

A UNIQUELY AMERICAN BIRTHDAY

by Rev. Christine Meier

It can be difficult to help U.S. citizens of today realize why they have inalienable rights. Socialists would have you believe they are “universal” rights. But that kind of thinking is corrupt. Everyone has a universal right— and any judge, government, politician and tyrant can decide whether and under what conditions you should keep or lose your “universal” right. That kind of thinking is foreign to the Declaration of Independence (1776), The Constitution (1787) and the Bill of Rights (1791).

Hey ya’ll, and a big shout-out from sunny Florida! For the last month we’ve been teaching American history at the church. “Why,” you might ask? Why might the Almighty tell American pastors of a classic, New Testament house church to teach their people something about American history? I asked the same question myself. It’s not like we don’t teach the Bible nonstop; we do. But something very crazy has gone on in this country while many churches were asleep: Progressive-socialists overtook the country, and they don’t like our American history and they especially don’t like churches who preach it. Look at this statistic: Only 23 percent of the 76 top ranked universities in America require their history majors to study American history.¹

Another thing those running this country into the ground don’t like are inalienable rights (as opposed to universal rights). Under inalienable rights every human is given them by “nature’s” God. They are God-given rights, not man-decided rights. No one can take an inalienable right away from you. Under inalienable rights, it must be a collective decision that the group makes as to what rights they will negotiate in order to remain under the security of the group. Our Bill of Rights, or the first Ten Amendments are rights we refuse to negotiate. That’s because they are inalienable, not universal. You cannot even take away your own inalienable right. This is the idea behind the Fifth Amendment. Since the framing generation did not have an unlimited supply of pen and paper (or vellum), they spoke in limiting parameters; or said another way, they wrote what would be considered the outside limit of an institution or the demarcation line of exemplar, standard or even precedent. For example, we have limited government. That means branches of government are not allowed to go over a certain line. Because government was the highest human authority, it is the government which is limited in the First

Amendment. That means free speech, both religious and political or otherwise is permitted in government, on the job and in the public square. Why? Because government was the boundary line for the First Amendment— government itself and everything under the authority of human government— business, job, public square, etc., is where the people can exercise their First Amendment rights.

You can follow this line of thinking through every single one of the first Ten Amendments, or what we call our Bill of Rights. In the Second Amendment we have three demarcations: a militia, the state and the individual (the people). The Third Amendment sets its boundary for the military in "times of peace." The Fourth Amendment carries even more boundary lines: persons, houses, papers and effects, (places and persons), etc. The limitation is upon the court and/or those carrying out law. Government has tried to exclude various technologies, especially covering Internet-capable technologies, saying this was not included. But the courts have reasoned against that, saying that a person's effects, though not specifically stated as a cellphone, is still their "effect."²

Can you imagine a judge telling Americans their Fifth Amendment rights do not apply on the job? Yet today we have a federal judge (Reeves), who has a history of religious racism (see endnote for proof), just decide that Americans do not have religious rights on the job.³ If that were the case, then I would say our Congress must issue a warrant for the arrest of Lois Lerner, the woman behind the illegal “sharing” of American taxpayer information with the White House. She claimed her Fifth Amendment rights applied while she was on the job, working for the IRS. Judge Reeves decided Americans working for the State of Mississippi could not recuse themselves as a result of a conscientious objection to be a part of someone’s genderless marriage.

It matters very little what your opinion is concerning this issue. No one is attempting to deny the homosexual their genderless union. The human genome has already been mapped. The scientific fact remains that there is no “gay” gene.⁴ Why is that important? Because our rights are connected to science, or the science of nature, and nature’s God. The only “job” government does have is in making sure that all rights are honored: Those who scientifically and religiously object to being a part of a genderless union; and those who wish to be a part of genderless unions.

The only issue a government should have within this question is to make sure there are enough people available to perform such a union or sign the license, and those wishing to not participate be protected in that right. That's it. A limited government has no other decision-making requirement here. But alas, fellow citizen, a progressive-socialistic government is not limited. It is in your face, in your home, controlling through its ideology your courts, your press; and now it is showing its true self: It must control your religious life and beliefs, along with any science it does not like. Unfortunately, this issue has been used to remove religious rights from Americans. It will be used to undo the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. That is the intent. Those with a socialistic viewpoint (universal rights) need to remove our governing documents. They have come very close to doing just that.

The pattern is to use a divisive issue to undermine whatever governing documents a country has which flows counterproductive to progressivism's control. In the case of the USA, that would be our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Socialists did this with the Civil War. It did not take them long to infiltrate the government with progressive presidents, enacting further laws to undo our inalienable rights. Few realize that many religious dating websites are housed in Los Angeles, CA, under the banner of the Sparks Network. Recently a California judge ruled that Christian Mingle and many other religious dating websites will have to include LGBT activists in their ranks.⁵ Christians beware, because soon "they" will be in your churches attempting to deny who you can and cannot minister to. We don't write that to incite but to inform. It's clear we need to educate all Americans what and who gives them their rights. In light of that, we wanted to share two portions of Scripture which tie directly to inalienable rights.

