

THE GAY TAKEOVER IS ENTERING OUR CHURCH

I received the following letter, a few days ago, from the Northwest:

"Please read the enclosed article on Homosexuals! I have read your thoughts through the years and totally disagree with you! You come off as extremely homophobic!

"This is one, if not the best and most logical and loving articles I have ever read! And, believe me, it is a subject I have well studied through the years!

"My next step is to read her [Kate McLaughlin's] book!"—*Northwest [emphasis his]*.

For some reason, he decided to slip his card into the envelope. I had almost overlooked it. In large print were the names of two men (one of whom was his), living at the same address and phone. It was a personal, not a business, card. There was no firm name or address.

So I read the article. But be careful about letting your children read it! It will tell them that homosexuality is something they will always have, if that is the way they were born.

You will recall my tract set, *The Gay Agenda for the Seventh-day Adventist Church—Part 1-3 [WM-704-706, released in July 1996]*.

Well, the takeover is deepening.

Last night, I received a doleful telephone call from a friend in Iowa. He said the April 1997 issue of the *Review* settled the matter for him. In the strongest terms, he said it

was a signal that it was time for him to leave the denomination!

Is this the fruit that William Johnsson's publication is producing? Is this the objective of the editorial staff of the good old *Review*?

Are they trying to chase the faithful out of the church, in order to appease a few wealthy homos?

I asked my friend in Iowa which articles? He replied, Kate McLaughlin's article, "*Are Homosexuals God's Children?*" and Robert Folkenberg's "*Will the Real Evangelical Adventist Please Stand Up?*" (Did you know that *now* the good Adventists are the Evangelical ones? The article is a strong endorsement of salvation apart from obedience.)

Then this morning I received a phone call from another distressed friend. He said, "What are they trying to do? destroy the church?" I asked what he meant. He mentioned Kate McLaughlin's article, and then added that he got William Johnsson on the phone yesterday afternoon.

He said he started out by asking what had been the response to that article. Johnsson replied to the effect, "Oh, we've had a very good response!" Astonished that Johnsson would try to cover up what surely must have been a large number of negative complaints, my friend told him that he, Johnsson, was laying the foundations of utter ruin for the

Adventist Church.

Always gracious, Johnsson demurred, and said he and his associates were doing an excellent job at producing, what he called, a "new *Review*."

This latest article is not actually unique. In the last year we have had a number of articles in the *Review*, and in Adventist college and union papers, obliquely endorsing the gay lifestyle.

Yet the *Review* has especially led out in this trend. Is there any significance in the fact that these articles have especially made their appearance since the *Review* passed under General Conference control? That changeover occurred at the Utrecht Session. Prior to that time, for 146 years, the situation had been different. Control by the General Conference has accelerated the *Review's* journey into liberalism.

For over a decade, church leadership has extolled the new theology concept that we should be content to remain in our sins until Jesus returns and magically evaporates them.

But this has brought an increase in Sabbathbreaking, alcohol usage, sodomy, unnecessary adornment, and other practices. Read this:

"I attended college at three Adventist campuses. Homosexuality was present in the men's dormitories of each of those campuses. But

none of the deans knew about it; they seemed too busy coming up with worship talks designed to prepare us for life in the hereafter. From time to time a few rumors surfaced, and people would demonstrate a certain fascination with the subject for a while. But soon things would die down. Nothing could be proved. No one ever confessed.”—*Review, November 21, 1996.*

The above experience occurred a few years ago. But today the values of homosexuality are much more openly discussed on Adventist campuses. You will recall our study last spring (*Life at Walla Walla College—Part 1-4 [WM-676-679]*), which revealed the openness with which that faculty supported gays in their sins.

The January 22, 1993, issue of the *Campus Chronicle*, the student journal at Pacific Union College,

contained several articles on the subject (*see pages 6-7*), several by openly declared homosexuals.

These various Adventist articles on homosexuality contain certain unfortunate similarities:

1 - There is little or no condemnation of the practice itself. Indeed, the counsel given is that we should not look on those indulging these practices as particularly sinful, at least not any more than any other misdeed.

2 - Our concern should be to accept these people as they are rather than trying to change them.

3 - Homosexuality is not a choice; it is genetic. Gays were born that way, and therefore cannot forsake the practice.

