



Volume 1 Number 12

June 28, 2005

In Today's Report

1. Ten Commandments Decision - Supreme Court Gets It Wrong Again
2. Justice Kennedy Urges Lawyers To Defend The Courts
3. ACLU is Pro-Polygamy

TEN COMMANDMENTS DECISION - SUPREME COURT GETS IT WRONG AGAIN

In the decisions announced yesterday in two Ten Commandments cases, the United States Supreme Court continued its longstanding misinterpretation of the First Amendment's Establishment Clause.

By a 5-4 vote (in both cases), the court said a monument on the grounds of the Texas Capitol was constitutional, but copies of the Decalogue posted in several Kentucky courthouses violated the Establishment Clause.

In the Kentucky case, the court's liberals said the displays promoted religion, in violation of their fictitious doctrine of church-state separation (words which appear nowhere in the Constitution). In reality, as Chief Justice Rehnquist noted

in his majority decision in the Texas case, whether or not the stated purpose is to promote religion, that's the effect of every Ten Commandments display.

Rehnquist: "Of course, the Ten Commandments are religious - they were so viewed at their inception and remain so. The monument therefore has religious significance."

The case of former Alabama Chief Justice Roy Moore was much clearer. Here, there were no sanitizing secular documents. Moore's monument stood alone in the Alabama Judicial Building. The Chief proudly proclaimed that it was there to remind the public of America's Christian roots. In other words, Moore's case was clearly about the First Amendment right of the American people to publicly acknowledge God, and that is why the Court refused to consider it.

We have been in the forefront of this battle. Vision America had a rally for Judge Moore in Montgomery, in August of 2003, when his monument was removed.

That was followed by a series of Ten Commandments rallies, in 2003 and 2004, from Michigan to Utah.

We will continue to work for the right to display that document which is the moral foundation of America, and for the right of all Americans to publicly affirm the sovereignty of the Creator, just as the Founding Fathers did in the Declaration of Independence.

JUSTICE KENNEDY URGES LAWYERS TO DEFEND THE COURTS

In a speech to the Florida Bar Association, Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy said lawyers should speak out when judges are criticized.

"When judges are attacked unfairly, it's proper for the bar over the course of time, in a professional and elegant way, to explain to the public the meaning of the rule of law," Kennedy told several hundred attorneys.

Ironically, Kennedy and many of his colleagues themselves no longer understand what the rule of law means. As Justice Antonin Scalia explained in his scathing

dissent in the Kentucky Ten Commandments case, "What distinguishes the rule of law from the dictatorship of a shifting Supreme Court majority is the absolutely indispensable requirement that judicial opinions be grounded in consistently applied principle."

Under the rule of law, the Constitution and laws have an objective meaning. The meaning of words and phrases (for instance "an establishment of religion") don't change from year to year to suit the majority's whims. When the rule of law is respected, judges are guided by the intent of the Constitution's framers (or the legislators who passed a law) instead of reading their political views into the document under scrutiny.

When the same justice in one case says the First Amendment does not protect homosexual sodomy and 17 years later claims it does, how can anyone possibly call this the rule of law?

It's the critics of judicial tyranny who are the real champions of the rule of law, and judicial activists like Anthony Kennedy who are destroying that noble concept.

ACLU IS PRO-POLYGAMY

The head of the ACLU says polygamy is among the "fundamental rights" her organization is committed to defending. Don't hold the presses. This should come as no surprise to anyone who's been paying attention to one of the most destructive groups in America.

In a speech at Yale University, Nadine Strossen (president of the ACLU since 1991) said her group will defend "the freedom of choice for mature, consenting adults" whether they choose to practice homosexuality (and demand that their relationships be sanctioned by the state), bigamy or polygamy. Too bad no one asked Strossen about incestuous unions. Based on the organization's logic, the ACLU would have to defend that abomination as well.

At the outset of the gay marriage debate, pro-family advocates were mocked when we said it would lead inevitably to ending prohibitions against polygamy.

Now, one of the principal proponents of same-sex marriage has admitted the movement's larger agenda.

Whoever President Bush nominates to fill the next Supreme Court vacancy will be attacked as an extremist who's out-of-touch with the American people. Just remember, Ruth Bader Ginsburg (nominated to the Court by Bill Clinton, confirmed overwhelmingly by the Senate) was the ACLU's general counsel from 1973 to 1980, and a member of its national board of directors from 1974 to 1980. That's how "mainstream" Democratic nominees are - and why we must strive with every fiber of our being to change the composition of the Supreme Court. Help us fight the War on Faith - Get involved by following the action items above and by forwarding this alert to your friends and family.

Your financial contributions are always appreciated. [Click here to contribute.](#)

Dr. Rick Scarborough is the president of [Vision America](#) and acting chairman for the [Judeo-Christian Council for Constitutional Restoration](#). To book speaking engagements, contact the office at 936-560-3900.