

Transgender: Trans-ition to Nowhere

PETER JONES

Abstract

Based on Genesis 1:1, “In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth” (ESV), the apostle Paul in Romans 1:25 gives an amazingly complete definition of the only two ways of existing in the world: “they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever! Amen.” I call these two ways of existing Oneism and Twoism.

In Oneism, if you worship creation, you will believe that the world is self-created, self-explanatory, and all made of the same stuff (matter, spirit, or a mixture). Paganism is the worship of nature. If everything shares the same divine substance, then all distinctions are eliminated and everything is god. In Twoism, if you worship God, you will believe that he is the Creator—an external, intelligent, personal God. There are two kinds of existence—the Creator who is uncreated, and everything else, which is created. He has placed distinctions in his creation, making what I call Twoism a worldview based on the binaries of otherness and difference.

From living under the cultural canopy of biblical truth, our world has changed in the last one or two generations. This becomes especially evident in the modern views of sexuality—in particular, transsexuality, where human beings now self-define and reject the creational binary of male/female sexuality.

Introduction

Most people still regard “transgenderism” as an obscure or marginal issue.¹ Though transgender people are a tiny minority of the populace, the issue has brought about deep cultural conflict. Once the definition of gender is in question, there is no turning back. Perhaps the most striking element of modern Western society is its determination to dismiss the basic liberties God has given humanity by reinventing personal identity, in particular, personal *sexual* identity. Such experimentation is conducted without any satisfying criteria either to guide the process or to indicate when it will have reached a successful end. Such is the context in which we discuss transgenderism, the latest expression of sexual self-redefinition. Merriam-Webster defines *transgender* as “a person whose gender identity differs from the sex the person had or was identified as having at birth.”

I. *The Present Situation*

The speed of change is creating instant dinosaurs. In 2017, TV presenter Jenni Murray, host of BBC Radio 4’s *Woman’s Hour*, was issued an “impartiality warning” for saying that a sex change cannot make a man a “real woman.” A transsexual journalist argued that “the fact that she [Murray] is still allowed to host *Woman’s Hour* while spouting this bile is ridiculous Jenni Murray is a dinosaur and we all know what happened to them.”² This obvious threat to an honest statement of fact indicates the future for politically incorrect “deniers.”

Transgenderism has been an ideal in some indigenous cultures and societies, such as the Hijra of India, the Fa’afafine of Polynesia, the ladyboys and tomboys of Thailand, and the Takatāpui of New Zealand. However, it has not been on most people’s agenda. The first sex change operation in the West was performed by Dr. Felix Abraham—a mastectomy on a transman

¹ In this study, I am not referring to those born with physical anomalies that produce an intersex condition. I realize that such conditions require much wisdom and sometimes include difficult decisions, but, as an anomaly, it is not a condition on which we could establish a valid theology of gender. Note also since writing this article I discovered a useful recent book on the subject: Andrew Walker, *God and the Transgender Debate: What Does the Bible Actually Say about Gender Identity?* (Centralia, WA: Good Book, 2017).

² “BBC Issues Warning over Presenter’s ‘Transgender’ Comments,” *Christian Concern*, March 10, 2017, <https://www.christianconcern.com/our-concerns/bbc-issues-warning-over-presenters-transgender-comments>.

in 1926.³ The first serious study, *The Transsexual Phenomenon*, appeared in 1966 by the American endocrinologist and sexologist Harry Benjamin, who worked with “sex expert”—some say, “pervert”—Alfred Kinsey.⁴ The term “transgender” did not appear until 1971, and its shortened form, “trans,” until 1996.⁵

Within a few years, however, popular interest in the subject has grown out of all proportion. Transgenderism is not about the handful of sexually abnormal surgical cases. It has reached the headlines with much-trumpeted stories like that of Bruce (now Caitlyn) Jenner, winner of the gold medal in the men’s decathlon in 1976, who came out as transgender in 2015. Jenner was appropriately named *Time*’s “Person of the Year, 2015” and received ESPN’s “Arthur Ashe Courage Award,” though not for athletic achievement!

Other examples of public transgenderism indicate how widespread the phenomenon is becoming:

- Thomas Beatie gave birth to three children between 2008 and 2010. Beatie, born a woman, underwent a surgical and legal gender transition before having children. Arizona recognizes Beatie as their father, even though, biologically, he is their mother.
- Transmen, once women, while insisting on being called by male pronouns, nevertheless have periods, mammograms, and abortions. Therefore, the British Medical Association tells doctors not to call pregnant women “mothers,” in case transgender individuals are offended.⁶
- In 2017, half of Fortune 500 and other large companies offered employees transgender-inclusive health care benefits.⁷
- The District of Columbia motor vehicle department offers an “X” option, in addition to the male/female choices for driver’s licenses or identification cards.⁸
- In 2017, Canada’s Senate passed a law (67 to 11) for the Human Rights Code, criminalizing the wrong use of pronouns to address transgender

³ Stephen Whittle, “A Brief History of Transgender Issues,” *The Guardian*, June 10, 2010, <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2010/jun/02/brief-history-transgender-issues>.

⁴ Harry Benjamin, *The Transsexual Phenomenon* (New York: Ace, 1966).

⁵ Whittle, “A Brief History of Transgender Issues.”

⁶ Laura Donnelly, “Don’t Call Pregnant Women ‘Expectant Mothers’ as It Might Offend Transgender People, BMA Says,” *The Telegraph*, January 29, 2017, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/01/29/dont-call-pregnant-women-expectant-mothers-might-offend-transgender/>.

⁷ John Biver, “Identity Politics and Paraphilias: An Ugly Fight and Bestiality/Zoophilia,” *BarbWire*, April 4, 2017, <http://barbwire.com/2017/04/04/identity-politics-and-paraphilias-an-ugly-fight-bestialityzoophilia/>.

⁸ “DC begins issuing gender-neutral driver’s licenses,” Associated Press, June 29, 2017.

people. Those who refuse to comply are liable for hate crimes and will be jailed, fined, or made to take anti-bias training.⁹

- The Obama administration introduced the full integration of women and homosexuals into all aspects of the US military. Currently, the Army has mandatory transgender sensitivity training, covering everything from “trans-female soldiers,” to “transgender shower etiquette,” to dealing with “male soldiers” who become pregnant.¹⁰ The taxpayer finances double mastectomies and artificial penises for transmen soldiers and castration and vaginal construction for transwomen soldiers.
- One transgender activist now feels comfortable declaring that straight men who do not desire transgender women have an issue they “should try to work through.” Straight men unwilling to be romantic with transwomen hold an “odd opinion.” They should treat “transwomen as the women they are.”¹¹

Whether you are aware of these facts or not, dear reader, we must consider our Christian response to this cultural phenomenon.

