

## RICK 'lukewarm' WARREN: "waxing worse and worse"

2<sup>nd</sup> Timothy 3:13

As a lead-in to this short article I would recommend you to go to the audio on this link <http://www.gbc-peel.org.uk/media/Cecil%20Andrews%20%20Prayer%20Meeting.mp3> and then scroll through it and **listen from 31 minutes 10 seconds to 34 minutes 15 seconds.**

In that short portion I refer to Rick Warren's activities connected with the '**Proposition 8 Referendum**' that was held in California back in 2008. In the face of intense lobbying from the 'gay' community residents there were asked to vote on a **possible redefinition of the word 'marriage'**

My reason for directing you to these comments is to relate them to two articles that have been published where Rick Warren refers back to that time and to what his words and actions were.

The first article is located on

<http://christiannews.net/2012/12/04/rick-warrens-regret-over-making-video-supporting-biblical-marriage-questioned-by-family-group/>

Published on 4 December 2012 it reads as follows –

A pro-family group is calling into question recent statements made by Rick Warren, author of *The Purpose-Driven Life* and pastor of Saddleback Church in California, surrounding his regret over creating a video in 2008 that expressed his support for Biblical marriage.

During a recent interview with Marc Lamont Hill of the *Huffington Post*, Warren sought to clarify matters pertaining to his creation of a video years ago in which he stated that those who follow the Bible should support California's Proposition 8 ballot initiative. He had been accused of lying months after releasing the video for stating during an interview on *Larry King Live* that "[d]uring the whole Proposition 8 thing, **I ... never once issued a statement, never once even gave an endorsement in the two years Prop. 8 was going.**"

"People say that I campaigned for Proposition 8. The meaning of the word 'campaign' means two different things," Warren told Hill. "To me, that means that you go out and you speak at rallies, you do advertisements for it and stuff like that."

**"I never made a single statement on Prop. 8 until the week before, and in my own church, some members said, 'Where do we stand on this?'"** he explained. "[So], I released a video to my members. It was posted all over like it was an advertisement."

Hill commented that Warren is a well-known pastor, and that he should be aware that any statement he makes will likely be distributed to the public.

"It might be disingenuous to say that you have a church of 20,000 people, and you have a book that 32 million people have read and 60 million have accessed," Hill said. "To say that 'I was just giving a message' –"

“You know what? You’re exactly right, Marc, and I learned a lesson from that,” Warren replied. “And I learned that anything I say now privately is now public. And I actually learned from that mistake of going, ‘Oh, wait a minute, everybody took that like I was pontificating to the whole world.’”

Hill then asked Warren if he could do it all over again, if he would still have created the video.

“I would not have,” Warren replied. “**I would not have made that statement.** I wanted to talk to my own people as a duty, because as a shepherd, I’m responsible for those who put themselves under my care. I’m not responsible for everybody else. I am responsible for the people who choose to be under my care and ask me a question.”

“So, I’ve had to look at how do I communicate to my people in a way that doesn’t look like I’m pontificating to the entire world,” he added.

Following Warren’s explanation, some are expressing concern, including **Peter LaBarbera of Americans for Truth About Homosexuality**. LaBarbera **told Christian News Network that Warren’s comments made him appear as if he was ashamed to publicly stand for the Biblical definition of marriage.**

**“[Warren] regrets that the statement got out wider than his church. To me, that’s incredible because he should be happy that he had influence outside of his church to the whole body of Christ in California – indeed, to people all over the state voting on the issue who look to him for guidance,” he said. “And so, that troubles me that he even says now that he wouldn’t make that video. ... That’s saying that he does not want to be a leader on the homosexual ‘marriage’ issue.”**

LaBarbera stated that he believes many pastors are becoming inward and exclusive about their beliefs, when they should be using their influence outside of the four walls of the church.

“[Warren] used the word ‘pontificate.’ You’re not pontificating. You’re putting your voice out there as a spiritual and moral leader, and that’s what pastors need to do,” he said. “They need to get outside of this mindset that I’m only allowed to talk to my church.”

“The question is, are Christian leaders self-segregating on the moral issues because they’re under the gun of the pro-gay culture?” LaBarbera asked.

He stated that the fear of man should never be an excuse to run from the Christian responsibility of publicly standing for truth.

