



The AMERICA FIRST Leader

July 29, 2008

The Official Newspaper of the America First Party

www.AmericaFirstParty.org

The Threat of Gay Marriage “I Now Pronounce You 'Party A' and 'Party B'”

By Michael E. Lynch
AFP Press Secretary

Ten years ago, most Americans would have considered the term “gay marriage” an oxymoron. Today, it is one of the most divisive, controversial issues in American politics. More than any issue, it has revealed the deep flaws in our current political system, wherein constitutional checks and balances have been ignored and abused.

At the time of this writing, two states—Massachusetts and California—have legalized gay “marriage.” In both cases, the law was passed, not by a state legislature or a referendum of voters, but by a small group of activist judges. In fact, the recent California judicial ruling requiring gay “marriage” rights came DESPITE a recent referendum where 61 percent of the voters wanted to preserve marriage as a relationship between one man and one woman.

Some may question why we should care. After all, nobody has proposed legislation that would prohibit two heterosexuals from freely

marrying one another. Heterosexuals are still free to marry whomever they choose. “Gay ‘marriage’ does not hurt you,” we hear. However, this issue may not be as innocuous as some may believe. This article will outline a brief history of gay “marriage,” including its development within the United States. It will then look at the current climate. Finally, it will indicate the problems within society that gay “marriage” will either cause or worsen.

Homosexuals have been around for a long time. In fact, it was quite openly tolerated in Greek and Roman culture. However, by the end of the fourth century, when Christianity had become the official religion of the Roman Empire, civil law placed strict prohibitions against same-sex “marriage.” Since that time, the phrase “gay ‘marriage’” has been almost unthinkable in the Western world.

Ten years ago, most Americans would have considered the term “gay marriage” an oxymoron. Today, it is one of the most divisive, controversial issues in American politics.

With the emergence of “political correctness” and an emphasis on “tolerance” as the greatest moral virtue in Western culture, the call for gay rights has grown louder in recent years. While one may argue that homosexuals should be protected from violence or similar criminal activity, the “gay rights” lobby has increased its demands in recent years. Homosexual



Protesters in San Francisco campaign for marriage rights for same-sex couples (March 11, 2004) Photo by AJ Alfieri-Crispin, San Francisco, CA.

activists have demanded protection, not only from employment discrimi-

get a joint bank account? Why can't we adopt and raise children?”

In 1996, Congress overwhelmingly passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DoMA), which was signed into law by President Bill Clinton. This law defined marriage, for the sake of federal regulations, as a union between one man and one woman. However, this law does not forbid individual states from defining marriage differently. It mainly defines who can be considered one's spouse for the purposes of federal benefits or regulations. For example, a state may grant a marriage license to two men, whose union would be recognized as legally valid within that state. However, they would not be able to file a
(Continued on Page 7)

Inside this Issue:

- Chairman's Message . . . Page 2
- Party Principles Page 3
- War in Iraq Page 4
- It's the Economy Page 5
- Party War Resolution . . Page 9

Is Indifference Our Greatest Enemy?

By Jonathan Hill
AFP National Chairman

Americans are getting increasingly uncomfortable. Energy costs are being felt at the gas pump. With the possibility of \$5 to \$6 gas this summer, many may be forced to keep thermostats lower next winter. Taxes never seem to get lower, and the bite of inflation is felt at supermarkets and department stores, as the dollar continues to plummet. Many sense fundamental problems at play. But will the increasing unease provoke the right grassroots political response?



does not know how to respond, is not able to, or does not care to, and this is why our national train remains derailed.

Why do many Americans appear so unresponsive? Is it ignorance, inability, or indifference? To some degree, it is all three. And there may not be a person alive who has not had all of these limitations. Ignorance has certainly been a factor in my responsiveness—hopefully we are all learning with time. Ability is often related to availability, and there is always a limit as to what any individual can do. It is a fair bet that, for whatever reason, there are many indifferent Americans as well, and maybe we all have to struggle to combat this tendency.

No one is perfect. That being said, could things be this bad today if



"Patrick Henry Before the Virginia House of Burgesses," Peter F. Rothermel's 1851 depiction of Patrick Henry's "If this be treason, make the most of it!" speech against the Stamp Act of 1765.

No one is perfect. That being said, could things be this bad today if people seriously cared about our common national interest?

energy, immigration, foreign, and fiscal affairs—shows signs of imminent meltdown. The average citizen either

people seriously cared about our common national interest? It is noteworthy that in past times there was more usage in public discourse of the word "commonweal," which means "public good." That was also a time when people kept their front doors unlocked, and when, if you were sick, your next door neighbor might call on you with a bowl of chicken soup. Today, the concept of the "commonweal" seems totally absent from public commentary, people do not know their neighbors, and crime is rampant. People seem more focused on satisfying materialistic urges, and less so on assisting their neighbor or nation.