4 - If we are good Christians, we will embrace, love, and accept them as they are. Doing so will increase

the level of unity and mutual understanding in the church, and help us all be better Christians. God fully accepts them as they are; we should also.

Anyone conversant with the gay agenda will recognize the source of these concepts. Although preached by gay organizations, they come from the father of lies. Such theories eliminate the need to obey the law of God and desolate the atonement of Christ. According to the theory, having accepted Christ, all the “Christian sinners” will go to heaven anyway. So we might as well have a closer fellowship with our fellow sinners during our earthly sojourn.

Consider these comments:

“Like being part of a racial minority in South Africa, being homosexual is being born ‘unlucky.’ Both are ge-

Though it should not be, the objectives of our leadership seem to be gradually moving closer to those of worldly organizations with a special sodomite agenda.

The U.S. Senate considered a bill last year, called the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA). It was pushed by homosexuals who bribed certain congressmen to bring it to the floor of Capitol Hill. Its backers included homosexuals; feminists; and their supporters, like Senator Ted Kennedy, to “protect” homosexuals from bias on the job.

But, in reality, ENDA is but another blatant attempt to destroy our society’s moral foundations. This bill, if enacted would have forced people to hire people with a variety of “sexual orientations,” including transvestites, pedophiles, and masochists. ENDA was voted down 50 to 49; one vote made the difference (another senator did not vote).

On the local and state level, the battle to give homosexuals “special rights” continues.

After the defeat of ENDA, Senator Ted Kennedy vowed to attach ENDA to every Senate bill in 1997 until the act passes.

The White House liaison to the homosexual lobby has been looking for a way to grant homosexual “couples” the same employment benefits as married men and women. Clinton is planning to bypass Congress and sign an executive order this

year, giving “domestic partners” of all homosexual federal employees the same benefits given to spouses in normal heterosexual marriages.

San Francisco now requires all firms doing business with that city to adopt the city’s pro-homosexual policy in their companies.

—And now, in 1997, ENDA is back. Recently a gay group, the Human Rights Campaign Fund, said that 47 senators have already committed to co-sponsor ENDA. They are planning to introduce it as an amendment to popular legislation, so it will quickly pass. Some may wish to phone their senator (202-224-3121) about this matter.

Even the churches are rapidly changing.

Detroit auxiliary Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, speaking at a symposium for homosexual Catholics, said this:

“I hope that within our church every gay person, every lesbian person, every bisexual person, or transgendered person will come out and speak up . . . I would say this especially to priests and bishops in our church.”—*quoted in Detroit News, March 14, 1997.*

Gumbleton’s comments received a standing ovation.

As we near press time, word has come in that 16 different bills, dealing with a variety of subjects, are pending in the California State legislature. Each one would give homosexuals additional preferential rights.

netic conditions that weren't asked for. Both are unalterable, and both permeate every aspect of life. But God rescued me from living a lifestyle of open homosexuality."—*Jeremy Van Dieman, Adventist Review, November 21, 1996, p. 9.*

"I don't care now that I was born homosexual or that the church wasn't there for me with answers when it could have made a difference. I now understand that even inherited tendencies to sin can be overcome."—*Op. cit., p. 11.*

He is right in that last sentence. Unlike some of the other more permissive articles we read in Adventism, in Jeremy's article, homosexuality was a problem that could be forsaken. —Yet the *Review* still printed his error, that it is a choiceless hereditary problem. It is not true that we are born with a chosen sin.

Originally, our denominational publications sounded like our evangelists: They denounced sin and pointed men to Jesus Christ as the only means of deliverance. They did not placate transgression and smooth it over.

But times have changed. We now find articles which call on us to empathize with gays and understand them just as they are.

The closest we come to the old-fashioned religion, is when, occasionally, an article is released giving "both sides." But we should have clear-cut articles on the right side, not ads for both sides.

Last summer, the *Review* printed such an article. Entitled "Gay Adventists—The Ultimate Oxymoron?" it fills an entire page with pro and con reasons on the subject. (You will find it reprinted on page 5). In the left column we find the correct position:

"Is it possible to be an adulterer and an Adventist? Or a murderer and an Adventist? My point remains the same: *either change your lifestyle or change your name!*"—*Gay Adventists—The Ultimate Oxymoron?* *Adventist Review, August 1996, p. 12, left column [italics*

hers].

