

## Chapter 26

### **IS YOUR CHILD GAY?** *Be Aware That He or She Is Being Seduced*

The U.S.A. is rushing madly toward the edge of a cliff. Waiting for us at the bottom of that cliff is the legalization of sodomy, the banning of free speech to protect sodomites from criticism, and severe religious oppression such as we have never known before. If we elect to plunge over that cliff on election day November 4, 2008, there will most likely be no return. We citizens are literally deciding if we want to remain a free people. Actually, we could be deciding before November 4, 2008 if we choose wrong in the primaries. This year the primaries are exceedingly crucial.

### **Sodom, California**

On January 1, 2008, the religion of atheism—and its doctrine that sodomy is righteousness instead of sin—becomes officially protected from criticism by the government in the public schools of California. The free speech of theists who believe that sodomy is sin has been officially banned. Only the doctrines of the humanist religion may be taught or practiced. Voicing the opposing views of other religions are decreed to be “hate-crimes.”

### SB 777

This bill passed the Democrat majority California State Assembly September the 11th by a 21-to-15 vote, and was signed into law by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger on October the 12th 2007.

#### **What SB 777 Does**

The lead author of this bill was Senator Sheila Kuehl. The bill was sponsored by Equality California, a homosexual organization. A document on Equality California’s web site explains what the bill does:

SB 777 would update and explicitly list all the prohibited categories of discrimination in publicly funded K-12 schools and institutions of higher education. Those categories include:

- Disability
  - Gender
  - Nationality
  - Race or ethnicity
  - Religion
  - Sexual orientation
  - Any other characteristic that is contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code
- In addition, SB 777 would reference already codified definitions of these protected bases as follows:
- with the person’s assigned sex at birth.
  - **"Nationality"** includes citizenship, country of origin, and national origin.
  - **"Race or ethnicity"** includes ancestry, color, and ethnic background.
  - **"Religion"** includes all aspects of religious belief, observance, and practice, and includes agnosticism and atheism.
  - **"Sexual orientation"** means heterosexuality, homosexuality, or bisexuality.
  - **Disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic contained in the definition of hate crimes set forth in Section 422.55 of the Penal Code** includes a perception that the person has any of those characteristics or that the person is associated with a person who has, or is perceived to have, any of those characteristics.

Finally, SB 777 would standardize various nondiscrimination statutes throughout the Education Code by amending those laws with a reference to the characteristics contained in the general prohibition of discrimination in Section 220. This will remedy deficiencies in protection for many students and confusion that exists for implementation and compliance by teachers and school administrators. Another advantage to this approach is

that whenever additional protected categories are added to Section 220, these other educational laws will be updated automatically to include all the recognized civil rights protections that exist in the Education Code.

Specifically, the bill links the following Education Code sections to the characteristics listed in the general prohibition against discrimination in Section 220:

- Section 235. Prohibiting discrimination in the operation of alternative schools and charter schools.
- Section 260. Establishing the responsibility of school district governing boards to ensure that school district programs and activities are free from discrimination.
- Section 50. Prohibiting bias in teacher instruction or school sponsored activities.
- Section 66251. Guaranteeing equal opportunity in postsecondary educational institutions.
- Section 66270. Prohibiting discrimination in the programs and activities of postsecondary institutions.<sup>42</sup>

This document needs to be examined carefully.

#### *SB 777 Declared Atheism and Agnosticism To Be Religions!*

This is exactly what this book has been proving over and over again. Humanism and atheism are the same thing—they are an anti-God **religion**. This is the most important fact in this chapter; understanding this is the key to victory. As a religion the teaching of their doctrines may not legally be funded by government, as that violates the First Amendment. Also, according to the First Amendment, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof...” Since public schools receive federal funding, SB 777 is the type of law that the First Amendment forbids. SB 777 even more firmly establishes humanism/atheism as the official state church, and at the same time prohibits the free exercise of other religions. This violation of the First Amendment must not be allowed to be ignored. ***This is the key—THE ONLY KEY—to stopping this vile, wicked, anti-God, humanist religion. Disestablish the humanist church, and it will collapse. Make humanists use their own funds instead of tax fund to pay for the teaching of their vile religion, and it will be reduced to insignificance. [If you haven’t yet read chapter 22 of this book, be sure to do so].***

#### *SB 777 Protects Atheism and Agnosticism From Criticism*

By specifically naming atheism and agnosticism, SB 777 give them special status above other religions. Therefore, if Christians or other theists say that atheism is wrong and is rebellion against God, they can be charged with committing a hate crime. But atheists can talk against Christianity and other theist religions all they want with impunity. SB 777 therefore bans free speech, except for the established humanist church.

#### *SB 777 Protects the Act of Sodomy*

This bill redefines gender. Gender no longer means male and female. Now it “means sex: and includes a person's gender identity and gender-related appearance and behavior” (Emphasis added). So, if a person identifies him or her self as a homosexual, or bi-sexual, and dresses like the opposite sex, and behaves like homosexuals behave, no one is allowed to say that is wrong. And how do homosexuals behave? Well, you already know from going to the web page given in chapter one. But for more in depth information, Paul Cameron of Family Research Institute has written an excellent article titled “Medical Consequences of What Homosexuals Do,” which explains what they do and the consequences. Since this is the type behavior that homosexuals are trying to seduce children into, parents need to understand what the consequences are going to be if their children are unable to resist the seduction. You can find the article on the web at this URL:

[Http://www.familyresearchinst.org/Default.aspx?tabid=73](http://www.familyresearchinst.org/Default.aspx?tabid=73)

<sup>42</sup> Senator Sheila Kuehl, “FACT SHEET: STUDENT CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (SB 777),” *Equality California* (2007), <http://www.eqca.org/atf/cf/%7B687DF34F-6480-4BCD-9C2B-1F33FD8E1294%7D/SB%20777%20FACT%20SHEET.PDF>.

Please go there now and read the very sobering facts.

Consider that even in *Little Black Book* distributed by homosexuals to encourage such behavior, it says, "As you can see, it can be hard to be sure you are safe from all STDs. If you are having sex, get tested every 3-6 months!" Sure, and if the test shows that you have AIDS, then what?

Just like all other humanist practices, sodomy is insanity. Do a web search for "bug chasers gift givers." Doing such a search, I found an article titled "Bug Chaser & Gift Giver Parties" on the About.com:Gay Life website. A copyright notice at the bottom of the page says that About, Inc. is "a part of The New York Times Company. Fitting! Here is what the article says (I'm combining several paragraphs into one to save space):

Deliberately Transmitting HIV. What is a "bug chaser?" A bug chaser is a gay man who deliberately attempts to contract HIV by having unprotected sex with a man or group of men who are known to have the virus. What is a "gift giver?" A gift giver is an HIV positive gay man who deliberately transmits the virus, often times to bug chasers, or those willing to contract it. What are bug parties? Bug parties are sex parties often ranging from a few to as much as 30 people. Unsafe sex with every participant at the party is encouraged. . . . Why do people participate in bug parties? Many psychologists theorize that participation in bug parties is actually an anxiety disorder where the non-infected individuals fear getting HIV so greatly that they would rather contract it and free themselves of the anxiety of living in fear. These parties are also seen as a sort of club for those living with HIV. Infecting a HIV negative and willing participant initiates them into their world.<sup>43</sup>

The question is: does anyone have a right to engage in behavior that on-purpose spreads fatal diseases? Is this not murder? Yes, it is. One homosexual even admitted it, saying, "If I know that he's negative and I'm [haveing sex with] him, it sort of gets me off. I'm murdering him in a sense, killing him slowly, and that's sort of, as sick as it sounds, exciting to me."<sup>44</sup>

#### SB 777 Sanctions Extra-Marital Sex

According to SB 777, "**Sexual orientation**' means heterosexuality, homosexuality, or bisexuality." Bisexuality means having sex with both men and women. As long as there are laws against polygamy, this cannot be done without having extra-marital sex. This law therefore implies that marriage is not important and is of no value. And of course we know that many homosexuals have literally hundreds of sex partners, and they certainly don't bother to marry each other first.

A survey conducted by the homosexual magazine *Genre* found that 24 percent of the respondents said they had had more than a hundred sexual partners in their lifetime. The magazine noted that several respondents suggested including a category of those who had more than a thousand sexual partners.<sup>45</sup>

So, this law sanctions fornication and adultery, and says that no one may say that fornication is wrong.

What if a bi-sexual pressures your child to have sex with him or her? If you child says, No, that is wrong!, then your child can be punished for discriminating against bi-sexuals. What if your son is approached by some homosexual boys in the now bi-gender bathroom, and told to lower his pants so they can "love him." If he refuses stating that sodomy is sinful behavior, he will be punished for discriminating against homosexuals. And no teacher can come to his rescue without risking his or her career. For parents to send a child into such an environment is child abuse, pure and simple.

It needs to be pointed out that discrimination against a person for committing sodomy is much different from discrimination against a person because of his skin color or nationality. It is **not** a sin to be a Jew or to have black skin. It **is** a sin to commit sodomy. Sodomy is a sin just like murder and rape are sins. It is necessary to discriminate against murder and rape and sodomy, as these are very harmful and destructive actions that destroy civilization if left unpunished and thus encouraged. No one has the right to sodomize.

<sup>43</sup> Ramone Johnson, "Bug Chaser & Gift Giver Parties," *About.com: Gay Life*, [Http://gaylife.about.com/cs/gay101/a/bugparties.htm](http://gaylife.about.com/cs/gay101/a/bugparties.htm).

<sup>44</sup> Gregory A. Freeman, "Bug Chasers: The Men Who Long to be HIV+," *Rolling Stone*, 1923 January 2003, [Http://www.shoutwire.com/viewstory/16216/Bug\\_Chasers\\_Men\\_Who\\_Want\\_To\\_Be\\_HIV\\_Positive](http://www.shoutwire.com/viewstory/16216/Bug_Chasers_Men_Who_Want_To_Be_HIV_Positive).

<sup>45</sup> Timothy J. Dailey, "The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality," *Family Research Council*, no. 232, [Http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=IS01B1](http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=IS01B1).

*SB 777 Forces Boys and Girls To Use the Same Bathrooms and Locker Rooms*

Humanism is mental and moral insanity. It is absolutely insane to force boys and girls to use the same bathroom. It is inevitable that a boy and a girl will find themselves in such a bathroom alone with each other, having no privacy. Will girls have to use urinals like boys? It would be interesting to know how they can do that. In spite of what humanists teach, there is a very big difference in the way boys and girls are made. Will boys urinate in a urinal in front of girls, or will millions of dollars worth of urinals have to be removed and replaced with millions of dollars worth of toilets with stalls? Who is going to pay for all this? Mark my words, rape will take place in such bathrooms! This is worse than insane! It is evil and wicked to the core—it is the *ultimate* of the ultimate child abuse. Humanists claim to be defenders of the right to privacy, but then they pass laws to deny privacy to everyone. Humanism is hypocrisy.

