

FAMILY BULLETIN ALERT

Faith, Freedom & Citizenship Class

Kempsville Presbyterian Church

June 19, 2005

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

How To Celebrate Father's Day

June 15, 2005 by Phyllis Schlafly

On this Father's Day, Americans should ponder the appalling fact that an estimated 40 percent of our nation's children are living in homes without their own father. Most of our social problems are caused by kids who grow up in homes without their own fathers: drug abuse, illicit sexual activity, unwed pregnancies, youth suicide, high school dropouts, runaways, and crime.

Where have all the fathers gone? Some men are irresponsible slobs, but no evidence exists that nearly half of American children were voluntarily abandoned by their own fathers; there must be other explanations.

For 30 years, feminist organizations and writers have propagated the myth that women are victims of an oppressive patriarchal society and that marriage is an inherently abusive institution that makes wives second-class citizens. Feminists made divorce a major component of women's liberation and their political freedom.

For three decades, feminists have toyed with the question that Maureen Dowd chose as the title of her forthcoming book, "Are Men Necessary?" That's just the latest version of Gloria Steinem's famous line, "A woman without a man is like a fish without a bicycle."

College textbooks portray marriage as especially bleak and dreary for women. Assigned readings are preoccupied with domestic violence, battering, abuse, marital rape, and divorce.

During the Clinton Administration, the feminists parlayed their hysteria that domestic violence is a national epidemic into the passage of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). This created a gigantic gravy train of taxpayers' money, known as feminist pork, that empowers pro-divorce, anti-

male activism.

Not satisfied with several billions from the U.S. Treasury, 67 feminist and liberal organizations supported a lawsuit to try to get private allegations of domestic abuse heard in federal courts so they could collect civil damages against men and institutions with deep pockets. Fortunately, the Supreme Court, in *Brzonkala v. Morrison* (2000), declared unconstitutional VAWA's section that might have permitted that additional mischief.

However, VAWA's billions of dollars continue to finance the domestic-violence lobby, and there is a deafening silence from conservatives who pretend to be guardians against federal takeovers of problems that are none of the federal government's business. Local crimes and marital disputes should not be subjects of federal law or spending.

Billions of dollars have flowed from VAWA to the states to finance private victim-advocacy organizations, private domestic-violence coalitions, and the training of judges, prosecutors and police. This tax-funded network is, of course, staffed by radical feminists who teach the presumption of father guilt.

Legislating a special category of domestic violence is very much like legislating a special category of hate crimes. Both create a new level of crimes for which punishment is based on who you are rather than what acts you commit, and the "who" in the view of VAWA and the domestic-violence lobby is the husband and father.

A Justice Department-funded document published by the National Victim Assistance Academy established a widely accepted definition of "violence" that includes such non-criminal acts as "degradation and humiliation" and "name-calling and constant criticizing." The acts need not be illegal, physical, violent, or threatening; "domestic violence" becomes whatever the woman says it is.

The Final Report of the Child Custody and Visitation Focus Group of

the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges admitted that "usually judges are not required to make a finding of domestic violence in civil protection order cases." In other words, judges saddle fathers with restraining orders on the wife's say-so without any investigation as to whether it is true or false.

The late Senator Paul Wellstone (D-MN), a big advocate of VAWA, admitted that "up to 75 percent of all domestic assaults reported to law enforcement agencies were inflicted after the separation of the couple." Most allegations of domestic violence are made for the purpose of taking the custody of children away from their fathers.

The June issue of the Illinois Bar Journal explains how women use court-issued restraining orders (which Illinois calls Orders of Protection) as a tool for the mother to get sole child custody and even bar the father from visitation. In big type, the magazine proclaims: "Orders of protection are designed to prevent domestic violence, but they can also become part of the gamesmanship of divorce."

The "game" is that mothers can assert falsehoods or trivial marital complaints and thereby get sole custody orders that deprive children of their fathers. This "game" is based on the presumption (popularized by VAWA and the domestic-violence lobby) that fathers are inherently guilty and dangerous.

Congress should not be spending taxpayers' money to deal with marital disputes, and courts should not deprive children of their fathers on a presumption that fathers are dangerous. Congress can help us celebrate Father's Day this year by refusing to reauthorize the costly VAWA boondoggle.

<http://www.eagleforum.org/>
E-mail: eagle@eagleforum.org

Comment: Phyllis is on to something. Write/call and demand they stop this abuse. Ed.

Sen. Warner, 441-3079 and Senator Allen at 518-1674. Congresswoman Drake – 497-6859.
Cong. Randy Forbes 547-1000. Cong. Robert "Bobby" Scott - 380-1000

NeoCon Global Government

June 13, 2005, by Cong. Ron Paul

This week Congress will vote on a bill to expand the power of the United Nations beyond the dreams of even the most ardent left-wing, one-world globalists. But this time the UN power grabbers aren't European liberals; they are American neo-conservatives, who plan to use the UN to implement their own brand of world government.

