

Are the Laws of God Outdated?

A woman professing faith in Christ sent us the following letter (in colored text) that was featured on an episode of the TV program, "The West Wing," and has now been in circulation for several years. The premise of the letter is to ridicule the commandments of God given to Moses, thus justifying those who wish to excuse the sin of homosexuality in particular, and thereby all sins in general.

We answer point by point within the letter, demonstrating the stupidity of those who, in their darkness, mock the Law of God to justify the sins they cling to, which destroy them. It is an amazing thing that those who would call themselves Christian could support such a thing, but that is an indication of the depravity of the days in which we live. If there is one thing to be assured of, it is this: The Law of God is inexorable, and inescapable.

"Dear Paul,

I thought you might find the following, which was forwarded to my spirituality list group, of interest. It is food for thought and Lenten meditation. Kate

Laura Schlessinger is a US radio personality who dispenses advice to people who call in to her radio show. Recently, she said that as a observant Orthodox Jew homosexuality is an abomination according to Leviticus 18:22 and cannot be condoned in any circumstance. The following is an open letter to Dr. Laura penned by a US resident, which was posted on the Internet:

Dear Dr. Laura:

Thank you for doing so much to educate people regarding God's Law. I have learned a great deal from your show, and I try to share that knowledge with as many people as I can. When someone tries to defend the homosexual lifestyle, for example, I simply remind them that Leviticus 18:22 clearly states it to be an abomination. End of debate. I do need some advice from you, however, regarding some of the specific laws and how to follow them."

Our Answer Begins:

First of all, of Jesus, the Lord of lords and King of kings, the Truth Himself, it is said, "no guile was found in His mouth" (I Peter 2:22). Of those in true faith it is said, "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile."

I ask you readers: In the Name of God, how is it that you can have genuine faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, in the One Who laid His life down for you, yet heed and exemplify such a one as has written this letter? He begins with

flattery, false thanksgiving, mockery, sarcasm, pretense and lies, all of which become more apparent as he continues.

Plainly, the man is a liar, and who did Jesus say was the father of lies? None other than Satan. This man demonstrates all the characteristics of Satan and therefore we know with whom we are dealing. Obviously, you cannot uphold his ways for godliness nor truth nor sincerity nor love, all hallmark characteristics of those who worship the Lord Jesus, not in vain with lip service but from the heart, in spirit and in truth.

Do you then think he is wise or clever? The Scriptures, written by wise men of God, and inspired by God Himself, say otherwise: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, but fools despise wisdom and instruction." It is evident that the one writing Dr. Laura is a damned fool (not using those words loosely), and would gain immeasurably if he heeded but a tiny portion of what she had to say.

Now Dr. Laura is not a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ; nevertheless, she does have some respect for God's Word (the Scriptures) and His laws, which is worth something. (UPDATE - July 20, 2010: Dr. Laura has published a statement denying that she holds the position attributed to her in this article. Of that position, she writes: "It supposes that I ever quoted Leviticus that homosexuality is an abomination. That never happened. I repeat: that never happened. I never said that. I don't believe that." We have now edited this posting accordingly, with more on Dr. Laura's statement at [the end](#).)

Her enemy scorns the laws of God, be they ancient or present; he has no use for them because he has no use for God. Yet you people uphold his words as worthy of spiritual attention and "Lenten meditation"!

The man is not even evilly clever though he thinks himself otherwise. And he is most certainly ignorant of Scripture though he quotes Scripture as though he was informed. I will prove it to those who have any decent notion at all of honoring the True God rather than their superstitious and chosen versions of Him. Read on.

"a) When I burn a bull on the altar as a sacrifice, I know it creates a pleasing odour for the Lord (Lev. 1:9). The problem is my neighbours.. They claim the odour is not pleasing to them. Should I smite them?"

