

They didn't refuse the lesbians based on orientation, Alex: Contra-wise, the bakers, Sweet Cakes by Melissa, did PLENTY of business with the lesbian couple, previously, proving they did not hate gays or lesbians or homosexuals. PROOF: The final order of the state even admits as much:

<http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/SweetCakesFO.pdf>

<http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/SweetCakesFO.pdf>

They had no problems making a cake - just not a cake with obscene symbols on it. It'd be like a Jewish baker being asked to make a KKK Nazi-themed cake with 'KKK' writing & a Nazi logo on it, so as to not offend the religious beliefs of the local chapter of the Klu Klux Klan. He could, legally, refuse. :) :D (y)

Gordon Wayne Watts They had no problems making a cake for lesbians: in fact, the lesbian couple were repeat customers, hello! They just didn't want to make a cake with what, according to their religion, were obscene symbols and lettering on it. It'd be like a Black or Jewish baker being asked to make a KKK Nazi-themed cake with 'KKK' writing & a Nazi logo on it, so as to not offend the religious beliefs of the local chapter of the Klu Klux Klan. He could, legally, refuse. smile emoticon grin emoticon like emoticon Sweet Cakes by Melissa is no less protected than the Jewish or African-American bakers in this scenario!

[Unlike](#) · [1](#) · [Just now](#)

News Flash: If the lesbian couple had been serious, and really wanted cakes (and not wanted to cause trouble), they could have ordered blank cakes and decorated the cakes themselves. That they didn't is evidence of their ill motives to hurt. : ( Contra-wise, the bakers, Sweet Cakes by Melissa, did PLENTY of business with the lesbian couple, previously, proving they did not hate gays or lesbians or homosexuals. PROOF: The final order of the state even admits as much:

<http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/SweetCakesFO.pdf>

<http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/SweetCakesFO.pdf>

\*PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT: The Kleins, legally, \*do\* have a right to refuse service: They didn't refuse to serve GAYS -just a gay function. #BigDifference. - #KnowTheDifference They CAN legally refuse service.

PROOF-Short answer: No - they can tell the truth and be OK -- It'd be like a Jewish baker being asked to make a KKK Nazi-themed cake with 'KKK' writing & a Nazi logo on it, so as to not offend the religious beliefs of the local chapter of the Klu Klux Klan. He could, legally, refuse. :) :D (y)

PROOF-longer answer: This would be like a Jewish or Muslim family refusing to serve a "Pig Roast," because Islam and Judaism believe that pork is unclean. In other words the Cake Making family, here, don't hate gays, but it's their religious belief to refuse service on things that go against their religious beliefs. Moreover, bartenders have a right to refuse sale if someone has had too much to drink, AND: convenient store clerks can refuse sales of alcohol or tobacco if someone regardless of age comes in without an I.D. -- Pastors, priests, reverends, etc.. can, likewise, refuse to serve at events that go against their religious beliefs: Since it's based on behaviour, not race, it's not discrimination.

The Klein family, who make cakes here, DO love their gay customers, and in fact, I hear they did LOTS of business with the lesbian couple, even after knowing they were gay. :D

PS: In Argument II of my own brief, I defended gays against mistreatment, so, while I'm a right-wing Conservative Christian, I don't hate gays either: Observe:

"II. Prejudice Against Homosexuals is Wrong.....11-14"

[http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571\\_bsac\\_GordonWayneWatts\\_REPRINT.pdf](http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571_bsac_GordonWayneWatts_REPRINT.pdf)

[http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571\\_bsac\\_GordonWayneWatts\\_REPRINT.pdf](http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571_bsac_GordonWayneWatts_REPRINT.pdf)

I also defended gay's rights to adopt as well, in my letter to the Governor:

<http://gordonwatts.com/redux-on-CS-HB-7013.html>

<http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/redux-on-CS-HB-7013.html>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RgWlhYAtan4>  
HIDDEN CAM: #GayWeddingCakes at Muslim Bakeries?

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LmdiqB\\_8l2k](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LmdiqB_8l2k)  
HIDDEN CAMERA: Muslim Bakeries Turn Down Gay Wedding Cake

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rVAW\\_xUtVKQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rVAW_xUtVKQ)  
Are Muslim Bakeries untouchable? #GayWeddingCake

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RgWlhYAtan4>  
HIDDEN CAM: #GayWeddingCakes at Muslim Bakeries?

