

The Gay Agenda

for the Seventh-day Adventist Church

Part One of Three

This study is a brief overview of the origin and progress of the gay and lesbian movement in the Seventh-day Adventist denomination. We have printed relatively little on this topic over the years, other than a 1981 study (Adventist Homosexual Challenge—Part 1-2; April 1981) and a more recent gay longevity summary.

In this present analysis, we will try to summarize the earlier data, plus greatly enlarge on it.

Do not underestimate the challenge of Adventist-oriented homosexuals. They are determined that the church accept them as they are.

However, we will learn that the greater danger is from the hetero-

sexual liberals in our church, who wield much greater influence and are also working toward toleration for gays. The gay agenda is shared by our liberals. Salvation in sin—all types of sin—is part of the liberal creed.

Women's lib is the current fad in our denomination; further down the road, the call will be for the acceptance of practicing homosexuals.

Definitions in this field tend to be somewhat confused, but we will follow the usual pattern: By "homosexuals" or "gays," we mean men or women with that tendency. But "gays," in the phrase "gays and lesbians," refer to men. "Lesbians" mean

women homosexuals. "Male homosexuals" mean men only.

A "practicing homosexual" means one who regularly engages in homosexual activities. A "former homosexual" is one who no longer does those things.

Christians generally avoid discussing this topic, because it is so grotesque and unpleasant. But we need to know what is taking place in this segment of professed Adventism.

Oddly enough, it has been the arrival of AIDS which, alone, has weakened the growing strength of the gay movement.

Here is this special report. You will want to share it with those who need it:

HOW TO OVERCOME HOMOSEXUALITY

There is only one pathway to heaven, and it is the same one we must all take. You will find it outlined in the book, *Steps to Christ*. Whether you are a heterosexual or homosexual the solution is the same.

However, those who have personally known a practicing homosexual are aware that there is a strange, almost hypnotic quality gripping such people.

Confirmed gamblers have that same quality. So do alcoholics. Some people go to a horse race and win one bet—and are thereafter fevered. Later they lose their savings, their families, and their property. They act as if they are in a stupor, which they cannot shake off.

Several years ago, a couple visited us. I had known the wife in college. Before they left, she asked me to pray for her brother, who was a homosexual and could not seem to get out of it.

I told her I believed it was demon possession, and asked her to tell him to pray for the devil to be cast out.

A month or so later, she phoned and told me what had happened. She told her brother what I had said. In his case, he desperately wanted release—and no longer wanted anything to do with the perversion which gripped him. *That was the first key to success! He sincerely wanted out.*

All alone, he got on his knees and asked God for help. Then, in the name of Jesus Christ, he commanded the devil to come out of him.

He told his sister that, as he knelt there, he felt something coming up

and out through the top of his head; and he heard a distinct voice speak in a low, masculine, but horrible voice: "My name is queer!"

This experience occurred entirely alone, and cannot be attributed to sleight of hand or someone's tricks.

Her brother was delivered from the power of Satan, but henceforth had to conduct himself very carefully, and—as we all must do—humbly, continually relying on Jesus, so as not to fall back into sin. *Obedience thereafter, through continual reliance on Christ, was the other key to ongoing success.*

There is an answer. Trust and obey, for there's no other way, to be happy in Jesus, but to trust and obey.

— SECTION ONE —
HISTORICAL SURVEY

ORIGIN OF KINSHIP

In the mid-1970s, two or three Adventist-oriented homosexuals chipped in some money and placed classified ads in a number of widely circulated national homosexual magazines and newspapers. One ad stated in bold print: “*Am I the only gay Seventh-day Adventist?*”

The response was remarkably large; so much so, that the one who planned to answer the incoming mail could not handle it all by himself.

Prior to that time, Adventist homosexuals either remained quiet, left the church entirely, or joined the nearest *Metropolitan Community Church*. Those are nondenominational congregations, which practicing homosexuals attend so they can feel accepted by God, while continuing to practice sodomy. Over the centuries, many people have felt they were Christians, simply because they attended church once a week; this pattern of self-deception works effectively for homosexuals also. The first such congregation was founded in Los Angeles in the late 1960s by Troy Perry. One of his closest associates in organizing it was a former Seventh-day Adventist.

In response to a newspaper ad, in early January 1977, a number of homosexuals met in Palm Desert, California. As they do in all their meetings, they had a pleasurable time together. But, they also laid the groundwork for an organization of Adventist homosexuals. They named it “*Kinship*.”

By April, it had 75 members, a temporary chairman, and four committees: membership, educational, social, and spiritual.

All this may sound remarkable to a non-homosexual. But do not underestimate these folk: They fully believe they can regularly practice sodomy, and yet by saved by Jesus Christ and taken to heaven. (Yet, deep down, their consciences tell them it is not true—and this produces a continual conflict.)

They also believe they should be accepted by the Adventist denomination as fellow believers who are redeemed. Their practices should be accepted as variant, but acceptable Christian practices.

Back then, the members of Kinship lived almost entirely in southern California. They met two Sabbaths a month for a worship service, to be followed by social activities afterward. From time to time they would go camping, etc., together. But, by 1980, as stated in their newsletter, the number of their activities had broadened:

“Local and national activities throughout the year include retreats, picnics, chapter meetings, potlucks, worship, various social gatherings, and an annual Kampmeeting. These gatherings are places where gays and lesbians can interact, new friendships can be made, and feelings of ‘being the only one’ can be dissolved.”—*SDA Kinship, October 1980*.

The first chapter outside of California opened in Chicago. Kinship leaders hoped to extend their joyful fellowship throughout Adventist churches worldwide.

In March 1981, the organization was incorporated as “*Seventh-day Adventist Kinship International, Inc.*” To this day, it continues to be described as “*An Organization for Gay Seventh-day Adventists and their Friends.*”

By the end of that year, its mailing list in 10 countries included about 500 inquirers or members. By their own statement, the number of professionals in their ranks is higher than one would expect. According to Kinship, a number of their contacts and members are denominational employees. They note that most gays with denominational employment use pseudonyms and post office boxes in their written correspondence with Kinship. Nearly all members are or have been Seventh-day Adventists. Many left the church as young adults, but some went on to become denominational workers. As such, they are generally married to

give a semblance of normality to their lives.

It is such folk who are especially dangerous, for they do what they can, on church boards and in committees, to foster the work of Kinship and try to get homosexuality accepted by our church.

Because there is such strong hostility among normal Adventists toward such activities, gay and lesbians in the church are generally very careful to not disclose their true role identities.

