

"TRUTH FOR OUR TIMES"

AMERICAN DECENCY
SUMMER CONFERENCE
JULY 26, 2013



I am excited about this upcoming conference, AND, at the same time, I have never felt a greater need for your prayers and your stand with us!

Since several months ago I have projected that things were rapidly worsening in our embattled land. In considering our annual summer conference, we waited upon the Lord to carefully discern and to invite speakers who we believed would be used by God to stir, warn, exhort, counsel, and encourage us for what lies ahead.

I'm quite sure that by the time this conference arrives, our concerns for our country will only be heightened and magnified.

For those of us who follow the trends nationally and internationally, we realize that our enemies are not just "out there," but within our borders as well. Our freedoms of speech and religion are clearly more fragile than probably most of us can even imagine. We need to exercise these great freedoms to the best of our ability in these days of growing uncertainty.

Gary Bauer, one of our conference speakers, gives warning about the undermining of our these freedoms. He writes: **"If Obamacare remains the law of the land, we will likely be reading about more reports of IRS abuses in the future. Unfortunately, the stories may well involve reports of churches and ministries being shut down and priests and pastors being hauled off to jail.**

"... [T]he conservative movement has not yet seriously entertained the notion of civil disobedience. However, Some Catholic and evangelical leaders have said they will

close their hospitals, schools and businesses and go to jail rather than comply with Obamacare's coercive mandates.

In a recent column, Archbishop Charles Chaput warns that our heritage of religious freedom is in jeopardy. He wrote:

'...the latest IRS ugliness is a hint of the treatment disfavored religious groups may face in the future, if we sleep through the national discussion of religious liberty now. The day when Americans could take the Founders' understanding of religious freedom as a given is over. We need to wake up.'

This is a message I wish would be preached from every pulpit in the country!"

Our October 2012 event with Frank Gaffney was a defining moment for ADA. We were encouraged by the numbers that joined us and by their response to Gaffney's presentation. The general response was "jaw dropping." Most attendees had no idea of the threat being posed by the Muslim Brotherhood. We made many new friends that day who were exposed to the significant work of Frank Gaffney and The Center for Security Policy.

Our upcoming July conference gives us the opportunity to not just "preach to the choir," but also to have the "choir" bring others - their loved ones, neighbors, friends, pastor, fellow workers, Sunday School class, etc.

I hear it from people all the time. They have friends who don't acknowledge that America is embattled from within and from without. Friday night, July 26 presents a great

opportunity to have those you care about become informed, alerted and educated by outstanding men who love their country, their God-given freedom, and are fighting for our children and grandchildren.

This July event is not so much about us. It is about those who come after us. It is also about bringing glory and honor to God our Creator and Lord. For that reason, we have also invited Pastor Anthony E. Moore of the Carolina Baptist Church in Ft. Washington, Maryland just south of Washington, DC. HE WILL PREACH THE WORD OF GOD!

Our conference will be held in conservative West Michigan. This area has a rich Christian heritage. We hope - with the help of other ministries, individuals and churches - to mobilize the body of Christ to attend this important event!

Have you registered yet? By the time that you receive this newsletter, there will be less than 30 days before the event. **Your pre-registration makes us more efficient and eases planning.**

REGISTRATION REQUESTED

ADA Summer Conference

Friday, July 26, 2013

Time: 6:30 P.M. - 9:30 P.M.

Location: Sunshine Church

3300 East Beltline Ave NE

Grand Rapids, MI

Free Will Offering

To register call Kimberly at our office at 1-888-733-2326 or email us at kimberly@americandecency.org.



From the desk of Bill Johnson

Has it come to this? I think so.

What I share with you is very hard edge. My concern is that it could be greater than I even want to realize. I'm not just writing this to get your attention, but to inform and prepare you as to what may be unfolding in the immediate days ahead - perhaps even before you receive this newsletter.

Moments ago (June 20) I got off a phone conference call with Liberty Counsel President, Mat Staver. Mat is also the Dean of the Law School at Liberty University. He has argued numerous times before the U.S. Supreme Court and is one of the most highly regarded Constitutional attorneys of our day.

