

The Winsconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod or Idolatry!

By Sophia Siedlberg

Here is a question: Am I more qualified to talk about theology than some of the scholars at the Winsconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod. The answer to that question, surprisingly is “Yes”. I have never been to a theological college (I am a geneticist by training) I am not a practicing priest, pastor, rabbi or any other form of teacher. But I am still more qualified than WELS to comment on certain aspects of the bible. It is oddly enough a matter of birthright, I am not descended from some holy line, if anything I am a descendent of the most maligned group of people in the bible, the Zealots. The tradition still survives mainly in India when the apostle Thomas went to India with 72 of the families and settled there, the remainder of these people stayed in Israel and faced the Romans only later to be scattered in the European Diaspora.

It is not this that qualifies me but the fact that due to an accident of birth, having 5 alpha reductase-2 deficiency I was born a “Eunuch” (I was born with an intersex condition) I have followed the laws governing my role in life pretty much to the letter, I am an ascetic and I have walked with Jshua (According the Ebionite Theology, sorry I am not a tritheist) for most of my adult life. I take it very seriously, because it does require a lot of learning and contemplation. I am still a “sinner” but not an “aberration” who had no right being born. In fact this is where I feel it is finally time to answer back to the so-called “authority” of certain “Christians” who have overstepped the mark.

As a rule I am not supposed to judge, (Matthew 7:1) but there are circumstances where I can challenge authority in a way not dissimilar to the way Jshua (Jesus) did. Now Jshua was someone who also did this against the Pharisees and went into a three day argument with them.

I am now going to say as a follower of Jshua’s teachings, who practices the original form of asceticism that was around during the second temple era, that I resent the lies and idolatrous actions of certain so called “monotheists”. It is my right to do so and I will, because have clearly not read their bible, despite being reputed to be meticulous biblical scholars, what I have been reading is a lie, I am not going to mince words or present this with any nice words, I am going to say it because as a Zealot in the biblical sense it is my right to do so.

So here we go: Represented in a manner similar to a modern legal challenge. (so others can understand the process of accusation).

They call themselves the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, and they have decided to ratify what is male and female, they have decreed that people with intersex conditions are “Not a part of the natural order of G-d” Basically they have listed conditions by whether they have XX or XY chromosomes, (Mosaicism such as XXY is not mentioned I

add). What this means is a woman with CAIS or Swyers syndrome will be “made to fit the male role” because they have XY chromosomes, this is regardless of their physical state.

The Wiconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod are even aware of this, a woman with Swyers who is pregnant would be an “Abberation against the natural order” according to them.

I therefore accuse the Wiconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Gross Idolatry, Of Misrepresenting G-d and of placing burdens on people because they believe that the “Unfairness of it” is a virtue.

I do this in the name of my G-d, El Shaddai the G-d of Abraham to justify your statements on the subject of intersex people (who you call “BICs”) and I accuse you of Idolatry, the misrepresentation of G-d as described in scripture and your belief that “natural unfairness” is a virtue.

On Gross Idolatry: You have stated that you consider G-d to be a G-d of fertility in fact you not only express this openly you do so with the intent of making people worship this false G-d who demands perfection, in the flesh of all those who seek to walk with G-d. I call you to repent.

On misrepresentation: You are very clear about the character of G-d, so much so that what you describe is more akin to the Golden Calf of the book of Exodus than the G-d of Israel who gave the commandments to Moses. Historically there was another use of the name YH-H which took the form of a warrior-fertility diety from the early Canaanite belief system. This diety was also the husband and son of “Balat” of Jbeil and “Ba’al” of Jbiel, This diety demanded that people followed the rules governing sex and what we now term gender. This is not the G-d of Israel, as the exodus narrative clearly states G-d made a covenant with his people and the Golden Calf of the same name used in Jbiel (also known as Byblos) was denounced as a false G-d. the real YH-H was a name among many given to the all sufficient El Shaddai. As you are meticulous experts on scripture you, the Wiconsin Evangelical Lutheran synod will be aware of this historical narratives both within the scriptures and external to the scriptures but contemporary to the time they were written.

