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 **Jeff:** Our gracious God, we give You thanks and delight in You. We thank You now for the opportunity to gather and study Your word. Lord, we certainly pray and ask that You will be with our families while we’re apart from them today. We pray that You’ll strengthen them and feed them on Your word and by Your Spirit.

 Lord, as we gather we’re mindful that our nation is nearing an election that is contentious. And so we pray that You will bless our nation. Lord, we pray, asking that You will turn our hearts back to You. We pray that You would forgive us our sins, and they are many. And Lord, we ask that You would cause us to be a nation that kisses Your Son. Father, we ask that You would do this certainly for our good. We long to live in a nation of freedom and to enjoy the benefits and the blessings that we have for many years. But Lord, let it be our preeminent desire for our nation as a godly nation that does in fact acknowledge the Son as King. And Lord, we pray that would be our primary motivation.

 Lord, it is too often easy in our hearts for us to be motivated by the things that are comfortable, that are easy, and that cause us little pain. And so help that not to be our motivation, at least our primary motivation. Let us seek after You, not just as individuals but as a nation.

 Lord, we pray that You will bless us today as we study Your word. Be with Don as he is apart from us; we ask that Your hand would be upon him. And Lord, we pray that You’ll do these things for Christ’s sake, and we ask it in His name. Amen.

 **Brave Men:** Amen.

 **Jeff:** All right. Well I want us to continue thinking about what it is to be a man. Like I said to you before, as I’ve been thinking about this I think that sometimes the idea of being a man,--I’ll tell you, my own understanding is this. Somewhere in the 2000s a book came out. I’m not saying that I started here; but I guess in my mind I just started to think about these things at this point. There was a book that came out called *Wild At Heart.*

 I don’t know if you remember it, but it basically said that a man needs to be a man. He is feminized and the church has been feminized. A man has to tap into what it is to be a man. In my mind, as I read the book, I thought it was a lot of superficial stuff; you know what I mean. But that kind of book has touched a nerve in the church.

 And so I think what’s happened is that you have this sort of masculinized Christianity that has really snowballed not only with its abdication of feminism in the church and the feminization of the church, but it’s radicalized because it’s upset with what’s happening in the governmental realm. And so not only is there agitation about what’s happening in the church; there’s agitation about what’s happening in the state. And so what begins to happen is, men start to talk about the model man as if the model man is sort of the aggressive, domineering type. That would almost be like Nietzsche’s superman.

 I’ve read Nietzsche at points over the past several years, and I’ve thought to myself: I can see some Christian men who are leaders advocating this kind of masculinity. I can see them saying that he is right there. Nietzsche talks about women and their usurpation of men. And sometimes he’s right about that. But this idea of the masculinized man, the man that kind of triumphs over all, that kind of man is probably the worst part of us, not the best part of us. And so I’ve been thinking about what the Scripture says about being a man. What does it tell us?

 If you go back to something like 1 Corinthians and you look at chapter 13 like we looked at it, one of the things that characterizes a man is love. And that’s what characterized Jesus. And what I’m hoping to do is just to continue to look at some of those aspects that characterize men that we ought to pay attention to.

 I want to say this to you. I’m actually getting myself into a trajectory here that might lead us into another Bible study, but that’s okay. I want to share something with you. I’ve been debating about whether to do this or not, but I decided that I’m going to do this, but I’m doing it.

 Here’s the issue, okay? The issue is: What is it that makes a man a man? And what is it that makes a woman a woman?

 Now the question is, if we only say that the answer to that is biology, well, women obviously reproduce and men don’t. Okay, then the question becomes: Is there anything deeper that distinguishes a man from a woman? And what I’m thinking of is the soul itself.

 So man is created in the Garden of Eden, and the *nephesh--*the breath of life—is breathed into him. So the question I have for you is this: Is the soul that’s breathed into Adam a generic soul—once size fits all; the same soul given to man as given to woman,--individuated of course, but a man possesses the same identical soul and a woman possess that same identical soul? Or is there a masculinity to the soul of man and a femininity to the soul of woman? In other words, does the difference between man and woman go deeper than simply biology? If it doesn’t go deeper than just biology, then there is a sense in which the playing field is entirely leveled.

