

Preaching about Sexual Purity on the College Campus

Gary Cattell

Note: Gary Cattell has been preaching about Christ, and virtuous life in Him, in the open air on the main campus of Penn State University for over forty years. He's the author of a powerful book, *The Christian vs. The University: Fighting the Battle of Ideas on the College Campus*.

I'd like to begin by giving an idea of how the modern-day college student mind has been trained think. The average student has been trained to believe that there is a God, but that he cannot know who He is, or what is the right religion. His mind has been thoroughly secularized by the dominant media and educational establishments. The essence of secularism is that since we cannot know who God is, or what is the right religion, there's no sense in structuring a society and/or an educational system around that which we cannot know to be true. So we should stay "neutral" and keep God out.

When students are told that they cannot know who God is and what is the right religion, they fail to ask the obvious question, "Why not?" As soon as you ask that question, secularism crumbles. It has no answer. That's why one should have absolutely no respect for it. Secularism is a flimsy house of cards. So flimsy, in fact, that the breeze created by one walking past it would knock it over. It's nothing to be feared. The only power it has is that it's everywhere, from the elementary schools on up; but it doesn't have any apologetic power. As an idea, it's vacuous and bankrupt. Sadly, few of us fight it because we are intimidated by the names we are called if we publicly oppose it.

In order to keep students from questioning secularism, a scam is run at Penn State and most universities. The university begins by telling them that they cannot know truth, and that therefore we cannot know who God is, what is the right religion, why we exist, how we should live our lives, and what happens after death and how to prepare for it. All this, of course, is reinforced by most of the media the students consume. (By the way, if students were well-educated they would know that when one says that we cannot know truth, one is actually making a truth statement, and so that very statement cannot stand.)

In any case, after telling the students that they cannot know truth, they then proceed to tell them that homosexuality and transgenderism are good and that's the truth; that no human being is being harmed in abortion and that's the truth; that fornication and drunkenness within reasonable limits are good and that's the truth. So, right after telling them they cannot know truth, they then proceed to tell them that all these things are true and must be believed!

This is effective because once the students believe that they cannot know truth, they will put that part of their brain in neutral. It can then be filled with anything the university wants, and students are not educated well enough to see through the scam.

These beliefs are not enforced by giving evidence and entering into debate, but by name-calling. If one agrees with the university, he is said to be virtuous, kind-hearted, open-minded, practically an angel. If one disagrees, he is called a racist, a bigot, a homophobe, a transphobe, or simply a hater.

Since students have been convinced that they cannot know the truth, and since we would all rather be called good names than bad, it works. The students submit and believe what they are told.

One of the consequences of this is the squashing of free speech. I don't remember the last time I heard anyone at Penn State (faculty or student) speak out loudly and publicly against homosexuality and/or transgenderism. Faculty are afraid of being fired, and students are afraid that if it gets out on social media that they took a public stand against these behaviors, corporations won't hire them.

Even the Christians and Christian groups are silent and afraid, which is more than a little embarrassing. Christians down through the ages have been imprisoned, tortured, and killed for their faith; and yet we modern Christians stay silent because we are afraid of being called bad names, and/or losing or not getting a job. At some point, we have to decide whether we are going to cower in our churches and fellowships, or stand up and fight, not caring what we have to lose. As soon as we care about what we have to lose, we become impotent.

Most students at Penn State know nothing about Christianity. They have no knowledge of the Trinity, nor do they acknowledge the Bible as an authority. It's not necessarily that they are against Christianity, but since they believe that no one can know the truth, they see it, and all religions, as irrelevant. If you tell the students about salvation, they will be polite and listen, but they won't believe that you know it to be true.

It is a bit convoluted, but since the students don't believe they can know truth, and yet we all need some sort of truth to guide our lives, they believe everyone can have their own truth. Yet they don't actually believe anybody's "truth" is really truth, or at the very least can be known for sure to be the truth.

