

## II. OBAMA & MARRIAGE

Barack Obama is the most extreme, most liberal candidate ever nominated for president by a major political party. That's not hyperbole. It is the demonstrable truth of Barack Obama's record. And nowhere is that fact more evident than in his embrace of the radical agenda of the militant homosexual rights movement.

In February, the Obama campaign released an "open letter" to the homosexual community in advance of the Ohio and Texas primaries. Here are some key excerpts of that letter:

"...throughout my career, I have fought to eliminate discrimination against LGBT [lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender] Americans. In Illinois, I co-sponsored a fully inclusive bill that prohibited discrimination on the basis of both sexual orientation and gender identity, extending protection to the workplace, housing, and places of public accommodation. In the U.S. Senate, I have co-sponsored bills that would equalize tax treatment for same-sex couples and provide benefits to domestic partners of federal employees.

"And as president, I will place the weight of my administration behind the enactment of the Matthew Shepard Act to outlaw hate crimes and a fully inclusive Employment Non-Discrimination Act to outlaw workplace discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. As your President, I will use the bully pulpit to urge states to treat same-sex couples with full equality in their family and adoption laws.

"...I support the complete repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) – a position I have held since before arriving in the U.S. Senate. While some say we should repeal only part of the law, I believe we should get rid of that statute altogether. ... I have also called for us to repeal 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell,' and I have worked to improve the Uniting American Families Act so we can afford same-sex couples the same rights and obligations as married couples in our immigration system."<sup>1</sup>

Clearly, Barack Obama was pandering to the far-left fringe elements of the Democrat base – an entire movement that identifies itself based on private bedroom behaviors. But, re-read key sentences from that statement above, just so that you understand exactly what Obama is promising:

***"As your President, I will use the bully pulpit to urge states to treat same-sex couples with full equality in their family and adoption laws. ...I support the complete repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) – a position I have held since before arriving in the U.S. Senate."***

Of all the issues our next president will confront, Barack Obama intends to "use the bully pulpit" of the presidency and full weight of the federal government to force the radical homosexual agenda on America, in our laws, in our classrooms, and, ultimately, in our churches.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Washington Blade*, "Sen. Obama releases statement to the gay community," Feb. 28, 2008  
[http://www.washblade.com/thelatest/thelatest.cfm?blog\\_id=16855](http://www.washblade.com/thelatest/thelatest.cfm?blog_id=16855)

- THE DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT – OUR LAST LINE OF DEFENSE

The Defense of Marriage Act did not ban homosexual “marriage.” It simply acknowledged that the Constitution’s full faith and credit clause gives states the right to refuse to recognize same-sex “marriages” performed in other states. The “complete repeal of the Defense of Marriage Act” would eliminate the ability of individual states to define marriage for themselves and would enable radical judicial activists to impose same-sex “marriage” across the country at their whim.

Right now, if you are married in, say, Idaho and move to, say, Florida, you do not have to get remarried, because legally valid marriages of one state are recognized in other states due to the Constitution’s full faith and credit clause. Without the exemption created by the Defense of Marriage Act, a single federal judge could cite that clause in declaring same-sex “marriages” performed in Massachusetts legal in all 50 states.

No state would be safe, because even state constitutional amendments remain subject to federal review. Without DOMA, the 27 states that have enacted marriage protection amendments would be extraordinarily vulnerable.

Just to be clear about how radical and controversial Obama’s position is, in 1996 the Defense of Marriage Act passed the House of Representatives on a vote of 342-to-67 (83% in favor), passed the Senate 85-to-14 and was signed into law by Bill Clinton, a Democrat.<sup>2</sup>

**✘ *Obama has embraced a position rejected overwhelmingly by Congress, a Democrat president and the people of 27 states who have passed marriage protection amendments by an average vote of 69%.***

- SAME-SEX “MARRIAGE” -- A NEW CIVIL RIGHT?

Sadly, Obama sees the demands of the homosexual movement through the prism of civil rights. This is a twisted narrative that many African-Americans have resisted. But Obama believes a movement based on private sexual practices somehow mirrors the struggles black Americans faced to vote or to gain employment. In 2004, while campaigning for the U.S. Senate, Obama went so far as to call the Defense of Marriage Act “an abhorrent law.”<sup>3</sup>

“President Obama” clearly intends to put the full weight and force of the federal government behind the idea that homosexual conduct should be made equal to race and religion in federal civil rights law. As president, he would defend the notion that men can and should be allowed to “marry” other men, and that two “daddies” can compensate for the lack of a mother.