THE FIRST KAMPMEETING

In 1980, at a Kinship board meeting, the idea of holding a gay and lesbian campmeeting was first discussed. It was then suggested that it would be good to get some church leaders to speak at their forthcoming “kampmeeting” (that is how they spell it), for this would give their organization more of a semblance of acceptance by the denomination.

Certain kinship members, who had parents in high places in the church, carefully made approaches. The response was good. On one hand, there were those leaders who were either themselves homosexual, or had gay sons or daughters. On the other, there were faithful ministers who naively imagined that official contacts with Kinship might help rescue those people from a terrible bewitchment.

But the viewpoint of Kinship was not clearly perceived. They did not want redemption from sin, but acceptance in their sin!

Not yet aware of that fact, the General Conference executive committee met to discuss the request that representatives from the church be sent to speak at the forthcoming Kinship gathering in Arizona.

Most of those at that committee meeting recognized that to do so, was but a step away from showing acceptance of Kinship and its practices. But Neal C. Wilson, GC president at the time, thought it would be a good idea. His thinking was that such a contact might help reach these poor people and help them out of their per-

version. Most of the others felt the negatives outweighed the positives. But Wilson prevailed, as he generally did.

Through furtive contacts, Kinship already knew exactly which church representatives to invite to their first national gathering.

That first Kinship Kampmeeting was held in early August 1980, at a ranch-type resort near Payson, Arizona. (No, it had nothing to do with Leaves of Autumn Books; the selection of the Payson area was coincidental.)

Only 35 homosexuals dared show their faces, but they were comforted on their arrival by the fact that the General Conference had approved the sending of six Adventist “scholars and pastors” to speak with them. Perhaps those six could offer them solace and comfort.

These six were as follows:

Josephine Benton, woman pastor of the Rockville, Maryland, Church. She was the first female senior pastor of an Adventist church. And, according to reports in the Kinship newsletter, known to be remarkably tolerant toward the homosexuals who attended her very liberal church.

James J. Cox, at the time a New Testament professor at Avondale College, in Australia. By that early date, Avondale was already well on its way toward attaining the distinction of becoming the leading homosexual center for Adventism in Australia and New Zealand.

Lawrence T. Geraty, then an Old Testament and archaeology teacher at the SDA Theological Seminary in Berrien Springs, Michigan. (Currently [1995] he is president of La Sierra University, and one of the leading advocates of women’s ordination in our denomination. *See our recent study, La Sierra University Church Ordains Women Ministers [WM-663-665].*)

Fritz Guy, at that time theology professor at the Seminary (also a strong new theology and women’s ordination advocate; recently the president of La Sierra University).

James Londis, at the time pastor of the Sligo SDA Church in Takoma Park, Maryland.

Thus, three (Cox, Geraty and Guy) came as “Biblical scholars,” and two (Benton and Londis) as “pastors.”

But there was also a sixth person who came; this one with an entirely different perspective.

Colin Cook was a counselor at the Green Hills Health Center in Reading, Pennsylvania, and formerly an Adventist pastor in England and America.

While the other five were warmly received by the homosexuals in attendance at the Payson meetings, Cook’s welcome rapidly wore off.

You see, Cook came with a different message, and it jarred the spirits of those suffering ones. Repeatedly, gays stood to their feet during the meetings to tell of sad experiences by Adventist friends and relatives, who were offended at their practices. They said they wanted help, but the help they wanted was acceptance.

To such a tearful gathering, Colin Cook came with a message of freedom in Christ. He told the assembled gathering that, through the enabling grace of God,—they could forsake those homosexual practices!

In marked contrast, the other five brought “comfort and encouragement” to the gathering, and told them to spread a message of good news to other Adventist-oriented homosexuals elsewhere. What was the good news? It was that God loves homosexuals just as they are. Period.

With the partial exception of Fritz Guy, the five gave no talk of self-control or changes required. Come to God as you are, accept Him and He accepts you—as you are, to stay as you are. “You suffering souls, it is difficult to change, so God accepts you as you are. Your actions do not change His love and acceptance. He is working out your salvation; you have but to rest in His love.”

Of course, such a message is salvation in sin, but we should not be surprised, for that is the message of the new theology, regarding all other

sinful practices: “God accepts you as you are. Do not try to put away sin, for that would be legalism and you will be lost. Instead, just accept His love, and you are going to be saved.”

But Colin Cook was different. He had been a homosexual who, for a number of years, had been an Adventist minister, who had later been dropped because of his perversion. But later he pled with Christ—and was delivered from that lifestyle.

Following that deliverance, Cook became a crusader, intent on trying to pull other Adventist gays and lesbians out of this road which leads to hellfire.

So when Cook spoke at the Kampmeeting, he gave a clear-cut message: You must forsake sodomy or you will be lost! You can come to Christ, and He will deliver you from it. You can become a new creature through the power of God.

But there were other messages presented at the gathering which were far different:

The Bible does not condemn homosexuality. It is just an alternative lifestyle. God will save you, even though, in sexual practices, you are different than other people. Be comforted, be comforted! All is well!

The other five said they were heterosexual (not homosexual), while Cook said he had been one. The others brought messages of comfort, while Cook brought a warning to change—and a way to do so.

The Arizona Kampmeeting was a turning point. For the first time, Adventist homosexuals had been given an acceptable theology which nicely covered over sin. And for the first time, they learned that they had powerful friends in the church who would work to help them in the future.

—*More on the messages presented at that 1980 Kampmeeting later in this report.*

At various sessions of the Kampmeeting, many arose to their feet to express their frustration with their treatment by church members and local congregations. They were made to feel as if they were sinners!

They said it was all very heart-wrenching. Five of the representatives from the General Conference sympathized with their trial. All six were confronted by intensive question and answer periods.

It is an interesting fact that homosexuals live with a strong sense of guilt and condemnation. They cannot understand why this should be, and attribute it to society, cultural mores, and organized religion. The truth is that the voice of the Holy Spirit speaks to them through their consciences, convicting them that they are doing wrong and need to repent—or they will be eternally lost.

Reading in their literature, one will find continual efforts to excuse and justify their conduct as “just an alternate lifestyle.” Yet that still, small voice keeps speaking to them, warning, ever warning.

The fact that there were leading representatives of the church, who believed practicing homosexuals could be saved, brought great relief and encouragement to most of those who attended the week-long session near Payson.

Yet, tragically, it was a false hope, an unfounded encouragement. It matters not what men may propound about sodomy; it is still condemned by the Word of God.

Men and women have since died of AIDS, who might have lived and rejoiced in God’s saving power. But they were encouraged to remain in their beds of licentiousness.