As a result, it's sometimes better to try to show the problems with the secular morality they adhere to, with the hope that if they can see problems with it, they may eventually abandon secularism altogether, come to believe that truth is knowable, and maybe eventually come to Christianity. This can be difficult because since students do not believe they can know truth, many do not care if their beliefs can be logically defended. But for those few who do, morals can be a place to start.

I think it's best when speaking to college students to be as straightforward as possible. They can smell a phony a mile away. There is sometimes a difference between preaching to students as they walk by and speaking with them one on one. In either case, we must love them, but we cannot be concerned as to whether or not they love us. We will always tend towards watering down the message if we want those to whom we are ministering to love us.

There is much virtue signaling on campus, and no more so than with transgenderism and homosexuality. As we said above, if you support these two behaviors, you can see yourself as a good, open-minded, kind-hearted person. The problem is that these conditions are both rather self-evidently wrong. As far as transgenderism is concerned, one's sex is not determined by how one feels on any particular day. It's determined by one's chromosomes. If you have the XY chromosome, you are a male. If you have the XX chromosome, you are a female. If you have the XY chromosome and you think you are a female, you have mental problems. You are not dealing with reality very well. The same goes if you have the XX chromosome and think you are a male.

What the students' professors will tell them is that there's a difference between sex and gender. They tell them that sex may be determined by one's chromosomes, but gender is determined by how

one thinks and feels. Of course, they just made that distinction up out of thin air. It wasn't very long ago if you asked someone to tell you the difference between sex and gender, they wouldn't have understood why you were asking the question. Sex and gender were always seen as being synonymous.

For many years a male or a female who wanted to be the opposite sex was called a transsexual. Once it was realized that it was impossible to change one's sex, because it's impossible to change one's chromosomes, this false dichotomy between sex and gender was created.

The problem is that thoughts and feelings are highly unreliable. We have all thought things that we believed were so rational and logical that they just couldn't be wrong, and then new information came along and we found out that we were wrong. We've all felt things so deeply that we just couldn't be wrong, and then over time, we found out that we were. Since thoughts and feelings are unreliable, they have to be checked against something concrete. It would be nice if the students knew who God is and what is the right religion, but since they don't, chromosomes will do.

It used to be commonly understood that if physical reality differed from one's thoughts and feelings, it was never physical reality that was wrong; it was always one's thoughts and feelings that were wrong. These days, in most universities, if the physical reality of one's chromosomes differs from one's thoughts and feelings, one is actually told that it is physical reality that is wrong. This is absurd, and virtually cult-like in its scope. In a cult, you are expected to believe the cult master even if he is telling you something that contradicts the physical reality that is right in front of your face. At many universities today, if a guy comes up to you and says he is a girl, in cult-like fashion you are supposed to deny the physical reality in front of you, obey your cult masters (the dominant media and educational system), and address him as a "her." It's both illogical and absurd, but this is the state of most universities these days.

This denial of physical reality in order to justify one's thoughts and feelings has also found its way into the question of homosexuality. Everything about the physical reality of the male body, the female body, and the purposes of sex screams heterosexuality. Nothing even whispers homosexuality except the thoughts and feelings of those who engage in it. The reality is that there is only one opening in the male or female body in which a penis and sperm belong and that is the vagina. There is only one purpose for sperm and that is to create life, and it can only do that in a vagina. As far as lesbians go, they have a vagina in which a penis and sperm belong, but they don't have a penis and sperm to put in it. Once again students are supposed to deny the physical reality right in front of them, bow the knee to their cult masters, and accept homosexuality as being normal.

The most important reason why homosexuality is wrong, is that it is a denial of life. Males have been given sperm and females have been given eggs for the express purpose of creating life. When two members of the same sex engage in sexual relations, they are not using birth control to not create life at that moment. Nor do they have the misfortune of one partner being infertile, which is out of their control and maybe at some point could be fixed. Rather, they are purposely having sex in a way in which the creation of life is and forever will be impossible. This is the complete and utter denial of life; and it's both perverse and evil.

