

Pomosexuality

Lust Clusters, Sexual Revolt,
and the Christian Responses



Douglas Wilson

Douglas Wilson, *Pomosexuality: Lust Clusters, Sexual Revolt, and the Christian Responses*

Copyright ©2015 by Douglas Wilson

Published by Canon Press

P. O. Box 8729, Moscow, Idaho 83843

800-488-2034 | www.canonpress.com

Cover design by James Engerbretson.

Interior design by Valerie Anne Bost.

Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotations are from the King James Version.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise, without prior permission of the author, except as provided by USA copyright law.



Table of Contents

- 1 Boundaries // 7
- 2 Gospel & Sexual Issues // 11
- 3 Driving Principles // 17
- 4 What Is Normal? // 23
- 5 What is Natural? // 29
- 6 A Big Deal // 35
- 7 New Scholarship // 41
- 8 Truth Decay // 47
- 9 Raccoons in the Garbage // 55
- 10 Lousy Haters // 61
- 11 National Repentance // 65
- 12 The Folly of Preaching // 69



CHAPTER 1

Boundaries

Boundaries are an essential element in any art, but it does not follow from this that if the boundaries are honored and respected, the great art will necessarily follow. A lot of pedestrian poetry has been written within the confines of the traditional forms.

Sexual boundaries follow the same kind of pattern. The one true God sets the limits for us, creating the nature of male and female and setting them both within creation, and then providing His law for us as additional guidance and protection. Those boundaries can be honored in the letter, but dishonored in the spirit. If a man and a woman have a lackluster and apathetic love life, the fact that it is not perversion does not prevent it from being dull. Plenty of sonnets have scanned and rhymed according to rule, and yet have not been what poetry should be.

But it is a sophomoric and superficial reaction to reject standards in order to be able to say that poetry should be whatever a poet says it is. The revolt of our current generation against the triune God (who made heaven and earth) is a revolt in the direction of polytheism—multiple gods, multiple voices, multiple laws,

and a general clamor out of which it is possible to select whatever suits a person at the time. The political name for this is pluralism, and the philosophical and cultural name for it is postmodernism. Radically relativistic, it cannot be prevented from eventually hitting the craggy rocks below—nihilism and despair. But while falling, a number of people have the temporary sensation of absolute freedom, and they seek to use that freedom in the creation and pursuit of various sexualities.

We are now dealing with metrosexuals, sodomites, catamites, lesbians, virtual perverts, bisexuals, and transgendered individuals. Sometime in the next ten years, look for more to push to the front of the line demanding societal respectability—pederasty and bestiality included. But because all this is a function of sexual postmodernism, we should simply call all of it pomosexuality.

Pomosexuality refers to the infinitely elastic sexuality that will result if we give way to the nihilistic demands of evolutionary postmodernism. If everything is in flux, then *everything* is in flux. If nothing is fixed, then *nothing* is. That includes, obviously, every form of sexual expression, and the sinful heart of man will gravitate to that application right away.

So in these pomosexual days, the obvious move is to challenge the very idea of a sexual identity in the first place. But this notion does not get laughed to scorn in the way, say, that a fundamentalist would if he told a homosexual activist that all he needed to do was “find a nice girl”. *He* would get laughed to scorn because he is saying it on the basis of a fixed, creational identity, one that presupposes the veracity and applicability of God’s appointed order. Can’t have that.

The new pomo-argument (that a homosexual is not bound by the *identity* of homosexuality) is welcome news to everybody in this generation, actually, because in pomo-speak it means that we are not bound by *anything*.

The U.N. has, I believe, collected and identified five genders among the children of men, and thus it is that we now have LGBT, with S in the implied background. Others have begun adding Q, just to top things off, but you may rest assured that the fetish community (F) and the animal-lovers community (A) will not rest until they too are accepted. It may take a while to get gaybashers on the list, not only because G and B are already in use, and because bigotry runs deep, but also because no one seems to understand that gaybashers get *aroused* when they express themselves this way. But now that science has shown the existence of the moral absolute that blood flow to certain regions of the body always establishes, we are in principle done. At least until we discover that bigotry has found a new fortress and hideout, which it no doubt will, pretending (as is bigotry's wont), that little children should be off limits . . .

Not to be outdone by the prudes at the U.N., Facebook has made it possible for you to sign up with 58 genders or thereabouts. It is hard to keep track because the "science" is constantly changing on this.

In other words, pomosexuality wants everybody to be able to construct their very own identity, *ad libitum*, as though gender discovery were like playing Mr. Potato Head with an infinite number of plastic parts, and no potato. Potatoes are way too confining.