Silver and gold have I none (I'm deep in Credit Card debt, myself, due to MY fight in court to defend BIBLE-based marriage) -- but: in spite of my VERY WEAK finances -->> Here is something to help you win \*your\* case: since the court could not compel an ACLU lawyer to take \*my\* case against \*their\* (liberal) religious beliefs (when I pitched a solution to the court that would preserve the Biblical definition of marriage, while -at the same time -defending gays against some actual mistreatment), likewise, no court could compel \*you\* to bake a cake against \*your\* religious beliefs. This is sound case-law, and I suggest you pursue this legal tact. Observe:

<http://www.prweb.com/releases/2015/03/prweb12608018.htm>

<http://www.prweb.com/releases/2015/03/prweb12608035.htm>

[http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571\\_bsac\\_GordonWayneWatts.pdf](http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571_bsac_GordonWayneWatts.pdf)

[http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571\\_bsac\\_GordonWayneWatts.pdf](http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571_bsac_GordonWayneWatts.pdf)

PS: I do know about law, having nearly won in court on behalf of Terri Schiavo, all by myself - on the merits. (My petition to save Terri Schiavo was not decided on technical issues, as some erroneously claim: it got past the clerk, who rules on technical issues, and was decided by the court, in a 4-3 split decision.) Observe:

[1] In Re: GORDON WAYNE WATTS (as next friend of THERESA MARIE 'TERRI' SCHIAVO), No. SC03-2420 (Fla. Feb.23, 2005), denied 4-3 on rehearing. (Watts got 42.7% of his panel)

<http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2005/2/03-2420reh.pdf>

[2] In Re: JEB BUSH, GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, ET AL. v. MICHAEL SCHIAVO, GUARDIAN: THERESA SCHIAVO, No. SC04-925 (Fla. Oct.21, 2004), denied 7-0 on rehearing. (Bush got 0.0% of his panel before the same court)

<http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2004/10/04-925reh.pdf>

[3] Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo ex rel. Schiavo, 403 F.3d 1223, 2005 WL 648897 (11th Cir. Mar.23, 2005), denied 2-1 on appeal. (Terri Schiavo's own blood family only got 33.3% of their panel on the Federal Appeals level)

<http://media.ca11.uscourts.gov/opinions/pub/files/200511556.pdf>

Gordon Wayne Watts  
Lakeland, Florida (between Tampa & Orlando)

**Enough is enough! The Kleins, legally, \*do\* have a right to refuse service: They didn't refuse to serve GAYS -just a gay function. #BigDifference. - #KnowTheDifference They CAN legally refuse service. PROOF: This would be like a Jewish or Muslim family refusing to serve a "Pig Roast," because Islam and Judaism believe that pork is unclean.**

In other words the Cake Making family, here, don't hate gays, but it's their religious belief to refuse service on things that go against their religious beliefs. Moreover, bartenders have a right to refuse sale if someone has had too much to drink, AND: convenient store clerks can refuse sales of alcohol or tobacco if someone regardless of age comes in without an I.D. -- Pastors, priests, reverends, etc.. can, likewise, refuse to serve at events that go against their religious beliefs: Since it's based on behaviour, not race, it's not discrimination.

The Klein family, who make cakes here, DO love their gay customers, and in fact, I hear they did LOTS of business with the lesbian couple, even after knowing they were gay. :D

PS: In Argument II of my own brief, I defended gays against mistreatment, so, while I'm a right-wing Conservative Christian, I don't hate gays either: Observe:

"II. Prejudice Against Homosexuals is Wrong.....11-14"

[http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571\\_bsac\\_GordonWayneWatts\\_REPRINT.pdf](http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571_bsac_GordonWayneWatts_REPRINT.pdf)

[http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571\\_bsac\\_GordonWayneWatts\\_REPRINT.pdf](http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/14-571_bsac_GordonWayneWatts_REPRINT.pdf)

Gordon Wayne Watts  
Lakeland, Florida (between Tampa & Orlando)

**Collusion and R.I.C.O.!**

<http://dailysignal.com/2015/06/01/emails-raise-questions-of-bias-in-case-against-bakers-who-denied-service-for-same-sex-wedding/>

You need to ask a lawyer about this news article: We are praying for you, Aaron and Melissa, Sweet Cakes by Melissa, and hope our feedback here is encouraging -and actually helpful. Moreover, I hope that those who hate you realise how silly they are -and they they simply stop wasting their time and energy.

What's the Bible say about a homosexual lifestyle? ANSWER: Matthew 5:17 (AMP) in which JESUS says: "17 Do not think that I have come to do away with or undo the Law or the Prophets; I have come not to do away with or undo but to complete and fulfill them." -- Since both Old and New Testament (Particularly Romans chapter 1) forbid homosexual lifestyles, and since Jesus did not overturn these codes, then it's still COLD IN EFFECT. Note: I did not say a gay orientation: An orientation is merely a temptation, not a sin (see Hebrew 4:15), but the lifestyle is distinct from the temptation.

Leviticus 18:22 New International Version (NIV) 22 “Do not have sexual relations with a man as one does with a woman; that is detestable.

Genesis 1:27 (KJV) So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

Leviticus 20:13 New International Version (NIV) 13 “If a man has sexual relations with a man as one does with a woman, both of them have done what is detestable. They are to be put to death; their blood will be on their own heads.