The "United Nations Reform Act of 2005" masquerades as a bill that will cut US dues to the United Nations by 50% if that organization does not complete a list of 39 reforms. On the surface any measure that threatens to cut funding to the United Nations seems very attractive, but do not be fooled: in this case reform "success" will be worse than failure. The problem is in the supposed reforms themselves-- specifically in the policy changes this bill mandates.

The proposed legislation opens the door for the United Nations to routinely become involved in matters that have never been part of its charter. Specifically, the legislation redefines terrorism very broadly for the UN's official purposes-- and charges it to take action on behalf of both governments and international organizations.

What does this mean? The official adoption of this definition by the United Nations would have the effect of making resistance to any government or any international organization an *international* crime. It would make any attempt to overthrow a government an international *causus belli* for UN military action. Until this point a sovereign government retained the legal right to defend against or defeat any rebellion within its own territory. Now any such activity would constitute justification for United Nations action inside that country. This could be whenever any splinter group decides to resist any regime-- regardless of the nature of that regime.

This new policy is given teeth by creating a "Peacebuilding Commission," which will serve as the implementing force for the internationalization of what were formerly internal affairs of sovereign nations. This Commission will bring together UN Security Council members, major donors, major troop contributing countries, appropriate United Nations organizations, the World Bank,

and the International Monetary Fund among others. This new commission will create the beginning of a global UN army. It will claim the right to intervene in any conflict anywhere on the globe, bringing the World Bank and the IMF formally into the picture as well. It is a complete new world order, but undertaken with the enthusiastic support of many of those who consider themselves among the most strident UN critics.

The only true reform of the United Nations is for the US to withdraw immediately.

Comment: The H.R. 2745 bill, the so-called UN reform measure, would actually greatly enhance UN power and further erode U.S. independence. Tell your Rep (Drake) that the only sound solution to the UN's sixty years of corrupt progress toward a full-fledged world government is to **Get US out!** of the United Nations through passage of H.R. 1146, the "American Sovereignty Restoration Act of 2005." Ed.

ARMED CITIZEN

Andrew Atkinson was looking for trouble one Wednesday night as police were called to investigate a disturbance he had caused at a Malta, Montana, tavern. Still on the scene at the tavern the police were then called to a nearby home where an intruder had been reported. Robert Taylor said that a man, later identified as Atkinson, had forced his way through Taylor's front door. After a fierce struggle, the 59-year-old homeowner shot Atkinson in the leg. Both men were hospitalized, and Taylor was released with minor injuries. Upon his release from the hospital, Atkinson was to be arrested and charged with burglary, according to Phillips County Sheriff Tom Miller. (*Great Falls Tribune*, Great Falls, MT, 06/03/04)

REMAKING AMERICA

The flood of legal and illegal immigrants who are not assimilating, and who are being increasingly radicalized, is changing our culture and country.

by Roger O. McGrath in the New American 6/13/2005.

On Tuesday, May 17, Antonio Villaraigosa was elected mayor of Los Angeles. When he takes office in July, he will become the first person of Mexican descent to do so in more than 130 years. He will not be the last. Although there were several factors figuring in his victory, the changing demographics of the City of the Angels stand out prominently. Los Angeles is now 48 percent Hispanic (the term favored by the U.S. Census) and only 31 percent white (now generally used to mean non-Hispanic whites) - and the Hispanic percentage is increasing while the white is shrinking.

Unlike James Hahn, the incumbent mayor, Villaraigosa had no family legacy to rely on. His father crossed the border from Mexico in 1950 and abandoned the family when Villaraigosa was five. What Villaraigosa has going for him is loads of energy and political savvy and La Familia de La Raza - The Family of The Race. The Mexican population of Los Angeles, and more generally the Hispanic population, is growing by leaps and bounds. Moreover, much of that population is not assimilating. Whites aren't encouraged to cast votes simply on the basis of their ethnic identification, but Mexicans are. Exit polls suggest that Villaraigosa won 85 percent or more of the Hispanic vote. While the voter turnout citywide barely exceeded 30 percent, on the virtually all-Hispanic Eastside, where Villaraigosa was reared, it reached nearly 40 percent.

...Thanks to the relentless efforts of groups like MEChA and the official propaganda of the Mexican government, countless Mexicans have been indoctrinated in the ideological myths of *La Reconquista*. A Zogby International poll, conducted in Mexico during 2002, found that 58 percent of Mexicans claimed that "the territory of the U.S. Southwest rightfully belongs to Mexico" and 57 percent thought that they "should have the right to enter the United States without U.S. permission." It would seem that MEChA and Antonio Villaraigosa do not hold minority

Few people seem to understand that the Southwest that Mexico lost in the Mexican War was Mexican for only 24 years, from the time the Spanish governors left in 1822 to the arrival of the American forces in 1846. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo made