

Alabama's full faith and credit in law not Obergefell

Faced with the impossibility of consummating and thereby conceiving children, two women living as a couple in Alabama set up a second residence in Georgia where lesbians are allowed to adopt children. These children were conceived in one of the lesbians by insemination from an anonymous male donor.

Later in 2011, the two women split up, and the non-parent lesbian (V.L.) sued in an Alabama state court, accusing biological lesbian mother (E.L.) of denying her access to the children, one now 13 and 11-year-old twins.

The case made its way to the Alabama Supreme Court, which refused legal standing for V.L. The U.S. Supreme Court then issued a 6-2 ruling, to summarily overturn the Alabama order.

While the press and V.L. are making the argument this recent case is about a rejection of the full faith and credit clause, it is not! This goes back to the SCOTUS opinion of Obergefell not being based on legal reasoning, history, tradition, the Court's own rules, or the rule of law, but upon the empathetic feelings of the "five lawyers" in the majority.

As Americans we find ourselves in another philosophical conundrum with many people believing the courts have already determined the definition of marriage. Well if they are talking about earthly courts, they are grossly misled.

Here is the definition of marriage given by our Creator incarnate, Jesus Christ, as recorded in the 19th chapter of Matthew:

"Have you not read that He Who made them at the beginning 'made them male and female,' and said, 'For this reason a man

shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh?'"

The jurisdiction over this sacred institution is the family and the Church. Government's duty is to recognize and defend the institution of marriage.

For just a minute, think about the pretension that it takes for mere human beings to think that they have the authority or ability to change what is eternal and forever fixed by the Creator. To attempt such a foolish and vain thing is to do nothing less than to make the claim that you are God.

Random courts, legislatures and governors all over America have already done exactly this.

Chief Justice Roberts put the court's self-aggrandizing claim of power in historical context: "Those who founded our country would not recognize the majority's conception of the judicial role. They, after all, risked their lives and fortunes for the precious right to govern themselves. They would never have imagined yielding that right on a question of social policy to unaccountable and unelected judges."

I am reminded of a prophetic warning given by Paul, an original apostle of the Christian Church:

"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but according to their own lusts, because they have itching ears, they will heap up for themselves teachers; and they will turn their ears away from the truth, and shall be turned aside to fables."

Fables.

The notion that a court can change the sin of sodomy into a substitute for marriage is a dangerous, destructive fable.

Learn more about your Constitution with Jake MacAulay and his "Institute on the Constitution" and receive your free gift.

2016 Jake MacAulay – All Rights Reserved