CHAPTER 2

Gospel and Sexual Issues

Our culture's wholesale abandonment of biblical ethics in matters of sexuality—what I have been calling pomosexuality—is the direct and immediate result of a failure of the Church to proclaim and live out life in Christ, life in the gospel, life in the triune God. So the way out of this impasse in our culture wars cannot be to pass this law or that one, but rather to restore the cultural preconditions (through gospel preaching, and *only* through gospel preaching) which alone make it possible for a society to reflect a biblical understanding of sexuality. Good laws are obviously not bad, but neither are they the gospel. *The gospel is the only answer to our cultural crisis.*

Given the truth of this, at the same time, it would be a mistake of the first order to treat sexual issues as somehow peripheral, or not a big deal. When an understanding of the gospel fades, the very *first* place where the new darkness will manifest itself is in our sexual practices. Sexuality is the canary in the mine—the sudden rise of pomosexuality shows us immediately that something is desperately wrong. It should never be relegated to a third-order symptom.

Rather, it is a first-order symptom of our estrangement from God.

The Christian faith proclaims a basic dualism between that which is *God* and that which is *not God*. This is the Creator/creature distinction. This means that the Creator God, when He places things on this side of the divide, means for them to stay put. Male is male, and female is female, and what a lot of fun that turned out to be.

But if there is no God, as in atheism, or all is God, as in pagan pantheism, there is nothing in the world but raw material that can, in principle, meld, blend, turn into, or copulate with, anything or anyone else. All is one. The pagan mentality is one of metamorphism and change, no limits, no boundaries. Paganism is protean, and *insists* on this. When professing Christians are attracted to this, it is because of a failure on the part of pastors, elders, fathers, and mothers in living out the joy of accepting what the Creator unilaterally and authoritatively *did*.

And this is why, when we preach the gospel, both within the Church and outside it, sexual issues have to be front and center. We are preaching repentance and faith. When we preach repentance, this is followed immediately with a declaration of the Christ who alone makes such repentance coherent. When the Christian faith first came to the Roman Empire, they confronted a culture that was steeped in the sexual no-boundaries-paganism that we are now seeing again. And the apostles did not say, "Well, let's preach Christ and the Trinity, and these sexual issues will eventually sort themselves out." No, they *confronted* the sexual distortions at every turn.

And this is quite striking because the Christian sexual ethic *made no sense* to the pagans. But sexual ethics is the place where we can *clearly* see the antithesis between biblical Christianity and paganism. And this is why “social Trinitarians” and group hug communitarians who are not hostile to sodomy, for just one example, clearly do not know what they are talking about.

As he proclaims the lordship of Christ, what does Paul *lead with* in his cultural engagement with Rome? He preaches Christ and Him crucified, certainly, but what does every new convert have to take into account before being baptized? What does a potential Christian have to read through, and not in the fine print either? Paul addresses this virtually every time he turns around. Allow me to string some passages together for effect.

“*Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers*” (Rom. 1:29).

“It is reported commonly that *there is fornication among you*, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father’s wife” (1 Cor. 5:1).

“I wrote unto you in an epistle *not to company with fornicators*” (1 Cor. 5:9).

“But now I have written unto you not to keep company, *if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat*” (1 Cor. 5:11).

“Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: *neither*

fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind" (1 Cor. 6:9).

"*Now the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body*" (1 Cor. 6:13).

"*Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body*" (1 Cor. 6:18).

"*Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand*" (1 Cor. 10:8).

"*And lest, when I come again, my God will humble me among you, and that I shall bewail many which have sinned already, and have not repented of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they have committed*" (2 Cor. 12:21).

"*Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness*" (Gal. 5:19).

"*But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints*" (Eph. 5:3).

"*Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry*" (Col. 3:5).

"*For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication*" (1 Thes. 4:3).

Talk about Johnny One Note. And this was the *Roman Empire*. Talk about a hard sell.

Now my point is not that Paul believed, somewhere in his heart, that fornication and sodomy were wrong. He did, and even this is disputed in these perverse

times. My point is that the out-in-front proclamation of sexual purity was a strategic decision on Paul's part. This was a *strategic* issue, and not just a moral one. And I believe that he did this because there is no better way to rebuke the *theology* of paganism than by assaulting the *lusts* of paganism. And there are few more glorious ways to preach life in Christ, and the liberating power of the gospel given us by the triune God, than to set Christian marriage and sexual purity before an astounded and lust-racked world. As we do this, we exhibit the life of the Trinity in glorious ways. And if we do not exhibit a fierce *and open* hostility to every form of pomosexuality, we do not understand the Trinity.