 And some people may want that. There are what are called egalitarians who want that level playing field. Men and women are entirely equal. The only thing different about them is that women give birth and men don’t.

 And yet I struggle to see that. Again, I’m not sure. Here’s what I’m saying: If you’re waiting for me to spit out some answer to this, it’s not gonna happen. I’m sort of wanting to engage in some dialogue with you about this to gather some of your thoughts about it. But let me kind of work through this a little bit more.

 So think about man’s creation. God creates him and breathes into him the breath of life; he becomes a living being. How does he create woman? He takes her from the rib of man. But there is no story about breathing the breath of life into a woman. So where does her soul come from Is her soul from the man just like her physiology is from the man? And if that’s the case,--and I don’t think we want to go there because that’s what we would call traducianism,--that is, the body produces the soul. Where does the soul come from? It comes from biology. And I don’t think we want to go there; I don’t want to go there. There is an invisible spiritual quality about the soul that materiality can’t produce.

 So I’m more of what is called a creationist when it comes to the soul. That has nothing to do with the creation of the heavens and the earth. Creationism means that God creates and imparts the soul to each individual.

 **Don Bishop:** Wouldn’t that be the same argument for questions as to where man came from?

 **Jeff:** Yes, that’s exactly it. It’s the argument about this whole thing of the creation of man and woman. So my question is: Is there a masculinity to the soul and a femininity to the soul? And is that the driving force behind what is typically masculine? That is, a man typically seeks to provide and defend, those kinds of things, whereas a woman seeks to nurture and protect—you know, those kinds of things. What do you think of that? What are your thoughts on that?

 Now somebody could say, “You know, that’s the difference between testosterone and estrogen; that’s not a soulish thing.” So I guess the question is: Are we basically saying that the difference is only biology, and that the soul is a generic kind of one size fits all soul?

 Now I want you to think about this just for a second, okay? I don’t think you can distinguish between the soul and the mind. The mind is not the brain, right? When the brain stops working we believe that the mind goes on. Whatever that person was before is not just the function of the brain; it’s the mind which we also call the soul; that continues on. And so the question is, when I die, if I were to die before the Lord comes back and I go to be with the Lord in heaven and I see my wife, am I going to recognize her as a feminine soul like I recognized her as a woman here? But absent from her body and her biology, am I going to recognize her as a woman?

 **John Gratner:** *“In the image of God He created them; male and female He created them.”*

 **Jeff:** Yeah.

 **Gary Craig:** She’s actually going to have a body and soul.

 **Jeff:** Well, later.

 **Ted Wood:** She’s going to have her body in the age to come.

 **Jeff:** In the age to come her body will be renewed. But the question is, in that intermediate period, what’s the soul?

 **Ted:** What is the soul? That is the question. When you’re talking about the soul, what is it?

 **Jeff:** I would say it’s the immaterial aspect of us that is beyond the bodily functions that house that immateriality. So for instance, in this life it is its likes, its dislikes, its loves, its passions, its interests, its accumulated knowledge, it’s my ability to communicate with other individuals; it’s all of those things, right? So when I die those things are gone, and where do they go? They are my soul which has now departed to be with the Lord.

 So if you think about it, the question is: In heaven, think about this. There are no eyes to see with, no mouth to speak with, no nose to smell with. It’s an immaterial invisible soul. Is it feminine? Is it masculine?

 **John:** Will we still be wrong?

 **Jeff:** Huh? *(Laughter)* Brother, we won’t in a renewed world! *(Laughter)*

 **Ted:** Jeff?

 **Jeff:** Yes?

 **Ted:** I know this is considered heretical.

 **Jeff:** Okay.

 **Ted:** But I’ve always thought that the soul has three parts: the mind, the emotions and the will.

 **Jeff:** Right.

 **Ted:** And so that’s a convenient tool to think about the soul—the *nephesh* in Hebrew; the *psuche* in Greek. I think about it in that way, and I think it’s different in the spirit: body and soul and spirit.