Homosexuals do not really try to defend their behavior anymore. Their right to marry has put homosexuality on equal par with heterosexuality, so there really is no need for them to do so. When they used to try they would have two basic defenses. One claim was that they were born homosexual, and the other was that they love each other.

As far as being born homosexual goes, I will generally give it to them for the sake of argument, but up to this point in history, there is no proof for this claim. Once in a while, you'll see an article with a big headline claiming that researchers have found the homosexual gene/genes, but the body of the article never supports the headline. They just hope that all you read is the headline. And besides, since everyone is born with a heterosexual sex organ, designed specifically for heterosexual intercourse, it is quite obvious (according to physical reality, which cannot be wrong) that everyone is really born heterosexual.

Anyway, as I said, I give it to them for the sake of argument. The argument the homosexual makes, and the culture is agreeing with, is that since he is born homosexual, engaging in homosexual sex must be right. Yet moral reasoning must be consistent. If we take one behavior and put it on a pedestal because it meets certain criteria, then all other behaviors that meet the same criteria must be placed on the same pedestal. If we say that homosexuality is justified simply because they are born that way, then any other behavior people are born into must also be justified. But let's see if we as a culture can be consistent with that sort of moral reasoning.

Long before homosexuals began saying that they were born homosexual, alcoholics (with cultural backing) claimed to be born alcoholics. These days they may say that they are born with addictive behavior, but it's the same thing. So if we are going to be consistent with what the culture says about homosexuality, we would have to say that if one is born an alcoholic, then alcoholism must be good. We need to be consistent with our moral reasoning. If homosexuality has to be good simply because one is born homosexual, then alcoholism has to be good just because one is born an alcoholic. If, as a culture, we are not willing to say that alcoholism is good simply because one is born an alcoholic, then we cannot say that homosexuality is good simply because one is born homosexual. The same is true for any behavior that the culture believes may have genetic factors.

The other traditional defense of homosexuality is that since homosexuals fall in love in the same romantic, infatuated way that heterosexuals do, and if heterosexuals justify sex based upon that sort of love (of course Christians don't justify sex upon that criteria, but the secular culture does), then their having sex should also be justified. In other words, having sex is justified if it's done between two consenting adults who love each other. Once again, let's see if we, as a culture, can be consistent with this line of reasoning.

If having sex is justified if it's done between two consenting adults who love each other, then what about a father and his adult son or daughter, or a mother and her adult daughter or son? Or what about adult siblings? If they are having sex, and claim that it is morally acceptable because they love each other, then if the culture is going to be consistent, their sexual behavior should be acceptable. But of course, it's not.

If having sex is justified simply because two consenting adults love each other, then all of the incestuous relationships mentioned above, plus any other perverse sexual relationship which meets that criteria, would have to be justified. Once again, it's not proper moral reasoning to put one behavior that meets certain criteria on a pedestal, but not allow other behaviors that meet the same criteria to be on the same pedestal. If we're not going to justify the above behaviors even though they are done between consenting adults who love each other, then we can't say that homosexuality is justified simply because they are consenting adults who love each other.

Homosexuality cannot be defended based upon the physical reality of the male body, the female body, and the purposes of sex; or being born homosexual; or being consenting adults who love each

other. The only defense left to them is their own personal thoughts and feelings. But once again, moral reasoning based solely on thoughts and feeling is never justified.

Now we proceed to fornication. I like to use that term because it sounds like sin. Pre-marital sex sounds like a neutral description of an event, while fornication sounds like you did something wrong. In any case, let's proceed.

Sperm has only one function in its short existence, and that is to create life. If one is not at a point in time in one's life in which he wants to create life, then why is he ejaculating this life-creating substance, or by extension why is she letting someone ejaculate it into her? It doesn't make any sense. Of course, this doesn't mean that once you are married you can only have sex if you want to create life, but you need to be married before having sex because that's the time of life when creating life is a welcomed event.