Both are lengthy and should be read in their entirety. They are Romans Chapter 1 through to Chapter 2:11 and James 1. For those of you following along, we suggest a Bible which helps you with the Greek these portions of Scripture were written in. The second encouragement we would offer is that you read in light of who these epistles were written to and for what purpose and what author wrote them. Paul, writing to the saints living in Rome is encouraging them in their financial giving and sharing his desire to leave them with spiritual gifts when he is able to visit. He also starts a long indictment of the human race, proving what happens when we refuse God and become an unthankful people. Eventually, it becomes so bad, our DNA is changed (Romans 1:19, 27). There are scholars who disagree with the fulness of what others believe Paul was talking about here. Some feel it only

relates to how the practices of sin are achieved inside the human body, and others feel it extends to something far deeper and on a cellular level. Both verses 19 and 27 carry the same words in Greek (en Heautou, en Autos), with vv 27 being the dative or accusative case of the Greek. Unless you read this in the Greek or read it in a study Bible helping you with the translation, you would miss the connection between these two verses.

After reading this many feel the apostle is being too negative. Let me ask a question: How negative would you feel someone to be if they told you eating at a certain restaurant will leave you sickened with some kind of invisible or alien particle being received into your body, from which recovery will be long, arduous and difficult? This is the idea in the Greek. Looking back to Romans 1:11, we see Paul making a theme of leaving the believers with some spiritual gift before he mentions their financial offering (vv 13). We see similar language in 2 Corinthians 9, where the subject of the offering is much clearer. Here in Romans it is not as clear, but can be assumed as part of Paul's journey. So the theme of receiving spiritual enablement into one's being is not disjointed in the Greek from receiving something unclean after one partakes of the various practices seen in this portion of Scripture. When reading Romans 1, we can easily see what negatively affects our bodies when we view God with spiritual uncleanness. Surreptitiously enough, it starts small. Paul says in vv 19, it is because we deny God and then remain unthankful. Now, there's a thought for complaining Americans: Unthankfulness causes spiritual decline.

There are those who might be inclined at this point to call the Bible or the Apostle Paul a hater, bigot or some other words I choose not to print. You would be in error. That's because the Bible did not contain chapter breaks or verses as originally written. So if you will read on but a few more verses to Chapter 2, you will see the apostle shift his direction to those who are religious or who claim Christianity. He tells them they are hypocrites (without using that word), if they judge those he was referring to in Chapter 1. That's because we all have "blind" spots. By picking out the speck in our fellow man's eyeball, while ignoring the twig in our own, we are basically guilty of similar misfeasance. (Matthew 7:3-5; Luke 6:41)

Here is Jesus saying something similar: "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam which is in thine own eye?" (Matthew 7:1-3) This leads us to our second portion of Scripture in James. The theme here is temptation and persevering through it. I find it hard to believe that our early

Founding Fathers missed this portion here in James: “But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.” (James 1:25)

There is another theme in this book, and it is the theme of receiving a perfect spiritual gift once we overcome the temptation. Some scholars believe this has to do with salvation solely and only. Others view this as including the gift of salvation, but also something else; something unseen and precious. The perfect law of liberty is somewhat of a confusing concept for many folks to understand. How is it we receive something liberating after we accept or obey something which comes with a rule or command? God spoke these rules and boundaries into existence long before any of us inhabited this good, green earth. So when we accept His ability to purchase our salvation as a free gift, all sorts of liberating spiritual benefits flow to us.

There are some questions which can be asked at this point. How does a church receive folks involved in all sorts of practices the apostle mentions in Romans 1? What is a church or pastor to do to protect the saints, while allowing those who truly desire freedom to be set free? The answer is given by the apostle. There is also some wisdom which was given to me by an elderly apostle who was over our ministry. In the first reality, Paul mentions those given over to a reprobate spirit. If someone is coming into the church to hear the word and be changed, they are not reprobate. If, on the other hand, they are coming in to see how much you will tolerate or who they can target with their “wares” or daring you to throw them out so they can sue, then policy must already be in place to protect the saints. At the same time, the reprobate must be told tolerance and Christian forbearance does not apply to theft, sexual sin and ambulance chasing. An elderly apostle told me years ago, “I put some folks in a ‘four by four’ area. If they mess in that area, then I know they cannot be let loose throughout the rest of the congregation.”

We, as the body of Christ and leadership called by Jesus are commanded with shepherding and protecting the flock of Christ. While the conceptual application of handling these issues may be the same for all churches, the methods are certainly different. A large congregation will apply different methods to attain the same goals as opposed to what a small congregation or house church might do. No pastor wants their sheep fleeced by the “next and best stock market secret.” But that is exactly what happens to some folks in larger congregations when warnings are not given in time to protect the unsuspecting victim, or other miscreants are not exposed in a timely manner.

