

# Marriage on the Rock 09

*Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.*

Date: 09 January 2017

Preacher: Marvin Wiseman

[ 0 : 00 ] Welcome to Marriage on the Rock. Here's Marv Wiseman.

More Consequences of the Fall We've noted the negatives that resulted from disobedience toward God and the moral failure of our first parents in Genesis 3.

It's referred to as the Fall. And was it ever? Everything in creation that had been initially called very good by the Creator now came crashing down.

Following that Fall, a series of curses were imposed upon all of creation that remain in effect today. The serpent was cursed, the ground was cursed, and Eve would feel the effects of a curse as well, with also having pain in bringing forth children.

All that she suffered, plus a desire to control and dominate her husband, that would largely be unrealized. Despite her desire to rule over him, he will have the upper hand, and will rule over her.

[ 1 : 05 ] The Fall and these consequences of an ensuing power struggle between the sexes is as old as, well, as old as that Fall itself. There's an old adage that goes something like this, Man and woman get married so that the two may become one, and then they struggle to decide which one they will become.

Well, in a lot of marriages that is a sad reality. But there is certainly no excuse for that kind of adversarial relationship for husbands and wives who are believers. For them, God has provided something far superior to the painful contest of competition.

He has provided the basis for a satisfying cooperation. The husband sacrificially loves her, and she joyfully submits to him. It is far from superiority or domination.

He is not a tyrant or demanding boss, and she is not a beaten-down inferior. He derives respect and admiration from her, and she bathes in his unconditional love, kindness, protection, and provision.

These are not natural roles derived from the Fall, but supernatural roles graciously provided every couple in Christ as a part of the redemptive package he purchased for them through his death on the cross.

[ 2 : 27 ] It elevates marriage from the adversarial competitive mode into the complementary, wonderfully cooperative mode. And yes, it is readily available to all marriage who are in Christ.

To be advised, however, availability does not guarantee implementation. The implementation of this incredible provision is dependent upon the motivation of the husband and the wife, because neither can do it alone.

What God has provided for believers, he does not force upon believers. Rather, he uses human volition to partner with his provision to make the desired goal of a marriage on the rock a reality. And there is nothing like it in this world. That's because it's really otherworldly. It is a bit of heaven right here on earth, and it awaits every Christian couple as explained in Marriage on the Rock, Volume 1.

It's a supremely beautiful thing. The tragedy connected to the concept of a marriage on the rock is that so few actually enjoy it. And our view is life is too short and the positive blessings too great to settle for anything less.

[ 3 : 40 ] Husband and wife role reversals. Not only do we find the scriptures declaring that the male will dominate the female, but it also declares here in Genesis 3 that the wife will seek to dominate her husband, but will not succeed in doing so.

There are, of course, always exceptions, and some cases where the wife does succeed in gaining ascendancy over her husband. The proverbial description of this scene is to call the husband hen-pecked.

No doubt the analogy stems from the rooster in the barnyard being dominated by one or more of the hens. Even in the barnyard, it's normally the rooster who is in charge and the hen who is subservient.

Are there marriages, even among Christians, where the wife is clearly in charge and has her say almost unilaterally when it comes to which one gets their way? Of course there are.

And in almost all of those instances, the wife is the more dominant personality. She is more decisive and directional and nearly always more articulate in making the case for whatever she wants to do.

[ 4 : 57 ] Such women are married to a more laid-back, passive, easy-going husband who has learned it's easier to just let her have her own way than it is to oppose her.

He has discovered, perhaps, multiple times, that when he does stand up to her and disagrees, she has ways of making him regret it. So he just melts down into a yes-deer mood, while all the while resenting her for her insistence and her ability to ride roughshod over him.

He suffers in silence because it just isn't worth it to contend with her. And while he is silent, it's hard for him not to be resentful toward his wife.

And this resentment often works both ways. The wife fully senses that her husband should be decisive and more fully involved in the decision-making, and she may resent him because she feels he leaves everything up to her and doesn't take charge in anything.

He is so passive it drives her up the wall. Yet her dynamic and take-charge tendency overwhelms him, and he feels he is no match for her.

[ 6 : 11 ] So he just steps aside and lets her go. Here is a perfect example of what we mean in saying that, more than anything else, marriage is spiritual. A couple like this, and there are many, are both suffering from a spiritual deficiency as to what marriage is and how it is to be conducted.

In the case of the wife wearing the pants, as it is often called, he is unhappy because she does, and she is unhappy because he lets her.

In her heart of hearts, she wants a strong take-charge guy for a husband, and he wants a wife who is respectful and responsive to his leadership. But he's not providing it, and if he tries to do so, she resists him.

Do you see why this is a problem that's mainly spiritual? Can a Christian couple with a marriage like this honestly talk about it? If not, the spiritual problem is compounded, because we can't fix something we can't even talk about.

The biblical solution is upcoming. Keep listening. Negative and Positive Role Models It appears to be a recognized reality that each of us tend to repeat the kind of situation we lived with in our family while growing up.

[ 7 : 36 ] This may be positive and beneficial, or it may be downright scary and very negative. The spectrum extends all the way from being reared in a godly setting where mom and dad thrive daily with a marriage on the rock, to the other extreme of perpetual parental bickering, manipulating, disharmony, power struggles, threats, and distrust.

The scary thing about this latter scenario is that even though one may have severely chafed under that tension, it was nonetheless presented to them as what a marriage was supposed to be like. That was their role model, and likely the only one they had. So, couple that with the unintentional tendency of human nature to mimic or imitate whatever our role model may have been, whether positive or negative, we do tend to go and do thou likewise, because that's the ongoing scenario that was consistently set in front of us.