“The homosexual activist never agonizes and says, ‘Wow, I don’t think I should talk beyond my group of homosexual activists,’” LaBarbera explained. “They’re pontificating all the time. They’re telling us what to think. They’re telling us that we’re bigots if we are against homosexuality, or even if we’re against same-sex ‘marriage’ now, they call you a bigot or a hatemonger or a homophobe.”

“I get the fact that [Warren] is under the gun by the homosexual lobby. We all get it,” he continued. “The homosexual lobby is aggressive and loud and vocal, and they want him to shut up about homosexuality being a sin, and they want him to conform to their ideology, but he can’t.”

LaBarbera stated that just like Warren is unashamed to proclaim the need to be involved in humanitarian work, he should likewise make use of his platform to uphold God’s definition of marriage.

“I just wish he would stop backtracking and seeming embarrassed about helping to protect marriage,” he said. “He doesn’t have any qualms about preaching to everybody in the world the need to have compassion for people with AIDS, and he’s right about that. But, he also in the same way

[should] be outspoken and non-defensive about helping to protect the historic definition of marriage.”

**As previously reported, Warren also came under fire for other comments made during the Huffington Post interview, during which he stated that homosexual behavior “might be” a sin, and that he believes homosexuals will go to Heaven if they “accept Christ.”**

**Rick Warren's office did not return calls for comment by press time.**

The second article is located on

<http://www.thebereancall.org/content/rick-warren-regrets-video-supporting-biblical-marriage>

and basically re-runs the comments made by Rick Warren.

In the first detailed article near the end it states "[As previously reported](#)" and this refers to the article located on

<http://christiannews.net/2012/11/29/rick-warren-uncertain-if-homosexual-behavior-is-sinful-says-gays-go-to-heaven/>

That article published on 29 November 2012 reads as follows –

Controversy is stirring over recent comments made by Rick Warren, author of the best-selling book *The Purpose-Driven Life* and megachurch leader of Saddleback Church in California, who stated that homosexual behavior "might be" sinful, and that he believes homosexuals go to Heaven.

During an interview this week with the *Huffington Post*, Warren was asked by Marc Lamont Hill if having romantic feelings for a member of the same sex is a sin. Leading up to the question, Warren was explaining that he does not hate homosexuals, and that people should disagree politely on the subject of homosexuality.

"I have many, many gay friends, and have worked around the world with them in gay organizations to try to stop AIDS," he said. "We're doing 'World AIDS Day' this weekend at Saddleback Church. **My wife and I have given millions of dollars to help people with HIV/AIDS and have worked with gay organizations on that.** (Cecil – has Mr Warren never read Matthew 6:1?)

"What about the love part, though? I hear about the AIDS part," asked Hill. "It's not illegal to love somebody," Warren replied.

"But you think it's a sin," Hill asserted. "No, it's not a sin to love somebody," Warren said.

**"It might be a sin to have sex with them," he added. "It might be."**

However, just moments prior, Hill aired a clip from an interview that Warren participated in on *Piers Morgan* this week, where Warren presented a slightly different answer. He began by responding to the question of whether or not a person can be born homosexual.

"I think the jury is still out on that," he said. "It wouldn't bother me if there was a 'gay gene' found, because here's what we know about life: I have all kinds of natural feelings in my life, and it doesn't necessarily mean that I should act on every feeling. ... I do not believe that attraction is a sin, but I do believe that some actions are sin."

Warren stated during his interview with Hill that he believes sex outside of marriage is always sinful, however, and that he obtains his views from the Bible.

"I make no bones about it. I'm an evangelical pastor, so my source of authority is, what does the Bible say about it?" he said. "However, people will have other sources of authority."

"Or, different readings of the Bible," Hill injected.

"Or different readings — that's very true," Warren agreed.

Later during the interview, when Hill asked Warren if he believes homosexuals will go to Hell, he replied that they will not.

“No, not because they’re gay,” he said. “We go to Hell because we choose to reject the grace of God.”

When Hill asked what happens to a homosexual that accepts Jesus, Warren responded enthusiastically.

**“He’s going to Heaven!” he declared. “Without a doubt.” (Cecil – provided that with true repentance he earnestly seeks to do what the Lord told the adulterous woman of John 8:11 “Go and sin no more”)**

Warren is not the first evangelical to make the assertion, however. Earlier this year, megachurch author and speaker Joel Osteen similarly told popular talk show host Oprah that he also believes homosexuals are saved.