The Andrews University student newspaper later reported on other events at the Payson meetings:

“Workshop topics for Kampmeeting included, ‘It’s OK to be Gay,’ ‘Ethics for Gay and SDA,’ ‘Relationships,’ and ‘Being Gay and SDA’ . . . Also on the agenda of Kinship’s Kampmeeting was the election and enlargement of the board of directors from five to sixteen, reflecting the growth of Kinship in the past year.”—*Student Movement, October 15, 1980.*

CHURCH ACTIONS

In the fall of 1980, following the Payson meeting, the six representa-

tives were asked to report back to the General Conference on what had transpired there.

As reported in the October 1980 issue of *SDA Kinship* (Kinship’s monthly newsletter) and the April 1982 issue of *Spectrum* (a liberal quarterly), they told the executive committee that the homosexuals had made nine requests of the church:

- (1) A new analysis by the Biblical Research Institute of the subject.
- (2) Balanced articles in church papers on the subject.
- (3) Balanced sex education programs in our schools.
- (4) Balanced reading lists prepared for all grades of Adventist education.
- (5) Balanced guidelines prepared for pastors working with homosexuals.
- (6) Preparation of a list of sympathetic church pastors and teachers, which young people with these tendencies could go to for counsel and encouragement.
- (7) The setting up of telephone hot lines, which young people could call in complete confidentiality.
- (8) Recognition of Kinship as an organization, which members with these tendencies could be directed to for guidance and help.
- (9) The appointment of Josephine Benton and Lawrence Geraty as special chaplains to Kinship. Apparently, of the five, they were the most comforting.

After vigorous discussion, the General Conference executive committee voted to approve the first seven requests, but not the last two.

The reasoning was that approving the last two might indicate church approval of Kinship.

But, in view of the fact that Kinship had urgently asked that Benton and Geraty henceforth be their chaplains, the two were told they could still be Kinship “chaplains” if they wished, as long as it was agreeable to their employers. Whether any official approval was ever given, we are not certain. However, certain later newsletter comments indicate it was given.

You will notice that Colin Cook, with his heartfelt appeals to forsake sodomy in the strength of Christ, was not wanted by Kinship as a chaplain.

That is significant. A different kind of spiritual peace was desired. Men and women were choosing their own destruction.

Kinship, in its monthly newsletter, revealed the general tenor of the report, given by the six to the General Conference executive committee, and noted how it concluded:

“The report ended with the following quotation from a letter Mrs. White wrote to G.I. Butler, president of the General Conference, dated April 21, 1887:

“ ‘I wish that we had much more of the Spirit of Christ and a great deal less of self and less of human opinion. If we err, let it be on the side of mercy rather than on the side of condemnation and harsh dealing.’ ”—*SDA Kinship, October 1980, Vol. 3, No. 4.*

We agree: *More Bible truth* and *less human opinion* is needed. *More mercy* that warns the sinner to flee from the devil, while there is still opportunity. It is the worst cruelty to comfort a sinner in his sins.

Over the next few months and years, a number of notices, alerting our young people to Kinship (and contacts with gays through it), were published in our various college student newspapers. Phone numbers and addresses were included, so the students could contact Kinship and learn how to enjoy salvation in sin. (Two examples: the November 15, 1980 issue of the Canadian Union College newspaper, the *Aurora*, and the October 15, 1980 issue of the Andrews University newspaper, *Student Movement*.)

Subsequently, a large part of the September 1981 issue of *Ministry* magazine was devoted to “*Homosexual Healing*.” It featured a 10-page interview with Colin Cook, by editor Robert Spangler; a 3-page study by Raoul Dederen, professor of historical theology at the Seminary; and an editorial by Spangler.

In addition, the General Confer-

Continued on the next tract

More WAYMARKS - from —

PILGRIMS REST

HCR 77, BOX 38A - BEERSHEBA SPRINGS, TN 37305

The Gay Agenda

for the Seventh-day Adventist Church

Part Two of Three

Continued from the preceding tract in this series —————

ence appropriated a sizeable amount of money to help establish Quest Learning Center, in Reading, Pennsylvania. That was a step in a good direction.

Headed by Colin Cook, the objective of this halfway house was to take in Adventist homosexuals and help them escape the seductive power of Satan. Although misunderstood by Kinship, Cook's intentions were sincere. Kinship wanted happy fellowship and church homes for homosexuals preoccupied with their perversions. In contrast, Cook wanted to get rid of homosexuality.

LATER IN THE 1980s

In the fall of 1981, a second Kampmeeting was held; this one in northern California. While the church was not asked to send representatives, five scholars and pastors met with the Kinship group. (It may have been the same five; but of this we do not have clarity.) We do know that their studies were new theology—and greatly cheered the homosexuals with the forgiving love of God for sinners who loved their sins more than they loved God.

By the spring of 1982, eight regional Kinship groups had been organized in North America. In addition, a fast-growing group was started in Australia.

Throughout the 1980s, there was sporadic growth. In the early mid-80s, a schism occurred which nearly wrecked Kinship. But the splinter gradually died out.

One cheering note to Kinship members was the fall of Colin Cook later in that decade. He had been di-

rector of the Quest Center, but was overcome by temptation as he counseled young men who came to Quest for help in escaping sodomy.

Eventually, this fall came to light and Cook was discharged from Quest. We have heard nothing about the project in later years, and assume it probably closed down.

A report at the time in the liberal journal, *Spectrum*, was gleeful. Here the one who said God could help people overcome homosexuality—had been overcome himself.

Christians sorrow when someone falls into sin, but the wicked rejoice. *Spectrum* rejoiced very, very much. One would think it was homosexuality on their part which had been reprobated by Cook.

In the January-February 1981 issue of their monthly sheet, "*SDA Kinship*," they predicted that word had been received that a very favorable article about Kinship and gays would probably be printed soon in *Spectrum*.

"It is possible that *Spectrum*, the periodical of the Association of Adventist Forums, will be publishing a series of positive articles on homosexuality in the near future. It would be good that we all subscribe to this newsworthy magazine. Beside its possible positive support of our own life-styles, it is very informative on all crucial views and attitudes of today."—*SDA Kinship, January-February 1981, Vol. 4, No. 17.*

In the April 1982 (Vol. 12, No. 3) issue of *Spectrum*, two favorable articles appeared.

What has happened to Colin Cook in the years since, we do not know. Perhaps he found his way back

to God. We would hope so.

THE KINSHIP LAWSUIT

Then came the Kinship Lawsuit, which the present writer reported on at length in April and December 1991.

For a number of years, Neal C. Wilson, GC president, had been fascinated with the idea of eliminating independent ministries by throwing trademark lawsuits at them.