And to complicate issues further, the husband and wife may come from radically different backgrounds in their growing up years. Each may have had a decidedly different exposure from their parents as to how a marriage was to be conducted, and each tends to unconsciously carry that previous experience right into their own marriage relationship.

It can portend a marriage of blissfulness or one of abject misery. What the marriage on the rock must strive for and seek to produce in their own relationship is set forth in the scriptures, particularly that of Ephesians 5 and 1 Corinthians 13.

[ 9 : 32 ] This needs to be the spiritual dynamic infused into their marriage regardless of the role models they experienced while growing up. If either grew up in the negative and painful role modeling we just described, they are to embrace the spiritual principles in the scriptures so that the conducting of their marriage effectively overrides that negative practice to which they were exposed by their parents.

The injection of the biblical provisions God has stipulated for marriage will not merely counter but actually overcome the unfortunate examples they were exposed to during childhood.

That's the beauty of God's provisions for a marriage on the rock. No matter the negative role model one may have experienced earlier we are not doomed to repeat it.

Yes, the tendency to do so is real but for committed believers they need not go that way because God has provided something so much superior to what their role model might have been.

He has a role model of his own and it is borne out in the husband's sacrificial love for his wife and her loving submission to his God-given headship.

[ 10 : 47 ] Let the rejoicing begin. It's a marriage on the rock. How Males Became Dominant We have noted in the previous volume that marriages worldwide are usually determined by their respective culture and historical traditions and in most of these the wife is accorded a status that is definitely less than that of the husband.

History reveals that this was often the case because a lesser status was all that men were willing to give them. And why was it that men were able to assign a lower status to them?

Well, being physically stronger men could simply overpower women and take advantage of the women leaving them little choice but submission. This hardcore reality is true to this day in many parts of the world.

The world of humanity being fallen as it is is awash with all kinds of inequities and injustices and marriages have certainly not been able to avoid them.

It's probably not reasonable to expect anything more than this sad reality for marriage as the world views it and conducts it. However, for believers in Christ who belong to the Christian community we are not to pattern our marriages from the world's example.

[ 12 : 13 ] We who would have a marriage on the rock answered to an entirely different standard. One that is utterly foreign to the way the world conducts its marriages. And yes, this includes a standard different from the cultural and traditional ways marriage is conducted right here in the USA.

From our inception as a nation birthed in the late 18th century women were never regarded with equal status to men. Why was that?

Largely because that's the way women were regarded in the nations of Europe from which most of our ancestors came. And when they came to America it simply never occurred to them to leave those standards of an inferiority of the woman behind.

They brought them with them. As noted, part of the reason women were accorded lesser status was due to the physical weakness compared to the man.

And this placed the man in the role of protector of the woman who was not as capable of physically protecting herself. And from whom was the man protecting the woman?

[ 13 : 27 ] Largely from other men who might have even been predators. So, what would prevent her protector from also being her predator?

That was due to the feelings he developed toward a given woman. Feelings of protectiveness due to a romantic interest and all that accompanied that.

Essentially, it came down to a desire on the part of this protector man to oversee the safety and well-being of the woman of his interest. This involved his being in charge or the overseer of the woman for her own protection.

And this dependence on her part morphed into her submission to the man, perhaps now her husband, who is pledged to be her protector and provider. This appears to be a large part of the dynamic involved in the role of the female being subservient to the male.

Quite practical as well. More explanation is needed upcoming. Our pervasive self-centeredness The male domination of women is an age-old reality stemming, as we have discovered, from the original fall of our first parents, Adam and Eve.

[ 14 : 45 ] This historical event, called the fall, more than anything else man can offer, explains why the world today is the way it is and why masculinity and femininity are the way they are.

In many places of this world, males not only dominate females, but sometimes to the extent of downright cruelty or brutality. And worse still, it may even be condoned by the culture and legal authority in which they live.

Why is this? And how can this go on anywhere in this so-called enlightened 21st century? Well, it's all due to the fact that advances in civilization and technology do not change the basic nature of

humanity.

It's a fallen world made up of fallen people, remember? And a principal product of our fallenness is the embedded tendency we all have for self-centeredness.

Self-centeredness simply places pleasing ourselves above everyone else. Men and women, both in their fallenness, have this characteristic as our moral baseline.

[ 15 : 59 ] It is systemic to all of humanity. The only person who ever avoided this moral infection was Jesus Christ. But with all others in this human race, self-centeredness is our very driving motivation, and we will often go to all lengths to get our own way.

Sometimes, as is often the case, somebody else gets in our way because they too want their own way, and this is the stuff that produces conflict.

To get your own way when opposed by someone else who wants their own way also, you either negotiate with them and settle for the proverbial half a loaf, or you overpower them so that they are forced to yield and let you have your way.

When nations do this, we call it war. This self-centeredness surfaces at a very early age, generally before we are freed from the playpen.

We grew up honing the skills of our self-centeredness, and of course, both mates automatically bring it into their marriage. Today, in many marriages, especially in the western world, an egalitarian mode often surfaces, or the mate with the more dominant personality prevails when decision time comes.

[ 17 : 25 ] And some succeed in verbally overpowering their mate with persuasive or even manipulative rhetoric, all in pursuit of having things their own way. It is often followed with a triumphant smugness when they succeed, and they are usually clueless that they are paying a heavy price in the quality of the relationship, because in their so-called victory, they have inadvertently created a spirit of resentment in their mate.

But for Christians, God has provided a remedy greatly superior to this, still upcoming, and it's a marriage on the rock. An Historic Distortion of Marriage Part 1 We are devoting time and attention to the relational male and female dynamics that have been around since our first parents were created and placed in that specially prepared garden for them in Genesis 2.

