



Reprobate Theology

The homosexual seduction of the American church

by Scott Lively

Reprobate Theology

The homosexual seduction of the American church

by Scott Lively

In 1992, while I was serving as the chief spokesman for a high-profile anti-homosexuality ballot measure in Oregon, my family took in an ex-homosexual man who was dying of AIDS. I was somewhat fearful of the possibility that one of my family members might catch the disease (I never really trusted the assurances of the public health services) yet I felt very strongly that this was what God wanted: for us to care for Sonny. My feelings were confirmed when God miraculously provided a uniquely suitable house for us all to live in (the only rental we could afford in the only school district we had chosen), complete with a separate daylight basement apartment for him. Sonny lived with our family for the last year of his life.

Sonny had suffered the ravages, both spiritual and physical, of the homosexual life, beginning when he was raped at the age of seven in the men's room of a YMCA. He confessed to me his involvement in twenty years of activities too defiling and sordid to describe here. Yet when faced with his own imminent death, Sonny invited Jesus Christ into his life, renounced homosexuality, and was born again. God blessed his decision by providing him, during the final months of his life, with friends, a Christian family and the love he had never previously known.

I was privileged to share Sonny's last moments of consciousness in the hospital on the night that he died. Four of his closest Christian friends, two former Satanists, an ex-lesbian and myself (a recovered alcoholic and drug addict) showed up unexpectedly in his hospital room (one had even brought her guitar) and sang Sonny's favorite worship songs with him. Then the four of us laid hands upon him and asked the Lord in His mercy to take him home. It was one of the sweetest experiences of my Christian life. Sonny drifted off to sleep and died later that night. He was unafraid and at peace.

My article begins with this anecdote because I want the reader to understand how deeply I personally care about the men and women who struggle with a homosexual "orientation." I normally decline to affirm my compassion for homosexuals in my talks on this topic precisely to avoid the appearance that a "disclaimer" is necessary to prove that one is not a hater or "homophobe." I discovered early in my career

Copyright 2003 by Scott Douglas Lively. See www.abidingtruth.com for additional materials. Permission to reproduce this article is granted so long as the above copyright line, including website, is prominently displayed. *Reprobate Theology: The homosexual seduction of the American church* is a publication of Veritas Aeterna Press, a division of Abiding Truth Ministries, PO Box 3691, Citrus Heights, CA 95611. Bulk quantities of this publication are available at a substantial discount by calling 1-800-834-1508.

as a defender of family values that “gay” activists and their allies use the accusation of hatred as a weapon, not because they believe it is true (they know that most of their opponents do not hate them), but because it is a very effective tool of psychological manipulation -- especially when used against Christians.

How does the accusation of “hate” manipulate Christians? Being called hateful or “mean-spirited” makes us Christians feel that we have failed to be a good witness of Christ. We know that our Christian duty is to show the love of God through the example of our lives and the way we treat others. We Christians also know that to hate one’s fellow man is to break the second great commandment.

“Gay” political strategists know this about us as well. (Indeed, many homosexual activists were raised in supposedly Christian homes where parental hypocrisy or misguided legalism helped to alienate them from the church.) However, within these strategists’ end-justifies-the-means political philosophy, Christian compassion is seen not as a virtue to emulate but as a weakness to exploit for political advantage. They accuse us of hating homosexuals simply because they know it puts us on the defensive, which gives them a psychological advantage in fighting us for control of the culture. It is a calculated and cynical tactic, designed to turn Christians’ greatest strength into their greatest weakness.

I know this from personal experience. During the Oregon ballot measure campaign -- throughout the very same weeks and months that my family was watching Sonny battle the horrible complications of slow death by AIDS -- I was being continually attacked in the public media as a “gay-basher” and “hate-monger” by the Oregon “gay” community.

While Sonny was living with us, I assiduously avoided any appearance of exploiting him for political or public relations benefit and rarely if ever mentioned him in my many public debates and media interviews. Despite the fact that the “gay” political leaders and their allies knew all about Sonny and that we were caring for him in our home, they coolly conducted a long, ruthless and very personal campaign of character assassination in order to discredit my representation of the “gay” issue to the public.

The lesson here for the church is that accusations of hatred from the “gay” community and its allies will never be silenced by evidence that Christians have genuine compassion towards homosexuals. The “gay” activists will be satisfied by nothing less than the total capitulation of the culture to their agenda. In facing their challenge, Christians must be prepared to do good works, to love and minister to homosexuals, without receiving public credit. We must also resist the temptation to compromise our Biblical values to “earn the respect” of our accusers or silence their criticism. A realistic appreciation of our relentless and dedicated cultural adversaries is central to all that follows.

Subversion of the Church

That homosexual activists have developed sophisticated tactics for politically neutralizing Christians is a fact lost on most of the church. Indeed, few Christians are even aware that the implicit goal of the “gay” movement is the replacement of our society’s Judeo-Christian sexual ethic (i.e. marriage and the natural family) with an anything-goes sexual morality -- or that homosexual political activism has been the main driving force behind the anti-family movement (including the abortion and porn industries) since before in-the-closet “gay” activist Alfred Kinsey launched the sexual revolution in America in 1948. (For a discussion of this topic see my monograph, *Why and How to Defeat the “Gay” Movement.*)¹

As simplified as it may sound, the culture war in America is at its core a battle between Christians and homosexuals. It is a winner-take-all fight to determine whose presuppositions about sexual morality will form the foundation of all of our laws and policies. Frankly, the homosexuals have been winning this fight for many decades because the church has been asleep.

This article is an effort to educate church leaders about the homosexual strategy to control or discredit the church and the extent to which it has already succeeded.

In 1987, two homosexual political strategists, Marshall K. Kirk & Erastes Pill, published a now infamous article in *Guide Magazine* under the title, “The Overhauling of Straight America.”² In it they summarized their strategy.

While public opinion is one primary source of mainstream values, religious authority is the other. When conservative churches condemn gays, there are only two things we can do to confound the homophobia of true believers. First, we can use talk to muddy the moral waters. This means publicizing support for gays by more moderate churches, raising theological objections of our own about conservative interpretations of biblical teachings, and exposing hatred and inconsistency. Second, we can undermine the moral authority of homophobic churches by portraying them as antiquated backwaters, badly out of step with the times and with the latest findings of psychology. Against the mighty pull of institutional Religion one must set the mightier draw of Science and Public Opinion (the shield and word of that accursed “secular humanism”). Such an unholy alliance has worked well against churches before, on such topics as divorce and abortion. With enough open talk about the prevalence and acceptability of homosexuality, that alliance can work again here.