You greatest crime is the “unfairness” where you say the mis treatment of “BICs” and “Eunuchs” is due to your understanding that “G-d” (As in the Ba’al or YH-H of Jbiel married in an incestuous relationship to Balat the Asherah) makes only “male and female” this is incorrect. Let’s begin then with this “unfairness”. For anyone reading this I will now go into detail about my accusation.

After basically classifying most intersex people as “male” and a few as “female” under the guise of “BICs” they make the following statement:

“When wrestling with how someone with a BIC assumes some of the more public roles in the Christian community assigned to either men or women there is the issue of causing offense or causing a weaker Christian to stumble in faith. For example, a Christian with a BIC who is a male could serve as a WELS pastor and assume all leadership responsibilities consistent with that gender. Physical appearances because of the BIC may give the impression that the person is not a male. If not afforded the opportunity to clarify the matter it may cause some to stumble in their faith. One with a BIC will want to carefully judge whether this malady would interfere with his public service in a male role.

Is it fair? Of course not! Yet, the inclination for the general public to stumble is a reality. All of us must balance that reality and all of our alternatives as we seek to glorify God with our bodies and lives.”

Let’s translate this into plain English, what the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod are saying is that anyone who appears female but has an “XY Chromosome” (Note the missing centromer) is male but really cannot take a “male leadership role” however in all other respects they should be treated as a male, that is if they want to get married as a woman, they must only marry another woman. (Which WELS would then consider a lesbian relationship and ban) In effect “BICs” are given less rights than a woman would be in their church. As they clearly base their ideology on the notion that people are valued on their ability to reproduce rather than emphasizing their walk with G-d, it is clear to me that the “unfairness” is more vindictive in nature. What they fail to recognize is scripturally speaking they WELS could well be damned to burn in hell. Why? Matthew 19 is the reason why. You will notice that when Jshua (Jesus) was asked about divorce Jshua sort of ended up on the issue of “Eunuchs”. There are two ways you can look at this the first would be to see them as a deformed member of a given sex (Usually male) or as something more akin to G-d. It is of course in the interest of the idolaters within WELS to take the former view that such people or “BICs” are “Abberations” and thus excluded from the congregation in some way. And yet Jshua clearly says “Some are born this way some made that way by men and some become that way in order to follow G-d” Jshua was referring to the ascetic path followed by some in the Qumran Community (Oh yes they were walking exactly the path I do I follow that path having been “born that way”).

The truth for these idolaters would be much more painful, and this is why many of them “Would not hear it”. Those in WELS who hold up fornication as an ideal will claim that the highest ideal is “fornication within marriage”. I am not saying that sex within marriage is wrong, is indeed ordained by G-d. But when these people fail to see their place in the scheme of things and overstep their authority, then it goes from sex within marriage to “fornication within marriage” It become “fornication within marriage” because they are placing sex above the walk with G-d and above G-d. They then regard

the silencing of those who are free from the shackles of lust to be a higher moral principle. So what is G-d in their eyes? Well certainly not the G-d that stood before Abraham and said "I am El Shaddai" those at WELS who claim to have an understanding of Hebrew, Paleo Hebrew and Aramaic will be aware of what the name "El Shaddai" means. "The G-d of the strong breasted one" (And "Breasted" was a reference to female mammary glands). Generations of "translators" have tried to avoid this by claiming that the word meant "The almighty" but in contemporary Hebrew and by default Judaism the original meaning remains "G-d the all sufficient" and similarly in Islam we find the insistence that Allah (Root Eloh) is "non definable". These people are breeders who do not know their place and they use cruelty as a virtue to prop up their "Authority" which over steps the mark.

What was the instrument of G-d's wrath when Jehu finally oversaw the death of Queen Jezebel? It was not Jehu, but a "Eunuch" now if someone says "the eunuch was male" then they are denying the real meaning of El-Shaddai, for El Shaddai means "the all sufficient" and not "A castrated male" A "Castrated male" would be immune to Jezebel's "Charms" but someone in the image of El Shaddai following the will of El Shaddai would be the only one allowed to push Jezebel out of the window. It was not the responsibility of a breeder to carry out this particular act. Why? well for a man to push a woman out of a window is not kosher, for a woman to do the same, it is not kosher, only someone in the image of El Shaddai could do this at that time and in that context. If Jehu pushed Jezebel out of the window Jehu would have overstepped the mark.

Let's look at 2 kings Chapter 9.

