

August 2003



The JOURNAL

A Summit Ministries Publication

And because they did not think it worth while to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them over to a worthless mind to do what is morally wrong.

Romans 1: 28

From The President's Desk

One has to tip one's hat to the sodomy crowd and their friends in high places both in America and around the world for their years of effort to take the West, and now America, down the primrose path to Sodom and Gomorrah. If only Christians had such staying power.

Someday the whole story will be told (the U.S. Supreme Court referred to Europe as an example for their pro-homosexual decision since there is nothing in the U.S. Constitution about such a legal right) and it probably will go back to the Marquis deSade and the French Revolution era right up through the Kinsey Institute and the likes of Michel Foucault.

It is now official—America is legally a pagan nation and the next few years will see this being played out in lavender colors with homosexual marriage, on one hand, and an attempt to squelch all opposition on the other. Homosexuals cannot stand competition especially when they are running the show. And trust me, they are running the show. The Democratic Party is a sodomy political party and the Republican Party is under tremendous pressure to accept sodomy as normal, moral and healthy. Further, the pro-homosexual mass media will make sure that all negative comments on sodomy and sister activities be relegated to the sidelines if not shut off all together. Of course, this should surprise no one because even now there are Christian Colleges where all negative comments relative to sodomy are prohibited. Some Christian Colleges even have “Ribbon Week” glorifying sodomy!

It is difficult to add anything to what we've already reproduced in this issue of the Summit Journal, but there are a few things worth accenting.

First, sodomy has to be, along with abortion, a direct insult to our Creator and Redeemer God, especially in light of the fact that from the beginning of Creation He made us male and female (Mark 10:6). Flushing life (male semen) into an alley of refuse and disease has to be the ultimate insult toward God's creative process of male and female uniting in marriage to create another human being. To the doers of such deeds life and all its marvels means nothing! That the creative nature of man has no meaning has a meaning to the Creator. What a travesty we have made of the creative order that at one time God called good (Genesis 1).

Second, sodomy has to be the premier insult to women. Men using men as women—what could be more mean spirited than that? No wonder lesbianism flourishes when a gaggle of effete males seduces one another, or worse, seduces the unwary—especially the young and naïve.

Third, sodomy is a disaster for children. One can imagine what public education's sex education courses are going to be like as the new curriculum explains in detail the wonders and glories of sodomy (along with male prostitution, pedophilia, rimming, fisting, golden showers, etc.) If this isn't child molestation then that term has no meaning. If America wishes to read its future in this cultural arena, look no further than ancient Sparta (see Bertrand Russell, *The History of Western Thought*).

Fourth, sodomy connects to multiple species of disease (including AIDS). Let's be honest for a change—working around the sewer has its dangers! One need hardly spell out this point except to say that all medical professionals know the dangers. It's just not politically correct to tell the American people. In one sense, the U.S. Supreme Court might just as well have turned the Black Plague loose on the nation. Sodomy is responsible for all kinds of diseases, diseases which already killed tens of thousands and will continue to kill thousands more.

Fifth, the U.S. Supreme Court's decision proves conclusively that morality can indeed be legislated—a lie perpetuated for decades by liberals and leftists to keep Christian morality at bay. Six justices used their own pro-sodomy morality to inflict their moral code upon all of us. Because there is absolutely nothing in the U.S. Constitution declaring sodomy a protected act, the decision had to be based on the moral order of the six judges. It was! These six legislated their morality!

Sixth, sodomy has never been accepted as moral by any of the world's religions except one—Secular Humanism. It is a sexual activity of the intellectual elite, the well-funded and the immoral elements of the social order (see Foucault and Kinsey). It has been pushed by the Communists (see Foucault) for years in order to destabilize the West, and by the Humanists (see Kinsey) for years to destroy Biblical Christian morality (see *Humanist Manifest 2000*).

Now the Supreme Court has once again risen to the fore to do the dirty work of the Communists and Humanists.