Romans 1:24-27 (NIV)

24 Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another. 25 They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen. 26 Because of this, God gave them over to shameful lusts.

Even their women exchanged natural sexual relations for unnatural ones. 27 In the same way the men also abandoned natural relations with women and were inflamed with lust for one another. Men committed shameful acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their error.

PS: The Bible is true and correct:

<http://www.gordonwatts.com/theology/reincarnation.html>

<http://www.gordonWAYNEwatts.com/theology/reincarnation.html>

Good question; here's *\*my\** take: First, the short answer: it'd be like a Jewish baker being asked to make a KKK Nazi cake so as to not offend the religious beliefs of the local chapter of the Klu Klux Klan. He could, legally, refuse. smile emoticon grin emoticon like emoticon -- You see the problem here, right? The religious beliefs of the Jewish baker *\*supersede\** those of the Klan members, simply because he is not required to be forced or compelled into doing business a certain way... The customers, on the other hand, can go to another business.

This is not like denying service because you're Black, female, gay (orientation), etc... In fact, the bakers at Sweet Cakes by Melissa have no problems serving gay customers (or Blacks, Whites, Jews, Klan members, females, males, etc.) -- They simply are not required to do something they view as pornographic. (Really, could you compel a baker to put a picture of a nude person on a cake to satisfy your religious belief? Since the answer is 'no,' then we know that the bakers here are victims of a double standard!)

<http://shoebat.com/2014/12/12/christian-man-asks-thirteen-gay-bakeries-bake-pro-traditional-marriage-cake-denied-service-watch-shocking-video/>

<http://freedomoutpost.com/2014/12/christian-man-asks-thirteen-gay-bakeries-bake-pro-traditional-marriage-cake-denied-service/>

<http://www.christianpost.com/news/13-gay-bakeries-refuse-to-make-traditional-marriage-cake-with-the-message-gay-marriage-is-wrong-131479/>

<http://www.teaparty.org/hypocrisy-christian-man-asks-thirteen-gay-bakeries-bake-pro-traditional-marriage-cake-denied-service-72428/>

<http://buzzpo.com/christian-man-denied-service-by-thirteen-gay-bakeries-after-requesting-pro-traditional-marriage-cake/>

Speaking of double standards, see THESE vids: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RgWIhYAtan4>  
HIDDEN CAM: #GayWeddingCakes at Muslim Bakeries?

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LmdiqB\\_8l2k](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LmdiqB_8l2k)  
HIDDEN CAMERA: Muslim Bakeries Turn Down Gay Wedding Cake

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rVAW\\_xUtVKQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rVAW_xUtVKQ)  
Are Muslim Bakeries untouchable? #GayWeddingCake

**OK, slightly longer answer: They didn't refuse to serve GAYS -just a gay function. #BigDifference. - #KnowTheDifference They CAN legally refuse service. PROOF: This would be like a Jewish or Muslim family refusing to serve a "Pig Roast," because Islam and Judaism believe that pork is unclean. In other words the Cake Making family, here, don't hate gays, but it's their religious belief to refuse service on things that go against their religious beliefs. Moreover, bartenders have a right to refuse sale if someone has had too much to drink, AND: convenient store clerks can refuse sales of alcohol or tobacco if someone regardless of age comes in without an I.D. -- Pastors, priests, reverends, etc.. can, likewise, refuse to serve at events that go against their religious beliefs: Since it's based on behaviour, not race, it's not discrimination.**

Quoting from page 19 of 122 of the PDF (point (49)) of the state's own Final Order: “Other than posting LBC's complaint on his Facebook page, there is no evidence that AK(Aaron Klein) gave Complainants' names to the media,” and (above that, also in point (49)), the state's official findings admit: “he did not initiate any contacts with the media.” [[Page 16, point 39,bottom of page, where the AUNT makes a death threat, was not the fault of the Kleins.]]

Source: <http://www.oregon.gov/boli/SiteAssets/pages/press/Sweet%20Cakes%20FO.pdf>

Cached copies: <http://gordonwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/SweetCakesFO.pdf>

And: <http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/GayMarriageSuit/SweetCakesFO.pdf>

[The initial complaint, after all, is public record! So, no, they did not publish anything private – do others agree?](#)

Ah, yes! I was right! "No, the Oregon bakers weren't fined for publishing the complainant's home address, or for otherwise publicizing the complaint against them" Washington Post, By Eugene Volokh July 10 at 9:23 PM

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2015/07/10/no-the-oregon-bakers-werent-fined-for-publishing-the-complainants-home-address-or-for-otherwise-publicizing-the-complaint-against-them>

See also: <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2015/07/13/fact-check-theres-a-false-accusation-circulating-on-social-media-about-the-christian-bakers-who-declined-to-make-a-gay-wedding-cake-and-were-fined-135000>

The Kleins did not publish anything that wasn't already public information. So, no, they didn't dox anyone. This pattern of behaviour suggests that the state, itself, let the information out. Indeed, what liberals fail to realise is that when the lesbian couple filed suit, it became public information:

[http://www.oregonlive.com/portland/index.ssf/2014/07/person\\_who\\_wont\\_identify\\_himse.html](http://www.oregonlive.com/portland/index.ssf/2014/07/person_who_wont_identify_himse.html)

<http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2011/10/03/govt-increasingly-getting-your-private-info-from-internet-companies>

Re: [[Melissa L'Villa's DELETED comment: [which said] " Judge not lest ye be judged" Karma is a BIYOTCH...wink emoticon

Like · Reply · 13 mins · Edited]] >>

<https://www.facebook.com/melissa.lynn.560?fref=ufi>

Looks like Karma got YOU - your post was deleted, and I could not reply to it, but here's my reply anyhow... If you're gonna quote the Bible, Melissa, you should quote it correctly: Judging? Is it OK to 'judge' others according to Jesus and the Bible? YES. >> John 7:24 (KJV) Jesus says: "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." [[Of course, we must be loving, and not hateful, when judging, I will give you that.]]

Matthew 7:1 (KJV) says: "Judge not, that ye be not judged," but is that it? NOT.

Once you get the speck out of your own eye, then it IS ok to judge. Read the WHOLE passage: Observe:

Matthew 7:1-6 New International Version (NIV)

Judging Others

7:1 "Do not judge, or you too will be judged. 2 For in the same way you judge others, you will be judged, and with the measure you use, it will be measured to you. 3 "Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? 4 How can you say to your brother, 'Let me take the speck out of your eye,' when all the time there is a plank in your own eye? 5 You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother's eye. 6 "Do not give dogs what is sacred; do not throw your pearls to pigs. If you do, they may trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you to pieces.

AGAIN: John 7:24 (KJV) Jesus says: "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment."

The Klingon High Council officially supports you, Sweet Cakes by Melissa:

Proof: [www.GordonWatts.com/StarTrek](http://www.GordonWatts.com/StarTrek)

[www.GordonWayneWatts.com/StarTrek](http://www.GordonWayneWatts.com/StarTrek)

Gordon Wayne Watts // Klingon and proud of it!

<http://www.gotquestions.org/ceremonial-law.html>

<http://christianity.stackexchange.com/questions/14495/what-is-the-biblical-support-for-the-moral-civil-ceremonial-distinction-of-old-t>

<https://www.google.com/search?q=moral+civil+ceremonial+law>

**@ Mel Brown, you raise many valid points; let me see if I can address them all:**

[[ ""You still dont get the point do you...especially in regards to cherry picking sin

They broke the law weather you like it or not."" ]]

\*\*As I said, I disagree that the law was broken; see my other posts about the Jewish baker analogy for more on that. :)

[[ ""Again if you CAN make a cake for divorced people those who have commited adultery then you can make one for a lesbian wedding. (Im sure the Kleins made wedding cakes for people who have been divorced)"" ]]

\*\* Maybe their religion allows for divorce and remarriage; ever thought of that!?

[[ ""When I get married I will be using a celebrant as Im not giving my money to a church that doesnt pay taxes...."" ]]

\*\* Your personal choice. :)

[[ ""A priest told me that when you a judging others you are standing in judgement yourself"" ]]

\*\*Wait! I see you're an atheist! Why would you quote a priest? (Except perhaps knowing I might accept that as an argumnet?) But, FWIW, here's what I believe: John 7:24 (KJV) quoted Jesus saying: "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment," meaning it's OK to judge, but just make sure you're correct (and loving). Moreover, Mathew 7:1 is often taken out of context:

Matthew 7:1 (KJV) says: "Judge not, that ye be not judged," but is that it? NOT.

Once you get the speck out of your own eye, then it IS ok to judge. Read the WHOLE passage: Observe:

Matthew 7:1-6 New International Version (NIV)

Judging Others

7:1 "Do not judge, or you too will be judged. 2 For in the same way you judge others, you will be judged, and with the measure you use, it will be measured to you. 3 "Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the plank in your own eye? 4 How can you say to your brother, 'Let me take the speck out of your eye,' when all the time there is a plank in your own eye? 5 You hypocrite, first take the plank out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother's eye. 6 "Do not give dogs what is sacred; do not throw your pearls to

pigs. If you do, they may trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you to pieces.

[[ ""Religious fanatics always quote the bible yet its been re written as there is more than one Testament.]]

So if God was real then there would be 1 GOD and 1 Bible not 100's that are being worshipped by humanity today

I am an atheist. If I am wrong which I highly doubt it then its up to GOD to judge me no one else. ""]]

\*\* You raise 2 issues: The accuracy of the Bible and the existence of God; thankfully, I addressed both subject here, showing historical, prophetic, scientific, etc. evidence for the Bible's accuracy, and pointing out also that if even WE HUMANS can't make dinosaurs ("cheating" so to speak, with technology, dead dinosaur DNA, live toad-frog DNA, etc.), then how could a dead universe (which, given time, would occur) do this?