32: And he lifted up his face to the window, and said, Who is on my side? who? And there looked out to him two or three eunuchs.

33: And he said, Throw her down. So they threw her down: and some of her blood was sprinkled on the wall, and on the horses: and he trode her under foot.

The underlying narrative here is that the "eunuchs" were the "property" of Jezebel, but by their nature they were in truth the property of El Shaddai, those who saw this superficially would associate Jezebel's servants with Jezebel's sin. But when push came to shove (Literally) they were in truth in the image of El Shaddai, and the idolaters at WELS had better not forget that.

Jezebel incidentally re-introduced Ba'al and Balat of Jbeil into the Israelite kingdom WELS should take that as an old testament warning.

This brings me on to the misrepresentation of G-d. Matthew Chapter 7 has something interesting to say on this.

16: Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

17: Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit.

18: A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.

19: Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

20: Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.

21: Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

22: Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?

23: And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

Idolatrous breeders seem to think that “Fruits” mean “babies” but more sensible people know that “Fruits” mean what one does when walking with Gd. Good fruits are obeying G-d, walking a righteous path, bad fruits are being dogmatic and cruel, Oh sorry did I say cruel, that does sound a tad too liberal doesn't it, how about idolatrous, arrogant and overstepping authority. Verse 22 is particularly interesting, you will notice how those pleading to Jshua talk of having prophesied in his name and others will claim to have cast out devils. They will have done many wonderful works by running a synod that oversteps it's authority for example.

And yes I can say that and have the authority to say that because I am made in the image of El Shaddai (5 alpha reductase deficiency) and I am saying this because I walk with G-d and I walk with Jshua who do you at WELS walk with?

The misrepresentation lies in this point of argument, I know that WELS will either indulge in a bit of gnashing of teeth or they will ignore what I have said (At their peril) by what authority do they speak? Martin Luther? G-d? Jshua? The Shekinah? No they do not. But we will start with their using the name of Martin Luther, who founded the protestant movement as a humble priest challenging those in authority about their corruption. (This corruption was selling tickets to get into heaven, and profiting from salvation). In a way he was challenging corrupt authority as I am now.

The misrepresentation is the idea that G-d is Justifiably “unfair” (And in particular towards those born with “BICs” this is however a contradiction because G-d is the all sufficient El Shaddai. Higher authority does lie where there is nothing of the flesh, or when the flesh lacks elements of the masculine or feminine as distinct forms.

Galatians 3:28 where Paul writes:

28: There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

Illustrates the point really, Jew or Greek, well that challenges something even I would have problems wit, I being of the Kanai tradition am supposed to despise Hellenism. I don't but I do know that when Paul came out with this, it would have been a very challenging remark, the same applies to “Bond nor free” there was a hierarchy in the cultures of the time and slavery was at the time seen as part of that order. Would anyone suggest that today we re-introduce slavery? The last part “Neither male nor female” seems to challenge people today. “All one in Christ Jesus” suddenly overrides the potential objection because in the context of Paul's Writing “Christ” is the earthly agent

of El Shaddai. The all sufficient, and where would the Christian faith be if Jshua was not reputed to follow an ascetic path?

I am not aware of the all sufficient El-Shaddai demanding people follow sex roles to the letter. And this is where we get into the accusation of idolatry. I will quote WELS:

“Out of curiosity, how do we (the WELS church) decide who is male and who is female? Can someone with only one sex chromosome be a pastor? Should someone who is androgen insensitive marry a woman or a man? I realize that none of this matters when it comes to salvation, but I thought this issue might be relevant to all the recent sex role questions.

A biological intersex condition (BIC) poses a challenge for those striving to follow the Scriptural teachings on proper role relationships. BICs generally consist of a genetic make-up that is contrary to the physical appearance with regard to sexual organs.”

The narrator at the WELS is correct when saying “none of this matters when it comes to salvation” but when focusing on the flesh above “salvation” it matters a lot. It is clearly evident that the narrator has no idea whatsoever what the relevance of sexual dimorphism really is, they just blindly assume that if someone fits that scheme they are “Acceptable” if not they are (I quote) an “Aberration”. Well how can something representing the nature of El Shaddai be an “Aberration”. Perhaps WELS are not walking with El Shaddai. They continue:

“It may be helpful to think of the life developing from the point of conception to be inclined to develop as a female. When God uses the elements of the procreative process to trigger this child to be a male the child has the receives the distinctive XX chromosomal make-up. That, in turn, triggers a chain of events which prompts the development of male sexual organs and inhibits the development of female organs. In BICs these inhibitors malfunction in some manner, either partially or fully. The result is a person who is genetically one sex, but who also has some or many of the physical characteristics of the opposite sex.”