The headship for the union between man and woman was delegated by God to the husband. There did not appear to be the need for headship until after their disobedience recorded in Genesis 3. God's delegation of the man to be the head of the marriage union may have been because of primogenitor, that is, the man was created first, or due to Eve having been the first to disobey by yielding to the temptation by Satan, or combination of the two.

At any rate, male dominance over the female became a reality and has been solidly entrenched in family relationships the world over to this present day.

[ 19 : 11 ] In many marriages, especially in areas where Christianity has had little influence, this dominance may involve mental or physical cruelty from the husband, even to the extent of brutality.

Why do these husbands treat their wives in this manner? Because they can. They are like an absolute master, with their wife being little more than chattel property, with no recourse in the culture, nor does she have any legal means of escaping such domination.

Why would any woman subject herself to this kind of treatment and virtual dehumanization? Good question. If you as a woman are born and reared in a culture where this is the norm, most would not even think to question it, certainly not challenge it.

To the female in this context, her lot in life centers entirely in that of strict obedience to her husband and his wishes. She exists and serves at his pleasure.

She is 100% dependent upon her husband for absolutely everything. And if she displeases him, she does so at her own peril.

[ 20 : 33 ] We in the Western world look upon such arrangements in utter disbelief. Why in the world would any woman subject herself to this kind of situation? Well, it is as we just said, if this is all you know from your earliest childhood, you grow to adulthood with this pre-programmed mindset.

Not only are there women taught that this is the way it is, but this is the way it is supposed to be.

The wife is to get in line and stay in line with the program.

It was established, say these, by God himself, and any woman not subservient to it, or that would, God forbid, oppose it, would be the same as opposing God himself.

This, too, a woman is taught from earliest childhood. In reality, such a scheme is nothing more than a gross distortion of the male-female roles in marriage, but it does exist in many places in the world. An Historic Distortion of Marriage, Part 2 To understand the present, we must pay attention to the past, and we are briefly delving into the history of worldwide relationship between men and women who become husbands and wives.

[ 22 : 00 ] Male dominance has been the order from the beginning, due, we suggested, to the male being created first, and possibly due in part to the woman first succumbing to the original temptation.

In their new state of moral and spiritual fallenness, each was and is characterized by self-centeredness. Each believes, it's all about me.

This would lead the husband, in his self-seeking attitude, intent on controlling and dominating the woman. But this same self-centeredness is part of the female psyche as well, and she in turn wants to control her husband.

Each seeks to establish and fulfill their own agenda, which predictably leads to the age-old power struggle between the sexes. Is true love there a true caring for the other?

Well, often it is, and this is what enables them to genuinely care for one another, even while the struggle for power may continue. It is a complicated, sometimes mixed bag of a love-hate relationship.

[ 23 : 12 ] We have noted earlier that nothing complicates human relationships like sin, and both the male and female are well endowed with what the Bible calls the flesh, or the human ego.

So, how does this struggle pan out? Well, that too is complicated. In cases where real love was never present, or once was, but has since gone underground, the stronger of the two usually prevails, most often the husband, who is stronger physically, and may control the family assets through his employment, thus making the wife in a dependent position with little recourse, but to submit to his agenda, even if grudgingly.

This is a relatively primitive kind of marriage, but there are many of them out there, here in the USA, and in every other part of the world.

It's a workable arrangement, if by workable you mean they are able to stay married despite the ongoing struggle for control. Many marriages function this way, often assuming this is all there is, and the way marriage is supposed to be.

This is essentially true if a couple has nothing but their fallen flesh or ego to work with, and for those who are not Christians, operating from their self-centeredness, often coupled with emotional immaturity, this is all anyone has a right to expect.

[ 24 : 49 ] And let's be clear, by emotional immaturity we mean that which can include even those in their sixties and upward. Because chronological maturity in years lived is surely no guarantee of an emotional maturity that is constantly energized by one's flesh and its always present selfishness.

Recalling our basic premise We need to briefly interrupt our present train of thought about the historic roles of the male and female in the marriage relationship.

This interruption is to remind us of our basic premise of Marriage on the Rock. All of this content, previous and forthcoming, is based upon the biblical record of human history as set forth throughout Scripture, particularly having to do with origins depicted in the book of Genesis.

We adopt this model unreservedly, not only because we believe it to be true and reliable, being the very revelation of God, but also because it undeniably fits the human condition.

Even secular history recounts the human situation through the ages as being portrayed just as the Bible predicted and describes it. Much of it is not pretty or positive, but it is accurate.

[ 26 : 16 ] In short, nothing but the Bible adequately explains why things were as they were ages ago, as well as why things are as they are in our present day.

The opposing point of view to this biblical model is that embraced by the evolutionists and social scientists. They view humanity as having progressively moved upward from simpler biological life forms to the current elevated status of human.

The creationists and the evolutionists both have the same evidence to evaluate in order to reach their conclusion, but each has an entirely different presupposition regarding origins.

It is critical to understand that human relationships on every level and venue are tied to the issue of origins. Our origin determines purpose, meaning, and destiny.

In evolution, there are none. A mere biological, unintelligent, and random beginning described as an accidental coupling of key ingredients has no purpose, destiny, or intentionality at all.

[ 27 : 31 ] While we admit this does not prove evolution is false, it certainly doesn't help its case. However, the biblical record of creation, particularly that of the moral failure and fall of all humanity, as lodged in our original parents of Adam and Eve, provide an undeniably accurate account for the world and its occupants, being as they are, acting as they are, and dying as they are.