God instituted clean animal sacrifices to educate His chosen people on the terrible consequence of sin, reminding them of what it would cost Him in the fulness of time when He would give His only begotten Son for our sins. These sacrifices were meant for but a certain period of time until Jesus Christ was crucified, which was nearly 2000 years ago. The sacrifices were then fulfilled in their purpose. God confirmed this by promptly removing the temple and priesthood in Jerusalem (which were necessary for these sacrifices), within one generation after the fulfillment in Christ.

Are the Laws of God Outdated?

The spiritual significance of the sacrifices was what God referred to as "a sweet savor" unto the Lord. The sacrifices portrayed the complete obedience of the Son to the Father, the perfect example of submission to God, even unto death, if necessary. Those true disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ followed in His footsteps. For example, all the apostles laid down their lives, literally, for the gospel, condemned by wicked men who chose their own sins instead of repenting of them as these disciples urged them to do. No different today.

Those sacrifices had nothing to do with any neighborhood but were performed in the appropriate place, inoffensively. The sacrifices were performed at the Tabernacle or Temple altar and not just anywhere such as in groves or private properties, as by the heathen. There were very specific regulations, which signified that it is not up to the creature (worshiper) to decide how, where, or when he ought to worship God but for the Worshiped One to decide.

The person writing Dr. Laura has no concept of true worship whatsoever and no honor of God at all, yet he speaks as though he knows something. There were also those in the ancient past who, by nature, simply opposed God's will, and faulted whatever God did. It is no different today.

As for "smiting," it is not about smiting but instruction in righteousness, not according to man's self serving and self preserving ways and thoughts, but according to God's wise ways. After all, He is the Creator, not we, and we would be advised to consider that perhaps He knows just a bit more than we do. The cleverest scientist/inventor has yet to know how to make one hair, while the Creator of that scientist/inventor has created not only him but also all things. How arrogant, impudent and stupid of a mere creature to vaunt his ignorance in his Creator's face as though he has the wherewith to judge his Maker!

But where there was "smiting," it represented, in typical form, the consequences of sin, and served as a warning of same. In essence, such a discipline said, "When you do thus and so, thus and so happens to you, not necessarily deliberately by someone, but it happens nonetheless."

Do you really think, for example, that a cold blooded murderer who gets off with a seven year sentence escapes true judgment? Think again. Justice comes, in one form or another. It is a law that one reaps what he sows. If O.J. Simpson is guilty of the murder charges for which he was acquitted, do you suppose he "got away with murder"? I assure you, he did not. What man's justice fails to perform, justice by nature as God has sovereignly set it up succeeds. Indeed, appearances are deceiving.

The "smiting" was in a theocracy, a society of people chosen of God to learn and manifest His grace in due time, and not in a mixed and basically pagan society as is prevalent nearly everywhere, including present-day America, contrary to the opinion of many.

Are the Laws of God Outdated?

"b) I would like to sell my daughter into slavery, as sanctioned in Exodus 21:7. In this day and age, what do you think would be a fair price for her?"

Firstly, has this fellow never heard of a dowry?

Secondly, if you read the whole context, Exodus 21:7-11, you will find that the term "maidservant" does not refer to, nor does it have the same implications as, the writer's or our present day definition of the word "slave." The man's comments are therefore quite irresponsible and ignorant (not using the latter word derogatorily but definitively). And those who believe and repeat him are irresponsible and ignorant as well.

"c) I know that I am allowed no contact with a woman while she is in her period of menstrual uncleanness (Lev. 15:19-24). The problem is, how do I tell? I have tried asking, but most women take offense."

Replying to fiction as though it were factual:

Women who take offense at such a question are not those for whom these laws were initially designed.

Secondly, for those they were intended, the question would not have to be asked; they would conduct themselves generally as they ought.

Thirdly, how is this conduct interpreted, by whom and why? Obviously this fellow seeks freedom from any laws of holy conduct before God, using these passages, falsely interpreted and perceived, to absolve himself of any responsibility in more serious matters. And he despises those who take a strong moral stand based on God's laws. Whom should you follow, a scoffer who ridicules that which God spoke and instituted, or those who try to honor His life-giving ways?