Since the publication of “The Overhauling of Straight America,” the “gay” movement has enjoyed success far beyond what its writers envisioned. The following are just a few examples of their victories in the past couple of years:

1. The California Council of Churches, representing 21 member denominations, elected as its president the “Reverend” Gwynne Guibord, an open Lesbian.
2. In Dallas, Texas, a \$35 million dollar “church” facility, called the Cathedral of Hope, was dedicated as the world’s “gay and lesbian mecca:” a symbol of “gay Christianity” equivalent in the eyes of its creators to Vatican City for Catholics and Salt Lake City for Mormons.
3. The “Reverend” Troy Perry, founder of the 300- “church” -strong homosexual denomination called the Metropolitan Community Church was appointed to the Board of Trustees of Chicago Theological Seminary and invited to lead Chapel Service at Yale Divinity School.
4. Soulforce, the “gay Christian” pressure group, now with chapters in 14 states, gained national publicity for its campaign against “spiritual violence” (i.e. failure to affirm homosexuality as normal)

by physically invading the Southern Baptist Convention.

What these examples reveal is that the homosexual movement is now using several different tactics to defeat the church. The first is pitting “liberal” churches against Biblically conservative ones in an effort to divide and conquer. The second is direct competition with the church for moral authority in the culture through the legitimization of “gay” congregations which preach an alternative “gay” theology. The third tactic, not prescribed in Kirk and Pill’s blueprint, is the covert infiltration of conservative churches by “gay” activist saboteurs and change-agents.

Homosexual Tactic # 1: Divide and Conquer

The “Gay Christian” arm of the homosexual political movement was started in 1968 by a former Pentecostal minister named Troy Perry. Perry founded the Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches (UFMCC) in that year.

Perry’s organization would eventually spawn the stand-alone “gay” religious community we recognize today, but at first it served more as a staging ground for introducing pro-homosexual doctrine into “mainline” Christian denominations. “By 1980,” writes author Joe Dallas, “...Gay caucuses flourished in [some] traditional churches, while...independent gay churches continued their expansion.” Dallas, a former homosexual and erstwhile member of the Metropolitan Community Church (MCC), has written one of the most important books in print on this topic. In *A Strong Delusion: Confronting the “Gay Christian” Movement*, he describes how the first barriers to “gay theology” were overcome by Perry and his followers.

Armed with a stronger theological base, the gay Christian movement sought to mainstream itself within the larger Christian community....On September 9, 1981, the UFMCC applied for membership in the ecumenical National Council of Churches of Christ USA. The amount of controversy raised by a pro-gay denomination joining the NCC can be measured by the NCC’s public response upon hearing, through the media, of the UFMCC’s intentions. Before the UFMCC even filed, the NCC sent them word, also via the media,

that any attempt to join their organization would be “impertinent foolishness.”

Undeterred, the UFMCC officially submitted its application, [strategically characterizing] their alignment with other denominations as “part of the healing process.”For two years, representatives of the Metropolitan Community Church participated in extended discussions with the NCC...and...even conducted an



ecumenical service for NCC members in the spring of 1983. [Nevertheless, that Fall NCC] decided to table indefinitely, any further plans to accept the UFMCC into membership.

Here is a lesson to the church, for while others might have given up, the homosexual activists did not. Characteristically, they relentlessly pressured the NCC to accommodate them and eventually prevailed. Today, as noted above, an open lesbian presides over one of their largest state chapters, and the “gay” cause (i.e. opposing the Bible-believing church) has become a political priority of the organization. Meanwhile, it is now conservative churches who are being challenged to join “the healing process.”

The PFLAG Phenomenon

The homosexuals’ key to success is psychological manipulation, which is why they succeeded first with the “liberal” churches. Only a knowledge of and strong commitment to scriptural truth can protect a believer from the manipulation that takes place in “the healing process.” As Perry himself acknowledged, “I knew I would have few if any problems with the so-called liberal churches. Liberal churches do not usually deeply involve themselves with Scripture.³”

Here lies the greatest danger to the conservative churches, because Perry’s observation about liberal churches in general is also true of many “conservative” Christians individually. Far too many “conservative” Christians do not deeply involve themselves with Scripture, especially scriptures that address uncomfortable topics such as divorce and homosexuality. Why would they, when these topics are seldom if ever addressed by their pastors? (The phenomenon of “seeker sensitivity” -- i.e. the deliberate avoidance of socially controversial doctrine in growth-oriented congregations -- deserves much blame here.) Lack of Biblical knowledge has created a favorable climate for pro-homosexual activism in the church. Homosexual defenders are even now winning the hearts and minds of the more nominal members of “Bible-believing” denominations.

In the privacy of their ministerial associations or board rooms, today’s conservative pastors probably dismiss any such pro-homosexual efforts as “impertinent foolishness,” but in the end, their smugness will turn to embarrassment if they underestimate their adversary.

A recent incident at the Baptist William Jewell College in Nashville, Tennessee, is instructive. A December 11, 2002 article in the Baptist Press highlighted a debate in the student senate about whether to add “sexual orientation” to the school’s student bill of rights. In response, Department of Psychology Chairperson Patricia Schoenrade went public with a warning that she had witnessed a trend toward affirmation of the homosexuality lifestyle at the school. An outspoken advocate of “gay rights” until accepting Christ in 1998, Schoenrade showed the courage of the converted in speaking out against the pro-“gay” trend at William Jewell. According to her, other faculty at this supposedly conservative institution in the heart of the Bible Belt were afraid to confront the problem for fear of being judged intolerant.

Importantly, the process of converting “conservative” Christians to a pro-homosexual mindset is not blatant, but very subtle. Consider, for example, the tactical accusation by “gay” activists that Christians hate them.

The less confident of the truth of God’s word a Christian is, the more easily he or she will be

manipulated by being called a hateful (or intolerant) person. Biblically-grounded Christians know that true love never condones sin. Even Jesus' most generous acts of mercy are always tempered with an admonition to "go and sin no more" (John 5:14, 8:1-11). Yet those who are weak in faith or knowledge can be led to believe that compassion for homosexuals requires acceptance of homosexuality. Even worse, some can be persuaded that God created homosexuality as a positive good to be celebrated, and not a challenge to be overcome.

