

# A CHANGE OF AFFECTION BY BECKET COOK

## A RESPONSE TO KATHY BALDOCK'S REVIEW

by Avram Yehoshua

[The Seed of Abraham](#)

Kathy Baldock takes Becket Cook 'over the coals' in her review of his book on Amazon<sup>1</sup> by stating that she's read books like this before and they fail to satisfy because she says that Cook, a former homosexual, but now a Christian who abstains from homosexuality, is only deceiving himself. Baldock, a well known LGBTQ advocate,<sup>2</sup> with no formal credentials,<sup>3</sup> presents three points to prove her case:

1. The term *homosexual* wasn't used in an English Bible until the RSV used it in 1946, and then, only in 1st Cor. 6:9, where two Greek words, one meaning *effeminate* and the other meaning, *men who had sex with men*, were combined into one word (homosexual). Baldock says the term homosexual really shouldn't be used to describe a man with same sex preferences because a man laying with another man in ancient times, according to Baldock, was either forced to do so or in subjection to the other man (who might not want to lay with the man). Baldock believes same sex sexual relations today aren't like that; they're in a different category, and so she teaches that the Bible doesn't speak against same sex preferences or attractions or homosexuality, and so being homosexual isn't a sin because 1st Cor. 6:9 doesn't address homosexuality. Other English Bibles, though, began using the term 'homosexual,' and because of that, "Christian anti-gay books started popping up"<sup>4</sup> (in the 1970s), and homosexuality has been confused with what Paul was speaking about, according to Baldock.
2. Baldock also takes Cook to task for his self-imposed celibacy, which is how many former homosexuals and lesbians live their new Christian lives, saying that isn't an answer. She says,  
"After all, imposed celibacy (as required of Catholic priests) was an idea straight from the devil (Martin Luther). Mockery and disdain for the Catholic idea of imposed celibacy had been part of the Protestant narrative for over 450 years since the Reformation."<sup>5</sup>
3. Baldock also points out that,  
"in 1973 the American Psychological Association corrected their non-science, non-study-based decades-old wrongful designation of homosexuality as a mental illness," (and so) "one may have hoped people in the religious world would revisit the placement of the word 'homosexual' in the Bible as well."

This third point means for Baldock, being gay is not an illness, and therefore, should be accepted by the Church as an alternate lifestyle. In other words, gay or homosexual people can continue in their same sex ways and still be Christians in good standing with Jesus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kathy Baldock's Aug 4, 2019 review on Amazon of Becket Cook's book, [A Change of Affection](#). "The passages all referred to sexual acts resulting from excessive behaviors, rape, lust, manipulation, or abuse. There were no categories of heterosexual or homosexual when any section of the Bible was written."

<sup>2</sup> LGBTQ means, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer.

<sup>3</sup> Michael Brown takes Kathy Baldock to task for her unscholarly and ungodly responses to her review of his book, in his article, "[Exposing A Deceptive Book Review](#)." Brown also says that "Kathy has no serious academic credentials of her own yet freely speaks as an authority."

<sup>4</sup> Baldock's Aug 4, 2019 review on Amazon of Becket Cook's book, [A Change of Affection](#).

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

Because of those three points Baldock presents her understanding:

“But here is the bottom line: *a great moral injustice* (the conservative Christian approach *to changing or rejecting* LGBTQ people) was the result of factual errors (*mistranslated words*, and viewing homosexuality *as a mental illness, then a sin*). What do we/you do with and about all this? It’s gotten pretty complicated. Do you ignore it, remain complicit, and carry on?”<sup>6</sup>

Baldock then criticizes Becket Cook and Christianity for not accepting the concept that a gay or homosexual person can be a Christian by stating that she’s read a lot of books like Cook’s, and that,

“The majority of conservative religious leaders certainly have ignored, remained complicit and carried on. The authors, whose books (including “A Change of Affection”) I have read and reviewed certainly have done the same. *I’ve read all these books. Not many people can claim that. They are all basically the same.* The books are full of the easy, thinly-constructed, sloppy, crowd-pleasing work that continues to bolster the *gays-must-change narrative*...I am sure Cook is a well-intentioned and lovely man, but this book and all the promotion that goes with it will be weaponized against LGBTQ Christians.”<sup>7</sup>

Baldock’s last point is that since the Church didn’t come against gay people in the early 1900s (and earlier), and that homosexuality was seen medically as a mental illness, but now it’s seen as an alternate lifestyle, that the Church shouldn’t call homosexuality a sin. The problem with this is that she conveniently passes over 3500 years of God calling men laying with men sin. It doesn’t matter if a man was subjected to another man or if they had an attraction to each other (which is Baldock’s ‘new perspective’ on the subject). The Bible is clear that any and all men laying with men is sin.

Also, one reason why the Church didn’t preach against men laying with men or homosexuals was because gay men and women didn’t openly parade their sin in public. It wasn’t ‘seen’ and so it wasn’t preached against. Gay men kept their homosexuality to themselves, keeping it ‘in the closet,’ until gay rights activism began in the 1970s.<sup>8</sup> Since then the Church has preached against it ‘with one voice.’