It may be helpful to remind the narrator that this is a discussion about the material in the context of the spiritual (As the WELS would insist it should be). It is also evident that the narrator while dealing specifically with the flesh has little or no idea of the genetics involved. “XX chromosomal make up” would by the usual (though not exclusive) standards refer to a “female chromosomal make up” I can let that pass as a typo but I cannot let the following pass:

“Can someone with only one sex chromosome be a pastor”

Let me see now “XX” that’s two “X” chromosomes and “XY” that’s one “X” Chromosome, by simple Boolean (Mendellian?) logic “Only one sex chromosome”

can only refer to “XY” which is by common terms seen as “male” so this means that women can be pastors and men are open to question in this role. The Narrator was starting the text on the premise that XX = male and XY = female, clearly they were new to the subject of sex differentiation and failed to correct the error later on. (Having read more on Wikipedia basically). They continue:

“A person who is genetically a one sex but has the physical characteristics of another sex experiences enormous, complicated and painful psychological conflicts. There are a number of support groups formed to help those wrestling with BICs.”

It is those like the narrator at the WELS who are at the root of these “psychological conflicts” because the petty minded idolater wants life to be neat and tidy and fit the scheme as decreed by idolatry. As you read the narrative further this idolatry becomes even more evident.

“The severity of a BIC can vary from mild to extreme. In extreme cases, for example, some contend that even though a male with a BIC cannot conceive a child, he may have a fully functional uterus. That means with the help of a procedure like IVF he can bear a child to term. While this could happen in only the most severe cases it illustrates how deep the conflicts can be. Any situations of public or partial nudity (public washrooms, locker rooms, etc.) could be embarrassing and distressing.”

I assume the narrator is talking about Swyers Syndrome, that is a woman with a uterus and at the same time 46XY. (At this point they had read some article on Wikipedia and realized the mistake but only dug themselves into a deeper hole). Perhaps they could explain why someone born physically female, with a uterus, raised as a girl and quite content with being female would consider:

“He may have a fully functional uterus”

In any way shape or form a well reasoned comment? So what are WELS describing here a fully human woman or a “male chromosome”. Do you know that is like saying “What do you see? The G-d of Abraham and the G-d of Moses and the G-d of Israel or do you see a golden calf?” to reduce any part of G-d’s creation in the scriptural context is to reduce G-d into a graven image. However this gets a lot worse as the narrator stumbles from one mistake the next.

“How is this condition treated by science. In the case of males born with substantially developed external female organs physicians often opt to encourage the development of

the female characteristics. It is often the path of least resistance. It is far easier than suppressing further development of female organs, surgically changing them and fabricating male organs. So you have genetic males chemically treated to develop a more consistent female appearance.”

I am assuming from that commentary they are trying to describe the policies of Dr John Money, however this is incorrect, some children born with “BICs” are surgically and chemically masculinized. So the statement they are all feminized is incorrect. It is also worth mentioning that in both sets of procedures no consent from the person actually being operated on is involved. As they are legally too young to give consent. This becomes more relevant later on. however the narrator continues digging:

“The challenge facing a follower of Christ is how to define what is a "male" and "female" for purposes of complying with God's expressed wishes for the respective sexes. Science defines males as those carrying the XY chromosome. A female carries the XX chromosome. The writers of Scripture were unaware of this genetic information.”