---

<sup>2</sup> DOMAWatch.org, <http://www.domawatch.org/about/federaldoma.html>

<sup>3</sup> ABC News, “A Conspiracy of Silence On ’08 Trail?” May 15, 2008, <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/Vote2008/story?id=4866998&page=1>

- WHO DECIDES?

In May 2008, after the California Supreme Court issued its opinion ordering same-sex “marriages” in that state, the Obama campaign issued a press release that read in part:

“[Senator Obama] respects the decision of the California Supreme Court, and continues to believe that states should make their own decisions when it comes to the issue of marriage.”<sup>4</sup>

But, apparently he didn’t really mean that. Californians had already decided the meaning of marriage once before. In 2000, they passed Proposition 22, a law defining marriage as the union of one man and one woman. But it was Proposition 22 that the court struck down!

Knowing the liberal tendencies of the Supreme Court, the citizens of California were prepared for an adverse ruling and had gathered the necessary signatures to put a marriage protection amendment on the November ballot. The people, not the courts, will for a second time decide the meaning of marriage in California. And, rhetorically at least, Senator Obama ought to respect the right of the people to “make their own decisions when it comes to the issue of marriage.”

But, in June 2008 it was reported that Barack Obama sent a letter to the Alice B. Toklas LGBT Democratic Club, in which he wrote:

“...I support extending fully equal rights and benefits to same-sex couples under both state and federal law. That is why I support repealing the Defense of Marriage Act and the ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ policy. ...And that is why I oppose the divisive and discriminatory efforts to amend the California Constitution, and similar efforts to amend the U.S. Constitution or those of other states.”<sup>5</sup>

Did you catch that? According to Senator Obama, if you try to that ensure marriage remains the union of one man and one woman in your home state by exercising your rights as an American citizen, it is **YOU**, not liberal judicial activists on the courts, who is being “divisive and discriminatory.”

---

<sup>4</sup> *Time*, “Obama Reacts with Nuance to California Gay Marriage Ruling,” May 15, 2008  
<http://thepage.time.com/2008/05/15/california-overtuns-gay-marriage-ban/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.alicebtoklas.org/abt/index.asp>

- ELECTORAL REPERCUSSIONS

How out of touch is Barack Obama on the radical notion of men “marrying” other men? A 2007 Quinnipiac poll found that homosexuality remains a powerful issue in key states like Ohio, Florida and Pennsylvania.<sup>6</sup>

In all three states, a much higher percentage of voters (34 percent to 10 percent in Ohio, 28 percent to 10 percent in Florida and 28 percent to 11 percent in Pennsylvania) said they would be “less likely” to vote for a candidate who received an endorsement from a gay rights group.

✘ On June 6<sup>th</sup>, the nation’s largest homosexual rights lobbying group, the Human Rights Campaign, endorsed Barack Obama citing his “unwavering commitment” to homosexual rights issues.<sup>7</sup>

In his recent discussion at Saddleback Church, Obama told Pastor Rick Warren, “I am not somebody who promotes same-sex marriage.”<sup>8</sup> Yet, if his past is any guide, and if he follows through as president on the promises he has repeatedly made throughout his political career, Obama’s actions would undeniably lead to the establishment of same-sex “marriage” across the nation.

- INDOCTRINATING OUR CHILDREN

In addition, legal recognition of homosexual “marriage” is being used by liberal educational bureaucrats to justify promoting the homosexual agenda in the classrooms. When a parent went to court to stop a Massachusetts elementary school from introducing homosexuality to his son, lawyers for the school district actually argued that the state of Massachusetts now had a “legitimate state interest” in teaching the homosexual lifestyle to children since homosexual “marriage” was now legal, and they argued that “The state must fight ‘discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation; in ways that ‘do not perpetuate stereotypes.’”<sup>9</sup>

In fact, this very issue came up in New Hampshire during one of the first Democrat debates in 2007. A member of the audience told the candidates about a situation that occurred in 2006 in Lexington, Massachusetts, in which second grade students were read a “fairly tale” about prince who could not find true love until he met another prince. The book is called “King and King” and it is being used to indoctrinate young children about same-sex “marriage.”

---

<sup>6</sup> *Politico*, “Gay Support Could Cost Candidates,” Aug. 8, 2007 <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0807/5290.html>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.hrc.org/10571.htm>

<sup>8</sup> <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0808/16/se.02.html>

<sup>9</sup> *WorldNetDaily*, “‘State interest’ argued in teaching homosexuality,” Feb. 14, 2007 [http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=54241](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=54241)

This concerned citizen asked the Democrat candidates, “Would you be comfortable having this story read to your children as part of their school curriculum?”

Former North Carolina Senator John Edwards responded first, saying:

“Yes, absolutely. I want my children to understand everything about the difficulties that gay and lesbian couples are faced with every day, the discrimination that they’re faced with every single day of their lives.”