II. *Dubious Science?*

Leading progressives are calling religious and cultural Neanderthals to embrace the value of transgenderism and to defend its practice in immediate public legalization. This call fails to recognize the philosophical and scientific difficulties attached to this deeply human problem. Consider the story of Dr. Paul R. McHugh.

McHugh is a retired professor of psychiatry and behavioral sciences at the renowned Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. Appointed by President George W. Bush to the Presidential Council on Bioethics, McHugh was, for twenty-five years, the psychiatrist-in-chief at Johns Hopkins Hospital, recognized as the leading academic medical institution for the treatment of transgender people. In 1965, Johns Hopkins made history as the first

⁹ Rob Shimshock, “Canadians Could Face Hate Crimes over Using the Wrong Gender Pronouns,” *The Daily Caller*, June 16, 2016, <http://dailycaller.com/2017/06/16/canada-passes-law-criminalizing-use-of-wrong-gender-pronouns/>.

¹⁰ “Transgender Training: Army Sensitivity Training Now Addresses ‘Male Pregnancies,’” *BarbWire*, June 30, 2017, <http://barbwire.com/2017/06/30/armys-new-transgender-training-now-addresses-male-pregnancies/>.

¹¹ Dave Urbanski, “Transgender Activist: Straight Men Should ‘Work Through’ Non-Attraction to Transgender Women,” *TheBlaze*, July 3, 2017, <http://www.theblaze.com/news/2017/07/03/transgender-activist-straight-men-should-work-through-non-attraction-to-transgender-women/>.

academic institution to offer gender-affirming surgical procedures.

In one publicized case, Dr. John Money (disciple of sexologist Alfred Kinsey and member of the transsexual research team at Johns Hopkins) was firmly convinced that gender was a social construction that could be “learned away” through psychological and behavioral intervention. In 1967, a Canadian couple, the Reimers, asked him to repair a botched circumcision on their two-year-old son, David. Money surgically changed David’s genitalia from male to female, assuming that David’s sexual identity would be shaped by his upbringing as a girl. Money demanded that the parents raise David as a girl without telling him about the surgery. The experiment was an utter failure. By age twelve, David was severely depressed and, at age fourteen, chose to undo the gender change and live as a boy. In 2000, at the age of thirty-five, David and his twin brother Brian, who had been included in the deception, exposed the sexual abuse Money had inflicted, and, soon after, both committed suicide.¹²

However, to return to McHugh—in 1979, McHugh, director of the transgender program, shut it down. He said that most of those who had undergone sex reassignment surgery “had much the same problems with relationships, work, and emotions as before,” and so he concluded, “We psychiatrists would do better to concentrate on trying to fix their minds and not their genitalia.”¹³

In 2016, seeking justification for their past professional conclusions, McHugh, and a Johns Hopkins colleague, Dr. Lawrence S. Mayer,¹⁴ published a 150-page report of the current academic literature on gender reassignment. Entitled “Sexuality and Gender: Findings from the Biological, Psychological, and Social Sciences,”¹⁵ this major study examines scores of scholarly and scientific studies that prove heterosexual gender to be a fixed condition that cannot successfully be changed.

The following is a short discussion of this report, which serious readers should read for themselves. The authors offer “a careful summary and an up-to-date explanation of research—from the biological, psychological,

¹² For a fuller description, see Walt Heyer, “‘Too Many End in Suicide’: The Dark History of Gender ‘Reassignment,’” *LifeSiteNews*, May 4, 2015. See also another botched attempt that ended in suicide—John Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl* (New York: HarperCollins, 2000).

¹³ Paul R. McHugh, “Surgical Sex: Why We Stopped Doing Sex Change Operations,” *First Things*, November 2004, <https://www.firstthings.com/article/2004/11/surgical-sex>.

¹⁴ Lawrence S. Mayer, M.B., M.S., Ph.D., is a scholar in residence in the Department of Psychiatry at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and a professor of statistics and biostatistics at Arizona State University.

¹⁵ Paul McHugh and Lawrence Mayer, “Society and Gender,” *The New Atlantis* (Fall 2016).

and social sciences—related to sexual orientation and gender identity,” showing that sexual orientation is chosen and not fixed and that gay and transgender people are not “born gay.”¹⁶

The study warns us that we are dealing with sensitive human beings, firstly because the concept of “sexual desire” is complex and difficult to define, with currently no agreed-upon definitions of “sexual orientation.”¹⁷ Furthermore, the subject is fraught with danger, since “combined world-wide studies showed up to fifty percent higher rates of mental disorders and substance abuse among persons self-identifying in surveys as lesbian, gay, or bisexual.”¹⁸ Among the transgender subpopulation in the United States, the rate of attempted suicide is as high as forty-one percent, ten times higher than in the general population. A 2001 study of 392 male-to-female and 123 female-to-male transgender persons found that sixty-two percent of the male-to-female and fifty-five percent of the female-to-male transgender persons were depressed at the time of the study and that thirty-two percent of each population had attempted suicide.¹⁹ McHugh and Mayer conclude that “the real issue is public health not [the ideological] issues of civil rights, or the right to self-define.”²⁰ In other words, progressive ideology must not trump the concern for real, suffering human beings.

One major goal of today’s “progressives” has been to show that sexual deviancies are inborn or biologically determined and, therefore, totally natural. If this is true, then heterosexuality is not normative. In 1991, Simon LeVay, a well-known homosexual scientist, sought to show brain differences in homosexual men,²¹ but he later stated frankly, “I did not prove that homosexuality is genetic, or find a genetic cause for being gay.”²² Indeed, a study of over 23,000 individuals presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Human Genetics in 2012 found “no linkages reaching genome-wide significance for same-sex sexual identity for males or

¹⁶ McHugh and Mayer, “Executive Summary,” *The New Atlantis* (Fall 2016).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 66.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 75. See Kristen Clements-Nolle et al., “HIV Prevalence, Risk Behaviors, Health Care Use, and Mental Health Status of Transgender Persons: Implications for Public Health Intervention,” *American Journal of Public Health* 91.6 (2001): 915–21, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.91.6.915>.