 **Jeff:** Yes. Ted is advocating for, or at least mentioning, a tripartite view of the soul, which would be soul, spirit and affections. That’s what you’re saying.

 **Ted:** Yes; I’m saying mind, emotions or affections, and will.

 **Jeff:** So you combined one. *(Laughter)*

 **Ted:** I won’t use the word *affections;* mind, emotions and will. You might want to call emotions affections.

 **Jeff:** Right.

 **Ted:** I don’t know; I haven’t thought about that.

 **Jeff:** Okay. And then there is the bipartite view, which says that the soul and the spirit are the same thing; the words are used interchangeably.

 **Don:** Well if they’re not the same, how does it go with the body?

 **Jeff:** Uh-huh. Well you know, I guess if you’re going in Ted’s direction, then one might—

 **Don:** I would never go in that direction. *(Laughter)*

 **Ted:** That was quite a comeback. *(Laughter)*

 **Jeff:** It was a delayed comeback, but it was still good. *(Laughter)* Go ahead.

 **Ted:** It just seems to me—and I’ve thought about this a lot,--what does it mean to be born again? It means the same thing as happens with Adam when he had the breath of life, the spirit of life, and he became a living soul at that point. So what does he become? He becomes one who is thinking, he has emotions, and he has a will. And the work of the Spirit, when we receive the Holy Spirit, is to work on our souls. The Spirit begins to invade and overtake our souls so that we think like Christ and we begin to feel like Him and to will like Him.

 **Jeff:** So let’s say that we acknowledge, whether we’re bipartite or tripartite, let’s acknowledge that these aspects are the invisible immaterial aspects of our makeup.

 **Ted:** Right.

 **Jeff:** We call it the soul.

 **Ted:** *(Unclear)*

 **Jeff:** Now here’s the question. And I want an answer to this question, okay? This is not rhetorical. I don’t know if it’s well-formed or not, but here it is. **Ted:** Yes.

 **Jeff:** I’m generalizing, and I think that’ okay to do in a room like this. Oftentimes women are more emotional than men, right? I don’t care if they hide it at some points.

 Have you ever met that woman who is in kind of a high position in the company? She’s really tough and hard-nosed, and then she walks into the office and she crumbles. I don’t care whether you can hold it together better or not. But I don’t think most men walk into the office and fall down like that.

 We may stress about some things differently. It’s not that we’re mindless emotion and they are emotions, it’s that we handle things differently. Ando here’s my question. My question is: Is it only the estrogen that causes us to handle emotions differently? Or is it something about the very soul—the mind, emotions and will—is it something about the very soul of a woman that causes her to respond differently to situations and a man to respond differently? It’s not estrogen, but these things.

 **Ted:** It’s something beyond chemistry.

 **Jeff:** Something beyond chemistry.

 **Ted:** Is there something beyond chemistry that is involved in this? Jordan Peterson talks a lot about this.

 **Jeff:** Hold your tongue just a second.

 **Ted:** I’m not holding it.

 **Jeff:** Hold your tongue, because here’s the deal. One of the reasons why this is so important is that if it’s only biology, a question then arises when somebody says, “In my innermost heart I feel like a man, but I’m trapped in the body of a woman. And so I just have to redo the plumbing and then I’ll be straightened around.” And the question is: Is the person who says, “I feel like a man trapped in a woman’s body,” is the soul of that person something generic—one size fits all—so that in their inner recesses they could feel either way?

 **Ted:** No. *(Laughter)*

 **Jeff:** Okay, go ahead. You were going to say—

 **Ted:** I think that to say that God breathed into Adam’s nostrils the breath of life and he became a living soul, and to say that Eve did not experience that same thing, that women get their souls from men, is just to argue in circles. I would just say that we don’t know what is in a male soul or a female soul.