"d) Lev. 25:44 states that I may indeed possess slaves, both male and female, provided they are purchased from neighbouring nations. A friend of mine claims that this applies to Mexicans, but not Canadians. Can you clarify? Why can't I own Canadians?"

I could have mentioned earlier, and did so generally if not specifically, that certain practices and rules of conduct applied at certain times and not at others. Of course, that seems to be the very point the writer to Dr. Laura was trying to make. The problem is that he casts out the moral law of God with everything else, mixing the good with the bad, the moral with the ceremonial, and so forth. The Bible does not state that this fellow may possess slaves as he claims; the words were not meant for him.

Secondly, his sarcasm and lies continue.

As for the commandments and moral laws of God, those are perpetual, every bit as binding today as when they were given, and the consequences for breaking them just as sure. The law on possessing bondservants was not one of them. The law

Are the Laws of God Outdated?

against murder was and is. Would you people care to throw out restrictions against murder too, seeing as how those commandments were given 3500 years ago? If you support abortion, you've already done so.

"e) I have a neighbour who insists on working on the Sabbath. Exodus 35:2 clearly states he should be put to death. Am I morally obligated to kill him myself?"

Exodus 35:2 says nothing of the sort, particularly not to the one interpreting it and taking it out of context. Capital punishment was the responsibility of the authorities under God and not the right of anyone at all. Continuing to answer a fool for the sakes of those who might have hope of being delivered of foolishness, his leaven (influence):

Firstly, seeing that we live in a fragmented and pagan society, neighbors are not as were neighbors in a theocracy under Moses or other God appointed prophets, judges or leaders.

Secondly, laws of God were binding on Israelites who were under penalty if disobedient, unlike the status of heathen nations, who did not have the same kind of accountability. The Israelites were under preparation and instruction for a time to come. Having said that, the time came when Israel was called upon, by the power and direction of God, to destroy those nations that did live lawless lives, lives degenerated beyond salvaging because of lawless conduct.

Which begs the question: "At what stage are all of you?" Is there yet hope of repentance as Jesus Christ and all His disciples throughout the ages called for, or have you gone beyond salvation? This is not a stupid or unlearned question or thought. Consider. Read Proverbs chapter one and see that there is a time when God withdraws His outreach to you. That is a fearful and extremely terrible place to be. I happen to know that the end for you is near.

As for the Sabbath, people surely perish not keeping it, not because they are killed by legal or religious authorities, but by consequences that come automatically. I know. I've been there and did not know it until I was given the wonderful gift of the Sabbath to keep. What a blessing! What a difference between not keeping the Sabbath (including substituting any other day, such as Sunday) and keeping the true seventh day! It is like night and day, truly. There is a spiritual death we experience when offending in the laws of God, which is not apparent to the carnal eye. Just as effective as stoning, I assure you.

"f) A friend of mine feels that even though eating shellfish is an abomination (Lev. 11:10), it is a lesser abomination than homosexuality. I don't agree. Can you settle this?"

There were ceremonial laws, dietary laws, and moral laws, with different purposes, durations and applications. The presumably fictional friend would have been right. If he or she is not fictional, that writer might gain something by listening to him or her. Some matters were and are more important than others, not that this fellow cares.

"g) Lev. 21:20 states that I may not approach the altar of God if I have a defect in my sight. I have to admit that I wear reading glasses. Does my vision have to be 20/20, or is there some wiggle room here?"

Firstly, weak eyesight was not mentioned as a defect. However, the mentioning of defects was simply the spiritual instruction by physical example to teach the spiritual holiness of God. The message was that perfection was required on the part of man in order to be able to draw near to God. The sacrifices emphasized the fact that God would provide that perfection through Jesus Christ's atonement on the cross on behalf of all mankind, and that man could not attain to that perfection himself.