There are three aspects to the sexual act – the creation of life, increasing closeness/oneness, and pleasure. The closeness/oneness and pleasure aspects of sex only make sense if linked to the creation of life. And just as with closeness/oneness, if it's okay to have sex for the sole purpose of having a pleasurable experience with someone, what about having sex with your parents, siblings, cousins, and even the old lady across the street in order to have a pleasurable experience with any or all of them? Once again, sex totally separated from the creation of life quickly becomes absurd.

Since all three aspects of the sexual act occur simultaneously, they were obviously never meant to be separated. Once the penis goes into the vagina, sperm comes out. The sperm's sole job is to create life. At the same time, closeness is achieved, and pleasure is experienced. Since the purpose of inserting a penis into a vagina is to ejaculate sperm, then the creation of life is obviously the main purpose of having sex. At the same time, oneness is present in the sexual act, so the husband and wife can be as close as possible so that the family has the best chance possible to survive. This is important because the family is the basic building block of society, and if the family breaks down the society breaks down.

Pleasure is present as a motivator and as an effect. It's similar to eating food. The purpose of eating food is to fuel the body. If eating were not pleasurable, it would be difficult to eat enough food to fuel the body. If sex were not pleasurable, it would be a rather strange thing to do. Why would you put that thing there if it weren't pleasurable? It would be difficult to be motivated to have enough sex to continue the race, keep the husband and wife close enough to keep the family together, and by extension keep society from breaking down. Keeping sex within marriage is simply the only thing that makes sense.

Since fornicating and abortion are intimately related, I think it would be a good idea to take a minute to look at abortion. When I ask pro-choice advocates what a woman is pregnant with, one of the things they tell me is that it's just a mass of unrelated cells. This is rather self-evidently not the case. The cells are very much related and are developing in a very specific way. Some will tell me that it is only a *potential* human being, but that doesn't answer the question. The question is not, what do you think that thing might be in the future, but what is it now.

Others will tell me that it's a fetus, an embryo, or maybe a fertilized egg. These, of course, are all stages of development in mammals. All mammals go through the same stages of development. So once you say that a woman is pregnant with a fetus, fertilized egg, etc., you are saying she is pregnant with a mammal. So, what sort of mammal do we suppose she might be pregnant with? It's probably not a dolphin or a whale. The only thing it can be is a human mammal.

Some who are pro-choice will admit that the fetus, etc., may be a human mammal, but they claim that it's not a human *person*. The problem with that argument is that humans are persons by definition. If you have to change the definition as to what it is to be a human being just to win the abortion debate, I would say you have lost already.

Even if someone who is pro-choice won't accept any of the above, it seems to me that before we legalize abortion we should have to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that abortion does not kill a human being. Because if it does, the consequences are catastrophic. Not only can they not prove it beyond a shadow of a doubt; they cannot even prove it beyond a reasonable doubt. Those who are pro-choice cannot even agree among themselves as to when one becomes a human being. Some say when there is a heartbeat, some say when there are brainwaves, some when they feel pain, others when they are viable outside the womb. And these days some even believe one is not a human being until one has spent some amount of time outside of the womb. If pro-choicers cannot agree as to when we become a human being, why should we believe them when they tell us we are not one at conception?

When we pro-lifers say that we are a human being at conception, what we are saying is that we are human by nature. We don't have to do anything, become anything, be a certain sex, have a certain skin color, etc., to be a human being. We are just human because we are. If we say that we are not a human being at conception, we must then give the government the authority to tell us who is a human being and who is not, but why would we ever think that would be a good idea? Don't we have enough experience in our own country, much less in the history of the world, to know that any time a government is deciding who is fully human and who is not, someone is getting killed, enslaved, segregated, or otherwise taken advantage of? Can anyone name one time in human history when a government declared some portion of the world population to be less human than the rest, when given enough time we've looked back on it and decided they were right? The answer, of course, is no. So why do we think we are right this time? All of world history tells us we are wrong.

The pro-choice philosophy in America is as follows. They say that until one develops to a certain point, they will not call him a human being and refrain from killing him, and they won't at least make it illegal for him to be killed. This is self-evidently evil. Who are they to decide who is a human being and who is not, and what makes them different from any two-bit dictator who has or is using the same dehumanizing philosophy to kill and enslave multitudes of people?