Baldock takes the stand that since the Church didn’t come against it before, they shouldn’t be doing it now, especially with science affirming gayness as an alternate lifestyle and not a sin, but science isn’t in the position of declaring something sin or not, especially secular, anti-God science. Their stance doesn’t alter God’s Word and understanding of homosexuality or men laying with men in sexual intimacy. It’s not what man says about the act that matters, for man is constantly changing his mind on many matters of science, but what does Paul say in 1st Corinthians 6:9?

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> The American Gay Rights Movement: [A Timeline](#). In 1948 Alfred Kinsey published *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, revealing to the public that homosexuality is far more widespread than was commonly believed. In 1951 the Mattachine Society, the first national gay rights organization, is formed by Harry Hay, considered by many to be the founder of the gay rights movement. In 1969 The Stonewall riots transform the gay rights movement from one limited to a small number of activists into a widespread protest for equal rights and *acceptance*. Patrons of a gay bar in New York’s Greenwich Village, the Stonewall Inn, fight back during a police raid on June 27, sparking three days of riots. (How can we be asked to *accept sin*?)

## Paul's Words in First Corinthians 6:9

Point one of my paper (p. 1) pertains to Baldock's problem with the RSV, in 1946, using the word *homosexual* for 1st Cor. 6:9. Before the RSV combined the two Greek words in 1st Cor. 6:9 into 'homosexual' the two words were each given a different English word or phrase, and the term homosexual wasn't used. As an example of this I've italicized the two English word/phrases from the King James Bible:

“Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor *effeminate*, nor *abusers of themselves with mankind*,” (1st Corinthians 6:9 KJV).

The two Greek words speak of sinful sexual behavior. The first Greek word is *malakos*,

“μαλακός; *malakos*...*soft*; *soft to the touch*...in a bad sense: *effeminate*, of a catamite,<sup>9</sup> a male who *submits* his body to unnatural lewdness, 1 Cor. 6:9.”<sup>10</sup>

A *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* states the Greek word *malakos* conveys the meaning of,

“*being passive* in a same-sex relationship, *effeminate* esp. of *catamites*, of men and boys who are sodomized by other males in such a relationship...1 Cor 6:9 (‘male prostitutes’ NRSV is too narrow a rendering; ‘sexual pervert’ REB is too broad).”<sup>11</sup>

The Greek lexicons speak of *malakos* as a male who is in subjection to another male, and/or a male who acts as the ‘woman’ (*effeminate*) in the relationship of a male with another male in being submissive. This male is penetrated by the other male.

The second Greek word, coming right after *malakos* in 1st Cor. 6:9 is ἀρσενοκοίτης (*arsen'nokoi'tays*). Thayer states it means, “one who lies with a male as with a female, a sodomite:<sup>12</sup> 1 Cor. 6:9; 1 Tim. 1:10.”<sup>13</sup> A *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* says it is,

“one who has intercourse w. a man as w. a woman...a male who engages in sexual activity w. a pers. of his own sex, *pederast* <sup>14</sup>1 Cor 6:9.”<sup>15</sup>

Kathy Baldock takes issue with the 1946 RSV's combining of the two Greek words into the one word, homosexual, because she doesn't think those words describe the homosexual today. According to Baldock, those words don't recognize her understanding of 'homosexual' as the “natural existence of attraction between two people of the same sex.”<sup>16</sup> This understanding, Baldock writes, wouldn't come about until modern man identified this 'natural desire' of 'same sex attraction' in the 1970s through the APA study.<sup>17</sup> She writes,

“to imagine the writers of Leviticus, or the Apostle Paul in the first century, could have under-

---

<sup>9</sup> A catamite is “a boy (who is) kept for homosexual activity.”

<sup>10</sup> Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, para. 6152.

<sup>11</sup> Walter Bauer, augmented by William F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and Frederick Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (third edition, 2001), p. 613 (Accordance Bible Software).

<sup>12</sup> Sodomy is “sexual intercourse involving anal or oral copulation.”

<sup>13</sup> Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, paragraph 1786.

<sup>14</sup> Pederasty is “a sexual relationship between an adult man and a pubescent or adolescent boy. The term pederasty is primarily used to refer to historical practices of certain cultures, particularly ancient Greece and ancient Rome.”

<sup>15</sup> Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, p. 135.

<sup>16</sup> Kathy Baldock, [How and When the Word Homosexual Was First Introduced into the Bible](#) (Nov. 25, 2017). Also, in the USA, there isn't the class system, as there was, say, in ancient Rome, where a 'lord' or wealthy man could have a whole stable of catamites for his pleasure.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

stood such things about *same-sex attractions is not within the realm of possibility*. Indeed, the writers did see same-sex behavior, *but it was not what we understand today as a homosexual sexual attraction.*”<sup>18</sup>

“Every example of same-sex interaction in the Bible is an example of: subjugation through rape or violence, or excessive or lustful behavior done with full disregard of acceptable social and sexual norms of male dominance, self control, or sex towards procreation.”<sup>19</sup>

Baldock doesn’t seem to think that ‘same-sex interaction’ is lustful (for if it were to her it would fall into her ‘every example’ of men together not caring about ‘procreation.’ Perhaps she needs a refresher course on lust?