Manipulation of nominal Christians in this way is the stock in trade of a group called Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (PFLAG). PFLAG purports to be a support group for relatives of homosexuals, but in reality it is another political arm of the "gay" movement. Its membership is made up primarily of two types of people, 1) politically sophisticated homosexual activists, and 2) naive parents and other close relatives of homosexuals, who through guilt and coercion have been induced to support the homosexual agenda. The arm-twisting tactics most often used by their "gay" activist relatives often takes this form: "If you really loved me, you'd accept me as I am and not try to change me."

Importantly, acceptance in this context does not mean love for the homosexual struggler, but full endorsement of the "gay" person's decision to embrace a dangerous lifestyle defined by voluntary behavior. Already deeply troubled by the thought that their own parenting mistakes might have caused their children's homosexual problem, PFLAG parents are anxious to appease and overcompensate. By joining PFLAG, they not only assuage their parental guilt, they avoid being called haters. Indeed, instead of being targets of name-calling, these parents receive praise by the "gay" movement and its allies for being models of "genuine Christian compassion." This attitude of acceptance without discernment has been called "Nicer than Jesus" Christianity.

The PFLAG phenomenon extends far beyond the membership of the group itself. Many church fellowships and even whole denominations have been emotionally manipulated to reject Biblical truth in favor of the PFLAG position.

Within a denomination the transition usually occurs church-by-church in stages. A church congregation will transition from nominally Bible-believing to pro-gay by first becoming a "welcoming" congregation, in which open homosexuals are welcomed to join in worship even though the church continues to define homosexuality as sin. Almost inevitably the congregation yields to pressure and changes its status to an "affirming" one, in which homosexuality is deemed morally neutral or a positive good. The following, quoted from a regional Episcopalian newsletter, reveals this move away from Scripture.

In June, all parishes received a diocesan letter inquiring as to which parishes wished to be listed in an intra-diocesan directory of parishes that welcome and affirm lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered (LGBT) Christians. After receiving input from parishioners at two parish meetings and prayerfully considering the matter at four vestry meetings. . .we stated that we could not reach a consensus with respect to "affirming." Some parishioners were prepared to include this term in our response, but for others, their understanding of the term "affirming" was in conflict with their views of God's teaching as manifested in scripture. However, we made it clear that ours is a parish that welcomes, values and supports all of God's children. . .Given the strong feelings that were stirred by this matter, the vestry

formed a committee to continue the dialogue.

Several denominations have been specifically targeted by the “gays” with varying success. In the Episcopal church, certain “progressive” bishops have been ordaining homosexuals as ministers since as early as 1977, a number of such clergy having signed a statement in 1994 declaring homosexuality and heterosexuality to be “morally neutral.”⁴ Openly homosexual and pro-homosexual contingents have been active nearly as long in the Presbyterian USA, United Methodist, Lutheran, American Baptist, United Church of Christ, and Congregational denominations.

Rhetoric from the pro-homosexual activists is nearly always couched in terms of victims and oppressors. Too often, however, these defenders of homosexuality have not acted as victims’ advocates, but as radical self-indulgent militants. At a May 5, 2000 Methodist convention, for example, hundreds of Methodist clergy pledged to disobey the just-reaffirmed policy against ordaining homosexuals, and two Bishops were arrested as part of a human blockade organized for the purpose of closing down the convention.⁵



We are all-too-painfully aware of the homosexual problems in the Catholic church. Despite the liberal media’s attempt to paint the continuing sex-abuse scandals as pedophilia, the age of the victims -- 12-17 years -- belies this characterization. Pedophilia involves prepubescent children. The offense of the accused Catholic clergy is in fact pederasty, the same form of adult/teen male homosexuality practiced by the ancient Greeks.

Psychotherapist Richard Sipe, a laicized Catholic priest and acknowledged expert on sex abuse in the church says that at least 20% of priests are homosexuals; of those many are organized in a powerful secret network he calls the ‘lavender mafia.’⁶ Sipe is not alone in this assessment. In his book *Goodbye! Good Men*, Michael S. Rose describes a highly organized and militant homo-fascist network of active Catholic “gays” who punish anyone who opposes them.⁷ Perhaps the most succinct summary of the perspective of conservative Catholics is the title of a document prepared by the lay organization Roman Catholic Faithful (RCF). It reads “The Homosexual Network’s Death-Grip on the Roman Catholic Church.” RCF was the first group to expose St. Sebastian’s Angels, an international coalition of in-the-closet active homosexual priests. Open advocacy of the homosexual lifestyle is carried out in the Catholic church by the group Dignity.

Even Judaism, whose anti-homosexual traditions run very deep, has not been immune to the persuasive power of “gay” activists. On March 29, 2000, the most liberal branch of Judaism, the Reform faction, voted to allow rabbis to bless same-sex unions in Jewish marriage rituals. Openly homosexual Reform rabbis have been allowed since 1990.⁸ Homosexual marriage has not been recognized in Conservative Judaism, but officiating over such a ceremony would not be grounds for a rabbi’s expulsion as it would be if he conducted an inter-faith marriage.⁹ A recent report in the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* stated that the president of the 800-congregation-strong United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism intends to ask the Rabbinical Assembly (the legislative body of Conservative Jewish congregations) to reconsider

whether homosexuality can be accepted under Jewish religious law.¹⁰

On a hopeful note, a conservative backlash known as the Confessing Church Movement has been building in the “mainline” religious community. A collection of articles on this topic was published in the April/May 2002 issue of *The American Enterprise* under the title “Back Toward Orthodoxy.” In these articles, the “Good News” movement of the United Methodist church (which led the counter-attack against “gay marriage” proponents) was credited with reversing a 30-year decline in church membership. Similarly, a strong stand against homosexuality was associated with recent resurgence of the Southern Baptists. In the Presbyterian Church USA, Confessing Church affiliation had grown to 1,000 congregations by June of 2001,¹¹ a trend which helped that denomination stop a homosexual ordination amendment that year, and again in 2002 by an even larger margin. Even the Episcopal church has seen an anti-homosexuality backlash, with a small but growing number of churches forming chapters of a pro-family organization called Episcopalians United.