 **Jeff:** Okay, so here’s the problem—

 **Ted:** You may have Scripture.

 **Jeff:** No, no. Here’s the difficulty; I’m just throwing this out to you. This is 1 Corinthians 16; we went over this. *“Be watchful; stand firm in the faith. Act like men and be strong. Let all that you do be done in love.”*

 You read that, and though it says *“Act like men,”*—and we talked about how that can be translated and is translated in other places “be courageous and have courage,” let’s just translate it like that. Every one of these—“be watchful, stand firm in the faith, be courageous, be strong, let all you do be done in love”—we could say that that whole list of things could be said to a woman just as equally as it could be said to a man. And so what’s the real difference?

 **Ted:** And then that becomes the issue, doesn’t it?

 **Jeff:** Right.

 **Ted:** Because when in Scripture Paul refers to others as “brethren,” are only men to listen to what is being said?

 **Jeff:** Say that one more time.

 **John:** Brothers and sisters.

 **Ted:** He references brothers. Is he only speaking to them?

 **Jeff:** Oh yes; right. Is it generic brothers, brothers and sisters?

 **Ted:** In the ESV there is an asterisk that says “brothers and sisters.”

 **Jeff:** So is the admonition *andridzomai*—act like men—to both men and women?

 **Ted:** What is the word in Greek?

 **Jeff:** *Andridzomai.*

 **Ted:** Isn’t that “be strong?”

 **Jeff:** It’s from the word for man. So is *andridzomai*—to be manly or to be like men—is that generic brothers?

 **Ted:** I’m kind of sorting this out too; I haven’t thought a lot about this.

 **Jeff:** Well I think about this in our day and age. So Carl Truman recently said that every age has a particular issue that it wrestles through. And ours happens to be anthropology, right? From the perspective of our age we have to deal with anthropological questions. And in my mind this is one of the key anthropological questions.

 Now if we have to say that we can’t answer it, then we can’t answer it. But it’s worth at least thinking about as a problem, because it is one. Were you going to say something, Jim?

 **Brave Man:** When you look at the Scripture, we don’t necessarily consider evil men.

 **Jeff:** Okay. So you introduce this. And let me answer your question, okay? Here’s the question. So pre-Fall, before the Fall, God creates man, and then He finds no suitable helper for him. So he creates a woman.

 Now here’s the question. The question is: Is the woman prior to the Fall to submit to her husband who is her head? There are some who would say that prior to the Fall there is no headship and submission. That happens after the Fall.

 Now I would say that headship and submission is prior to the Fall. Why? Because when you go ahead to Ephesians 5, it says, “Do you have a crappy marriage? Hey, husbands, love your wives as the head. And wives, submit to or respect your husbands.” And that will mirror Christ’s love for His church and the church’s submission to and respect for Christ. And so it’s almost like he’s saying, “Do you want a pre-Fall marriage? Here’s the recipe.”

 Think about this. This means that patriarchy is not a bad word. But we’ve all been taught that patriarchy is bad. And patriarchy is not bad. Patriarchy means fatherly rule, male headship.

 Now that can be abused; I’m not saying it can’t. Just as a woman can abuse her role, so can a man abuse his role. But the fact of the matter is that you’re right. We’ve got to read these things not in their cultural context but in their biblical context. And if I’m right about that, then the Biblical context says that as men we are the head of our homes. And our wives submit to that, or at least they’re supposed to.

 Remember what God said. In the Fall God said, “I’m going to curse you.” You know, the NIV always makes this sound romantic. You don’t have to read it, but it’s Genesis 3. And it says this: *“To the woman He said,--“* In the old NIV it says, *“Your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you.”* Ah, that’s very nice! *(Laughter)*

 The ESV says: *“Your desire shall be contrary to your husband, and he shall rule over you.”* Oh yeah, that’s more like what we see today, right? *(Laughter)* You know, her desire is contrary to his, and his desire is to press her down. Hers is to rise up and to usurp his place as head; his is to hold her down in some way.

 Or—and here is where we are today!—hers is to rise up, and his is to go, “Whatever. Where’s the remote control?” *(Laughter)* And so there’s abdication.