Baldock also seems to only see *malakos*, the first Greek word, as a catamite, one who is forcibly subjected to another male, and so this doesn’t pertain to her definition of homosexual in today’s same sex relationships where one man plays the effeminate part.

The second Greek word is seen by Baldock to only pertain to pederasty, “a sexual relationship between an adult male and a adolescent or pubescent boy.” Unfortunately for Baldock’s position both definitions encompass wider shades of meaning and so overthrow her narrow interpretations of the Greek words. *Malakos* also means one who is *effeminate* and who submits (voluntarily) to ‘unnatural lewdness,’ and *arsen’nokoi’tays* also means any person who has same sex intimacy or as Thayer defines the word, “one who lies with a male as with a female.”

Baldock is wrong about all ancient same sex activity being one of rape, etc. It doesn’t take into account men mutually laying with one another, which was a widespread phenomena in many countries. She is trying to navigate a very fine line between what God calls an abomination (men laying with men as with women) and a same sex relationship that is mutually agreed upon (her understanding of ‘homosexual’). She believes that neither Moses, the Apostle Paul nor God could have known of this sensitive scientific difference of male attraction. What she fails to acknowledge is that there were same sex relationships of attraction and mutual consent in the days of the ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as other ancient peoples (e.g. the Canaanites). Perversion by any name is still perversion, and homosexuality isn’t as pristine as Baldock would have us believe.

Of course, her position has no bearing whatsoever on God declaring these relationships an abomination in both the Old and the New Testaments. Nowhere in Scripture does God say that two consenting and ‘loving’ male individuals who are attracted to each other may have same sex intimacy. If that was written in Scripture, Baldock would be right, but because it’s nowhere to be found, but just the opposite is written, she is twisting God’s Word to suit her perverse theology.

The various English Bible translations of First Corinthians 6:9 have a number of different English words that address the two Greek words. The turn of the century ASV, as well as the archaic KJV, and also the modern NASB and NET present accurate English translations:

1. The ASV, which predates the 1946 RSV has ...effeminate (nor) .....abusers of themselves with men.
2. The KJV, which also predates the RSV, has ...effeminate (nor) .....abusers of themselves with mankind.
3. The NASB has .....effeminate (nor) .....homosexuals.
4. The NET has .....passive homosexual partner (nor) .....practicing homosexuals.
5. The ESV has .....adulterers<sup>20</sup> (nor) .....men who practice homosexuality.
6. The HCSB has .....adulterers (nor) .....anyone practicing homosexuality.
7. The NIV has .....male prostitutes<sup>21</sup> (nor) ...homosexual offenders.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> It’s strange that both the ESV and the HCSB translate *malakos* as adulterers and not effeminate. It’s hard to see how an adulterer (not an adulteress) would be effeminate.

8. The NRSV has .....male prostitutes (nor) ...sodomites.

The term homosexual may not have literally been used in the English Bible until the RSV chose to combine the two Greek words into one English word in 1946, but it describes the practice of both the effeminate homosexual and the masculine homosexual found in the two Greek words of 1st Corinthians 6:9. This sin, like idolatry and adultery, will keep those practicing it out of the Kingdom of God, whether they call themselves Christian or not. The point is that one cannot practice a lifestyle of homosexuality, however it is defined, and expect to be happy on Judgment Day (Gal. 5:19-21). Being sexually intimate with one another is still a sin that will condemn them on Judgment Day, and that is what the second Greek word expressly deals with, while the first takes the effeminate partner to accountability

Kathy Baldock's first point, that the,

“term *homosexual* wasn't used in the English Bible until the RSV used it in 1946, and then, only in 1st Cor. 6:9-10, and so it really shouldn't be used to describe a man with same sex preferences,”

is certainly not a valid biblical nor linguistic point because she seeks to erase the sinful act of men laying with men if 'they are attracted to one another' (i.e. it's not rape, etc.). Baldock completely overlooks that there's nothing in Scripture that supports "same sex preference," which is called sin, and such a sin, according to God, was worthy of death.

### ***Why wasn't the word homosexual used in the King James Version?***

It might seem strange to us that the neither the KJV nor the ASV have the word *homosexual* in 1st Cor. 6:9 or anywhere else (e.g. 1st Tim. 1:10).<sup>22</sup> That's because the word didn't come into the English language until 1892. It was first coined or created in 1880 by a German doctor in referring to aberrant sexual perversion. He took the Greek 'homo' (man), and combined it with the Latin 'sexual.' In translating Krafft-Ebing's "Psychopathia Sexualis," from German into English *homosexual*<sup>23</sup> came into the English language. Other terms, such as *homogenic* (H. Havelock Ellis, "Studies in Psychology," 1897), and *sexual inversion* (1883) were earlier clinical terms for it in English, but they didn't stick after *homosexual* entered the fray.

