

Gail Riplinger Attacks Jack Schaap and Slanders Ex-Husbands

“He that is first in his own cause [to plead his case] seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth [examines] him.” Proverbs 18:17

On July 22, 2009, Dr. D.A. Waite publicized the divorces of Gail A. Riplinger. His reason for doing this was that she had lied to him and Mrs. Waite when they asked her last year if the reports they'd heard were true. Back then, at the January 2008 Straightway Baptist Church KJV Conference, Dr. Waite revealed Riplinger's answer live via Internet video. She had denied she had ever been divorced and told him she had been married to “the same man for all these years.” At that time Dr. Waite felt confident in believing that Gail had been honest with him. That's when we sent him photocopies of the certified marriage and divorce documents we'd obtained from Mahoning, Portage, and Summit counties so that Dr. Waite could view the information for himself. During the July 22 conference Dr. Waite stated he had not believed that the documents we mailed to him had been authentic. Only after a friend close to him had ordered certified copies did he realize that our documents had not been fakes. Dr. Waite said that he called Riplinger to give her a fair chance to explain the documented divorces, and give a defense, before he announced them but that she had not been interested in talking to him about them. Then, at the July 14, 2009 King James Bible Summit held at Hyles-Anderson College, Pastor Jack Schaap publicly addressed Riplinger's two divorces along with appropriate Scriptural standards to which every professing Christian is held responsible.

We do not know where Pastor Schaap found out about Riplinger's divorces. Whether from our site, through Dr. Waite, or some other source, it is uncertain. Hopefully he took time to review the divorce and marriage documents for himself before speaking about them publicly.

Following the Summit conference a rebuttal letter reportedly written by Riplinger's current pastor, Dewayne Sands, with input from Riplinger's daughter Bryn, was placed on the HAC Alumni's front page (HACalumni.com). The letter, which has no date on it, raises more than a few serious concerns that must be addressed. The record can and will be set straight. Documents and dates do not lie. Every truly God-fearing, Bible-believing Christian that is ready to just jump behind Gail Riplinger and rush to accuse those who hold the facts (when such accusers have not even attempted to check the record for themselves first) needs to pay close attention here.

First, it is questionable whether Dewayne Sands, pastor of the Believers Baptist Church (formerly of Mount Airy, NC), is the actual author of the letter. There is strong evidence pointing to Riplinger as the real the author. Pastor Sands needs to be asked whether or not he was even aware of the letter before it was placed on the web. The letter is in Word document format and lacks a real signature:

Sincerely yours,

Dewayne Sands

Pastor Dewayne Sands

This raises the question of whether it was Riplinger who wrote the entire letter and then, with permission from Pastor Sands, placed his name on it. If Pastor Sands authored the letter, why did he not personally sign it? Why the electronic signature?

The “voice” of the letter displays a strong resemblance to that of Riplinger, as evidenced by her books and articles. Here are several examples of what appear to be *Riplingerisms*:

- ❖ The next voice he hears may be that **of an animal at the Chicago Zoo.**
- ❖ ...turning **Hammond into Mammond.**
- ❖his **July Summit of Ignorance.**
- ❖ ‘...look at Mary’s past record. **It spells l-o-o-s-e-r.**’ [sic]
- ❖ Exegesis without context is **the blanket which wraps all heresy.**
- ❖ Like Judas, Schaap's rebuke shows he will be **“falling headlong” soon.**
- ❖ ...everyone heard Schaap **moaning at the Summit**, like Abimelech, as **his “heady” and “highminded” frame bites the dust.**
- ❖ It is the material in [Gail’s] books that is **so head-knocking** and powerful.

And why would any pastor refer to a female member of his congregation as “This ole **‘babe’**,” regardless of the context? In addition, there are parts of the letter that just don’t make much sense, such as:

Gail likes to say **God got three for the price of one**, when he used her.
[Emphasis in original]

What does that mean? Is Riplinger being likened to the Holy Trinity? We should hope not.

The comparison of Gail to both Jael and Deborah, among other Bible women, throughout the letter strongly resembles the material of several church lecture videos and written materials in which she not only likens herself to these examples but even mentions the same verse themes as found in Pastor Sands’ letter. Themes such as:

- ❖ ...“Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if **the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch**” (Matt. 15:14).

