

"From the cowardice that shrinks from new truth, from the laziness that is content with half-truths, from the arrogance that thinks it knows all truth, O, God of Truth, deliver us."



A Controversial Newsletter "The Printed Voice of Summit Theological Seminary"

~ All articles are written by George L. Faull, Rel. D. unless otherwise stated ~

Vol. 28 No. 3

July 2015

George L. Faull, Editor

Supreme Court Legalizes Gay Marriage

--By Terry Carter and George L. Faull

On June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in favor of gay marriage. It is now the "law of the land" in all fifty states. Now Christians have nowhere to go in this country where the Biblical concept of marriage is enforced.



There is much to be said about this and the consequences will be far reaching. However, brother Faull and I have a few initial thoughts that we would like to share at this time.

1. Make no mistake about it, this is a threat to religious freedom. The dissenting justices have issued strong warnings on this very point. The only ones saying otherwise are those with no interest in religious freedom.
2. They will be coming after churches who do not agree with this decision. Again the dissenting justices have already warned about losing tax exemption status, etc. Despite what the pundits are saying, it is either naïve or an outright lie that they will not come against us legally. Two years ago nobody thought they would go after florists, bakers, or photographers. Just a few months ago, nobody thought they would go after a family-owned pizza parlor in a small Indiana town. The quick and

complete change of heart by politicians from opposing gay marriage to strongly backing it, shows just how quickly things are changing.

3. This will affect churches in regards to weddings, Church discipline, and membership. Brother Faull and I have both announced publicly that we will no longer be performing weddings. Anyone who does, whether a preacher or public official, will place themselves in great legal jeopardy. Since the courts have presumed to know more about marriage than preachers or even God, let them take care of the weddings.
4. Justice Alito recognized that we will be labeled as "bigoted" and treated as such by "governments, employers, and schools" if we do more than whisper our thoughts privately. Those in favor of this decision want our religious freedom limited to our Church buildings. They call us hypocrites when we fail to live out what we believe. But if we attempt to live out what we believe on this issue, they will sue us and fine us just like they have florists, bakers, and photographers.
5. In redefining marriage, the court has ignored one of the first and most basic statements of Scripture regarding what it means to be human: "male and female He created them." **Genesis 1:27**
6. Our view of marriage used to be driven by what was best for children. That is no longer the case. Justice Alito noted that our changing views of marriage are caused largely because, "the tie between marriage and procreation has frayed". He goes on to note that, "more than 40% of all children in this country are born to unmarried women". This is the inevitable result of abortion, homosexuality, immorality between heterosexuals, divorce, etc.
7. Justice Kennedy justified the majority decision in part by saying that without marriage for homosexuals, "their children suffer the stigma of knowing their families are somehow lesser". Of course a homosexual can have a child from some other than their partner. However, they can never have a child that is "their" child in a biological sense. It was not God who provided for homosexuals to

have children through adoption, artificial insemination, foster care, etc. In fact, even “married” homosexual couples cannot have children through natural processes without one of them engaging in sex outside of marriage. This is true even with their “definition” of marriage. Of course, even then it can only be the child of one of them biologically. We wonder if they will call that adultery and try to make God the author of that just like they have tried to make God the author of their homosexuality.

8. Justice Kennedy said, “*As all parties agree, many same-sex couples provide loving and nurturing homes to their children; whether biological or adopted. And hundreds of thousands of children are presently being raised by such couples.*” This is simply not true.

First of all, not all parties agree about what kind of homes homosexual couples provide for children. Second, as stated above, homosexual couples don’t have biological children (at least not the biological child of both of them). Third, we do not believe for a minute that there are “*hundreds of thousands of children presently being raised by such couples*”. We don’t believe that any more than we believe that 10% of the population is homosexual. Figures don’t lie but liars figure.

9. Justice Roberts asked, “*Who do we think we are?*” Evidently the court thinks that they are above the creator of mankind and virtually all of mankind for the entire history of the world.
10. Justice Kennedy is reported to have said that the only reason anyone opposes gay marriage is because they hate gays and lesbians. We wonder if he hates polygamists, the pedophile, the incestuous, etc.! Does he believe there are other reasons to oppose those unions?
11. As Kendall Faull said of the justices, “*They redefine perversion as marriage, lust as love, evil desire as natural orientation, and any disagreement with them as hate.*”
12. The mantras “love wins” and “love is love” will be used very soon to justify polygamy, incest, pedophilia, etc.
13. In our frenzy to have diversity on the Supreme Court, the largest demographic in this nation is entirely unrepresented there. There is not one member of the court who is a Protestant. Six are Roman Catholic, and three are Jewish. Noting the disparity between the makeup of the nation and that of the court, Justice Scalia called this “social transformation without representation”.