This is the reason why 'homosexual' wasn't used in the 1611 KJV. The 1901 ASV didn't use it because it wasn't recognized by most people in the USA. It would take some time for the term to be understood by the general public. By 1946 the RSV used it because it had entered mainstream consciousness.

---

<sup>21</sup> It's strange that both the NIV and the NRSV translate *malakos* as male prostitutes and not effeminate. It seems that they think the only effeminates in the ancient world were male prostitutes.

<sup>22</sup> The ESV, HCSB, NASB, and NET use homosexual for 1st Timothy 1:10.

<sup>23</sup> [Matt Slick](#), in his article, *The word "homosexual" didn't appear in English Bibles until 1946*. "In technical use, either male or female; but in non-technical use almost always male. Slang shortened form homo first attested 1929."

# What Does God Say?

The Apostle Paul speaks of homosexuality in his Letter to the Romans, without using the term homosexuality, but the act is evident:

“For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. For even their women *exchanged the natural use for what is against nature*. Likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, *burned in their lust for one another, men with men committing what is shameful* and receiving in themselves the penalty of their error. which was due.” (Romans 1:26-27 NKJV)

Same sex attraction, whether male or female, is as ancient as fire and brimstone, which destroyed the town of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19:24). Everett Harrison writes that just before these verses Paul speaks of the sin of idolatry and then turns to emphasize ‘perversion in sexual relations.’<sup>24</sup> In the ancient world there was a direct connection between idolatry and sexual perversion. Once men left the knowledge of the one true God, attained from both gazing into the Heavens and the world about them with its animals, trees, fruits and food, etc., they devised gods and goddesses who practiced their sexual perversions, authorizing them in their perverse ways.

Douglas Moo writes that all men know what is right, but when they choose to deviate from it, God gives them over to a depraved mind. Each man chooses to sexually sin or not:

“Though Gentiles do not have ‘special revelation,’ as the Jews do in the Scriptures, they nevertheless have been given knowledge of the truth about God in the creation around them. *God’s invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen* (v. 20). Paul makes clear that Gentiles in his day, and people who have never heard the gospel or read the Bible in ours, have genuinely ‘seen’ something of God and who he is. But some people who receive that truth do not respond appropriately to it: rather than glorifying God or giving him thanks, they turn from the truth to embrace idolatry (vv. 21-23).”<sup>25</sup>

In other words, men and women know that it’s wrong to have same sex intimacy, but they choose to live their own sinful and rebellious ways. Harrison, and then Moo, write of how God gives them over to a depraved mind, saying,

“Paul’s use of ‘exchanged’ is suggestive. The first exchange, that of the truth for the lie, is followed by another—the upsetting of the normal course of nature in sexual relations. Instead of using the ordinary terms for men and women, Paul substitutes ‘males’ and ‘females.’ *The irony is that this sort of bestiality finds no counterpart in the animal kingdom*. Perversion is the unique contrivance of the human species. In bringing this discussion to a close, the apostle uses two expressions, ‘received’ and ‘due penalty,’ which in the original involve the idea of recompense, the punishment being in keeping with the offense. These terms serve to underscore the principle of *lex talionis* contained in the words, ‘Because of this, God gave them over...’ *Sexual deviation contains in itself a recompense, a punishment for the abandonment of God and his ways...*The ‘gay’ facade is a thin veil for deep-seated frustration. *The folly of homosexuality is proclaimed in its inability to reproduce the human species* in keeping with the divine commandment (Gen 1:28)...Throughout the passage man is represented as active—seeing, thinking, doing. He is not represented as victimized, as taken captive against his will, as the dupe of evil influences from outside himself. ‘Sin comes from the mind, which perverts the judgment. The

---

<sup>24</sup> Everett F. Harrison, Author; Frank E. Gaebelin, general Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed., *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 10, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1990), paragraph 52786 (Accordance Bible Software).

<sup>25</sup> Douglas J. Moo, *Romans*, New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition; ed. D. A. Carson. et al. Accordance electronic ed. (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1994), p. 1121.

effect of retribution is to abandon the mind to that depravity' (Henri Maurier, *The Other Covenant* [New York: Newman Press, 1968], p. 185)."<sup>26</sup>

This understanding, of man knowing that there is a God who created the Universe *and* that He is a righteous God who has a standard for our behavior, forms the foundation of Natural Revelation. Moo writes:

"This passage is one of the most important in the Bible for the concept of 'natural revelation:' the idea that, in addition to revealing himself in Christ and in the Scriptures, God *has also revealed himself to everybody through nature and history*. As Paul will hint at later (see Rom. 1:32; 2:14-16), all human beings have the capacity to receive such revelation because they continue to bear the divine image...Thus, Paul concludes, because all people have been given access to genuine knowledge about God, they are, when they turn from it, *without excuse* (v. 20)."<sup>27</sup>