Such an action, of course, parallels predicted coercion of the government, by Protestantism, at the time of the National Sunday Law enactment:

"When the leading churches of the United States . . . shall influence the state to enforce their decrees and to sustain their institutions, then Protestant America will have formed an image of the Roman hierarchy, and the infliction of civil penalties upon dissenters will inevitably result."—*Great Controversy, 445.*

The lawyer supervising those various trademark lawsuits, for the General Conference, was Vincent Ramik, a Roman Catholic attorney (*see Review, September 17, 1981 for verification; reprinted in several of our earlier papers*). He bragged over the phone, to a lady in southern Indiana, that he had already "put 35 [independent Adventist ministries] out of business."

But when the church, working through high-priced Ramik and his fleet of local attorneys, took on an eleven-member church in Hawaii (*suit filed April 19, 1987*), they ran into trouble. Max Corbett, a faithful Adventist attorney living in Houston, came to the rescue of the beleaguered group.

As a result, a blizzard of legal papers flew back and forth for several years, rejoicing the hearts of the Honolulu attorneys who reaped hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal fees from the General Conference. It is our understanding that the Hawaii suit, alone, cost our world headquarters over \$700,000.

The Hawaii suit greatly hurt the General Conference financially. Since then, it has had repeated financial cutbacks and layoffs. But it was the Kinship suit which brought it down legally. It came about in this way:

The General Conference was losing favor with the membership, because of those trademark lawsuits, in which it tried to use the power of the civil government to fine or imprison anyone taking the name, "*Seventh-day Adventist*," without its permission. So Wilson, who had become disenchanted with Kinship, got the bright idea of suing it. Surely, a majority of church members would approve of refusing such a den of sinners the use of our name!

But leaders at world headquarters forgot something: Homosexuals have a lot of discretionary income, and they will, on occasion, come to one another's aid.

When the suit was filed, big money came into play to defend Kinship. Homosexual organizations around the country were willing to chip in; topflight lawyers were retained. "Gay rights" was the name of the game, and they were glad to help Adventist gays get theirs.

In addition, there were enough homosexuals in high places in church work, that they could work in various ways to compromise the situation. I was personally told this by a key player in the suit. Every decision made at world headquarters—was immediately phoned to the attorneys retained by Kinship.

In the initial hearing, on February 26-27, 1990, the U.S. District judge, in Los Angeles (Mariana R. Pfaelzer), noted that some Adventist homosexuals were treated well by the church, because of their professional standing and big tithe checks, while

others elsewhere were disfellowshipped and treated shabbily. This differential treatment disturbed her. But she showed special concern over the possibility that this might not be a trademark suit, but an attempt to deny free speech—and thus a First Amendment violation by the church.

After a second hearing (March 27, 1981), the final judgment, issued in October 1991, decreed that most anyone had a right to call himself a "Seventh-day Adventist." (*See our various trademark tractbooks; and especially note "Kinship Court Trial—Part 1-2 [WM-335-336] and "Kinship Case Decision" [WM-371].*)

Although the judge specifically ruled that the term, "Seventh-day Adventist Church," was not included in the ruling, yet church leaders quietly recognized that their doom would be sealed if they tried to start anymore trademark lawsuits. The next court case would probably extend Judge Pfaelzer's decision to the "*Seventh-day Adventist Church*."

And no more were begun.

So never say the homosexuals did nothing to help historic believers. In the providence of God, in this one instance, the outcome of their battle with leadership greatly helped the rest of us.

The number of paid memberships in Kinship has varied over the years from 200 to 900. The current membership is at the lower end (about 400). We predict that (due to a combination of the comforting new theology, which encourages deviant sex and AIDS, which destroys those practicing it) that membership will keep dropping. Homosexuals are dying off!

In addition to those on the membership rolls, there have been 2,000 to 3,000 others who have, over the years, contacted Kinship, attended meetings, or donated money.

From 1982 to 1988, Robert Bouchard, an attorney in New York City, was president of Kinship. Another past president was Michael McLaughlin. Vern Schlenker, Jr., was elected president during the Payson gathering, replacing Ben Pickell, Jr. The current

president [1995] is Darin Olson.

Two other developments at the Payson Kampmeeting was the enlargement of the Kinship board of directors, from 2 to 17, and the appointment of Ronald Lawson of New York, as the special liaison to the denomination's administrators. He must have done his job well; for, to this day, he still holds that position in Kinship. He could tell some interesting stories.

THE OREGON KAMPMEETING

Yearly Kinship Kampmeetings and frequent weekend gatherings continue to be held. The most recent annual meeting was held last August in a location in the Columbia Gorge, east of Portland, Oregon. We are told that the primary topic of discussion at such gatherings is no longer, as at Payson in 1980, how to ignore the voice of conscience.

Now it is how to solve the AIDS problem! Life for practicing homosexuals has greatly changed since 1980!

All about them, friends and "lovers" are dying.

How to avoid AIDS? What to do when you get it? How can you help friends who have it? Where do you go to find sympathetic AIDS specialists? How can we get more government money when we have full-blown AIDS? What is the best way to arrange burial services?

Pleasant topics, these. But always they drift back to a special question: How can I have sex without get AIDS?

Far better to discuss how to stop having illicit sex! But Colin Cook's pleadings were not for them. And now they are dying.

The first Friday night at the Columbia Gorge meeting, an emotional memorial service was held for "friends and lovers" who have already died of AIDS. It was mentioned that 56 have already died, two within the previous few weeks. Each year, the number increases.

Ron Lawson, Kinship's church liaison, stated that AIDS is the overwhelming concern of every homosexual

group—everywhere.

Those poor folk need to be led to Christ, but Kinship stands as a barrier. It steadfastly maintains that homosexuality is an inbuilt factor (genetics, you know) which cannot be changed, and that there is no such thing as guilt, only cultural inhibitions.

With such an outlook, their “kin-folk” are not inclined to want to stop doing the vile things which result in AIDS.

— SECTION TWO —

LIBERAL TEACHINGS

We have already discussed what Colin Cook taught at that 1980 Kampmeeting near Payson, Arizona.

His message is significant, not only for its agreement with Scripture, but also for its rejection by Kinship.

Yet the other presentations were, if possible, even more significant. For they reveal a secret part of the agenda for our church. Yes, it is an agenda by gays, but also by our own new theology liberals.

Salvation in sin and women’s ordination is only part of the program of events the liberals have in store for us. Acceptance of homosexuality as a practical alternate lifestyle is another.

