

## Calendar

Group 9 (Steve Thompson) will be today after morning services at the Thompson's home.

Singing for shut-ins: See Grant Mulligan or David Hamilton.

## Marriage Protection — We Shouldn't Need It

REBECCA HAGELIN

[Voters in the United States consistently approve traditional marriage. Including the election on November 3rd, where voters in Maine turned down proposition that would have allowed homosexual "marriages,"\* the tally is now 31-0. There is still no state in the union where the voters have allowed the definition of marriage to be overturned (courts and legislatures are another, demonstrating only that legislators and judges are often out of touch with the people they are paid to serve.

Below, I've reprinted a slightly edited article from 2003 that speaks to the necessity of these propositions. While we are happy that 31 states have voted to sustain the traditional definition of marriage, we are sad that these measures are even on the ballot. It only shows how successfully Satan has snipped a bit here a bit there at the moral fabric of the American people in the last 50 years.]

I have to admit that I'm not that happy about the project the good people at Concerned Women for America are working on.

They're one of the groups supporting President Bush's "Marriage Protection Week"... Although I love and applaud the theme: "Marriage: One man, one woman." I just hate that we've reached the point where such a week is necessary. Thankfully, we have a president who has drawn the proverbial line in the sand with his bold declaration that he will do all he can to protect the sacred institution.

Marriage is the legal union of one man and one woman. It's simple, yet powerful. It's so basic to who we are, so absolutely mandated by the laws of nature, which its critical place in society would seem beyond explanation. From time immemorial, the family – starting with marriage between one man and woman – has been the foundation of every single civil society.

To alter that unit now would be the single greatest social experiment mankind has ever embarked upon. If the composition of marriage were changed, in just one or two generations the landscape of America would be irrevocably altered, affecting not just the family, but every other institution as well. If you weaken the foundation

---

\*The term "homosexual marriage" is, scripturally, an oxymoron.

### The church of Christ

meeting at 900 E. Natoma  
PO Box 492  
Folsom, CA 95630  
916/608-4866

#### Elders

Forrest Brown: 530/295-9230  
Randy Clark: 916/939-5066  
Rich Ladd: 916/774-9048  
David Posey: 530/676-9514  
Dennis Reagan: 916/797-5539

#### Deacons

Brent Agee: 916/786-0436  
Bryan Byrd: 916/351-9320  
David Byrd: 916/985-6564  
Barrett Cain: 916/351-0774  
Michael Caisse: 530/672-2902  
Jeff Clark: 916/985-8689  
John Daniels: 916/985-3090  
Jerry Deschler: 916/285-9115  
Steve Dickey: 916/983-1071  
Eric Fields: 916/817-6495  
David Main: 650/292-5417  
Terry Raposa: 916/782-1140  
Dane Scott: 916/631-7221  
Russ Tarrant: 530/672-1748  
Steve Thompson: 916/983-4170  
Jeff Warshaw: 916/933-9399

#### Evangelist/Editor

David Posey: 530/676-9514  
dpaulposey@mac.com

#### Service Times

Sunday Morning Assembly

9:30 AM

Sunday Evening: 5:00 PM

Wednesday Bible Study

7:30 PM

Classes for all ages.

Private classes arranged at your convenience.

[www.folsomchurch.com](http://www.folsomchurch.com)

upon which a society is built, the result is a weaker society that will eventually crumble.

Homosexual activists claim that they want to certify their fidelity to one another – for a few of them, perhaps that’s true. But the reality is the vast majority of homosexuals don’t stay in a committed relationship – they float from one partner to the next, with many of the males having hundreds of partners over a lifetime.

The real goal of the movement to allow homosexuals to marry each other isn’t to enjoy “marriage” – it’s to redefine and destroy the institution that God designed. “Unions” between a man and a man, or a woman and a woman, or two men and one woman – or any other combination you can imagine – are not the equivalent of marriage, and they should never be treated as such.

Raving feminists have for years equated marriage to slavery, claiming that wives are second-class citizens and that the institution of marriage should be abolished. The radical feminists and homosexual activists are closely aligned – many of the most vocal feminists are lesbians – and anyone who has studied their organizations and leadership knows that one of their shared goals has always been to destroy the traditional family. Redefining marriage is the first step.

It’s clear that protecting marriage is no longer enough: We need to encourage it, to strengthen it.

...Married couples soon will become a minority, overtaken by singles and those in alternative living arrangements. Already, we hear of “wars” breaking out within companies because married employees are paid more and receive more in benefits. Fortunately, we have family-friendly groups such as CWA and Focus on the Family working hard to dismantle this time bomb.

Elected officials can help, too. Back in 2000, Frank Keating, then the governor of Oklahoma, spoke at the Heritage Foundation. He talked about how he had ordered the state chamber of commerce and the economics departments of his two flagship state universities to find out what held back the state economically. They came back with

several reasons, such as the fact that taxes were too high.

But then the economic experts said something surprising: “We have too much divorce among families with children. We have too many out-of-wedlock births. We have too much violence and drug abuse.” Keating couldn’t very well change his state’s divorce laws, so he got the legislature to lower the price of marriage licenses if couples would agree to attend a marriage course beforehand. He also got Oklahoma’s churches, synagogues and mosques to agree to require their members to attend such courses before marriage.

In the process, he lowered divorce rates, poverty rates and spousal-abuse rates. The federal government spends \$200 billion per year on welfare aid for families with children, 75 percent of which goes to single-parent families. It spends about half that much dealing with the social consequences of the decline of marriage. Why?

Because children who aren’t in intact two-parent families learn less, earn less, get in trouble more, abuse drugs and alcohol more – and have more trouble with their own marriages.

Would removing some of the tax and welfare-aid consequences of tying the knot – and throwing in some ideas about what it means to get, be and stay married – make all that spending go away? No. But it would help a lot...

...Although I proudly join with Concerned Women for America, Focus on the Family, the Family Research Council and dozens of other fine organizations in voicing my support for marriage, my heart is heavy that we must do so. While I’m standing firm for marriage, I’ll also be on my knees praying for God’s protection on this great land...

“...CHILDREN WHO AREN’T IN  
INTACT TWO-PARENT FAMILIES  
LEARN LESS, EARN LESS, GET IN  
TROUBLE MORE, ABUSE DRUGS AND  
ALCOHOL MORE – AND HAVE MORE  
TROUBLE WITH THEIR OWN  
MARRIAGES.”

OCTOBER 15, 2003