All this points to the promise and subsequent fulfillment of a Redeemer for fallen humanity in the person of Jesus Christ. And included in the new birth of freedom man may have through trusting in this Redeemer is a new nature with the new potential for living and loving that transcends mere human ability.

This is realized in the greatest way with a new capacity to love one's fellow man in general and one's marriage mate in particular. This new position, potential, and ability is the spiritual dynamic available to every believer in Christ.

This is the abundant life of which Christ spoke in John 10 when he declared that he came for this very purpose. The historic struggle continues.

As noted in earlier segments, the self-centered desire for domination of others is the greatest culprit to threaten marriages as well as relationships in general.

[ 29 : 06 ] The reason we desire to dominate is because in our self-centeredness we naturally want our own way about things. What things?

Most everything. If our mate is content to always let us have our own way to the exclusion of them having their way, then there is no problem and no conflict.

There is, of course, also the likelihood that in this situation our mate is seriously ill or on life support. I jest, of course, but I think you get the point.

The reason your mate wants their way as opposed to your way is simply because their way is the best way and the right way. Just ask any man.

And, of course, here is where the ever-present and predictable ego surfaces. This tends to produce selfish stubbornness and a marital conflict is off to the races.

[ 30 : 06 ] The issue at hand may be large or small, but when this is an ongoing pattern, as it is in all too many marriages, even with Christians, it has a cumulative effect.

Because each conflict that is not resolved, whether large or small, contributes to an emotional distancing between the parties. The distances may be so gradual they are not even realized until they reach critical mass and become not merely noticeable, but a real barrier.

A barrier to the closeness both mates need and want. And all of this is further complicated, at least in some marriages, where the whole idea of closeness is not really an issue or even necessarily desired.

But what the issue is, is control. And, as we have noted, historically, traditionally, culturally, and many times legally, the husband, the male, is in control.

This is even the way Genesis 3 says it's going to be, following the fall. This, despite the fact that the woman will seek to control or dominate the man, she will not be able to do so, and he will rule over her.

[ 31 : 21 ] In primitive situations, some of which continue to exist, male dominance continues this kind of arrangement. Both mates strive for control as a matter of course.

In most marriages, one's self-centeredness demands it. But there is a much better way. That better way is the way of other-centeredness, where each mate is focused on the needs and wishes of the other, which is, of course, humanly abnormal.

It's abnormal because it's supernatural and is realized in a marriage on a rock. This is that of which we spoke in earlier volumes, when we emphasized the key ingredient of marriage being spiritual more than anything else.

This is the biblical arrangement that puts an end to the marital power struggle, because each mate is walking in the spirit as opposed to walking in the flesh.

A refresher course, you might benefit from Volume 1 over again. Marriage on the Rock, Volume 9, Track 10.

[ 32 : 30 ] More Fallout from the Fall. The male dominance we have been considering is deeply rooted in human origins, as noted earlier in Genesis 3.

We pointed out the dynamics involved with the greater physical strength of the man over the woman, thus rendering her into a forced kind of submission. Also, the factors of a genuine attraction between the sexes colors the picture with the romantic element, which then leads to the man assuming the role of protector of the woman.

His being the protector again places her in the position of submission to the man, because as her protector, he sets the terms and strategy of the protection, thus making her subservient again to his plans for that protection.

Clearly, the man is in charge. Most wives are not only sensitive to this, but usually are grateful to have one of greater physical strength than themselves serving as protector and provider.

Admittedly, this arrangement reflects a primitive kind of situation, but we are persuaded that it fits the facts, historically and even to this present day. Despite the fact that this is the way it is, and has been, does not mean it is at all satisfactory.

[ 33 : 50 ] The major flaw of the male dominance reality is sadly revealed in all too many instances of men taking unfair advantage of women in nearly every venue of society all throughout human history.

Culturally, and often legally, women have been disadvantaged and in so many ways subservient to men and utterly dependent upon the good graces of their male counterparts.

When and where these good graces were extended in a caring and loving relationship, women tended to be somewhat content. Even though they were not recognized as an equal to the male, they were generally accepting of the role that history and culture had dealt them.

But how were things for women when those aforementioned good graces were not forthcoming?

Women often paid a price, consisting of inequities, blatant discrimination, ill treatment with mental and sometimes physical cruelty.

In short, women throughout the world were accorded downright shabby treatment from many men who clearly lacked those good graces we spoke of.

[ 35 : 02 ] In much of the world, particularly the East and Mideast, these attitudes of male supremacy continue to prevail, often legally sanctioned by the power structures, again, almost all of which are male entirely, or at least male-dominated.

Here in the West, there was much of the same, but to a lesser extent, due no doubt to at least some influence from those of a biblical persuasion who decried the ill-treatment of women.

Yet, even among these Christian constituents, there remained a gross distortion about how the husband was to regard and treat his wife. It was often a far cry from the clear biblical model set forth in Ephesians 5 that we have already seen.

So, where is all this going, and what has it come to now? Upcoming in our next segment. Women's Upward Climb It was the women's suffrage movement early in the 20th century that began a slow process of elevating womanhood toward the goal of equality of the sexes.

A number of spunky women were simply fed up with the crass inequities that had been in place for so long, centuries in fact, and they began making some noise about it that could not be ignored.

[ 36 : 29 ] Many tried to ignore it, but ever so slowly it began taking hold. The women's right to vote was a landmark decision in 1920, assuring more rights for women would be forthcoming.

However, the Great Depression of the 30s exacted such a huge toll on the average American that women's rights didn't gain much momentum compared to dealing with all the economic hardships imposed by massive unemployment.

