

Georgia insight

Sue Ella Deadwyler
4168 Rue Antoinette
Stone Mountain, Georgia 30083

*"She hath done what she could."
Mark 14:8a*

Oklahoma Legislator Threatened For Defending Biblical Morality

It's becoming more evident everyday. On issues of morality, if voiced in public, traditional, Biblical or conservative opinions are condemned as discrimination or hate speech. If they are publicly expressed, antagonists immediately go into attack mode to intimidate and eliminate the conservative, Biblical or traditional voice. That became crystal clear in January after the wife of a Southern Baptist pastor spoke in an open-to-the-public political gathering. In early March, her edited comments were taken out of context and posted on *YouTube.com*. Result: Oklahoma State Representative Sally Kern received death threats¹ and demands for her resignation.

Why was Representative Kern attacked? She touched an LGBTQAI² nerve. Though she shared facts and straightforward Bible truths, comments such as these stoked LGBTQAI ire, "Studies show no society that has totally embraced homosexuality has lasted more than a few decades. It is not a lifestyle that is good for this nation." She further said the gay agenda's mainstreaming of homosexuality and redefining of marriage are a great threat to our nation. Considering the issue, it's easy to trace the origin of the attack to Washington, D.C., where the Gay & Lesbian Victory Fund decided which of her comments to post on the Internet. Soon, a poll by Channel 5 KOCO-TV asked, "Should she resign?" and Representative Kern released this statement:

"To put this simply, as a Christian I believe homosexuality is not moral. Obviously, you have the right as an American to choose that lifestyle, but I also have the right to express my views and my fellow Oklahomans have the right to debate these issues.

"In recent years homosexual activists have begun to aggressively promote their agenda through the political process, often providing substantial financing to candidates who agree with their views, including many running for state legislative races. National publications, such as Time, The Atlantic and USA Today, have noted that trend. That is their right, just as it is my right to voice opposition to their agenda, which I have been asked to do at several public forums in recent months. That's what democracy is all about. It appears some homosexual activists believe only one group is allowed a voice in this debate. I disagree.

"A vigorous debate on an issue is not 'hate speech' – it's free speech. I have made clear my opposition to the agenda of homosexual activists, but I have never endorsed or supported any hateful action targeting individuals on the other side of this debate and never will. The fact that many gay rights activists claim anyone opposing their agenda is engaging in 'hate speech' says more about them than me.

"Most Oklahomans are socially conservative and believe marriage is a sacred institution, the union of one man and one woman, and that the traditional family is worth protecting and preserving. When I campaigned for office, I promised my constituents to stand up for those values, and I do not apologize for keeping my word." (Emphasis added.)

¹ By early March over 3,000 e-mails and hundreds of calls included condemnation, death threats and obscenities.

² LGBTQAI, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, questioning, allies, intersex – current self-identified categories

Why is Anyone Surprised at Gloucester High's 17 Pregnant Girls?

The “pregnancy pact” of 17 Gloucester, Massachusetts high school girls (age 16 and under) may or may not be out of the ordinary, but the girls testing positive in the school clinic “high-fived” each other, while girls with negative tests were described as “long-faced”. Everyone knows sexually active children are bound to result in pregnant girls. Georgia educators know sex outside of marriage is illegal and “safer sex” methods often result in disease and pregnancy.

Factor in governments’ presumption that sexually active minors are emancipated (free from the authority of mom and dad) and parental barriers to promiscuity are all-but obliterated. Result: pregnancy of minors is becoming commonplace. In fact, today’s teen fashion is so suggestive of maternity clothes as to smack of designers’ attempt to dress all girls as expectant mothers.

On its face, Georgia’s “**Family-Planning Services Act**” of 1966, amended in 1968, seems to encourage promiscuity. It treats sexually active minors as emancipated, even though they are underage, unmarried and dependent upon parents for support. The Act authorizes state-funded family-planning services for (a) any one who is married (b) or the parent of at least one child (c) or pregnant (d) or requesting such services. That includes minors. Parents are not notified.