*SB 777 Provides For Protecting Other Sins In the Future*

Some sodomites have sex with animals and even with dead bodies. Other homosexuals want sex only with young boys. Sodomites argue that they can't help it; they were born that way. Murderers could just as truthfully as homosexuals say the same thing—that they were born to murder, and therefore should not be discriminated against. Rapists could say the same, that they were born to rape, and so should not be discriminated against. Senator Kuehl says that “Another advantage to this [SB 777] approach is that whenever additional protected categories are added to Section 220, these other educational laws will be updated automatically to include all the recognized civil rights protections that exist in the Education Code.” So, these people obviously have plans to legalize other sinful behavior in the future. People who ignore this warning should remember it when some sodomite rapes the corpse of a loved one lying in state at a funeral home, or when they find a homosexual in their barn sexually mounting their favorite horse, or when they learn that some sodomites have raped their son. When sodomy is concerned, an ounce of prevention is worth a trillion tons of cure. It is doubtful that the emotional damage homosexual rape causes to a child can ever be completely repaired.

**SB 777 Protects Sodomy Even in Alternative and Charter Schools.** This bill will protect sodomy in every school in California that receives government funding. This includes “alternative schools and charter schools,” and any other school that receives government funding. Remember, government funding always means government control. That is why theists should never seek or accept any government funding for their schools. **THIS IS ALSO WHY THE SO-CALLED “FAITH-BASED INITIATIVE” IS A MISTAKE AND WILL NOT HAVE THE DESIRED EFFECT, BUT WILL INSTEAD FURTHER ENSLAVE THEISTS IN THE U.S.A.**

Right now these laws will not apply to totally privately funded private schools or to totally privately funded home-schooled children. But eventually they will. If it is wrong to discriminate against sodomy in public schools, then it is also wrong to discriminate against sodomy in private schools and in private homes. Changing this law to make it universal will be the next step.

The European Human Rights Court just a few weeks ago concluded in a case involving similar objections that parents do not have an “exclusive” right to lead their children's education and any parental “wish” to have their children grow up without adverse influences “could not take priority over compulsory school attendance.”

That court said a German family had no right to provide homeschooling for their children.

In the case that originated in Germany, homeschooling parents Fritz and Marianna Konrad argued for that right because they said Germany's compulsory school attendance endangered their children's religious upbringing and promotes teaching inconsistent with the family's Christian faith.

But the court concluded, “The parents' right to education did not go as far as to deprive their children of that experience.”

“The (German) Federal Constitutional Court stressed the general interest of society to avoid the emergence of parallel societies based on separate philosophical convictions and the importance of integrating minorities into society,” the European ruling said.<sup>46</sup>

**THEISTS, BE THEY CHRISTIANS OR NOT, CANNOT ALLOW ANY LAW SUCH AS THIS TO GO INTO EFFECT IN THE U.S.A, WITHOUT ALSO PLACING THEMSELVES AT GREAT RISK OF GOING TO PRISON FOR “HATE**

<sup>46</sup> “‘Gay’ Groups: We Have Rights to Your Children!” *WorldNetDaily*, 2006 October 2006, [http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=52311](http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=52311).

**CRIMES.” Now is not the time to hesitate or to be lazy—IMMEDIATE action is vital for our own well being, to say nothing about the well being of our children!**

**You could go to jail.** Already on the state level it has get to the federal level.

On January 14, 2005 a “Diversity Book bag” containing a book titled *Who’s In a Family* by Robert Skutch was sent home from the kindergarten of Estabrook Elementary School in Lexington, Massachusetts in the hands of the five year old son of David and Tonia Parker. The Parkers were alarmed at the homosexual contents of this bag. They did not want their son exposed to homosexuality, especially at his young age. They wrote to the principle of the school, “The real question is—do parents have the right to exclude/shield their children from these contrary values being pushed upon young children in elementary school... Do you commit to us that [son's name] will not be subjected to homosexual family values at Estabrook?” Numerous e-mails were thereafter exchanged over a period of three months between the Parkers and the school, but the school administrators would not agree to exclude the Parker’s son from homosexual discussions.

On April 27, 2005, the Parkers were invited to a face-to-face discussion about the issue at the school. As the meeting seemed at a stalemate, the Principal and Director of Education seemed to change course. Although they had claimed they “did not have the authority” to allow David Parker to be informed when his 6-year-old son was exposed to discussions of homosexuality, they suggested that the Superintendent did have the authority to agree -- at least until the full process of appealing to the School Committee went through.

So they had David hand-write an agreement, which they discussed with Superintendent William Hurley over the telephone, and then faxed to him. David was led to believe that Hurley was going to sign this - but instead he called back saying he rejected it, and they decided to have David arrested for trespassing.<sup>47</sup>

The police were called, and David Parker was arrested and taken to jail. He was not allowed to call his lawyer. The next day he stood handcuffed (see photo right) before Judge Robert McKenna in Concord District Court.

When he informed Judge Robert McKenna that he had not been allowed to call his lawyer, the judge scolded him for not being respectful. Parker was released on \$1,000 surety bond. He was officially informed that he may not set foot on any school property in Lexington, or he will be arrested again for trespassing. A hearing was set for June 1, followed by court appearances on Aug. 2 and Sept. 19.<sup>48</sup>

Parker wisely refused to plea bargain<sup>49</sup>, and refused to plead guilty to false charges—which would have been dishonest. Thus began a series of enormously expensive (over \$200,000) legal proceedings. Large numbers of parents gathered in support of the Parkers, and the case drew nationwide media attention. On October 20, 2005 the Middlesex County District Attorney dropped the charges against David Parker. However, the Parkers were informed that their request to opt-out their son from homosexual discussions was denied, and that if they didn’t like it they should home school.



David Parker hand cuffed in court after spending a night in jail for insisting that his five-year-old son not be taught about homosexuality.

<sup>47</sup> “Lexington, Mass., Father of 6-Year-Old Arrested, Spends Night in Jail,” *MassResistance* (2005), [Http://www.massresistance.org/docs/parker/main.html](http://www.massresistance.org/docs/parker/main.html).

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> Never ever plead guilty to a crime you did not commit. Not only would doing so be dishonest, but also could result in you ending up in prison. Lawyers who want you to lie are wicked people who cannot be trusted.

In April of 2006, the Parkers filed a federal civil rights lawsuit against the Lexington school system to appeal this ruling. In August of 2006 the Lexington school system filed a 57 page motion to dismiss the Parker's lawsuit. In September of 2006 the Parker's lawyers filed a rebuttal to the motion to dismiss the lawsuit. That same month the American Civil Liberties Union and major homosexual groups (Human Rights Campaign, Massachusetts Teachers Association, Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders), plus local gay organizations filed a brief in federal court opposing the Parker's lawsuit. In October of 2006 the Lexington school system filed a rebuttal to the Parker's rebuttal.

On February 7, 2007, the lawsuit began with school and ACLU lawyers arguing that the case should be dismissed.

"Once I have elected to send my child to public school, my fundamental right does not allow me to direct what my child is exposed to in the public school," the [school's] lawyer said. Once you send your child to a public school, you give up your ability to control what is taught to your child, he asserted.

The ACLU lawyer also spoke, and said that because of the publicity surrounding this lawsuit, "teachers have been chilled - they are afraid to open their mouths on things they have been teaching." . . . She added that "it is a tremendous bonus [for children in the schools] to be exposed to ideas different from their parents." She also said that "the exposure of children to ideas that their parents abhor" has nothing to do with a violation of religious freedom.<sup>50</sup>

On February 23, 2007 U.S. District Judge Mark L. Wolf decided in favor of the school and ACLU, and dismissed the lawsuit! WorldNetDaily summed up what happened like this:

A federal judge in Massachusetts has ordered the "gay" agenda taught to Christians who attend a public school in Massachusetts, finding that they need the teachings to be "engaged and productive citizens."

U.S. District Judge Mark L. Wolf yesterday dismissed a civil rights lawsuit brought by David Parker, ordering that it is reasonable, indeed there is an obligation, for public schools to teach young children to accept and endorse homosexuality.

Wolf essentially adopted the reasoning in a brief submitted by a number of homosexual-advocacy groups, who said "the rights of religious freedom and parental control over the upbringing of children . . . would undermine teaching and learning."<sup>51</sup>

**You or your child could be beaten or worse.** Sodomites respond viciously when it is pointed out that they tend to be violent people. Not all of them are violent, but many of them are. They use threats and violence to intimidate individuals, businesses, organizations, and politicians in order to force their will on others. Here is an example:

On May 17, 2006 - the two-year anniversary of same-sex "marriage" in Massachusetts - David Parker's first-grade son, Jacob, was beaten up at the Estabrook Elementary School in Lexington during recess, receiving multiple blows to the chest, stomach, and genital area.

During the recess period, a group of 8-10 kids suddenly surrounded Jacob and grabbed him. He was taken around the corner of the school building out of sight of the patrolling aides, with the taunting and encouragement of other kids. Jacob was then positioned against the wall for what appeared to be a well planned and coordinated assault. Many children stood, watched silently, and did nothing as the beating commenced.

The group of kids surrounded Jacob and he was beaten and punched. Then, as he fell to the ground, another child was heard saying to the group of children, "Now you all can finish him off," and as he was down on his hands and knees, the beating continued on his back. Then, fortunately, one little girl ran to contact the oblivious playground aides to stop it.<sup>52</sup>

The school at first acknowledged the facts about the beating, but later radically changed the story and worked with gay activists to demean the Parkers.

February 2005 (the year before the above incident), an incident in the same school prompted a family to pull their child from the school in the middle of the school year, and move out of the area. Like the Parkers, Mr. and Mrs. Montalvos

told the school they wanted to opt-out of the diversity book bag, which the schools EXPRESSLY told them they could do. Furthermore, the parents requested that the principal please respect their values and morals and remove their children from any material or discussion, whether oral or written, in the classroom pertaining to such subjects. The book bag was sent home with their kindergarten son anyway, even though the parents made these requests in writing to the Estabrook principal.

<sup>50</sup> "Contention Inside and Outside as David Parker's Civil Rights Lawsuit Begins in Federal Court," *MassResistance*, 2007 February 2007, [http://www.massresistance.org/docs/parker\\_lawsuit/hearing\\_020707/index.html](http://www.massresistance.org/docs/parker_lawsuit/hearing_020707/index.html).

<sup>51</sup> Bob Unruh, "Judge Orders 'gay' Agenda Taught to Christian Children," *WorldNetDaily*, 1924 February 2007, [http://wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=54420](http://wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=54420).

<sup>52</sup> "David Parker's First-Grade Son Surrounded and Beaten up at School," *MassResistance* (2005), [http://www.massresistance.org/docs/parker/parker\\_son\\_incident/index.html](http://www.massresistance.org/docs/parker/parker_son_incident/index.html).

Further discussions with the principal revealed that all children at Estabrook have access to books about lesbian and gay-headed relationships in each and every classroom, and that any teacher or adult can read these books to children any time they wish, with no thought of notifying their parents.

