).

***Gender theory further holds that any distinctions between males and females (e.g., men acting as heads of their households, dressing in ways that are socially appropriate to one's gender, and so on) are "constructs" that society forces them to abide by. If they "transgress" (gender theorists love that word) those social boundaries, the gender theorist argues, they are ostracized and punished.***

Many gender theorists will even go so far as to say that a person may be a man on the physical level, but if he feels like he is actually female, then he may identify as female. Gender theorists argue that he then should be able to live as his chosen gender, even down to using the women's restroom, dressing in women's clothing, and being referred to as she/her.

***The natural outworking of all this gender confusion is complete distortion of what the Bible says about the roles of men and women and about marriage.*** If there is nothing that requires a man to identify as male or a woman to identify as female, why maintain a rigid definition of marriage? ***"Marriage between a man and a woman" only matters if the definition of man and woman matter.*** If two men "get married," but one identifies as a female, society has simply tried to find a way around God's design for marriage by making *male* and *female* meaningless words.<sup>6</sup>

However, there is strong scientific evidence that the differences between men and women run deeper than basic anatomy. Dr. Gregg Johnson, professor of biology at Bethel University, wrote a detailed article on gender differences. He explained that males, among other things, are often more dominating, more goal and rule oriented, and have bodies and nervous systems that are built for long hours of physical toil. Women, on the other hand, demonstrate more care-giving behaviors, are more in touch with social dynamics, and have bodies that favor fat storage, which aids in pregnancy.<sup>7</sup> In fact, Dr. Johnson concludes, "Sex differences present in all the organ systems across various mammalian species go far beyond the superficial anatomical characteristics necessary for reproduction. These differences are direct responses to the levels of circulating hormones, which differ significantly between the sexes."<sup>8</sup> Under the localized influence of hormones and the DNA blueprint, certain embryonic tissues are formed into either male or female structures and other tissues regress. Later, at puberty, increasing amounts of testosterone and estrogen prompt maturation of these sexual differences.

So, generally speaking, if you're born a male, there's no way to truly change that.<sup>9</sup> This is consistent with Genesis 1:27; God has made us male and female. Psalm 139:13–14 explains that our biological development is marked by the hand of God:

*For You formed my inward parts; You covered me in my mother's womb. I will praise You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.*

In light of passages such as this, we should desire to embrace our role as a biblical man or woman, rather than trying to change ourselves into the opposite of what God intended.

Scripture has norms and expectations for men and women as well, particularly focused on modesty. While Scripture does not clearly outline a dress code for us, we are given guidelines. For example, 1 Peter 3:1–5 tells women to dress modestly and to place their primary focus on their spiritual development. Ephesians 4:17–19 tells the people of God not to be like unbelievers, who engage in lewdness. Romans 12:1 makes clear that we are to present our bodies as holy and acceptable before God—which we can hardly do if we refuse to live modestly or within the male or female boundaries God formed in us. With regard to cultural expectations, Scripture seems to indicate that we should dress not only modestly but also in ways appropriate to our gender in whatever culture we live. A prime example is in 1 Corinthians 11, where Paul addresses the issue of head coverings in the church. Of course, textual details and history are far too unclear to give a definitive answer as to what the head coverings represented (and indeed, commentators vary in their interpretations), but suffice it to say, head coverings were *clearly* intended for women, at least in that congregation:

*Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonors his head. But every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, for that is one and the same as if her head were shaved. For if a woman is not covered, let her also be shorn. But if it is shameful for a woman to be shorn or shaved, let her be covered. (1 Corinthians 11:4–6)*

While some Christians would argue that this passage applies to women in the church today, others believe the text indicates it was a culturally specific issue. Whether the head coverings are meant to indicate that the woman is married (as in some countries today) or something else, Paul was writing about a symbol that may not carry the same meaning today. The custom was that women either cover their heads or cut their hair short—but it was considered “disgraceful” in that day for a woman to do the latter. What does that tell us? Paul is advising women to—within the bounds of modesty—adhere to cultural expectations of femininity. On the same front, Paul indicates that if a man wears a head covering, which was meant for a woman, it is dishonoring. Here, too, Paul seems to be indicating that men, within the bounds of modesty, should adhere to cultural expectations of masculinity. But what is significant is that men were barred from wearing head coverings—and if a man did, there would certainly be a question as to why he was adorned with something intended for a woman. If a man dons what is typically considered female clothing, we have to ask the question, why is he doing such a thing? Has the culture determined that it is now masculine and appropriate? Likely not. Is the man trying to be subversive and get a reaction out of people? Possibly. Has the man decided he would rather identify as a woman, which could lead to more extreme measures, such as sex reassignment surgery? If that is the case, he is clearly trying to change how God created him, as though he can do a better job.<sup>10</sup>

When a person expresses the desire to live as the opposite sex and takes measures to do so, he or she could very likely be experiencing some sort of gender confusion—and many secularists would agree. The difference is in how we would approach the situation—they would encourage him to embrace his perceived “identity,” while the believer should seek to share the gospel with him and to teach him God’s design for men and women.