A special concern to the gays and lesbians are the “seven homosexual texts” which condemn their lifestyle. If they could just reason away Scripture, they imagine that all their problems would be solved.

“Pastors, educators, and authors throughout our country are re-examining this powerful subject, and deciding that perhaps the Bible was never intended to be an official guidebook on human sexuality.

“Careful studies are being made in the original texts of the “Seven Homosexual Scriptures” with many positive things happening and new insights being gained.”—*SDA Kinship*, October 1980.

The above words were written a few weeks after Kinship leaders, attending the Payson meetings, heard Geraty, from Andrews, and Cox, from Avondale, doing their best to explain away homosexuality—as a relatively in-

nocent, harmless sexual pastime.

In the past, Kinship headquarters had a helpful source of rationalizations and a library, full of pro-gay publications which Kinship kept in stock for loaning to its members. First and foremost, Kinship had to keep its members believing in the worth of homosexuality.

“Kinship maintains a well-stocked library of books, journals and periodicals concerning gays and the church. Many such publications are available for your enlightenment, and will undoubtedly free you of much guilt you may have borne throughout your lifetime.”—*Ibid*.

But, as of August 1980, when the Payson meetings convened, they also had Adventist Bible teachers telling them that their actions were acceptable to God, and not condemned by His Word.

Here is a brief overview of the presentations of each of the five/six representatives to the Payson Kampmeeting:

JAMES LONDIS

Londis felt that church pastors were too unacquainted with gays to be able to properly understand, much less help them. He said that, instead of sympathizing with homosexuals, too many church members and workers condemned them as sinners—and this drove some to suicide. Pastors needed to be educated, Londis said.

JOSEPHINE BENTON

Josephine Benton is famous in feminist circles as the first women pastor in our denomination. Although not as well-known among heterosexuals, she was also very favorable to homosexuality. She herself was “a happily married heterosexual,” but her report at Payson and a comment in the Kinship newsletter revealed she considered the gay lifestyle quite acceptable in others.

The January-February 1981 issue of *SDA Kinship*, included a letter from a young homosexual who had found solace each week in attending Josephine Benton’s church in Rockville, Maryland (not far from General Conference headquarters in

Takoma Park). It is clear from what he wrote that Benton approved of his sexual perversion as a practice which would not keep him out of heaven:

“When I came to Rockville, I found acceptance, even in my desire to have an intimate relationship with another man. I have been given hope that because I believe in Christ’s sacrifice for my sinful nature, God is able to accept me where I am and work with me from there. While I am not entirely convinced of my acceptance before God as a homosexual, I have been given a ray of hope by the nurturing power of the love which has emanated from the Rockville SDA congregation.”—*SDA Kinship*, January-February 1981, Vol. 4, Number 17.

At Payson, she said:

“Would God require a whole group of people either to change orientation or be celibate when they didn’t choose their orientation, and statistics say perhaps only four percent could change even with extensive counseling?”—*Josephine Benton*, quoted in *Elvin Benton*, “Adventists Face Homosexuality,” *Spectrum*, April 1982.

It is clear from the above quotation that Benton adheres to the locked-in genetic theory, as the cause of homosexuality. When a choice must be made, she also considers it better to practice sex in sin, rather than not practice it at all.

The present writer was intrigued by the fact that the above *Spectrum* article was authored by an “Elvin Benton, the religious liberty secretary for the Columbia Union.”

Checking back into our archives, we found that, in 1979, Elvin Benton and Mrs. Josephine Benton both lived at 8507 Hood Street, Takoma Park. The author of this very favorable article about homosexuals is probably Mrs. Benton’s husband. Because of its clear familiarity with the Payson gathering, there is the very real possibility that she wrote the article, under her husband’s name.

FRITZ GUY

According to Fritz Guy, not only do we need to understand exactly what the Bible meant in the homo-

sexual passages, but we need to know whether homosexual acts done today—are what is condemned in Scripture.

He also noted that gays probably inherit their traits, so they can do little about them anyway.

Fortunately, he did mention that everyone is responsible for his or her actions.

LAWRENCE GERATY

We discover that Lawrence Geraty—today one of the most outspoken proponents of women's ordination—back in 1980 was rationalizing away the Bible in an attempt to prove that God never did condemn homosexuality!

Read this—and see how Geraty explains away Scripture. “Benton” is writing:

“What began to be clear [at Payson], as the theologians got into their presentations, was that a simplistic English reading of the few scriptural references to homosexual acts would not suffice to determine the Lord's will for homosexual persons today. Indeed, the theologians themselves admitted that until recently they were not well informed. ‘Abysmally ignorant,’ one called himself. ‘Part of the problem’ (of misunderstanding gay people), admitted another. All freely conceded that their studies were not yet complete and that some questions might never have absolute answers.

“Lawrence Geraty undertook to examine the scriptural references to homosexuality in the area of his expertise—the Old Testament. ‘Pejorative [derogatory, disparaging] references there to homosexual acts,’ said Geraty, ‘may not be so hard to understand, but how they apply can be learned only in the human situation.’

“According to Geraty, the Sodom story [Genesis 18:1-19:29], for example, clearly refers to sexual acts, but the acts seem primarily to stem not from homosexual passion but from intent to degrade Lot's angelic visitors to the lowly level of women, who were then considered little more than chattels.”—*“Adventists Face Homosexuality,” Spectrum, April 1982.*

Geraty said that the sin of the sodomites was not homosexuality, but mistreating angels!

Yet a chapter earlier, Christ told Abraham that He was going to destroy Sodom because of its great wickedness—before the angels went there in human form! (Genesis 18-19).

Geraty then decides that other apparent prohibitions against sexual immorality, in the Old Testament, may only have been “ceremonial laws” which were later done away with!

“References to homosexual acts in the Levitical ‘holiness code’ have been read by religious people to make moral judgment against those acts. However, noted Geraty, other parts of the same code, such as rules against sexual intercourse during menstruation and against mixing dissimilar fabrics in the same garment, are substantially ignored. Geraty observed that theologians, arguing that some of the holiness code rules are moral and some only ceremonial, have justified these divisions of the Levitical admonitions, but that a careful biblical scholar wouldn't divide them in this fashion. If any can be ignored, perhaps none should be considered binding.”—*Ibid.*

That is a classic example of explaining away Scripture! According to Geraty, sodomy is acceptable to God, and our error has been in misunderstanding the meaning of the Bible. Fortunately, we have theologians like Geraty to reinterpret it for us.

May our guardian angels protect us from the theologians! The path of sin leads to the abyss, and the theologians seem intent on leading us down it.