²⁰ McHugh and Mayer, “Society and Gender,” 11, and n. 66. See also David Nimmons, “Sex and the Brain,” *Discover*, March 1, 1994, <http://discovermagazine.com/1994/mar/sexandthebrain346/>.

²¹ Simon LeVay, “A Difference in the Hypothalamic Structure between Heterosexual and Homosexual Men,” *Science*, New Series, 253.5023 (August 30, 1991): 1034–1037.

²² McHugh and Mayer, “Society and Gender,” 11.

females.”²³ Making the “born that way” thesis even more untenable, McHugh and Mayer cite numerous studies that show that approximately eighty percent of adolescent boys and half of adolescent girls who expressed either partial or exclusive same-sex romantic attraction in late childhood “turned” heterosexual (opposite-sex attraction or exclusively heterosexual identity) as young adults.²⁴ Mayer and McHugh state their convictions clearly:

The scientific definition of biological sex is, for almost all human beings, clear, binary [that is, heterosexual], and stable, reflecting an underlying biological reality that is not contradicted by exceptions to sex-typical behavior, and cannot be altered by surgery or social conditioning.²⁵

Their examination of scientific studies shows “*no biological features that can reliably identify transgender individuals as different from others.*”²⁶ This conclusion was supported by Johns Hopkins endocrinologist Charles Ihlenfeld, who publicly announced that eighty percent of the people who want to change their gender should not do it and “too many end in suicide.” Ihlenfeld stopped administering hormones to patients experiencing gender dysphoria and switched specialties from endocrinology to psychiatry so he could offer such patients the kind of help he thought they needed.²⁷

Despite the lack of scientific proof, drastic interventions continue to be prescribed, even for many prepubescent children, some as young as two. Mayer and McHugh state, “We have reservations about how well scientists understand what it even means for a child to have a developed sense of his or her gender. We strongly urge caution in this regard.”²⁸ Dr. Michelle Cretella, president of the American College of Pediatricians, agrees:

Today’s institutions that promote transition affirmation are pushing children to impersonate the opposite sex, sending many of them down the path of puberty blockers, sterilization, the removal of healthy body parts, and untold psychological damage. These harms constitute nothing less than institutionalized child abuse.²⁹

²³ Ibid., 33, n. 51, referencing E. M. Drabant et al., “Genome-Wide Association Study of Sexual Orientation in a Large, Web-based Cohort,” 23andMe (2012), <https://blog.23andme.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Drabant-Poster-v7.pdf>.

²⁴ McHugh and Mayer, “Society and Gender,” 53.

²⁵ Ibid., 93. Note that the hermaphroditic biological condition of malformed genitalia or the possession of both sets of genitalia is not a third gender but a biological malformation.

²⁶ Ibid., 105.

²⁷ Cited in Susan Brinkmann, “What the Public Needs to Know about Sex Change Surgery,” Women of Grace, May 5, 2015, <http://www.womenofgrace.com/blog/?p=39616>.

²⁸ Ibid., 115.

²⁹ Michelle Cretella, “I’m a Pediatrician: How Transgender Ideology Has Infiltrated My Field and Produced Large-Scale Child Abuse,” *The Daily Signal*, July 3, 2017, <http://dailysignal.com>.

These warnings seem verified by the growing number of people who call themselves “de-transitioners.”³⁰ These unfortunate individuals were deeply harmed by sex reassignment surgery involving castration, mastectomy, and chemically induced sterility. Deeply regretful, they often seek to recover their original gender identity. The testimony of Walt Heyer is disturbing. He states, “I underwent gender reassignment surgery and lived for eight years as Laura Jensen, female.”³¹ He adds, “Eventually, I gathered the courage to admit that the surgery had fixed nothing—it only masked and exacerbated deeper psychological problems.”³²

The American College of Pediatricians (ACPed) is a national organization of pediatricians and other healthcare professionals “dedicated to the health and well-being of children. Formed in 2002, the College is committed to fulfilling its mission by producing sound policy, based upon the best available research.”³³ The ACPeds, like the Mayer-McHugh report, on the basis of “the best available research,” has publicly called for an end to the normalization of gender dysphoria (GD) in children:

Mandates by public institutions to force the acceptance of GD as a normal variant of child development and require social accommodation, toxic hormone therapy and surgical removal of healthy body parts, are misguided and dangerous. The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, the Christian Medical Association, and the Catholic Medical Association share the College’s concern over this approach. Together our groups represent over 20,000 physicians and health professionals. Opposition also exists among liberal-leaning healthcare professionals who have created an online community known as Youth Trans Critical Professionals. However, those who dare to speak out in support of “First do no harm” often encounter significant public and private harassment, and many have lost or will lose their jobs.³⁴

In spite of this, “progressive” scientists refuse the scientific evidence. McHugh’s research is dismissed as “a weapon in the arsenal of anti-transgender politicians and extremists.”³⁵ Dean Hamer, PhD, scientist emeritus at

com/2017/07/03/im-pediatrician-transgender-ideology-infiltrated-field-produced-large-scale-child-abuse/.

³⁰ Laurie Higgins, “Former ‘Transgenders’ Talk about De-‘Transitioning,’” Illinois Family Institute, March 7, 2017, <https://illinoisfamily.org/homosexuality/former-transgenders-talk-de-transitioning/>.

³¹ Walt Heyer, “I Was a Transgender Woman,” The Witherspoon Institute, April 1, 2015, <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2015/04/14688>.

³² Heyer, “Too Many End in Suicide.”

³³ “About Us,” American College of Pediatricians (2016), <https://www.acped.org/about-us>.

³⁴ “Normalizing Gender Dysphoria Is Dangerous and Unethical,” American College of Pediatricians, August 3, 2016, <https://www.acped.org/normalizing-gender-dysphoria-is-dangerous-and-unethical>.

