

**BAKE
THE
CAKE**



SCOTUS Cake Decision is NOT “Just Like” Laws Against Races Marrying

By [Warner Todd Huston](#) June 5, 2018

Liberals are woefully wrong that this week’s Supreme Court decision that an Oregon baker can legally refuse to bake a cake for a gay wedding is somehow exactly like the time when whites and blacks could not marry.

The recent decision has no parallel to America’s racist past. None.

On Monday, June 4, the United States Supreme Court granted a victory to people of faith, holding in a 7-2 decision that the U.S. Constitution does not allow the Colorado Civil Rights Commission to force Colorado bakery owner Jack Phillips to bake a wedding cake for same-sex weddings despite his Christian religion. The court specifically cited one of the commissioners who exclaimed that Phillips’ Christian beliefs on marriage were “despicable.” (The full decision can be seen [HERE](#).)

As it happens, the court found that the Colorado Civil Rights Commission showed hostility to Phillips’ religion. It cited one commissioner who said “it is one of the most despicable piece of rhetoric that people can use to – to use their religion to hurt others.” the court also cited a second official who said that Phillips can believe “what he wants to believe,” but should not be allowed act on his religious belief “if he decides to do business in the state.” The court also found further bias against the baker when it dismissed complaints against other bakers in similar cases.

The decision was called a “narrow” one because the ruling did not rule in a broad sense on all such cases, but only ruled that this particular Colorado baker’s rights were violated because the state government official specifically attacked the baker’s religion while using his government powers to enact sanctions.

This decision only on the particular merits of this one case still leaves the greater question open: Can a Christian businessman refuse to do business with someone based on religious beliefs?

Indeed, this particular case offered a wide majority with several of the court’s liberals joining the conservatives in the ruling.

Whatever the ruling actually is or isn’t, the left is lying about what this case means. Liberals are out there rending clothes and gnashing teeth and claiming that the ruling somehow makes “bigotry” a national law.

For instance, the far left Patheos, a left-wing website that pretends to take religion seriously but is really just a repository for anti-religious sentiment, uncorked a June 4 article entitled, “**Supreme Court Gives Pass to Religious Bigotry.**”

Here is the hate-site Patheos blurted out:

Let’s consider this decision for what it is: a binding ruling by the top judicial court in the land favoring a baker’s superstitious beliefs over the fundamental human rights of American citizens.

I italicized that word because in uber-Christian America, religion is viewed as not superstitious but a wholly rational, substantive worldview. But — and I grow weary of saying this to no effect — it’s wholly not. All supernatural, God-centered religion, including Christianity, is, as far as can be confirmed in the real world, purely imaginary. A thing of mind only, with no manifest materiality.

Yeah. All you Christians are big stoopit dummieheads.

But wait, you modern Christians aren’t the only ones who are stoopit according to the geniuses at Patheos. The founders were, too.

“So, because our Founding Fathers without adequate foresight enshrined ‘religious freedom’ in our Constitution, the ideas of religion have come to be seen as packing as much actuality (even more to some) as, say, the ideas of democracy itself. This allows people with imaginary biases in their heads to persecute and shun other

Americans at will by just proclaiming their fantasies are a religious thing,” they wrote.

I won't bother going on with this fool's blather. But it is a perfect example of the hate all liberals have for the religious.

As for the militant gay lobby, they, too, think the ruling somehow enshrines “bigotry” in the nation's law. Take the gay issues site The Advocate, for instance, that **exclaimed** that the decision will be “shamed by history” because it allowed the Colorado baker to indulge his “bigotry.”

“If we aren't already, Americans of the future will be ashamed of what the Supreme Court justices have wrought: an ignorant lecture on how we all better be nice to the bigots,” The Advocate cried.

The shrill, liar at The Advocate went on raising hackles and alarms:

The ruling issued today goes on and on about how the mean people at the Colorado Civil Rights Commission were dismissive of the notion God ever said it was OK to turn away gay customers.

I don't mean to be condescending, especially since that now apparently means I could lose my rights, but when so-called religious people argue that my marriage is a sham, I take it personally. Justice Anthony Kennedy and his courtesy police will surely haul me away for saying it, but I don't have a lot of patience left for religion turned into a weapon.

But even more liberals exclaimed that this ruling is a throw back to the days of Jim Crow and saying the ruling legalizes the sort of bigotry exactly like racism and the laws that used to bar whites from marrying blacks.

Extremist, left-wing comedian Seth McFarlane, for one, insisted that the ruling is exactly like racism.

But McFarlane was hardly alone in his misinterpretation of the ruling:

All this “racism” comparing is, however, is a flat out lie.

Indeed, the Bible does not approve of “racism,” nor does it maintain that Christians cannot marry people of other races.

Some claim that passages of the Bible (such as Genesis 11:6-9, Deuteronomy 32:8, Acts 17:26) tell Christians not to marry outside their race. This, though, is an incorrect interpretation of the passages.

In fact, these passages do not mention race. God does separate people by language in Genesis, for instance. But not race. Further, the Bible also does not even prohibit people from learning someone else's language. Further, even when God did mete out punishment in Genesis, the Tower of Babel the story does not go on to insist that the penalties are those that man should carry forward. In fact, the real lesson is that man should not conspire to thwart the will of god. It wasn't a lesson prescribing racial purity.

Some point to the Bible's proclamation that Jews should not marry outside their religion as proof that the tome approves of racism. But this is also not a racial issue because Judaism is not a race. It is about religion, not race. The Bible tells Jews only to marry the opposite sex and marry a believer within the religion. It says nothing about race.

Indeed, in Ruth 1:16, the Bible notes that anyone who believes in God "shall be my people." That would be irrespective of race or national origin. All believers are "my people" regardless of origin.

Then there is the often misstated "Curse on Ham," the progenitor of the black "race." Some say this curse separates blacks from whites. But the curses was on Ham's son, Canaan, not Ham. So this purported curse is not on the black race. Just one member of it.

Indeed, nothing in the Bible, not believing, not relations, not diversity, not even certain ideals of exclusivity, say anything about race.

So, in the end, claims that Christianity allows white Christians to discriminate against blacks is incorrect. And therefore, the Bible-based proscriptions against gay marriage are in no way "exactly like when blacks couldn't marry whites." And that is because the racist laws against intermarriage were never properly based on the Bible in the first place.

Please feel free to use this information to defeat this oft repeated lie, won't you?