Instead of respecting the Montalvos values and beliefs, the principal seemed to think the problem was the Montalvos, and suggested the parents attend a workshop entitled, "How and why to talk with your children about diversity" which was held at Diamond Middle School on February 8th. . . . Many of the teachers and parents at this meeting were in favor of teaching acceptance and normalization of homosexuality. When Mr. Montalvos discussed his belief system and his legal rights to shield his own children from these materials and discussions in the public schools, a parent told him to leave and to place his children in a private or religious school. One of the Estabrook staff members had to physically restrain this parent as she was apparently preparing to physically attack.<sup>53</sup>

Therefore, the Montalvos family left Lexington, concluding that this school was not a safe place to have their children.

Here is another example of homosexual violence:

Arlington, VA (Aug. 28, 2007) -- Last week Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays & Gays (PFOX) exhibited at the Arlington County Fair in Arlington, Virginia. PFOX has exhibited at this county fair for the past four years and hands out materials on same-sex attraction and tolerance for the ex-gay community to a hungry public. A local gay group also exhibits there and distributes materials on gay rights.

As happens every year, gay activists disrupted our booth activities. They screamed obscenities, threw our materials from the exhibit table to the ground, insisted we recognize their same-sex "spouses," demanded that PFOX leave, and hit a PFOX volunteer because he is ex-gay.

When we explained that the county's sexual orientation law allows both the gay booth and our ex-gay booth to exhibit, the unhappy gays insisted that sexual orientation laws on hate crimes and discrimination do not apply to ex-gays -- only gays -- and no tolerance should be extended to former homosexuals.

All the gays who stopped by our booth that week insisted that no one could change their sexual orientation from gay to straight, although they knew of people who had changed in mid-life from heterosexual to a gay lifestyle or had changed their gender.

The gays became infuriated when our ex-gay volunteers testified about leaving homosexuality. They adamantly refused to accept the ex-gays' sexual orientation. One gay man went so far as to hit our ex-gay volunteer because he refused to recant his ex-gay testimony. We summoned a police officer, who ejected the gay man off of the fairgrounds. Our ex-gay volunteer decided not to press assault charges against the gay man because he wanted to turn the other cheek as Jesus had done.<sup>54</sup>

Paul Cameron of Family Research Institute has done extensive study of violence committed by homosexuals. He found that

Although the total number of victims dispatched by a given killer is often in doubt, (e.g., homosexual Henry Lucas claimed that he killed 350), it appears that the modern world record for serial killing is held by a Russian homosexual, Andrei Chikatilo, who was convicted in 1992 of raping, murdering and eating parts of at least 21 boys, 17 women and 14 girls. The pathology of eating one's sexual victims also characterized Milwaukee's Jeffrey Dahmer in 1992. He not only killed 17 young men and boys, but cooked and ate their body parts.

The top six U.S. male serial killers were all gay:

- Donald Harvey claimed 37 victims in Kentucky;
- John Wayne Gacy raped and killed 33 boys in Chicago, burying them under his house and in his yard;
- Patrick Kearney accounted for 32, cutting his victims into small pieces after sex and leaving them in trash bags along the Los Angeles freeways;
- Bruce Davis molested and killed 27 young men and boys in Illinois;
- A gay sex-murder-torture ring (Corll-Henley-Brooks) sent 27 Texas men and boys to their grave; and
- Juan Corona was convicted of murdering 25 migrant workers (he "made love" with their corpses).<sup>55</sup>

Humanist "love" is just selfish lust; it is hatred feigning to be love. And if a person rejects what God says about sex, then it is logical for that person to also reject what God says about human life.

### **AB 394**

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger also signed a second pro-sodomy bill into law.

The second sexual indoctrination bill that Schwarzenegger signed, AB 394, will promote transsexuality, bisexuality, and homosexuality to students, parents, and teachers through school training programs against 'harassment' and 'discrimination.'"

Moralists can read between the bold lines on that second bill. It means that those who express the biblical position on homosexuality could face lawsuits.<sup>56</sup> [Underline emphasis added.]

<sup>53</sup> Gerry Wambolt, "Family Left Lexington School System Over Homosexuality in David Parker's Elementary School" (2005), MassResistance.

<sup>54</sup> "GAYS ASSAULT EX-GAYS AT COUNTY FAIR," *Venus Magazine*, 1928 August 2007, <http://venusmagazine.org/Gay%20Assault%20PFOX.html>.

<sup>55</sup> Paul Cameron, "Violence and Homosexuality," *Family Research Institute* (2006), <http://www.familyresearchinst.org/Default.aspx?tabid=74>.

<sup>56</sup> Grant Swank, "CA Schools: Pull Christian Kids Out," *The Conservative Voice*, 2007, 22 October 2007, <http://www.theconservativevoice.com/article/28694.html>.

Of course students, parents, and teachers will have to be taught what sodomy is in order to not discriminate against it. Parents should note that if they are going to have to attend school training programs against harassment and discrimination, this is going to force them to waste time in a very unpleasant way. Consider how much more unpleasant it will be for their children to be under the authority of sodomite teachers as they teach them sodomy. The pressure and intimidation on your children and their classmates to do wrong to please the teacher and be like their friends will be immense. Many children won't be unable to resist it.

### *Christians Reactions To SB 777 and AB 394*

There are basically two reactions to the passage of these two pro-sodomy laws from the Christians in California: some are calling for a referendum, and others are urging parents to immediately pull their children from public schools. Both of these actions are absolutely essential. For the reason explained in the section above this one, parents who have their children in private schools or are home schooling them, ***are also put at risk by this law, and must help defeat it.***

#### **The Call For a Referendum**

According to the Save Our Kids web site ([saveourkids.net](http://saveourkids.net)), which is a web site of Capitol Resource Family Impact (CRFI), they have "filed a referendum to prevent the implementation of SB 777. CRFI is calling on every concerned citizen to join them in this huge undertaking." They add that,

The Attorney General has given us clearance to begin collecting signatures. Petitions have been printed and are being distributed throughout the state. If you have already signed up to receive petitions, they should arrive in the mail shortly.<sup>57</sup>  
This is a very expensive and labor intensive undertaking. CRFI explains:

Here is a brief summary of why we cannot post the petitions on our web site:

- The petitions are 17 x 14 and are 4 fold, like a booklet. Most citizens do not have printers that can print 17 x 14 paper.
- Because this is a referendum (not an initiative), we must include the entire text of SB 777. The bill is over 30 pages long, thus making the referendum petition very long.
- Many of the local county election offices, where referendum petitions are turned in, would reject petitions not in the specific print layout. We cannot risk invalidating thousands of vital signatures because the petitions were not printed properly or printed on separate pages and stapled together.
- We have consulted with both our attorneys and consultants and they are all in agreement that we must not put them online. These are the same very experienced consultants that conducted the Save Our License initiative and were very involved in the Davis recall effort.
- Because most people cannot print the petitions and we cannot staple them (they must be in a booklet format), we are forced to print the petitions ourselves and then distribute them.<sup>58</sup>

So the referendum process has been made very hard and expensive—obviously to try to discourage it from happening. The will of the people doesn't matter to whoever made such rules. Getting their own way is all that matters.

Also, what about AB 394? Sadly, it appears that there is not enough money and manpower to stop both bills.

UPDATE: according to the sodomite website [Advocate.com](http://Advocate.com),

The Student Civil Rights Act, which went into effect on January 1, prohibits in publicly funded schools and activities discrimination that is based on religion, race, disability, gender, or sexual orientation. Opponents, led by the Alliance Defense Fund and Advocates for Faith and Freedom, were able to garner just 350,000 signatures, far fewer than the necessary 433,000 to qualify for a June referendum.<sup>59</sup>  
So Californians have lost their freedom of speech, and California children have been placed in great danger.

<sup>57</sup> "Help Us Repeal SB 777 to Protect Our Kids," *MassResistance* (2007), <http://www.saveourkids.net/>.

<sup>58</sup> "Update on Petitions," *MassResistance* (2007),

[http://www.saveourkids.net/news.html?news\\_id=13&start=0&category\\_id=1&parent\\_id=1&arcyear=&arcmonth=](http://www.saveourkids.net/news.html?news_id=13&start=0&category_id=1&parent_id=1&arcyear=&arcmonth=)

<sup>59</sup> "Petition Against Students' Rights Falls Short," *Advocate.Com*, 1915 January 2008, [http://www.advocate.com/news\\_detail\\_ektid51608.asp](http://www.advocate.com/news_detail_ektid51608.asp).



### **The Call For an Exodus**

The second reaction to these two pro-sodomy bills being signed into law is a call for Christians to pull their children from public schools to either place them in private schools or home school them. Actually, if Christian parents truly love their children they have no choice but to do this—anything less is child abuse.

Christians in California are outraged that their **children in public schools will be indoctrinated pro-homosexuality in all its aspects. Therefore, believers are urged to pull their students immediately out of all public schools for home schooling or private schools...**

CRI's legislative liaison Meredith Turney said: "SB 777 will result in reverse discrimination against students with religious and traditional family values. These students have lost their voice as the direct result of Gov. Schwarzenegger's unbelievable decision. The terms 'mom and dad' or 'husband and wife' could promote discrimination against homosexuals if a same-sex couple is not also featured."

"Parents want the assurance that when their children go to school they will learn the fundamentals of reading, writing and arithmetic – not social indoctrination regarding alternative sexual lifestyles. Now that SB 777 is law, schools will in fact become indoctrination centers for sexual experimentation," she said per WorldNetDaily.com's Bob Unruh.

WorldNetDaily reports: "Ray Moore, a spokesman for Exodus Mandate, which advocates Christians give up on public schools and either school their children at home or send them to Christian schools, agreed with Thomasson, and went further. **"This really is a call to conservative and Christian pro-family groups to give up this absurd idea of public school reform," he told WND. 'It can't be done. The longer they talk about saving public schools, the longer they prolong this agony, when they could be setting up new schools.'**"

Christians must act as a united block—and quickly. There is no time to lose. There is no Christian who can absent himself from the cause.<sup>60</sup> [Emphasis added.]

Moore is totally correct. Many (perhaps most) public school teachers are humanists, and they believe sodomy is a righteous lifestyle. Such teachers are not fit to teach children. Stopping these two bills from taking effect will not change the beliefs of those teachers. A complete change of teachers and administrators is essential.

### **The Call For Abolishment**

The above two reactions are vital, but they are not enough. They are defensive measures only, and will not solve the problem. They buy a little time, but leave parents in financial straits. Parents will be forced to pay for both the teaching of truth to their own children, and the teaching of lies and immorality to other people's children. That is religious oppression. The parasite cancer of humanist socialism will continue to eat the flesh of the United States of America, sapping her vitality and dragging her ever closer to death. **The best defense now is an all-out offense.**

The public school system is based on socialism, and that cannot be fixed except by abandoning the public school system altogether. Socialism is stealing—sin. Sin cannot be reformed, but must be forsaken. Get away from it, and never return to it. The cancer of socialism can only thrive on a free-enterprise host, and then only until it has killed that host. Only major surgery can save the U.S.A.: **THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM MUST BE ABOLISHED. Mark this well, most people will be very hard pressed to send their children to private schools while at the same time being heavily taxed to support public schools. Go all the way to deliver them from such tyranny by abolishing the public school system or else all other efforts will be in vain.**

One major obstacle must be recognized and overcome. Most parents know the Public Schools are a horrible mess, but they have been taught to have faith in government instead of in God. They cannot imagine private education being financially possible for them. Churches across America must teach these people to have faith in God, instead of in Uncle Sam. Evangelism is essential; every person in the United States must be reached with the gospel!