³⁵ Dawn Ennis, “Human Rights Campaign Sets Sights on Johns Hopkins after

the National Institutes of Health, dismisses Mayer and McHugh's claims in a scathing review titled "New 'Scientific' Study on Sexuality, Gender Is Neither New nor Science."³⁶ He rejects their work as "data cherry-picking" and cites studies that he believes contradict their work.³⁷

III. *Brain Sex*

Persons with a Y chromosome will always be biological males, in spite of an approach called "brain-sex," which attempts to show that gender is formed *in utero* in the interplay of sex hormones with genes that may produce a sense of incongruence between objective biological identity and psychologically perceived gender identity.³⁸ However, after a careful analysis, Christian psychologist Mark Yarhouse, like many in the field, does not find brain-sex suppositions convincing.³⁹ He concludes, "We do not know what causes gender dysphoria."⁴⁰ Even a convinced transgenderist, Amy Ellis Nutt, says, "There is no one test for gender. ... Gender is truly less about biology and more about what we tell ourselves—and others—about who we are."⁴¹

Hamer, however, represents a powerful and convinced progressive lobby, epitomized by the young transwoman spokesperson of the homosexual Human Rights Campaign, Sarah McBride, the first transgender person to address the Democratic National Convention in 2015. McBride dismisses McHugh's careful academic work as "transphobic" with "dangerous consequences for transgender people, in particular, transgender young people."⁴²

Controversial Trans Report," NBC, September 1, 2016, <https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/hrc-sets-sights-johns-hopkins-after-controversial-sexuality-gender-report-n641501>.

³⁶ Dean Hamer, "New 'Scientific' Study on Sexuality, Gender Is Neither New nor Scientific," *Advocate*, August 29, 2016, <http://www.advocate.com/commentary/2016/8/29/new-scientific-study-sexuality-gender-neither-new-nor-scientific>.

³⁷ See the public lecture by Quentin Van Meter, MD, FCP, a pediatric endocrinologist and a Fellow of the American College of Pediatricians and the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, who demonstrates the illegitimate, non-scientific, politically correct, scandalous influence of the protransgender lobby that has taken over the public expression of the transgender issues. Clearly, we are not dealing with just scientific evidence but rather with an antibiblical ideology about the nature of the human person. See "Presentations from Mass-Resistance Texas Teens4Truth Conference," *MassResistance*, December 28, 2017, <http://www.massresistance.org/docs/gen3/17d/MR-TX-Teens4Truth-Conf-101817/presentations.html#VanMeter>.

³⁸ Amy Ellis Nutt, *Becoming Nicole: The Transformation of an American Family* (New York: Random House, 2015), 88–95.

³⁹ Mark A. Yarhouse, *Understanding Gender Dysphoria: Navigating Transgender Issues in a Changing Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015), 72.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁴¹ Nutt, *Becoming Nicole*, 167.

⁴² Ennis, "Human Rights Campaign."

She threatened that unless Johns Hopkins took action and denounced the report of their retired professors, there would be “consequences”: Johns Hopkins’s score on the Healthcare Equality Index would be significantly impacted. The threat worked—immediately. Soon after McHugh’s report appeared, Johns Hopkins reinstalled a transgender program at the medical school, including sex reassignment surgery.

IV. *Child Abuse*

A balanced medico-scientific conclusion is proposed by a group including Michelle Cretella (MD and President of the American College of Pediatricians), Quentin Van Meter (MD, Pediatric Endocrinologist, and Vice President of the American College of Pediatricians), and Professor Paul McHugh. They believe that contemporary gender ideology harms children and is really child abuse. They recently issued eight guiding principles:⁴³

1. Human sexuality is an objective biological binary trait: “XY” and “XX” are genetic markers of male and female, respectively—not genetic markers of a disorder.
2. No one is born with a gender. Everyone is born with a biological sex. Gender (an awareness and sense of oneself as male or female) is a sociological and psychological concept; not an objective biological one.
3. A person’s belief that he or she is something they are not is, at best, a sign of confused thinking.
4. Puberty is not a disease and puberty-blocking hormones can be dangerous.
5. According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American College of Pediatricians (DMC-V), as many as ninety-eight percent of gender confused boys and eighty-eight percent of gender confused girls eventually accept their biological sex after naturally passing through puberty.
6. Pre-pubertal children diagnosed with gender dysphoria may be given puberty blockers as young as eleven, and will require cross-sex hormones in later adolescence to continue impersonating the opposite sex. These children will never be able to conceive any genetically related children even via artificial reproductive technology.

⁴³ “Gender Ideology Harms Children,” American College of Pediatricians, September 2017, <https://www.acpeds.org/the-college-speaks/position-statements/gender-ideology-harms-children>.

7. Rates of suicide are nearly twenty times greater among adults who use cross-sex hormones and undergo sex reassignment surgery, even in Sweden, which is among the most LGBTQ-affirming countries.
8. Conditioning children into believing a lifetime of chemical and surgical impersonation of the opposite sex is normal and healthful is child abuse.

V. *The Real Issue*

The “objective,” “scientific” reaction of Hamer reveals the real issues at stake. He claims McHugh’s report “will have zero impact in the scientific world” but will “lend a certain air of legitimacy to the anti-LGBT arguments of various right-wing groups in the U.S. ... the religious fundamentalists who are working to export homophobia to the developing world.”⁴⁴

This ideological standoff comes down to philosophies regarding the meaning of life. Defenders of transgenderism dismiss McHugh’s work because McHugh shows his religious colors by referring to gender-reassignment surgery as “mutilation” and by explaining his actions in a conservative Catholic publication, *First Things*.⁴⁵ Hamer would doubtless take issue with the statement of the American College of Pediatricians, which seeks to “base its policies and positions upon scientific truth,” but “within a framework of ethical absolutes,” namely, “the sanctity of human life from conception to natural death and the importance of the fundamental mother-father family (female-male) unit in the rearing of children.”⁴⁶

The latest scientific evidence comes from a study published in 2017 by Professor Shmuel Pietrokovski and Dr. Moran Gershoni, both researchers from the respected Weizmann Institute’s Molecular Genetics Department in Rehovot, Israel. These researchers found that around 6,500 of the 20,000 protein-coding genes expressed “activity that was biased toward one sex or the other in at least one tissue, adding to the already major biological differences between men and women.”⁴⁷ These scientists conclude that “when it comes to the differences between the sexes, we see that evolution often works on the level of gene expression.” This genetic study refutes the “trans”

⁴⁴ Hamer, “New ‘Scientific’ Study.”

⁴⁵ Paul R. McHugh, “Surgical Sex: Why We Stopped Doing Sex Change Operations,” *First Things*, November 2004, <https://www.firstthings.com/article/2004/11/surgical-sex>.