- ❖ ...“a certain woman cast a piece of a millstone, and all **to brake his [Abimilech’s] skull**” (Judges 9:53).
- ❖ ...“Slay me, that men say not of me, **A woman slew him.**”
- ❖ “But **God hath chosen the foolish things** of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen **the weak things** of the world to confound the things which are mighty; And base things of the world...”
- ❖ “**Ye are of your father the devil**, and the lusts of your father ye will do...”

Mrs. Riplinger should be careful to not cast stones from a glass house. Using Scripture unrighteously toward others while using it to cover sin can backfire in ways unexpected, because the word of God is a “twoedged sword” (Hebrews 4:12).

It appears that Bryn Riplinger Shutt was granted responsibility of explaining for her mother. What Bryn perhaps did not know is that the facts of all those years ago—even her mother’s own words from the past—would return to tell on her.

Bryn is quoted in the letter as saying:

“...Her own life has given her these perceptive eyes. Her alcoholic father had begun beating her as an infant, which brought the swift return of her mother, a nurse, to her own parent’s house. Her father died very soon after, and she found herself growing up in this home with an alcoholic grandfather, who locked her in his car for hours while he was in a bar. ...Like many young girls, she had sought to escape a mixed-up home by establishing her own. Subsequently, she was *rejected* by not one, but two men, with whom she shared a marriage license, **which existed only on paper**. These men’s **physical anomaly or homosexuality**, neither of which she had anticipated, deferred anything but a **strained friendship**, wrought with **their cruelty**. Before she met my father, her gracious patience had **left her waiting many years** for the return and repentance of the one, now dead, **who had abandoned her almost from the start to pursue his homosexual lifestyle**. To be rejected and abandoned by father, grandfather and **then two men**, **left her ripe for** the verse where Jesus said he had come “to heal the brokenhearted.” **This verse led her to Christ** and that is why she is so mad at the new versions which omit this phrase in Luke. What **two unsaved losers** did to her **somewhere between thirty and forty years ago** has virtually **nothing to do with the Bible version debate at hand, nor her character**. Only the devil, the accuser of the brethren, would set a tongue on fire of hell, to use these hurts to besmirch my mother’s good character. Although these experiences were all monumentally heartbreaking to her, **she says that without them she may not have received Christ, recognize her lost condition**, and been able subsequently to minister to the “brokenhearted” as Christ does.” [Emphasis added]

If this report is true, then why is it fraught with untruth? The end portion is completely contradicted by public court records and Riplinger's own testimony from the past.

“Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear” (1 Timothy 5:20).

First, it is simply *false* that both divorces took place *before* Riplinger “received Christ.” According to her own words, Riplinger was “saved” before the divorces took place. It has been nearly 14 years since Riplinger told at least two large church congregations what her age was when she was “saved.” Perhaps Gail has forgotten her own information after so many years and needs a little help to refresh her memory.

During lectures given at both the Berean Baptist Church of Winston-Salem, NC, and the Temple Baptist Church of Knoxville, TN, in the mid-1990s, Riplinger told the people, “I was saved when I was 26 years old.” (Both lectures are preserved on video, sold by Riplinger through her A.V. Publications, Corp. now located in Ararat, VA.) According to public documents, she was born in October 1947. And that means she turned 26-years-old in 1973. The first divorce, filed by her, was completed on February 12, 1975—one year and four months after her 26th birthday—specifically, four months after her 27th birthday. Even if she had been “saved” near the end of her 26th year, the divorce still took place four months after that. She married her second husband, Frank, one year and seven months later, on November 5, 1976. Then, it was on August 6, 1984 that her divorce from him was completed. She married her current husband, Michael, just two months and five days after the divorce. According to her own testimony and legal facts, she cannot claim that her two divorces happened before any salvation experience or that they showed her a need for Christ. Her two different testimonies (past and present) have met in a clash of contradiction.

These questions must now be asked: which “testimony” is true? The one she gave during the 1990s to several churches or the one she is now telling her daughter and pastor? Why did she fabricate a false testimony, either then or now? And how can we know we can trust her at her word? These questions need to be answered.

Another set of questions also arises: Why did she remain married to the first husband for **five years** if he was unable to consummate the marriage for whatever reason? Why did she purchase a house with him (Youngstown, Ohio) if this was the case (again, public property and deed records are on file at the Mahoning County Courthouse)? Instead, an annulment is something one would obtain, and *that* shortly after the wedding, if an “anomaly” prevents a marriage from moving forward and both parties agree to part ways—not a divorce five years later, after having purchased a home and automobiles together. She did not claim “sexual unfaithfulness (of any kind)” on the petition for divorce.