To further dislodge sexually active minors from parental authority, the following two provisions of a **Georgia law passed in 1971** authorizes persons other than parents to consent to surgical or medical treatment of minor children if the procedure or treatment pertains to reproduction:

Georgia Code Section 31-9-2. (a)(4) Any person temporarily standing in loco parentis¹, whether formally serving or not, for the minor under his care; and any guardian, for his ward;

(a)(5) Any female², regardless of age or marital status, for herself when given in connection with pregnancy, or the prevention thereof, or childbirth.

In 1985 the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families published a study entitled, “Teen Pregnancy: What is Being Done? A State-By-State Look”.

That 397-page report said this about Georgia’s official attitude toward sexually active minors:

“Teens are a special target population for Title X³ programs and comprise 1/3 of the population served.

Teens seeking services are considered emancipated minors, and are offered a full range of services without parental notification or consent, which is perceived as a major barrier to services. Parental involvement is encouraged.” [How can treating teens without notifying parents encourage parental involvement?]

When (a) “non judgmental” sex education teaches how-to with whomever, provided “protection” is used and (b) sex crime laws aren’t enforced, (c) minors who want to be sexually active feel free to practice what they learn. Consider the requirements of CDC’s recommended AIDS curriculum for churches and clubs. It’s entitled *Becoming a Responsible Teen*⁴.

Philosophy: Risk-taking decisions are very personal, so empower teenagers with tools to act out their choices.

Focus: Sexuality training for teens: how-to, using-what, with whom, regardless of laws and morals

Leader Must: (a) List slang words to describe sexual activity; (b) practice the slang until (c) comfortable using it in class; (b) adjust your body language and expressions to show your ease in using such words.

New Words: Use gender-neutral, androgynous, nonjudgmental words to affirm/support alternate lifestyles.

Intercourse: All lifestyles use condoms for oral, anal, vaginal intercourse. Have no condom? Do *outercourse*.⁵

¹ When asked whether such consent could be given by school teachers, the attorney said, “Yes.”

² Note: (4) includes boys and girls; (5) allows minor girls to personally consent to sex-related surgery or medical treatment.

³ Title X, Public Health Services Act, expired at the end of 1985. However, when the above report was published in 1986 Title X operated under a continuing resolution to support family planning clinics, train personnel, along with development and dissemination of family planning and population data. Participating clinics must give confidential free-of-charge natural family planning methods, infertility services, and services for adolescents. Those requirements remain today.

⁴ By Dr. Janet St. Lawrence, Jackson State University, Mississippi and Jackson-Hinds Cooperative Health Center

⁵ Outercourse: share pornography, kisses, body massage, share baths, mutual masturbation, sensuous feeding, etc.

It's the Law in Colorado and Florida, On the Ballot in Maryland! ***Transsexuals May Use Any Public Facility Anywhere, Including in Schools***

Public schools and religious schools could be forced to hire transgender or trans-sexual kindergarten teachers.
There would be no religious exemption.

- Citizens for a Responsible Government, Montgomery County, Maryland

Montgomery County, Maryland does not have such a law ... yet. Citizens for a Responsible Government (CRG) in Montgomery County launched a "STOP BILL 23-07" project to put the issue on the November ballot. They said, "The Bill means that any man, for example, who insists he is a she, from the County's legal viewpoint, is [a she]. (Is that a Clinton definition of is?)

To certify Bill 23-07 for the November ballot, CRG obtained 32,000 signatures on a petition – 10,000 more than required – despite intimidation that was documented on video and released to *YouTube.com*. It revealed the actions and words of a county council member's senior adviser as she disrupted and threatened volunteers on a sidewalk outside a Giant food store. She said, "An e-mail went out; you're going to be asked to leave. Any petitions gathered today are illegal."

For the purpose of using all public restrooms, locker rooms, showers and other public facilities in schools and elsewhere, the county's proposed Bill 23-07 attempts to erase all biological distinctions between males and females of all ages. Under the guise of granting them "civil rights," *it would grant special rights to transvestites, transsexuals and cross dressers.*

Consider this. County schools use the following definition to teach gender-bending attitudes to 12-year-olds: "Gender identity is your identification of yourself as a man or woman, based on the gender you feel to be inside." As you wonder how much confusion that causes, think about this. Bill 23-07 would allow gender-confused people – teachers, administrators, technicians, staff, students, visitors – to identify as the opposite sex and use either or both facilities, until they assume birth-sex identity again. They could not be restricted to either sexual identity, but could trans-fer (pardon the pun) from one identity to another at will. No public facility would be off-limits for males or females that assume trans identities. I may be stating the obvious, but *if this passes, there would be no public facilities to accommodate only females or only males.*

A "trial run" of the proposed new law occurred in Montgomery County when a man, wearing a blue ruffled knee-length skirt and makeup walked into the women's locker room. When interviewed for WJLA-TV, a female who observed the episode said, "I could see his muscles, I could see his large hands. He was wearing a blue ruffled skirt that came down to the knee. I was very upset. I'm still upset. There's a lot he could've seen."