Secondly, there is no physical altar now as there was then, and the writer to Dr. Laura has never been near a true altar of God, physical nor spiritual, nor has he cared to be near one. I have and am at the altar of God. Thus I serve to inform those who think that writer has somewhat to say, that God is indeed Who He declares Himself to be in Scripture, and that repentance is required of all. Your foolishness and ignorance destroy you; God would have it otherwise.

"h) Most of my male friends get their hair trimmed, including the hair around their temples, even though this is expressly forbidden by Lev.19:27. How should they die?"

Firstly, you and your male friends were not included in the formal instructions and precepts of Israel. God instituted certain ordinances for a certain chosen few for a specific time for His own purposes.

Secondly, the passage quoted was a reference to certain pagan religious rites, customs concocted in the heathen mind presuming to worship God or other gods. Again, God, not the one presuming to worship, decides the where, when, what, how and why. In that sense, you therefore **were** included, not in the letter, but in the spirit and intent of those instructions. In choosing your own ways above God's ways you serve as an example of evil to be avoided by all those who would have life.

Thirdly, there was no death penalty for the cutting of the hair, but idolatry kills, and if the cutting of the hair was as a result of idolatry, death would surely come even if a penalty was not imposed.

"i) I know from Lev. 11:6 8 that touching the skin of a dead pig makes me unclean, but may I still play football if I wear gloves?"

What the writer is arguing in essence is that because certain hygiene, dietary and other laws were practiced then and under those circumstances, with wisdom of God, and are not seen in society today, that therefore anything included in the Old Testament in the form of do's and don'ts is antiquated and no longer valid. With that kind of logic and reasoning, you should now be free to kill, commit adultery, lie, steal, blaspheme God and do whatever your heart desires.

Are the Laws of God Outdated?

Besides which, far from being outdated or silly, there is a very real application of this law today. When God said not to "touch the carcass" of the unclean animals, it was not a legalistic injunction, but a principle of life and death, as are all His laws. What God was warning against was even contemplating or entertaining the notion of spiritually eating those things that are not fit for consumption. Doing so will lead to unwholesome and destructive results. He was teaching, by illustration, that there is the clean and unclean in all things, physical, moral, mental and spiritual.

For example, those who ridicule the Bible, as does our letter writer here, have begun to entertain sin by "touching the unclean thing," in this case embracing homosexuality as clean, if not practicing it. Whoever denies one law of God has, in essence, denied all His laws. He or she has denied the Lawgiver. He is life itself. The only possible result for those who go against God's laws is that they will be broken, reaping death.

Furthermore, some of those who, though not directly partaking themselves, but sanctioning others to "eat" the unclean (homosexuality, in this case) have gone on to sin in the same manner as well, breaking up families, and bringing untold devastation to many. Sin spreads its pernicious effects like cancer. That is why God has said what He did, to keep you away from that which consumes like cancer. Whether partaking directly or not, even giving countenance to sin brings death.

Do you think a little cancer tumor in your body is no problem? Would you encourage more? And these sinners have the audacity to scorn and mock as though the things of God are so stupid, making them objects of contempt? How wicked of them! They rightfully deserve the destruction they so assiduously pursue!

So when anyone publicly comes out in support of the Ten Commandments and basic God-given laws of life according to His wisdom, the lawless, such as this critic, mock and condemn them. And you, Kate Brennan, and you, Jim and Martina Rolando praise and honor him and all such others. You ought to be speaking against this vileness instead of joining and promoting it. Shame!

And what is the Catholic Church all about, I ask you, that you can freely call yourselves Catholics and still support and partake in this kind of thinking and public speaking?

"j) My uncle has a farm. He violates Lev. 19:19 by planting two different crops in the same field, as does his wife by wearing garments made of two different kinds of thread (cotton/polyester blend). He also tends to curse and blaspheme a lot. Is it really necessary that we go to all the trouble of getting the whole town together to stone them? (Lev. 24:10 16) Couldn't we just burn them to death at a private family affair like we do with people who sleep with their in laws? (Lev. 20:14)"

These words, as all his others, are plainly not those of a seeker of truth and righteousness, but of a sarcastic scorner of God, of His laws, of His wisdom, and of all that is good and right and true. Nevertheless, for the sake of others, let us make some comments:

Are the Laws of God Outdated?