It will be interesting to see how the Muslim world portrays America to its people on this issue. I know how I would do the portraying, and if I know how to do it, one can bet the anti-American Imams do too. What a slap in the face of every American soldier representing this country in the Muslim world! What a slap in the face of our founding fathers! What a slap in the face of our U.S. Constitution! What a slap in the face of God Almighty who knows that America has decided to mimic Sodom and Gomorrah instead of Jerusalem! Foucault instead of Moses and Jesus Christ!

The sodomy decision boggles the mind and spirit. Unfortunately, America is going to learn the hard way that God is smarter than Foucault (a European sodomy practitioner who died of AIDS).

In closing, let me say two additional things. First, Summit Ministries will continue to teach its Christian students that the homosexual lifestyle is immoral, unnatural and unhealthy (Romans 1). Second, there is no doubt that the Gospel of Jesus Christ can speak powerfully to individual homosexuals and set them free from their particular sexual sins, just as that same Gospel has set all of us sinners free from our own peculiar sexual sins (lust, fornication, adultery, pornography, etc.) In the final analysis we all have sinned and come short of God's glory and standard. It's just that some of us have bent the knee to God at the Cross and experienced His grace, mercy and love and have come to the conclusion that while the wages of sin is death, the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ the Lord (Romans 6:23). That doesn't make us better or more worthy—just forgiven.

Month In Review

Q But the men of Sodom were exceedingly wicked and sinful against the LORD.”

—Genesis 13:13

Q Because the outcry against Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grave.”

—Genesis 18:20

Q Now the two angels came to Sodom in the evening, and Lot was sitting in the gate of Sodom. When Lot saw them, he rose to meet them, and he bowed himself with his face toward the ground. And he said, ‘Here now, my lords, please turn in to your servant’s house and spend the night, and wash your feet; then you may rise early and go on your way.’

“And they said, ‘No, but we will spend the night in the open square.’

“But he insisted strongly; so they turned in to him and entered his house. Then, he made them a feast, and baked unleavened bread, and they ate.

“Now before they lay down, the men of the city, the men of Sodom, both old and young, all the people from every quarter, surrounded the house. And they called to Lot and said to him, ‘Where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may know them carnally.’

“So, Lot went out to them through the doorway, shut the door behind him, and said, ‘Please, my brethren, do not do so wickedly! See now, I have two daughters who have not known a man; please, let me bring them out to you, and you may do to them as you wish; only do nothing to these men, since this is the reason they have come under the shadow of my roof.’

“And they said, ‘Stand back!’ Then they said, ‘This one came in to stay here, and he keeps acting as a judge; now we will deal worse with you than with them.’ So they pressed hard against the man Lot, and came near to break down the door. But the men reached out their hands and pulled Lot into the house with them, and shut the door. And they struck the men who were at the doorway of the house with blindness, both small and great, so that they became weary trying to find the door.”

—Genesis 19:1-11

Q You shall not lie with a male as with a woman. It is an abomination.”

—Leviticus 18:22

Q If a man lies with a male as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination. They shall surely be put to death. Their blood shall be upon them.”

—Leviticus 20:13

Q There shall be no prostitutes of the daughters of Israel; nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel...for even both of these are abomination unto the LORD thy God.”

—Deuteronomy 23:17, 18

Q And there were also sodomites and prostitutes in the land. And they did according to all the abominations of the nations which the LORD had cast out before the children of Israel.”

—I Kings 14:24

Q Claiming to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man, birds, four-footed animals, and reptiles.

“Therefore God delivered them over in the cravings of their hearts to sexual impurity, so that their bodies were degraded among themselves. They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served something created instead of the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.

“This is why God delivered them over to degrading passions. For even their females exchanged natural sexual intercourse for what is unnatural. The males in the same way also left natural sexual intercourse with females and were inflamed in their lust for one another. Males committed shameless acts with males and received in their own persons the appropriate penalty for their perversions.