 **Ted:** Sometimes it’s not worth fighting.

 **Jeff:** Yeah, right. Well that’s wisdom, Ted. *(Laughter)*

 **Ted:** I’m wondering if the issue today may not be anthropology, but autonomy.

 **Jeff:** Autonomy.

 **Ted:** Because the issues related to gender are really issues of autonomy. And you see it in every area of society. Even a greater issue than autonomy is self-autonomy, which means I am in charge; I can call the shots.

 I mean, I listen to Jordan Peterson quite a bit. He makes some interesting observations. He says that nobody can actually determine their genders by themselves. All of the relationships we have are a matter of—*(Unclear)*

 **Jeff:** But—

 **Ted:** So you can say, “I’m a man but I’m a woman inside; I really feel like a woman.” You can say that about yourself, but Peterson says that you don’t have the final word. Peterson says that it’s an agreement between you and the culture; you have to survive within the culture. You can’t say, “I don’t care what the culture says.”

 **Jeff:** Yes. So here’s the interesting thing, right? The interesting thing is that we have this expressive individualism. Emotionally inside, I’m a man. I’m trapped in a woman’s body, and vice versa. And so let’s say that I say in my own mind, “All right. I’m no longer a man; I’m a woman.”

 **Ted:** Yeah.

 **Jeff:** But now all of a sudden—and this is the key,--I need to be recognized by others. Did you ever read Carl Truman’s *The Rise and Triumph of the Modern Self?* This is Hegel’s influence on this whole argument. Hegel says that recognition by others is preeminent in the construction of an identity.

 And so it’s not enough for me to say that I am a woman. For my identity to really take root I need to be recognized by others and by you, which is why the whole culture is forcing us to recognize these people, because it’s against that mindset.

 **John:** And while I respect Peterson, he stops short because society doesn’t have the last confirmation on what your identity is, because the source of identity is the Designer who created us with purpose and function. And you can tell the Almighty as the Bright and Shining One that I’ll be like the Most High. But look, He’s not going to assent to your idea even if you are that being, let alone someone that He created as a human being who designed us as male and female. The Almighty Creator who has function and purpose behind His creation which He gave the breath of life to isn’t going to assent to that, even if society does. And so I think that sometimes we may get a little off track. *Andridzomai.* What English word does that sound like?

 **Jeff:** Androgynous.

 **John:** Androgynous, right?—which is a lack of a characteristic specifying man or woman; it’s a generic term. And I realize that the English language doesn’t take us in the direction; it’s always somewhat dangerous today. But nevertheless we see how the word has developed. It may be more of a selective term there than necessarily pointing to the male of the human species. Like you suggested, if we would spend some time in a concordance, the word is *nephesh.* Before we get that description in chapter 2 of Genesis, we get the scene out of Genesis 1 where *“in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.”* That’s just a definitive, declarative scene. And so if we work from there forward, rather than starting with the breath of God thing, the breath of God is given in other places. So it’s not necessary specifically to work on that with the specific Hebrew word, because it doesn’t have to mean that it’s specific to Adam here and not given over here where it’s given in other instances. So it pushes us back to more of a functional view. Why did the Almighty make humans, and how did He do it? There are two sides of the coin. Sorry.

 **Jeff:** No, go ahead.

 **John:** We think we know what the Bible says because we learned it in Sunday school a long time ago that Adam became a man. And the Lord came up and stuck His hand inside and pushed it out and put some dirt around us, or something like that. It doesn’t quite say that. If you really study what it says, He tosses out his side. And again, if you use your concordance, you look at all the instances of that word that is translated “rib,” in some of the translations it has this idea of the other half, the other side of the image: the poles on this side of the ark; here are the ones on the other side of the ark of the covenant. The cherubim are on both sides of the mercy seat. They are used in those kinds of contexts. Genesis uses the term “equal sides” in one sense of the other, and it creates the whole. You can’t make the whole without both sides interacting and interlocking in that way. Yet they have different functions.

 And so we get back to this. The Almighty decided to make man—not a man; the word is not specific. He made Adam; we’ll get to that later, and we certainly refer to some of that. But He made human beings in His image; in His image He made them male and female, because we see so many things that overlap, where we’re much more the same than we are different. But there are differences on the edges.