## Footnotes

1. “Evangelical feminists” often cite Galatians 3:28 to support their idea that the New Testament removed gender roles. Paul wrote, ““There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”” However, to rip this verse from its context is a deeply flawed hermeneutical practice, and the evangelical feminist’s interpretation of this verse forces numerous contradictions in the New Testament. For example, Galatians is generally regarded as Paul’s earliest canonical letter. So if Paul was saying that there is no longer any distinction between these groups, then it is rather strange that he continued to make distinctions for many years between Jew and Gentile (Romans 1:16–17; 11:25–28; Acts 18:1–6), slave and free (1 Corinthians 7:17–24; Ephesians 6:5–9; Colossians 3:22–4:1), and male and female (Ephesians 5:21–33; Colossians 3:18–19).
2. While Abraham, David, Solomon, and others in Scripture did practice polygamy, they were not pursuing God’s original design for marriage, and their polygamous relationships should be viewed as examples of conduct Christians should not engage in. For more information on polygamy in the Bible and the disastrous consequences of these relationships, see Roger Patterson, “What About Polygamy in the Bible?,” also available as a chapter in Ken Ham and Bodie Hodge, gen. eds., *How Do We Know the Bible Is True?* Volume 1 (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2011).
3. Obviously, due to the fact that we live in a fallen world, some women are unable to bear children. For further information on childbirth and pain, see Dr. Elizabeth Mitchell’s articles, “Is It Wrong to Interfere with the Pain of Childbirth?,” “The Evolution of Childbirth?,” and “Understanding the Answer in Genesis 3:16.”
4. For further information on how God worked through Eve, see Dr. Georgia Purdom’s presentation, *Hope Amid Despair*.
5. Raymond C. Ortlund, Jr., “Male-Female Equality and Male Headship: Genesis 1–3,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, John Piper and Wayne Grudem, eds. (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2006), p. 108.
6. Since *marriage* is defined in the Bible as being strictly between a man and a woman, two men or two women or any other formulation of a “marriage” is outside of God’s design and therefore not a true marriage.
7. Gregg Johnson, “The Biological Basis for Gender-Specific Behavior,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood*, John Piper and Wayne Grudem, eds. (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2006), pp. 282–284.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 284.
9. This is not to say that there are not exceptions to the rule. Hormone levels vary, and not every man or woman will exhibit every characteristic Dr. Johnson describes. However, generally speaking, these differences are readily apparent in men and women, and they are based on God-given hormones that correlate to gender.
10. Regarding hermaphrodites (those who are born anatomically both male and female), I am not advocating that nothing be done for their condition. Humanity is marked by the Curse, and with that comes a marring of God’s design for us. In those rare cases, in which there are physical and social issues and challenges that must be dealt with individually, wisdom should be exercised in determining how to handle the situation so that the outcome is God honoring. For more on this, see Dr. Elizabeth Mitchell’s article, “Feedback: Hermaphroditism.”

## God's Creation...

### The CBMW Danvers Statement (1987)...Affirmations (Excerpts)

Based on our understanding of Biblical teachings, we affirm the following:

1. Both Adam and Eve were created in God's image, equal before God as persons and distinct in their manhood and womanhood (Gen 1:26-27, 2:18).
2. Distinctions in masculine and feminine roles are ordained by God as part of the created order, and should find an echo in every human heart (Gen 2:18, 21-24; 1 Cor 11:7-9; 1 Tim 2:12-14).
3. Adam's headship in marriage was established by God before the Fall, and was not a result of sin (Gen 2:16-18, 21-24, 3:1-13; 1 Cor 11:7-9).
4. The Fall introduced distortions into the relationships between men and women (Gen 3:1-7, 12, 16).
  1. In the home, the husband's loving, humble headship tends to be replaced by domination or passivity; the wife's intelligent, willing submission tends to be replaced by usurpation or servility.
  2. In the church, sin inclines men toward a worldly love of power or an abdication of spiritual responsibility, and inclines women to resist limitations on their roles or to neglect the use of their gifts in appropriate ministries.
5. The Old Testament, as well as the New Testament, manifests the equally high value and dignity which God attached to the roles of both men and women (Gen 1:26-27, 2:18; Gal 3:28). Both Old and New Testaments also affirm the principle of male headship in the family and in the covenant community (Gen 2:18; Eph 5:21-33; Col 3:18-19; 1 Tim 2:11-15).
6. Redemption in Christ aims at removing the distortions introduced by the curse.
  1. In the family, husbands should forsake harsh or selfish leadership and grow in love and care for their wives; wives should forsake resistance to their husbands' authority and grow in willing, joyful submission to their husbands' leadership (Eph 5:21-33; Col 3:18-19; Tit 2:3-5; 1 Pet 3:1-7).
  2. In the church, redemption in Christ gives men and women an equal share in the blessings of salvation; nevertheless, some governing and teaching roles within the church are restricted to men (Gal 3:28; 1 Cor 11:2-16; 1 Tim 2:11-15).
7. In all of life Christ is the supreme authority and guide for men and women, so that no earthly submission-domestic, religious, or civil-ever implies a mandate to follow a human authority into sin (Dan 3:10-18; Acts 4:19-20, 5:27-29; 1 Pet 3:1-2).
8. In both men and women a heartfelt sense of call to ministry should never be used to set aside Biblical criteria for particular ministries (1 Tim 2:11-15, 3:1-13; Tit 1:5-9). Rather, Biblical teaching should remain the authority for testing our subjective discernment of God's will.



