

FAMILY BULLETIN ALERT

Faith, Freedom & Citizenship Class

Kempsville Presbyterian Church

June 27, 2004

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

Friends, the FMA is so important that we should all become activists on this issue. For that reason I will dedicate most of this issue to the FMA arguments. I am for it! Editor

(AgapePress) - Pro-family forces are gearing up for the first real test of the Federal Marriage Amendment. It is due to come up in the U.S. Senate on July 12.

Why Support the Federal Marriage Amendment?

By Victoria Cobb of the Family Foundation

Many conservatives have been debating the merits of a Federal Marriage Amendment, with some very respected organizations and individuals choosing to withhold support. At The Family Foundation, we understand both sides of the issue and have taken a great deal of time reviewing the implications before choosing to support it. Of course, since we are affiliated with Focus on the Family and Family Research Council, we have taken some direction from Dr. Dobson and from Tony Perkins.

S.J. Res. 30, introduced by Senator Wayne Allard of Colorado, simply defines marriage only as the union of a man and a woman, and restricts the privileges to be conferred only to that relationship. While this amendment does not address other forms of same sex marriage such as civil unions, there is simply not enough support in the U.S. Senate for a more complete amendment.

However, we believe that the FMA, if passed, will do several things:

1) FMA will give us a foundation from which to work. The fact is that while it isn't perfect, without it, we will lose this battle in a very short period of time. When the Supreme Court's Lawrence v. Texas decision legalizing sodomy came down just one year ago this month, analysts said it would be years before we had to think about same-sex marriage. Instead, it was months. We feel that once the Congress and the states settle on the definition of marriage in an amendment, we will have the momentum to begin to take back what we have lost. We have to defend the definition while we are trying to protect the institution.

2) The whole issue of civil unions is complicated. While we would prefer an amendment that included a ban, that is just not going to happen considering the current make-up of

Congress. However, Virginia is in a very good position since we just passed a ban on civil unions. Consequently, other states may follow. This is a pure example of federalism at its best; the Constitution leaves to the states that which it chooses not to deal with.

3) Either way, a vote on FMA will put our Senators on record when it comes to marriage. This may prove very important in the Senatorial elections later this year. Focus on the Family and Family Research Council are heavily involved in educating citizens in those states that have Senators up for reelection that either oppose FMA or have not taken a position.

4) We have been asking people this question: If we could have passed a pro-life amendment to the U.S. Constitution BEFORE Roe v. Wade, would we have done so? Even if it left the question of abortion to the states? Absolutely, we would have. The fact is that without an amendment, even an imperfect one, we are setting ourselves up to allow a court, any court, to give us same-sex marriage. A procedural vote to allow debate on the amendment is currently scheduled for the week of July 12. The Family Foundation was pleased to learn last week that Senator George Allen has listened to your concerns and has agreed to vote in favor of the amendment. However, we would still like to see him become a co-sponsor. Also, in light of his vote last week in favor of "hate crime" legislation for homosexuals, we are particularly concerned that he show clear leadership on the issue of marriage. Senator John Warner has yet to take a public position on FMA.

Please contact Senators Allen and Warner and ask them to become co-sponsors of FMA!

Senator Allen is **518-1674; 202-224-4024**.

Senator Warner is **441-3079; 202-224-2023**

MARRIAGE PROTECTION SUNDAY

Sunday, July 11 is being designated "Marriage Protection Sunday", with churches across America planning to celebrate marriage and inform members about the importance of the Federal Marriage Amendment. Perhaps we at KPC can participate. *Ed. AND*

Monday, July 12, Is "Contact Your Senators Day."

FRC Questions Marriage Strategy

The U.S. House of Representatives plans to hold a vote on a measure that would take away the authority of federal courts to rule on the federal Defense of Marriage Act. The "Hostettler Bill" is seen as an easier route because passage

only requires a simple majority, rather than the 2/3rd majority required for the Federal Marriage Amendment (FMA). While it is easier, the Hostettler approach is not a long-term solution because it lacks the permanency of an amendment. Only an amendment to the U.S. Constitution will protect, once and for all, the institution of marriage from black robed tyrants sitting on both state and federal courts. FRC has drawn the line on this issue.

