



THE CHICK-FIL-A RUCKUS IS THE BIBLE HATE LITERATURE?

When Dan Cathy, president of the Chick-fil-A restaurant chain stated that he believes in the biblical view of marriage—that is, between one man and one woman—he unleashed a firestorm of protests. But he also garnered much support as hundreds of thousands of people across the nation heeded former presidential candidate Mike Huckabee’s call for “Chick-fil-A Appreciation Day” on August 1. In contrast, the LGBT community’s planned “kiss-in” day set for August 3 was a relative bust. Although the “kiss-in” received much prior media attention, there was little to be heard of it on or after the day it was held.

Cathy’s politically incorrect audacity to suggest that God’s Word should take precedence over man’s misguided thinking brought angry condemnation from public figures representing all walks of life including politicians who threatened to hinder Chick-fil-A’s ability to do business in their jurisdictions.

So-called “celebrities” have jumped on the anti-Chick-fil-A bandwagon as have media commentators, educators, and others. But the most ominous tone was set by some leftist politicians who threatened Chick-fil-A with the power of government to prevent them from doing business in certain areas.

Boston Mayor Thomas Menino accused Cathy of hatred and vowed to block a Chick-fil-A store from opening in his city. Chicago mayor Rahm Emanuel expressed similar sentiments, as did Chicago alderman Joe Moreno who threatened to block a Chick-fil-A’s opening unless the company filed a comprehensive anti-discrimination statement with the city.

Philadelphia City Councilman James Kenney wrote a letter to Cathy criticizing him for his comments.

“As an American you are legally entitled to your opinion, regardless of how insensitive and intolerant it may be, but as a fellow American and an elected member of Philadelphia City Council, I am entitled to express my opinion as well,” Kenney wrote. “So please—take a hike and take your intolerance with you. There is no place for this type of hate in our great City of Brotherly Love and Sisterly Affection.”

Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel told the paper that he supported Moreno’s decision. “Chick-fil-A’s values are not Chicago values. They’re not respectful of our residents, our neighbors and our family members,” Emanuel said. “This would be a bad investment, since it would be empty.”

San Francisco mayor, Edwin Lee, tweeted a warning to Chick-fil-A not to open an outlet in his city: “Very disappointed #Chick-fil-A doesn’t share San Francisco’s values & strong commitment to equality for everyone,” he stated. “Closest Chick-fil-A to San Francisco is 40 miles away & I strongly recommend that they not try to come any closer.”

In Los Angeles, Mitch O’Farrell, a candidate for the L.A. City Council urged Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa to “lead a delegation of local clergy and representatives of the LGBT community” to confront Dan Cathy with charges that his company’s stance is of a “destructive nature.” “I think city officials must play

a larger role,” said O’Farrell, “The longer this drags on, the more pain and anxiety it’s going to cause people. I think it’s time for leadership to step in.”

Villaraigosa stated his support for the LGBT community.

“I’m proud to support them as we call on Chick-fil-A’s leadership to reconsider their position and join the growing majority of Americans who support marriage equality,” Villaraigosa said. “In Los Angeles and in America, love and liberty will always triumph.”

In spite of a shared political philosophy, some left-leaning groups are taking a position contrary to that of those government representatives, choosing rather to support freedom of expression over their desire to see Chick-fil-A disappear. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) weighed in on Chick-fil-A’s side, contrary to its normally leftist stance against Christian voices. Adam Schwartz, senior attorney for the ACLU of Illinois, told Fox News, “When an alderman refuses to allow a business to open because its owner has expressed a viewpoint the government disagrees with, the government is practicing viewpoint discrimination.”



Schwartz stated that the ACLU “strongly supports” same-sex marriage, but suggested that if government can hinder a business for its stance against same-sex marriage, it can also hinder a business for being in support of same-sex marriage.

Law experts have concurred with the ACLU’s position.

“It’s also a very slippery slope,” said Jonathan Turley, a professor at the George Washington University Law School. “If a city council started to punish companies because of the viewpoints of the chief operating officers, that would become a very long list of banned companies.”

Several experts on constitutional law have stated that to deny Chick-fil-A from opening a restaurant based on Cathy’s statement would violate the First Amendment. “It would be an open-and-shut case,” said Wilson Huhn, a professor and associate director of the Constitutional Law Center at The University of Akron School of Law. “You can’t do that. They cannot be denied a zoning permit based upon the viewpoint of their CEO.”