And then came World War II, with the national focus on winning the war. And while the war did set all other causes aside, including women striving for equality, it also provided a backdoor kind of progress for women, as depicted in Rosie the Riveter.

With so many able-bodied men in uniform, an adequate male workforce was unavailable to staff the hundreds of thousands of jobs in factories, providing all kinds of needed war material for the effort. And here is where women came to the rescue. Their huge numbers prove more than capable to not only keeping the home fires burning, but keeping the factories humming with a gigantic production of war material, working around the clock.

[ 37 : 53 ] Womanhood had proved their worth in an undisputed way, and a grateful nation gladly recognized their accomplishments. The decade of the 50s was largely spent on America just trying to get back to a pre-war kind of footing.

GIs were returning and starting families, needing jobs and housing. The late 40s and the 50s saw a dramatic population increase called the baby boom, and millions of young families were just getting underway.

Then, the turbulent 60s, when everything seemed to break loose. Front burner issues now consisted of the Vietnam War, civil rights issues with its pros and cons, the hippie movement, drug proliferation, and the rapid rise of the radical feminist movement.

Does anybody remember the bra-burning days? Actually, the feminist movement had been brewing for some time. Prominent women, writing best-selling books, put feminism on the front burner of American culture.

And why was this movement even birthed? In the main, women in general were still being regarded as less capable, less important, and less deserving than men.

[ 39 : 18 ] And men who decry the feminist agenda and its demands have only themselves to thank for it. Aggressive women, in particular, had long since tired of the off-shabby treatment given them by so many men.

Equality versus sameness We have noted that generally poor treatment of women by so many men created the ongoing dissatisfaction among women, resulting in the feminist movement of the 1960s. As noted earlier, it was largely due to the poor treatment of women that this feminine crusade was undertaken. It had been a long time coming, and would prove to be effective in addressing issues of inequality of the sexes.

But, like all reform movements, with whatever the cause, the reformers tend to over-reform by becoming extreme in their applications and demands of the movement.

Because their radical demands were the ones that get the most of the publicity, many Americans, especially men, became turned off and unsympathetic to the whole program of women's rights.

[ 40 : 35 ] Perhaps the most extreme claim of the feminist was the ridiculous insistence that there really was no actual difference between males and females, apart from their physical anatomy with the obvious different body parts, but, other than that, they claimed men and women were actually the same.

Thus, they moved from demanding that the sexes were equal to demand that the sexes were the same, separated only by hidebound tradition and cultural environment.

Boys were boys, they insisted, only because they were taught and conditioned to be boys by the toys they were given and the clothes they wore that labeled them boys.

Girls were girls, not because anything of femininity was inbred in them genetically, but only because they, too, were conditioned by parents and society and expected to play with dolls and so on.

So, boys were masculine and girls were feminine, not because they actually were from birth, but solely because they were conditioned to be that way.

[ 41 : 46 ] No longer content to demand and pursue equality of the sexes, they were now pushing for adopting the sameness of males and females.

This, among other things, legitimizes women holding any job or position that a man might hold, since there is no inherent difference between them, say they.

This is, of course, just plain folly, and some would add just plain nutty. Now, we know, as has been suspected all along, there really is a difference between the sexes and anatomical differences are only the proverbial tip of the iceberg.

Physical and neurological brain research has proved conclusively that distinctions other than physical really are inbred and inherent in males and females.

There really is a masculine way of thinking and being that is definitely different from the feminine way of thinking. Well, who knew? Well, just about everybody knew and operated for millennia on that basis.

[ 42 : 57 ] It was only the radicals among the feminists that continued to push the envelope in an effort to obliterate any real differences between male and female. Celebrating the Differences Despite the current craziness of our culture that finds some insisting there is no inherent difference between masculinity and femininity, we are persuaded the differences are real, not only attested to by thousands of years of history, but by every accepted standard of common sense.

It is only the avant-garde social revolutionists, often spurred on by an elite academia, that insist on the blending of genders. We reject their claims totally, and more importantly, the Bible rejects them from Genesis 1 onward.

What is desperately needed for marriages is not merely the recognition of sexual differences beyond that of physical body parts, but to the individual makeup that constitutes men and women in every part of their being, emotionally, psychologically, as well as physically.

They are not to be blended and attempted to treat as sameness, but their obvious differences need to be celebrated and enjoyed by both partners in the marriage union.

What male, worthy of masculinity, has not been utterly intrigued about femininity? It often begins in grade school, when sometimes boys outwardly show derision and dislike for girls.

[ 44 : 39 ] Yet, something brewing inside that boy betrays his outward dislike for girls, because inwardly, if he will allow himself to be honest, he finds them unexplainably appealing.

But don't let anyone know that. When he reaches puberty, that male testosterone begins an upward climb, and the next thing you know, girls are pretty neat, even outwardly.

He may even be a subject of disgust and betrayal by his fellow males, by his going gaga over, of all things, some girl.

But their disgust of him will fade when their hormones reach the level his did. He was just a little earlier bloomer than they, but they'll be along soon.

They, too, will join the happy throng of guys who spend much of their time talking and thinking and fantasizing about that certain girl, or girls, a girl in the sophomore class.

[ 45 : 44 ] What's going on here? Life. That's what's going on, and it is wonderful beyond description. It works much the same way for girls.

Among them, it's often called being boy crazy, particularly by her mother, who, truth be told, probably experienced some boy craziness of her own when she was her daughter's age.

This is age-old boy-meets-girl stuff, and it's just about the most heavenly thing on planet earth.

Each, the boy and the girl, are intrigued and drawn to the differences existing in the other.