"Human rejection of God leads to God's punishment of humans. Three times in this paragraph Paul tells us that Gentiles have made an 'exchange:' *turning from the truth of God and his moral requirements to their own gods and sinful ways* (vv. 23, 25, 27). Three times also Paul indicates God's reaction to this 'exchange' with the statement *God gave them over* (vv. 24, 26, 28). Faced with human sin and rebellion, *God turns people over to the sin they have chosen and its consequences*. The language Paul uses (Gk. *paradidōmi*, 'hand over') refers to...a judicial act in which God confirms people in the decision they have made and turns them over to the consequences of it. Prominent among the sins to which God has handed over people are idolatry (v. 25; cf. v. 23) and sexual sins, *especially the sin of homosexuality* (vv. 24, 26-27). Paul here agrees with the Jewish tradition—and the OT—in seizing on homosexual practice as a particularly evident example of the Gentiles' rejection of God. *Unnatural*, applied to homosexual practice in v. 26, in this context denotes the practice as one that is *against the natural law, given by God to regulate all people*."<sup>28</sup>

R. C. H. Lenski says that at first their sin is an evil desire given in to, but as they continue to practice this abominable lifestyle it becomes *pathos*, "πάθος a constant burning passion" in which "they drown...in the vile-ness."<sup>29</sup> Lenski writes that calling them 'male and female' is degrading, and that they are seen as descending to the level of an animal and "being nothing but creatures of sex."<sup>30</sup> Lenski states,

"females are mentioned first" because "they 'as well,' in these passions of dishonor" are like the males in their vileness. Paul uses *metallaxan* μετήλλαξαν, the same verb used in v. 25...a "frightful *exchanging*, a horrible trading and perversion...*They exchange 'the natural use for that contrary to nature*."<sup>31</sup>

Thayer states that *metallaxan* means, "to exchange, change...one thing into another, Rom. 1:26."<sup>32</sup> In other words, homosexuals and lesbians and the entire LGBTQ community become something they were never intended to be—a perversion of nature. Lenski, writing around 1932, reveals that in his day (as well as ours), this perversion was defended as moral. This,

"vileness is defended to this day *as not being immoral in any way*. In 1931 a book came off the

---

<sup>26</sup> Harrison, *Romans*, para. 52786.

<sup>27</sup> Moo, *Romans*, p. 1121.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., pp. 1121-1122.

<sup>29</sup> R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans 1-7*, Lenski's Commentary on the New Testament; Accordance electronic ed. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), pp. 112-113.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 113.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Joseph Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Accordance electronic ed., paragraph 6354.

press which fully corroborated Paul, for this book propounded a code of sexual ethics that was uncontrolled by God. Let go of God, and the very bottom of filth will be reached. Even the most *unnatural will be called quite natural.*"<sup>33</sup>

Baldock isn't the first 'advocate' for the sinful, immoral, ungodly and unnatural lifestyle of LBGTQ people. Her third point, that same sex relations were first seen as a mental illness, and that the APA in 1973 'corrected' their assessment of it, that it wasn't a mental illness, and so, 'an alternate lifestyle,' is man's way of allowing for this sin, but Scripture has always declared it an abominable sin in the face of men justifying it. Lenski relates that Paul, speaking of this perverse lifestyle as 'unseemly' (Romans 1:27, KJV), wants us to know that it was condemned by God 15 centuries earlier in Mosaic Law:

"The unseemliness...is so positively forbidden in Lev. 18:22, 24, 25 as a pagan abomination and defilement...The prevalence of this beastly sin in the whole Greek and Roman world of Paul's day, *which was practiced and fully defended by the most prominent men in that age is well known.* Paul cites these sexual violations of nature as marking the depth of immorality to which godlessness descends, because sexual degradation always constitutes such a mark...It is so the world over to this day. Without God sex runs wild."<sup>34</sup>

"That recompense is the vicious effect of the unnatural sexual vices upon men's own bodies and their minds, corrupting, destroying, disintegrating. The thought is this: *deliberately rejecting the knowledge of God, which they had by nature* because they loved all sorts of unrighteousness, which this knowledge would most certainly have condemned, God gave men over to the sin they would not let go (of) at any price, to its most disgraceful and disgusting forms, and in their delusion practicing these, they received as due reward the awful results in their own corroding bodies."<sup>35</sup>

## God in the Old Testament

1500 years before Paul wrote his Letters to the Corinthians and Romans, God states to Israel, "You must not lie with a male as with a woman. It is an abomination!" (Lev. 18:22) Commenting on this, Baruch Levine writes,

"Male homosexuality is associated with the ancient Canaanites...Two biblical narratives highlight this theme, one about the men of Sodom in Genesis 19, and the other concerning the fate of the concubine at Gibeah in Judges 19. Although Gibeah was an Israelite town, the story clearly implies that Gibeah's Israelite residents had descended to the abominable ways of the surrounding Canaanites."<sup>36</sup>

"It is also thought that the pagan priests, called *kedeshim*, regularly engaged in homosexual acts.<sup>37</sup> The term *mehir kelev*, "the pay of a dog," mentioned in Deuteronomy 23:18-19, refers to the wages of a male prostitute, who usually serviced men, not women, in ancient societies."<sup>38</sup>

Two chapters later, in Lev. 20, God speaks of the punishment given to those of 'same sex' preferences:

"If a man lies with a male as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed an abomina-

---

<sup>33</sup> Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans 1-7*, p. 114.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 115.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., pp. 116-117.

<sup>36</sup> Baruch A. Levine, Nahum M. Sarna, General Editor, *Leviticus*, The Jewish Publication Society's Torah Commentary; Accordance electronic ed. (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), p. 123.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Deut. 23:18; 1 Kings 14:24; and Job 38:14.

<sup>38</sup> Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 123.



tion. They shall surely be put to death. Their blood shall be upon them.” (Lev. 20:13 NKJV)<sup>39</sup>

“Same sex preference” is called sodomy, after the city of Sodom which practiced “same sex preferences.” God speaks of Sodom as *exceedingly* wicked, saying, “the men of Sodom were exceedingly wicked and sinful against Yahveh” (Genesis 13:13). In the days of Lot, Abraham’s nephew, the men of Sodom ‘preferred’ men, as is evident in the story of the two angels who came to escort Lot out of Sodom before God rained fire and brimstone down upon that ‘same sex Paradise’ (Gen. 18:16ff.). God later tells Israel that it was because of the sins of Canaan that He was ending the Canaanite tenure in the land, *and He warned His people Israel not to follow suit:*

“You must not lie with a male as with a woman. It is an abomination! Nor shall you mate with any animal, to defile yourself with it! Nor shall any woman stand before an animal to mate with it! It is perversion! Do not defile yourselves with any of these things, for by all these acts the nations are defiled, *which I am casting out before you!* For the land is defiled, therefore *I am placing the punishment of its iniquity upon it*, and the land vomits out its inhabitants. Therefore, you must keep My statutes and My judgments, *and shall not commit any of these abominations*, either any of your own nation or any stranger who dwells among you (*for all these abominations the men of the land have done*, who were before you, and thus the land is defiled), lest the land vomit you out also when you defile it, as it vomited out the nations that were before you. *For whoever commits any of these abominations, the persons who commit them shall be cut off from among their people!*<sup>40</sup> Therefore, you must keep My ordinance, so that you do not commit any of these abominable customs which were committed before you, and that you do not defile yourselves by them. I am Yahveh your God!” (Leviticus 18:22-30)

Whether we use the words homosexual, sodomite, same sex preference or men lying with men, the Scriptures are clear: it’s a wicked sin worthy of death. It should be obvious, even to Baldock, that one cannot be a ‘same sex’ guy or gal and be a biblical Christian. The two are not compatible. Baldock’s position is totally and irrevocably unbiblical, coming against the God of Israel who made Man male and female,<sup>41</sup> not male and male nor female and female.

C. F. Keil, in his authoritative, informative and insightful *Commentary on the Old Testament*, writes that in the Old Testament it was,

“forbidden to ‘lie with mankind as with womankind,’ i.e., to commit the crime of *paederastia*, that sin of Sodom (Gen. 19:5), *to which the whole of the heathen were more or less addicted* (Rom. 1:27), and from which even the Israelites did not keep themselves free (Judg. 19:22ff).”<sup>42</sup>

*The Expositor’s Bible Commentary* states,

“*Homosexual acts* are clearly denounced here as hateful to God. The penalty given at 20:13 is capital punishment. They are denounced also in Romans 1:26-27. *The sin of homosexuality was*

<sup>39</sup> *Tanach* תנ"ך The Stone Edition כתובים, נביאים, תורה, Rabbi Nosson Scherman, Editor; Contributing Editors Rabbis Yaakov Blinder, Arie Gold and Meir Zlotowitz (Brooklyn, New York: ArtsScroll–Mesorah Publications, Ltd., Third Edition April 2013–April 2018), p. 290, note to Lev. 18:22-23: “The harshness with which the Torah describes these perversions testifies to the repugnance in which God holds their practitioners.”

<sup>40</sup> The phrase, to be cut off from one’s people, is usually taken to mean that the person is to be killed.

<sup>41</sup> “Then God said, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.” So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; *male and female* He created them. Then God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”” (Genesis 1:26-28 NKJV) “Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother *and be joined to his wife*, and they shall become one flesh.” (Genesis 2:24 NKJV)

<sup>42</sup> C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, Accordance electronic ed. 10 vols. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996), paragraph 1672.