⁴⁶ “About Us,” American College of Pediatricians.

⁴⁷ Weizmann Institute of Science, “Researchers Identify 6,500 Genes That Are Expressed Differently in Men and Women,” *ScienceDaily*, May 4, 2017, <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/05/170504104342.htm>.

theory that attempts to detach gender from biological sex. Despite genital re-assignment and cosmetic plastic surgery, there is no way a man can become a woman. The most audacious, sexually suggestive drag queen is still a man!

I leave this subject with a quote from the very public lesbian and brilliant literary critic Camille Paglia:

It is certainly ironic how liberals who posture as defenders of science when it comes to global warming (a sentimental myth unsupported by evidence) flee all reference to biology when it comes to gender. Biology has been programmatically excluded from women's studies and gender studies programs for almost 50 years now. Thus very few current gender studies professors and theorists, here and abroad, are intellectually or scientifically prepared to teach their subjects. The cold biological truth is that sex changes are impossible. Every single cell of the human body remains coded with one's birth gender for life.⁴⁸

Hamer gives his side away in his passionate prose for sexual liberation:

I've been gratified by the gradual increase in knowledge and acceptance of the deeply rooted, intrinsic origins of sexual orientation and gender identity, and equally pleased by the growing realization that freedom of sexuality and gender are basic human rights *independent of any scientific explanation*.⁴⁹

He believes in "pansexual naturalism," whatever science might say. Only this explains how Vimeo eliminates from its "public" platform the 850 videos posted by *Pure Passion Ministries*, a Christian ministry posting testimonies from people who have suffered through abusive homosexual experiences and found healing. Vimeo's openly ideological principle is posted for all to read: "Referring to homosexuality as a 'dysfunction of sexual brokenness' or 'sexual distortion' is not OK, nor is reference to 'the fact that God can transform the life of anyone caught in homosexual confusion.'" Vimeo baldly states, "We don't believe that homosexuality requires a cure and we don't allow videos on our platform that espouse this point of view."⁵⁰ Yet the service gladly hosts pedophile videos glorifying the North American Man-Boy Love Association, all kinds of sexual perversity, including pornography, as well as jihadi calls to violent action. Deliverance from homosexuality? *Verboten!*

⁴⁸ Jonathan V. Last, "Camille Paglia: On Trump, Democrats, Transgenderism, and Islamic Terror," *The Weekly Standard*, June 15, 2017, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/camille-paglia-on-trump-democrats-transgenderism-and-islamist-terror/article/2008464#>.

⁴⁹ Hamer, "New 'Scientific' Study" (my italics).

⁵⁰ Michael L. Brown, "Vimeo Declares War on Gospel Transformation," Ask Dr. Brown, March 27, 2017, <https://askdrbrown.org/library/vimeo-declares-war-gospel-transformation>.

VI. *The New Orthodoxy: Legislation without Evidence*

Only 0.6% of US adults identify as transsexual,⁵¹ and the medical and legal issues have not been the subject of extensive civic debate. So it is curious that transgenderism has provided progressive thinkers an occasion to create an all-inclusive, moralizing discourse. In 2015, the highest law-enforcement officer in the United States, Attorney General Loretta Lynch, gave a detailed and public “moral” argument in support of the normalization and acceptance of transgender people. Going beyond immediate legal debates about appropriate bathroom accommodation, Lynch placed transgender issues in the context of the noble struggle for civil rights and characterized opposition to full transgender acceptance as equivalent to the violent hostility shown to the desegregation of schools in 1954.⁵² Among other things, Lynch declared,

This is about the dignity and respect we accord our fellow citizens and the laws that we, as a people and as a country, have enacted to protect them—indeed, to protect all of us, and it’s about the founding ideals that have led this country—haltingly but inexorably—in the direction of fairness, inclusion and equality for all Americans.⁵³

Without convincing scientific evidence, powerful cultural voices demand strict and *immediate* legislative action. The rush to action without hard fact is disturbing. The famous “bathroom” bills are an example, imposing on various states a new “normal” pansexual view of reality. On November 15, 2017, the governor of California signed into law Senate Bill 179, which allows individuals to change their sex on legal identification documents, without even a doctor’s note. “Non-binary” is now a legally recognized gender, rendering all previous literature and jurisprudence of Western civilization out of date. Though the American College of Pediatricians has issued a statement that transgender ideology “harms children,” and the most recent edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association (DSM-V) recognizes “Gender Dysphoria” (GD) (formerly listed as “Gender Identity Disorder,” or GID), as a “mental disorder,” yet we rush to pass laws demanding its general acceptance. Similar judicial action is occurring elsewhere.

⁵¹ Mayer and McHugh, “Sexuality and Gender,” 9.

⁵² Ernesto Londoño, “Loretta Lynch’s Enlightened Defense of Transgender,” *The New York Times*, May 9, 2016, https://takingnote.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/05/09/loretta-lynchs-enlightened-defense-of-transgender-people/?_r=0.

⁵³ Ibid.

A missionary friend in Costa Rica recently wrote to say that “the Ministry of Education just published an entire curriculum (mandatory for all schools) which includes gender stuff from first grade on, in ALL the courses. And the Social Medical Services just approved giving hormones and psychological counseling to transgenders, and they want to fund operations also.”⁵⁴

The Canadian government may legally remove children from families that refuse to accept their child’s chosen “gender identity,” thanks to Bill 89, “Supporting Children, Youth and Families Act, 2017,” passed by the Ontario province in a 63 to 23 vote. The Minister of Children and Youth Services, Michael Coteau, who *introduced* the bill, said that “a parent’s failure to recognize and support a child’s gender self-identification is a form of child abuse, and a child in these circumstances should be removed from the situation and placed into protection.” He stated,

I would consider that a form of abuse, when a child identifies one way and a caregiver is saying no, you need to do this differently. If it’s abuse, and if it’s within the definition, a child can be removed from that environment and placed into protection where the abuse stops.⁵⁵

Although many are rushing to legislate gender identity, in some places you cannot even talk about it. According to the students at Evergreen State University, “free speech” isn’t important when the lives of “‘black, trans, fems, and students’ are concerned.”⁵⁶ In our time, the unpardonable and punishable sin has become the questioning of an individual’s self-created identity, in particular, as transgender. What is going on?