The Catholic backlash may be more pronounced over time, given the degree to which the church has suffered for tolerating homosexuality. In May of 2002, a spokesman for Pope John Paul II responded to the homosexual scandals by saying that “gays” should not be ordained.¹² Philadelphia Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua has declared that he tries to screen out “gay” clergy, calling homosexuality “a moral evil.”¹³ Natural consequences of homosexual conduct may speed the process of change, since a high percentage of homosexual priests have AIDS; so many that Catholic priests as a group are dying of the disease at four times the rate of the general population.¹⁴

Still, the pro-family response may be too little too late for some denominations. While the conservative Presbyterians seem to have regained control of their national assembly, a sizable liberal minority threatens to bolt from the denomination.¹⁵ And while opposition is rising in the Episcopal church, the highly organized homosexual faction called Integrity noted in its publication of the same name that recent resolutions authorizing the blessing of same-sex unions were only narrowly defeated: “Deputations that were divided in 2000, and bishops who abstained, especially need to be nudged...You may want to arrange a ‘listening session’ between Integrity members...and bishops in your diocese.”¹⁶

Members of conservative denominations might be tempted to shrug off the homosexual infiltration

of mainline churches as “their problem,” but that would be a grave mistake. We must keep in mind Kirk and Pill’s political blueprint. Homosexuals seek power within the liberal churches to exploit the resources and credibility of those institutions in the ongoing campaign against the Bible-believing churches and other Judeo-Christian institutions. A typical example of this was an October, 2000 threat by the General Board of the Church and Society of the United Methodists to the Boy Scouts of America. The Methodists told BSA that its policy against homosexual scoutmasters could cause the youth organization to be denied the use of church property.¹⁷

More serious has been the emergence of a multi-denominational pro-homosexual movement that directly challenges the Bible-believing



church. The author has personally witnessed numerous instances in which groups of pro-homosexual clergy have banded together in ad hoc groups to help advance the homosexual agenda. Typically, this takes the form of mass-endorsement of the homosexual position in newspaper advertisements or giving pro-homosexual testimony at meetings of local government bodies. Increasingly, pro-homosexual clergy outnumber conservative clergy in these contests.

Clergy United for the Equality of Homosexuals (CUEH) is one organization that has taken an aggressively proactive approach to promoting homosexuality both in the church and the larger society. The following description is drawn from CUEH's own materials:

[CUEH] calls the Christian churches and their clergy to recognize the plight of the victims of the last remaining respectable bigotry in America, homophobia, and challenges them to redress this wrong for which Christians are largely responsible. By thorough biblical examination, sharing the most current research on homosexuality, and encouraging clergy and congregations to engage in and address the issues of homophobia, CUEH will provide support and successful strategies to pastors, lay leaders, judicatory officers and the public.

Homophobia is, of course, the pejorative term invented by the "gay" movement to define *all* disapproval of homosexuality as a form of mental illness rooted in irrational fear and hatred of homosexuals.

To further its agenda, CUEH director Rev. Steven Kindle held a seminar at the First Congregational Church in Santa Barbara, California in November of 2002. The seminar was titled, ironically, "Beyond the Bible and Homosexuality." Kindle's explicit goal was to "help stop spiritual and physical violence against gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered people."

Here we see just how far the "divide and conquer" tactic has evolved: ostensibly non-homosexual Christian clergymen have moved well beyond the mere affirmation of the "gay" lifestyle and have assumed a posture of moral outrage against those who dare to assert the plain Biblical truth about homosexual sin. Moreover, they expressly blame Christian teaching for violence against homosexuals in society.

While Kindle's position by no means constitutes the majority one in the American church, it would be foolish to ignore it in light of the trend we have exposed in this article. We are likely to see an increase in activism of this type, with an increasing impact on conservative churches. We find one example in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, whose St. Paul, Minnesota Bishop, Mark Hanson, censured but did not expel a local congregation that ordained an openly lesbian woman as pastor in 2001.¹⁸

An entire conservative denomination has already succumbed to "gay" seduction. The following quotation is taken from the 2000-2002 Biennial Report of the Brethren Mennonite Council (BMC), based in Minnesota. The writer is BMC President, Al Hoffman.

In the past two years, BMC has witnessed an unprecedented number of events in the Mennonite and Brethren worlds where glbt ["gay," lesbian, bisexual and transgendered] people, supporters and supportive congregations have claimed their place as full citizens in God's reign. The Student Government Association of Eastern Mennonite University passed

a motion to grant official club status to “A Safe Place,” an organization with a mission to create a space for discussion on sexuality issues. The Association of Brethren Caregivers, an agency of the Church of the Brethren, hired Former BMC Board President, Ralph McFadden. Brave in the face of retributions, Germantown Mennonite Church joyfully ordained our gay brother, David Weaver, to chaplaincy ministry. One of our SCN Publicly Affirming congregations, Manchester Church of the Brethren, provided prophetic, visible leadership within the church of the Brethren by voting to offer same-sex commitment ceremonies. A Canadian pastor has come out as lesbian and is receiving strong support. The Michigan district of the Church of the Brethren has ordained Matt Smucker, a former BMC board member. Peace Church of the Brethren in Portland, Oregon called Kirby Lauderdale, an out gay man, as their pastor. Illinois Mennonite Conference apologized to Oak Park Mennonite church and Maple Avenue Mennonite church for its earlier censure of them for their inclusive ministry. BMC is connecting with more and more young people who are coming out at our denominational schools and in congregations. There is an unstoppable movement of the Spirit happening across BMC’s midst.

Finally, lest anyone think that peaceful co-existence with pro-homosexual Christian factions is possible, consider the fate of Mrs. Fisher, an 83-year-old member of Immanuel United Church of Christ in West Bend, Wisconsin. Mrs. Fisher, along with an 88-year-old co-conspirator and twelve other long-time members of this “progressive” congregation, were legally expelled from membership for opposing the pastor’s efforts to make the church more pro-homosexual. To exacerbate the insult, the expulsion notices were delivered shortly before Christmas, 2002. In its own defense, the church issued a glib statement that while most church members understand that times have changed, “there is another group that would like to identify this as 1952.”¹⁹

How can the rest of the church escape being poisoned by “gay” activism? The only antidote is clear teaching from the pulpit on the subject of homosexuality.