 We were talking about emotionalism, or being emotional. I thought of what is recorded after the showdown with the prophets of Baal. Elijah went out and his emotional reaction was that he wanted to die. And people had the opposite problem after that. “Oh, I would have gathered you under My arms like a mother hen,” with softness and tenderness, as the Lord says. And it takes the whole thing.

 It doesn’t mean you have the same roles and functions. Someone says, “Yeah, but I want to have my own role and function and I’m going to define it. And I want you to accept it.”

 So back to the Lord. Here is what He says: “I didn’t make a mistake with you. I made you in your mother’s womb. And I made you to be the person who I have a plan for. That first expresses itself in this life, as in the next life. And there’s a difference in biology, there’s a difference in function. There’s a difference in the quality of the soul and the spirit and where we go from here. But in sovereign wisdom He intentionally made man and woman as they are for the function and purpose of being human beings. There are different animals that might have passion or whatever. It’s a function and a position and an imaging kind of thing that nothing else in creation does.

 And that’s the issue. Everyone has an issue with it, and that is that they don’t know the design of the Creator.

 **Brave Man:** Amen.

 **Jeff:** That’s exactly it.

 **Gary:** A couple points. I don’t see androgynous as being gender-neutral in any way. You never hear of an androgynous male. You hear about androgynous women who is a man and a woman. And another point is that I see women as a subset of men, which they are genetically. And I think it’s significant in that everyone would say he’s a man that way. *(Laughter)*

 **Jeff:** You’re on a role, Gary. So we were talking about Jordan Peterson and his response.

 **Ted:** Jordan Peterson is not a Christian. When you listen to him, keep that in mind.

 **Jeff:** Right. So I want to throw one last thing in here. And that is that when we get to the New Testament, in Galatians chapter 3 it says that there is neither male nor female; we are one in Christ. Now today, for instance, I know that text is often times used to say that there are no rules. To your point, there are no rules. And so in Christ now there aren’t simply men who are eligible for the pastorate. Now men and women are eligible for the pastorate, despite what Paul says in 1 Timothy chapter 2. Oh, that’s just a cultural thing. That was a church where the women were out of control, and so he had to put that stipulation on them. That stipulation is on no other church, just them.

 And so I think we have to take into account that there is a sense today in which we are one in Christ: neither male nor female, neither slave nor free, and so on. But what does that mean? Does that mean that we lose our identity? Does that mean that our roles are obliterated?

 No. I think we have to take that for what it is. What would you say that is?

 **Gary:** We’re equal.

 **Jeff:** In what sense?

 **Gary:** In our standing before God.

 **Jeff:** Yes. I think that’s statement about the terms of our salvation. Before God there is neither male nor female, slave or free; we are one in Christ.

 **Ted:** If I can get you to that same place in Galatians, it’s very helpful. It says that there is neither male nor female. But if you go over to verse 27, the verse before it, *“For as many of you who were baptized into Christ”*—in union with Christ,--*“have put on Christ.”*

 **Jeff:** Yes.

 **Ted:** *“Therefore there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free, neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”* In fact we are one in Christ Jesus, but there are Jews and there are Greeks.

 **Jeff:** Right.

 **Ted:** And there are slaves and there are free.

 **Jeff:** Yeah.

 **Ted:** Jews and Greeks are very similar. *(Unclear)*

 **Jeff:** So I think that what we need to keep in mind is that our text does say those kinds of things. But those are really talking about our identity in terms of our salvation. In Christ there is no difference, right? If I’m in Christ I am not better than or less than; I am in Christ, and my identity is then bound up with Christ. I am Christ’s.

 **Ted:** it’s more than salvation, though. Being in Christ is more than salvation.

 **Jeff:** Well, it affects more. But I think that verse is talking about it. So again I think that if we doubt that, I want you to go further. What I don’t want to destroy is identity. What I don’t want somebody to do—which they’ll do!—is to say that since there is neither male nor female in Christ, that means that biology is less than the spiritual, which can be modified, right? If there is neither male nor female in Christ, if all are one in Christ, that means that biology is something that is less than the spiritual, and can be modified, which is a problem.