In the right column we have a defense of homosexuality. It is classified as just another problem, like not paying the proper amount of income tax. So much so, that, the author claims, anyone who judges sodomites to be sinners—is doing wrong and should leave the Adventist denomination!

"... God is the ultimate judge and that He commands us to love, not to judge. When you come to that realization, then, and only then, will you be worthy of being called a Seventh-day Adventist. Until then, *maybe you should consider a name change.*"—*Op. cit., right column [italics theirs]*.

But is the "both sides" approach proper? Should our publishing houses present truth and error as two possible alternatives? Do we find defenses of both sides of sodomy in the Bible? No, we do not! People who are licentious need to be warned to flee to Christ and totally abandon their profligate ways, or they will be lost. No tame message dare be given. It is a life and death matter.

And now we come to the article, about which I received those phone calls: "Are Homosexuals God's Children?" by Kate McLaughlin. That title, plus the nearly 6 x 8 inch sketch of a man and woman furiously hugging, catches the readers attention.

This article is a hard-driving teaching device. The objective is to instill the concept that homosexuals are born that way and, although they may practice avoidance, they cannot change. The author implies that the church must change its teaching, as stated in the first paragraph, and accept sodomites as they are:

"If you had asked me nine years ago what I knew about homosexuals, I would have replied emphatically that they were disgusting men, depraved and perverted, who were obsessed with sex, and furthermore, that the Bible said they would not enter heaven."—*Kate McLaughlin, "Are Homosexuals God's Children?"*

Adventist Review, April 1997, p. 26.

According to McLaughlin (the reader is told it is the pseudonym of a pastor's wife), the above viewpoint is incorrect. —Yet is not that the position we find in the Bible? A practicing homosexual will not enter heaven.

Instead, McLaughlin teaches the reader that—

"Homosexuality is a *condition*, not a *behavior*. Whatever may cause a homosexual orientation, it is not something a person *chooses.*"—*Ibid. [italics hers]*.

McLaughlin, who says she published a book, entitled *My Son, Beloved Stranger*, amplifies on her thinking:

"The typical Christian answer to the dilemma of homosexuality is to pray that God will 'heal' the homosexual and restore him or her to heterosexuality.

"A person's sexual orientation has nothing to do with whether or not a person is a Christian.

"Are homosexuals God's children? Did not Jesus befriend prostitutes, including Mary Magdalene?

"As caring Christians, we can make special efforts to include homosexuals as warmly loved and appreciated members of our church family.

"I long to see our church take the lead in demonstrating Christian love and compassion for homosexuals, neither condemning them for an orientation over which they have no control, nor encouraging them to accept something less than God's best for their lives."—*Op. cit., pp. 27-29.*

The above teaching is rampant in the world today. The homosexual community is trying to win everyone over to it: *Love us as we are. Indeed, get acquainted, and you may want to join us.*

But there are deep theological implications here. Toleration for sin is a hallmark of Satan's plan to overcome individuals and entire churches. For centuries it has been fashionable to view sin as a problem that is

hopeless, something we cannot escape from:

- Catholicism speaks of “Original Sin,” which comes to a person at birth. Augustine invented that idea because he was an admitted sexual monomaniac, and needed a doctrinal way to explain it away (see *Augustine and His Strange Ideas [DH-3]* and *The Error of Original Sin [FF-27]*).

- The Reformed Churches teach the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, which also declares that a person cannot escape from his pre-determined sinful course.

- Modern Protestants and Adventist liberals loudly proclaim that no one can stop sinning until the Second Coming; therefore Christ did not take our nature, because, if He had, He would not have been able to keep Himself from committing sin either.

—But all these theological arguments are excuses for sin. Such theories only intensify sinful activity; they do not lessen it.

If it is true that we cannot stop sinning, then it is not necessary to obey the law of God—any of the Ten Commandments. If that be true, we should no longer preach it. We can break the Sabbath, commit adultery, blaspheme, and totally live like the world.

When people are told that all they need to do is verbally “accept Christ,” they are encouraged to glut in their sins, imagining for a time that they will inherit heaven.

The ramifications of this whole sin controversy are immense. And correctly so, for it all started in heaven when Lucifer said that God’s law was unjust and could not be obeyed. The controversy has raged ever since.