This is the source of the fascination. The other is very unlike me, and I am mysteriously and helplessly drawn to them. This emotional chemistry is really not fully understood by anyone, not poets or songwriters, but we still keep trying to explain it.

**PERVERTING GOD-ORDAINED DIFFERENCES** In a foolish and futile effort to achieve what they call complete equality, radical feminists and other avant-garde social activists have tried to obliterate the obvious and legitimate differences between the sexes.

[ 47 : 07 ] This effort, some call gender blending, flies in the face of everything related to common sense. It's nothing more than an additional example of reformers and their tendency to over-reform.

The same extreme exists in other areas as well. Some reformers can't reasonably reform anything without an over-correction. Like the issue of environmentalism, the same nonsense is found in the issues of women's rights.

These two issues were virtually ignored for centuries, and then, when finally addressed, the protagonists shoot three miles past the moon in their efforts of correction.

The net effect is viewed by the masses as downright ridiculous. But, of course, to those pushing the extreme agendas, nothing is ever enough.

With the gender issues, the latest invasion of radicalism is realized in same-sex marriage, a hitherto unimagined concept that has become a reality practically overnight.

[ 48 : 17 ] The pace with which social phenomena are occurring is dizzying. Gender blending strikes at the very fabric of our humanity like nothing else ever has.

And it's all in the name of what is labeled equality. Traditionalists and biblically-based moralists see it as a clear-cut perversion of what the Creator intended.

But we are reminded by them of how out of step we are with the wisdom of the current culture. And for our opposition to the homosexual and same-sex marriage, we, of course, are labeled intolerant, judgmental, lacking in compassion, and denying people's rights to love and marry whom they choose.

And we, of course, deny that we are being judgmental because we do not have the right to judge others, including them. Yet we must insist that God has already judged them, and we are merely relaying His verdict of their position and behavior.

This we must do, if we truly love them as the Scriptures say we should. The least we can do for those living and acting under God's severe displeasure is to warn them and urge them to turn from it.

[ 49 : 39 ] All of their ongoing efforts, which are very well funded, very well publicized, and becoming increasingly popular with the masses, do not in any way change the reality.

The reality is, there are definite differences between the sexes, and they are intentional. Each serving a purpose and function that the other cannot and should not attempt to fill.

Rather than denying that, and insisting on changing the God-ordained distinctions, the need is to recognize God's intention and provision, and bring ourselves into compliance with it.

Why Radicals See No Perversion There are no doubt some who describe themselves as Christians that see no problem with the concept of same-sex marriage, certainly not to the extent they would be willing to call it a perversion.

While admitting the Bible nowhere sanctions males marrying males and females marrying females, they would take comfort in the fact that neither does the Bible prohibit this.

[ 50 : 50 ] There are many things the Bible, of course, does not prohibit. Among them, it doesn't prohibit pigs from flying. That's preposterous, some would say.

Well, my point precisely. Yet, despite what we believe would be an extreme minority of Christians or Bible believers who applaud same-sex marriage, we are confident that most by far would come from the persuasion of atheism, backed by a full-blown endorsement of evolutionary thought.

Because once God and the intentionality behind divine creation is dismissed, one is hard-pressed to label same-sex marriage as a perversion.

If one embraces an evolutionary hypothesis that doesn't even require a creator, then why not same-sex marriage? Why not same-sex marriage and or any other combination of coupling, tripling, quadrupling, or whatever in a union called marriage?

That line from the novel Brothers Karamazov says it very adequately. If there is no God, all things are permitted. And this is where many radicals engaging in or at least endorsing same-sex marriage are coming from, and why they are offended by those who call it a perversion.

[ 52 : 18 ] Because something can be labeled a perversion only when a thing becomes the opposite of what it was intended to be. It is perverted when it is turned on its ear and made to be the opposite of what it was intended.

But if there is no God, there is no one who ever intended anything. All was developed from random chance. No intention, no purpose, and ultimately, no meaning.

With the denial of biblical special creation and using evolution as the vanguard for their position, the same-sex marriage crowd is merely being logical in their position.

Moral issues, and this certainly is one of them, all depend on what is accepted as one's final authority. And once God is ruled out as the authority, man is all that remains.

He then becomes his own authority, and devotes himself to the recruiting of others to think like him, approve of him, and affirm him in whatever endeavor he pursues, whether homosexuality, lesbianism, same-sex marriage, add whatever else you wish to the list.

[ 53 : 34 ] It all becomes equally valid, because what is passed off as a standard is always a work in progress, ever-changing with the mind and desires of the individual being the only acceptable standard.

Voila! Why not same-sex marriage? The Intended Norm Versus the New Norm In speaking of terms like intended and norm, two things immediately come to mind.

In merely using the word intended, the concept that arises is that which requires an intender.

Intentionality demands an intelligence behind that which was intended.

It also implies meaning and purpose. The use of the word norm, short for normal, requires the existence of some set standard previously existing by which other entities can be evaluated or compared.

Those that comport with a given and accepted standard are labeled normal. Those that do not are referred to as abnormal.

[ 54 : 52 ] They are different. They do not fit into the commonly accepted designation we call normal. The biblical position is one which says there is an intended norm, and the intender of that norm is none other than God himself.

Additionally, that which God the Intender established as the norm is that in the beginning God created them male and female. The two, a man and a woman, are to be joined together in marriage, and these two then become as one.

He brings his masculinity and its reproductive capacity, while she brings her femininity and its reproductive capacity. And besides their physical genitalia that makes procreation possible, each has a distinctive emotional and psychological component they contribute to the union.