In January, Gainesville, Florida banned discrimination based on the "inner sense of being a specific gender ... with or without regard to the individual's designated sex at birth." However, the new law exempts "public accommodations" where "being seen fully unclothed (showers?) is unavoidable," while adding gender identity as a category to be protected from discrimination. Protection would be the same as provided civil rights groups. It changes city laws that affect the Human Rights Board, the Equal Employment Opportunity, Equal access to Places of Public Accommodation, as well as Fair Housing and Equal Credit Opportunity policies.

The majority of the standing-room-only crowd opposed the ordinance, but the county commission passed it, anyway. So, Gainesville, Florida joined Key West, West Palm Beach and Miami Beach that already accommodate the wishes of those with "gender identity" issues.

Colorado Governor Signed Transgender Nondiscrimination Bill

“Who would have believed that the Colorado state legislature and its governor would have made it fully legal for men to enter and use women’s restrooms and locker-room facilities without notice or explanation? And by the way, because of the way this bill is written it is not subject to the initiative process. There is no recourse.

[It] will be coming to every state in the country.”

- Dr. James Dobson, Focus on the Family

Dr. James Dobson made the above statements about S.B. 200, officially entitled the “Expanded Discrimination Prohibitions Act” that passed in Colorado and was signed by Governor Bill Ritter (D) May 29th. The Act includes this definition: “Sexual orientation means a person’s orientation toward heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality, or transgender status or another person’s perception thereof.” Passage of S.B. 200 requires over 20 changes in Colorado law.

He could’ve vetoed it, but with a stroke of his pen, Ritter abolished gender-specific restrooms and locker rooms statewide and gave civil rights status to those claiming to have issues with gender identity. Businesses – including but not limited to restaurants, bathhouses, mortuaries, theaters, gyms, barber shops and massage parlors – and all public facilities *are prohibited from using gender identity or the perception thereof to deny employment or access to facilities.*

Representative Amy Stephens warned, “Lest we think that this is just the ‘bathroom bill,’ I’d like us also to realize that this really is about Christian businesspeople being able to practice their faith through their profession.” Then, she reminded her colleagues that a photographer was fined \$6,000 for refusing to take pictures of a same-sex couple’s ceremony in Albuquerque.

Courts “Dis” Parents and Say Schools Control What Pupils Learn

On November 2, 2005 in a unanimous decision, the three-judge U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruled that parents have no fundamental right to control the upbringing of their children. In that court’s opinion, a parent’s right “does not extend beyond the threshold of the school door” and a public school has the right to share with students “whatever information it wishes to provide, sexual or otherwise.”

The opinion went further: “[T]here is no fundamental right of parents to be the exclusive provider of information regarding sexual matters to their children. ... [P]arents have no due process or privacy right to override the determinations of public schools as to the information to which their children will be exposed.” Elaborating on that, the judges said enrolling children in public schools “substantially diminished” parental rights to control their education.

Congress Disagreed with That Decision & Reaffirmed Parental Rights

On November 16, 2005 the U.S. House of Representatives passed HR 547, by a 320-91 vote, to condemn the court’s stunning November 2, 2005 decision. Though not a binding resolution, HR 547 expressed the representatives’ attitude in this sentence, “[T]he U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit deplorably infringed on parental rights.” HR 547 referenced several court decisions that affirm parental rights, dating from 1923 and forward. Then, concluded with this:

“Whereas the rights of parents ought to be strengthened whenever possible as they are the cornerstone of American society: Now, therefore, be it resolved, that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that – the fundamental right of parents to direct the education of their children is firmly grounded in the Nation’s Constitution and traditions ...”

Georgia Insight is a conservative publication financed entirely by its recipients.