“And because they did not think it worthwhile to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them over to a worthless mind to do what is morally wrong. They are filled with all unrighteousness, evil, greed, and wickedness. They are full of envy, murder, disputes, deceit, and malice. They are gossips, slanderers, God-haters, arrogant, proud, boastful, inventors of evil, disobedient to parents, undiscerning, untrustworthy, unloving, and unmerciful. Although they know full well God’s just sentence—that those who practice such things deserve to die—they do not only do them, but even applaud others who practice them.”

—Romans 1:22-32

Q Do you not know that the unjust will not inherit God’s kingdom? Do not be deceived: no sexually immoral people, idolaters, adulterers, male prostitutes, homosexuals, thieves, greedy people, drunkards, revilers, or swindlers will inherit God’s kingdom. Some of you were like this: but you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and by the Spirit of our God.

—I Corinthians 6:9-11

Q Now we know that the law is good, provided one uses it legitimately. We know that the law is not meant for a righteous person, but for the lawless and rebellious, for the ungodly and sinful, for the unholy and irreverent, for those who kill their fathers and mothers, for murderers, for the sexually immoral and homosexuals, for kidnappers, liars, perjurers, and for whatever else is contrary to the sound teaching based on the glorious gospel of the blessed God that was entrusted to me.”

—I Timothy 1:8-11

Q Now I want to remind you, though you know all these things: the Lord, having first of all saved a people out of Egypt, later destroyed those who did not believe; and He has kept, with eternal chains in darkness for the judgment of the great day, angels who did not keep their own position but deserted their proper dwelling. In the same way, Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities around them committed sexual immorality and practiced perversions, just as they did, and serve as an example by undergoing the punishment of eternal fire.”

—Jude 5-7

Q But you, dear friends, remember the words foretold by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; they told you, ‘In the end time there will be scoffers walking according to their own ungodly desires.’ These people create divisions and are merely natural, not having the Spirit.

“But you, dear friends, building yourselves up in your most holy faith and praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, expecting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ for eternal life. Have mercy on some who doubt; save others by snatching them from the fire; on others have mercy in fear, hating even the garment defiled by the flesh.

“Now to Him who is able to protect you from stumbling and to make you stand in the presence of His glory, blameless and with great joy, to the only God our Savior, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, power, and authority before all time, now, and forever. Amen.”

—Jude 17-25

Q First, to map out the boundaries within which all discussion must go on, I take it for certain that the physical satisfaction of homosexual desires is sin.”

—C.S. Lewis, *A Severe Mercy*

Q But the same Thomas Jefferson who articulated the right to pursue happiness also said that we are ‘free from all but the moral law.’ He counseled that ‘[h]ealth, learning and virtue will insure your happiness,’ and in his Notes on the State of Virginia endorsed strict penalties for, among other things, the crime of sodomy. This connection between virtue and happiness is the real expression of the American mind, and of a liberty distinct from license.”

—John B. Kienker, *Claremont Review of Books*, Summer 2003, p. 31

Q In a resounding opinion emphasizing that gays and lesbians are ‘entitled to respect for their private lives,’ the Supreme Court on Thursday struck down state laws that make homosexual sex a crime and opened the door to legal attacks on other laws that discriminate

against gays.

“The vote was 6-3, with moderate Justices Anthony Kennedy and Sandra Day O’Connor joining more liberal colleagues to reject the laws and deliver the court’s most significant civil rights decision for gays and lesbians.

“The watershed opinion rejecting a Texas sodomy law was sweeping in scope and dramatic in tone. Kennedy wrote the ruling, which overruled a 1986 decision that, the court said, ‘demeaned’ the interests of gays and lesbians and helped prolong discrimination.

“That case, *Bowers v. Hardwick*, upheld a Georgia law similar to the Texas statute struck down Thursday—a decision the court said was ‘not correct when it was decided, and it is not correct today.’

“As for Thursday’s decision, the court said, ‘This case does involve two adults who, with full and mutual consent from each other, engaged in sexual practices common to a homosexual lifestyle. The state cannot demean their existence or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime.’”