## Appendix...Secular Worldviews and Biblical Norms

Cultural narratives aren't self-sustaining or free-floating. They need to be situated within a worldview that makes them meaningful, intelligible, and plausible. Simplifying somewhat, we can identify two secular worldviews that have shaped and supported the mainstream narrative...

### *Naturalism*

**Naturalism is the view that *nature is all there is*, where 'nature' is basically understood as whatever can be studied scientifically. For the Naturalist, the natural universe—the physical cosmos—is the only reality that exists (or at least the only reality that matters).** According to Naturalism, everything has (ultimately) a *scientific* explanation, and that must include *human nature* and *human experiences*.

**According to the standard origins story of Naturalism, we are the products of undirected naturalistic evolutionary processes. We're highly evolved animals with some unique abilities. On this view, there is no transcendent purpose or meaning to human life. If there is any meaning to human life, it is one that we create for ourselves.**

**It's no secret that Naturalism has a hard time accounting for objective moral laws.** On what basis can a Naturalist argue that some human behaviors are *objectively morally right* while others are *objectively morally wrong*? If Naturalism were true, why would there be laws of morality that stand over us? How *could* there be?

**In the absence of any better moral theories, Naturalists will commonly adopt some version of *utilitarianism*, according to which morality is defined in terms of whatever maximizes pleasure and minimizes pain—"the greatest happiness for the greatest number," as Jeremy Bentham famously expressed it.**

How then would a Naturalist view of transgenderism? A Naturalist will typically want to say that gender identity is a *psychological phenomenon rooted in the physical brain*.

Furthermore, a Naturalist will be inclined to say that transgenderism is just one facet of human biological diversity, of natural variation within a species. There's no right or wrong about it. Transgenderism isn't a disorder or dysfunction because, on the Naturalist view, there's simply no right way or a wrong way for a human being to be. We are what naturalistic evolutionary processes have made us—end of story.

**If anything can be said to be 'wrong' it's that some people are unhappy with their bodies. They have a *male body* and a *female brain*, or vice versa, and that incongruity causes them pain; it causes emotional suffering.**

**Thus, if they're going to be happy, one or other—the body or the brain—needs to be changed.**

**So which must change? For the Naturalist, it's the body that will have to change**, for two basic reasons: first, it's generally easier (and safer) to modify the body than to tinker with the brain; secondly, our *personal identity* is more closely associated with our brain, because the brain is the seat of consciousness (and thus of self-consciousness). From the Naturalist's perspective, then, it makes sense for a transgender person to pursue 'sex reassignment' treatments.

### ***Postmodernism***

**Postmodernism—to simplify matters to an almost criminal extent—can be characterized as the view that *there are no absolute norms and there is no objective reality*. According to this worldview, reality isn't something objective “out there” to be discovered.** It isn't something that exists independently of our thoughts and our language. Reality is something we *create* or *construct* by the way we think about and speak about our subjective experiences. That means, of course, that truth is always relative; it is relativized either to the individual subject or to groups of subjects (communities or societies).

**Consequently, the Postmodernist will have quite a different take on transgenderism than the Naturalist. For the Postmodernist, 'gender' is a fluid social construction that isn't anchored to any objective biological categories. It isn't a category imposed on us by nature; rather, it's a category we invented and which we impose on our ourselves. So gender identity isn't rooted in brain physiology (as the Naturalist holds) but is entirely a matter of personal preferences and self-perceptions.**

**Put simply: what you are is what you *perceive* yourself to be. *In fact, more strongly: what you are is what you conceive yourself to be.*** For self-conception is more powerful than mere self-perception. On this radical view, you have the freedom and the right to define yourself, indeed to *redefine* yourself, without limit. And if your physical appearance doesn't currently align with your self-defined identity, then your physical appearance needs to get in line.