So which G-d are we talking here the G-d of science or the G-d of the scriptures? Having finally figured out which sex XX and XY are usually associated with (But not exclusively) the absurdity of the petty minded idolatry becomes even more evident, Just because science notes that XX and XY karyotypes are roughly distributed among males and females, suddenly this is an absolute and no amount of evidence to the contrary the chromosomes define sex in the absolute and monolithic sense? There is something a little wrong with this. The Narrator continues digging:

“Instead, as I read Scripture, I see four consistently touted characteristics that would distinguish a male from a female:

- (1) He is one of the two physical components of the procreative process (Genesis 1:2)*
- (2) He provides the procreative semen for fertilization (Genesis 38:8-9)*
- (3) He is able to bear the O.T. distinctive sign of God's chosen people - circumcision (Genesis 17:10)*
- (4) He looks like a male and/or is accepted by others as a male, often based on appearance (1 Samuel 17:42; Philippians 2:”*

There is a reason why there are four, but a bio elitist idolater is not going to see it. Perhaps I should explain. G-d has 144 names, having created the universe in 144 periods of time (for creationists that is 144 hours for more realistic observers of evolution that is 14.4 billion years) and at the end G-d has 144,000 elect (that's 144,000 ascetics). It is a complex symbolism that does run through the bible. Of the 144 names 72 of them are nice and 72 of them not so nice, of each of the respective sets of 72, 36 are masculine and 36 are feminine. all of these names are singularly known as the plural “Elohim” or G-d

(Yes the singular and plural are interchangeable) and also in terms of the gender division El Shaddai. Most of those gender descriptions refer back in some way to the 144 named El Shaddai.

Read this:

“28And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

29And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.

30But many that are first shall be last; and the last shall be first.”

This is the conclusion to Matthew 19, the very chapter in which Jshua discusses eunuchs.

However we need to return to the narrator and their last quotation:

“He looks like a male and is accepted by others as a male often based on appearance”

This does not apply to “Males” who are in reality women with CAIS or Swyers (To give two examples). The narrator continues to dig:

“Scripture readily acknowledges that there are aberrations to this intended order.

A) Some cannot produce offspring due to immaturity, disability or agedness (Genesis 17:17)

B) Some lack the physical means to bear the sign of circumcision (Matthew 19:12)

C) Some lack the strong male appearance (John 7:24)

In considering these four characteristics it should be observed that the first two reflect God's strong interest in the procreation of the human species. The latter two focus on how one is perceived by others. They are not in conflict. These are complimentary characteristics. They are supportive of each other.”

What was that? Abberations? And what is this Matthew 19:12? Let's have a look at Matthew 19:12

“12: For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which

have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it."

Seems to me that I was thinking of this before, and indeed I was, I need only refer the idolater back to what I said earlier. I have 5 alpha reductase deficiency by the way, and I am made in the image of El Shaddai! The idolater continues to dig:

"In considering points 3 and 4, appearances did not change reality. Whether it be by birth or intervention of man, these appearance can be changed, but it doesn't change the reality. The eunuchs were still considered men and despite appearances men are men."

So despite evidence to the contrary a woman with Swyers, in possession of a uterus, raised as a girl and quite happy with that is a man and must be made aware of being a man. But she cannot run a ministry because "he" appears like a woman. This is of course the sort of gold plated bull you can expect from an idolater. Perhaps such a woman is red haired and a Hittite. "Some are sick some are sad some have lost the joy they had". The hole gets deeper:

"The characteristics, however, that deal with the male role in procreation seem consistently valid. Even in the case of the elderly and the children, their maleness was validified by either the potential of procreativity or the past existence of it. Even eunuchs were considered men because it was recognized that if not for an error in birth or by the hand of men there rested within them the potential to serve the male role in procreation even if it could not practically happen."

Presumably this "male role" would be enacted with Mother Balat or Wife Balat?

"In this regard science has done a service in understanding aberrations to the norm of male and female. Science has recognized that a consistent marker for the male species is the XY chromosome, and for female it is the XX chromosome. From those standards aberrations are recognized and judged as the exceptions to the rule."

No such an "Abberation" is judging the WELS as a nest of vipers, a whitewashed tomb and as a den of Idolatry, they are clearly placing sex dimorphism to the point of absurdity above G-d, and given the old testament nature of G-d as the people of the time would have understood it, it is clear that WELS are either missing the point or denying G-d's actual role in creation. If they think for one moment that someone like me would lower myself to bowing town to golden calves then they are very mistaken.

"In the case of BICs we have chromosomal men and chromosomal women with aberrations. Whether it be men with whom the development of female sexual organs was not suppressed or it is women who have the strong presence of certain male hormones, it doesn't change the fact that these are men or women - they are not both."