Firstly, if this fellow had any credibility as to interpretation of Scripture, we might do well to heed, but he doesn't. Here again he thinks his own thoughts and is proud of them, though even he instinctively knows their foolishness. The Lord was not talking of not having two grains in one field but of not mixing them so that, for example, one would not put barley and wheat in a seed drill together to raise a mixed crop. I doubt that his so-called uncle does or would do so unless he is as foolish as his nephew.

Secondly, we are talking of inadvisable mixtures, mixtures that would confound, corrupt, or mutate. God did not and does not condemn any and all mixtures. There are many instances in the Scriptures of mixing, for example, oil and flour and salt together in holy sacrifices.

When it came to cloths, some materials shrink, dye, wash, and dry differently so that confusion and complications arise when these are mixed. Above that, there were spiritual lessons in these physical instructions. We are not to mix holy with unholy, good with bad, truth with error, etc. And we are not to throw out the good as if it were bad, as does the writer with whom we deal.

Thirdly, some offenses are less than others, calling for different disciplines. God does not call for stoning or burning because someone mixed grains or cloths. Instructions on these matters were for the welfare of God's people, that they would reap the benefits of wisdom, being spared natural consequences and having to learn the hard way, if at all. Penalties where applicable were clearly spelled out.

Fourthly, I've already addressed the fact that sins are found out in all of life just as surely as if they were legally judged and punished by man. God's legal and physical judgments of sin through His earthly rulers were lessons teaching that consequences surely come.

Regarding foul language and attitude, I recall seeing an old man at a hospital who could do nothing but curse in nearly every word or phrase he uttered. I knew that he had developed and practiced the habit over years until he degenerated to one who could only be known as "a senile old man who did nothing but curse."

Though physically alive, he was truly dead. The nurses shunned him, found no pleasure in him whatsoever, and were quite reluctant to do their duties with him. Nor did he have any visitors to honor him. What a miserable end!

Do you really think you escape consequences for your sins simply because some man did not "smite" you for sinning? Someone may as well have put the fellow out of his misery long ago. Yet, he served as an example and vindication of God's counsel and laws. Truly, "the fool has said in his heart that there is no God." Those who curse, as this man's supposed uncle does, do not escape - stoning, burning or not. His nephew will not escape.

"I know you have studied these things extensively, so I am confident you can help. Thank you again for reminding us that God's word is eternal and unchanging. Your devoted disciple and adoring fan."

God's Word is indeed established, though not in appearance as the scoffer supposes. It has been proven, is proven, and it will be proven so. Jesus, the Lawgiver Himself, declared that heaven and earth will pass but not one jot or tittle of the law will pass. Many have searched these things out and found them to be so, and are thus in awe of Him and His Word.

I need not speak for Dr. Laura. The fellow thought it not possible that anyone could answer him. As it is written, "The way of a fool is right in his own eyes...but he that hearkens unto counsel is wise."

However, the issue is not only with him but also with those people who thought him to be so clever. And while extolling him, you call yourselves after Christ's Name, that is, "Christians"? Together with him, you have mocked God.

It is apparent that to many, this man's questions, surmisings, and mocking are foolish indeed. However, such questions as these were aired, I am told, on "The West Wing" with Sheen (who, I am told, is Catholic) taking the major role. If Martin Sheen approves, playing the President of the US, then to many simple folk, these questions and reasonings have credibility, fiction or not.

The world will respect Hollywood before Heaven, and fiction before fact, anytime. I answer not for the wise, but for the foolish, the ignorant and blind, that they might be shaken out of their destructive stupor they think to be appropriate and even wise.

