

As this magazine is going to the press we are approaching the annual celebration of the birthday of the United States of America on July 4, 1776. When I look at the state of our nation today I find myself wondering how this great nation got to the point where there is even confusion over the use of restrooms. Indeed, there is so much confusion that local jurisdictions have begun passing legislation that allows men dressed as women the nonsensical “right” to enter and use the Ladies’ Restrooms.

Some states have enacted legislation to prevent local jurisdictions from creating those local ordinances. One such was North Carolina where the state came under immediate attack by outsiders. The law overrode the local Charlotte ordinance that would have allowed people to use the restroom of the gender with which they “identified” whether or not the gender was that of which they were born. Before the ink was dry there was an attempt to repeal the law.

In the attempt to get the legislation restricting improper use of restrooms overridden by the courts, proponents of the attempt claim that members of the transsexual and transgender “groups” are discriminated against by those laws. However, that claim is based upon the erroneous notion that changing one’s gender or wearing clothes of the opposite sex is somehow a right. It is clear that the Founding Fathers’ understanding of “rights” has been perverted to incorporation of “rights” that were never envisioned by them or condoned by the God of the Scriptures.

The Founding Fathers recognized, and published within the Unanimous Declaration of Independence, that all men are granted rights by the Creator to “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” Some would argue that wearing the clothes of the opposite sex or undergoing physical modification of their bodies makes them happy and as such they have a right to do this. Nobody denies that such have a right to do anything to their body that does not harm another. However, therein is the crux of the disagreement over whether or not said “rights” must be

recognized by others.

Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., once said “The right to swing my fist ends where the other man’s nose begins.” In other words, the exercise of our rights must never lead to the infringement of the rights of others. We have notoriously seen bakers and other service providers sued and threatened with criminal sanctions for refusal to provide their services based upon a religious conviction that providing said services requires them to set aside sincerely held religious beliefs and to be involved in what to them is sinful behavior. What has happened is that proponents of the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transsexual) communities have found a way to pit the right to the practice of one’s religion secured under the Bill of Rights against their “right” to be and do as they wish to do. This tactic is deliberate. There are undoubtedly providers of the services available who will not have a religious problem with such. The fact that the LGBT community targets religious business owners shows the political nature of their actions.

However, since the rights we all recognize were recognized by the Founding Fathers to come from Nature’s God, one must then question whether LGBT “rights” are in fact rights at all. As written earlier, the Founder’s agreed that “all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” If we can accept what the Founder’s wrote, then any right that exists must have originated with “their Creator,” who they also referred to as “Nature’s God.”

If the LGBT community has the right to act and dress as they do, then there should be support for that “right” within the words of Nature’s God, who was recognized by most of the signers of that great document as being the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Most people fall back on the “love” commandment stating that we have to love all men. It is truth that one of the two Great Commandments is that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves. But, does that mean that we have to love wrong, sinful behavior?

In Deu 22:5 we find written the following, "The woman shall not wear that which pertains unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the LORD thy God." There is no doubt that this is a clear description of the sinfulness of the transvestite proclivity for wearing the clothing of the opposite sex. God, through Moses, made it clear that cross-dressing is an abomination. If God calls something an abomination, should we then approve it in the name of "loving our neighbor?" I think the answer to anyone who studies the scriptures is a resounding, "No!"

What about the idea of "changing" one's sex? In Genesis 1:27 we read that God created "them," Adam and Eve, male and female. The changing of one's sex via a surgical procedure is the same as saying that God did not know what He was doing when He created us. Yet, we read that "before I formed you in the womb I knew you," as was stated to Jeremiah. We read that God knew His Children and predestined them to the calling before the founding of the world. Science tells us that no amount of sexual change can ever change the chromosomes which determine our sex—male and female. The idea of changing one's gender is an impossibility and disapproved by God.

Moreover, we have an instance recorded for us in Genesis 3 where our first mother thought she knew what was right for her even though God had decreed something different. We find there that God had given Adam and Eve ALL things in the Garden—EXCEPT the fruit of one tree. Eve decided for herself that she knew better than God, that the fruit of that tree was good. She then took the fruit as a result of which we all die as God warned her in the beginning.

In Leviticus 19:28 we find a command that we should not mutilate our flesh. What can the cutting of our flesh to "change" our gender be other than mutilating our flesh?

Moreover, the changing of one's gender appears to be for the purpose of engaging in sexual activity with a person of the same, now "opposite," sex. The Bible is clear on this matter despite the protestations of the LGBT community. Notice 1Co 6:9-10: "Or do you not know that unjust ones will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be led astray, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor male prostitutes, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor covetous ones, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor plunderers shall inherit the kingdom of God."

