

FAMILY BULLETIN ALERT

Faith, Freedom & Citizenship Class

Kempsville Presbyterian Church

July 17, 2005

The views expressed herein are the views of the Editor, Vernon Fix. FBA on the Web at <http://hrcc.exis.net>

Fili-blustering

When President Bill Clinton nominated Ruth Bader Ginsburg to the Supreme Court there were no doubts the former ACLU lawyer was an extremely liberal choice. However Republican senators at the time, respecting the President's judicial nominating powers granted by the U.S. Constitution, allowed her confirmation to go through in a mere 42 days. The Republicans at the time believed the political beliefs of a judicial nominee are not disqualifiers, and politics must take a back seat to civility. Mere hours after the announced retirement of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, the Democrats were threatening the once unthinkable - filibustering a Supreme Court nominee. Senator Barbara Boxer (D- CA), made the historically inaccurate declaration that, "The filibuster is on the table. It has been on the table for 200 years."

According to the Senate's written history the filibuster's popular origin dates to the 1850's, and since then has been subject to numerous rule modifications. In all of U.S. history no nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court has ever been filibustered. If the Democrats go through with their filibuster threat they can expect strong reaction from the American people. A new CNN poll finds that 86 percent of Americans say it's likely that Democrats will use "inappropriate political reasons" to try to block President Bush's nominee to the Supreme Court. Senate Democrats need to abandon the tactics being promoted by the Democratic leadership and restore civility to the U.S. Senate. Every nominee deserves an up or down vote. From FRC.

BLACKSTONE ON PROPERTY

A quote from Sir William Blackstone: "So great is the regard of the law for private property that it will not authorize the least violation of it; no, not even for the general good of the whole community." This quote is lamenting the *Kelo* decision by the U.S. Supreme Court that eviscerated the 5th Amendment...

Blackstone published his lectures as *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (4 vol., 1765-69), a work that reduced to order and lucidity the formless bulk of English law.

Blackstone's *Commentaries*, written in an urbane, dignified, and clear style, is regarded as the most thorough treatment of the whole of English law ever produced by one man. Blackstone's manual on law was the text for almost every lawyer in the 18th and 19th Century America. He also liberally quoted the Bible in explaining the law. Imagine that! Ed.

Kelo vs. New London

VIRGINIA BEACH (July 9, 2005) - -At the Tidewater Libertarian Party breakfast three speakers, all lawyers, spoke to a standing room only crowd. Mr. Gary Amos, an expert &

historian in Constitutional law, Mr. Joe Waldo, one of Virginia's leading anti- eminent domain litigators, and Mr. Steven Merrill, TLP general counsel, whose brief to overthrow the eminent domain law in a recent Supreme Court case was cited by Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas in his dissent all spoke against the recent Supreme Court decision.

The Supreme Court recently ruled by the narrowest majority, in *Kelo vs. New London*, that government can take private property to give to other private owners who'll use the land to pay higher taxes.

Amos explained that the very meaning of 'eminent domain' is that "the government owns your property." This concept "is wrong based on (this country's) founding principles."

Amos (picture to left) explained that 'eminent domain' actually means that all land is owned by the 'emperor' or government - a concept that ruled in Roman days when the emperor even owned citizens to the extent they were forced to die fighting each other and wild animals for the entertainment of the emperor.

That concept, Amos added, was rejected by America's founding fathers in the drafting of the Constitution. It is a Constitutional protection that is now perverted by judicial activism. Amos went on to explain that we should not use 'eminent domain' when we mean the 'taking of property' which is allowed in the constitution. The 'taking of property' assumes that you own the property and the government is just another buyer on equal footing and must provide just compensation. Do not say 'eminent domain' when you mean the 'taking of property'.

According to a dissenting opinion by Justice Sandra O'Connor, the court in the ruling said, it is OK for government to take private property for the private use of others because the only people who'll suffer are the people who aren't politically connected, Waldo told the gathering.

Shortly after the ruling, the media in interviewing municipal lawyers were told by Portsmouth's lawyer 'not to worry' because it isn't going to happen in Virginia. But it has already happened locally in several cases for example, private property was taken from the owners to build Portsmouth's Renaissance Hotel. *Excerpted from a VirginiaNewsSource.com article.*

Comment: Mr. Amos has spoken at least 2 times at KPC and our Sunday school class studied with his 12-14 week long video series on Christian involvement in Government . He gave a great talk Saturday. Editor.

Nike Endorses Homosexual Civil Unions, Next Step Marriage

According to USA Today, Nike has become the first major corporation in America to publicly endorse

Sen. Warner, 441-3079 and Senator Allen at 518-1674. Congresswoman Drake - 497-6859.
Cong. Randy Forbes 382-0080. Cong. Robert "Bobby" Scott - 380-1000

homosexual "civil unions," a back door move to legalize homosexual marriage. Nike endorsed a bill in their home state of Oregon which would legalize "civil unions."