VII. *Pansexualism—A Triumphant Contemporary Pagan Ideology*

Such hastily constructed legislation concerning the cultural parameters of sexuality reveals a deep ideology emerging in the West at breakneck speed. We have seen endless arguments for alternate sexualities, but transgenderism seems to bring us to an endpoint. It overrides arguments for homosexuality, which has sought justification in the genetically inalterable

⁵⁴ Personal communication.

⁵⁵ Thomas D. Williams, “New Ontario Law Enables Gov’t to Seize Children from Parents Opposing Gender Transition,” Breitbart, June 6, 2017, <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2017/06/06/new-ontario-law-enables-govt-to-seize-children-from-parents-opposing-gender-transition/>.

⁵⁶ Dave Urbanski, “F*** Free Speech’: Evergreen State Students Double Down, Want to ‘Weed Out’ Those Who Oppose Them,” TheBlaze, June 20, 2017, <http://www.theblaze.com/news/2017/06/20/f-free-speech-evergreen-state-students-double-down-want-to-weed-out-those-who-oppose-them/>.

basis for same-sex attraction. This is why a radical feminist of yesteryear, Germaine Greer, a literary scholar and lesbian who was one of the great pioneers of second-wave feminism, recently opposed transgenderism. In a public lecture, she denied that men who have undergone sex-reassignment surgery are actually women. She was rejected because of her “offensive” views.⁵⁷ Now we hear that gender can be what we want it to be, and we can eliminate traditional “obligatory sexualities and sex roles” and create “an androgynous and genderless (though not sexless) society, in which one’s sexual anatomy is irrelevant to who one is, what one does, and with whom one makes love.”⁵⁸

Such thinking falls into the category of identity politics, which has taught the rising generation a reticence to disagree with *anything* for fear of seeming intolerant—except, of course, what *they perceive to be* intolerant.

In this utopian vision, differences of economic status, race, and gender must be eliminated. There must be total equality among all classes of humans, and also there must be the power for everyone to choose his or her own destiny without restraint, including men who choose to be women and women who choose to be men. The political civil rights agenda of the Sixties has become the identity politics of the 2000s.⁵⁹

This thesis is powerfully expressed in the writings of postmodern feminist Judith Butler. In her books, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (1990)⁶⁰ and *Undoing Gender* (2004),⁶¹ Butler sees gender as “performativity theory.” Being a woman or man is not something that one *is* but something that one *decides to do*. There is no divine creation—only self-creation. As one of the early feminists, Simone de Beauvoir, famously stated in 1949, “On ne naît pas femme: on le devient [One is not born a woman; one becomes one].”⁶² Gender is not a fixed causal result of biological sex. Rather, it is a constructed status, radically independent from biology or bodily traits, “a free floating artifice, with the consequence that man and masculine might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and

⁵⁷ Last, “Camille Paglia.” See also Sheila Jeffreys, *Gender Hurts: A Feminist Critique of The Politics Behind Transgenderism* (New York: Routledge, 2014).

⁵⁸ McHugh and Mayer, “Society and Gender,” 66; David Nimmons, “Sex and the Brain.”

⁵⁹ Larry E. Ball, “Identity Theology in the PCA: The Central Agitating Issues at the Recent PCA General Assembly Meetings Have Been Related to both Race and Gender,” *Aquila Report*, June 29, 2017, <https://www.theaquilareport.com/identity-theology-pca/>.

⁶⁰ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (1990; repr., New York: Routledge, 2006). See the account of her work in Wikipedia.

⁶¹ Benoit Denizet-Lewis, “The Scientific Quest to Prove Bisexuality Exists,” *The New York Times Magazine*, March 20, 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/23/magazine/the-scientific-quest-to-prove-bisexuality-exists.html>.

⁶² Simone de Beauvoir, *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949; repr., Paris: Gallimard, 2004).

woman and feminine a male body as easily as a female one.”⁶³ Transgender furthers this theory because biology can now be manipulated to fit one’s chosen gender. Transgender is no longer a cultural oddity for a minuscule population. It has become an ultimate argument in the contemporary project for the destruction of Western culture through the tools of self-created hypersexualization.

This is cultural neo-Marxism, expressed through sexuality. Such cultural redefinition destroys objective distinctions between the all-powerful state (with its official ideology) and everything else—individuals, churches, families, businesses, morals, and truth. This total flattening of distinctions seeks ultimate embodiment at the core of the human being by creating a genderless sexuality—with no support from biology. By deconstructing sexuality, men and women are remade in the image of the genderless state.

This argument has been brilliantly made by German Christian sociologist Gabriele Kuby in her groundbreaking book, *The Global Sexual Revolution: The Destruction of Freedom in the Name of Freedom* (first published in German in 2012),⁶⁴ which was endorsed by Pope Benedict XVI with the comment, “Mrs. Kuby is a brave warrior against ideologies that ultimately result in the destruction of man.”⁶⁵ It might seem strange to suggest that the cause of the destruction of Western civilization as a whole is sexuality, but Kuby is surely right. Western society is no longer undermined from the outside by notions of class warfare and the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dominance of a master race. The West is imploding from within. The “attack is aimed at the person’s innermost moral structure.”⁶⁶ Sexuality can no longer be assessed in terms of good and evil. The only “good” is the promotion of genderlessness, which is promoted by the United Nations, the European Union, and Hollywood in the name of creating a sexually liberated “new human being.” Kuby ominously concludes, “We have lost the war in one fundamental area. ... This state of affairs in the present time has been achieved by a radical, essentially unopposed, sexualization of the culture.” It works on the principle that “whatever stands in the way of your freedom is deconstructed: gender identity as man or woman, morality, the family, the Church, the sanctity of life.”⁶⁷ Her conclusion is stark but unavoidable:

⁶³ Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 6.

⁶⁴ Gabriele Kuby, *The Global Sexual Revolution: The Destruction of Freedom in the Name of Freedom*, trans. James Patrick Kirchner (Kettering, OH: LifeSite/Angelico Press, 2015).

⁶⁵ Cited on the Amazon page featuring the book.

⁶⁶ Kuby, *The Global Sexual Revolution*, 9.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 270.

