



WORLDNETDAILY.COM THE DIGITAL PIONEER

20  
YEARS

IN INDEPENDENT ONLINE NEWS SINCE 1997

## Supreme date with destiny in 'gay'-wedding-cake war

Bob Unruh

October 9, 2017

The U.S. Supreme Court has picked Dec. 5 to hear arguments in the case of a Colorado baker who was accused of violating a state regulation by refusing to promote a same-sex “wedding” with his artistry.

In Colorado, it was a biased Civil Rights Commission that ordered Jack Phillips of Masterpiece Cakeshop to provide his customized wedding cakes to same-sex duos if he provided them to anyone. He also was told to undergo state-mandated, homosexual-rights thought training, and take his staff with him.

A member of the state’s Civil Rights Commission, Diann Rice, publicly exhibited bias against him during a hearing, comparing him to a Nazi.

“I would also like to reiterate what we said in the hearing or the last meeting,” Rice said during consideration of Phillips’ case. “Freedom of religion and religion has been used to justify all kinds of discrimination throughout history, whether it be slavery, whether it be the Holocaust, whether it be – I mean, we – we can list hundreds of situations where freedom of religion has been used to justify discrimination. And to me it is one of the most despicable pieces of rhetoric that people can use to – to use their religion to hurt others.”

This is the same state commission that ruled that homosexual bakers can legitimately refuse to create a cake with a Bible verse that condemns homosexuality – because it offends their beliefs.

Against that argument will be the constitutional First Amendment rights Phillips holds.

The U.S. government has explained in its own friend-of-the-court brief what those are.

“[Previous precedent] illustrates that an application of a public accommodations law that fundamentally alters expression and interferes with an expressive event triggers heightened scrutiny, notwithstanding the law’s content-neutrality. In the view of the United States, a comparable First Amendment intrusion occurs where a public accommodations law compels someone to create expression for a particular person or entity and to participate, literally or figuratively, in a ceremony or other expressive event.

“Such application of a public accommodations law exacts as great a First Amendment toll as the application in [the previous decision] Hurley.”

The government’s brief continued, “The application of Colorado’s public accommodations law to petitioners involves the requisite degree of compulsion. The law compels Phillips to design and create a custom wedding cake for a same-sex couple. A custom wedding cake is a form of expression, whether pure speech or the product of expressive conduct.

“It is an artistic creation that is both subjectively intended and objectively perceived as a celebratory symbol of a marriage. In addition, the law compels Phillips to participate, through his creative expression, in an expressive event. Weddings are sacred rites in the religious realm and profoundly symbolic ceremonies in the secular one. And within the context of a celebration imbued with such meaning, the cake-cutting ceremony is itself an iconic ritual.

“When Phillips designs and creates a custom wedding cake for a specific couple and a specific wedding, he plays an active role in enabling that ritual, and he associates himself with the celebratory message conveyed.”

That infringes on the Constitution, the brief explains.

“Forcing Phillips to create expression for and participate in a ceremony that violates his sincerely held religious beliefs invades his First Amendment rights. ... Colorado has not offered, and could not reasonably offer, a sufficient justification for that compulsion here.”

Phillips lost in Colorado courts, where enforcement of “gay” advances are common, to the point one of the state Supreme Court justices has boasted of being a “gay” activist.

The Alliance Defending Freedom, which is working on Phillips’ behalf, explained that the moral component of Phillips’ work is important, as he declines, too, to produce Halloween products.

“Jack Phillips doesn’t design cakes for all events – he never has. He has a set of values based on his religious beliefs – a moral code – that guides his life, including his work. When an event conflicts with Jack’s beliefs, he doesn’t participate. The Constitution protects that freedom – not just because Jack is a person of faith, but also because he is an artist who pours his time, talent, and incredible skill into creating custom works of art for his customers,” the organization explains.

“But that hasn’t stopped LGBT activists and the State of Colorado from coming after Jack. They’ve accused him of intolerance and discrimination, forced him to reeducate his staff and file quarterly compliance reports with the government, and demanded that he design cakes for same-sex weddings.”

“The Supreme Court’s decision in Obergefell may have redefined marriage, but it didn’t redefine freedom,” the group said. “The government does not have the power to force creative professionals like Jack – or anyone for that matter – to celebrate events that violate their faith. That’s the kind of freedom the First Amendment guarantees, and that’s why we seek justice for Jack.”

The state of Colorado will be arguing in the Supreme Court that it has the right to dictate to people that they must violate their faith in order to satisfy the talking points of teams of homosexual activists – even though the same state rules don't apply to homosexuals.

The Phillips case, which has generated a tidal wave of support for the Colorado baker, focuses on the conflict between the religious rights protected in the U.S. Constitution and the recently created “right” to same-sex marriage.

LGBT activists contend there is no exemption for Christians who follow biblical standards for marriage.

Christians believe the standard for marriage was established by God, through the Bible, and no earthly court, including the U.S. Supreme Court, can change it.

That position was stated emphatically by Rabbi Jonathan Cahn, author of the New York Times best-seller “The Harbinger” and the inspiration behind the “Isaiah 9:10 Judgment” movie. His most recent book, “The Paradigm,” is just out.

He was addressing the Washington: A Man of Prayer event in the U.S. Capitol in 2015, just before the Supreme Court released its marriage opinion, which four justices criticized as unconnected to the Constitution.

“The justices of the Supreme Court took up their seats [in a hearing] on whether they should strike down the biblical and historic definition of marriage. That the event should even take place is a sign this is (the) America of (George) Washington’s warning ... a nation at war against its own foundation,” Cahn said.

“If this court should overrule the word of God and strike down the eternal rules of order and right that heaven itself ordained, how then will God save it? Justices, can you judge the ways of God? There is another court and there another judge, where all men and all judges will give account.

“If a nation’s high court should pass judgment on the Almighty, should you then be surprised God will pass judgment on the court and that nation? We are doing that which Israel did on the altars of Baal,” said Cahn.

There are the briefs from 20 different states, 86 members of Congress, 479 creative professionals, 34 legal scholars, 33 family policy organizations, 22 Utah Republican state senators and 14 legal and economic scholars.

In addition, he is supported by the Becket Fund, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, Focus on the Family, Samaritan’s Purse, the Navigators, Tyndale House, Cato Institute, Christian Law Association, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, the National Association of Evangelicals, the Rabbinical Council of America, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, Concerned Women for America, numerous Christian colleges, the Southern Baptist Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission, First Amendment Lawyers Association, Foundation for Moral Law, Aaron and Melissa Klein, Family Research Council, U.S. Justice Foundation, Thomas More Society and numerous Catholic groups, led by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops.

They believe Phillips has the right under the U.S. Constitution to decline to support something that conflicts with his religious beliefs.