“Will a gay person be accepted into heaven, as you see it?,” Oprah asked Osteen. “I believe they will,” he replied.

Craig Gross of “XXXChurch” also made statements in July that he doesn’t think God would send homosexuals to Hell.

“Why do they (religious people) believe that the gay guy goes to Hell, but the fat preacher who builds some of the largest churches in the world makes it to Heaven?” Gross wrote in an online blog.

However, many Christians view statements such as these as compromise against the word of God.

**“The concept of a ‘gay Christian’ is an oxymoron in light of numerous Scriptural instances wherein homosexual behavior is forbidden,” Alex Mason, policy analyst for the Family Policy Network, told Christian News Network. “One cannot live in a continual state of unrepentant sexual sin while calling themselves a Christian.”**

“That’s not to say Christians can’t struggle with sin, including sexual sin,” he continued. “The Christian life as a constant struggle against sin, and just as some Christians struggle to defeat heterosexual lust, others may struggle to defeat homosexual lusts.”

**Peter LaBarbera, the president of Americans for Truth About Homosexuality, agreed. He stated that he was shocked at Rick Warren’s comments.**

**“You don’t want to give the impression that it’s fine and dandy to live the homosexual lifestyle and as long as I believe in Jesus, I can still go to Heaven,” he said. “It’s one thing to have attractions and [fight] that, [and another to embrace homosexual behavior].”**

Mason, whose ministry operates the website [HopeForHomosexuals.com](http://HopeForHomosexuals.com), stated that Warren should have explained his beliefs further, so as not to jeopardize the eternity of valuable souls.

“Warren failed to define what it means to ‘accept Christ,’ leaving viewers with the notion that a person can simply express a ‘belief’ in Jesus’ existence without turning away from the sins He died to atone,” he lamented.

**“When you accept Christ, your behavior changes,” LaBarbera said. “And the attitude is [people like Warren] don’t want to talk about changes. ... We know that God changes homosexuals, so why isn’t Rick Warren saying that?”**

LaBarbera also told Christian News Network that he thinks Warren is treading into very dangerous territory by insinuating that the issue of homosexual behavior is a grey area.

“What part of Romans 1 doesn’t Rick Warren understand? It’s so clear,” he said. “When you make statements like these, you end up losing the Biblical sense, and the Biblical sense is that this is an abomination.”

Mason agreed, and outlined that sin needs to be taken seriously by those who wear the name of Christ.

“Christians should not, for one moment, hesitate when asked about behaviors that Scripture clearly calls sinful,” he said. “It is impossible for anyone to legitimize or make holy what God Himself has called unholy.”

**“The Apostle Paul did not hesitate to faithfully echo God’s standards in his letter to the Corinthians, wherein he included a long list of sins that will keep people from the kingdom of God, including the sin of homosexuality,” Mason continued, citing 1 Corinthians 6:9-11. “Modern preachers would do well to follow Paul’s example in condemning that which God has condemned, while also proclaiming that the only hope for sinners – homosexual and heterosexual alike – is faith in Jesus Christ: ‘All who call on the name of the Lord will be saved.’”**

LaBarbera said that Warren should not only have called homosexual behavior sin, but should have gone deeper to the root issue.

“It’s also sinful to lust after another man,” LaBarbera said. “We can’t advocate sin as believers, and we have to think about how that the person that’s struggling with homosexuality is going to hear this.”

**“There is no Biblical basis for his statements,” he added. “I think Rick Warren needs to retract that [‘might be’] statement and clarify it. If he does not retract it, he has fallen into error.”**

“Rick Warren has a heart for lost souls, but he seems fearful he’ll offend people he could otherwise lead to salvation by telling the truth about their sin. That may indicate an inadequate faith in God’s sovereignty, or a failure to fully believe God’s Word has the power to transform lives,” Mason concluded. “I pray he’ll find the courage to be just as determined to be the salt of the earth as he is to be a light to the world.”

**Requests for comment were not returned by Saddleback Church.**

In **Revelation 3:14-19** the Lord writes to the professing church in Laodicea and identifies their boasting in **verse 17** when He says **“thou sayest, I am rich and increased with goods”**.