The conference call concerned the U.S. Supreme Court and its impending decisions in the coming days: Proposition 8 and DOMA - Defense of Marriage Act.

Mat Staver reminded those of us on the conference call (Christian leaders, Tea Party members, activists) of the history surrounding the 1973 Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade*. He spoke of the disgusting and tragic reality that little to no public outcry was expressed then. Five people determined that the murder of unborn babies was now the law of the land. Since then, over 55 million babies have been killed.

The U.S. Supreme Court is now about to rule on the Biblical institution of marriage.

One case involves California's ban on same-sex marriage, but could impact as many as 35 other states, depending on how the justices rule. If the court rules that supporters of the ban, known as "Proposition 8," lack standing, determining how other states are affected would require further litigation. In other words, a "to be continued" option is on the table.

The other case involves the federal Defense of Marriage Act and the question of whether federal benefits should be extended to same-sex couples in the states where gay marriage is legal. This case is a little more clear-cut — either the court will uphold the law or overturn it.

Taken from the [Washington Post](#), June 20]

Mr. Staver makes it abundantly clear that homosexual rights advocates seek to "tear down the family and put the homosexual agenda, particularly led by same-sex marriage, on a collision course with the free exercise of religion."

Consider the following (short list) if the Supreme Court rules against Biblical marriage:

1. Hate crime laws will be increasingly instituted and enforced. Pastors could well be prosecuted for preaching what God's Word says regarding homosexuality and refusing to perform same sex "marriage" ceremonies.
2. Homosexuality is an abomination to God, but will be a protected class by the government. Christian school teachers and administrators, pastors, business owners, etc. would be charged with discrimination if they speak out against or refuse to embrace homosexuality.
3. Organizations such as our own American Decency could easily lose their (c)3 tax-exempt, non-profit status as we continue to call homosexuality what it is - SIN.
4. God will not bless a nation that puts a stamp of approval upon that which he calls an abomination. The evidences of God's displeasure are evident and becoming more so with each passing day.
5. Increasing levels of godlessness will be adopted by the youth of America: lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender. As our youth and persons of any age sow seed of debauchery it will beget debauchery.

We are rapidly coming upon a time when a handful of unelected, increasingly politicized appointees who have decidedly determined that the rule of man supercedes the law of God, will be put on notice that their allegiance to the U.S. Constitution and to

natural law is under question and if it continues, will be met with a stand of national civil disobedience.

God's law supercedes man's. As Christians, we must defy man's law if it requires us to break the law of God.

As of this writing, the Supreme Court decisions have not been announced. If these rulings undermine the definition of marriage, will it be this generation's *Roe v. Wade*?

As Maggie Gallagher writes, "it depends on how we, the American people, respond to judicial attempts to impose a new morality unrooted in our history, our traditions, or the plain language of the Constitution."

There is a letter (see page 8) that is now being circulated by Christian leaders throughout our ranks that will very shortly be delivered to the U.S. Supreme Court. It has been signed by hundreds of Christian leaders and pastors, including Jim Dobson, Don Wildmon, Dr. Ben Carson, Gary Bauer, Gen. Jerry Boykin, and many others. I, too, have signed it.

The letter states in part: ***Make no mistake about our resolve. While there are many things we can endure, redefining marriage is so fundamental to the natural order and the true common good that this is the line we must draw and one we cannot and will not cross.***

There are 31 states that have voted against same-sex marriage. Their governors will be asked to be signatories on the letter. Similarly, persons from all walks of life are being asked to sign a similar petition. You can do so online at: <http://www.lcaction.cc/674/petition.asp>

In addition, those who attend our July 26 summer conference will also have opportunity to sign the petition and receive additional copies to circulate at church or among family and friends.

America is at a crossroads. Now is the time to boldly stand against the destruction of marriage as God ordained it. We have drawn a line. The definition of marriage is not negotiable. If you agree, please stand with us.

Unmanned: How the 21st century man is leaving his post

By Chris Johnson



A few months ago, Ronald Bailey wrote a post on his blog at Reason.com called “The War on Men is Working” in which he quotes another blog by a University of Michigan economist, Mark Perry, regarding a recent Bureau of Labor statistics study. Here is the quoted section of Mr. Perry’s blog.

