

Civil Rights for Civilized People

Should then homosexuals have civil rights? Does civil rights give rights to break civil law or natural law? In order to understand these questions, we must first consider if homosexuals are civil, are their acts civil? Do they have rights to break natural laws, drawing the innocent into their perversion? Is it civilized to break these instinctive laws? When and why is homosexuality and sodomy civilized when God, the Creator of nature and its laws, says it is not?

Civil rights are rights belonging to a person by virtue of his status as a citizen or as a member of a civil society. Social equality is a civil right if a person lives and conducts his life in a civilized manner. This means that he conducts his life in a manner that benefits society. Homosexuals put on a public display of contributing to society, like in a recent rally in Washington, but why does a person have to vie for equal status? Why do they have to try to prove themselves? In other words, homosexuals strive for equality or in this case superiority. They have engaged in a contest, a war or campaign. They are competing for the control of society's moral conscience. They have committed themselves to a pledge of personal combat to resolve this issue.

Homosexuals marched in Washington to show their strength, vying for civil rights or equal status. But should they have such rights when their moral conduct is not civil? Do civil rights have nothing to do with the personal responsibility of being civil, of living a right moral life? To be civilized is to be well-bred. Civil means befitting. Citizens observing befitting, accepted social behavior from an individual or a group of individuals is what gives a person civil rights. These rights are bestowed upon the individual by the society, the people who observe one's behavior and see that it qualifies that person to these rights that benefit society. But the "Queer Nation" movement is trying to force society to accept behavior that is not socially acceptable. It is not decent nor is it civil. Civilized people would never engage in such vile practices as homosexuals defiantly, and actively engage in.

At first, homosexuals were probably a minority in Sodom. But eventually they probably began to vie for their rights there (Rom 1:32). Obviously they as well as their behavior became accepted and their rights were protected to the point that the whole city became queer. There were not ten righteous men in all of Sodom, and even if they, like Lot, didn't like what was going on there, they were helpless because the Sodomites had civil rights to do what they were doing. So what was the proverbial lesson that we must learn from the fate of this ancient city? If there is no outcry in this land, what will be the outcome? Surely, the society will be destroyed, maybe not from fire from heaven — yet, but the fate is inevitable.

Men in government, who are elected officials who represent the collective will of the people, must be men who have a high degree of moral character. If not, these men will be lawless men, worthless and unable to be approved by God as one worthy of authority to rule over the nations, who are just as the *New Testament* states (1 Pet 2:13-14).

Tom Stoddard, executive director of the Campaign For Military Service, an ad-hoc group working to overturn the ban on gays in the military, said this recently of President Clinton: "This meeting symbolized the entry of lesbian and gay people into the mainstream of American life, and it is the President of the United States who, through his *moral leadership*, permitted that to happen."

What is moral leadership, and does President Clinton really possess it or is he a lawless man? The word moral is applicable to actions that are good or evil, virtuous or vicious, and has reference to the law of God as the standard by which their character is to be determined. Moral leadership is formed by moral character which comes from moral law. The law of God proscribes the moral or social duties of man and prohibits the transgression of them.

Being moral pertains to the discernment of good and evil, i.e. moral philosophy, It is designed to teach goodness or correctness of character and behavior; instructive of what is good and bad. Being moral is being or acting in accordance with standards and precepts of goodness or with established codes of behavior, *especially with regard to sexual conduct*. Moral obligation arises from the conscience or the sense of right and wrong (Rom 2:14-15), for which all mankind will give account (verse 16).

How can a president of a nation display *any* moral leadership when he does not sense the moral wrongness of homosexual behavior? It is recorded in 1 Pet 2:14 that rulers and governors and all leaders are established by God to praise those who do good and *punish those who do evil*. The answer is clear. You judge for yourselves. The fruit of such leadership is rotten. We do not ask the President to use force but to rule righteously. But how can he if he is unrestrained by Gen 3:16-19 or Rom 2:14-15? This is the fruit of lawlessness, not subjecting oneself to the natural law of nature, therefore not having it in you to punish those who practice evil (2 Tim 3:1-5, 2 Ths 2:7-8).

These are the very ones who elected a president who condones this kind of people (perversions), passed laws to protect what good men hate (1 Pet 2:14)! Can you imagine what Peter thinks about this whole matter?

Government in this world is for this very purpose; they exist for none other than to praise those who do good and punish those who do evil. Isa 5:20, "Woe to those who call evil good and good evil, who put dark for light and light for dark, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter."

The government today in this country forces good men to accept what is instinctively known as gross immorality as good. Claiming to be wise, they are fools instead (Rom 1:23). Professing to be smart they make simpletons of themselves. They have brought the image of God down to the most base evil. For they were without understanding, conscienceless, faithless, heartless, lawless, and merciless (Rom 1:31). Is anyone guilty of verse 32?

God had already told Abraham that He was going to destroy Sodom (Gen 18:20). So the two angels were sent to Sodom to inspect it. Only Lot offered them hospitality when they arrived. When the townsmen heard that there were perhaps "strange new flesh" in town, they wanted to have detestable sexual relations with them. Lot protected his guests and offered them instead his very own daughters in their place. But the townsmen being the way they were, refused this offer and tried to gang rape the angels, who appeared as men.

So Mr. President, remember Lot (2 Pet 2:7). He was grieved about what you gladly endorse. You allow what God destroyed. You, therefore, work in opposition to God. We do not ask you to use force against them, but to be righteous, even as Lot of old. Don't condone, much less endorse (or promote, defend, and protect) what God loathes or what is detestable to Him.

Outcry meant that a vehement, loud cry of detestation against this kind of sin was heard in heaven. *Outcry* — a loud cry in *protest* or *objection* (Rom 9:29). Unless there is again an outcry against this sin, the USA will also be destroyed. This destruction will not immediately be some external divine retribution or foreign invasion, rather it will be like a virus wreaking havoc from the inside out, even as AIDS does. The damage is hidden for a while as the acceptance of homosexuality works its way through the social and political fabric of America. This is the same kind of damage the AIDS virus is doing to the human body as it slowly destroys, for years even, a key component of the body's immune system, the lymph system.

Once, this was thought to be the virus' dormant time, when the outward signs and obvious impending bodily destruction of full-blown AIDS were not visible. By the time the virus reaches this later stage, only palliative measures can be taken, as there is no remedy. When homosexuality has corrupted the restraints on evil in American society to the point of complete confusion of sexual identity and roles, and finally homosexual gangs are roaming the streets as they were in Sodom, then there will be no regaining the moral fiber of a nation that preserves the rights of a people to seek God (Acts 17:26-27). A people who no longer do this have become worthless. Their end will be according to their deeds.

People must ask themselves the question, "Is there any moral fiber in anyone in America today to protest against this gross sin?" Or even raise an objection before they pass laws (civil rights laws) to forbid it. Queers are asking for civil rights and are no longer considered queer in our defunct society. *Civil rights* are rights belonging to a person by virtue of his status as a citizen or member of a civil society. *Social equality* is your civil right as a civilized person who would benefit society. Status is the legal character or condition of a person of social standing, one of high standing or prestige.

Civilized means well-bred. *Civil* means befitting citizens observing accepted social behavior. This behavior is a person's civil rights. Civilized society consists of well-behaved citizens, not "Civilized

people live here all right, but they all go native on a Saturday night.”

Civil rights — are homosexuals civil? Are their acts civil? Do they have rights to break natural laws? Is it civilized? When and why is homosexuality civilized when God says it is not. Civil rights mean homosexuals are vying for equal status. Why would civilized people have to vie for their civil rights? Vie means to strive for victory, or equality in this case, if not superiority; contend; compete. To wage is to engage in war or campaign; it is a pledge of personal combat to resolve an issue. Homosexuals march on the White House for working for, vying for civil rights of equal status, when heretofore they would have been either hung or stoned, depending upon in which *civilized society these atrocities occurred*.