<http://www.gordonwatts.com/theology/reincarnation.html>

or: <http://www.gordonwaynewatts.com/theology/reincarnation.html> -- I recommend u print this out for offline review, over coffee or snacks; easier, in my opinion, than sitting in front of a computer screen.

[[ ""Also I think JESUS would be horrified that people use his name to promote hate towards others here. ""]]

\*\* I agree, and even Jesus agrees: only FEW versus MANY make it: Matthew 7:13-14 (KJV)

13 Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat:

14 Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it

[[ ""So many christians say that gay people will burn in hell ect yet they are sinning them self. ""]]

\*\* I agree, and so does Jesus. But, MANY straights AND MANY gays will sadly burn in hell - due to their own choice of rejecting Jesus. :(

[[ ""Religion seems to love people based on terms and conditions not real love or kindness. ""]]

\*\* Even Jesus, Paul, and many Old Testament prophets, had issues with religion - often arguing with the religious leaders of their time. :p

[[ ""Especially when they are taking 10% of peoples income, getting rich while theie followers find it hard to make ends meet. Yet they make millions on a tax free status.

Since when did JESUS say lets legally rob people on a weekly basis. ""]]

\*\* Fair enough, but what about churches, like my church, which has a food pantry for the poor people, and helps them with food and clothing (and SOMETIMES shelter for the homekless, but not enoyugh to satisfy me -- or ISAIAH 58:6-7 or MATTHEW 25:31-4??6)

[[ ""Religion is flawed and I dont want to be a part of it. Unlike · 1 · 4 hrs · Edited""]]

\*\* Neither did Jesus. □ Relationship, not religion.

Gordon Wayne Watts  
Lakeland, Florida, between Tampa & Orlando.//



Hey, I want to apologize to you for accusing your organisation of blocking me on your sister page, <https://www.facebook.com/FloridaFamilyAction> (see above). -- I was, indeed, blocked, but, after a recent similar experience, I am now almost 100% Certain that it was Facebook (and not your page admins) who blocked me. (Of course, I still occasionally post on <https://www.facebook.com/floridafamilypolicycouncil> - this page - and, of course, am not blocked; thank you for allowing dissenting views on occasion!) Anyhow, I felt bad about lobbing what was probably a false accusation.

I owe it to you to explain what happened:

Anyhow, I was posting regularly on <https://www.facebook.com/pages/Sweet-Cakes-by-Melissa/352725392798> (I saved a template from which I could copy and paste comments, and then change a word or two to address the person to whom I was replying; it is attached here as a PDF.)

So, here's what happened:

I kept getting a lot of pop-up messages with CAPTCHA's asking me to identify the waterfalls, cats, dogs, etc. in the picture, implying that Facebook was getting ticked off at me! (CAPTCHA: Completely Automated Public Turing test to tell Computers and Humans Apart -- definition: A challenge-response system test designed to differentiate humans from automated programs.)

That implied or suggested that maybe I was "posting fast," a sin in Facebook's world!

Next thing I knew, I went to their page, and I was BLOCKED! And, so I emailed them, asking what was the problem. (Unlike my occasional disagreements with FFA / FFPC when I supported limited abilities of gays adopting, on Aaron and Melissa Klein's SweetCakes page, I totally and 100% supported them, and was quite careful to be polite to the liberal trolls!)

So, I was QUITE surprise I was blocked, but then I looked closer, and I noticed that ALL of my (probably in the hundreds) posts were GONE! All at once! Since no mere mortal human can delete things that fast, I am certain it was Facebook's evil computer, and not their page admins.

While I have had theological and legal disagreements with y'all that do indeed qualify as "Epic Battles! (See e.g., <http://gordonwatts.com/redux-on-CS-HB-7013.html> or <http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/redux-on-CS-HB-7013.html> as but 2 examples), this new information makes me believe that none of y'all had any problems with me posting on your smaller page.

Sorry for the length of my email :p But: As a Christian, who has received blessings fro the sovereign King, Jesus, I

owe it to my King to do what I can to clear up a potential misunderstanding once I learn new updates that might make a difference. My apologies in either case - either for wrongly believing y'all blocked me or for somehow offending someone so they blocked me. So, whether y'all did or didn't block me, either way, I would appreciate your thoughts on this guess of mine as to who blocked me on y'all's smaller FFA page. Thx.