“Geraty's bottom-line conclusion: that the Old Testament by itself is not sufficient to settle the question of the morality of homosexual relationships in today's world.”—*Ibid.*

JAMES COX

James Cox, from Avondale, also set to work to destroy the plain teachings of Scripture.

Here is a masterful statement of

deception, as summarized by “Benton”:

“James Cox began his presentation with a remarkably concise statement that there are no terms either in Old Testament Hebrew or New Testament Greek that precisely equal our English words ‘homosexuality’ or ‘heterosexuality.’ In fact, Cox asserted, there is no discussion in scripture of homosexual orientation. While there is mention of certain homosexual acts unacceptable in the Christian community, none is defined with sufficient specificity for us to know exactly what is being described.”—*Ibid.*

This is astounding! Those poor gays come to the church for help, and it sends representatives who tell them to relax and enjoy their undefined sins.

“Cox pointed to clear New Testament disapproval of some kinds of sexual acts, both homosexual and heterosexual, even if determining exactly what those acts were is difficult. What is clear, Cox maintained, is that sexual acts growing out of lust—misusing people—were patently unacceptable.

“Cox closed his presentation by noting that neither Jesus nor Ellen White said anything explicitly about the issue of the morality of homosexuality. Perhaps, Cox suggested, a question worth exploring is how to be sexually responsible.”—*Ibid.*

“Perhaps,” Cox said.

With a man like that in the Bible department at our Australian college, it is little wonder that in the later 1980s we have received reports about the remarkable toleration of sodomy at that institution.

As I recall, Cox was later appointed to the presidency of Avondale College. Because of his encouragement to continue in sin, many who took Cox's advice have since died of AIDS.

By the time the Payson meetings ended, the leaders at Kinship knew they had solid friends in high positions in the denomination who were trying to get them jobs and, espe-

The Gay Agenda for the Seventh-day Adventist Church

Part Three of Three

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

cially, acceptance.

“For gays and lesbians having difficulty with their home church because of their sexual orientation they do not have to fight it alone. There is now strong support from sympathetic pastors, chaplains and other Kingship members.”—*SDA Kinship*, October 1980.

The following poem, printed in the January-February 1981 issue of *SDA Kinship*, reveals both the fascination of Kinship living and their continual attempt to convince themselves that their sodomy is precious in the sight of God:

Filling the Hollow Space

You fill the hollow space
That exists at the center
of my soul.
When you hold me
In your gentle embrace
I feel as though the whole universe
Could not contain the love
I have for you.
You are my life—
My primary reason for living;
Without you
I would be an empty shell.
My emotions would be lost,
Wandering in an abyss
of loneliness.
But loneliness has departed
Since you have come
And I think God knew
That would happen
When He gave you to me.
And I suspect that His joy
Is as great as mine.—*D.F.*

In a separate study, released at the same time as this one, we will pro-

vide you with an in-depth Bible study on homosexuality.

Friend, the Bible does condemn those perverted activities. But it also holds out hope for all those who wish to take hold of the strength of Christ, be forgiven of their sins, turn from them, and live a new, free, clean life in Him.

It is an interesting fact that such devoted poetry is generally not genuinely sincere. As a rule, there is little or no loyalty among gays. They frequently change partners.

REPLY TO THE LIBERALS

In their presentations, the five General Conference representatives noted several points which deserve replies:

1 - Benton said that a person is deprived who does not have sex. He must have an outlet for it. Fritz Guy implied the same thought.

The truth is that sex is something you are only to give your married, heterosexual spouse. Otherwise you are to have nothing to do with it.

Not to engage in sex is not deprivation. It is simply not carrying out an extraneous body function. People are not animals, that they must have sex.

I recognize I will be called a prude or some such term for saying that. I first ran into that kind of attitude in public high school. Any person who will live a clean life and defend right principles will be ridiculed. But right is right, regardless of how few will openly defend it.

This does not mean that we are able, of ourselves, to resist the wiles of the devil. We must flee to Christ. Sheltered in the Rock, we are empow-

ered by His grace to resist all the temptations of the devil and to come off conqueror.

2 - Benton said that, because a person must have an outlet for sex, it is better to indulge in homosexual relationships, than to abstain from sexual activity.

We are to do right because it is right, regardless of our passing feelings. It is better to die than to do a wrong act.

Seventh-day Adventist teachers and pastors who instruct others that it is all right to sin, should be fired.

Several years ago, I came across a little poem. It is easy to memorize and hard to forget:

Feelings come and feelings go,
And feelings are deceiving;
I stand alone on the Word
of God,
Naught else is worth believing.

Those in our church, who cannot trust their lives to God and His Word, should get out of the church and stop being a decoy of Satan to others.

3 - Londis and others said that it is ignorance of homosexuals by others that causes the problems of homosexuals.

If I overeat or lose my temper, it is my own fault. I cannot blame others for my lapses. The help comes from Christ, not from others.

4 - Londis said that telling gays they are sinning causes them to feel unhappy and sometimes suicidal.

If a man is ready to fall over a cliff, we warn him of the dangers of the cliff and we tell him how to get back away from it.

It is right to give the warnings; but, in the process, we must point the sinner to Jesus who alone can bring deliverance.

5 - According to Josephine Benton and Fritz Guy, gays cannot help their condition. It is inherited and in their genes, and they are locked into it.

Sinful tendencies can be inherited or acquired, but the actual commission of sin is always our choice. This is the teaching of the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy. All inherited or cultivated tendencies to wrongdoing can be overcome.

We never have to sin. There is never a valid excuse for it. To excuse it is to defend it.

6 - Benton said that, although God could change anyone, He does not often do so. The implication is that it is necessary to sin because God does not do His part.

Whenever one's heart is still lingering on sin and loving the sinful deed, God will not work a miracle to deliver him from going ahead and indulging it. When we are fully ready to give Him all we have and are, He can—and always will—grant us enabling strength.

Christians who have overcome sin in His strength know this. It is those who do not make such a definite commitment—and are therefore themselves in bondage to their own secret sins—who doubt God's ability to redeem others.

7 - Fritz Guy questioned whether a gay could ever change his ways.

Both the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy are replete with statements that any and every sin may be resisted and overcome in the strength of Christ. If we heterosexuals can resist the temptation to commit fornication, then you homosexuals can resist and overcome also!

We are all flesh, we are all tempted—yet we are not all falling. Some of us are choosing to overcome in Christ's strength.

8 - Geraty said that a warning against sin in Scripture is not enough; it must also provide us with a detailed picture of the commission of

that sin in order to identify it as sinful. He says such detailed portrayals are not given.