—The [Colorado Springs] Gazette, June 27, 2003, p. 1

Q Has the end of the world arrived because the Supreme Court ruled no state may prohibit private, consensual homosexual conduct? No, the end of the world is being handled by the Supreme Judge. But the end of the Constitution has arrived, and that is something about which everyone in this temporal world should be concerned.

“Writing for the majority that struck down the Texas anti-sodomy law, Justice Anthony Kennedy takes us on a journey with no fixed origin, no map, but a certain destination. His constitutional rewriting will lead to same-sex ‘marriage’ and a Constitution that means to liberal judges what the Bible means to liberal theologians—a document to be tailored to the whims of culture, not the reverse. This, from justices named by Ronald Reagan (Sandra Day O’Connor and Kennedy) and George H.W. Bush (David Souter).

“Beginning with the manufactured ‘right to privacy’ created out of nothing by the godlike court in *Griswold vs. Connecticut*, Kennedy leads us through *Roe vs. Wade* (which many correctly predicted would follow *Griswold*) to the present *Lawrence vs. Texas*. He asserts that religious beliefs, history, tradition and even the desires of the majority to set parameters for the moral climate in which they wish to live are irrelevant. ‘Our obligation is to define the liberty of all, not to mandate our own moral code,’ said Kennedy. That can lead to anarchy.

“Kennedy dismisses thousands of years of law, history and theology, choosing to rely solely on modern times: ‘In all events we think that our laws and traditions in the past half century

are of most relevance here.’ Kennedy deletes the wisdom of the ages, preferring to download the squishy morality of post-modernism.

“Sen. Rick Santorum (R-Pa.) predicted two months ago that if the court struck down anti-sodomy laws, challenges would soon follow to laws prohibiting bestiality, polygamy and all sorts of other sexual practices. We will now see him proved right (see Justice Antonin Scalia’s remarks below). Prostitutes, call your lawyers.

Kennedy said anti-sodomy laws ‘do more than prohibit a particular sexual act. Their penalties and purposes, though, have more far-reaching consequences, touching upon the most private human conduct, sexual behavior, and in the most private of places, the home.’

“Supreme Court decisions like this one also have far-reaching consequences. Griswold led to Roe, which led to partial birth abortion. And this ruling will lead to same-sex ‘marriage,’ because the court has removed from the people their right to create community standards for themselves. Inevitably, this will force the schools to teach homosexuality as normal and not just an ‘alternate lifestyle.’ The trend in that direction was already well advanced before this ruling.

“It fell to Justice Antonin Scalia to say what needed to be said. While chiding the court for reversing itself in a Georgia sodomy case (*Bowers vs. Hardwick*) only 17 years ago, Scalia took the majority’s arguments and turned them back. He noted that if the logic for reversal was applied to Roe, then Roe would also fall.

“He said that the majority believe a case should be overturned if ‘(1) its foundations have been “eroded” by subsequent decisions, (2) it has been subject to “substantial and continuing criticism”, and (3) it has not induced “individual or societal reliance” that counsels against overturning. The problem is that Roe itself—which today’s majority surely has no disposition to overrule—satisfies these conditions to at least the same degree as *Bowers*.’

“Then Scalia gets to the heart of it: ‘Countless judicial decisions and legislative enactments have relied on the ancient proposition that a governing majority’s belief that certain sexual behavior is “immoral and unacceptable” constitutes a rational basis for regulation.’

“No wonder Kennedy wants to ignore history and appeals only to the last 50 years for his constitutionally twisted and morally specious rationale. Scalia declared the end to ‘all morals legislation. If the court asserts that the promotion of majoritarian sexual morality is not even a legitimate state interest, none of the above-mentioned laws (prohibiting fornication, bigamy, adultery, adult incest, bestiality and obscenity) can survive basis-review.’

“This ruling and similar court usurpations of lawmaking power from the people’s representatives will, and should, be a major theme in the coming election campaign. We

know where the Democratic presidential candidates stand, as well as most Democratic members of Congress. Where do Republicans stand, and will President Bush make this an issue, as he should?”