Another rule of thumb is to make sure that one elder or saint or mature Christian family is assigned to those needing special deliverance. Those tasked with their oversight must have had experience in seeing the specific spiritual malady removed. They cannot be novices and they themselves must have proof of overcoming the debilitating effects of these conditions. In this way, the immature in Christ are not exposed and the individual truly desiring deliverance can find it. Within larger congregations, this gives the leadership a connection to make sure their new charges are growing in Christ, receiving the needed deliverance and the younger believers are kept safe from stumbling. The goal is always respectful deliverance with the dignity which Christ gives. Following the Holy Spirit's directive in this area is paramount. Another step is to make sure the power and presence of God are not hindered from worship and prayer services. In this way the Holy Spirit can easily bypass all our "best human" efforts (in spite of our best human efforts) to bring direct deliverance. Our High Shepherd must always have direct access to His sheep. We humans are only under-shepherds.

In a land where a document like the Declaration of Independence is cherished, how is it we miss the ability to distinguish freedom from licentiousness? We can clearly see from Romans 1 & 2 (as well as other portions of Scripture) that it is a soul-based stumble which can, if left unrecognized, cause a spiritual and then in some cases, a physically-based affliction. Though none of these can be traced by sight, like ink poured into water can be traced; yet the result can, if not repented of, still be "seen." It is the blood-bought and Holy Spirit-filled church which can recognize the malady and apply the necessary tools (repentance and deliverance) to see souls set free. This is worship and this is our inalienable right. The process, though, is voluntary— on both the part of the participant and the body of Christ. The body of Christ has the right to say to any individual, we cannot, for whatever reason, help you. The individual has the right to say, I choose not to be helped by you. When either of these variables apply, the body of Christ can refer them to another congregation and the individual(s) should leave that particular congregation.

We view this process as one unique act of our worship to our Creator. No court, government or other system has the ability to change or chastise this process. This is a core tenet in understanding freedom and liberty and inalienable rights. At that point licentiousness is clearly seen and easily defined. Our three-part compacting documents which govern this land are not from some old era with no applications for today. That is the lie progressive-socialists would have you believe. In this way they can attempt to exchange inalienable rights for "universal" rights. Not only do we reject that theory, but our land stands on its inalienable rights. This is why churches, schools, parents and caregivers must teach their children and educate all

others as to the difference. The difference will save your life and save this land. It has had the distinct honor of doing so for 240 years.

We leave you this month with a portion of the Declaration of Independence. We encourage you to view it online at your favorite site, or you can view the endnote for the one quoted here.

**The Unanimous Declaration of the
Thirteen United States of America**

In Congress, July 4, 1776

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, 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; that, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. (Jefferson now lists 27 grievances and closes with these words:)

WE, THEREFORE, the REPRESENTATIVES of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, in General Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name and by the authority of the good people of these colonies solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, FREE AND INDEPENDENT STATES; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought

to be, totally dissolved; and that, as free and independent states, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.⁶

-
1. <http://freebeacon.com/culture/top-ranked-colleges-dont-require-history-majors-study-u-s-history/>
 2. 70 Years of American Captivity: The Polity of God, The Birth of a Nation and the Betrayal of Government, see on this site. See Section 4, Chapter 1
 3. <http://www.wnd.com/2016/07/federal-judge-strikes-down-mississippi-religious-freedom-law/#!>To see the other side of the argument (I could argue it here, but one sentence and quote from this judge should make everyone see that his real argument was not framed to protect the religious freedoms of Americans or for equal protection. “In physics, every action has its equal and opposite reaction. In politics, every action has its predictable overreaction,” writes Judge Reeves. “And now Obergefell has led to HB 1523. The next chapter of this back-and-forth has begun.”) <<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Justice/2016/0701/Why-the-case-against-Mississippi-s-religious-objections-law-was-different>> So from the start, before any state could make a law to protect the religious rights of any of its citizens, this judge had formed his opinion. Furthermore, if political science or even natural science were the foundation of his ruling, he would not have cited Obergefell, since “science” had nothing to do with that decision. Justice Kennedy cited “love” when he wrote for the majority.
 4. <<https://www.geneticliteracyproject.org/2015/10/12/despite-what-you-may-have-read-theres-no-gay-gene/>> The previous is a quick and unbiased article. The second one is more involved with various overtones, but the science is still good. <<https://www.trueorigin.org/gaygene01.php>>
 5. <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/lgbt-anti-christian-california/>
 6. excerpted Declaration of Independence. Can be seen on your favorite site or from this one <<http://www.heritage.org/initiatives/first-principles/primary-sources/the-declaration-of-independence>>