He then goes on to state plainly what their true spiritual state is **“thou art wretched, and miserable** (Vines: ‘pitiable’) **and poor** (Vines: ‘metaphorical use’: Cecil - to convey ‘spiritual poverty’) **and blind** (Vines: ‘metaphorical use’: Cecil - to convey ‘spiritual blindness/ignorance’) **and naked”** (Vines: ‘the carnal condition of a local church)

Earlier in **verse 16** the Lord describes this church as being **“lukewarm”** – according to Vines Dictionary this professing church in Laodicea **‘afforded no refreshment to the Lord such as is ministered naturally by either cold or hot water’**.

When it comes to his views on **‘the practice of homosexuality’** and his views on so-called **‘same-sex marriage’** Rick Warren certainly falls into the **‘lukewarm’** category. By his uncertain leadership (**“If the trumpet shall give an uncertain sound who shall prepare himself to the battle?” 1 Corinthians 14:8**) he is identified with those referred to by Paul in **2nd Timothy 3:13** **“evil men shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived”**. By his backtracking on his earlier biblically based comments Rick Warren is in little danger of suffering as Paul

outlined in the preceding verse in **2nd Timothy 3:12** “and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution”.

In the light of this ‘lukewarmness’ by Rick Warren, a so-called leading USA ‘evangelical’ pastor, the report of 9 January 2013 on this link [http://www.worldmag.com/2013/01/national\\_cathedral\\_to\\_host\\_gay\\_weddings](http://www.worldmag.com/2013/01/national_cathedral_to_host_gay_weddings) should really come as no surprise – that report reads

WASHINGTON—Evangelical policy groups are not surprised by the Washington National Cathedral’s announcement Wednesday that same-sex “wedding” ceremonies would be allowed at the 106-year old church.

“The Episcopal Church has been increasingly out of touch with Christian orthodoxy and the rest of the Anglican Communion worldwide for some time, and this only adds to that,” said Peter Sprigg of the Washington-based Family Research Council.

Last November, Maryland voters approved a same-sex “marriage” ballot initiative, joining the neighboring District of Columbia in legalizing such unions. In the aftermath of the Maryland ballot result, National Cathedral officials decided to start hosting such ceremonies effective immediately.

“As a kind of tall-steeple, public church in the nation’s capital, by saying we’re going to bless same-sex marriages, conduct same-sex marriages, we are really trying to take the next step for marriage equality in the nation and in the culture,” the Rev. Gary Hall, the cathedral’s dean, told the Associated Press.

The cathedral is the seat of The Episcopal Church and its 2 million members in the United States. But it also serves as a place of celebration and mourning for the nation’s larger faith community. It is where the national prayer service for this month’s presidential inauguration will occur, and it has hosted the state funerals for former Presidents Ronald Reagan and Gerald Ford. With hundreds of thousands of visitors to the National Cathedral each year, pro-gay “marriage” groups will herald this decision as a symbolic victory for their movement.

**The National Cathedral will offer a new rite of “marriage” for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender members that The Episcopal Church’s House of Bishops authorized last year.** The decision to use the new rite and the performing of same-sex “marriage” ceremonies is left to the discretion of the bishops overseeing each diocese within the larger church. The bishop of Washington, in charge of a diocese that covers the District of Columbia and four counties in Maryland, decided last month to allow the new expanded “marriage” rite. Last year, the bishops also voted to allow the ordination of transgendered persons. Such decisions have led some conservative Episcopal congregations to leave the denomination.

**The move by the National Cathedral comes one month after the first same-sex “wedding” performed at Cadet Chapel at the U.S. Military Academy in West Point, N.Y.** In November, voters in Maine and Washington joined Maryland to become the

first three states to approve a ballot initiative legalizing gay “marriage.” While same-sex “marriage” is now legal in nine states and the District of Columbia, the U.S. Supreme Court is scheduled to hear cases on the issue in March.

“We still have voter referendums in 30 states, including North Carolina last year, that define marriage as between a man and a woman,” said Sprigg. “That’s a very strong statement of public policy that will not be overturned anytime soon.”

Truly, and reverently speaking, our Lord’s stomach must be churning!

**Cecil Andrews – ‘Take Heed’ Ministries – 10 January 2013**