If we were to take the pro-choice philosophy that one is not a human being until he develops to a certain point, I think I can make a pretty good case that newborn babies aren't fully human. All I would have to do is make the claim that when one is fully a human being, one can walk, talk, and reason on a level higher than an animal. Newborn babies cannot walk, talk, and reason on a level higher than an animal; therefore they must not be fully human. All I did was use the pro-choice philosophy, which consists of comparing an earlier stage of development with a later stage, and then arbitrarily declare the earlier stage to be less human than the later.

If I use the same philosophy, I think I can show the average college student to be not fully human either. I would just have to use the latest scientific findings that the human brain is not fully developed until one is twenty-five. The average college student is under the age of twenty-five; therefore his brain is not fully developed, so he is not fully human. I could also say that in thirty years, when that college student is in his fifties, he will be a very different person physically, mentally, and emotionally. So maybe we are not fully human until we are fifty. Or, we could say that in thirty more years, when that fifty year old is eighty, he will be a very different person mentally, physically, and

emotionally. So maybe we are not fully human until we are eighty. Or, maybe we become fully human when we are fifty and begin to devolve after that. Once we say that we have to develop to a certain point before we are fully human, there is no natural stopping point. We can draw that line anywhere we want, and therefore no one is safe.

The one argument that pro-choice advocates have used almost from the beginning, and still use today, is that a woman has a right to do with her body as she pleases. This argument is not true on either a biological or a civil law level. As far as biology is concerned, it simply is not true that the fetus is the mother's body. It has both the mother's and the father's DNA. This makes the fetus a distinct entity from the mother. We all have our mother's and father's DNA, but that certainly does not make us our mother's body. In fact, it actually makes us a human being who is distinct from our mother. In addition to all of that, the fetus may not even be female. There is absolutely no biological evidence that shows the fetus to be the mother's body.

As far as the civil law is concerned, a woman does not have the right to shoot up heroin, or do recreational drugs (except marijuana in a few states). In most states, she does not have the right to be a prostitute. She certainly does not have the right to sell her body parts on e-bay, or even in many places to commit suicide, which is the ultimate in doing with your body as you wish. So, this most famous and most used argument of the pro-choice movement is a fraud any way you look at it.

In the end, there is no good argument for abortion, or any way to show beyond a reasonable doubt that a baby is not being killed. Abortion has always and will always be about having sex without consequences. As long as we want to be a nation of fornicators we will be a nation of baby killers.

In closing, I would like to encourage anyone reading this to not be afraid of secularism. It is a vacuous, flimsy, house of cards. It is based on the two interrelated ideas that we cannot know who God is, or what is the right religion, and these ideas cannot be defended. We must educate ourselves and our kids as to why we believe what we believe. There has never been a more important time in American history to learn apologetics. We can no longer afford to allow the secular elites to ram secularism down our throats. We must fight back.

In response to the above, some say that we should just let the society be the society. We will be the church and will maintain our Faith no matter what they do. But look at what happens when we do so. Kids in elementary school are being taught that homosexuality is good, that they can be any gender they want to be, that morals are up to the individual, that God is anyone you want him to be if you even want him to be, etc, etc. If we allow the culture to secularize our children's minds in elementary school, we will most likely lose them forever.

We must take a stand. We cannot be afraid of being called bad names. We cannot fear for our reputations. From the first century until today we Christians have been imprisoned, tortured, and killed for our Faith. How will we be able to take our place with our fellow Christians in eternity if we will not take a stand because we do not want to be called bad names, or for fear of losing our job.

The time for hiding and rationalizing is over. The time to stand up and fight has come. It's time to learn to run with the footmen so that if and/or when the time comes, we will be able to run with the horses. "If you have raced with men on foot, and they have wearied you, how will you compete with horses? And if in a safe land you fall down, how will you do in the jungle of the Jordan?" (Jer. 12:5, RSV).

