

TFL Responds: Utah Gay Marriage on Ice

On Monday, the US Supreme Court granted a request for a stay on a ruling by U.S. District Court Judge Robert J. Shelby, who ruled on December 20 Utah's state law affirming marriage being between a man and a woman is unconstitutional. The state of Utah applied for a stay with the 10th Circuit Court three times, but were denied every time. They then were forced to then apply for a stay with Justice Sonia Sotomayor, who referred the request to the whole court.



"The FAMiLY LEADER and I applaud the leadership of Utah's Governor for challenging an activist judge's opinion to usurp the will of the people regarding God's design for family with the union of one man/one woman marriage," said Bob Vander Plaats, President and CEO of The FAMiLY LEADER. "People understand that courts and judges don't get to make law, don't have the power to execute law nor do they have the privilege of amending our constitution. The power belongs to 'we the people' not 'we the courts.'"

[fblike style="standard" showfaces="false" verb="like" font="arial"]

It's Not About the Cake

~ by David Barnett

Now widely reported by non-traditional media, and largely ignored by the major media outlets, a Colorado judge has ruled that a bakery owner must violate his religious beliefs and bake a cake for homosexual aggressors or pay a fine so large it would drive him out of business.

We've said it before, and we'll say it again – you will be made to care.

Ironically, even the Colorado Constitution clearly states that “Only a union of one man and one woman shall be valid or recognized as marriage in this state.” However, a citizen who actually *believes* that, must now be punished and relegated to be a 2nd rate citizen who's rights are not guaranteed and protected by the Constitution.

The right to free speech and freedom of religion as guaranteed by the First Amendment has been ruled by an activist judge to be subject to the feelings of a particular people group. Judge Spencer said in the ruling:

“It may seem reasonable that a private business should be able to refuse service to anyone it chooses,” he ruled. “This view, however, fails to take into account the cost to society and the hurt caused to persons who are denied service simply because of who they are.”

Translation: “Because they might feel bad, this baker and other Christians like him, must forfeit their right to religious liberty.”

So, let me get this straight – in order to get a *cake*, these two guys sued a baker, and had his first amendment rights stripped away?

Somehow, I don't think this is about cake...

Let me remind you again: You will be made to care.

Read

more:

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/dec/9/editorial-colorado-ruling-takes-the-cake/#ixzz2n7GI84vN>

WATCH: Bob Discusses Marriage with Sen. McCoy

Bob Vander Plaats and Senator Matt McCoy discussed the importance of marriage and family in the wake of a formerly-unknown NBA player, Jason Collins announcing he was now part of the homosexual lifestyle. Bob pointed out:

- Any sex outside of marriage is against the heart of God.
- No one opposed to the homosexual lifestyle has called for him to resign from basketball.
- Sex within marriage is the healthiest and best way to live.
- The FAMiLY LEADER is about championing the gold standard – we want only the best for Iowa’s families.

[fblike style="standard" showfaces="false" verb="like" font="arial"]

Part 2:

- Why same-sex “marriage” exists.
- What happens when you undefine marriage?
- What does it say about a party if they change their position on a foundational issue like marriage?

[fblike style="standard" showfaces="false" verb="like" font="arial"]

Part 3:

- Why TFL is involved opposing a casino in Warren County.
- Why gambling hurts families.
- What impact gambling has in a community.

[fblike style="standard" showfaces="false" verb="like" font="arial"]

Part 4:

- Why the Senate investigation of Kent Sorenson needs to be put to rest quickly.
- What impact this investigation could have on the Iowa Caucuses.

[fblike style="standard" showfaces="false" verb="like" font="arial"]

Part 5:

Predictions! What would happen if the US Supreme Court overturns marriage.

[fblike style="standard" showfaces="false" verb="like" font="arial"]

Lincoln: Don't Allow "Eminent Tribunal"

By Phyllis Schlafly, Founder and President of the Eagle Forum –



"The U.S. Supreme Court is right now holding in its hands the issue that can make or break America. Within a few weeks, the Court will hand down its decision on the definition of Marriage, and it is expected to be binding on all our 50 states. The Court has before it two cases. In one case, the homosexuals are asking the Court to declare unconstitutional the Defense of Marriage Act, known as DOMA. It was passed by overwhelming majorities of Congress in 1996 and signed by President Clinton. It simply declares that in all reference in federal law to marriage (of which there are more than 1,000), marriage means the union of a man and a woman. The other case came from California. California voters, in a statewide referendum, passed Proposition 8 defining marriage as the union of a man and a woman. The homosexuals got two federal courts to declare that referendum vote unconstitutional, and Prop 8 sponsors have appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold the vote of the people."

"Let me tell you a little history. You know I fought the Equal Rights Amendment for ten years against incredible odds. The most decisive vote in those ten years was in the Illinois State Legislature in 1980. The ERAers had announced that the ERA would pass that day and that would end the fight. All the

media, all the TV networks, were in the balcony of the Legislature expecting to film their victory. We had done all our lobbying, but we knew we were still short of votes. Illinois votes electronically, and it was very tense as the votes lit up the board. That day, God brought us two votes from Chicago Democrats who had never voted with us before, and we won. ABC immediately put the feminist leader, Eleanor Smeal, in front of the TV camera and said, "You told us that you had the votes. Why didn't you win?" She replied, "There was something, very powerful against us, and I don't mean people." That's right. We had something, Someone, very powerful on our side who delivered the two votes we needed."

"That's what we are asking God to do for us now. Find and deliver the votes we need to preserve your definition of marriage. We need His help. And we need you to ask Him for help. And we need you to go to your pastor and ask your pastor to ask his congregation to pray that the Court upholds Marriage."

"We must pray for God to enlighten any swing votes to persuade them to uphold marriage the way the Lord ordained it. But we do have to give some thought to what we will do if the Court throws out traditional marriage and opens it up to any people who want to live together. I don't like thinking about that possibility, but we probably should. For guidance, I suggest we look at Abraham Lincoln's First Inaugural Address, where he dealt with the worst Supreme Court decision in history, the infamous Dred Scott decision. The Supreme Court ruled wrong in that case, holding that a man who traveled to other states had to be protected in his property right of owning the slave, named Dred Scott."

"Abe Lincoln was eloquent. He first of all admitted that a Supreme Court decision would be binding on the parties to a case. But then he said that we should consider such an erroneous decision limited to that particular case and never let it become a precedent for other cases, with the hope that

it may one day be overruled. Then he made this important pronouncement: "If the policy of the government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in person actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal."

"In other words, if the Supreme Court makes such an erroneous decision on such vital questions as slavery, or the definition of marriage, we will no longer be a self-governing people but a nation ruled by "that eminent tribunal." And that, we cannot allow to happen."

[fblike style="standard" showfaces="false" verb="like" font="arial"]