—Cal Thomas, *Jewish World Review* (web), July 1, 2003

Q Sodomy was a criminal offense at common law and was forbidden by the laws of the original 13 states when they ratified the Bill of Rights.”

—Judge A. Scalia, Dissenting U.S. Supreme Court decision on sodomy, June 26, 2003

Q While the [U.S. Supreme] Court does not overrule *Bowers* [*Bowers v. Hardwick*, 1986] holding that homosexual sodomy is not a ‘fundamental right,’ it is worth noting that the ‘societal reliance’ upon that aspect of the decision has been substantial as well. (A member of the armed forces shall be separated from the armed forces...if...the member has engaged in a homosexual act or acts.)”

—Judge A. Scalia, Dissenting U.S. Supreme Court decision on sodomy, June 26, 2003

Q The Texas statute undeniably seeks to further the belief of its citizens that certain forms of sexual behavior are ‘immoral and unacceptable,’ *Bowers*, supra, at 196—the same interest furthered by criminal laws against fornication, bigamy, adultery, adult incest, bestiality, and obscenity. *Bowers* held that this was a legitimate state interest. The Court today reaches the opposite conclusion. The Texas statute, it says, ‘furthers no legitimate state interest which can justify its intrusion into the personal and private life of the individual,’ ante, at 18 (emphasis added). The Court embraces instead JUSTICE STEVENS’ declaration in his *Bowers* dissent, that ‘the fact that the governing majority in a State has traditionally viewed a particular practice as immoral is not a sufficient reason for upholding a law prohibiting the practice,’ ante, at 17. This effectively decrees the end of all morals legislation. If, as the Court asserts, the promotion of majoritarian sexual morality is not even a legitimate state interest, none of the above-mentioned laws can survive rational-basis review.”

—Judge A. Scalia, Dissenting U.S. Supreme Court decision on sodomy, June 26, 2003

Q Today’s opinion is the product of a Court, which is the product of a law-profession culture, that has largely signed on to the so-called homosexual agenda, by which I mean the agenda promoted by some homosexual activists directed at eliminating the moral opprobrium that has been traditionally attached to homosexual conduct. I noted in an earlier opinion the fact that the American Association of Law Schools (to which any reputable law school must seek to belong) excludes from membership any school that refuses to ban from its job-interview facilities a law firm (no matter how small) that does not wish to hire as a prospective partner a person who openly engages in homosexual conduct. See *Romer*, supra,

at 653.

“One of the most revealing statements in today’s opinion is the Court’s grim warning that the criminalization of homosexual conduct is ‘an invitation to subject homosexual persons to discrimination both in the public and in the private spheres.’ Ante, at 14. It is clear from this that the Court has taken sides in the culture war, departing from its role of assuring, as neutral observer, that the democratic rules of engagement are observed. Many Americans do not want persons who openly engage in homosexual conduct as partners in their business, as scoutmasters for their children, as teachers in their children’s schools, or as boarders in their home. They view this as protecting themselves and their families from a lifestyle that they believe to be immoral and destructive. The Court views it as ‘discrimination’ which it is the function of our judgments to deter. So imbued is the Court with the law profession’s anti-anti-homosexual culture, that it is seemingly aware that the attitudes of that culture are not obviously ‘mainstream’; that in most States what the Court calls ‘discrimination’ against those who engage in homosexual acts is perfectly legal; that proposals to ban such ‘discrimination’ under Title VII have repeatedly been rejected by Congress, see Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 1994, S. 2238, 103rd Cong., 2d Sess. (1994); Civil Rights Amendments, H.R. 5452, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. (1975); that in some cases such ‘discrimination’ is mandated by federal statute, see 10 U.S.C. §654 (b) (1) (mandating discharge from the armed forces of any service member who engages in or intends to engage in homosexual acts); and that in some cases such ‘discrimination is a constitutional right, see *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale*, 530 U.S. 640 (2000).