The mental mindset and way of thinking of the male is decidedly different from that of the female. While this may at times appear maddening, if it is learned to be understood and appreciated, it instead becomes quite fascinating and intriguing.

These differences can be big contributors that prevent boredom in a marriage, never at all moment. This is the norm that God intended, and all of Scripture supports it.

[ 56 : 18 ] Those who deny this to be the intended norm are usually eager to deny the authority of the Bible and God as the Intender. And logically, if there is no Intender who established what is normal, then everyone is free to establish their own standard and view as to what is normal.

In fact, the very concept of abnormal is eliminated. Who are you or anyone else to declare someone else's preference sexually or matrimonially as abnormal?

Those who do so are immediately labeled as judgmental, bigoted, narrow, religious fanatic, and as one who seeks to impose their values upon others.

They insist that even though man marrying woman exclusively used to be the norm of another day, now there is a new enlightenment that includes same-sex marriage as the new norm.

Out with the old and in with the new. Such is precisely where we are today. Never mind what the Bible says. The U.S. Supreme Court said this is the new norm.

[ 57 : 32 ] Not Surprised by the New Norm Christians who subscribe to the divinely intended norm set forth by God in the beginning of marriage between one man and one woman should really not be surprised by what is now described as the new norm, or at least a legitimate part thereof.

No, their insistence upon the legitimacy of men marrying men and women marrying women not only should not surprise us, but perhaps even be anticipated.

This is because the perversion of human nature described in Romans chapter 1 and elsewhere. These folks are identified herein as abandoning the natural for what the passage defines as unnatural.

In other words, what is depicted as unnatural, they have convinced themselves is not unnatural at all, but has, in fact, become their new natural.

What this means is that they are simply being what they are. And what could be more natural than that? In their estimation, at least for them, they would regard marriage to the opposite sex to constitute something unnatural.

[ 59 : 01 ] This is why we should not be surprised at their insistence of legitimizing same-sex marriage. Their reasoning demands that no one has the right to say what is natural for others.

This is something for the others to determine for themselves. Consequently, to validate this kind of reasoning, the same-sex people see themselves as their own authority in these matters while rejecting the right of the authority that the Bible and tradition has imposed upon mankind.

By their doing this, we should not be surprised at all by their position for same-sex marriage. We should see it as quite predictable. Where the conflict inevitably arises is the insistence of the homosexual community that their standards of what is natural and thus acceptable also be adopted by the heterosexual community and affirmed by them as being equally natural.

Their insistence has actually paid off, at least within the officialdom of government, particularly with the Supreme Court ruling that legalized same-sex marriage.

Additionally, to most holding the same-sex marriage position, while it's regrettable the Bible forbids it, the U.S. Supreme Court has legitimized it, and that's good enough for them, for now.

[ 60 : 40 ] But there's still that pesky Bible language insisted upon by those who have the Bible's authority above that of the Supreme Court and the law of the land. What is to be done about these stubborn holdouts?

They will not be persuaded inwardly. They must surely be silent so they cannot speak outwardly. But what about free speech? Upcoming. How the New Norm Came to Be A conflict of huge proportions continues to be brewing between the proponents of same-sex marriage and the proponents of free speech, who see a constitutional right to speak their mind in opposition to same-sex marriage.

That the Constitution protects the right of free speech in the very First Amendment is indisputable. But what is disputable is the Constitution's protection of people of the same sex marrying each

other.

One will search this document in vain to find any such reference stated or implied. Well, how, then, can there even be a contest of what is clearly, constitutionally, uncontestable?

It's a newly-birthed social phenomenon called political correctness. The engine driving this juggernaut is a well-oiled, finely-tuned, heavily-financed public relations effort unlike anything ever before seen.

[ 62 : 17 ] It is the most daring and successful turnaround of public sentiment and opinion that Madison Avenue has ever executed.

And it has been brilliantly couched in terms of people being allowed to love whom they choose. Well, who could possibly oppose a concept like that?

Still, they would have to contend with those people who will strongly disagree. What can be done about them? Another stroke of evil genius.

Change these people from being merely disagreeable to being haters. Change them from being disagreeable to being intolerant.

How can you do that? The dictionary clearly defines the word hate and intolerant, as meaning something quite different from merely disagreeing.

[ 63 : 20 ] But never mind. The public today isn't consulting dictionaries anyway. They are consulting whatever they hear and see in the media. And if we call these folks who disagree with same-sex marriage as being haters of gays, utterly discriminating, and intolerant of same-sex marriage, and that's how the public will see them.

And if that's the way the public sees them, government institutions will take their cue from that public opinion. They always have, always will.

And legislation will automatically follow, and even the Supreme Court, comprised of its current makeup, will follow with a majority ruling that will give a legitimate new status to same-sex marriage demands.

And that, boys and girls, goes a long way in explaining how same-sex marriage came to be. Is it here to stay? Well, at least for what appears to be the foreseeable future.

So, what should be the Christian response to all this? Do we dummy up? Do we simply cave and surrender? What should be the believer's game plan?

[ 64 : 37 ] Upcoming. Only the intended norm is of God. Regardless of the deviations and perversions that modern man sets forth in issues of morality and what constitutes immorality, God has already expressed himself on these matters.

And if ever we as Christians have occasion to discuss these issues, particularly sexuality and marriage, with those who insist on the new norm, so-called, of same-sex marriage, homosexuality, and related issues, we should labor to make it clear that these are not our standards.

We are not qualified, nor have we as mere fellow human beings the right to condemn or be judgmental of those who espouse what we have identified as the new norm.

All we are telling them is that the intender who originally established the one-man, one-woman union has already spoken, and quite clearly on these issues.