<sup>60</sup> Swank, "CA Schools: Pull Christian Kids Out."

**Gomorrah, U.S.A.**

So far in this chapter we have discussed only the state of California. But in 2006 the Sodomy Party won, and now the sodomy party has begun at the federal level of government. Every person in the U.S.A. is directly effected.

On September 27, 2007, Rep. Barney Frank, one of two openly homosexual members of Congress, introduced H.R. 3685, also called the Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 2007.<sup>61</sup> By November 8, 2007 this bill had been through all the required steps, and was passed by a vote of 235-184 in the House of Representatives, and was sent to the Senate, where Massachusetts Democrat Edward Kennedy plans to introduce a similar bill.<sup>62</sup> H.R. 3685 is “the first federal ban on job discrimination against gays, lesbians and bisexuals.”<sup>63</sup> The Library of Congress Thomas summary of the bill begins as follows:

Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 2007 - (Sec. 4) Makes it an unlawful employment practice for covered entities (employers, employment agencies, labor organizations, or joint labor-management committees) to discriminate against an individual on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation, including actions based on the actual or perceived sexual orientation of a person with whom the individual associates or has associated. Prohibits preferential treatment or quotas. Allows only disparate treatment claims.

(Sec. 5) Makes it an unlawful employment practice to discriminate against an individual because the individual opposed any practice made an unlawful employment practice by this Act or made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this Act.

(Sec. 6) Makes this Act inapplicable to a corporation, association, educational institution, or society that is exempt from religious discrimination provisions under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(Sec. 7) Makes this Act inapplicable to the relationship between the United States and members of the Armed Forces, including the Coast Guard. Declares that this Act does not repeal or modify any federal, state, territorial, or local law creating a special right or preference concerning employment for a veteran.<sup>64</sup>

At first glance this bill doesn't seem so bad. It doesn't apply to religious institutions or the military. Of course, because those are the two groups most likely to oppose the bill; humanists are willing to get what they want one step at a time. For now, H.R. 3685 only applies to “employers, employment agencies, labor organizations, or joint labor-management committees.” For most people, since it doesn't apply to them personally they will not worry about it. But there is a problem with that kind of thinking.

*Who Is an Employer?*

Suppose you need someone to babysit your three year old son. Guess what? If you hire a baby sitter, that makes you an employer! So, let's say, two strange sodomite men dismount their Harley in front of your house in answer to your ad. One is wearing an earring, a tongue stud, multiple bead necklaces, a see-through lace blouse unbuttoned half way down his hairy chest, and skin tight pants which reveal a high state of arousal. The other is wearing long, permed, bleached blond hair, make up, painted fingernails, a low-cut blouse, a mini-skirt, and high heel shoes. They hug, paw, and lip kiss during the interview. Watching two men lip kiss is sickening. They ogle your son, and stress how much they “love” little boys. When you tell them you were expecting for a girl to apply for the job, they frown angrily, and inform you of their rights under the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.

You are now in a serious dilemma. You have a gut feeling that you would be a stupid fool to risk your three year old son with these people. But if you refuse to hire one of them based upon “actual or perceived sexual orientation,” you face being charged with a federal crime, having to pay a huge fine, doing time in a federal prison, and having a criminal record for the rest of your life. **Who do you sacrifice on the altar of political correctness to the insane humanist religion? You or your son?**

<sup>61</sup> <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:h.r.03685:>

<sup>62</sup> Andrew Miga, “House Passes Job Bias Ban Against Gays,” *MyWay*, 2007 November 2007, [Http://apnews.myway.com/article/20071107/D8SP50200.html](http://apnews.myway.com/article/20071107/D8SP50200.html).

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> “Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 2007,” *Library of Congress Thomas*, 2007 November 2007, [Http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:HR03685:@@D&summ2=m&](http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:HR03685:@@D&summ2=m&).

### UPDATE

At least one commentator has reported that H.R. 3685 has been defeated. That is incorrect. As of Jan. 24, 2008, the bill is still very much alive. According to the Library of Congress Thomas website, the latest action on the bill occurred “11/13/2007: Read the second time. Placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders. Calendar No. 479.” However, even if the bill were defeated, it would not change the danger posed by a humanist being elected as president, because this bill has already been introduced 14 times. Humanists are simply never going to take “no you may not sodomize” for an answer. They intend to keep introducing this bill until it becomes law.

A pro-sodomy bill similar to the ones recently passed in California was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by Linda T. Sanchez of California July 23, 2007. It is bill number H.R. 3132, and has been given the title Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2007. And there are many others. Go to <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/thomas> and type in “gender” or “sexual orientation” and see how many bills come up. You will—are at least should be—greatly alarmed.

### Conclusions

Several important lessons need to be learned from this chapter.

#### *Compromise With Wickedness Brings Defeat*

Sodomites are driven by insatiable wanton lust. Concessions from godly people never satisfy them, but rather provoke them to demand more. They don't want equality—**THEY WANT SUPERIORITY AND OUR CHILDREN**. The only way they can multiply is by seducing the children of heterosexuals. And the fact that their movement is growing by leaps and bounds proves that they are excellent seducers. They view each compromise we make as another step toward producing more sex objects.

Protections for transgender workers were in the original [Employment Non-Discrimination Act of 2007] bill. But Democratic leaders found they would lose support from moderate and conservative Democrats by including transgender employees in the final bill.

"That's a bridge too far," said Rep. Rick Boucher, D-Va. "It's better to take it one step at a time."<sup>65</sup>

So, don't be deluded into thinking that this is the last step of their demands; it is just the beginning. Their goal is to totally silence us as they seduce or coerce as many of our children as possible into being their sex partners.

#### *Fake Tolerance Is Intolerance*

Humanists love the word “tolerance,” that is, when it applies to others being tolerant of their wicked acts. They, however, are totally intolerant of any opinions contrary to their own. They are especially intolerant of God's opinion as voiced in the Bible. As in just about every realm of life, humanists are hypocrites in their use of “tolerance.” Another example of an intolerant group demanding tolerance, but giving no tolerance in return was pointed out by Michael Bresciani in an article for *The Conservative Voice*:

Tolerance is a word that is sailing around at the speed of stupidity. The confusion it creates is apparent when Islamic groups like CAIR go about pointing out every perceived insult to Islam in America even as America and the rest of the world are not afforded a speck of tolerance in return, in fact the doctrine and ideology of Islam forbids it. A cartoon, a negative statement about Muhammad or refusal to convert to Islam can result in death. Yet there are Americans who also watch for any and all possible intolerant language as it pertains to Islam. Double standards notwithstanding; this is the stupidity connected to the word “tolerance” that betrays its obvious lack of wisdom and social importance.<sup>66</sup>

And who are those “Americans” who watch for any and all possible intolerant language as it pertains to Islam? The humanists, of course. Liberal, humanist, Democrats always take the side of America's enemies.

<sup>65</sup> Miga, “House Passes Job Bias Ban Against Gays.”

<sup>66</sup> Michael Bresciani, “California Passes SB 777 - Here Come the Language Police,” *The Conservative Voice*, 1918 October 2007, <http://www.theconservativevoice.com/article/28720.html>.


But you will be looking a long time trying to find any tolerance from them for Bible-believing Christians. Humanists are bigots with great hatred of Christianity.

### *Fiscal Republicans Are Democrats*

Liberal Republicans generally claim to be fiscal conservatives, meaning that they are not conservatives on the more important social issues like abortion and homosexuality.

### **Arnold Schwarzenegger**

Arnold Schwarzenegger is an example of this type Republican. Telegraph.co.uk recently named him the 8th most influential “liberal” in the U.S.A., right after Michael Moore! The Republicans of California chose him to represent them because they thought that since he was running on the Republican ticket he must be a conservative. Or perhaps they supported him because they felt he had the best chance of winning—which is not wise. Why not pick a true conservative and help him win; rather than a liberal who will oppose you once he wins. They ignored his marriage to Maria Shriver of the radically liberal Kennedy clan. They also ignored the Drudge Report headline article on Tuesday September 23, 2003, exposing the fact that Schwarzenegger posed in the nude for Robert Mapplethorpe, a man notorious for photographing “men engaging in homosexual acts.”<sup>67</sup> Now they feel betrayed.



### **Mitt Romney**

Mitt Romney, former governor of Massachusetts, has been portraying himself as a Reagan conservative, but his record reveals a very liberal/humanist position instead.

#### *Mitt Romney's Record in Massachusetts*

MassResistance, also of Massachusetts, has a long extensively documented article about Romney on their web site. The article is written by Brian Camenker, and is titled “The Mitt Romney Deception” and details his long history of supporting the radical liberal, humanist, sodomite agenda. Says Camenker:

Romney was probably the most pro-abortion and pro-gay rights Republican official in the nation for the last decade. The idea that he has suddenly become a conservative after a decade of liberal actions and statements would be merely amusing were it not for the fact that he's running for the presidency and that many conservatives are falling for this act...Romney has supported abortion since before the 1972 Roe v. Wade ruling!<sup>68</sup>

Camenker lists the following facts about Romney. (1) Romney campaigned for Governor of Massachusetts as a pro-choice candidate, and was endorsed by the New York-based Republican Pro-Choice Coalition; (2) Romney supported some embryonic stem cell research; (3) Romney approved of the abortion pill and

<sup>67</sup> Matt Drudge, “CAMPAIGN CHASES EROTIC MAPPLETHORPE NUDE PHOTOS OF SCHWARZENEGGER,” *Drudge Report*, 1923 September 2003, [http://www.drudgereportarchives.com/data/2003/09/24/20030924\\_204603\\_arnold.htm](http://www.drudgereportarchives.com/data/2003/09/24/20030924_204603_arnold.htm).