Those who want to remain in their sins can find a religious teaching which excuses it. But those who

want to be done with the hateful thing will find in Jesus Christ a wonderful Saviour who can forgive their past and, by His grace, enable them to live clean Godly lives.

Fortunately, although McLaughlin espouses hereditary sodomy, she believes it can be kept in abeyance. Yet she says gays can never marry and live normal lives.

The truth is that, although we can have tendencies to sin, we do not inherit sin. A person can inherit a weakness to gluttony, but he is not locked into being a glutton. In Christ’s strength, he can choose to be normal.

Christ can also enable His children to marry, live normal lives, and be affectionate to their spouses and children.

Before concluding this study, let us delve into the underlying problem: Let us examine the nature of homosexuality.

First, what are we born with?

We are born with tendencies, or leanings toward certain likes; and, during our lifetime, we choose additional leanings.

We are told, in the Spirit of Prophecy, that all inherited and cultivated tendencies to evil may be overcome.

A tendency is not sin. It is the *indulgence of that leaning* that is sin. Indeed, many tendencies can be made into great strengths. A person may have a tendency to quick decisions. He can either move toward impulsive, unwise decision-making and a hasty temper or he can temper it with caution and become a man of careful, but very decisive, action.

In contrast, sodomy is not a tendency, but a sin. A man may be born with certain leanings, but he is not born a glutton or a homosexual. That required later decisions on his part.

Man is born with a fallen nature,

with leanings toward sin, but he is not born a sinner. In the midst of a world filled with sin, his mother conceived him. In other words, Psalm 51:5 is saying that we are born with a fallen nature.

Second, how does the sin itself come into existence in a person’s life? Sodomy is not an inherited orientation, but a chosen possession. And when you select it, you become possessed.

When a person chooses to sin, a devil temporarily gains control of him. It may be for a few, brief, angry, hateful words spoken in wrath. At that moment, you can see the demon in his face. But then the demon is forced by the good angels to leave, so the person may once again select between the right and the wrong in this matter.

Or it may become a long-term matter. He may continue to rechoose anger, and repeatedly go into terrible rages. The demon is then permitted to remain within him, and settled hatred takes the place of a quick flash of anger.

This is also the explanation for this seemingly mysterious fascination some people have with the truly weird things that homosexuals do. I will not list those activities here, but they are most horrible, and involve very strange activities—and even beatings—which the devils tell them are pleasurable.

Can demon-possessed persons be delivered from the demons? Yes, but only by submitting to Christ and totally cooperating with the Holy Spirit in refusing to again do those things.

In 1980, friends we had known many years before stopped by to visit us. I had been publishing only about a year. Before departing, the wife came to me and asked me to pray for her brother. She said he was a homosexual. But, it was clear

THE GAY TAKEOVER IS ENTERING OUR CHURCH

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

from her words, he was different than some of them: *He wanted to quit*, although he did not know how to do so.

The Lord guided that I should tell her that homosexuality was demon possession. I said she should tell him to kneel down alone and give his life to God, totally. And—the thought came to mind—I added that she should tell her brother to command the demon to come out of him.

She later told me what followed. Upon hearing that, he knelt down alone in prayer, gave himself anew to God—and then commanded the demons to come out of him.

Immediately, he later told her, he could feel something coming up

and out of the top of his head, and a deep man's voice saying, "My name is Queer!"

And he was delivered!

We do not approve of the theatrics we sometimes hear about in deliverance sessions, but this occurred entirely alone. It is a decisive proof that the psychiatrists are wrong in declaring that "Jesus just treated mental illness; He did not really cast demons out of people. There is no such thing as demon possession."

And the young man avoided another potential danger of deliverance ministries: He combined the deliverance *with thereafter keeping the commandments of God by faith in Christ* (note the warning

given by Christ: Luke 11:24-26, but also read the context: verses 5-26. [Matthew 12:43-45 is the parallel passage]).

Only demon possession can explain the weird monomaniac fixation of hardened homosexuals. But they can receive forgiveness and power to overcome, just as all the rest of us can. The sin against the Holy Spirit is a persistent unwillingness to repent and submit oneself to God.

Whether or not they personally command the demons to flee, if they will sincerely, consistently surrender to Christ and obey His Word—He will chase out those devils!

This talk about certain sins being hopeless is not true.