This is rampant rationalization. The first chapter of Romans speaks of people who are sinners, and in a few phrases describes the nature of their sin as accurately as is needed: *Romans 1:24-27*. We do not need a pornography book in order to more clearly define homosexual sin.

9 - As mentioned earlier, Geraty said that the sin of the sodomites was not homosexuality, but mistreating angels!

Yet a chapter earlier, Christ told Abraham that He was going to destroy Sodom because of its great wickedness. That was before the angels went there in human form! (*Genesis 18-19*).

10 - Geraty says that, because some things in the Mosaic books are no longer heeded, we do not need to obey any of their prohibitions against homosexuality.

Prohibitions against homosexuality are mentioned in various places throughout the Bible.

11 - Geraty classes sexual perversion as a light transgression, on the same level with the type of cloth you wear in your clothing.

But there is no comparison. Geraty is a timeserver and man-pleaser.

12 - According to Benton, Geraty said that, unless all Biblical rules are followed, we do not need to obey any.

Geraty should not be retained as an Adventist minister.

13 - Geraty concluded that the Old Testament, by itself, does not present a clear-cut warning that homosexuality is a sin, and must be avoided.

Geraty claims to be an "expert" on the Old Testament. He needs to open the Bible and read what the Old Testament says about sodomites:

Male sodomites: Genesis 19:4-14, 24-25; Deuteronomy 23:17; 1 Kings 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; 2 Kings 23:7; Job 36:14 (margin).

(New Testament: Matthew 11:24; Luke 10:12)

Female sodomites:

"The word 'harlot,' in Genesis 38:21-22; Deuteronomy 23:17; Hosea 4:14, is the translation of a Hebrew feminine form of the word translated elsewhere 'sodomite.'"—*Nave's Topical Bible, 1293.*

Sodomy: Genesis 19:5-8; Exodus 22:19; Leviticus 18:22-23; 20:13, 15-16; Deuteronomy 23:17; 27:21; Judges 19:22; 1 Kings 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; 2 Kings 23:7.

(New Testament: Romans 1:24, 26-27; 1 Corinthians 6:9; 1 Timothy 1:9-10)

Sodom: In addition, there are comments about Sodom:

Its people were wicked: Genesis 13:13; 19:4-13; Deuteronomy 32:32; Isaiah 3:9; Jeremiah 23:14; Lamentations 4:6; Ezekiel 16:46, 48-49 (New Testament: Jude 7).

It was destroyed because of the wicked things done there: Genesis 19:1-29; Deuteronomy 29:23; Isaiah 13:19; Jeremiah 49:18; 50:40; Lamentations 4:6; Amos 4:11; Zephaniah 2:9 (New Testament: Matthew 10:15; Luke 17:29; Romans 9:29; 2 Peter 2:6).

14 - James Cox said that homosexuality is not mentioned in the Bible, with the implication that, therefore, it is not a sin.

That is a breathtaking statement. Here is a man who flaunts a vile practice in our face, and declares it to be not even hinted at in either the Old or New Testament! It takes a brave man to say that, and dare God to send the fire on him that fell on the sodomites.

15 - Cox said that the New Testament mentions some improper heterosexual and homosexual acts, but we really have no idea what those acts were. So we do not know what sexual sin is.

Sexual relations of men with men and women with women is clearly defined in *Romans 1:24-27* as sin—and that is in the New Testament.

Cox is as much as saying that God was wrong to condemn the sodomites to the flames, when they had not even committed a definable sin.

16 - Cox says that the only sexual acts, which are sinful, are those which hurt someone.

Little wonder that there is immorality at Avondale College, in Australia! Have all the free and illicit sex you want, according to Cox.

17 - Cox said that Jesus never said anything negative about homosexuality.

Cox purports to be a “New Testament scholar,” yet he says Jesus never referred to the sin of the sodomites. He should read *Matthew 10:15; 11:24; Luke 10:12* (all of which say essentially the same thing). The sin of Sodom must have been so terrible that Jesus used it as the reference point to compare the sin of Capernaum to.

Cox should also read *Luke 17:29-30*. The sodomites were not destroyed because they were eating and drinking. Jesus well-knew the meaning of *Genesis 19*. Cox knows it too.

It is a remarkable fact that, except for the antediluvians, Christ spoke more often about the sin and destruction of the sodomites, than about any other group of Old Testament sinners.

18 - Cox said that Ellen White never said anything negative about homosexuality.

It is incredible the lengths to which these new theology advocates will go in order to defend sin and comfort sinners.

Homosexuality is sodomy. Read what Ellen White says about the sinful practices of the sodomites, which led to their destruction:

4BC 1161; CH 23-24, 110; Ed 209; GC 269, 431; MYP 85; PK 297;

Forbidden sex is hard on the body. A year or so ago, we published longevity statistics which revealed that the average life span of a male homosexual was only about 42 years; and the average for a lesbian was about 52. They die prematurely because of enervation and transmitted disease.

PP 156-157; SD 232; 1T 395; 3T 162-163; 4T 110, 191; 5T 78, 232.

More passages could be found, but that should be enough for a starter.

Actually, the above arguments are excuses for sin. But the matter goes deeper than that: They are also reproaches on the character of God.

As did Adam when confronted with his sin, such excuse their sin and say it is God’s fault. He made us the way we are, and—while we continue in the enjoyment of our sin—He must either work a miracle to change us—or He must take us to heaven as we are.

A basic issue in the great controversy between Christ and Satan underlies this matter. For 6,000 years, Satan has declared that the problems are all God’s fault. He made the law wrong; He made people wrong.

I am here to tell the scoffers that unless they start vindicating God’s principles and justice in the great controversy, they are not going to heaven. They are fighting a lost cause to remain on Satan’s side of the argument.

The word, “homosexual,” may not be found in the King James Version of the Bible, but neither is the word “millennium.” “Calvary” is only found once, yet it is the central event of all human history.

In His providence, the Lord revealed to us the occurrence at Sodom, that we might ever know His view of sexual perversion. Prior to the final judgment, He needed only to provide us with one such event—and He burned a hole in the ground to emphasize His point.

— SECTION THREE —

BIBLE STUDY ON SODOMY

The following Bible study (now slightly enlarged) was prepared by the present writer in 1980, and is reprinted from WM-30-31. Instead of there being only “seven homosexual texts,” we find many, many passages dealing directly or indirectly with this topic. Here are some of them:

The “cities of the plain” (*Genesis*

13:12) were located at what is now the southern portion of the Dead Sea, near the tongue of land protruding from its eastern shore. These five cities were Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim, and Zoar (*Genesis 14:2; Deuteronomy 29:23*).