COMMENTARY

Individuals who disagree with Chick-fil-A’s policy on same-sex marriage have every right to boycott the company and to criticize its position. But when government officials actively work to deny the company the ability to operate, it is thought control by government.

Chick-fil-A’s president, Dan Cathy, was not proactive in his statement that he believes in traditional family values; he was responding to a question by a reporter for a Christian publication. Should he be denied his freedom of speech or conscience for stating his position? May Christians no longer discuss these things among themselves or in their own media without suffering the threat of sanctions by government? What other ideas might the government feel free to restrict?

This is not yet the Union of Soviet Socialist America. The ideological conflicts among philosophical and religious differences should be allowed to exist without the government taking sides and selectively punishing people for what they think or say. Even liberals would (or should) agree with that.

As the occupier of the Oval Office, Barack Obama has been conspicuously silent on the Chick-fil-A ruckus during this run-up to the November elections. However, his allegedly “newly evolved” position on same-sex marriage places him in the same camp as his friend Rahm Emanuel.

This radical posturing by government officials entrusted with representation of all the people reveals an anti-Christ mind-set. The same anti-Christ mind-set permeates the vast majority of people who hold positions of influence within American society. Yet as much as law experts and the ACLU are at this time suggesting that government discrimination against those who take a stance contrary to the government’s support for same-sex marriage is contrary to the First Amendment, the Chick-fil-A incident has exposed the anti-Christ mind-set of many, if not most, government officials, both elected and appointed. The single, most common word used to classify Chick-fil-A by those government representatives, and even by those who are defending the First Amendment, is the word “hate.”

To be on the side of the Bible, particularly in the conflict over so-called “gay rights,” is to be branded a “hater.” It doesn’t matter that Chick-fil-A has a record of practicing non-discrimination toward people in the LGBT community, both in hiring and in serving the public, or that Cathy has affirmed his company’s respect for all people, regardless of race, gender, or sexual orientation. The fact that he would affirm traditional marriage was enough for him to be branded a hater. That accusation is the foundation upon which will be built the wholesale persecution of Christians and others who speak, however softly, in support of biblical principles contrary to the anti-Christ perversions of society.

Dan Cathy’s support for traditional marriage unintentionally exposed the insidious mind-set of the left which would love to see the Bible classified as hate literature. This on the basis that the Bible’s words describing God’s displeasure with sodomy and related sins might cause some people to engage in hate crimes against the protected class of sexual deviants.

Too far-fetched? Not possible in a “Christian country” like the United States of America? Don’t count on it.

Between leftist politicians and the leftist media, Americans are being programmed to think that sexual deviancy is normal and that sexual deviants should be a protected class. “Sexual orientation” is already included as a protected class in federal laws, and many states have followed suit.

Until recently there was no such thing as a “hate crime.” In response to unwarranted attacks on people considered members of certain protected classes, state, federal and local statutes have been enacted to add extra severe penalties on top of normal penalties for crimes against such people. The first such legislation was the Civil Rights Act of 1866 entitled, *An Act to protect all Persons in the United States in their Civil Rights, and furnish the Means of the vindication*. The primary intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 was to convey to black people the same rights enjoyed by non-blacks as citizens of the United States of America, and to protect them from unjust treatment from government and private citizens. However, the Act didn’t prevent individuals from practicing discrimination in the dispensation of goods and services. As late as the mid-1960s blacks were still prohibited from engaging in commerce and other activities, particularly in some of the southern states.

The Civil Rights Act of 1968 allows for federal prosecution of anyone who “willingly injures, intimidates or interferes with another person, or attempts to do so, by force because of the other person’s race, color, religion or national origin.” This applies to protection for individuals to engage in six types of federally-protected activities which include patronization of a public place or facility, renting or leasing a dwelling, applying for employment, attending school, voting, and acting as a juror.

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 requires the United States Sentencing Commission to increase the penalties for federal hate crimes committed on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, or gender.

In 2009 Barack Obama signed into law the *Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act* which was attached to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010. This expanded the federal hate crime law to cover crimes against people based on their actual or perceived gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability. The Act also eliminated the requirement that the victim be engaging in a federally-protected activity.

As of this date 45 states and the District of Columbia have laws against bias-motivated violence or intimidation.