Homosexual Tactic # 2: Directly Compete for Moral Authority

The “gay Christian” movement started by Perry in 1968 has come of age. An Internet search using this term produces almost 10,000 hits. In addition to the 300 member MCC, there are several other homosexual denominations: the Alliance of Christian Churches, The Evangelical Network Churches, the National Gay Pentecostal Alliance and Agape Churches of America.

At the root of all of these is the package of twisted rationalizations called gay theology, invented for the purpose of challenging the moral and doctrinal authority of the Bible-believing church. Dallas writes,

To convince conservative Christians that God condones homosexuality, the gay Christian movement needed a rebuttal, *in conservative terms*, to the traditional biblical view. Ignoring the bible would hardly be acceptable; attacking its authority would be even worse. For the gay Christian movement to convince its toughest critics, it needed to affirm the bible

as the ultimate authority *and* prove that the ultimate authority did not condemn homosexuality.²⁰ [(Emphasis in original).

The landmark effort to justify homosexuality biblically was the award-winning 1981 book *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* by John Boswell. Tellingly, Boswell was himself homosexual and died of AIDS in 1994.²¹ His ideas have been amplified by others, but the two persistent central arguments of “gay theology” are both contained in Boswell’s work. These are 1) that most scriptural passages addressing homosexuality have been misinterpreted to condemn behavior that is not condemned by God, and 2) that the few actual proscriptions against homosexuality were merely elements of the Old Testament Jewish ritual cleansing and purity laws that are no longer in effect.

To those lacking a reasonably close familiarity with the Bible (a group that includes most non-Christians and a sizable percentage of church-goers), the pro-homosexual arguments have proven highly persuasive. People are quick to agree with the proposition that much of the Bible is subject to broadly different interpretations. It is a small step from there to entertaining “gay theology” as a possibly valid alternative perspective to traditional views. Add to this an emotional suspicion of “fundamentalism” born of years of anti-Christian rhetoric in the media and popular culture, and it is easy to see why “gay theology” has attracted its adherents. Only those willing to challenge the pro-“gay” arguments themselves will understand just how specious they are.

Fortunately, that work has been done by some highly qualified Bible scholars. Dr. James De Young is a professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Western Seminary in Portland, Oregon. In 2000, he published *Homosexuality: Contemporary Claims Examined in Light of the Bible and Other Ancient Literature and Law*. All of the numerous and complicated elements of gay theology are addressed in this nearly-400-page volume.

De Young’s scholarship is impeccable, but truth has never been a deterrent to the “gay” movement. Indeed, Boswell’s fatally flawed arguments are still adopted practically verbatim by activists like Kindle. For example, Kindle parrots Boswell’s assertion that the sin for which Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed was not homosexuality but “inhospitality.” He claims that the early rabbis never associated homosexuality with the sin of Sodom and that the entire story is better explained by studying the Middle Eastern cultural value of hospitality. He places the greatest emphasis on supposed problems of interpretation from the original Hebrew, resting his case on the fact the Hebrew word for “to know” (i.e. when the Sodomites demanded that Lot “send out the men that we may know them”) only implies sexual activity 10 of the 943 times



that it is used in scripture. That word, *yada*, is most often used to mean (roughly) “discover what they’re here for.” This appears to be a plausible alternative to the traditional view, and one that is difficult for the untrained layperson to dispute.

That argument is quickly dispatched by De Young.

What Boswell and others neglect to discern is that each of those ten instances is identified as sexual knowledge by context. When a word can have more than one meaning, context, not frequency, is the crucial factor. Word frequency only enables one to weigh the likelihood of meaning or to consider the range of possible meaning when the context is unclear.... [In context] a sexual sense in [this verse] is virtually certain.²²

De Young elsewhere summarizes his refutation of several other of Boswell’s points.

Homosexuality violates the creation order and patterns for male and female roles and for marriage (Genesis 1-2). It arises from the same internal rebellion as did the fall recorded in Genesis 3....Jewish tradition expressed in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the LXX, the Mishnah, and the writings of Philo and Josephus condemns homosexuality, Jewish sources do not distinguish between homosexual acts that are ritually impure and homosexual acts that are morally wrong²³

Throughout Scripture, condemnation of homosexuality is consistent, universal and absolute. The text never suggests that it condemns some specific form of homosexuality while it tolerates or accepts other forms. For example, it was not for homosexual rape alone that Sodom was judged; the attempt on the angels confirmed God’s decision to deal with the larger pattern of degradation....Nor does any other text restrict the condemnation. The prohibition of Deuteronomy 23 applies beyond male cult prostitution (as does Leviticus 18 and 20; 1 Kings 14:24; 15:20; 22:46; 2 Kings 23:7; 1 Cor. 6:9; and 1 Tim. 1:8-10). New Testament teaching in Romans 1:26-27 cannot be made to fit only pederasty or any other specific perverse act, such as the abandonment of one’s “natural” sexual orientation. In Paul’s thinking, both the passive (*malakoi*) and active (*arsenokoitai*) homosexual partners are outside the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:9).²⁴

The revisionists’ claim that homosexuality was condoned or approved by early rabbinical authorities is strongly refuted by modern Jewish scholars. Rabbis Marc Angel, Hillel Goldberg and Pinchas Stopler addressed this question in their joint article in the Winter, 1992-93 edition of *Jewish Action Magazine*. Their summation serves also as a rebuke to pro-homosexual advocates in the Jewish Reform and Conservative movements:

There is not a single source in all of the disciplines of Jewish sacred literature — halachah, aggadah, philosophy, muscar, mysticism — that tolerates homosexual acts or a homosexual

‘orientation.’ Jews who sanction homosexuality must do so wholly without reference to Jewish sacred literature, in which case their justification has no Jewish standing; or without reference to Jewish sources, in which case they act with ignorance or intellectual dishonesty. The idea, set forth by some of the non-Orthodox leadership, that the Torah prohibited only coercive and non-loving same-sex relationships, thus allowing for a contemporary, voluntary and loving same-sex relationship, is wholly without basis in a single piece of Jewish sacred literature written in the last 3,000 years.