14. It is interesting that the justices in the majority include three who are Jewish and two who are Roman Catholic. Their decision is in clear violation of their sacred Scriptures. The Jewish Scriptures call for the death of homosexuals. All five justices turned their backs on the beliefs of their respective religions.
15. In the Old Testament God regulated with whom a man could have heterosexual intimacy. However, He made no such regulations for homosexuals. He simply forbade homosexuality on the penalty of death. As Christians in this day of grace, we are thankful that we are not required to impose such a penalty for any sexual sin.
16. In the end, the homosexuals may come to regret their public recognition of their “marriages”. If Muslims take over this country, it will be the proof they need to put them to death as their Sharia law demands. Muslims are fighting just as hard to implement Sharia law in this country as the homosexuals have for gay marriage. Further, like the homosexuals, they are winning legal battles all the time.
17. It is the height of hypocrisy that on the same week we removed the Confederate flag because it offends a minority, the White House was bathed in the colors of the rainbow flag, which is offensive to the majority.

No doubt you have seen some of the quotes from the dissenting justices on this decision. After downloading the entire decision including the dissenting opinions, we would encourage you to read these quotes in their context. Many of them are much stronger and more powerful in context than in brief. Here are just a few of them:

“The decision will also have other important consequences. It will be used to vilify Americans who are unwilling to assent to the new orthodoxy. In the course of its opinion, the majority compares traditional marriage laws to laws that denied equal treatment for African-Americans and women. The implications of this analogy will be exploited by those who are determined to stamp out every vestige of dissent.” --Justice Alito

“In our society, marriage is not simply a governmental institution; it is a religious institution as well. Today’s decision might change the former, but it cannot change the latter. It appears all but inevitable that the two will come into conflict, particularly as individuals and churches are confronted with demands to participate in and endorse civil marriages between same-sex couples. The majority appears unmoved by that inevitability.”

--Justice Thomas

“[The majority ruling] distorts the principles on which this Nation was founded. Its decision will have inestimable consequences for our Constitution and our society.” --
Justice Thomas

“The majority’s decision is an act of will, not legal judgment. The right it announces has no basis in the Constitution or this Court’s precedent. The majority expressly disclaims judicial “caution” and omits even a pretense of humility, openly relying on its desire to remake society according to its own “new insight” into the “nature of injustice.”...As a result, the Court invalidates the marriage laws of more than half the States and orders the transformation of a social institution that has formed the basis of human society for millennia, for the Kalahari Bushmen and the Han Chinese, the Carthaginians and the Aztecs. Just who do we think we are?” --
Justice Roberts

“Although the majority randomly inserts the adjective ‘two’ in various places, it offers no reason at all why the two-person element of the core definition of marriage may be preserved while the man-woman element may not. Indeed, from the standpoint of history and tradition, a leap from opposite-sex marriage to same-sex marriage is much greater than one from a two-person union to plural unions, which have deep roots in some cultures around the world. If the majority is willing to take the big leap, it is hard to see how it can say no to the shorter one.” --
Justice Roberts

“Today’s decision, for example, creates serious questions about religious liberty. Many good and decent people oppose same-sex marriage as a tenet of faith, and their freedom to exercise religion is—unlike the right imagined by the majority—actually spelled out in the Constitution... The majority graciously suggests that religious believers may continue to “advocate” and “teach” their views of marriage...The First Amendment guarantees, however, the freedom to “exercise” religion. Ominously, that is not a word the majority uses. Hard questions arise when people of faith exercise religion in ways that may be seen to conflict with the new right to same-sex marriage—when, for example, a religious college provides married student housing only to opposite-sex married couples, or a religious adoption agency declines to place children with same-sex married couples. Indeed, the Solicitor General candidly acknowledged that the tax exemptions of some religious institutions would be in question if they opposed same-sex marriage...There is little doubt that these and similar questions will soon be before this Court. Unfortunately, people of faith can take no comfort in the treatment they receive from the majority today.” --
Justice Roberts

“Perhaps the most discouraging aspect of today’s decision is the extent to which the majority feels compelled to sully those on the other side of the debate. The majority offers a cursory assurance that it does not intend to disparage people who, as a matter of

conscience, cannot accept same-sex marriage...That disclaimer is hard to square with the very next sentence, in which the majority explains that “the necessary consequence” of laws codifying the traditional definition of marriage is to “demean” or “stigmatize” same-sex couples...The majority reiterates such characterizations over and over. By the majority’s account, Americans who did nothing more than follow the understanding of marriage that has existed for our entire history—in particular, the tens of millions of people who voted to reaffirm their States’ enduring definition of marriage—have acted to “lock . . . out,” “disparage,” “disrespect and subordinate,” and inflict “dignitary wounds” upon their gay and lesbian neighbors...These apparent assaults on the character of fair minded people will have an effect, in society and in court. Moreover, they are entirely gratuitous. It is one thing for the majority to conclude that the Constitution protects a right to same-sex marriage; it is something else to portray everyone who does not share the majority’s “better informed understanding” as bigoted.” --
Justice Roberts

“A system of government that makes the People subordinate to a committee of nine unelected lawyers does not deserve to be called a democracy.” --
Justice Scalia

“The Supreme Court of the United States has descended from the disciplined legal reasoning of John Marshall and Joseph Story to the mystical aphorisms of the fortune cookie.” --
Justice Scalia