Riplinger's story that her second husband, Frank, abandoned her from the beginning of their marriage “to pursue his homosexual lifestyle” and that she waited “many years” for him to repent and return to her is implausible on several accounts. First, there are public documents showing Frank **did not** abandon Gail early in their marriage never to return to her. Together, she and Frank started a non-profit philanthropic organization in 1981, called *Truth and Life*. The record, complete with both of their signatures, is on file with the Ohio Secretary of State for anyone to see. The group dissolved after Gail divorced him. When Gail was reviewed for hire as an Instructor with

KSU in the early 80s she would have been required by the school to partake in extra-curricular activities that benefited the community. This group would have fit the bill. Also, there is the public property deed, containing both of their names, for the bi-level home they purchased together in a quiet Kent neighborhood several years before the divorce.

Next, there's a neighbor and Bible study friend (who asked to remain nameless in this fiasco) who was close to Gail and Frank in the 1980s. He said there had been no noticeable problems with the Kaleda marriage and that Frank had been the spiritual head of their home. Back then it was Frank who held a somewhat strong preference for using only the King James Bible while Gail showed no particular Bible version preference at all. Frank and Gail regularly attended church and were very much together in the years preceding the divorce. Once again, Gail did not state "sexual unfaithfulness (of any kind)" as her reason for seeking the divorce, as the divorce record shows.

Whether or not Frank was a homosexual matters not in this situation because the meager two months' time that Gail waited after the divorce before marrying Michael make her suspect in having had a relationship with him while she was still married to Frank. Even if Frank had abandoned her, she would not have rightfully been allowed to pursue a relationship with another man before getting the divorce. It is not any of us who make the rules; it is God who has already made them. Does a woman who has been in two "cruel" marriages apply for a marriage license with another man just 28 days after her divorce if she has not *first* gotten to know him well over a reasonable period of time? After all, why would she rush into another marriage, not knowing the man, and risk making the same mistake she'd made twice in the past? Logic argues against Gail marrying Michael before she knew him well enough to be sure she was not marrying a third homosexual man. Michael's sister was attending Kent State University, taking art classes at the same time that Gail was working on her M.F.A. in Art between 1980 and 1983. If Gail wishes to tell a truthful story, then she may explain when she met Michael.

Gail's reason for divorcing these two men stands outside Scriptural grounds, since Jesus said that *only* adultery is a cause for divorce. When Gail filled out and signed those court divorce papers, she was signing legal documents and would have had to affirm that the information she gave was correct and true. Yet she did not declare *adultery* by either husband as her reason—homosexual or heterosexual. Since she documented neither "homosexuality" nor "abandonment", it is impossible for her to legally prove these men were homosexuals. In other words, she has no burden of proof. Her accusations against these men constitute hearsay. According to the legal statements in the second divorce record, it was Gail who abandoned Frank. Frank, in both his counterclaim and a handwritten letter to his lawyer, stated that he wished to remain married to Gail. Gail accompanied Frank to his lawyer's office where Frank appeared to his lawyer as pressured to withdraw his counterclaim. After Frank withdrew it Gail pushed for the divorce, which was finalized shortly thereafter.

It's all in the public records, folks! Those who choose not to check them for themselves, we exhort you to hold your tongue of judgment from those who have, like the Bereans of the Bible, thoroughly checked into this matter. And we exhort you to abstain from partaking in mutual slander with this woman. Let it not be said of witnesses who deliver truth: "Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the *truth*?"

And none of this has anything to do with her character? We daresay that Gail and her pastor would not give the same leeway to Bill Clinton, the 42nd president of the United States. However, Gail is a teacher in the church. How much more does the character of a leader in the church matter than that of a president? Paul said that teachers would receive the greater condemnation because they have a greater responsibility—that of representing Christ (God incarnate) and His word to the church and the unsaved world. If the character of leaders in the church matters not then there would not be such a specific list of requirements for pastors and other leaders in the church. If God demands such things of pastors, he demands them of every church teacher and leader. Moral obedience is on the top of the list.