“[The BLS Study] includes data on educational attainment at ages 23, 24, and 25 by gender from a longitudinal survey of 9,000 young men and women who were born between 1980 and 1984. For each of the three ages reported (23, 24, and 25) there is a significant gender gap favoring women for college degrees, and for the youngest cohort of 23-year-olds the gender disparity is huge: there are 165 women in the sample who have graduated from college at age 23 for every 100 of their male peers. (his emphasis) Also, at each age group there are more women currently enrolled in college than men (e.g. at age 23, 17.3% of women are enrolled in college vs. 16.8% of men), so there is really no chance that the college-degree gender gap will close in the future.”

Interestingly enough, Ronald Bailey also brings attention to a Pew poll released last year, “Two-thirds (66%) of young women ages 18 to 34 rate career high on their list of life priorities, compared with 59% of young men. In 1997, 56% of young women and 58% of young men felt the same way.

Obviously, career as a priority skyrocketed for young women between the study and 1997 while the rate for men stayed virtually the same. So, more women are obtaining college degrees than men, and presumably, are aiming higher.

The fact that the percentage of men claiming career as a high priority has stayed the same, while the rate of men earning college degrees (compared to women) has gone

down suggests that, men, perhaps are not dreaming as big - shooting for careers not requiring a college education.

Mr. Bailey closes his blog post with the humorous observation that, “*given these trends, the dating scene for guys who do go to college must be awesome.*”

Funny you should say that, Ronald. According to the New York Times, it is.

“North Carolina, with a student body that is nearly 60 percent female, is just one of many large universities that at times feel eerily like women’s colleges. Women have represented about 57 percent of enrollments at American colleges since at least 2000, according to a recent report by the American Council on Education. Researchers there cite several reasons: women tend to have higher grades; men tend to drop out in disproportionate numbers; and female enrollment skews higher among older students, low-income students, and black and Hispanic students...”

...Needless to say, this puts guys in a position to play the field, and tends to mean that even the ones willing to make a commitment come with storied romantic histories. Rachel Sasser, a senior history major at the table, said that before she and her boyfriend started dating, he had “hooked up with a least five of my friends in my sorority — that I know of.”

These sorts of romantic complications are hardly confined to North Carolina, an academically rigorous school where most students spend more time studying than socializing. The gender imbalance is also pronounced at some private colleges, such as New York University and Lewis & Clark in Portland, Ore., and large public universities in states like California, Florida and Georgia. The College of Charleston, a public liberal arts college in South Carolina, is 66 percent female. Some women at the University of Vermont, with an undergraduate body that is 55 percent female, sardonically refer to their college town, Burlington, as “Girlington.”

So, according to “researchers,” women are trying harder (higher grades,) dropping out less, and enrolling more often. The guys that do attend and don’t drop out are very busy with extra-curricular activities. That’s coming from the liberal New York Times which is apparently naive enough to actually believe that, “*most students spend more time studying than socializing.*”

This is not an encouraging commentary on the young collegiate male in general.

At this point, much could be said, I am sure, about the change in America’s education system and the ways in which America’s students have changed in their passion for knowledge and desire to learn and have given in to the myriad distractions and entertainments. I, unfortunately, am not equipped to discuss it. I once started to read Professor Alan Bloom’s relevant book about the subject, “The Closing of the American Mind,” but I didn’t get very far past the part where he says today’s students don’t have the attention span required for traditional academia.

So, in review, more women than men are interested in college and more women than men graduate from college. The men who do go to college have a pretty wide range of distractions to choose from.

Now, let’s swing over to an opinion piece on FoxNews.com by Suzanne Venker entitled, “The War on Men.”

“The battle of the sexes is alive and well. According to Pew Research Center, the share of women ages eighteen to thirty-four that say having a successful marriage is one of the most important things in their lives rose nine percentage points since 1997 – from 28 percent to 37 percent. For men, the opposite occurred. The share voicing this opinion dropped, from 35 percent to 29 percent.

Believe it or not, modern women want to get married. Trouble is, men don’t.