It is feared by some that those statutes make any crime against a protected class of person a "hate crime" whether or not hatred is the motivation. However, the language in the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2009 requires that the federal government "prove beyond a reasonable doubt, as an element of the offense, a nexus to interstate commerce in every prosecution brought under one of the newly created categories of 18 U.S.C. 249(a)(2)." The government must also "prove beyond a reasonable doubt two intents on the part of the accused: first, that the crime of violence was motivated by racial, ethnic, or religious hatred; and second, that it was committed with the intent to interfere with the victim's participation in one or more of the federally protected activities. Even in the most blatant cases of racial, ethnic, or religious violence, an accused has committed no Federal crime in violation of section 245(b) unless he is proved to have possessed both these intents."

Sec. 6(a)(2)(A) of the Act includes within the protected class people victimized on the basis of their actual or perceived "gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability."

It is also feared that in some cases the charge of committing a hate crime may be leveled against someone who did not engage in the crime, but may say or do something to unintentionally encourage someone else to commit such a crime. For example, if someone writes an article in which he expresses opinions contrary to the LGBT community's objective to force its values upon society, and someone who reads that article decides to go out and kill or attack a homosexual or lesbian, might the writer of the article be held responsible for the crime as well? Might the pastor of a church who condemns deviant sexual practices based on Leviticus 20:13 or Romans 1:26-27 be prosecuted if one who hears him goes out and commits a violent act against a sodomite?

At present, language in the federal statutes precludes such possibilities based on First Amendment protections. For example, Sec. 10(3) of the *Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act* states:

CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS- Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any constitutionally protected speech, expressive conduct or activities (regardless of whether compelled by, or central to, a system of religious belief), including the exercise of religion protected by the First Amendment and peaceful picketing or demonstration. The Constitution does not protect speech, conduct or activities consisting of planning for, conspiring to commit, or committing an act of violence.

Section 10(4) states:

FREE EXPRESSION- Nothing in this Act shall be construed to allow prosecution based solely upon an individual's expression of racial, religious, political, or other beliefs or solely upon an individual's membership in a group advocating or espousing such beliefs.

This is well and good for the time being. At least the federal government is prohibited from persecuting Christians for expressing biblical values. However, the court of public opinion is being systematically swayed against the Bible. When politicians and celebrities accuse Christians of practicing hate because they take a stance for righteousness, they are in reality charging God with hate. As the accompanying cartoon demonstrates, they aren't mad at Chick-fil-A; they're mad at God.

And let's face it: as much as they preach "love" and decry what they call "hate," they hate believers in Christ as well as the faith upon which we stand. Be assured that the Chick-fil-A ruckus will not entirely abate; many other opportunities to lay the accusation of hate on believers in Christ will be coming.

Corporations, social organizations and government entities are jumping onto the pro-LGBT bandwagon. Although we have federal protections against prosecution for now, it will become more difficult for true believers in Jesus to function in society. Conscience will dictate that we cannot support businesses that openly cater to the LGBT agenda until there are no other alternatives; those who openly profess their faith in Jesus will find it increasingly difficult to sell their goods and services to a growing population sympathetic to the LGBT community.

But what about Muslims? They are also opposed to deviant sexual practices, at least according to their religious tenets.

It appears as if Muslims are de facto members of a protected class themselves. And regardless of their religious beliefs, they don't make a public issue of sexual deviancy. It could be said of them that they prefer to propagate faith in Allah rather than address the sins of the populous, other than what they perceive as the Christian West's warfare against Islam.

The Jews for the most part also do not address the sins of society. Many are leftists, and most see faith in Christ as more evil than sins against God's Word. Only biblical faith stands against the world's onslaught of godlessness.

The day might well be coming in our lifetime that even the First Amendment will not protect us from federal prosecution. ❖

The *HuffPost Gay Voices* blog lists these national companies that support same-sex "marriage" and other sodomite causes:

American Apparel	Oreo Cookies
Betty Crocker	Old Navy
Cheerios	Pampers
Crest Toothpaste	Pepsi Cola
Ford Automobiles	Pillsbury
GAP	Safeway
Girl Scouts of America	Starbucks
Green Giant	Target Stores
Home Depot	Tide
JCP (J.C. Penny)	Walgreen Drugstores
Levis	Walt Disney World
Macy's	Wheaties