 **Ted:** Yes, it’s a real problem.

 **John:** If there’s a scandal in the verse, we might already have an issue. But if connected to these other pairs, if we see those pairs shored up at the end, with John in his vision which he sees around the throne, with every tribe, tongue and nation represented as the family of God, which is what we’re talking about here, so that it encompasses more so like Ted is pointing to, then God loves the family of all these human beings. And he hints that at the end and the distinction is still there and the unity is just s salient, which is the whole point. So in that verse you can’t pull the things apart. *(Unclear)*

 **Jeff:** Do you know what your problem is? Your problem is that you’re looking at the whole of Scripture. *(Laughter)* And you know, these feminist theologians or LBGQ theologians—you know, they don’t look at the Bible like that. They cut a verse out—

 **John:** Like the super heroes kept in context.

 **Ted:** My daughter is an Episcopal priest. She is very liberal and very selective about her Scriptures.

 **Jeff:** Oh, yeah.

 **Ted:** There is no understanding. And when we’ve entered into a discussion—which we don’t have anymore,--it raises questions about who is going to take care of me in my old age. *(Laughter)* She said to me, “Dad, you know the Bible better than I do.” This is pivotal, isn’t it?

 **Jeff:** Yeah, right.

 **Ted:** And Don, you don’t have to put that in the transcript. *(Laughter) )Unclear)*

 **Jim Hamilton:** To simplify this a little bit, Christ was simply a man. And that’s the way God created Him.

 **Ted:** No.

 **Jim:** Then why are we confusing Him with a woman? We don’t confuse things; we don’t see Christ as a woman.

 **Ted:** But He didn’t want to be a woman.

 **Jim:** So He knew the difference from the very beginning. He knew the difference.

 **Jeff:** Well, I think the problem is that the enemy has become this idea of the binary. For instance, even a gay and lesbian couple wants there to be a binary, right? But when you get to the trans-gender issue, now the binary is the enemy and we want it to be monistic. We want a monad; we want one thing. We want the inherent thing that we can individuate. And so as we’re looking at thig we’re going, yes. God created a man in the garden, not a woman in the garden from which He created a man; He created a man from which He created a woman.

 But how some would like to view it is—going back to your point about Genesis 1:26,--that One who created man—male and female He created them,--what they would say is that He created the monad, the one. And that’s the one unindividuated property from which two came. And so it doesn’t start with a binary; it starts with a monad. And so they use that to try and say that maleness or femaleness is not the issue. The one is the issue, and one can become either.

 And so that doesn’t compute with us who read the Bible and say that He created a man. And from the man He created a woman. And God is portrayed as a man, and Jesus is a Man, and on and on.

 That doesn’t compute with them, because what drives them is their philosophy that seeks to undermine the Scriptures. And really, that’s what’s happening, right? We know the world does not want to accept what this says. They adjust what this says if they claim to believe it. It wants to adjust what this says so it can accommodate a philosophy that believes anything it wants. That’s where we’re living today.

 Getting back to what I wanted to talk about in the last few minutes, I’m going to draw us back to this idea about what it is in this world that we can best do. We’re a room full of men. We can actually make a difference. Do you realize how many people we affect and influence by what we do?

 There was a Christian college. I can’t remember the exact details of the story. (Someone) came to the college; he was actually a Communist. He came to the college and spoke at the college. And they were telling him “We can’t do anything. This college has its tracks down on us; we can’t do anything. We can’t even chew gum.”

 And he said, “You can’t even chew gum? Z” Immediately he said to them, “I can shut down the city with chewing gum. Tell everybody to chew gum, everyone around this campus. And that will be your rebellion. And then they’ll listen to you.”

 And so on campus everybody started chewing gum. There was gum everywhere; gum was literally clogging up the campus. And the administration then listened to the kids, and they no longer became a Christian college. *(Laughter)*

 I don’t know what happened to him. But my point is that there is a Communist thinking strategically about the simple thing of using gum as an end.