<sup>68</sup> Brian Camenker, “The Mitt Romney Deception,” *MassResistance*, 1920 November 2006, <http://www.massresistance.org/docs/marriage/romney/record/index.html>.

supported legalization of RU-486; (4) Romney signed a proclamation to celebrate the anniversary of Baird v. Eisenstadt, a 1972 court ruling legalizing birth control for *unmarried* people; (5) Romney twice sought and received the endorsement of the homosexual Log Cabin Republican Club; (6) Romney's campaign distributed bright pink flyers during Boston's Gay Pride that declared 'Mitt and Kerry [running mate Kerry Healey] wish you a great Pride weekend! All citizens deserve equal rights, regardless of their sexual preference.' (7) Romney supported the Federal Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA), a pro-gay bill; (8) Romney advocated homosexual couples' right to bear or adopt children; (9) Romney promised to "support and endorse efforts to provide domestic partnership benefits to gay and lesbian couples"; (10) Romney supported and promoted legalizing homosexual civil unions; (11) Romney opposed the Boy Scouts' Ban on Homosexual Scoutmasters; (12) Romney barred Boy Scouts from public participation in the 2002 Olympics; (13) Romney appointed prominent homosexual activists to key positions in his administration; (14) Romney appointed prominent homosexual activists and Democrats as judges—he passed over GOP lawyers for three-quarters of the 36 judicial vacancies he filled, instead choosing registered Democrats or independents -- including two gay lawyers who have supported expanded same-sex rights; (15) Romney "nominated Stephen Abany to a District Court. Abany has been a key player in the Massachusetts Lesbian and Gay Bar Association which, in its own words, is 'dedicated to ensuring that the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court decision on marriage equality is upheld, and that any anti-gay amendment or legislation is defeated'"; (16) during his final days as governor, Romney bucked tradition by not appointing any new judges, but instead left it to his liberal Democrat replacement to appoint them; (17) Romney's Commission on Gay and Lesbian Youth used huge taxpayer funding to promote homosexuality in the public schools; (18) Romney issued a proclamation celebrating gay "Youth Pride Day"; (19) under Romney's leadership, the Massachusetts Department of Education continued to be rabidly pro-homosexual. The Department's web site is full of "How To" information for homosexual activists within the public schools.; (20) Romney's Department of Public Health contributed to the *The Little Black Book: Queer in the 21st Century*.... Distributed to middle-school and high-school students at a GLSEN [Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network] conference at Brookline High School, it discussed highly dangerous homosexual practices such as fisting and what homosexuals call "water sports." ... here's one quote: "There is little risk of STD infection and no risk of HIV infection from playing with pee"; (21) Romney opposed federal legislation that would stop public schools from promoting homosexuality; (22) The Massachusetts Department of Social Services, run by the Romney administration, honored a homosexual "married" couple (two men) as their adoptive "Parents of the Year" for 2006; (23) Romney refused to endorse the original 2002 Mass. constitutional amendment absolutely defining marriage as one man and one women; (24) After the Massachusetts Supreme Court ruling that same-sex "marriages" were protected by the Massachusetts Constitution, Romney issued altered marriage licenses and ordered town clerks to issue the licenses and Justices of the Peace to perform same-sex marriages when requested, or be fired; (25) Romney favored "Assault" Weapons Ban; (26) Romney supported minimum wage laws; (27) Romney imposed "socialized" health care on Massachusetts.

"David Parker's dilemma ... threatens the parental rights and religious freedom of every Massachusetts parent, and indirectly every parent in America," said John Haskins of the Parents' Rights Coalition.

"As the Lexington schools themselves are arguing, the state's right to force pro-homosexuality indoctrination on other people's children arises directly from former Gov. Mitt Romney's nakedly false and unconstitutional declaration that homosexual marriage is now legal."

Haskins said when the Massachusetts state Supreme Court demanded homosexual marriages in the state, it didn't have the constitutional or legal authority to order the governor to act or to order the Legislature to make any changes, and the creation of same-sex marriages in Massachusetts actually was accomplished by executive order from Romney.<sup>69</sup>

After all this radical humanist activity, Romney is now trying to convince American conservatives that he is a social conservative.<sup>70</sup> That is downright dishonest. Spend a few hours browsing the [www.massresistance.org](http://www.massresistance.org) website. You will be stunned.

<sup>69</sup> Unruh, "Judge Orders 'gay' Agenda Taught to Christian Children."

<sup>70</sup> Camenker, "The Mitt Romney Deception."

*Mitt Romney's "Faith In America" Speech*

On December the 6th 2007, Romney gave a speech to try to convince the American people to overlook his Mormon religion and elect him as president. He correctly addressed a topic "fundamental to America's greatness: our religious liberty." Later Romney almost identifies America's greatest violation of religious freedom. He said,

We separate church and state affairs in this country, and for good reason. No religion should dictate to the state nor should the state interfere with the free practice of religion. But in recent years, the notion of the separation of church and state has been taken by some well beyond its original meaning. They seek to remove from the public domain any acknowledgment of God. Religion is seen as merely a private affair with no place in public life. It is as if they are intent on establishing a new religion in America — the religion of secularism. They are wrong.

But actually Romney, himself, is wrong. It is not "as if" atheistic Humanists are "intent on establishing a new religion in America"; they have already done so, as I am sure Romney very well knows. The secular (meaning "leaving God out") religion of Humanism is America's established state church, and with its "hate crimes" bills threatens to deny freedom of speech to all who disagree with them. Other religious teachings are banned. Romney backed those "hate crimes" bills while he was governor.

While most churches have their Sunday Schools, the Humanist church has its Monday through Friday public schools, brainwashing our children in their sodomite, atheist religion five days a week, and Romney has fully supported this. Romney has shown himself to be of that "new" humanist religion in practice if not profession. What he has done in the very recent past speaks so loud that what he says now has no credit. It is impossible not to believe that his sudden professed change from a radically liberal humanist to a social conservative is for political gain only—to get the vote of the religion right—, and is therefore not genuine. He speaks of "the breakdown of the family," as though he thinks we have totally forgotten that it was his executive order started same-sex marriage in Massachusetts. No Republican has done more to hurt the traditional family than Romney.

**IMPORTANT UPDATE:** On Dec. 17, 2007, on NBC's Meet the Press, Mitt Romney reaffirmed his support for the pro-sodomy Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA). Romney used these same non-discrimination laws as the basis for legalizing gay marriage in Massachusetts. In trying to get the Christian vote he claimed to have changed his position to opposing ENDA, BUT NOW HE REVEALS THAT HE OPPOSES IT ONLY ON THE FEDERAL LEVEL; ON THE STATE LEVEL HE STILL SUPPORTS IT!<sup>71</sup>

**Rudy Giuliani**

Rudy Giuliani is another liberal, humanist Democrat running as a Republican. He advocated "passage of the Clinton semi-auto ban and supported passage of federal gun-owner licensing. As gun owners know, he also championed lawsuits to hold legal firearms manufacturers responsible for criminals who use firearms to commit violent crime."<sup>72</sup> Giuliani is also openly pro-abortion. Concerning homosexual issues, Giuliani has been photographed in drag. Do a web search on "Rudy Giuliani dressed in drag," and watch the videos. Can you imagine how embarrassing and disgusting it would be to have your president giving speeches dressed as a woman?! What more does one need to know about him? It would be better to not vote at all than to vote for such a man. He is, however, at least honest about his pro abortion and pro sodomy stand, while Romney lies about it.

**John McCain**

The OnTheIssues website lists John McCain as a "Populist-Leaning Conservative." But he is conservative only on fiscal issues. On social issues he is liberal humanist. In fact, he flip flops so much on so many issues, that it is hard to know if he actually has a stand other than whatever stand will get votes at the moment.

<sup>71</sup> <http://race42008.com/2007/12/31/mitt-romney-flip-flop-or-slip-on-enda/#comment-217049>

<sup>72</sup> Frank Miniter, "Presidential Candidates Ask for NRA Support," *National Rifle Association Website* (2007), <http://www.nrapublications.org/celebration/default.asp>.

McCain has long been the favorite Republican of the liberal press because he often takes very liberal positions, thus helping the Democrats pass bills. The ultra-liberal New York Times newspaper recently endorse McCain, so that shows what camp he is actually in..

#### *McCain on Freedom of Speech*

McCain is very weak on defence of First Amendment rights.

Arizona Senator John McCain has been widely criticized for fighting for and passing the McCain-Feingold Campaign Reform Act of 2002, a law that prohibits organizations, such as the NRA, from running issue ads that name a federal candidate within 30 days of a primary or caucus or 60 days of a general election. The NRA was in the forefront in its opposition to the law's free-speech ban.<sup>73</sup>

How can banning people from exposing the truth about dishonest, corrupt candidates be considered "campaign finance reform"? This reveals a disregard for the First Amendment. Disregard for the First Amendment is the number one problem we face in the USA.

#### *McCain on Abortion*

Judging from statements on McCain website, I was convinced that he took a strong pro-life stand. But further research shows that that is not the case. He supports federal funding of embryonic stem cell research. He says that he has "come to the conclusion that the exceptions for rape, incest, and the life of the mother are legitimate exceptions" to an outright ban on abortions."<sup>74</sup> McCain said in 1999, "I'd love to see a point where Roe vs. Wade is irrelevant, and could be repealed because abortion is no longer necessary. But certainly in the short term, or even the long term, I would not support repeal of Roe vs. Wade, which would then force women in America to [undergo] illegal and dangerous operations."<sup>75</sup>

KEYES [to McCain]: What you would say if your daughter was ever in a position where she might need an abortion? You answered [earlier today] that the choice would be up to her and then that you'd have a family conference. That displayed a profound lack of understanding of the basic issue of principle involved in abortion. After all, if your daughter said she was contemplating killing her grandmother for the inheritance, you wouldn't say, "Let's have a family conference." You'd look at her and say "Just Say No," because that is morally wrong. It is God's choice that that child is in the womb. And for us to usurp that choice in contradiction of our declaration of principles is just as wrong.

McCain: I am proud of my pro-life record in public life, and I will continue to maintain it. I will not draw my children into this discussion. As a leader of a pro-life party with a pro-life position, I will persuade young Americans [to] understand the importance of the preservation of the rights of the unborn.

Note that McCain did not agree with Keyes, but instead gave a non-answer answer. He has no real conviction against abortion.

So, as president, McCain would not do anything to stop abortion, but instead would say that it was not his responsibility as he passed the issue off to the states.

#### *McCain on Gay Marriage*

July 13, 2004, saying that a ban on same-sex marriage would be "unRepublican," McCain voted against the very badly needed Federal Marriage Amendment which would have banned gay-marriage by defining marriage in the United States as a union of one man and one woman.<sup>76</sup> In explaining why he voted against it he said, "It would prevent States, many of which are grappling with the definition of marriage, from deciding that gays and lesbians should be allowed to marry."<sup>77</sup> To which I answer, Of course! That is exactly what needs to be done. In August of 2005 he supported the Arizona initiative to ban gay marriage,<sup>78</sup> which he

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> [http://www.ontheissues.org/2008/John\\_McCain\\_Abortion.htm](http://www.ontheissues.org/2008/John_McCain_Abortion.htm)

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> John McCain, "MCCAIN STATEMENT ON THE FEDERAL MARRIAGE AMENDMENT," *Senate Website*, 1913 July 2004, [http://mccain.senate.gov/press\\_office/view\\_article.cfm?ID=246](http://mccain.senate.gov/press_office/view_article.cfm?ID=246).