*well known in Canaan*—witness Sodom (Gen 19:5) and Gibeah (Judg 19:22)...It is hard to understand how ‘gay churches,’ where homosexuality is rampant, can exist. Clearly it is possible only where people have cast off biblical authority and teaching.”<sup>43</sup>

Christopher Wright, in his commentary on Leviticus, states,

“The sacrifice of children (Lev. 18:21; *Molech* was the name of a god known in Canaan and elsewhere), genito–anal intercourse between men (18:22) and both male and female intercourse with animals (18:23) are all known to have been part of pagan worship in Egypt, Canaan and elsewhere.”<sup>44</sup>

For Leviticus 20:13 and its death penalty for homosexual activity, Harris says that,

“Homosexuality was quite common among the Greeks of a later time. The Bible is quite emphatic that it is a serious sin. Here the death penalty is specified. The NT condemns homosexual acts as shameless perversion (Rom 1:27).”<sup>45</sup>

One of Baldock’s points is that the Bible doesn’t speak against same sex relationships of today because they don’t involve force, rape, humiliation and/or conquest (although that can be debated). It’s common knowledge, though, that in “the glory that was ancient Greece,” men preferred men over women, and we’re not speaking of subjection and force, etc. Today, science has discerned that there are men who prefer men, but has man changed in 2,000 years? Is Baldock saying that in ancient Canaan and Rome, etc., it was only through humiliation, force and subjection, but today it’s voluntary? Has Man changed?

Or is it that Baldock doesn’t think that God and Paul spoke against same sex relationship. Same sex intimacy is just as sinful and immoral today as it was back then. It’s still a sin worthy of death because it upends, distorts and perverts God’s natural way of sex for Man.

## Conclusion

Baldock states, “homosexuals cannot change their sexuality.” She’s right about that, but Yeshua (Jesus) can. He came to save and restore and heal that which was taken and corrupted by Satan, and one of those things is the homosexual person who has been deceived into thinking that his homosexuality is ‘natural’ and ‘set in stone.’ The Scriptures are crystal clear that a same sex lifestyle is not of God, even if man (‘science’) says that it’s alright. There are ministries that God uses to fully deliver same sex practitioners so they can live biblical heterosexual lifestyles,<sup>46</sup> but sometimes, men like Becket Cook don’t achieve that and have to abstain and be celibate because they aren’t aware of such ministries. When one is fully delivered by the Lord Jesus, there is no longer any temptation to return to a same sex lifestyle...the temptation or desire just isn’t there.

Baldock, quoting Martin Luther on Roman Catholic celibacy (point 2) is completely off point. Institutional celibacy, as practiced by the Roman Catholic Church, is anti-biblical and against nature, and as we’ve seen in movies, newspapers and television, has been a homosexual and predatorial perversion of Rome for more than a thousand years, but Cook and others who voluntarily chose to stop practicing the homosexual lifestyle, with God’s grace and forgiveness, succeed. Celibacy, in and of itself, is not a sin. The Lord Yeshua said there are *some* men who willingly make themselves eunuchs. Rome doesn’t give their priests a choice; Jesus does...for

---

<sup>43</sup> R. Laird Harris, Author; Frank E. Gaebelien, general Editor; J. D. Douglas, associate ed., *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, vol. 2, *Leviticus* (Grand Rapids, MI, USA: Zondervan, 1990), paragraph 8892 (Accordance Bible Software).

<sup>44</sup> Christopher J. H. Wright, *Leviticus*, New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition; ed. D. A Carson et al. Accordance electronic ed. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994), p. 145.

<sup>45</sup> Harris, *Leviticus*, paragraph 8958.

<sup>46</sup> One such ministry is that of Francis MacNutt who wrote the book, [Can Homosexuality Be Healed?](#)

the sake of the Kingdom and their place in it, and no doubt, for men like Cook:

“For there are eunuchs who were born thus from their mother’s womb, and there are eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs *who have made themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven’s sake*. He who is able to accept it, let him accept it.” (Matthew 19:12)

Becket Cook, as well as countless others, has accepted that Word. Becket has righteously chosen to be celibate until totally delivered and/or until a godly heterosexual woman comes from the Lord for him. May God continue to be gracious to him.

The reason why the term homosexual only made its way into the English Bible in 1946 was because the word only came into being a few decades before that. Baldock’s first point, that a homosexual person wasn’t spoken of in Scripture fails to convince because the concept of it is clearly seen in both Leviticus and Romans.

Her third point, that the APA changed the medical condition of a same sex person from that of an illness to an alternate lifestyle, and so the homosexual of today shouldn’t be confused with whom Paul wrote of in First Corinthians 6:9 also fails to persuade. The two Greek words, especially the latter one, fully implements the homosexual today by defining it as a man laying with another man as with a woman. However Baldock seeks to define those two words so they don’t speak of a homosexual today, she cannot escape the reality that Leviticus calls it an abomination and Paul’s writing in Romans condemns it as debased.