 As an end to knowing the Biblical paradigm, what is it that we can be doing day by day to make change in our world? That’s the point.

 And I think there are a few things. I think that #1 is that we stop living according to the caricature of the world; we stop living like we’re stupid. We stop living like we’re the ones that are being led around by our noses. We don’t become mean; we just become men. That’s first.

 I think the second thing is that we stop whispering about the stuff that we know the world thinks is wrong.. We don’t become mean. But we stop hiding what we think is right, based on the word of God.

 For instance if we’re out publicly, and we’re in a conversation with somebody about trans-gender stuff or LGBTQ stuff or whatever, then we talk with our voices at the same level—not mean, but we just talk. And we call a spade a spade, right? When somebody jumps on us then we’re kind to them, and we say, Look; I have a different ethic and here it is, and let me tell you about it, and so on.

 And then thirdly,--and I think this is an important thing,--this is going to take just a minute of explanation. You know, there’s a Side A. and a Side B. Christianity in some contexts.

 Side B. Christianity is this. Side B. Christianity is that Christianity which says that I can be a gay Christian in my feelings. As long as I don’t act on it, I’m okay. In other words, dispositionally I can be gay, as long as I’m not gay in my actions.

 And we would say,--and I think that any conservative-thinking Christian is going to say,--Whoa, wait a second! First of all, you can’t define yourself in that way. You can’t define yourself by your sin. You can’t say, “I’m a gay Christian,” and let that be okay. And if those are your feelings, they need to be repented of, not lived in.

 Okay, so here’s my third point. I don’t know if you’ve heard of Steve Lawson. Steve Lawson had a five-year emotional affair. Whether there was more I don’t know. He was having a five-year emotional affair with a woman that was not his wife. And this is what he wants to say: It was just emotion; it’s not like it was a big deal.

 Now if it’s not okay for the Side B. Christian to say that I’m a gay Christian in my feelings but not my actions, why is it okay for Steve Lawson to say that it was just an emotional affair; it wasn’t a real affair? I think that’s one of the reasons why not just Christian men but Christians have no voice, because we’re not willing to say that if it’s wrong over there, the same situation applies over here; it’s wrong too.

 I think that to be men, we’ve got to realize that if we’re doing things that we’re condemning in others that look a little different but are the same sins species-wise, it needs to be repented of. I’m going to close with prayer.

 **Ted:** It’s too bad that you stopped right there. I mean, that carries a lot of conversation.

 **Jeff:** Yeah.

 **John:** Shouldn’t we seek by His grace to live the Sermon on the Mount? That would take care of both of those things right there.

 **Jeff:** It would take care of a lot of things. Live by the Sermon on the Mount? That’s a big order, but yes, that’s right. Ron?

 **Ron Baling:** In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus says, *“Judge not, lest ye be judged.”* Some people say that if we say that such and such is a sin, we are guilty of that. But I say that we have to differentiate between judging and discerning, and condemning.

 **Jeff:** Yeah.

 **Ron:** So when I say that someone is a sinner, and I am told, “You’re condemning us,” I say “No, I’m simply discerning what you do as a sin. I’m not judging you.”

 **Jeff:** Okay.

 **Ron:** “I’m not condemning you.” But there’s nothing wrong with discerning sin.

 **Jeff:** Jesus says, *“Stop judging by appearances, and make a right judgment”* in John 7.

 **Ron:** So He is speaking of judgment in two different senses.

 **Jeff:** Absolutely; that’s right. Okay, let me pray. Gracious God, thank You for this day and for the time You’ve given us to be together for this discussion. Lord, we pray that it would be fruitful in our thinking, and that it would make an impact not only on our lives but also the lives of those around us. Lord, help us to continue thinking about these issues that affect us today so deeply. Lord, we pray for the repentance of our country. We look forward to the election and ask that Your providence would smile upon us even as You forgive us. And we pray these things in Christ’s name. Amen.

 **Brave Men:** Amen. *(Applause)*