All we are doing is merely informing and reminding them of what this truly supreme intender has set forth. Christians are not the originators of these standards.

[ 66 : 06 ] We are merely their messengers. The standards are God's, not ours. And why do you suppose God has established them? His motivation is shouted loud and clear all throughout Holy Writ.

God has standards for human behavior because He has an amazing love for humans, the only beings said to be in the likeness and image of Himself.

Contrary to what some think, God doesn't want to spoil our pleasures or rain on our parade. God is not a cosmic killjoy, looking around to see who is having fun so He can demand they stop it.

God is a heavenly parent, concerned for the welfare and happiness of His creatures, much like we as parents, who want nothing but the best and safest for our children.

There are rules, guidelines, standards, and perimeters. God has put in place for mankind. And in the same way, a parent constructs a backyard fence for the toddler.

[ 67 : 17 ] It's not for the purpose of denying him free reign in the neighborhood and beyond, but it is designed to protect him from the many things that could harm him, perhaps even fatally.

God knows man needs standards with which he is to comply, for man's own blessing and benefit. God's standards were revealed as soon as there were people who needed them for their own protection, beginning with Adam and Eve.

Unfortunately, they never regarded God's prohibitions as being for their own benefit. They interpreted God's thou shalt not merely as God depriving them of something.

Divine standards for protection are a reflection of God's love and provision for us, including provisions and prohibitions regarding marriage. Christians and the New Norm There is no question about many in the Christian community being intimidated into silence.

The same-sex marriage, the LBGTG, will grudgingly allow Christians to hold an opposing view, even a biblical view, just as long as we keep it to ourselves.

[ 68 : 42 ] Formerly, they would only demand we keep it within the confines of the four walls of the church. Now they are not content with that, but seek to even silence us in our pulpits, threatening costly lawsuits for speaking out against it.

Christian florists and bakers who serve wedding parties with their flowers and cakes have been taken to court with expensive litigation, only to be found guilty of discrimination.

Their freedom of religion that prevents them from contributing in any way to a same-sex marriage union has been trumped by the gay community's cry of discrimination.

And, yes, the courts agree. Test cases have already decided against the Christians exercising freedom of religion as an acceptable exemption for not meeting the demands of the gay community. So, what now is to be done by way of response from the Christian community? The response must be the same as it has always been.

[ 69 : 51 ] We pay the price that goes with opposing the demands the Bible clearly identifies as ungodly. Why should we be any different from the Daniels, the Stephens, the Apostle Pauls, and the other early Christians who were called upon to oppose the evil standards imposed upon them by their culture?

And we oppose them because God opposes them. Ephesians 5.11 tells us to have nothing to do with the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but rather expose them.

Read the context for the explanation of unfruitful deeds of darkness, and the issue of sexual immorality is included clearly. We are called upon to expose them, and we expose them by calling them out and denouncing them.

We do that for the same reason God says He opposes them. It is because He loves people and He hates what sin does to people that He forbids these behaviors.

It isn't that God hates gays, but because God loves gays, and Christ died for them as much as He died for straights. He is also opposed to adultery, fornication, lying, stealing, and murder, all because He loves people, and He hates what those things do to people, the ruination of lives and relationships.

[ 71 : 25 ] Frankly, it's a lot easier and safer not to confront, not to expose, not to oppose. But if you truly do love and care for people, you simply cannot do that.

And yes, there will likely be a price to pay for doing so, but this is our sacred obligation. We must not fail to discharge it. You've been listening to Marriage on the Rock with Marv Wiseman.

Preview of Marriage on the Rock Volume 10 Upcoming On a segment found in the previous Volume 8 of Marriage on the Rock, We stated our intention to avoid further consideration of same-sex marriage due to its very concept being a logical absurdity.

We stand corrected. Not because it has ceased to be an absurdity, because it hasn't. It's still an absurdity. But now, it possesses the approval of an equally absurd Supreme Court of the United States.

Nonetheless, the only Supreme Court that truly matters has issued a position about human sexuality and its parameters of normalcy that transcends any human court, be it the U.S.

[ 72 : 54 ] Supreme Court or whomever. That being the case, such has compelled us, though reluctantly, to pursue it as we just did on the segments immediately preceding.

We do not plan to pursue it further, but we said that before. Upcoming on Marriage on the Rock, we will pursue some of the most intriguing and fascinating subject matter known to us as humans.

Why we think and act as we do, especially as males and females. In fact, we recommend you obtain a copy of the book called Spirit-Controlled Temperament by best-selling author Tim LaHaye.

You'll find it to be a valuable resource in conjunction with the upcoming subject matter on Marriage on the Rock, Volume 10. In all of my 50 years plus of personal and marital counseling, the Bible sheds more light on human behavior than any other source.

There's no question about that. And in a different vein, Spirit-Controlled Temperament also provides a great deal of insight toward understanding yourself and your mate.

[ 74 : 11 ] A lot of the enigmas regarding why we think and act as we do are revealed in this book that will clear away a lot of the fuzziness most of us have about ourselves and our mates.

No, we will not be using the book as a text but seriously recommending it as a collateral source for our subject matter. So if you obtain the book and have it at your disposal while we present Volume 10 of Marriage on the Rock, I assure you that you will be greatly enlightened and very appreciative of Mr. LeHaye's offering.

I sincerely hope you'll be with us. This is Pastor Marv Wiseman thanking you for listening and we trust benefiting from Marriage on the Rock. Vocal from The Berrys without Jasure on the Rock. I will see you in the background about an collateral for India. You should be holding a trustheart of Silver and Action if you need to have Laugh for in this video!