This “vale of Siddim” (*Genesis 14:3*) was once entirely above water. But, when God destroyed those cities because of their great wickedness (*Genesis 18 and 19*), the ensuing holocaust tore such a hole in the ground that this area now has the lowest elevation of any continental point on planet earth.

This destruction by fire was so terrific that it was mentioned repeatedly for centuries afterward (*Deuteronomy 29:23; Isaiah 13:19; Luke 17:29; Matthew 10:15; 11:24; Mark 6:11; Luke 10:12; Romans 9:29, etc.*). Its destruction, by falling fire, was cited by a New Testament prophet as the method by which all the wickedness of this world will finally be engulfed in oblivion (*Jude 7*).

What was the great wickedness of those people? It was homosexuality—open and unrepentant (*Genesis 19:4-9*). The cry of this wickedness had gone up to God (*Genesis 18:20-21; 19:13*). Therefore, He destroyed it (*19:14*) with such devastating fire sent down from heaven (*19:24-25, 29*)—that it became a smoking furnace (*19:28*). The north end of the Dead Sea is 13 feet deep; the south end, where Sodom and its companion cities once lay, is 1,300 feet deep. What an awesome lesson for all peoples who should afterward live.

Incidentally, this unusually deep hole in the southern Dead Sea is something of a geological wonder. How could such a deep place exist on a continental mass—and not be found elsewhere?

It stands as a powerful witness to the accuracy of the Bible—and to God’s reaction to stubbornly-held sin.

The wickedness of the sodomites was so debasing as to become proverbial (*Genesis 13:13, Lamentations 4:6, Isaiah 3:9*). And the judg-

ments that fell upon its companion city, Gomorrah, are also held up as a warning to us (*Genesis 18:20; 2 Peter 2:6; Jude 7*).

Jesus mentions the terrible wickedness and destruction of those bold apostates (*Luke 17:29; Matthew 10:15; 11:24; Mark 6:11; Luke 10:12*).

Even Paul and John refer to the evil depravity of the inhabitants of those cities (*Romans 9:29; Revelation 11:8*).

Repeatedly in Scripture, the sin of those cities is held up as an example of Divine judgment and punishment (*Deuteronomy 29:23; Isaiah 1:9; 13:19; Jeremiah 23:14; 49:18; 50:40; Ezekiel 16:46; Amos 4:11; Zephaniah 2:9; Matthew 10:15; Romans 9:29, etc.*)

Sodom was a vine whose juices and fruit were so corrupt that it had to be totally eradicated (*cf. Deuteronomy 32:32*).

The Bible also tells us about a later group of men—who were also called “sodomites.” This was because they shared in the sin of the cities of the plain. Yet they were not inhabitants of Sodom, nor were they or their descendants. They were men who had consecrated their lives to this same unnatural vice. This is why homosexuals are “sodomites.” Some of those ancient sodomites declared it to be a part of their religion, and acceptable to God! What blasphemy!

Regarding such people, Moses said that it was expressly forbidden

In other churches and in the world, the demand is for equal rights in the ministry for women, equal rights for gays, and equal rights for children (so they do not have to obey their parents), and equal rights for prisoners. How far will we go in copying them?

In fall 1995, Southern College placed a box, marked “Homosexual,” in the men’s dormitory. They have been asked to write comments on slips of paper, and place them in the box. The administration will then decide how rapidly to move forward.

to tolerate a sodomite (*Deuteronomy 23:17*), and that the wages, which a sodomite might receive for his services, dare not be put into the temple treasury—lest the treasury be defiled (*23:18*). God did not even want their money.

“The price of a dog” is a figurative expression used to denote the wages of a “*qadesh*” (sodomite); in the Greek called a “*kinaidos*” (dog) because of the dog-like manner in which such people debased themselves. It was for this reason that John, in Revelation, spoke of them as “dogs” (*Revelation 22:15*).

There were also female sodomites. The word, “harlot,” in *Genesis 38:21-22*, *Deuteronomy 23:1*, and *Hosea 4:14*, is the translation of a Hebrew feminine form of the word translated elsewhere as “sodomite.”

With the passing of centuries, the dreadful devotion to this perversion spread itself through many lands, and became consecrated by the churches as a part of their worship.

This included nations such as Phoenicia, Syria, Phrygia, Assyria, and Babylonia.

Do you want homosexuality (the worship of sexual organs) to be consecrated as a parallel worship in your church, along with that of the true God? Ashtaroth (the Greek Astarte) was the ancient goddess of this twisted lewdness.

Sodom, so closely associated with sexual perversion, thus permanently gave its name to it. This vice, popularized in Sodom (*Genesis 19:5; 2 Peter 2:6-8*), fastened itself on Israel (*1 Kings 14:24*) and the entire ancient world (*Romans 1:26-27*), although God through Moses expressly forbade it (*Deuteronomy 23:17*).

It is a shocking fact that, eventually it debased the very religion of God’s own people (*2 Kings 23:7*).

But there were men of God who sought to bring the people back to Heaven’s standard. About the year 890 B.C., Asa removed the licentious grove idols and the sodomites from the land (*1 Kings 15:12*). Some thirty years later, Jehoshaphat again rid the country of this problem (*1 Kings*

Coworkers at the National Institutes of Health, in Atlanta, have revealed that the genetic research of Dr. Dean Hamer (himself an open homosexual) was rigged to “prove” that homosexuality is hereditary, and thus blameless.

The news of Hamer’s “gay gene” was spread all over the world by the media.

Repeatedly, the Western world is being flooded with so-called “scientific research,” attempting to prove that homosexuality is innate, unchangeable, and therefore not immoral. But evidence to the contrary is abundant. The Bible would not condemn as sinful, that which we could not resist doing.

22:46). Approximately forty more years, and Josiah removed the sun-worshiping priests and tore down the sodomite houses in Jerusalem (*2 Kings 23:7*).

Hardened sodomites today, as those anciently, glory in their shame and tell us that their vile delights are acceptable to God and should be acceptable to men. But carefully read what Paul has to say about this perversion.

First, he tells about the power in the gospel of Christ to deliver us from our sins (*Romans 1:14-17*). Then he tells us about men and women who, scorning this redeeming grace, chose instead to remain in homosexual sin (*Romans 1:18-32*). Carefully read each verse.

And do not forget that an entire tribe of Israel was nearly wiped out because they refused to acknowledge that this practice was sinful (*Judges 19:11 to 20:48*). Most of the Benjaminites probably were not homosexual; but, in defending it, they perished along with those who indulged in it. That is a solemn warning to us today.

There is no neutral ground; you are either for this perversion, or you are against it.

— Vance Ferrell