—Judge A. Scalia, Dissenting U.S. Supreme Court decision on sodomy, June 26, 2003

Q Supreme Court decisions increasingly read like transcripts from the Oprah Winfrey show. Justice Antonin Scalia notes the court’s ‘famed sweet-mystery-of-life’ howler: ‘At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe and the mystery of human life.’

“Thursday’s Supreme Court decision announcing a recently discovered inalienable right to sodomy contained a few more: ‘When sexuality finds overt expression in intimate conduct with another person, the conduct can be but one element in a personal bond that is more enduring.’ Sodomy is a very high-minded business, according to the court, part of the lofty ‘liberty protected by the Constitution.’ Such is its preciousness that states can’t be trusted to regulate it.

“That sodomy is an inalienable right would no doubt come as a big surprise to the Constitution’s framers. They are, of course, the last constitutional experts the Supreme Court would ever consult. The Supreme Court, judging from the majority opinion’s slavish attention to Europe’s regard for sodomy, is much more interested in the thoughts of modern Danes than dead Americans.

“The framers didn’t approach sodomy with the same level of awe as today’s court. What the Kennedys and Souters call ‘liberty,’ the framers called ‘license,’ the abandonment to acts high in the catalogue of sin that spells the end of republics.

“The majority on the Supreme Court declares that anti-sodomy laws compromise the ‘dignity’ of homosexuals. The framers would reverse the judgment: it is sodomy that compromises their dignity, and it is the rule of law which points to and protects that dignity. The framers belonged to communities that passed such laws so as to safeguard a moral culture in which human dignity is possible.

“The framers would say that the assault to dignity comes from a legal culture that sanctions sodomy, a culture that turns children over to homosexual couples, a culture that places homosexual relationships on the same level of sanctity as the traditional family.

“The Supreme Court says anti-sodomy laws ‘demean’ people. The framers thought those laws would discourage people from demeaning each other through the slavery of sin. It would befuddle the framers greatly to hear sodomy and dignity in the same sentence. They held that the dignity of democracy depended on citizens governing themselves according to moral standards, not according to a respect for each other’s basest instincts. If citizens couldn’t govern their own dark passions, how long would a democracy that relies on their capacity for self-government last? This concern made anti-sodomy laws eminently sensible to the framers.

“But now, in our vast modern wisdom, we know better. What quaint fools the framers were. They thought society would teeter if vice had rights over virtue. We are doing just fine. They thought — can you believe it? — that such consensual acts as adult incest were wrong. Now we know that ‘it can be but one element in a personal bond that is more enduring.’

“Apparently any sexual relationship, with man or beast, is constitutionally permissible, provided that the parties to the personal bond give consent. Since animals can’t give proper consent, perhaps the court will let certain uptight communities outlaw bestiality. We’ll see. On the other hand, the ‘sweet-mystery-of-life passage’ Scalia cites gives practitioners of bestiality a pretty strong defense. If the passage has any meaning, as Scalia says, it will be the passage that ‘ate the rule of law.’

“Needless to say, we are not doing fine. We are losing real liberties while the Supreme Court invents bogus ones. To deprive a community of the liberty of preserving traditional laws is a monstrous distortion of the framers’ work and an act of judicial despotism which should outrage the public.

“License won for homosexual activists is liberty lost for communities and families. As America hurtles past homosexual adoption toward homosexual marriage, who but the obtuse

can deny this?"

—George Neumayer, *The American Spectator* (on the web), June 27, 2003

Q Today's 6 to 3 Supreme Court decision striking down the Texas law banning sodomy is a disaster for the pro-family side of America's culture war. The Texas legislature passed the law in order to promote the institution of marriage and the family and argued that communities have a right to choose their own standards. Six Supreme Court Justices said that a 'right to privacy' in the Constitution is grounds to overrule Texas and 13 other states with similar laws.

"Justice Kennedy who wrote the majority opinion brought cheer to the radical homosexual rights movement by saying that men engaging in sodomy 'are entitled to respect for their private lives.' He added, 'The State cannot demean their existence or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime.' Really?

