

We Ought To Obey God!

United Nations Conference on the Rights of the Child

Martin G. Collins

Given 14-Feb-09; Sermon #923c

What I have to bring it to you today—I do not have as much time as I would like to cover it, but it's a subject that actually affects almost every last person in earshot of my voice, the grandparents and parents and the children. It is something that this nation has been trying very hard to resist ratifying for more than twenty years now, but it looks like we are within a couple of months of it being ratified.

Some of you may have seen this article. It is titled, "Senator Boxer Asks State Department to Expedite U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child." This article came out February 19. It says,

After Ambassador Susan Rice's inability to make an ironclad commitment for immediate ratification, Boxer will ask Secretary of State Hillary Clinton for US support of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Children.

Under the Clinton Administration, they tried to get it ratified by Congress, and Congress refused because it is a horrible thing for families. But yet they are trying another route. They want to reclassify it from treaty to statute, so that they do not have to get approval from Congress to approve it for the United States.

The U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which opponents say could destroy American sovereignty by imposing international rulings on American law, could reach the Senate within 60 days. Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA) says she wants a 60-day timeframe for the State Department to complete its review so the Senate can move toward ratification of the UNCRC. . . . Opponents vehemently disagree. Under the Supremacy Clause (Article VI) of the U.S. Constitution, ratified treaties preempt state law. Since virtually all laws in the U.S. regarding children are state laws, this treaty would negate nearly 100% of existing American family law. Moreover, it would grant the government authority to override parental decisions by applying even to good parents a standard now only used against those convicted of abuse or neglect.

So, if you're a child beater in a true form, where you actually do serious harm to your

We Ought to Obey God! by Martin G. Collins (<http://www.cgg.org>)

child, you're hauled off to jail and your children are taken away from you. They want to apply the same thing to innocent parents who are genuinely taking good care of their children, but which do not meet the state's view of standards.

Calling it a "complicated treaty," Rice expressed her commitment to the treaty's objectives, but when Rice concluded that she could not meet the Senator's strict time frame, Boxer said they would take it up with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

So, they are trying to go around the Senators and the official channels and get it pushed through, rammed through, by Hillary Clinton, who does want it very badly because she fought for it earlier.

I have here excerpts from the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. If anyone would like to see it afterwards, you're certainly welcome too. They are appalling. The child has the inherent right to life, but it does not apply to unborn children, so there is hypocrisy throughout the thing. Also, they use the term "evolving capacities": "...in a manner consistent with the *evolving capacities* of the child." That is a code word for homosexuality or other perverse actions. They are guaranteeing the children the right to do those things.

So, as I said, this are several pages here of just excerpts out of that that will also hit religion. In Article 17: "State parties (or nations) encourage the mass media to disseminate information and material of social and cultural benefit to the child, in accordance with the spirit of Article 29." What they are saying is they want all education for children to come through the media and state sources, for example, public schools. So it's not a good thing, and it could be as close as 60 days away.

So, what do we do about that? What is our reaction to be? If you would turn with me to Acts 4, we will see a principle there that helps us to know exactly what to do. It is something that we should be applying in every aspect of our lives as well. In Acts 4, there is a principle very clearly described here (in both Acts 4 and 5) that provides instruction for us about how to act when the state or U.N. try to force us to relinquish God's way of life or parental responsibility.

Acts 4:18-21 So they [the Sanhedrin] called them [that is, Peter and John] and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said to them, "Whether it is right in the sight of God to listen to you more than to God, you judge. For we cannot but

We Ought to Obey God! by Martin G. Collins (<http://www.cgg.org>)

“speak the things which we have seen and heard.” So when they had further threatened them, they let them go, finding no way of punishing them, because of the people, since they all glorified God for what had been done.

The phrase in verse 19, “whether it is right in the sight of God,” in other words, is saying, “whether God will judge this to be right or not.” The essential principle is how God would view it—it’s all about how God would view it, not how we would. If He disapproved of it, it was wrong. It was not just a question regarding their reputation or their safety or their lives; it was a question of conscience before God. This is an excellent example of the main principle that should guide our Christian conduct.

This issue is not so much about safety and reputation and preserving our lives, but it’s about bringing everything to the test of whether it will please God or not. We should hold everything up to that standard and ask ourselves that. If it will, it’s right; if it will not, then it’s wrong.

The statement at the end of verse 19 “you judge” was an appeal to the Sanhedrin directly as judges and as men. The Sanhedrin acknowledged that it received authority appointed by God and that all their authority resulted from His appointment. So that is what Peter and John were relying on, that they understood that. Of course, God could modify, supersede, or repeal their authority, and they also understood that. The principle that it was better to obey God than man prevented them from condemning or passing judgment or punishing Peter’s and John’s statement. The only question was whether they had evidence that God had issued any command in this case, and that’s what they were trying to determine because the Sanhedrin had the pressure of the people who liked what Peter and John were saying.

This is one of the first and most bold appeals on record in favor of the right of private judgment and the liberty of conscience, which God gives each and every one of us. In Judaism, those rights were understood, and the Jewish leaders had to admit that the authority of God was superior to that of man in everything. So, they were released.

Later, in Acts 5:26, this reinforces what it says there in Acts 4:

Acts 5:26-32 Then the captain went with the officers and brought them without violence, for they feared the people, lest they should be stoned. And when they had brought them, they set them before the council. And the high priest asked them, saying, “Did we not strictly command you not to teach in this name? And look, you have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and

We Ought to Obey God! by Martin G. Collins (<http://www.cgg.org>)

intend to bring this Man's blood on us!" [Verse 29 is the crucial scripture here:] But Peter and the other apostles answered and said: "We ought to obey God rather than men. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom you murdered by hanging on a tree. Him God has exalted to His right hand to be Prince and Savior, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. And we are His witnesses to these things, and so also is the Holy Spirit whom God has given to those who obey Him."

This includes all members of the church, each and every one of us. We also obey God rather than men, and that's the principle that we will have to apply when we are faced with this—the Convention on the Rights of the Child—when they start trying to enforce that on each and every family in America, which is already beginning to happen by stealth.

This may be in 60 days or so; we will give them the authority to do it openly. Homosexuality is protected in the convention's rights, but heterosexuality is not, which is an interesting thing. So there is nothing but perversion coming out of that, but it's worded very cleverly.