The cultural revolution described in this book is taking place behind people's backs—top-down. It emanates from the power elites and is propelled by minorities who define themselves by sexual orientation and seek to topple the world order. Indeed, a change in values can only lead to a change in the world order. Because the changes are global, it is to be expected that the development aims at a new global order.⁶⁸

How is this “new global order” expressing itself? Openness to any kind of marriage is a natural outgrowth. Same-sex marriage, open adoption, the single-parent home, and gender fluidity have already redefined the family. Two-thirds of Americans feel that “a growing variety in the types of family arrangements” is “a good thing” or “makes no difference,” according to a Pew Research Center survey.⁶⁹ Personal liberty becomes the ultimate moral value, according to Justice Kennedy, who defines human freedom as “the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.”⁷⁰ The case is made even more graphically by Jeremy Rifkin, an advisor to the European Union since 2002 and head of the largest global economic development team. In 1983, Rifkin declared,

We no longer feel ourselves to be guests in someone else’s home and therefore obliged to make our behavior conform with a set of preexisting cosmic rules. *It is our creation now. We make the rules.* We establish the parameters of reality. We create the world, and because we do, we no longer feel beholden to outside forces. *We no longer have to justify our behavior, for we are now the architects of the universe. We are responsible for nothing outside ourselves, for we are the kingdom, the power, and the glory forever and ever.*⁷¹

Without God’s grace, this progressive utopia may well become a nightmare. The church must live out what true morals are, or a Oneist totalitarian system of people without honor, enforcing on everyone their own dishonorable rules, will operate unopposed. Christians who stand for the truth will doubtless face suffering.

VIII. *The Christian Position*

HarvestUSA, a ministry for sexually hurting people, makes an important point: “The Church is experiencing tremendous pressure to change its

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Julia Duin, “‘Open Marriage?’,” GetReligion, May 12, 2017, <https://www.getreligion.org/getreligion/2017/5/12/open-marriage-the-new-york-times-magazine-hopes-hopes-hopes-that-its-a-trend>.

⁷⁰ *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833 (June 29, 1992).

⁷¹ Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny: A New Word—A New World* (New York: Viking, 1983), 244.

understanding of what scripture says about personhood and identity—and to subsume its authority [under] that of the individual.”⁷² The pressure comes from two directions: from hard-hearted ideologues determined to silence the Christian understanding of human identity and from kind-hearted Christians fearful of placing demands on suffering people and making the gospel appear heartless.

The book *Becoming Nicole: The Transformation of an American Family*, by Amy Ellis Nutt,⁷³ takes a secular approach to the subject. It recounts the experiences of a boy, Wyatt Maines, who, as a toddler, “loved everything Barbie.”⁷⁴ The desire to be a girl never left him. Wyatt’s family encouraged his transition to a female identity, especially his mother, who herself came from a broken home and “had no idea of ‘normal’ family life.”⁷⁵ Wyatt’s mother told his teacher, “He really likes girls’ things, and we’re okay with that.”⁷⁶ Wyatt, now Nicole, at eighteen, had genital reassignment surgery to the delight of everyone in “her” family who all believed it was a perfectly normal thing to do, as Nicole became “her most authentic self.”⁷⁷ The very last phrase of the entire book expresses the guiding principle: “As long as she is happy.”

What would/should a *Christian* family do? Yarhouse, a competent psychiatrist and professor of psychology at Regent University in Virginia Beach, in his book *Understanding Gender Dysphoria*,⁷⁸ seeks to approach transgenderism from both a professional and evangelical Christian perspective. His book is a useful introduction to the complicated issues surrounding transgenderism, and his heart is touched by the suffering of those he has counseled. His two chapters devoted to a “Christian Response,” are, however, ambiguous. He is aware of the cultural forces that seek to “deconstruct the very nature of sex and gender” against the standards of Scripture,⁷⁹ but he is also dubious of “culture wars,”⁸⁰ and, as a therapist, is wary of causing harm to those suffering from gender dysphoria. He seeks to avoid “knee-jerk reactions”⁸¹ that endorse “rigid gender stereotypes” as “marker[s] of

⁷² Tim Geiger, “Transgenderism: The Reshaping of Reality,” HarvestUSA, 2016, <https://www.harvestusa.org/transgenderism-reshaping-reality/#.W4mSguhKjIU>.

⁷³ Nutt, *Becoming Nicole*.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 249.

⁷⁸ Yarhouse, *Understanding Gender Dysphoria*.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 157.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 43.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 158.

obedience to God.”⁸² He believes that gender dysphoria is a result of the fall⁸³ but that transgender people are “not morally culpable nor guilty of willful disobedience.”⁸⁴

It is surely fair to see gender dysphoria as an expression of the fall. It is another thing to normalize it, which Yarhouse seems to do. He does not go as far as some leaders in the Anglican Church, like the Archbishop of York, Dr. John Sentamu, who, in July 2017, filed a motion asking bishops to consider new liturgy specially designed to welcome a transgender person under their new name.⁸⁵ But Yarhouse does advise certain parents to allow their children the use of hormone treatments and eventual genital reassignment surgery,⁸⁶ since the primary goal of therapy is to “maximise ... self-fulfillment.”⁸⁷ His advice to churches is equally hesitant, for while aware of the difficulties involved in giving transgender people roles of authority in the church, he concludes bewilderingly that “there is not one blueprint that every church can follow.”⁸⁸

So how will the church resist this sexual Marxist destruction of culture? There is no question in the apostle Paul’s mind as to what blueprint the church should follow: “If anyone is inclined to be contentious, we have no such practice, nor do the churches of God.” He precedes those words with these: “Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a wife to pray to God with her head uncovered? Does not *nature* itself teach you that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her for a covering” (1 Cor 11:13–16 ESV; emphasis added). Paul’s teaching on the importance of making a distinction between women and men in the church, even in hairstyles, is based on the significance of the church’s witness in a pagan world to the givenness of *nature* and thus to God, the Creator of nature. Paul’s conviction is doubtless based on Deuteronomy 22:5: “A woman shall not wear a man’s garment, nor shall a man put on a woman’s cloak, for whoever does these things is an abomination to the Lord your God.” According to the context, Israel must witness before the pagan world to the principle of distinction, even in the way she farms (“You shall not sow your vineyard with two kinds of seed”; Deut 22:9) or

⁸² Ibid., 150–51.

⁸³ Ibid., 41.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 49, 83.

⁸⁵ Olivia Rudgard, “Transgender Worshipers Could Get Church Services to Celebrate Their New Identity after Synod Vote,” *The Telegraph*, July 9, 2017, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/07/09/transgender-worshippers-could-get-church-services-celebrate/>.