Marriage is too important to play politics with. We can lose a Republican majority in the House. We can lose a Republican majority in the Senate, and even lose the White House and survive; it's happened before. But if we lose marriage, it's over. *From Family Research Council, <http://www.frc.org>.*

"Massachusetts has redefined marriage for the entire country," he said. "Massachusetts residents will move to other states, and thus issues related to property rights, employer benefits, inheritance, and many others will arise. It is not possible for the issue to remain solely a Massachusetts issue; it must now be confronted on a national basis." *Gov. Romney, MA, arguing for the FMA.*

Mark September 3, 2004

Mark a crucial date on your calendar right now - September 3, 2004 a day that could mark a critical turning point in Second Amendment history.

You see, on September 3, 2004 - for the first time in history - your First Amendment right to speak out will be stripped away from you by the full force and power of the United States government, and your voice will be silenced from T.V. and radio airwaves nationwide.

Beginning on that day -- and until after the election is decided on November 2nd -- most political organizations T.V. or radio broadcasts that so much as mention the name of any candidate for the U.S. Senate or House will be outlawed by the new campaign finance "reform" law.

T.V. or radio broadcasts that talk about Senator John Kerry or President George W. Bush will be banned. That's right - blanket censorship.

Advocate T.V. or radio broadcasts designed to take your voice to the people - and tell voters where their candidates really stand on issues -- will be silenced and prohibited under threat of jail terms.

Even more unbelievable is that during this blackout period, when your voice is being censored, anti-family billionaires like George Soros, media extremists like Michael Moore, and gun-hating politicians like Senators Charles Schumer, Hillary Clinton, Ted Kennedy and John Kerry will be totally exempt from this law!

They can continue to buy all the T.V. and radio time they want -- or, better yet, get it free from their media allies like Dan Rather and Peter Jennings.

Adapted from an NRA editorial.

Comment: It is a bad law and it will get worse as special interest groups learn how to fully utilize it to their benefit. We as patriotic Americans need to get this law and the law

that muzzles Churches repealed as soon as possible. Ed.

STOP THE FTAA

"The world wishes to be deceived." Sebastian Franck (around 1500 A.D.)

Proponents heralded the FTAA as a bold move to "foster economic progress, enhance domestic prosperity, and raise living standards" throughout the Western hemisphere.

However, the real objective of the FTAA architects is so revolutionary that the proposal is shrouded in deception and misrepresentation. Even the term "free trade" in the name is a deception -- a violation of truth in labeling.

A deeper examination shows that the real objective of the FTAA's internationalist sponsors is to consolidate power, not to expand prosperity. The FTAA is a raw grab for power disguised as a free trade agreement.

The FTAA would bring the nations of this hemisphere, most especially the U.S., under the heel of a new regional authority. That new authority would have none of the checks and balances of the American constitutional system. To accomplish the globalist goal of economic and *political* "integration," the independence and distinctive legal systems of participating nations would have to *disintegrate* step by step, as is happening in the European Union. Americans would lose control of their own destiny.

In part, that means Americans would lose control of their property, suffer taxation by anti-American socialist bureaucrats, and watch helplessly as standards of justice they had taken for granted, such as the Bill of Rights, are trampled. Meaningful national borders would also cease to exist. *From the New American Mag.*

Comment: Please call your Senators and Congressmen to let them know you do not want the FTAA. Ed. Congressman Schrock -- 497-6859; 202-225-4215.

THE ARMED CITIZEN

Barbara Holland closed her used car lot for the day and drove home. She had checked to make sure the handgun she has carried since 1992 was loaded after a strange encounter at the car lot left her feeling uneasy. Holland pulled the car into her driveway and, as she entered her side door, Holland bent down to retrieve something she had dropped. Suddenly a man armed with a gun came rushing at her. Holland tried to slam her door on him, but the man shoved the door open and Holland fell back on her landing. Lying on her back, Holland snatched her pistol from its holster, ready to protect herself and her 15-year-old daughter who was home at the time. Her assailant's glare changed. "He looked surprised," she said. Holland recalls firing three times, but authorities later confirmed six shots. Police identified Holland's attacker, who died at the scene, as an ex-con named Clabe Hunt. (*Detroit Free Press*, Detroit, MI, 4/29/04)