And what purpose is that statement actually serving? It has little or no scriptural value as I have already pointed out, the arbitrary nature of this statement borders on the absurd and it is far from scriptural. If anything this is anti scriptural and I am prepared to back that up at any time. What WELS are actually doing are calling themselves monotheists while at the same time acting like a fertility cult. But as a Christian organization that claim to be monotheists, I feel it is my duty to “push them out of the window” metaphorically speaking. Because I for one will never bow down to idols, be that a golden calf or an incestuous mockery married and also the child of an Ashera and a Ba’al. Look this was Jezebel’s religion, we are talking the pre monotheistic fertility cults from the north east Mediterranean. Want proof? The digging continues:

“Recognizing this reality does not somehow condone homosexuality. These observations are made within the context of the natural order of things. To medically alter one's biology to enable them to do contrary to their created nature would simply be a move to circumvent the practical relevance of the logical construct. Its factual relevance in reference to its natural state remains intact and applicable. In other words, if one possesses the chromosomal genetics of a male but wishes to live as a woman and undergoes operations and treatments to change his appearance to that effect, does not change the reality he is still a man.”

Women with CAIS and Swyers do not have surgery to become women, they are born female, children born with other conditions who were made female by surgery had this done to them without consent. WELS sees fit to pass judgment on them by male standards, and even to conflate these people with Transsexual folks, (Which is interesting surely transsexual folks who are having surgery as an act of will are doing so in part to live a better life, and even follow G-d, ah not WELS will make sure that does not happen) Well they who do not hear this will not hear it, will they, I stand by the city gate and they are deaf right?

WELS have no understanding whatsoever of the “natural order” in fact they seem to go against the natural order, they would sacrifice their children on the alter of the two sex system (Gellitu) given the chance (No? none of you have never suggested aborting a fetus that is a “BIC”, I do not believe you), You the Winonsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod are in great danger of falling into the depraved pit of idolatry and savagery that was the marker of the religion practiced by Queen Jezebel. You are leading the children of G-d, made in the image of the one and all sufficient El-Shaddai into a Ga Ben Hinnom of your own vile making.

I call upon you the Winonsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod to repent of your crimes you have misrepresented the G-d of the scriptures, you have reveled in the cruelty you plan to inflict of G-d’s children and you are guilty of false piety leading to idolatry.

I did not want to say all that, while I am very biting in a lot of my writings, I find it very hard when people of faith are the subject of my discussion. I find it hard because I know that most of them are often well intentioned, seeking to walk with G-d. I am not a liberal

talking to these people about human rights. (Though today that is seen as a human rights question and I suspect rightly so), I am someone from the tradition that gave it's name to religious extremism. Hardly a "liberal" tradition by any standards. I do not hate or abhor the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, I know they have a very long tradition of affirming the faith and reading scripture in an inerrant and strict way. But that narrative they have written about intersex people or "BIC's" is an abomination before G-d. It is an abomination that attacks G-d and those made in G-d's image. I will draw your attention to Genesis 1:27

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

El Shaddai has spoken! "Man" was both Adam and Eve, and G-d made Adam and Eve in G-d's image. That image was El Shaddai!. (Actually it was also the use of mitochondrial DNA being passed on in a diploidic system, but they will not understand that). It stands to reason that WELS are in error, as are many about this very quotation. The G-d of the bible is the G-d of Abrahamic monotheism, Abrahamic monotheism is unambiguous about this there is only one G-d. If G-d appears to Abraham using the name El Shaddai it means that the image of G-d is to limited human understanding something that encompasses both male and female, the all sufficient, the one and only creator. The fact that human beings generally appear as one or the other half of this image does not mean and never meant those people who encompass both to any greater or lesser extent cease to be human and it most certainly do not give those who appear as the male name or the female name of Ha Shem the right to silence or undermine the sacred nature of those who hold both. This is not about people being homosexual or lesbian. It is not about what people get up to in bed or what clothes they wear, it is about the divine nature of G-d, and it transcends sexuality and sexual activity.

If G-d took physical form in some way as G-d did before Abraham the WELS would refer to G-d as an "Abberation". I strongly suggest they read the scriptures again, with their normal level of scrutiny instead of the lax rationalization that has led them into idolatry, misrepresenting g-d and love of the unjust.