"Consider the precedent the Court has now set. Every argument the six Justice majority used can be applied with equal force to strike down state laws against prostitution, bestiality, and every other form of adult sexual activity. Once the highest court of the land says that 'privacy' outweighs the compelling interest a society has in promoting family, and reliable standards of right and wrong, there is no place to draw a line. Indeed, even the drug legalization crowd must be celebrating. If two adults want to use drugs in the privacy of their own bedroom isn't their 'right to privacy' being violated by state laws prohibiting such behavior?

"Justice Scalia wrote the dissenting opinion and was joined by Justices Thomas and Rehnquist. He could barely contain his outrage and chose to take the unusual step of reading the dissent out loud from the bench. He mocked the majority accusing them of taking sides in America's culture war and wondering why the majority was too cowardly to declare 'a fundamental right to engage in homosexual sodomy,' since that is what the decision guarantees.

"Depressed yet? Ponder this. Of the six Justice majority, four of the Justices—O'Connor, Souter, Kennedy and Stevens were appointed by Republican Presidents! The White House did not even bother to file a brief in the case, even though it was the President's own home State of Texas that was under attack.

"So let's review the country that our federal courts have been constructing for us. It is a place where unborn children can be destroyed on a whim, a nation that requires parental permission for a tattoo, but not an abortion. It is a country where a copy of the Ten Commandments on the courthouse lawn is a threat to our liberty and the words 'Under God' in our Pledge of Allegiance is a violation of the separation of Church and state. And soon it may be a place

that allows men to marry men, effectively destroying 2000 years of Judeo-Christian tradition on the meaning of marriage.

“For all of these reasons, and more, we cannot afford one more mistake in a Supreme Court appointment. The President, if there is a vacancy, must appoint a Scalia or a Thomas type candidate, not another wimp ready to surrender to the social radicals. My friends we must fight back and the politicians we are electing must have the courage to help us.”

—Gary Bauer, Campaign for Working Families Statement, June 26, 2003

Q In an extreme activist ruling today the Supreme Court overturned a Texas sodomy law and its own precedent, declaring a supposed constitutional right to sodomy.

“The ruling in *Lawrence v. Texas* comes from Supreme Court justices who believe in a ‘living’ and ‘evolving’ theory of the Constitution—it’s as if the Founders wrote it on a blackboard and gave them an eraser and chalk,” said Jan LaRue, chief counsel for Concerned Women for America (CWA) author of CWA’s amicus brief in support of Texas. ‘If there’s no rational basis for prohibiting same-sex sodomy by consenting adults, then state laws prohibiting prostitution, adultery, bigamy, and incest are at risk.’

“No doubt, homosexual activists will try to bootstrap this decision into a mandate for same-sex marriage. Any attempt to equate sexual perversion with the institution that is the very foundation of society is as baseless as this ruling. By striking down *Bowers v. Hardwick*, we see how little value justices give Court precedents when they want to impose an agenda on the American people,” said Sandy Rios, president of CWA.

“ ‘Six lawyers robed in black have magically discovered a right of privacy that includes sexual perversion. More vaporous law emanating from “penumbras” that do not exist in the text of the Constitution,’ LaRue added.

“ ‘The Court has denied the people of Texas their constitutional right to decide what is immoral sexual behavior and replaced it with the Court’s version. The majority didn’t like the Texas sodomy statutes, so they struck them down,’ LaRue concluded.

“The case began when Lawrence and his male partner were arrested and pled ‘no contest’ to charges of committing ‘deviate sexual intercourse,’ defined under the Texas statutes as ‘deviate sexual intercourse with another individual of the same sex,’ which is ‘any contact between any part of the genitals of one person and the mouth or anus or another person; or the penetration of the genitals or the anus of another person with an object.’ They appealed to the Texas Court of Appeals, which upheld the convictions, and then to the U.S. Supreme Court.

“ ‘This ruling means that school children will be taught that homosexual sodomy is normal, healthy and the equivalent of marital sex,’ said Robert Knight, director of CWA’s Culture & Family Institute. ‘And it will intensify efforts to attack the next barrier to total sexual “liberation,” the laws regarding the age of consent.