A premise of “gay theology” that also underlies nearly all other forms of pro-homosexual argument is the idea that homosexuality is innate and unchangeable. Kindle’s seminar materials, for example, include a document entitled *GLBT Realities*. Among these “realities” are the assertions “One’s sexuality is not a choice or preference: It is a given,” and “Virtually all psychologists, psychiatrists, and psychoanalysts view sexual orientation as unchangeable.” A thorough Christian rebuttal to the “innate and unchangeable” premise may be found at www.exodusnorthamerica.com, the website of the international umbrella organization of ex-“gay” ministries. The scientific response may be found at www.narth.com, the website of the National Association of Research and Therapy of Homosexuality. A useful common-sense response is contained in my article, *Defeating “Gay” Arguments With Simple Logic* at www.abidingtruth.com.

It is not sufficient to simply assert the truth that God did not create people to have no control over conduct which he condemns. The church must educate itself on the nature and causes of homosexuality because these matters go to the heart of the issue in the minds of those who accept “gay” theology. Generally, these people are pro-“gay” because they believe homosexuals are “born that way” and therefore that it is simply unfair to force them to conform to the heterosexual norm.

It is also helpful to recognize the role of childhood sexual abuse in the lives of those who, as adults, claim an innate homosexual orientation. For example, UFMCC founder Troy Perry was, like my friend Sonny, raped as a child by an adult man. The act was arranged by his violently abusive stepfather to punish 13-year-old Troy for having come to his mother’s defense. Ironically, he describes this incident as part of his first defense of “gay Christianity,” *The Lord is My Shepard and He Knows I’m Gay* (Nash Publishing, 1972).

Ignoring “gay” theology is not an option, especially if we wish to obey the Lord’s commandment to love our neighbor. Joe Dallas writes

The body of Christ will suffer immeasurably because sound doctrine – and even the Bible itself – will have to be taken less seriously if pro-gay theology is widely accepted. You simply cannot tamper with one part of Scripture...without dismantling its authority in general...Gay author and minister Mel White (formerly of Fuller Theological Seminary), for example, describes his first homosexual encounter (which he engaged in while he was still married) as “inevitable.” He describes his partner in adultery/homosexuality as “one of God’s gifts.” Troy Perry...takes a similar view of a similar experience. Recounting a tryst he had with another man (while his own wife was in the next room), he recalls: Eventually, I came to realize that what we were doing seemed right for me. It stopped short of being

love, but was a marvelous education.” Adultery described as “right” and as “a marvelous education”?Can such low moral standards among people naming the name of Christ reflect anything but a diminished view of Scripture?

If “gay” theology fosters moral degeneracy in individuals, can it avoid having this effect on the church as a whole? An ex-“gay” friend told me he had participated in hot-tub and cocaine orgies with high-ranking “gay Christian” leaders. I have also learned from a reliable source that sado-masochism seminars had been held at “gay” churches in San Diego. In the Chicago area, the Catholic Communications Ministry Inc.(a group of homosexual priests, nuns and religious laypersons) newsletter of February, 2000 advertised a “retreat and workshop...for men seeking skills and experience in giving and receiving anal touch for healing and/or pleasure.”

There is also the question of the church’s moral leadership in society. Dr. De Young writes

If religion has a direct effect on morality, and morality, in turn, has a direct effect on law or legislation, then the new interpretations of Scripture have serious consequences for society, and we must answer them. Religious grounds derived from Scripture have influenced sexual behavior in the West more fully than has any other influence. Christians cannot abandon the implications that their theology has for public morality and legislation. They must speak to the legitimacy of homosexuality and its effects on morality and law within and without the church.

Homosexual Tactic # 3: Infiltrate and Sabotage

A final area of focus is the infiltration of the Bible-believing church by militant activists. Those who have never experienced political conflict with the "gay" movement may not appreciate the seriousness of this problem. Having devoted a dozen years to the defense of the natural family, the writer can attest to both the determination and the guile of "gay" activists -- for whom the end truly justifies any means. During my years with Oregon Citizens Alliance I was subjected to a continuous barrage of "dirty tricks" that included bomb threats, death threats, mail and phone tampering, lawsuits, vandalism, and more (the attacks stopped when I became a lawyer). The tactics of church infiltrators are more subtle, but no less desperate.

The leading figure in the effort to overthrow the Bible-believing church is Mel White, the former ghostwriter for both Jerry Falwell and Billy Graham. After coming out of the closet into open homosexual status in 1994, White founded the organization of militant "gay Christians" called Soulforce as a vehicle to attack the church. "Mel White's two primary messages," writes Joe Dallas, "are...The Religious Right is homophobic and must be stopped, and anyone promoting the idea that homosexuality can be overcome must be silenced."²⁵

That effort to stop and/or silence the church includes both overt and covert means.

"We have gone underground and we have people in every one of the Religious Right's organizations" [including churches]," bragged White. He later boasts

For decades we have played their organs, led their choirs, taught their classes, and filled their pews. We are their pastors and priests, their deacons, trustees, Sunday School teachers and superintendents....[Now we are taking action to end] our own oppression [and] reclaim our dignity [through] carefully planned acts of nonviolent dissent.²⁶

What actions are these in-the-closet homosexual activists taking in the church? We can only guess. Yet, considering the extent to which their out-of-the-closet comrades will go, we know we should be concerned.

In 1996 I was a guest speaker at Pastor Ron Greer's church in Madison, Wisconsin. Pastor Greer was the African-American fireman who made national news when he was kicked off the city fire department for speaking negatively about homosexuality on the job. My visit occurred while he was still struggling to keep his job. When we arrived at his small church for our evening program, the building was already surrounded by more than 400 "gay" radicals. When the door was unlocked by Pastor Greer, a large contingent of homosexual activists (mostly lesbians) shoved to the head of the line and pushed their way into the church. Within minutes they had taken control of the sanctuary and refused to allow the meeting to proceed. For over an hour these "gay" militants staged a profanity-laced demonstration inside the church while others ringing the building pounded on the walls and windows with rocks and trash can lids, chanting "Crush the Christians, Bring Back the Lions." In the end, police intervention was obtained to stop the demonstration and I was allowed to make my presentation.

In a similar manner, Soulforce specializes in pressuring the church with acts of civil disobedience. On June 11, 2002 a group of 200 Soulforce activists invaded the Southern Baptist Convention.