[Continued on page 4]

Unmanned: How the 21st century man is leaving his post

By Chris Johnson



[Continued from page 3]

The so-called dearth of good men (read: marriageable men) has been a hot subject in the media as of late. Much of the coverage has been in response to the fact that for the first time in history, women have become the majority of the U.S. workforce. They're also getting most of the college degrees. The problem? This new phenomenon has changed the dance between men and women."

Suzanne's article proved to be quite controversial because she went on to conclude that, "Men want to love women, not compete with them. They want to provide for and protect their families – it's in their DNA. But modern women won't let them."

Perhaps because she's a woman she feels the need to blame women. I have the opposite problem. I have no doubt that in some - probably many - cases, if the modern woman became a lady, the modern man would become a gentleman. But I don't think that man's character chasm is woman's responsibility. If anything, Biblically, it should be the other way around.

So, fewer men than women are graduating from college and pursuing careers and men don't want to get married.

Men also, tragically, don't want to be dads. From the New York Times, "It used to be called illegitimacy. Now it is the new normal. After steadily rising for five decades, the share of children born to unmarried women has crossed a threshold: more than half of births to American women under 30 occur outside marriage."

Tied to that startling tidbit, is this most re-

cent revelation from Pew, "A record 40% of all households with children under the age of 18 include mothers who are either the sole or primary source of income for the family, according to a new Pew Research Center analysis of data from the U.S. Census Bureau. The share was just 11% in 1960."

With perhaps a few exceptions, we don't have the excuse of fighting off vicious attacks by "femi-nazis." We don't have men being kicked out of colleges or not being allowed to marry. In most cases, women are not withholding their children from their fathers. It may be hard for a man to find a job in this economy, but apparently women aren't having the same problem.

What we do have is a lot of men who are not stepping up to their responsibilities. The statistics above show this! Could anyone say with a straight face that men have fewer opportunities than women?

So what's wrong with the 21st century man?

I said before that I don't like the term "war on men," but perhaps it is more appropriate than I thought. There is no human war on men.

Satan, however, attacks on every side, placating man's need for sexual intimacy with porn and cheap hook ups, pacifying man's need to be a protector and hero in the real world with video games which allow him to be a warrior in the virtual world, and deadening man's desire to be the leader of his family with a false vision of foolish and feeble sitcom fatherhood.

We have a culture which sneers at gender roles, but we have no voice to counter it. The church needs to realize that this is a serious issue, pick up the megaphone, and let men know that they were created for a purpose.

"Be fruitful and multiply," was a divine commission for the family to fulfill the roles that God designed for each member to live out.

The Bible has a lot to say about what God expects of His men, and central to that is His placement of man at the head of the family. After all, Ephesians 5:23 says that "the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church," and verse 25 calls husbands to love their wives "as Christ loved the church." The family unit is designed to point the observers to Christ and how He loves His church, "[giving] Himself up for her."

No wonder Satan has thrown so much at men! Can you imagine the implications for evangelism if every Christian family was a portrait of the sacrificial love of Christ for the church?

If you are interested in learning more about Biblical manhood and womanhood, I would point you to a couple of sermon series' that have helped me out by Pastor Eric Mason, which can be found at <http://www.epiphanyfellowship.org/resources/sermon>. Look for the "Newmanity" and "Eve Redeemed" series.

Another excellent resource we recommend is the book "Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood" by John Piper and Wayne Grudem.

American Decency Frontline
Vol. XXVII, Issue VII
Published monthly by
American Decency Association

Bill Johnson, President and Founder
bjohnson@americandecency.org

Lisa VanHouten, Executive Assistant
Kimberly Cargill, Administrative Asst.
Chris Johnson, Administrative Assistant

P.O. Box 202
Fremont MI 49412-0202
Phone: 231-924-4050
Fax: 231-924-1966
www.americandecency.org



ABC proudly promotes values-free adultery

by Lisa Van Houten



The name says it all - “Mistresses” - a new summer show on ABC. I suppose the name “Adulteresses” or “Home-wreckers” didn’t sound as catchy.

“Mistresses” centers around a group of four women who have no qualms about committing adultery with someone else’s husband - or cheating on their own. The premier episode wasted no time in letting viewers know what this show is about. The episode began with a graphic sex scene, ended with another pornographic display, and mixed in a few more explicit scenes throughout the middle of the show.

Network and cable television have long had the practice of showcasing sin. But now Hollywood is going a step further and making commandment-breakers the “heroes” of the show. On NBC it’s a murdering cannibal (“Hannibal”) and now ABC proudly promotes values-free adultery. Infidelity is the new trend ABC is selling as exciting, chic, fun.

You know the show must really be bad when even secular entertainment reviewers call it “trash.”

The Washington Post writes:

While watching “Mistresses,” ABC’s new Monday night sheet-steamer about a quartet of women living and lusting on the edge of whatever, my mind drifted briefly to some other place. ...

I kept thinking about how much I’ve heard the word “trash” come up lately when people talk about television’s iffy future.

When disenchanted viewers tout the

virtues of on-demand streaming (and cancelling their cable or satellite services) they say it’s because they are tired of all the trash. By not being able to subscribe to networks a la carte or pay only for the kind of shows they prefer, consumers feel overwhelmed by junk on channels they detest (and detest paying for). Newfound freedom is closely related to escaping TV’s omnipresent trash. Trash, trash, trash.

“Mistresses” certainly is trashy — or an attempt at a kind of art that repurposes leftover trash. ...”

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette describes the show as “tawdry” and states, “ ‘Mistresses’ strives to be a guilty pleasure, but it’s more likely to induce guilt than pleasure.”

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch asks: **“Do you think what TV really needs is more cheesy, sleazy melodrama with lots of soft-core sex scenes? ...”**

And this is what the New York Daily News says about the show:

“... Anyone who has seen the “Mistresses” promotions — which means anyone who has watched more than 30 seconds of ABC in the last two months — can’t have missed what ABC is selling here: seductive women seemingly reveling in a glamorous life of erotic sexual encounters. ...”

ABC, on its own website, describes the show this way: *“Mistresses is a provocative and thrilling drama about the scandalous lives of a sexy and sassy group of four girlfriends, each on her own path to self-discovery.”*

Sex? Scandalous? Yes to both on “Mistresses.” However, there is nothing “thrilling” about committing adultery. And destroying marriages and breaking vows does not equate to “self-discovery.”

“Mistresses” has been described by entertainment writers as a “guilty pleasure” – a term the show’s executive producer, Rina Mimoun, embraces, stating: *“I embrace the term because it is soapy ... Any time you take off your clothes a lot, you*

get a little guilty, so that’s fine. We’ve got a lot of naked boys and girls running around, so it’s a little guilty, but there’s more to it than that.”

Ad agencies and the entertainment industry tell us that “sex sells.” Well, not everyone is buying.

Millions of Americans are fed up with this type of salacious “entertainment.” Numerous comments posted on ABC’s web page for the show “Mistresses” reveal viewers’ disgust. Here are a few of those comments:

** “I will not be watching this garbage, a show about mistresses? Women who contribute to the decay of marriage, sorry ABC, big failure here. The title alone turns me off. I am an avid watcher of ABC shows but this is one I will be skipping.”*

** “Way too much Sex in the first 30 min. WHY did it take 30 min to get to a story line. ...”*

** Disgusting premise. ...”*

** “Really? A show about mistresses?? Speaking for me, I will NOT be watching this as I’ve already lived it in real life, and do not think this kind of behavior should be glorified. Do the writers/producers have any idea what kind of pain the person cheated on goes through? How dare you even think about putting this show on the air.”*

** “This show looks like such trash. ...*

** “I agree this concept is just really disgusting and not the type of morality we should be pushing onto kids, and this is coming from someone who is extremely liberal, I understand wanting to be edgy but this is just wrong.”*

As the Washington Post writers stated, many viewers are “tired of all the trash.” Join with us in holding accountable the sponsors who empower the garbage of ABC’s “Mistresses.”

San Francisco values put kids in danger

By Chris Johnson



Sexual abuse is a sad part of many people's realities. According to the CDC, 20% of college women have been raped in their lifetime. Researchers have also found that one in six men have been sexually abused by the time they turn 18.