Aimee Semple McPherson, a woman whom Jesus used mightily, was a Pentecostal evangelist in the early 1900s, and founded the Foursquare Church. Her Angelus Temple in Los Angeles, built in 1923, was the first megachurch in the world, holding 5,300 people. During the time she preached, in the 1920s and 30s, the 5,300-seat auditorium was filled three times every day, seven days a week. During the first seven years the church had forty million visitors. Jesus moved through her to heal thousands of people and many thousands gave their lives to Jesus and were Born Again. She also made more than a million meals for people during the Great Depression, opening up a center to feed and clothe the poor and needy. She astutely said,

“‘if Christianity occupied a central place in national life, and if the components of God, home, school and government were kept together, everything else would fall into place. Remove any of these,’ she warned, ‘and (civilization) topples, crumbles.’”<sup>47</sup>

How true that understanding is and that’s exactly what has happened in the USA in the last 60 years. “God” has been taken out of the schools and ‘put in the closet,’ and homosexuals, etc., have ‘come out of the closet’ and are teaching in schools. Abortion on demand is legally murdering millions of unborn infants a year, and same sex intimacy runs rampant and is designated an alternative moral lifestyle by people like Baldock. God, though, isn’t mocked and America is paying for this, as Aimee spoke of, decaying from the inside-out.

If a man has an impulse or attraction to steal, should he follow it? If a man has an impulse or strong attraction to sleep with his neighbor’s wife, should he follow it? Many do and they are known as thieves and adulterers. Having an attraction to one of the same sex doesn’t justify same sex intimacy anymore than a thief having an attraction to a diamond that isn’t his. The laws of God are boundary lines for us, restricting us from doing things that attract us, but are wrong and sinful in God’s eyes. No amount of attraction or desire can change that. God has ordered the Universe, from the stars to the snails, and anyone living outside His boundaries pays the price for it, whether he acknowledges it or not.

Marriage is the most intimate relationship a human being can have. It was designed by God for a man and a woman; not two men nor two women. Homosexuality and lesbianism, etc., are perversions of that and rebellion of the highest order against the God who created Adam and Eve, and gave man knowledge of Himself. Homosexuality seeks to attain that special, unique intimacy of love and marriage through the breaking of God’s natural order. The Bible is clear about it being an abomination and a sin worthy of death.

---

<sup>47</sup> [Aimee Semple McPherson](#).

There is more here than meets the eye. The spiritual Kingdom of Satan is very active among same sex people. Those who find themselves in this place need to turn from their sin to Yeshua the Messiah; seek to be Born Again and filled with the Holy Spirit and delivered from this abomination. He can do it and the person will be set free from the demons that have driven him to that same sex preference, to the glory of Yeshua who came to set the captive free. It's written of Jesus in the synagogue that,

“He was handed the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, and when He had opened the Book He found the place where it was written:”

“The Spirit of the Lord Yahveh is upon Me because He has anointed Me to preach the Great News to the poor. He has sent Me to heal the brokenhearted; *to proclaim freedom to the captives* and recovery of sight to the blind; *to set at liberty those who are oppressed* and to proclaim the year of favor of Yahveh.” (Lk. 4:17-19)

In all Baldock's words not once does she mention meeting or knowing Jesus, the Father or the Holy Spirit, but Becket Cook met God the Father and He changed him.<sup>48</sup> Becket says that the Holy Spirit overwhelmed him and he was so blown away by God's love for him that he couldn't stop crying because of the Joy of meeting God and for the sorrow of his sins.<sup>49</sup> At that first encounter *everything changed for Becket* and for the next year he was so full of joy that he woke up in tears every morning because he couldn't believe that he knew God and was forgiven of his sins and had eternal life. At that first meeting he also knew that he wasn't a homosexual anymore, which is a 'God thing,' and that was alright with him for now he knew the meaning of life. Homosexuality was 'no longer part of' Becket's identity.<sup>50</sup> I wonder if Baldock has ever met Jesus.

Kathy Baldock says that she's read many books like Becket Cook's, *A Change of Affection*, and they basically say the same thing—the person practicing same sex needs to stop. Perhaps Baldock needs to take that message to heart instead of desperately trying to destroy it? After all, their message lines up with the Word of God. The archetypical sufferer, Job, speaks of Baldock when he says:

“You forgers of lies, you are all worthless!...Oh, that you would be silent and it would be your wisdom! Now hear my reasoning and heed the pleadings of my lips. Will you speak wickedly for God and talk deceitfully for Him?...Your platitudes are proverbs of ashes and your defenses are defenses of clay.” (Job 13:4-7, 12)

Baldock's understanding of Scripture and of the God who inspired it, as well as humankind, is artificial and contrived; from the parsing of the word homosexual, to the Bible allegedly not dealing with nor understanding the finer nuances of homosexuals who are attracted to each other as opposed to those who were made to submit to another. Her teaching is a tempest in a teacup.<sup>51</sup> The only people who are listening to her are those who haven't met Jesus Christ of Nazareth.

“Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven, but he who does the will of My Father in Heaven. Many will say to Me in that day, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Your name, cast out demons in Your name, and done many wonders in Your name?' Then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness!'” (Mt. 7:21-23)<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> [Becket Cook](#) on the 700 Club.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Tempest in a teapot (American English), or storm in a teacup (British English), is an idiom meaning *a small event that has been exaggerated out of proportion*. There are also lesser known or earlier variants, such as tempest in a teacup.

<sup>52</sup> This document was created on Sept. 19, 2019 and revised on Sept. 29, 2019.