As the denomination's president, the Rev. James Merritt, began his annual address, demonstrators rose from their seats one or two at a time and walked the aisles, yelling to the more than 8,700 Southern Baptists seated on the bleachers and the floor...over and over: 'Jesus loves your Gay children', 'Stop the suffering', 'Stop killing us', and 'God loves all of us.'....the demonstrations continued during his speech.²⁷

A protest by "gay" activists at the United Methodist Convention in 2000 achieved similar success in temporarily shutting down legislative proceedings.²⁸

The pressure to abandon Biblical integrity is also being applied to individual churches. In September of 2002, White and his partner Gary Nixon leased a house across the street from Jerry Falwell's Thomas Road Baptist Church in Lynchburg, Virginia. "Their quest," writes Rev. Falwell, "is to compel our church members and me to alter our biblical stance that homosexuality is a sinful lifestyle. These men accuse me of endorsing 'spiritual violence' [even though] our church routinely ministers to homosexuals in the same manner we reach out to all sinners."²⁹ White ignored a call to repentance and responded with "[p]lans for...a march for equality around Lynchburg; a display of untruths uttered by Falwell answered by truths from mental health professionals, scientists, and Bible scholars; and trainings in non-violent civil disobedience."³⁰

The new militancy of the "gay Christian" movement is likely to increase, following a trend that began in the late 1960s. Dallas identifies three stages of development of this trend in the changing message of the

“gay church”: “1) ‘God loves us too’ (1969-1976), 2) ‘Not only does God love us, but He also approves of our being gay’ (1976-1979), [and] 3) ‘Anyone saying we can’t be gay and Christian must be stopped.’ (1980-present)”³¹

Wherever homosexuals have gained sufficient power Christians are indeed being stopped, primarily through “hate crime” laws. The following examples are drawn from an article by Robert Knight in *Family Voice*.

* When Rev. Kristopher Okwedy of Staten Island, New York, purchased space on two billboards to post a Biblical verse about homosexuality, he thought he was conveying the Word of God. But public officials forced the billboard company to remove the verses. Reason: They conveyed “an atmosphere of intolerance.”

* In Saskatchewan, Canada, a newspaper owner was hauled before the province’s Human Rights Commission for running an ad that contained Bible verses dealing with homosexuality. Two mayors in Ontario have faced personal fines for failing to declare “gay pride” events in their cities. Their refusal to celebrate homosexuality showed “bigotry” toward homosexuals, the human rights commissions concluded.

* Canadian authorities have warned Dr. James Dobson’s Focus on the Family, Dr. Jerry Falwell’s Old Time Gospel Hour, and the Dr. Laura (Schlessinger) Show that they cannot broadcast unless they cut any portions dealing with homosexuality. The Canadian broadcasting board cites Canada’s “hate crime” law, in which it is illegal to speak of any group derogatorily. This also means that pastors cannot read Bible verses on air regarding homosexuality, or they endanger the licenses of stations that carry them.

* In San Francisco, city supervisors passed a resolution denouncing a Truth in Love ad campaign by Concerned Women for America and other pro-family groups. It also urged local media not to run the ads. The message—that Jesus can save homosexuals and help them leave homosexuality—was said to be “full of lies” and causing “a marked increase in anti-gay violence.” One supervisor even wrote a letter directly blaming pro-family groups for the beating death of Wyoming college student Matthew Shepard.³²

The greater the level of homosexual power, the more severe the punishment of Christians. In Sweden, which has led the global march toward “gay” legitimization, an evangelical pastor served a four-week jail sentence in 1998 for violating a Swedish anti-hate statute against “verbal violence” toward homosexuals. His act of violence? He had preached a sermon about Sodom and Gomorrah.³³

Responding Appropriately

Christians, especially pastors, must awake to the reality of “gay” politics and its implications for the church.

1. The “gay” agenda is real. It is an evolving set of political objectives whose ultimate goal is the *supremacy* of homosexuality and related sexual lifestyles in our society and culture. Sexual orientation policies, domestic partnerships, hate crime laws, “gay” marriage, “gay” adoption, “gay” theology are only steps toward a future homosexual-dominated social order.
2. Gay activists define their personal identity by their homosexual actions and desires, which causes them to believe that advancing the “gay” agenda is a fight for their very lives.
3. The “gays” emotional urgency about their agenda, combined with the sense (fostered by their own propaganda) of being victims of severe injustice, allows them to justify virtually any political tactic against those whom they perceive as their enemies.
4. The most hated enemy of the “gay” movement is the Bible-believing Christian church, because the Christian commitment to preserving God’s design for the family, and to opposing sexual sin, stands as the final barrier to the legitimization of homosexuality.
5. Over the past 50 years in the United States the “gay” movement has achieved most of its political objectives and has now set its sights on the church – the only major social institution that still stands in its path to power.
6. “Peaceful coexistence” between the church and “gay” activists is not possible since their logical presuppositions about sexual morality in society are contradictory and mutually-exclusive. The cultural influence of one side must prevail; that of the other must diminish.
7. Failure of Bible-believing Christians to actively oppose the legitimization of homosexuality in the church -- and to actively compete for influence in the larger society -- will result in the defeat and plunder of the church by militant “gays.”

Students of history will recognize that the warning in item #7 is not mere hyperbole. The church has suffered defeat and plunder in the past, most recently under the Nazis. (Not coincidentally, the Nazi political machine was dominated by homosexuals, a little-known fact that is well documented in my first book, *The Pink Swastika*.³⁴)

The appropriate response to the homosexual seduction of the church is simply for genuine Christians to speak the truth in love, in the pulpit and the public square. We must not shrink from declaring open, unrepentant homosexuals to be non-Christians, despite the fact that we will be called “haters.” We must assert and defend the Christian presupposition that God’s natural order for mankind is heterosexual, monogamous marriage. In regard to the social controversies of the day (e.g. “gay” adoption), we must inform ourselves of the facts and integrate the facts into our recommendations to decision-makers. In the face of religious pluralism we must affirm the truth of Christ and His unchanging Word. In short we must take leadership and we must do it now.

Every Bible-believing fellowship in America needs to confront the issue of homosexuality in a manner that will empower believers to defend the faith against “gay theology.” This will also protect each church fellowship from any “gay” political intrigues that might otherwise harm or split the congregation. Yet this must be done in wisdom, realizing the importance of distinguishing “gay” militants from non-activist homosexuals who may be genuine truth-seekers in the church.

Optimally, the message of the church to homosexuals should be one of hope and healing through the love of Christ, manifested in the lives of church members. As noted in a September 4, 2000 editorial in *Christianity Today*, this is an unrealized ideal in much of the church today.

Churches have much work ahead to become places of hospitality and pastoral care for homosexual Christians. Something is deeply wrong if a Christian suffers ostracism after admitting to struggles with same-sex attraction. A wilful refusal to repent of sin is one matter; confessing to temptation is entirely another.

Frankly, the churches most protected from “gay” activism are *not* those which preach an “us versus them” doctrine, but those which actively minister to recovering homosexuals. Indeed, the ex-“gays” in these congregations tend to serve as “spiritual antibodies” against the invasion of unrecovered “gays” who would seek to harm the church. Their presence is also a shining witness to the redemptive power of Jesus Christ.

We can all learn from the experience of my friend Sonny. When his partner died of AIDS, Sonny was left alone to face the world and his own worsening condition. It was then that he remembered a time early in his adolescence when he had been introduced to Jesus at a Christian summer camp. The memory of that hopeful experience caused him to go back to church. Unfortunately, Sonny picked a lukewarm church, thinking it would be soft on homosexuality. After a while he opened up to some members of the church and told them about his situation. Shortly thereafter a major donor in the congregation, fearful of “catching” AIDS from Sonny’s presence in the church, went to the pastor and told him that either Sonny was to be asked to leave or he himself would leave the church. The pastor asked Sonny to leave.

At that time I was attending a “fundamentalist” church in Portland, Oregon which the homosexuals hated for its devotion to Scripture. Somehow Sonny found his way there. I heard the story about Sonny and the lukewarm church from my own pastor. He told it from the pulpit one Sunday morning to the entire congregation (without identifying Sonny by name) and announced that he had invited Sonny to join our church and that anyone who had fears about AIDS could meet with him and a health worker to receive information and resources. The pastor received a spontaneous outpouring of applause and as I sat there clapping I determined that I would seek out this man and befriend him.

Little did I know that Sonny had been sitting directly behind me every Sunday for several weeks, silently hating me because I was the spokesman for the Oregon Citizens Alliance -- a man whom he believed hated him out of bigotry because that is what he had been told by Oregon’s “gay” leaders.

Some weeks later I bumped into Sonny in the courtyard of the church and instantly realized that he was the man whom the pastor had described. Within the first ten minutes of our conversation he told me that he was about to lose both his home and his job. He was being fired from his post as the manager of a “gay” apartment complex because he had become a Christian and renounced homosexuality. I remember

hearing myself invite him to live with my family if we could find a house that would accommodate us both. Even then I knew it must have been the Holy Spirit speaking through me because I was so surprised to hear myself say it. However, the Lord miraculously provided the living arrangements, clearly confirming that we were in His will.

Sonny's story embodies the three primary ways that churches respond to the "gay" agenda. The homosexuals who turned Sonny out of his house and job because he renounced homosexuality are like the "pro-gay church," which will always act to silence genuine Christians, no matter how much harm results. The lukewarm church which seemed soft on homosexuality (because it failed to teach sound doctrine on the issue) is like the majority of mainline and conservative churches in America today. They help neither the hurting homosexual nor the misguided Christians in their pews. The fellowship that both Sonny and I attended is representative of the healthy church in America today: compassionate toward same-sex strugglers like Sonny, yet fully committed to the active teaching of Biblical truth about homosexuality.

To which type of church do you give your allegiance?

Endnotes

1. This document is published in full in pdf format at www.abidingtruth.com.
2. For the complete article see www.abidingtruth.com/pfrc/archives/Overhauling_of_Straight_America_printable.html or do a word search on "overhauling" at www.abidingtruth.com.
3. Dallas, Joe. *A Strong Delusion*, (1996) p.82.
4. Dallas p.19
5. "Anti-gay votes split Methodist conclave," *Sacramento Bee*, May 5, 2000.
6. Dreher, Rod, "The Gay Question," *National Review*, April 22, 2002.
7. Rose, Michael S., *Goodbye, Good Men*, 2002, Regnery
8. "Presbyterian leaders keep ordination ban on noncelibate gays," *The Orange County Register*, June 26, 1999.
9. "Reform Jews OK same-sex unions," *Washington Post*, March 30, 2000.
10. "Conservatives may rethink stance on gays, but change won't be quick," *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, January 27, 2003.
11. "Talk of Presbyterian Split Grows," *Christianity Today*, December 3, 2001.

12. "Catholic Church openly debates gay-priest issue," *Associated Press*, May 24, 2002.
13. Ibid.
14. Thomas, Judy L., "A Church's Challenge, Catholic priests are dying of AIDS, often in silence," *The Kansas City Star*, January 30, 2000.
15. "Talk of Presbyterian Split Grows," *Christianity Today*, December, 3 2001.
16. "Talk to Your Deputies and Bishops About Same-Sex Blessings!" *Voice of Integrity*, Summer/Fall 2002.
17. *Family Research Institute Newsletter*, December, 2000.
18. See www.religoustolerance.org/hom_elca.htm
19. "Church becomes a house divided," *JOnline, Milwaukie Journal Sentinel*, January 19, 2003
20. Dallas, p.86.
21. Pennington, Sylvia, *Ex-Gays? There are None!*, 1989, Hawthorne, p. 161.
22. De Young, James B., *Homosexuality: Contemporary Claims Examined in Light of the Bible and Other Ancient Literature and Law*, 2000, Kregel Publications, p. 33f.
23. Ibid. p. 61
24. Ibid. p. 154.
25. Dallas, p. 94
26. See www.soulforce.org.
27. "Gay rights protesters arrested at Southern Baptist convention," *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, 6-11-02.
28. "Holding the Middle Ground," *Christianity Today*, June 12, 2000.
29. "An unfolding tragedy," *WorldNetDaily.com*, 9/21/2002.
30. See www.soulforce.org.
31. Dallas, p. 95.

32. Knight, Robert H., "The Hate Crimes Agenda: An Attack on Faith," *Family Voice*, July/August 2001

33. "Hate Literature Laws Sweep the U.S. and Other Western Democracies," *The Christian World Report*, April, 1989, pg.1.

34. Lively, Scott and Abrams, Kevin A., *The Pink Swastika: Homosexuality in the Nazi Party*, 4th Edition, 2002, Veritas Aeterna Press. See www.abidingtruth.com or www.pinkswastika.com to read this 400-page book on-line.