Gordon Wayne Watts in Lakeland :)

**“The Colorado Civil Rights Division has held that Azucar Bakery didn’t discriminate based on religion when it refused to bake a cake with an anti-homosexuality message, reports the Denver Post (Anthony Cotton)...According to ABC 7 News Denver,**

**[William] Jack went to the bakery ... and requested two cakes shaped like bibles. He asked that one cake have the image of two groomsmen holding hands in front of a cross with a red “X” over them. He asked that the cake be decorated with the biblical verses, “God hates sin. Psalm 45:7” and “Homosexuality is a detestable sin. Leviticus 18:2”, according to the Civil Rights Divisions’ decision.”**

**Source: Legal for Colorado bakery to refuse to write anti-gay message on cake, By Eugene Volokh, April 07, 2015, The Washington Post**

**<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2015/04/07/legal-for-colorado-bakery-to-refuse-to-write-anti-gay-inscription-on-cake/>**

**Volokh's brief in support of bakery: <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/Elane-Photog-filed-brief.pdf>**

**“This case is largely controlled by a United States Supreme Court precedent that the court of appeals never mentioned: Wooley v. Maynard, 430 U.S. 705 (1977). Wooley, the New Hampshire license plate case that we discuss in detail below, makes clear that speech compulsions are generally as unconstitutional as speech restrictions. Wooley’s logic applies to photographs and other displays, and not just verbal expression. And that logic applies also to compulsions to create photographs and other works (including when the creation is done for money), not just to compulsions to display such works. Much of the reasoning used by the court of appeals is directly contrary to the reasoning of Wooley.**

**Indeed, the court of appeals’ reasoning would produce startling results. Consider, for instance, a freelance writer who writes press releases for various groups, including religious groups, but refuses to write a press release for a religious organization or event with which he disagrees. Under the court of appeals’ theory, such a refusal would violate the law, being a form of discrimination based on religion, much as Elaine Huguenin’s refusal to photograph an event with which she disagreed was treated as a violation of the law. Yet a writer must have the First Amendment right to choose which speech he creates, notwithstanding any state law to the contrary. And the same principle, as we argue below, applies to photographers as well.”**

**Source: “Amicus Brief in Elane Photography v. Willock (the New Mexico Wedding Photography Case),” By Eugene Volokh on November 2, 2012 4:21 pm in Freedom of Speech, The Volokh Conspiracy**

**<http://volokh.com/tag/elane-photography-v-willock/>**

**“About: The Volokh Conspiracy is a group blog. Most of us are law professors.” Source: <http://volokh.com/about/>**

**“The dispute began March 13, 2014 when Jack went to the bakery at 1886 S. Broadway and requested two cakes shaped like bibles. He asked that one cake have the image of two groomsmen holding hands in front of a cross with a red "X" over them. He asked that the cake be decorated with the biblical verses, "God hates sin. Psalm 45:7" and "Homosexuality is a detestable sin. Leviticus 18:22", according to the Civil Rights Divisions' decision.**

**On the second bible-shaped cake, Jack also requested the image of the two groomsmen with the red "X". He wanted it decorated with the words "God loves sinners" and "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Romans 5:8."**

**He told the civil rights agency he ordered the cakes with the imagery and biblical verses to convey that same-sex marriage is, in his words, "un-biblical and inappropriate."**

**Marjorie Silva, the owner of the bakery, told Jack that she would make him the bible-shaped cakes, but would not decorate them with the biblical verses and the image of the groomsmen that he requested. Instead, she offered to provide him with icing and a pastry bag so he could write or draw whatever messages he wished on the cakes."**

**Source: "Denver's Azucar Bakery wins right to refuse to make anti-gay cakes: Christian man wanted cakes with anti-gay messages," By Alan Gathright, Eric Luper, Posted: 8:33 PM, Apr 3, 2015, Updated: 7:43 PM, Apr 23, 2015, ABC 7 News Denver**

**<http://www.thedenverchannel.com/news/local-news/denvers-azucar-bakery-wins-right-to-refuse-to-make-anti-gay-cake>**

Gordon Wayne Watts What is the world? I can comment again... smile emoticon grin emoticon Yay!!! -- OK, enough of my celebration: we must work together to seek a peace accord between Sweet Cakes by Melissa and those who are angry with them - blessed are the peacemakers heart emoticon (For those who missed it, I was **\*\*BLOCKED\*\*** like Spock! here for a while -and thus unable to comment, an apparent Facebook restriction - meaning those of you who had your posts deleted and got blocked... it was not Melissa & Aaron Klein: it was Facebook: I think I was posting too much too fast.) THIS much I know: I started getting pop-up 'Turing tests' from Facebook and then all of a sudden ALL my posts ALL (like hundreds? thousands?) ALL gone! Just like that! As another wise man once said recently, no mere mortal can do that: Aaron and Melissa are innocent of blocking people - it was Facebook. (And, they're innocent of hating lesbians: they did business with them before - no problems with gays - just "gay cakes" as another wise man once said.)

Enough of my grandstanding: we must seek peace with one another: God is love. like emoticon  
Unlike · Reply · 1 · 5 mins · Edited

Leviticus 19:18 New International Version (NIV)

18 "Do not seek revenge or bear a grudge against anyone among your people, but love your neighbor as yourself. I am the Lord.

Matthew 5:9 New International Version (NIV)

9 Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.

Psalms 34:14 Amplified Bible (AMP)

14 Depart from evil and do good; seek, inquire for, and crave peace and pursue (go after) it!

1 Peter 3:11 Amplified Bible (AMP)

11 Let him turn away from wickedness and shun it, and let him do right. Let him search for peace (harmony; undisturbedness from fears, agitating passions, and moral conflicts) and seek it eagerly. [Do not merely desire peaceful relations with God, with your fellowmen, and with yourself, but pursue, go after them!]

Amplified Bible (AMP)

Copyright © 1954, 1958, 1962, 1964, 1965, 1987 by The Lockman Foundation

Matthew 5:43-48 King James Version (KJV)

43 Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.

44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

Hey, Carlos, you remember me, right? I'm the guy who almost saved Terri Schiavo -- all by myself -- in state court, losing 4-3. (Thus, you can rest assured that I'm a far-right "Moral Conservative.") Here's a pic that you let me take with you in your recent visit to Lakeland, Florida, to jog your memory:  
<https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=10203086934359172&set=t.1380495131&type=3&theater>

Oh, and proof of the aforementioned claims :)

[1] In Re: GORDON WAYNE WATTS (as next friend of THERESA MARIE 'TERRI' SCHIAVO), No. SC03-2420 (Fla. Feb.23, 2005), denied 4-3 on rehearing. (Watts got 42.7% of his panel)

<http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2005/2/03-2420reh.pdf>

[2] In Re: JEB BUSH, GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, ET AL. v. MICHAEL SCHIAVO, GUARDIAN: THERESA SCHIAVO, No. SC04-925 (Fla. Oct.21, 2004), denied 7-0 on rehearing. (Bush got 0.0% of his panel before the same court)

<http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/clerk/dispositions/2004/10/04-925reh.pdf>

[3] Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo ex rel. Schiavo, 403 F.3d 1223, 2005 WL 648897 (11th Cir. Mar.23, 2005), denied 2-1 on appeal. (Terri Schiavo's own blood family only got 33.3% of their panel on the Federal Appeals level)

<http://media.ca11.uscourts.gov/opinions/pub/files/200511556.pdf>

OK, enough of the polite introductions. I'm also a "Fiscal Conservative," which is why I query you about the matter below: Now that you're running for Federal office, these issues \*are\* within your purview. You remember the liberal interferences into the Free Market of higher ed which was in some paperwork I gave you that time we hung out? Well, the liberals have interfered with contract law, and violated Federal Constitutional provisions on impairing contracts:

Legal analysis:

[http://GordonWatts.com/Student-Loan-Abuse\\_Brief.pdf](http://GordonWatts.com/Student-Loan-Abuse_Brief.pdf)

[http://GordonWayneWatts.com/Student-Loan-Abuse\\_Brief.pdf](http://GordonWayneWatts.com/Student-Loan-Abuse_Brief.pdf)

My op-ed and selected letters to the editor: "Higher-Ed Tuition Costs: The 'Conservative' view is not on either extreme"

<http://GordonWatts.com/Higher-Ed-Tuition-Costs.html>

<http://GordonWayneWatts.com/Higher-Ed-Tuition-Costs.html>

Standard Consumer Protections (like bankruptcy) are the 'Economic 2nd Amendment,' which students need to defend against predatory lending:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D7Z9wWWjTJo> (Rep. Dennis Ross)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WnNkncv51cs> (Dr. Ron Paul)

Congressman Rep. Dennis A. Ross and former Congressman Ron Paul .com agree that students should be accorded the

same bankruptcy options as both Credit Card users and rich folk (like you) get: Do you agree with this Conservative assessment, and, are you willing to immediately introduce legislation to restore these free market checks against predatory lending --which desperate college students desperately need?

Thx.

Gordon//

[Sweet Cakes by Melissa](#)

[June 5](#) ·

The Lord will fight for you, and you shall hold your peace and remain at rest. Exodus 14:14

[Unlike](#) · [Comment](#) ·

[Share](#)

[Gordon Wayne Watts](#) Ecclesiastes 3:8b (NIV) "...a time for war and a time for peace." -- Sometimes, we must wait on The Lord; other times, He says that it's \*our\* time to fight!

Psalms 144:1 (NIV) "Praise be to the Lord my Rock, who trains my hands for war, my fingers for battle."

Proverbs 24:6 (KJV) "For by wise counsel thou shalt make thy war: and in multitude of counsellors there is safety."

Proverbs 20:18 (KJV) "Every purpose is established by counsel: and with good advice make war."

Sirach 4:28 (KJV) "Strive for the truth unto death, and the Lord shall fight for thee."

Sirach 4:28 (NRSV, 1989) "Fight to the death for truth, and the Lord God will fight for you."