<sup>77</sup> [http://www.ontheissues.org/2008/John\\_McCain\\_Civil\\_Rights.htm](http://www.ontheissues.org/2008/John_McCain_Civil_Rights.htm)

<sup>78</sup> Elvia Diaz, "Gay-Marriage Ban Initiative Wins Support from McCain," *The Arizona Republic*, 1926 August 2005, <http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/0826initiatives26.html>.

probably knew was going to fail anyway, but gave him a bragging point when addressing conservatives. He can be both for and against same-sex marriage, depending on the audience. McCain said in an interview with Reuters that he would be “comfortable with a homosexual as president of the United States.”<sup>79</sup> On this issue—one of the most important issues facing the next president—McCain is liberal humanist.

#### *McCain on Illegal Immigration*

McCain has also taken a very dangerous position on immigration. He fought very hard for passage of Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2007 (S. 1348), which would have given legal status and a path to citizenship for approximately 12 million people presently living in the United States illegally. He said, “In the short term, [a hard line on immigration] probably galvanizes our base. In the long term, if you alienate the Hispanics, you’ll pay a heavy price.”<sup>80</sup> Perhaps, but you still have to do what is right. Our soldiers may pay a heavy price for defending our liberties. But they are willing to take that risk because their love for our country overrides their love of self.

One of McCain’s former aides is reported to have said, “Yes, he’s a social conservative, but his heart isn’t in this stuff, but he has to pretend [that it is], and he’s not a good enough actor to pull it off. He just can’t fake it well enough.”<sup>81</sup> That is the most dangerous kind of “conservative,” because you never know when he will betray what is right in exchange for votes.

#### *McCain on Evolution*

Q: Do you believe in evolution?

McCain: Yes.<sup>82</sup>

### **Ron Paul**

The OnTheIssues website lists Ron Paul as a “Moderate Libertarian.” Ron Paul seems to take a social conservative stand on many issues. Upon a first reading, what he says sounds great, but much of what he says breaks down under critical examination, and he is seen voting like a Democrat. He has what I call a live and let sin philosophy.

#### *Ron Paul On Abortion*

Ron Paul says he is against abortion, but examine carefully the context of what he says:

In Congress, I have authored legislation that seeks to define life as beginning at conception, HR 1094.

I am also the prime sponsor of HR 300, which would negate the effect of Roe v Wade by removing the ability of federal courts to interfere with state legislation to protect life. This is a practical, direct approach to ending federal court tyranny which threatens our constitutional republic and has caused the deaths of 45 million of the unborn.<sup>83</sup>

So, while on the one hand he says he is against abortion, on the other hand, he wants to let each individual state decide to allow it or ban it. So, as president, he would not work to solve this problem, but would simply push it off on the governors. Now, I am very strong on states rights myself, but ***abortion is NOT a state issue. “Life” has been declared to be a federal issue by section 1 of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution*** which was passed by Congress June 13, 1866, and was ratified July 9, 1868. Here is what it says:

<sup>79</sup> [http://www.ontheissues.org/2008/John\\_McCain\\_Civil\\_Rights.htm](http://www.ontheissues.org/2008/John_McCain_Civil_Rights.htm)

<sup>80</sup> Steve Benen, “McCain ‘Trying to Square the Circle,’” *The Carpetbagger Report*, 2003 January 2007, [Http://www.thecarpetbaggerreport.com/archives/9509.html](http://www.thecarpetbaggerreport.com/archives/9509.html).

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

<sup>82</sup> [http://www.ontheissues.org/2008/John\\_McCain\\_Education.htm](http://www.ontheissues.org/2008/John_McCain_Education.htm)

<sup>83</sup> Ron Paul, “Life and Liberty,” *Ron Paul 2008* (2007), [Http://www.ronpaul2008.com/issues/life-and-liberty/](http://www.ronpaul2008.com/issues/life-and-liberty/).



All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.<sup>84</sup>

So, obviously, no state has authority to pass a law that deprives a person of life. Abortion deprives persons of life! In no way did humanist judges have the authority to supersede the Constitution with *Roe v. Wade*.

Do you see the word “privacy” in those Constitution words? No. There is nothing there about a “right to privacy.” What is protected is LIFE. The “right to privacy” idea did not come from the Constitution, but from the depraved humanist “ethics” of a few unjust judges, who called evil good.

*Roe v. Wade* is an illegal ruling. And we need a president with enough guts to honor and enforce the Constitution by prosecuting the abortionists who are violating the laws contained in the Constitution itself. Abortion is a federal felony. What if a state decided to legalize euthanasia of elderly parents? Let’s say that Idaho made it legal in Idaho for anyone to murder anyone over the age of sixty, but the other states voted for murder to be illegal in their states. A person in Oklahoma could then take his mother to Idaho on her sixtieth birthday, and legally murder her without receiving any punishment. A person from Idaho visiting his mother in Oklahoma, however, would be in grave trouble if he murdered his mother there.

Now, back to babies. If just one state allows the murder of unborn babies, then the women from all the other states could go there to legally murder their babies. How would Paul’s HR 300 and states rights stand help stop the murders? Ron Paul’s claim that he “never votes for legislation unless the proposed measure is expressly authorized by the Constitution” doesn’t seem to mean that he honors the Constitution when abortion is concerned.

#### *Ron Paul On Sodomite Rights*

The American View interviewed Ron Paul and asked him,

Is homosexuality a sin? Paul says he’s “not as judgmental about that probably because of my medical background. I don’t see it in [such] simplistic terms. I think it’s a complex issue to think it’s a sin or other problems with the way people are born. It’s too complex to give an answer as simple as that [that homosexuality is a sin.]”

Does he believe God says homosexuality is a sin? “Well, I believe a lot of people understand it that way but I think everybody is God’s child, too, so, you know, I have trouble with that.”<sup>85</sup>

So, Ron Paul has trouble accepting what the Bible says about sodomy being a sin. He doesn’t think homosexuality is sin. He thinks that people are “born” that way. Wow! Just examining his web site one would expect the opposite.

A web search found this conversation on the web site of a homosexual named Brian:

Dear Ron Paul,

As a gay man, I would really like to see you take a strong stance on gay rights as you have done with the war and immigration. I read that you are a libertarian and when I googled that term this is what I found:

Libertarianism is a political philosophy maintaining that all persons are the absolute owners of their own lives, and should be free to do whatever they wish with their persons or property, provided they allow others the same liberty and avoid abusing their liberty.

How can you NOT support gay rights and equality if you truly believe the above statement?

Sincerely,  
Brian

#### **Response from campaign:**

Dr. Paul voted against the Federal Marriage Amendment, one of only a few Republicans to do so.

<sup>84</sup> “The Constitution: Amendments 11–27,” *Archives.Gov*, [http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/constitution\\_amendments\\_11–27.html](http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/constitution_amendments_11–27.html).

<sup>85</sup> John Lofton, “Excerpts From Our Exclusive Ron Paul Interview,” *The American View* (2007), <http://theamericanview.com/index.php?id=916&PHPSESSID=4d627613baced8c2c91c6ff2b6bc2f25>.

Thanks for contacting us,  
 [name removed]  
 Ron Paul 2008<sup>86</sup>

This seems to be implying that Ron Paul is for gay rights. I sent an e-mail to the Ron Paul campaign asking for clarification on this issue. They answered:

In a recent interview, Dr. Paul had this to say on the issue of gay rights: "I don't see rights as gay rights, women's rights, minority rights. I see only one kind of rights: the individual's. The individual has a right to their life and their liberty, and everyone should be treated equally." This is just riding the fence, trying to get voters from both sides. The issue is not whether gays have the same rights as other individuals, but rather do any individuals have the right to commit sodomy, and do individuals committing sodomy have a right no other sinners have, that is, the right to be protected by the government from criticism of their wicked behavior. Rapists are individuals also; do they have such a right? No. Robbers are individuals also. Do they have such a right? No. Murderers are individuals also, do they have such a right? No.

Sodomy is a major issue facing the next president. Ron Paul either hasn't thought this issue out well (in which case he should not be president), or else he is on the sodomite's side (in which case he should not be president).

#### *Ron Paul On Same-Sex Marriage*

On this issue Paul again takes a stand that amounts to no stand. He says,

Mr. Speaker, while I oppose federal efforts to redefine marriage as something other than a union between one man and one woman, I do not believe a constitutional amendment is either a necessary or proper way to defend marriage. . . .

If I were in Congress in 1996, I would have voted for the Defense of Marriage Act, which used Congress's constitutional authority to define what official state documents other states have to recognize under the Full Faith and Credit Clause, to ensure that no state would be forced to recognize a "same sex" marriage license issued in another state. This Congress, I was an original cosponsor of the Marriage Protection Act, HR 3313, that removes challenges to the Defense of Marriage Act from federal courts' jurisdiction. If I were a member of the Texas legislature, I would do all I could to oppose any attempt by rogue judges to impose a new definition of marriage on the people of my state.<sup>87</sup>

In other words, he believes that this is an issue that should be decided by the States. As president, he would do nothing about this problem, except pass it off to the governors. That is wrong! Non-moral issues are decided by the states, but moral issues must be decided at the federal level. Sodomy is a very basic moral problem like murder or rape or slavery. States cannot be allowed to say that rape, or murder, or slavery, or sodomy is legal.

#### *Ron Paul On Prostitution*

A brothel owner near Carson City, Nevada has endorsed Ron Paul! OK, so what does the Ron Paul campaign people say about that?

A spokesman for Paul says the politician with a libertarian streak doesn't condone prostitution on a personal level. But, he says, "it's not the role of federal government and it's not in the constitution for federal government to regulate these things."<sup>88</sup>

Is that all you are going to say, Ron Paul? What kind of leadership are you showing here? Immorality is this country's biggest problem right now. It is destroying America. Don't you think you should at least issue a strong condemnation? Who can conscientiously vote for a person endorsed by a brothel owner?

#### *Ron Paul On Israel*

Ron Paul says that his foreign policy would be good for Israel. But Muslims and other Jew-hating groups think otherwise. Here is what one Muslim web site (MuslimsVoteRonPaul.com) has to say:

<sup>86</sup> Brian, "My Correspondence With Ron Paul About Gay Rights," *In Repair*, 1931 May 2007, <http://inrepair.net/2007/05/31/my-correspondence-with-ron-paul-about-gay-rights/>.

<sup>87</sup> Ron Paul, "The Federal Marriage Amendment Is a Very Bad Idea," *LewisRockwell.Com*, 2001 October 2004, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/paul/paul207.html>.

<sup>88</sup> "Nevada Brothel Owner Endorses Ron Paul," *NBC11.Com*, 1926 November 2007, <http://www.nbc11.com/politics/14693483/detail.html#>.

In the spin room after the Republican debate on Tuesday evening in Dearborn, Mich., a reporter from the Arab-American News asked Ron Paul what he thought of the term "Islamic fascism."

"It's a false term to make people think we're fighting Hitler," Paul responded. "It's war propaganda designed to generate fear so that the war has to be spread."

Why should YOU vote for Ron Paul?