Notice that Paul includes both homosexuals and male

prostitutes in his warning. Male prostitutes are listed as separate individuals from homosexuals in the warning. What would be the difference between homosexuals and male prostitutes; one engaged in the act freely and one charged for the same act in the temple? Were they men who sold themselves to women for sexual congress? The fact that Paul separated those two seems to indicate that they were different activities. In either event, the act was sexual and both were stated by Paul to not be inheritors of the Kingdom of God thus indicating that those activities are considered sinful.

There was nothing new in the biblical prohibition against male homosexuality. We read in Lev 18:22, "And you shall not lie with a male as one lies with a woman; it is a perversion." Perversion is a strong word. Those practicing homosexuality don't like to be designated as perverted. Yet, that is exactly what God inspired to be written.

Lest we think that only the homosexual act of men with men is discussed in scripture, let's examine Rom 1:26-27: "For this cause, God gave them up to dishonorable affections. For even their women changed the natural use into that which is against nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust toward one another; males with males working out shamefulness, and receiving in themselves the recompense which was fitting for their error." There's no doubt from the context that homosexual acts by men or women are "against nature" and "shameful." Putting these verses together with other writings it is clear that those who practice homosexual behavior will not be in the Kingdom of God and hence can't be a part of God's salvation—at least as long as they continue their sinful acts.

All things considered, if our rights come from God, and if God says that homosexuality, cross-dressing and self mutilation are abominations, then those acts cannot possibly be "rights" as granted by God and envisioned as protected under the Constitution by our Founding Fathers. While God grants us the freedom to walk in sin in that He doesn't strike us down for our sins the fact remains that those who practice such things are not doing so with the blessing of the God of Abraham. God's allowing sin to continue does not give rise to a right to conduct one's self in this manner. Certainly if God envisions these acts as sinful they cannot possibly be among the rights envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Several years ago the City Council in Houston, Texas,

passed an ordinance which allowed for men who felt like they were women to use the Ladies' Restrooms. To the credit of the people of the City of Houston, in a city-wide vote the ordinance went down in a crushing defeat. The matter is not dead because the LGBT community feels that they have a right to do the things that they do, and a right to inflict their behavior on the rest of the world. They will certainly attempt to get another ordinance enacted. What they don't realize is that they don't have the right to impose that lifestyle upon those of us who consider those activities sinful and abominable, just as God does.

The claim from the LGBT community is that they want equality. They've tried marriage and have now attacked the religious convictions of American citizens by deliberately finding ways to play their "right" against the religious liberty of Americans. What the LGBT people fail to accept is that they already had the right to form partnerships. Marriage is a partnership. Partnerships generally have the right of survival for a partner. Marriages generally do also. There is nothing to be gained by imposing their sin on the rest of Americans except to trample our right to freedom of religion.

That brings me to my final point. The Bill of Rights secures to Americans the right to freedom OF religion, not freedom FROM religion. The Founding Fathers were clear that our type of nation was only fit for the governance of a moral and religious people. By "a moral and religious people" they meant people who were not engaging in acts that harmed others or went against God. The clear intent was that religion would remain a part of how our country functioned while at the same time religion was above the ability of law makers to enforce or prohibit. Because it is clear that freedom to practice our religion was and is a right recognized by the Founding Fathers, and because LGBT "rights" were not recognized by God and hence not envisioned by the Founding Fathers, those demanding those "rights" may only do so where the rights granted by God are not impacted.

What do we do with those who demand their "rights" as practicing members of the LGBT community? We leave them alone. It is not our job to convict them of sin if God has not yet convicted them. If God is not willing to punish them now for their actions then we must resort to how Jesus told us to deal with all men, that is, to love our neighbors as ourselves. We can certainly do that without condoning the actions that are so destruc-

tive to our neighbors, friends and families who ignore the plain warnings of the Bible in order to indulge in the lusts of the flesh.

It is not our job to judge the LGBT community personally. It IS within our purview to judge that their actions are condemned as an abomination to God and are not suitable for us. It is our job to love them as our neighbors and to pray for their repentance, for it is only by their repentance, i.e., turning around and going a different direction, for those acts that they can become a part of the Kingdom of God. As fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers, children and friends of those in that community, our task as outlined by Jesus the Christ is to love them and hate the sin—not to accept it or clothe it with the same status as the rights granted to us by God and secured to us by the Bill of Rights.

From Sundown to Sundown, How to Keep the Sabbath and Enjoy It!

By May-Ellen Colon

If you need help in revitalizing your Sabbaths and understanding the principles of Sabbath-keeping, this book is for you. Dr.

Colon has identified fifteen biblical principles, based on character traits of God, to guide you. God loves you and wants to spend time with you. In fact, each Sabbath is an opportunity to take a vacation with Him and His family! Start planning now!

B247 \$15.00 suggested donation