[Unlike](#) · [Reply](#) · [1](#) · [4 mins](#)



**Brad Avakian**

February 5, 2013 ·

Everyone has a right to their religious beliefs, but that doesn't mean they can disobey laws that are already in place. Having one set of rules for everybody ensures that people are treated fairly as they go about their daily lives.



['Ace of Cakes' offers free wedding cake for Ore. gay couple](#)

The Oregon Department of Justice is looking into a complaint that a Gresham bakery refused to make a wedding cake for a same sex marriage. <br />It...

kgw.com

[Like](#) [Comment](#) [Share](#)

- You and [76 others](#) like this.
- [1 share](#)



- [Gordon Wayne Watts](#) While I agree that one should not be penalised or discriminated against based on orientation (aka sexual preference), Mr. Avakian, with all due respect, your assessment is egregiously incorrect and off-centre: Aaron and Melissa Klein (of [Sweet Cakes by Melissa](#) fame) had no problems making a cake for lesbians: In fact, the lesbian couple were repeat customers, hello! They just didn't want to make a cake with what, according to their religion, were obscene symbols and lettering on it. It would be like a Black or Jewish baker being asked to make a KKK Nazi-themed cake with 'KKK' writing & a Nazi logo on it, so as to not offend the religious beliefs of the local chapter of the Klu Klux Klan. He could, legally, refuse, no? like emoticon Thus, [Sweet Cakes by Melissa](#) is no less protected than the Jewish or African-American bakers in this scenario, and thus I must conclude that either you're very stupid in making a mistake or that your integrity is without honour.

\*\* As I don't wish to insult your intelligence, I must assume the latter. \*\*

Moreover, the [Sweet Cakes by Melissa](#) case is largely controlled by a United States Supreme Court precedent that I do *\*not\** recall you ever having mentioned, Mr. Avakian: *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705 (1977). *Wooley*, a now semi-famous New Hampshire license plate case, makes clear that speech compulsions are generally as unconstitutional as speech restrictions. *Wooley's* logic applies to photographs and other displays -yes, including bakers (see the KKK case above), and not just verbal expression. And that logic applies also to compulsions to create photographs and other works (including when the creation is done for money), not just to compulsions to display such works. Your reasoning, therefore, is directly contrary to the reasoning of *Wooley*. (Additionally, I was

unable to compel a lawyer to take my case, against his or her religious beliefs, when I filed before the [United States Supreme Court](#) in the recent gay marriage case. Do you not think the bakers have any less rights here? Equal Protectino, hello!)

PS: While I'm not a lawyer, I'm not a dumb county hick. I do know about law, having nearly won in court on behalf of Terri Schiavo, all by myself - on the merits. (My petition to save Terri Schiavo was not decided on technical issues, as some erroneously claim: it got past the clerk, who rules on technical issues, and was decided by the court, in a 4-3 split decision.) Observe:

[1] In Re: GORDON WAYNE WATTS (as next friend of THERESA MARIE 'TERRI' SCHIAVO), No. SC03-2420 (Fla. Feb.23, 2005), denied 4-3 on rehearing. (Watts got 42.7% of his panel)

<http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/.../2005/2/03-2420reh.pdf>

[2] In Re: JEB BUSH, GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, ET AL. v. MICHAEL SCHIAVO, GUARDIAN: THERESA SCHIAVO, No. SC04-925 (Fla. Oct.21, 2004), denied 7-0 on rehearing. (Bush got 0.0% of his panel before the same court) <http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/.../2004/10/04-925reh.pdf>

[3] Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo ex rel. Schiavo, 403 F.3d 1223, 2005 WL 648897 (11th Cir. Mar.23, 2005), denied 2-1 on appeal. (Terri Schiavo's own blood family only got 33.3% of their panel on the Federal Appeals level) <http://media.ca11.uscourts.gov/.../pub/files/200511556.pdf>

PS: In case you missed it, I AGREED with you that discrimination based on orientation would be wrong (had the Kleins done so) -- So, I'm not prejudiced. PROOF: In Argument II of my own brief, I defended gays against mistreatment, so, while I'm a right-wing Conservative Christian, I don't hate gays either: Observe:

"II. Prejudice Against Homosexuals is Wrong.....11-14"

[http://gordonwatts.com/.../14-571\\_bsac\\_GordonWayneWatts...](http://gordonwatts.com/.../14-571_bsac_GordonWayneWatts...)

[http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/.../14-571\\_bsac...](http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/.../14-571_bsac...)

Moreover, I also defended gay's rights to adopt as well, in my letter to the Governor:

<http://gordonwatts.com/redux-on-CS-HB-7013.html>

<http://gordonWAYNEwatts.com/redux-on-CS-HB-7013.html>

So, this shows that I'm not a hateful gay-hating prejudiced bigot, no?

[Gordon Wayne Watts](#)

[Lakeland, Florida](#)

(which, for your perspective, is squarely between Tampa & Orlando)

[4 mins](#) · [Unlike](#) · [1](#)