Assalaamu Alaikum Brothers and Sisters,

You can help by sharing and sending this note to all the Muslims you know as well as by registering as a Republican and voting for Ron Paul in the Republican primaries in your state. Here's why: Muslims and Americans have a unique window of opportunity for the 2008 election. There is a candidate running as a Republican that would work to completely cut off the funding to Israel, remove ALL US troops from Arab lands, and repeal the Patriot Act. He's a Republican with Libertarian views named Ron Paul. Ron Paul's policies ranging from monetary to foreign are top notch.<sup>89</sup>

All this makes one wonder just who the people are that are helping Ron Paul raise cash so fast.

Mel Gibson's Jew-hating, Holocaust denying dad has endorsed Paul.

Hutton Gibson, father of actor Mel Gibson, has endorsed Rep. Ron Paul (R., Texas) for president. "I intend to tell my 10 children and my 48 grandchildren that the only way to save the country is to vote for Ron Paul in 2008," says Gibson, who appears in the video endorsement sitting on a sofa wearing a "Legalize Freedom" t-shirt.<sup>90</sup>

And what about the anti-Semitic Klu Klux Klan people? They also support Ron Paul.

A LoneStarTimes.com investigation has conclusively established that a leading figure in the American neo-Nazi/White-Supremacist movement has provided financial support to Ron Paul's 2008 Presidential campaign.

The individual in question is Don Black, the founder, owner and operator of Stormfront, a "white power" web site that both professional journalists and watch-dog groups have identified as the premier English-language racist/hate-site on the Internet...

The evidence is as follows:

- \* Black proudly and openly identifies himself as Stormfront's guiding hand, and publishes a contact address on the Internet— PO Box 6637, West Palm Beach, FL, 33405

- \* A search by LST of public databases indicates that there is only one "Don Black" residing in West Palm Beach, Florida, zip code 33405

- \* A 7/16/01 USA Today article identifies Black's wife as being named "Chloe"

- \* That same article identifies Chloe as being the ex-wife of close Black associate and former "Grand Wizard" of the Ku Klux Klan, David Duke

- \* Minutes of a 9/7/07 City of West Palm Beach code-compliance hearing identify "Chloe H. Duke" as owning a residential property located at 203 Lakeland Drive

- \* According to Federal Election Commission records, on 9/30/07 the Ron Paul presidential campaign received a \$500 contribution from a Mr. Don Black, who lists his address as 203 Lakeland Drive and identifies his occupation as "self-employed/web site manager."<sup>91</sup>

A quick check reveals that as of November 18, 2007, numerous articles supporting Ron Paul for president appear on both Stormfront.com and DavidDuke.com.

Ron Paul says, "Too often we give foreign aid and intervene on behalf of governments that are despised. Then, we become despised." It is impossible to believe that Paul is not including Israel in that statement.

I sent this e-mail to Paul's campaign headquarters: "There are numerous posts on the web claiming that Dr. Paul hates Jews and will offer neither aid nor support to the state of Israel. Is this true?" They answered:

He does not hate Jews, see his issue statement denouncing racism:

<http://www.ronpaul2008.com/issues/racism/>

He plans on ending military aid and funding to all nations in the Middle East, including Israel's enemies. We should not be involved in directing Israel's foreign policy.

It is good to hear him say that he does not hate the Jews, but he doesn't seem to love them much either. He is right that we should not be directing Israel's foreign policy. And he is also right in stating that by giving military aid to both Israel and Israel's enemies, we have made the situation worse, not better. What we should do is give Israel massive military aid with no strings attached, and give Israel's enemies nothing except the promise that we will come to Israel's aid if Israel is attacked. A quick look at a globe and demographic statistics show that

<sup>89</sup> "Why Should YOU Vote for Ron Paul," *MuslimsVoteRonPaul.Com* (2007), <http://muslimsvoteronpaul.com/>.

<sup>90</sup> Susan Davis, "Paul Picks Up Backing From Mel Gibson's Dad," *Washington Wire*, 1914 November 2007, <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2007/11/14/paul-picks-up-backing-from-mel-gibsons-dad/>.

<sup>91</sup> Matt Bramanti, Editor, "LST: Neo-Nazi Leader Gives Ron Paul \$500," *LoneStarTimes.Com*, 1925 October 2007, <http://lonestartimes.com/2007/10/25/rpb1/>.

22 Arab and/or Muslim [Iran is not considered Arab] nations completely engulf Israel.... The Arab countries occupy 640 times the land mass as does Israel and outnumber the Jews of Israel by nearly fifty to one.<sup>92</sup> And those 22 nations all want to drive Israel into the sea. According to Numbers 24:9, God promises to bless those who bless Israel, and to curse those who curse Israel. The U.S. has been mightily blessed when she has taken Israel's side, and has suffered greatly when taking stands that harmed Israel.<sup>93</sup> It is vital to our interest that our next president be sincerely for Israel.

*Ron Paul On Evolution*

I sent the following question in an e-mail to Paul's campaign headquarters:

Does Dr. Paul believe in evolution? This is my second e-mail asking this question. I'm assuming that the answer is yes, since he didn't raise his hand in the debate when it was asked who does not believe in evolution.

Their answer:

Congressman Paul believes in evolution.

So, we have it straight from his headquarters—Ron Paul **does** believe in evolution. This means he does not believe the very first chapter of the Bible, and therefore probably doubts the truthfulness of the rest of the Bible also. That is why he refuses to accept what Bible verses such as Lev. 18:22; 20:13; and Romans 1:26-27) say about sodomy; he just doesn't really believe the Bible is true. Believing evolution makes him a practical humanist, and that means that he will make many decisions based on that very wrong world-view.

#### *"Who Does Not Believe In Evolution?"*

At the GOP presidential debate on Thursday May 3, 2007, Chris Matthews asked the candidates to raise their hands if they do not believe in evolution. Only three raised their hands: Mike Huckabee, Sam Brownback, and Tom Tancredo. All the rest, therefore, do believe in evolution, and that makes them humanists in practice if not in profession, and no Christian should consider voting for them.

Sam Brownback has dropped out of the race, and so has Tom Tancredo. Alan Keyes has since announced that he is also a candidate, so I sent him an e-mail asking this question: "Do you believe in a literal six-day creation by the living, personal, Triune God?" Dr. Keyes' director of correspondance, DeeAnn Stone, replied with this answer: "Yes, he does."

So, for Bible-believing Christians, the field has been narrowed down to two men: Mike Huckabee, and Alan Keyes. These are the only two men we can be sure actually believe in God. I could vote for either of these two men. I could not vote for Romney or Giuliani or McCain under any conditions—even if it meant not voting at all. The OnTheIssues website lists Alan Keyes as a "Libertarian-Leaning Conservative,"<sup>94</sup> and lists Mike Huckabee as a "Hard Core Conservative."<sup>95</sup> Of all the candidates for president, Mike Huckabee is the most conservative, and is the person I believe is the most qualified to be president.

#### *Rush Limbaugh Hating Mike Huckabee*

It is very sad that Rush Limbaugh, Ann Coulter, Sean Hannity, and some of the other conservative leaders have decided that fiscal conservatism is more important than social conservatism, and have therefore given their support to social liberals. Actually, I have examined Huckabee's record, and I am not convinced that Huckabee is that weak on the fiscal side of conservatism. Huckabee is against the greed shown by many leading Republican during the past 20 years are so. That does not make him weak on the fiscal side of conservatism. It appears to me that the real reason that Rush, Ann, and Shawn don't like Huckabee is because he is a "Bible believer." Rush has shown his contempt of Bible believers before. Rush tells off color

<sup>92</sup> "HISTORY of Israel & 'Palestine'," *Masada2000.Org*, [Http://www.masada2000.org/historical.html](http://www.masada2000.org/historical.html).

<sup>93</sup> For an excellent discussion of what our relation to Israel should be, read *Don't Mess with Israel* by Jame L. Milton. This 43 page booklet is available free on-line at: <http://www.biblebaptistpublications.org/israeljews.html>

<sup>94</sup> [http://www.ontheissues.org/Alan\\_Keyes.htm](http://www.ontheissues.org/Alan_Keyes.htm)

<sup>95</sup> [http://www.ontheissues.org/Mike\\_Huckabee.htm](http://www.ontheissues.org/Mike_Huckabee.htm)

jokes, cusses, smokes. Such things are not conservatism, Rush; they are humanism. When it comes to social issues, Rush is really more of a libertarian than he is a conservative. That, I believe, is the main reason why he doesn't like Huckabee. Rush claims that Huckabee is attempting to redefine conservatism, but Rush is the one who is trying to redefine conservatism. Huckabee is much more a Reagan conservative than Rush.

Rush has no children. So, the sodomy in public schools doesn't affect him personally. He is more concerned about his own pocketbook. Here is how he defines conservatism:

Conservatism is a set of principles and ideals, kind of like the Constitution. They don't float, they don't bend, they don't shape. You don't rewrite them to fit the social mores or depravity of the day or what have you. Conservatism is what it is. Conservatism seeks to balance the budget, not by raising taxes, but by cutting government and reducing the size of government.

There is not one word about social issues in Rush's definition. Rush says he is pro-life. He talks like he is against same-sex marriage. But, when it comes time to vote, fiscal issues are more important to him; and he is willing to support a pro-sodomite candidate. His value system is out of balance. In my book a poor virgin is better than a rich harlot. Having lots of money doesn't make you right, and certainly doesn't make you good. Rush is openly against McCain and Huckabee, saying that if either of them become the Republican candidate for president it will spit the Republican party. Rush says, "I don't think Congressman Paul has a snowball's chance." So, that leaves only Rudy Giuliani—a man who dresses in drag—and Mitt Romney—the man who brought gay marriage to Massachusetts. Rush is the one about to split the Republican party.

Rush and crew should listen up: the Evangelical/Republican marriage could very well be on the rocks. This large and important block of voters who put George W. Bush in the White House twice could well be close to saying bye-bye to the party of Lincoln and Reagan, and conservative talk radio could be the reason why. And don't let us kid ourselves, without W's overwhelming support from Evangelicals, Al Gore would be President and the term "Lock Box" wouldn't be a punch line.

Why in the world would Evangelicals bolt? The answer is simple—Rush and crew have demonstrated the values Evangelicals hold dear don't matter nearly as much as economic and foreign policy positions. No one in the Republican field is more committed to the causes that matter most to the Evangelical community than Huckabee—the former Baptist minister who is pro-life (and always has been), pro-traditional family and even open to amending the Constitution to define marriage as solely between one man and one woman. Huckabee believes in abstinence education and is very pro-states rights. These positions connect with Evangelicals and frankly are more important to many in these communities than tax breaks for billionaires, border fences or amnesty accusations.