***Thus, we have before us two secular worldviews which, in quite different ways, provide a broader framework for the mainstream narrative on transgenderism....we should recognize that these two worldviews—Naturalism and Postmodernism—do have one tenet in common: an axiomatic commitment to human autonomy. Both proceed from an absolute denial of any transcendent divine norms.***

What then is the overarching lesson to draw from these observations? Simply this: when we approach the issue of transgenderism, we need to be aware of how the issues and the overarching narrative have been supported and shaped by secular worldviews that are committed to human autonomy. We must not look at the issue through those warped lenses. Rather, we must view the issue through the lens of a Christian worldview: a worldview that represents a biblical perspective on God, creation, revelation, human nature, moral laws, the fallenness of this world, and what God has done and is doing to redeem this fallen world.

### *Normative Perspective*

*The normative perspective invites us to ask, “What are the norms or standards that apply here?” Perhaps the first and most general thing to say is that God himself is our ultimate norm. God himself is the final standard of what is true, good, and beautiful. That entails an utter repudiation of the kind of human autonomy reflected in the two secular worldviews outlined above. God, as the author of creation, defines his creation. God, as the creator of humankind, defines what it means to be human. We simply do not get to define what we are or who we are! In matters of Christian ethics, God’s norms are expressed to us primarily in his laws. God’s laws are what we might call our proximate norms.*

*In the first place, we have what Reformed theologians have called creation ordinances: moral laws grounded in the order and design of creation.* The most immediately relevant creation ordinance is that of human sexuality and family relationships:

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. And God blessed them. And God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it...” (Genesis 1:27–28)  
Therefore a man shall leave his father and his mother and hold fast to his wife, and they shall become one flesh. (Genesis 2:24)

It could hardly be clearer from the creation account that God did not intend sexuality and gender to be fluid and expressed on a continuum. Indeed, the assumption throughout the Bible is that there are two sexes, male and female, and the primary determiner of a person’s sex is *physiology*. We’re embodied beings and our sexuality is expressed through our bodies. The creation account thus establishes some foundational norms of human sexuality.

*Secondly, we have the Decalogue—the Ten Commandments—which the Reformed tradition has consistently taken as a summary of God’s moral law.* A number of these commandments are directly relevant to transgenderism.

***The First Commandment:*** “You shall have no other gods before me.” ***Once again, we find here an implicit repudiation of human autonomy, which is a form of idolatry—treating the creature as though it were the Creator. We should recognize that the LGBT movement represents a form of idolatry: treating human sexual experiences as a greater authority than the Word of God.*** Whatever our response to transgenderism, gender dysphoria, and so forth, it must be a response that seeks to interpret human experiences in light of God’s Word rather than the reverse.

***The Fifth Commandment:*** “Honor your father and your mother.” This commandment presupposes parental authority and leadership. It stands firmly against the idea that a child should set the agenda regarding his or her ‘gender identity’. The commandment also implies *parental oversight and care for children*, and thus the protection of children within a proper family structure. This clearly has major implications for ‘transgender parents’ (especially the cases of ‘transgender men’ who conceive and give birth, cases which we should expect to increase in number as transgenderism becomes even more mainstreamed).

***The Sixth Commandment:*** “You shall not murder.” This commandment enjoins the preservation and protection of human life, and thus has implications for (among other things) ‘sex reassignment’ treatments, many of which carry significant health risks.

***The Seventh Commandment:*** “You shall not commit adultery.” ***This commandment presupposes the biblical understanding of marriage as a covenant between one man and one woman, which in turn presupposes the basic binary of sexual differentiation established in Genesis 1 and 2.***

***The Ninth Commandment:*** “You shall not bear false witness.” According to the Westminster Shorter Catechism, “The ninth commandment requireth the maintaining and promoting of truth between man and man, and of our own and our neighbor’s good name, especially in witness-bearing.” This has obvious implications for ‘sex reassignment’ treatments: if biological sex is indeed the primary indicator of ontological sex, then such treatments are a form of deception—an elaborate charade—in which people attempt to present themselves falsely as members of the opposite sex.

We can see, then, that from a normative perspective the Bible has much to say about how we should understand and evaluate these issues.

**James N. Anderson**  
Associate Professor of Theology and Philosophy  
Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte

*Adapted from the second of two lectures—the Fifth Annual B. B. Warfield Lectures—delivered in October 2016 at the invitation of Erskine Seminary and First Presbyterian Church, Columbia, SC.*