Gail's latest story is faulty. If Bryn wrote it with information supplied by her mother, then her mother has lied to her and now Bryn is responsible as an adult child to search out the truth and uphold it. It doesn't mean she does not love her mother by seeking out the truth, but if she is going to say things on behalf of her mother, she needs to be sure the story she is telling is the truth. God will hold both Bryn and her mother equally responsible for their freewill actions. Gail's pastors are now responsible to carefully consider any future endorsement of things they know not.

It appears that Gail realized her divorces were no longer deniable, now that several pastors and others have access to certified copies, prompting her to form a quick alibi in order to "save face" by covering her previous lies with more lies. Facts are facts; truth is truth. The truth *always* comes out. Oh, but a sticky web is weaved...

A *public* apology is due Jack Schaap and Dr. and Mrs. Waite, and anyone else at whom the latest false accusations have been aimed. In the letter Pastor Schaap has been falsely charged of committing a "bold lie." The lie is not on the part of Pastor Schaap or anyone else who has discovered Riplinger's questionable past. It is not him from whom repentance is due in this matter. He was acting as a dutiful pastor, warning other Christians about a woman teacher not qualified to teach. He told the truth, and some are having a hard time with that. If pastors, who hold God's highest teaching office in the church, are required by God to be married to one wife then the same automatically applies to all lesser teachers, male and female. Gail has had two previous husbands, one of them still living. She has lived in adultery against him for 34 years.

Husband number one and the family of Frank are due an apology from Gail and Bryn for having referred to both men as "two unsaved losers" (a hostile and completely un-Christ-like comment) without solid evidence to support the accusation. "[H]e that uttereth a slander, is a fool" (Proverbs 10:18b). Frank went to church with Gail and people who knew them have reported there was no abandonment by Frank and that there was no indication of marital problems. Therefore, the only evidence that could prove he was "unsaved" lies with God who knows all hearts. With no evidence recorded by Gail to legally prove that she divorced either husband for being a homosexual, she has no way to prove they were "unsaved." Besides, the unsaved state of one's spouse is not grounds for divorce in the Bible. Scripture commands the Christian spouse to remain with the unsaved spouse and be a testimony of Christ to them. As for either man being a "loser", Gail needs to be very careful here since the only valid possibility they may have been "losers" is because they ended up marrying her and were eventually forced unlawfully into divorce court.

Gail owes a public apology to everyone she has lied to about this matter, as well as those of the past 16 years while she acted on false pretenses and gained the confidence of pastors and churches that she had the obligation of letting know about her real story but did not.

God says over and over in His word that lying is a sin. Scripture holds many examples of those who sought to lie and deceive in order to cover their sin. The church's responsibility is to expose such who lie to the fold of God.

Jesus said, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples. And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31-32).

Is Gail keeping his word by lying and covering her sin? Does she really care about the truth of which Jesus spoke?

Jesus also said:

"If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John 14:15).

"If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love" (John 15:10a).

He said it in the Old Testament:

"Therefore shall ye keep my commandments, and do them: I am the LORD" (Leviticus 22:31).

One of those commandments is "Thou shalt not bear false witness against [lie to] thy neighbor." Our neighbor is anyone with whom we have contact, whether in person or through personal writing (books, articles, emails, etc.). Jesus said that breaking one commandment makes one guilty of them all.

"He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 John 2:4).

"He that worketh deceit shall not dwell within my house: he that telleth lies shall not tarry in my sight" (Psalm 101:7).

"A faithful witness will not lie: but a false witness will utter lies" (Proverbs 10:18b).

"Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves" (Isaiah 28:15).

Something else that rings true from the word of God is that everyone can be sure that their sin *will* find them out. Gail's prayer and plea should be like that of Agur the son of Jakeh: "Remove far from me vanity and lies" (Proverbs 30:8a).

Our wish is to let the facts be a witness to the truth. We are not Pastor Schaap followers nor followers of anyone else but Jesus Christ and His word. We don't want to see dishonesty get a free pass. It is past time for those who rush to defend Gail without having verified the same facts we and others have to take the responsibility of doing so *before* they pass judgment on those who have.

Gail needs to stop her dishonesty. It's time to come clean and stop covering the truth. It's time for her to stop playing the victim to make her supporters continue rallying to her defense without question, when she knows they do so out of honor, because they trust everything she says. Do you trust her words over God's word? The lies have gone far enough and the time is now here to put an end to them.

The remedy is repentance. And before it is too late.