Then it was Barack Obama’s turn. Here are excerpts of his remarks:

OBAMA: “You know, I feel very similar to John. You know, the fact is my 9-year-old and my 6-year-old I think are already aware that there are same-sex couples. My wife and I have talked about it. ...”

KING: “Quickly, have you sat down with your daughters to talk about same-sex marriage?”

OBAMA: “My wife has.”<sup>10</sup>

So, the Obamas have taught their two young daughters about same-sex “marriage” and Barack Obama is promising to use the bully pulpit of the presidency to make sure *YOUR* kids learn about it too!

- THREAT TO RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

As the radical homosexual movement makes more and more demands on public policy, even the liberal media is starting to recognize the threat to religious liberty. After the California Supreme Court decision ordering same-sex “marriage,” *National Public Radio (NPR)*, not exactly a bastion of conservative thought, examined the claims of social conservatives who have warned for years that religious freedom was in the balance.

On June 13, 2008, *NPR* ran a report entitled, “When Gay Rights and Religious Liberties Clash.” After analyzing the expansion of so-called “gay rights” in several states, here’s what *NPR* observed:

“Armed with those legal protections, same-sex couples are beginning to challenge policies of religious organizations that exclude them, claiming that a religious group’s view that homosexual marriage is a sin cannot be used to violate their right to equal treatment. Now parochial schools, ‘parachurch’ organizations such as Catholic Charities and businesses that refuse to serve gay couples are being sued — and so far, the religious groups are losing.”<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> *MSNBC*, Democratic Presidential Candidates Debate, Sept. 26, 2007 <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/21013767/>

<sup>11</sup> *National Public Radio*, “When Gay Rights and Religious Liberties Clash”, June 13, 2008, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=91486191>

*NPR* also noted another cultural “side-effect” of our inability to define marriage as the union of one man and one woman: the growing acceptance of polygamy in America, which “is not limited to remote enclaves in the West or breakaway sects once affiliated with the Mormon Church. Several scholars say it’s growing among black Muslims in the inner city...”<sup>12</sup>

It is only a matter of time before the very same judges who can find no “rational state interest” in preserving marriage as the union of one man and one woman decide that there is no “rational state interest” in defining marriage as solely the union of two individuals. On what legal or moral basis could they possibly deny “marriage equality” to polygamists?

Writing in the *Los Angeles Times* on June 17, 2008, Marc Stern, the general council of the American Jewish Congress, warned that in the wake of the same-sex “marriages” now taking place in California, homosexual rights will trample religious freedom:

“Conflicts about the rights of gays and those of religious believers demonstrate that these are not hypothetical fears. ...If past rulings are any guide, it is religious rights that are likely to be ‘obliterated’ ... and it seems unlikely that the California courts will intervene. That’s a shame.”<sup>13</sup>

The cultural war is real, and Mr. Stern is absolutely right. The rights and religious liberties of men and women of faith will be “obliterated” by the homosexual movement and its judicial activist allies – UNLESS men and women of faith recognize this growing threat and take action in the political arena to stop it by supporting candidates who will unapologetically defend faith, family and freedom.

It is worth noting that in July a homosexual rights activist who maintains a blog on Obama’s campaign website filed suit against two Christian publishing companies for emotional pain and mental distress.<sup>14</sup> His “anguish” was caused by the fact that the Bibles they print describe homosexual conduct as a sin. He is seeking \$70 million in damages. His case is not likely to go very far – for now.

But today’s nuisance suit could well become tomorrow’s “hate crime,” especially if the liberal Democrats who control Congress succeed in passing so-called “hate crimes laws” and if “President Obama” uses the bully pulpit and moral authority of the presidency to follow through on his pledges to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and appoint more liberal judges to our courts. If that happens, it would not be a radical leap from suing publishing companies to suing pastors.

---

<sup>12</sup> *National Public Radio*, “Philly’s Black Muslims Increasingly Turn to Polygamy,” May 28, 2008  
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=90886407>

<sup>13</sup> *Los Angeles Times*, “Will gay rights trample religious freedom?,” June 17, 2008  
<http://articles.latimes.com/2008/jun/17/opinion/oe-stern17>

<sup>14</sup> *USA Today*, “Gay man sues publishers over Bible verses,” July 9, 2008  
[http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2008-07-09-gay-bible\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/religion/2008-07-09-gay-bible_N.htm)

Paid for by Campaign for Working Families and not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.

Phone: 703-671-8800 Fax: 703-671-8899 Web: [www.cwfpac.com](http://www.cwfpac.com)

E-Mail: [Info@cwfpac.com](mailto:Info@cwfpac.com)