

“TO RE-ESTABLISH  
ALL THINGS IN CHRIST”  
(Ephesians 1:10)

# The Wanderer

National Catholic Weekly Founded Oct. 7, 1867 • Our Second Century of Lay Apostolate  
St. Paul, Minnesota

139, NO. 27 — JULY 6, 2006

(Presented for mailing June 30, 2006)

Activist Points Out . . .

## Traditionalists Winning Most Of The Marriage Battles

By DEXTER DUGGAN

PHOENIX — Defenders of traditional marriage are winning battles around the nation, but many people have the opposite impression, a leading pro-family activist said in an interview.

“It’s amazing how much we’ve won, how long we’ve held [same-sex ‘marriage’] back. But this is not being covered by almost anybody,” Alan Sears told *The Wanderer* in a June 27 telephone interview.

Sears is president, CEO and general counsel of the Alliance Defense Fund (ADF), a national legal-activist organization based in

suburban Scottsdale to defend traditional moral values and religious freedom.

After Alabamans recently voted overwhelmingly in favor of a constitutional amendment to protect traditional marriage, Sears said he didn’t see any news stories longer than a paragraph or two reporting this. Nineteen other states already had approved similar measures.

Speaking to thousands of people every month as he travels the nation, Sears said he discovered two things about their knowledge of the effort to defend traditional marriage. “Number one, the aver-

age person doesn’t have a clue about what’s going on out there. Number two, they think we’re losing.”

However, when the American people have the opportunity to vote on the question, “They vote overwhelmingly for traditional marriage,” he said.

Sears said ADF has been involved in more than 30 cases “relating to the future of marriage in America . . . literally from Hawaii and Alaska to Florida,” as well as dozens of other cases concerning the homosexual agenda, aside from marriage.

“... It’s been a miracle and we’ve held the line,” Sears said, adding that every state needs a marriage amendment. And the nation needs a federal marriage-protection amendment, he said.

When President George W. Bush recently spoke in favor of a federal amendment, he cited protection against “activist judges” as a reason for the constitutional measure, Sears said.

The American Civil Liberties Union and homosexual activists “do not want the people to be al-

See  
“marriage battles” p. 8

# Marriage Battles

(Continued from Page 1)

lowed to decide this," Sears said. They want to keep this a judge thing."

He said the ACLU either sues to stop votes on marriage amendment from taking place or to overturn the results.

After 70% of Nebraskans casting ballots approved an amendment protecting traditional marriage, "one Clinton judge overturned" the result, Sears said, adding that the ruling by the Bill Clinton-appointed judge against the amendment now is on appeal.

When citizens of Hawaii and Alaska voted in 1998 for traditional marriage, Sears said, Ira Glasser, then the executive director of the ACLU, said, "Today's results prove that certain fundamental issues should not be left up to a majority vote."

Sears said a major message to Americans should be, "Same-sex marriage" is not inevitable.

After the city of San Francisco started issuing bogus "marriage licenses" to homosexual couples in 2004, a number of homosexual activists began writing articles that "basically proclaimed they had won. It was just a matter of time now. They were going to get it all," Sears said.

However, after the ADP's Jordan Lorence presented the case against the city before the California Supreme Court, that court voided the licenses.

Sears said homosexual activists "still think they have... the end during power to win," and think that supporters of traditional marriage "will become weary of the fight... They'll quit and go away."

But, he said, even voters in Oregon, often thought of as a secularist state in attitude, approved a marriage-protection amendment in 2004. The amendment won with a 57% majority.

"We can [win] if we choose to win," Sears said. "We've got to stay engaged" in the fight.

Homosexual activists have broader aims too, he said. "This agenda is not just about people who want to redefine marriage... it's very much about punishing those who don't agree with [same-sex 'marriage'] and don't go along."

He said an increasing number of articles take up the theme that approving homosexual "marriage" proves discrimination against Christians.

would increase discrimination against Christians.

"If the homosexual activists achieve their standard of having homosexual behavior equated with [protection against] racial discrimination, they would probably succeed in having tax-exempt status removed from churches, he said.

Sears and Craig Osten are authors of *The Homosexual Agenda: Exposing the Principal Threat to Religious Freedom Today* (Broadman & Holman).

He said homosexuals' current efforts are "simply steps along the way to the destination, which is abolishing marriage entirely" — a goal which they openly state at their conferences.

Homosexual activists don't want any type of sexual behavior to be viewed differently by the law than any other sexual behavior, Sears said, adding that not every member of the homosexual movement has this broad a goal.

Fighting the battle for marriage across the nation, Sears said, "What's astounding is how much work goes into every case."

"The only place we've lost in terms of a final decision, after all is said and done, is Massachusetts," Sears said, referring to the 2003 decision by that state's Supreme Judicial Court to legalize "gay marriage."

And even there, he said, ADP's Jordan Lorence has argued on behalf of a subsequent initiative petition for a state constitutional amendment to define marriage, giving the people the right to decide the issue.

Even though a federal marriage-protection amendment failed in the U.S. Senate in June, Sears recalled the determination of anti-slavery crusader William Wilberforce, who fought for decades before the slave trade was abolished in the British Empire in the 19th century.

Sears said court decisions on same-sex "marriage" are expected shortly in New York, New Jersey, and Washington state.

ADF legal counsel Dale Scho-wengerd told *The Wanderer* that in recent years, marriage-protection amendments have passed with an average 72% approval of voters, a "pretty amazing" margin.

"People still view marriage as a relationship between a man and a woman, and they feel pretty strongly about it," he said.

Traditional marriage has done well even before most judges. Scho-wengerd said, explaining that they recognize the "state has a vital interest in procreation," and in directing procreation into a marriage relationship.

"Kids do best in a marriage environment, between a man and woman," he said, pointing out that a fundamental of marriage "is about children."

On the other hand, he said, activists for same-sex "marriage" focus on just the adults' relationship.

In a June 27 interview, Scho-wengerd said that although some trial courts have overturned the traditional definition of marriage, only one appellate court has done so.

The ACLU, a strong proponent of homosexual "marriage," has financially come out and admitted they support polygamy and abolishing autonomy of consent... Personal good of society" for the ACLU, Scho-wengerd said.

Homosexual activists hope people will be conditioned by the media over the years to accept their behavior, he said.

"The homosexual agenda has had that strategy," Scho-wengerd said. "... They've really targeted the news media... Their goal is to get the behavior normalized, eliminated."

Regarding recent homosexual-inspired discrimination against faithful Catholics, columnist John Leo wrote on June 18: "The governor of Maryland fired one of his appointees to the Washington [D.C.] Metro transit authority board for stating a negative opinion of homosexuality on a cable TV talk show. The board member, Robert Smith, had said: 'Homosexual behavior, in my view, is deviant. I'm a Roman Catholic.'

The governor, Robert Ehrlich, said Smith's remarks were 'highly inappropriate, insensitive, and unacceptable.' Why didn't Gov. Ehrlich simply say that he disagrees with Smith but considers him an excellent public servant," Leo continued, "which the *Washington Post* coverage of the story makes clear he is? The answer is that in Washington, and among the elites everywhere, approval of homosexual-ity is now mandatory."