Homosexual activists are using the "civil union" approach as a back door approach to the legalization of homosexual marriage. Once they get their "civil union" approved, they will then go to court to secure the right to marry. From AFA Alert.

CFR's Plan to Integrate the U.S., Mexico and Canada

July 13, 2005 by Phyllis Schlafly

The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) has just let the cat out of the bag about what's really behind our trade agreements and security partnerships with the other North American countries. A 59-page CFR document spells out a five-year plan for the "establishment by 2010 of a North American economic and security community" with a common "outer security perimeter."

"Community" means integrating the United States with the corruption, socialism, poverty and population of Mexico and Canada. "Common perimeter" means wide-open U.S. borders between the U.S., Mexico and Canada.

"Community" is sometimes called "space" but the CFR goal is clear: "a common economic space ... for all people in the region, a space in which trade, capital, and people flow freely." The CFR's "integrated" strategy calls for "a more open border for the movement of goods and people."

The CFR document lays "the groundwork for the freer flow of people within North America." The "common security perimeter" will require us to "harmonize visa and asylum regulations" with Mexico and Canada, "harmonize entry screening," and "fully share data about the exit and entry of foreign nationals."

This CFR document, called "Building a North American Community," asserts that George W. Bush, Mexican President Vicente Fox, and Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin "committed their governments" to this goal when they met at Bush's ranch and at Waco, Texas on March 23, 2005. The three adopted the "Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America" and assigned "working groups" to fill in the details.

It was at this same meeting, grandly called the North American summit, that President Bush pinned the epithet "vigilantes" on the volunteers guarding our border in Arizona.

A follow-up meeting was held in Ottawa on June 27, where the U.S. representative, Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff, told a news conference that "we want to facilitate the flow of traffic across our borders." The White House issued a statement that the Ottawa report "represents an important first step in achieving the goals of the Security and Prosperity Partnership."

The CFR document calls for creating a "North American preference" so that employers can recruit low-paid workers from anywhere in North America. No longer will illegal aliens have to be smuggled across the border; employers can openly recruit foreigners willing to work for a fraction of U.S. wages.

Just to make sure that bringing cheap labor from Mexico is an essential part of the plan, the CFR document calls for "a seamless North American market" and for "the extension of full labor mobility to Mexico."

The document's frequent references to "security" are just a cover for the real objectives. The document's "security cooperation" includes the registration of ballistics and explosives, while Canada specifically refused to cooperate with our Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

To no one's surprise, the CFR plan calls for massive U.S. foreign aid to the other countries. The burden on the U.S. taxpayers will include so-called "multilateral development" from the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, "long-term loans in pesos," and a North American Investment Fund to send U.S. private capital to Mexico.

The experience of the European Union and the World Trade Organization makes it clear that a common market requires a court system, so the CFR document calls for "a permanent tribunal for North American dispute resolution." Get ready for decisions from non-American judges who make up their rules ad hoc and probably hate the United States anyway.

The CFR document calls for allowing Mexican trucks "unlimited access" to the United States, including the hauling of local loads between U.S. cities. The CFR document calls for adopting a "tested once" principle for pharmaceuticals, by which a product tested in Mexico will automatically be considered to have met U.S. standards.

The CFR document demands that we implement "the Social Security Totalization Agreement negotiated between the United States and Mexico." That's code language for putting illegal aliens into the U.S. Social Security system, which is bound to bankrupt the system.

Here's another handout included in the plan. U.S. taxpayers are supposed to create a major fund to finance 60,000 Mexican students to study in U.S. colleges.

To ensure that the U.S. government carries out this plan so that it is "achievable" within five years, the CFR calls for supervision by a North American Advisory Council of "eminent persons from outside government . . . along the lines of the Bilderberg" conferences.

The best known Americans who participated in the CFR Task Force that wrote this document are former Massachusetts Governor William Weld and Bill Clinton's immigration chief Doris Meissner. Another participant, American University Professor Robert Pastor, presented the CFR plan at a friendly hearing of Senator Richard Lugar's Foreign Relations Committee on June 9.

Ask your Senators and Representatives which side they are on: the CFR's integrated North American Community or U.S. sovereignty guarded by our own borders.

Read this column online at <http://www.eagleforum.org/>.

Comment: Now we have the John Birch Society, the Libertarian Party and the Eagle Forum all speaking out against CAFTA and FTAA. Now we need a huge grass roots effort to convince our Representatives to vote it down. Our misguided Senators have already voted YES and it passed the Senate. Ed.

"One single object...[will merit] the endless gratitude of the society: that of restraining the judges from usurping legislation." --Thomas Jefferson

"Get US Out of the United Nations!"