“ ‘By creating a constitutional “right” to sodomy, the court has made a mockery of real constitutional rights and has trampled on the rights of the people of Texas to govern their own communities. This is judicial tyranny at its worst,’ Knight said.

“ ‘This decision is further evidence that “We the People” have virtually lost the right to govern ourselves because of judicial activists who think they have a right to create law. More than ever, the American people need to put a stop to the obstructionist Senate filibusters that are blocking President Bush’s nominees to the federal courts,’ Rios concluded.”

—Concerned Women of America statement

Q While liberals want Americans to believe one can’t legislate morality the truth is that 6 justices just did it.

Q The fundamental difference [between left and right] is that conservatives think man is created in God’s image. Liberals think they are god—they want to create utopia on Earth with wealth redistribution, breaking the bonds of marriage and ties between parents and a child.”

—Ann Coulter, June 28, 2003

Q The Supreme Court today ruled 6-3 against the state of Texas striking down the state’s homosexual sodomy law and thereby the sodomy laws of twelve other states.

“Once again judicial activists have used their fertile imagination to create rights that simply don’t exist in the Constitution. In doing so, they have imposed their own moral judgments in place of state legislatures and have thereby undermined the democratic process. Unelected warriors wearing black robes become the chief architects of public policy.

“If the hallmarks of the test are consent and privacy, then that throws the door open to any sexual behavior. The radical homosexual lobby will seek to apply the logic, extending a blanket privacy protection over one’s choice of sexual partner to one’s choice of marital partner as well—regardless of sex.

“Private sexual acts have public consequences. The Court has ignored that fact and the right of states to enact laws in defense of public morals and public health.

“As Justice Scalia points out in his dissent and as Sen. Rick Santorum (R-PA) pointed out in

his analysis of this case a month ago, every state law that is based on moral grounds is now called into question based on this ruling”

—Ken Connor, Family Research Council statement

Q The U.S. Supreme Court today rewrote the U.S. Constitution and 3,000 years of legal history by striking down the Texas sodomy law in a 6-3 decision.

“The court overrode the Constitution, the history of American law, and its own precedent by declaring in *Lawrence v. Texas* that there is a right to privacy to protect private, adult consensual sexual activity. Justice Kennedy wrote for the majority, and only Justices Scalia and Thomas and Chief Justice Rhenquist dissented. The majority reasoned, unbelievably, that because of the trend in state legislatures to repeal sodomy laws, these laws have become unconstitutional.

“The Alliance Defense Fund, a national legal organization based in Scottsdale, Arizona, said the framers of the Constitution could never have imagined an interpretation finding in the Constitution a right to engage in the act of sodomy.

“ ‘We are disappointed but we’re not giving up hope and we’re not going away,’ said Jordan Lorence, a senior litigator with the Alliance Defense Fund. ‘This ruling provides us with new opportunities. We have already prevailed in other key cases, and we must persevere.’ The Alliance Defense Fund supported the prevailing parties in *Hurley v. Irish-American Group of Boston* and *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale*.

“In its 1986 *Bowers v. Hardwick* decision, the court upheld laws against sodomy. Then Chief Justice Warren Burger wrote in his concurring opinion ‘...in constitutional terms there is no such thing as a fundamental right to commit homosexual sodomy.’ Burger continued: ‘Decisions of individuals relating to homosexual conduct have been subject to state intervention throughout the history of Western civilization. Condemnation of those practices is firmly rooted in Judeo-Christian moral and ethical standards...[Sir William] Blackstone described “the infamous crime against nature” as an offense of “deeper malignity” than rape, a heinous act “the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature” and “a crime not fit to be named.” To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millennia of moral teaching.’

“ ‘It would have been a better day if the court had taken Burger’s words to heart, and followed its own holding in *Bowers*, and 3,000 years of history and precedent,’ Lorence said.”

—The Alliance Defense Fund statement