Victor Hafichuk

July 20, 2010 Update on Dr. Laura's Statement, [Setting My Record Straight About Gays](#):

In her statement, Dr. Laura says this matter came up when a friend approached her for advice. She writes, "**Somebody had contacted him and challenged him about being my friend because, (and to quote that person) 'she hates gays'.**"

The person making the remark was influenced by the report that Dr. Laura had quoted from Leviticus: "You shall not lie with mankind as with womankind. It is abomination to God" (Leviticus 18:22 MKJV).

Dr. Laura responds, "**That never happened. I repeat: that never happened. I never said that. I don't believe that.**" She goes on to defend her record by citing examples of how she gives advice to homosexuals on her show, even being dropped by one station for doing so.

So what does this mean? By disagreeing with the Scripture, Dr. Laura appears to be agreeing with her accusers who equate the Scripture to personal enmity against

Are the Laws of God Outdated?

homosexuals. Does Laura not think, for example, that those who believe the Scripture wouldn't talk to homosexuals or give them advice? That is her implication, but it is simply not true. Every true servant of God who is like his Master, the Lord Jesus Christ, will speak the truth in love to every person.

The apostle Paul, who believed all the Scriptures and taught men accordingly, said this about his preaching:

“For I have an obligation to all peoples, to the civilized and to the savage, to the educated and to the ignorant. So then, I am eager to preach the Good News to you also who live in Rome” (Romans 1:14-15 GNB).

Do you think that didn't include sinners of all kinds, including homosexuals?

While it is understandable that Dr. Laura wants to set the record straight, she is wrong to give the impression that those who believe the Scripture in Leviticus are hateful. And of course, she is wrong in her disagreement with the Word of God. Homosexuality may not be an abomination to her, but it is to God, and He plainly says so. Who is she to say she disagrees?

Of course, she may say she doesn't believe God said that. Fine; understood. She does believe in other of His commandments, however, whether she attributes them to Him or not (I have personally heard her support them, and I was thankful). What she really means, then, is that homosexuality is not an abomination. I see contradiction in her position, though, because she also says this: “**Here's the truth: I'm for marriage as a bond between a man and a woman.**”

Now, we know that Dr. Laura is in agreement with the Law of God when standing against fornication and adultery, so if two men can't be married, how could they have a legitimate sexual relationship?

Perhaps Dr. Laura, being diplomatic, thinks “abomination” a bit too strong a stand for her popularity and business to sustain the onslaught of enraged homosexuals and their lackey apologists who have swallowed the lies about a “natural and healthy lifestyle.” She may not even be aware of her own self-deception, so strong is the delusion people practice on themselves to maintain their positions in society and amongst their peers.

Dr. Laura, are you listening? I am speaking for you, not against, so don't go down the hate lane like the homosexuals have with you.

Speaking of which, the attack against Dr. Laura is indicative of the sinful nature of homosexuality, which inspires its practitioners and adherents to verbal violence against the innocent. In Laura's case, she was innocent of saying what she was charged with, but in others' cases, they are innocent of hatred when they tell the truth about the destructive nature of homosexuality.

And one more point - here is a conversation Dr. Laura recorded:

“Caller: I have to say, right off the bat that I need to apologize to you publicly because I wrote you a nasty-gram under the impression that you were against gay people. And I know better now, so I deeply apologize for that.

Dr. L: Thank you. How kind of you and thank you very much, and I accept your apology.

Caller: Thank you.”

The point is that the person is apologizing on the condition that he or she was wrong about Dr. Laura. But what if Dr. Laura had really taken that stand against homosexuality, declaring its wrongness? Would that sympathizer of homosexuals have apologized for nasty language and an unwarranted attack? It certainly seems to indicate quite otherwise! So now the apologist is “how kind” in Dr. Laura’s words, because she got her way?

Where are your judgment and Biblical morals now, Dr. Laura? Is not the road of compromise and kowtowing a slippery one indeed and full of ruts? Will you not now be subject to a law of spirituality and lose what you had hoped to unrightfully preserve? Have not many respected you for your strong moral fiber and example? Sure they have! Even your hateful enemies have, but not so much any more.

Paul Cohen & Victor Hafichuk