The three tenants of the Reagan revolution seem to be dissolving into just two pillars in the hearts and minds of Limbaugh, Hannity and the like. While trickle down economics and strong foreign policy are very important to the posse, strong social conservatism seems to be optional. Many in the world of conservative talk radio seem to care much more about economic and foreign policy issues, and much less about the issues that matter most to the Evangelical community.<sup>96</sup>

Those of us with children, are very concerned about the sodomy being promoted in public schools—we don't want our children or grandchildren molested or seduced into becoming homosexuals. Rush says that abortion and same-sex marriage aren't the only issues to be concerned about. True, but they are the main issues. America is turning into Sodom and Gomorrah. It would be better to be a poor but righteous nation than to be a rich Sodom and Gomorrah. Now that Fred Thompson has dropped out of the race, Huckabee and Keyes are the only social conservatives left. Keyes is not getting anywhere. So that leaves only Huckabee. If Rush can't support Huckabee now, than Rush is just not truly a social conservative, and we should no longer lend him our support. If he is just talking conservative between elections so as to gain our confidence to be able to steer us into supporting liberal, humanist, pro sodomites during elections, then that is treason to the conservative cause, and we must tell him bye. I for one will never vote for a candidate who is pro-abortion or pro-sodomy. Never! That is liberal, not conservative, no matter what Rush says.

### *Mick Huckabee On the Issues*

Huckabee is undeniably the strongest social conservative among the leading Republican candidates. As previously stated, Giuliani, Romney, and McCain cannot honestly be called social conservatives. On social issues, they are radical liberals. And, frankly, I don't see that they are that strong on fiscal conservatism

<sup>96</sup> Greg Taylor, "Huckabee Hatin' Could Backfire on GOP," *Yahoo! News*, 1924 January 2008, [http://news.yahoo.com/s/realclearpolitics/20080124/cm\\_rcp/huckabee\\_hatin\\_could\\_backfire\\_1](http://news.yahoo.com/s/realclearpolitics/20080124/cm_rcp/huckabee_hatin_could_backfire_1).

either, at least not the kind of fiscal conservatism that benefits the common man instead of just multi-millionaires. Huckabee has taken the strongest stand of all the candidates against illegal immigration.

Fred Thompson (who has recently dropped out of the race) makes the same mistake as Ron Paul on abortion. On November the 18th 2007, "Thompson said *Roe v. Wade*, the landmark Supreme Court decision allowing legal abortion, should be overturned, with states allowed to decide whether to permit abortions."<sup>97</sup> Huckabee immediately responded, rejecting that idea:

"It's the logic of the Civil War," Huckabee said Sunday, comparing abortion rights to slavery. "If morality is the point here, and if it's right or wrong, not just a political question, then you can't have 50 different versions of what's right and what's wrong.... For those of us for whom this is a moral question, you can't simply have 50 different versions of what's right," he said in an interview on Fox News Sunday. Huckabee is right. And the issues—murder and sodomy—are even more serious than slavery.

Huckabee has taken the strongest stand of all the candidates against sodomy. If you had to pick, would you rather your child be enslaved, murdered, or sodomized? At least with slavery you might be able to free your child later. With abortion your child is dead. And I would rather be murdered myself than have my child sodomized. These are issues on which there can be no compromise. I've had enough experience with sodomite activists to know that they are not going to accept "No, you may not sodomize" for an answer. They threatened to murder Beverly Hodges, our city council representative in Oklahoma City if she wouldn't stop voting against them. They threatened me also. The truth of what we are up against needs to be faced. The only way to stop these people is to make sodomy a capital offense, as the Bible says it should be: "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them" (Lev. 20:13). It is really sad that it has come to this, but it has. The sodomites are not going to give us any peace until we submit to the idea of them being able to legally sodomize our children without rebuke. A country cannot ignore abominable wickedness like America has for the last 20 years without criminals eventually ruling over her. I read once of a couple that bought a baby python for a pet. They still had it many years later, it having grown so slowly that they didn't realize the danger it now posed. Until, one day they found it in their new born baby's crib, the baby crushed, dead, and being swallowed. I wonder if they had mercy on the poor snake; after all **he really was** born that way. What about the children being seduced by these sex perverts? Is there no mercy for them? Does it matter to you if your child is sodomized and perhaps given AIDS?

Some activists contend that 'real homosexuals' are not the ones molesting pupils, but a different kind of person -- 'pedophiles.' Considerable evidence against such a dichotomy exists. Consider the 1996 homosexual scandal in Australia. When accused "To a man, each ... so far has claimed to be a homosexual with an interest in young men but not a pedophile, despite evidence that each has had sex with boys barely into their teenage years and younger." The news report noted that this was the same claim made by "lesbian school teacher Lee Dunbar who was recently jailed for having committed indecent acts upon one of her pupils when the girl was less than 14 years old." Dunbar had first engaged in a sexual affair with the mother of the victim, and only then turned to the daughter. In England, a male teacher who molested a girl pupil, was married, a father of two, worked as a male prostitute, and had also kissed and propositioned at least one male pupil demonstrating sexual flexibility in age and kind of sexual object choice. Or consider the 5 cases of HIV+ male teachers who molested boys -- from New Zealand: Leaf (45) who molested 5 boys between 13 and 15; a name-suppressed man who molested 6 boys aged 12 to 16; from Denmark: a name-suppressed man who molested 7 pre-teen boys, at least one of which he apparently infected; and from the U.S., McFarlane who molested 6 boys aged 7 to 9 yr., and Lepley who molested a 16 year-old boy. Obviously, these perpetrators got HIV from sex with other men, not from their victims (nor was Mutie, the HIV+ Kenyan school teacher who declared he "would not die alone", a 'pedophile' because he raped 5 elementary girls. Further, the testimony (for whatever its worth) of the perpetrators indicates the perpetrators are self declared 'homosexuals:' Thus Stratton, convicted of abusing boys 11 and 12 yr., was married and declared himself "bisexual" "with a predominance towards homosexuality") and Curran, convicted of molesting 9 boys aged 8 to 12 yr., said he was a "gay person" with a "sexual preference for people over age 65". Of course, excuses abounded. Misenti, who had his penis excised and dressed like a woman, declared he was a "she" and only molested 6 boy pupils because he "desperately wanted affirmation of his womanhood".<sup>98</sup>

And there is no end to stories like this.<sup>99</sup> Here is a recent one you'll probably remember:

<sup>97</sup> "Huckabee: Abortion not States' Call," *USA Today*, 1918 November 2007, [http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/election2008/2007-11-18-huckabee\\_N.htm?csp=34](http://www.usatoday.com/news/politics/election2008/2007-11-18-huckabee_N.htm?csp=34).


<sup>98</sup> Paul Cameron, "Teacher-Pupil Sex Across the World: How Much Is Homosexual?" *The Empirical Journal of Same-Sex Sexual Behavior* (2007), [http://www.ejssb.org./resources/ejssb\\_CameronP\\_WorldwideTeacherPupilSexualInteractions\\$5B1\\$5D.pdf](http://www.ejssb.org./resources/ejssb_CameronP_WorldwideTeacherPupilSexualInteractions$5B1$5D.pdf).

<sup>99</sup> Get on the web and check out this link: <http://www.familyresearchinst.org/Default.aspx?tabid=71>

The Missouri pizzaman in whose apartment two kidnapped boys were found by police last month has now been charged with 69 counts of forcible sodomy and two counts of kidnapping. All charges are felonies each carrying a possible life in prison sentence.

Prosecutor Robert McCullough said 18 of the counts against Michael J. Devlin relate to 13-year-old Ben Ownby, who disappeared Jan. 8 and was found Jan. 12. The other 51 charges are related to Shawn Hornbeck, now 15, who was abducted when he was 11 years old.<sup>100</sup>

What sodomites do to themselves is depressingly sad, but what they do to children is unbearably sad. They should be called “sads” not “gays.” Is it being intolerant to tell a rapist to repent and stop his unacceptable behavior or else you will have to separate your family from him, and perhaps call the police? Is one a bigot to tell a robber to stop robbing or else he cannot be right with God? We are all sinners. God saves repentant sodomites just as He saves repentant liars or adulterers or drug dealers. Is God a hater and bigot for giving the Bible that condemns self-destructive behavior in no uncertain terms? What is so awful about the modern gay movement is that it encourages rebellion instead of repentance. It discourages instead of giving hope. It blames instead of taking responsibility. It insures defeat by sin instead of supporting people to victory over sin. It pulls down instead of lifting up. It denies the truth instead of admitting it. “He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso **confesseth** and **forsaketh** *them* shall have **mercy**” (Prov. 28:13).



One of the Gay, Lesbian, Straight Education Network's (GLSEN) Jump-Start Guides for starting and running a Gay Straight Alliance club in a public school. The battlefields are public school classrooms, just as Humanists boast, and our children will be the spoils of war.

### *After the Election*

Having said all the above, I don't think Huckabee has faced the fact that the humanist religion is established as the state church in public schools. Neither does he seem to see that as a grave violation of the First Amendment, which is destroying America. Perhaps he knows it in his heart, but hasn't yet decided what to do about it. Whatever the case may be, humanism must be disestablished as state church, or else the advance of the humanist religion will continue until we are destroyed. So, we must not let up pressure once a president has been elected. Our trust must be in God, not in a mortal man.

If we succeed in getting a true conservative elected to the presidency, we will have won a very important battle. But that will not be the end of the war—not by a long shot. The war will just have begun. They humanists will try to destroy him by slander or by violence. They will try to Bork him or McCarthy him.

Also, just because a presidential candidate is personally against abortion and same-sex marriage does not mean that he will be able to stop those problems just by being elected president. To

hope that is to be naive. For instance, how will he gather the necessary two-thirds support in both houses of Congress to amend the Constitution to outlaw abortion and same-sex marriage when Democrats are the majority in both houses? And after that, three-quarters of the state legislatures will have to approve it before it will become law. We Christians have been too apathetic and too naive for too long, and have allowed things to get too far out of hand. This is going to be a long war which we cannot win without the faith in God needed to take the seemingly impossible necessary steps, and to fight relentlessly until TOTAL victory is won. Only God can give us such great victory. And God wants to give us such victory, but it is up to us—no faith no victory. “And this is the victory that overcometh the world, *even* our faith” (1 John 5:4). We must trust in

<sup>100</sup> Charles Montaldo, “Devlin Faces 69 Counts of Sodomy,” *Charles Montaldo's Crime / Punishment Blog*, 2006 November 2007, <http://crime.about.com/b/2007/02/06/devlin-faces-69-counts-of-sodomy.htm>.

God, not in men, not in government, not in a president. We must never say that the needed changes cannot be made. Be not faithless, but believing.

Also, it is essential that Christians realize that it is not the duty of government to make the culture Christian, nor could government do so. That is the duty of Christians. Jesus said, “Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men” (Mat. 5:4). Salt is a preservative, but if it has lost its saltiness it is worthless. A Christian who has lost his Christlikeness is also worthless—he or she will either have no influence or bad influence. Were Jesus in the USA today, He would not be sitting on a couch watching immoral TV shows while the world goes to Hell. He would read His Bible and pray every day. He would set aside lots of time every week to evangelize. He would make time to minister to individual people. Nothing—absolutely nothing—will take the place of visiting people in their homes, making friends with them, living a holy life before them, telling them what a difference Christ has made in your life and can make also in their lives, and presenting the Gospel to them. Light drives away darkness. Present the light of the Gospel to the world, and the humanists will run like cockroaches back into their holes.



Rudy Giuliani dressed in drag.