⁸⁶ Yarhouse, *Understanding Gender Dysphoria*, 123–24, 146.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 113.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 148, 157.

makes cloth (“You shall not wear cloth of wool and linen mixed together”; Deut 22:11). When God created, he made distinctions. He “separated” elements (Gen 1:6, 14, 18) to create a functional, harmonious cosmos. The rabbinic scholar Jacob Milgrom sees the distinctions required of Israel in Leviticus as recalling God’s work of creation in Genesis 1.⁸⁹ As important as it is to see the witness to the divine origin of the universe, much more is at stake. These distinctions go all the way back to the very person and being of God. That is why sexual identity is so important.

God creates by separating in order to reveal who he is, as one who is separate from the creation. Part of his personal essence is to be the transcendent, nondependent Creator relative to the creation. But that separateness goes to the heart of his being because the Godhead is a Trinity, and each person of the Godhead is separate from the other. This God also reveals himself by placing his image on human creatures. “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them” (Gen 1:27). Here lies the origin of human dignity, and it is bound up with separateness. The image of the Trinitarian God, who is both one and many, is given both to male and female and explains both their separateness as distinct persons and their oneness or “one flesh” unity. We love God by preserving his clear image within us. Just as the three persons of the Trinity may not be confused but must be kept separate in identity and function, so the man and the woman are created as separate beings who may not forsake their specific sexual identities and merge into an androgynous being (a reflection of what I call Oneism). So we love God and respect ourselves by preserving his clear image within us.

What I call Twoism (things being distinct) makes sense of gender in this time of raging conflict on an emotive subject. We may try to create our own identity, but Scripture tells us that the image of God in male and female is our true identity. Dr. Abigail Rine, professor of gender theory at George Fox University, states that her students “arrive in my class thoroughly versed in the language and categories of identity politics and are reticent to disagree with *anything* for fear of seeming intolerant—except, of course, what they perceive to be intolerant.”⁹⁰ Today, and especially in transgenderism,

⁸⁹ Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 689: “Creation was the product of God making distinctions (Gen 1:4, 6, 7, 14, 18). This divine function is to be continued by Israel: the priests to teach it (Lev 10:10–11) and the people to practice it (Ezek 22:26).” See my book, Peter Jones, *The God of Sex: How Spirituality Defines Your Sexuality* (Escondido, CA: Main Entry Editions, 2006), 128–29.

⁹⁰ Abigail Rine, “What Is Marriage to Evangelical Millennials?,” *First Things*, May 14, 2015, <https://www.firstthings.com/web-exclusives/2015/05/what-is-marriage-to-evangelical-millennials>.

feelings determine gender: “Who I think I am.” This philosophy is not neutral; it is a radically pagan view of personhood and identity. The world sees the destruction of the gender binary as the essential process of a liberation that calls each human being to discover individual authenticity. But in attempting such a vain task, we move further from our true dignity and blind ourselves to real authenticity, namely our male/female distinctions—a glimpse of who God is. In this sense, all forms of androgyny, such as homosexuality or normalized gender dysphoria, deny the Trinity and become symbols of God-denying pantheism (Oneism). Everything in the All-Is-One circle becomes a continuum—good and evil; God and man; animal and human; rocks and spirits—and sexuality is not spared. Male and female, no longer fixed, binary points, blur human life into an androgynous continuum.

Out of love for Christ, some homosexually tempted Christians choose a life of celibacy in faithfulness to the gospel and the clear witness of Scripture. This is part of Christian suffering.⁹¹ Bekah Mason, a same-sex attracted believer, notes that

in Scripture, marriage isn’t described as the highest expression of love. ... The highest love is *agape* love, not *eros* love, and *agape* is available to all, which means God isn’t withholding the best of himself from single Christians. He offers all of himself and his love to all people.⁹²

Transgender-afflicted believers may also be asked to suffer with sexual dysphoria out of love for God their Creator and Redeemer. They are not, as has been expressed in the recent Revoice conference (July 2018), free to see their homosexual desires without sexual expression as pleasing to God.⁹³ Truly celibate courageous believers will surely bring a noble and powerful witness to a culture committed to both erotic pansexualism and paninterfaith, by which the blurring of the divine image in human beings will inevitably lead to blindness about the only true God, separate from but the lover of his creation, the only hope for repair of broken human beings. The gospel is the greatest love story in history. Jesus shows us where love begins, loving first “the Lord your God” (Mark 12:28). Such love requires

⁹¹ Gregory Coles, *Single Gay Christian: A Personal Journey of Faith and Sexual Identity* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2017).

⁹² Bekah Mason, “Finding My ‘True Self’ As a Same-Sex Attracted Woman,” *Christianity Today*, June 23, 2017, <https://www.christianitytoday.com/women/2017/june/finding-my-true-self-as-same-sex-attracted-woman-obergefell.html>.

⁹³ See Peter Jones, “Revoice: Sliding Towards Heresy,” *Truthxchange*, August 3, 2018, <https://truthxchange.com/2018/08/revoice-sliding-into-heresy/>.

believers, including those with transgender feelings, to love the image of God (which includes the male/female distinction, Gen 1:27–28) as witness to the world. As Gregory Coles discovered, “Being gay did not mean that God had rejected me.”⁹⁴ As a faithful believer, Coles has been able to embrace the calling to be celibate by God’s sufficient grace (2 Cor 12:9). Hopefully, transgender believers can find this same grace even if their gender dysphoria is not solved on this side of glory. May they honor God as they “glorify God in their bodies” (1 Cor 6:20).

As a general solution, the Preliminary Position Paper on Human Sexuality adopted by the commissioners to the 37th General Assembly of the Evangelical Presbyterian Church on July 2, 2017, as it touches gender reassignment, is a fitting conclusion to this study:

God helping us, we shall continue, within our churches and in the public arena, to teach against and to refuse to condone or participate in any sinful form of sexual practice—including sexual abuse, pornography, sexual lust, extra-marital sex, adultery, polygamy, unbiblical divorce and re-marriage, homosexual conduct, same-sex union and marriage, and gender reassignment.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Coles, *Single Gay Christian*, 42–43.

⁹⁵ “EPC General Assembly Adopts Position Paper on Human Sexuality,” Aquila Report, July 2, 2017, <http://theaquilareport.com/epc-general-assembly-adopts-position-paper-human-sexuality/>.