Consider these results from studies by David Finkelhor, Director of the Crimes Against Children Research Center:

- * 1 in 5 girls and 1 in 20 boys is a victim of child sexual abuse;
- * Self-report studies show that 20% of adult females and 5-10% of adult males recall a childhood sexual assault or sexual abuse incident;
- * During a one-year period in the U.S., 16% of youth ages 14 to 17 had been sexually victimized;
- * Over the course of their lifetime, 28% of U.S. youth ages 14 to 17 had been sexually victimized.

That's a terrible thing to comprehend - not only that there are that many abuse victims, but that our culture produces that many perverts.

It's particularly difficult to accept this statistic: 35.6% of perpetrators of sexual assault crimes against children are children. Over a third of those who trespass on the innocence of kids are juveniles themselves.

The horrible truth of that fact is that in those cases there are two victims - the perpetrator

as well as the abused child. Often, the abuser is acting on his own experiences - the abuses he has survived - or an extensive exposure to explicit content.

After all, the average age of exposure to pornography for a school-aged boy is eleven. Think of the effect those images might have on a confused and curious child.

In that light, allow me to introduce California's Assembly Bill 1266. This bill will allow children of either gender to enter whichever bathroom they prefer.

"AB 1266 forces San Francisco values on all California schools," said Karen England, executive director of the Sacramento based Capitol Resource Institute. "This is a very radical idea. You're going to have first-grade boys going to the restroom next to first-grade girls without any supervision."

"Picture this ... your 7-year-old daughter comes home from school in tears, explaining she's afraid to go to the bathroom at school because a boy comes in while she's there. Outraged, you call the school to demand an explanation. You're told that your daughter is telling the truth, but because the boy says he wants to be a girl, officials' hands are tied.

'It's the law.'"

Or worse, what's to stop a "confused" boy from checking out the girls' locker room, because he claims to feel like a girl that day?

San Francisco Assemblyman Tom Ammiano seemingly acknowledged that some parents will be uncomfortable with their children sharing bathrooms and locker room showers with the opposite sex. However, according to Ammiano, promoting transgender identity trumps the protection of children. *"Discomfort is not an excuse for discrimination,"* he stated.

So, in other words, parents and children are being told that they are bigots, as Karen

England stated. *"And now if a girl doesn't want to shower with a boy, there's something wrong with you."*

Ammiano claims gender identity is a 'personal choice;' biology has nothing to do with it. As he puts it, one's gender is a *"person's internal, deeply-rooted identification as male or female."*

Yet Family Research Council's Peter Sprigg sheds light upon that falsehood. *"It's being demanded that we affirm that a man can become a woman and a woman can become a man. Even though the chromosomes and every single cell in their body will never change. This is an absurdity."*

Sprigg also expressed concern about the implications of pushing such social engineering upon vulnerable children.

"It's one thing for an adult to decide they want to be the opposite sex," he said. **"But for us to allow children to make these life-altering decisions - and even affirm and celebrate that - is particularly alarming."**

The bill will most likely pass the liberal congress and be signed into the law by California's liberal governor, but it can at least start the debate around the rest of the country before similar laws come up in our state governments.

Can't we trade political correctness just this once for the safety and innocence of the kids?

Think about what is at stake - not only for children in California, but potentially across the country. The loss of innocence; a heightened risk for sexual assaults; a generation corrupted by an immoral agenda.

Our children are creations of God - male and female He created them. However if this legislation passes, Californian kids will now be taught it's up to them to choose their gender.

Hannibal - one step forward, one step back

by Lisa Van Houten



Working at American Decency is not “just a job” to our staff. Each of us has a passion and concern for the many issues we tackle – I hope our writing and efforts reflect that. We are greatly troubled by the harmful influences which affect American families and contribute to the moral and spiritual downfall of our nation. This calling isn’t limited to our staff. ADA has a stellar board of directors and each volunteer board member serves because they are marked by this same passion and concern.

That was evident once again when one of our impassioned board members responded to our email alert highlighting Kohl’s as a sponsor of NBC’s “Hannibal.” She wrote:

Hi Bill,
I am SO mad about this! While most of these advertisers I don’t really do business with, Kohl’s gets A LOT of my business. Two weeks ago I went through heroics to contact them on the phone, because I wanted them to understand I was a customer who cared enough about this issue to contact them directly.

The lady I spoke with seemed to genuinely share my concern when she heard about the content of this show, and said she’d pass along my comments. The next week they did not advertise, but now I am hopping mad to see they’ve done it again. ...

I decided to post on their Facebook page, partly so they could hear my concern, and partly so others who might care can see it, too. Perhaps a little embarrassment might result when their indiscretions are broadcast beyond our mailing list of like-minded folks. This is what I posted:

I am absolutely appalled that Kohl’s, ostensibly a family store, sees fit to advertise on a program like “Hannibal,” about a serial killer who eats his victims and serves them to his unsuspecting guests. I called your customer service number to express my concern about two weeks ago; after a one-week hiatus, your ads reappeared again this week.

Even if I “just turn the TV off,” my family, including my four kids, still has to live in the world you are helping to create with this garbage. It is inappropriate and grossly irresponsible to enable such content, but that’s what Kohl’s is doing. I cringe as I wait for the day when we hear reports of Hannibal copycats.

Kohl’s was always our first choice store for all our clothing needs, but with your persistence in supporting this garbage, you have lost my support and my business. ...

Oh that more people would express such righteous indignation and have the resolve to follow through with action! Yet thousands of you, our readers, have expressed your concern to Kohl’s. Last month our newsletter included a postcard to Kohl’s and our email alerts give online readers an opportunity to automatically send a letter to Kohl’s and the other advertisers listed.

And Kohl’s has listened! Recently we received this report from a supporter who called Kohl’s directly.

Finally made contact with Chrissy Grabarz at Kohl’s. Got verification from her that Kohl’s made a conscious decision to discontinue sponsorship of Hannibal. I asked her, “Does that mean Kohl’s will never be on that program again?” She said, “That’s right!” ...

She was very sweet, very approving and understanding of what we are doing and why. She assured me that I was definitely not the only person they’d heard from. I said, “So you’ve heard from quite a few people on this subject?” She said “Oh yes!” I said, “So Kohl’s really does care what your customers think?” She replied,

“Oh my goodness, yes! Your voice message reached the company president!” That made me smile because it was something he needed to hear: that “each of us is responsible in our own realm of influence for good or bad - whether we tear down society or build it up. Kohl’s has so much influence that they are doubly responsible before God.” ...

I’m just so happy to know that, yes, we really can influence big companies who are going the wrong way if we just take a strong persistent stand for righteousness.

Thank you for all you do. Keep doing it!! God bless you.

While we’re greatly encouraged to have this response from Kohl’s, the battle continues. NBC recently announced the renewal of “Hannibal” for a second season. This renewal flies in the face of logic. The ratings for “Hannibal” have been dismal – coming in dead last among all networks for its timeslot week after week. The latest episode drew only 2 million viewers and an incredibly low 0.7 demographic share.

NBC Entertainment President Jennifer Salke praised “Hannibal,” stating: “We’re so proud of [this] show that is richly textured, psychologically complex, and very compelling. There are many great stories still to be told.”

So many “great” stories to tell about murder and cannibalism?? Even among the few avid fans of “Hannibal” there is surprise that NBC airs such gruesome content.

“... I’m surprised it’s even on network television as the show puts out some seriously hard imagery for a non-cable program.”

“... I am shocked by some of the stuff that gets on network with this show.”

The viewer above isn’t the only one that is shocked by the content of “Hannibal.” Any person with a modicum of morality would be as well. Please stand with us as we continue to oppose this disturbing show.

We Stand in Solidarity to Defend Marriage and the Family and Society Founded Upon Them



We stand together as Christians in defense of marriage and the family and society founded upon them. While we come from a variety of communities and hold differing faith perspectives, we are united in our common faith in Jesus Christ.

We acknowledge that differences exist between us on important matters of religious doctrine and practice. But, on the matter of marriage, we stand in solidarity. As a nation, we have lost our moral compass. As a result, we are losing true freedom. We affirm together that there is a moral basis to a free society. Though we live in a secular society, together we reject relativism and secularism.

We affirm that marriage and family have been inscribed by the Divine Architect into the order of creation. Marriage is ontologically between one man and one woman, ordered toward the union of the spouses, open to children and formative of family. Family is the first vital cell of society; the first church, first school, first hospital, first economy, first government and first mediating institution of our social order. The future of a free and healthy society passes through marriage and the family.

Marriage as existing solely between one man and one woman was not an idea manufactured by the Christian Church. It precedes Christianity. Though affirmed, fulfilled, and elevated by Christian teaching, the truth that marriage can exist only between one man and one woman is not based on religion or revelation alone, but on the Natural Moral Law, written on the human heart and discernible through the exercise of reason.

This claim of the existence of such a Natural Moral Law is the ground upon which every great civilization has been built. It is the source of every authentic human and civil rights movement. This Natural Moral Law gives us the norms we need to build truly human and humane societies and govern ourselves. It should also inform our

positive law or we will become lawless and devolve into anarchy.

Marriage is the preeminent and the most fundamental of all human social institutions. Civil institutions do not create marriage nor can they manufacture a right to marry for those who are incapable of marriage. In the words of the first book of the Bible, we read: "it is not good for man to be alone." (Genesis 2:18) Society begins with marriage and the family.

Like many other concerned Americans, we await the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States on two cases which open up the possibility that the institution of marriage will be further undermined by a judicial opinion. We pledge to stand together to defend marriage as what it is, a bond between one man and one woman, intended for life, and open to the gift of children.

The institutions of civil government should defend marriage and not seek to undermine it. Government has long regulated marriage for the true common good. Examples, such as the age of consent, demonstrate such a proper regulation to ensure the free and voluntary basis of the marriage bond. Redefining the very institution of marriage is improper and outside the authority of the State. The Supreme Court has no authority to redefine marriage.

If the Supreme Court becomes the tool by which marriage is redefined in the positive law of this nation, the precedent established will leave no room for any limitation on what can constitute such a redefined notion of marriage. Conferring a moral and legal equivalency to same-sex couples by legislative or judicial fiat also sends the message that children do not need a mother and a father. It undermines their fundamental rights and threatens their security, stability, and future.

As Christian citizens united together, we will not stand by while the destruction of the institution of marriage unfolds in this nation we love. The Sacred Scriptures and unbroken teaching of the Church confirm that marriage is between one man and one woman. We stand together in solidarity to defend marriage and the family and society

founded upon them. The effort to redefine marriage threatens the proper mediating role of the Church in society.

Experience and history have shown us that if the government redefines marriage to grant a legal equivalency to same-sex couples, that same government will then enforce such an action with the police power of the State. This will bring about an inevitable collision with religious freedom and conscience rights. We cannot and will not allow this to occur on our watch. Religious freedom is the first freedom in the American experiment for good reason.

Finally, the Supreme Court has no authority to redefine marriage and thereby weaken both the family and society. Unlike the Legislative Branch that has the power of the purse and the Executive Branch which has the figurative power of the sword, the Judicial Branch has neither. It must depend upon the Executive Branch for the enforcement of its decisions.

As the Supreme Court acknowledged in the 1992 decision of *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, its power rests solely upon the legitimacy of its decisions in the eyes of the people. If the Supreme Court were to issue a decision that redefined marriage or provided a precedent on which to build an argument to redefine marriage, the Supreme Court will thereby undermine its legitimacy. The Court will significantly decrease its credibility and impair the role it has assumed for itself as a moral authority. It will be acting beyond its proper constitutional role and contrary to the Natural Moral Law which transcends religions, culture, and time.

As Christians united together in defense of marriage, we pray that this will not happen. But, make no mistake about our resolve. While there are many things we can endure, redefining marriage is so fundamental to the natural order and the true common good that this is the line we must draw and one we cannot and will not cross.

To see the signatories of this letter, including hundreds of Christian leaders and pastors, go to www.lc.org/media/9980/attachments/pr_marriage_solidarity_statement_062013.pdf