Given all of this, it is no surprise that the country is a shambles. Voters who just focus on themselves are unlikely to take time to reflect on principles of good government before heading for the polls, and consequently, they are more likely to think that things like constitutions are just

quaint items of memorabilia from times past, with little practical significance. Like all voters, they tend to vote for people who share their outlook, and then the like-minded people they elect tend to appoint judges who reflect their values. Hence, we

ent course and watch our nation self-destruct, or we can return to the sound principles advanced by our nation's founders. Unfortunately, there is little hope that the major parties will be part of this solution. It is also true that the America First Party is

If people like ourselves have the charity, vision, and fortitude to act decisively, the party can develop rapidly.

have Roe vs. Wade and an ongoing stream of outrageous judicial decisions at both the federal and state levels. But from this pitiful situation, there is a lesson to glean: for our nation to survive, individual Americans must have charity in their hearts. If they do not, they will probably not make the right political decisions, and they will probably not take the time to discover the principles of sound government.

This is a pivotal time for our nation. We can either stay on our pres-

too small to affect change to current national policy, but this is partly because very few have expended personal resources like time and money to develop it. Nevertheless, if people like ourselves have the charity, vision, and fortitude to act decisively, the party can develop rapidly. What we do now will affect what future generations will face.

All major organizations have started small. For instance, the America First Committee of 1940 started

(Continued on Page 3)

The America First Leader

An Official Publication of the America First Party, prepared by the Public Relations Committee, and published by authority of the America First National Committee.

Press Secretary
Michael E. Lynch
Public Relations Cmte Chairman

Address all correspondence to:
America First Party
1630 A 30th Street # 111
Boulder, CO 80301

(866) SOS-USA1
info@americafirstparty.org
www.americafirstparty.org

Copyright 2008 by the America First National Committee. All Rights Reserved.

Indifference the Enemy

(Continued from Page 2)

its campaign by publishing its goals. Its second act was to initiate a petitioning program. Eventually, a movement of about 800,000 members was established.

It does not require corporate involvement and large donors to get a party like ours off and running. Ordinary citizens can employ methods like petitioning and pamphleteering, and in so doing help us to develop a contact list of people nationwide who agree with us on multiple issues. This is why, at the request of the Party-building Committee, our National

span of just one year!

I hope you agree that this level of participation must be realized, and if possible, it must begin with you. Our nation is clearly hemorrhaging in many ways from the policies of the two major parties. To unnecessarily delay our response could be disastrous and judas-like. For such a failure and betrayal, it would be right for future generations to regard us with contempt.

There may come a time when what we have been hoping for—a mass defection from the major parties—will happen. But the urgent

Our nation is clearly hemorrhaging.... To unnecessarily delay our response could be disastrous and judas-like.

Committee has established the Activist Program, which includes activities like the ones mentioned above.

And by the way, these are activities that are typical of virtually all political campaigns. To state it simply and frankly, they are basic activities which any successful political party must be involved in. All successful candidates for offices other than local offices must petition, distribute media, and identify supporters. If the membership of a political party does not have the wherewithal to engage in activities like these, there is no way that it will succeed.

But there is some very good news. There is virtually no doubt that these methods would rapidly accelerate our progress to becoming a viable national political force, and the scale of participation required is not enormous. Based on a trial run in one of the most liberal towns of Massachusetts, we have been able to get people to sign 2 petitions on hot-button subjects like homosexuality and immigration at a rate of 7 persons per hour! Based on this, just 20 people per state working 8 hours per week for 8 months of the year could provide us with about 750,000 new donor and member prospects nationwide. If only 10% of these were to join or contribute, the result would be a dramatic increase in our effectiveness. Again, this can happen in the

question is, will the AFP be ready when that happens? Will we have the funding, volunteers, and track record at that point in time to be given serious consideration by conservatives who are looking for another party?

The answer is partly up to all of us who support America First principles. Will we step forward to advance this cause in practical ways? Will we fully take advantage of our opportunities to reach out to member and donor prospects? I am firmly convinced that if we do these things, our party can expand very rapidly.

There is no doubt that we are short of our goal. But this can change in a heartbeat, if we choose to work together for the cause of America First principles. Although there is work involved, there is little that is as satisfying as advancing the common good of our nation and restoring our Republic. Let us do it while we still have the opportunity! And in doing this work, we may gain the double benefit of inspiring our fellow citizens to additional acts of charity and patriotism.

So if you have not yet requested a membership form, volunteered for the Activist Program, or sent in a contribution, then please consider doing so as soon as possible. These are the action items that will make the difference between success and failure.

Party Founding Principles

The Statement of Principles of the America First Party was adopted at the first meeting of the National Committee on April 20, 2002. The Principles provide an outline for the Party's Platform, which contains a section for each of the Principles headings. Each Platform section then expands upon that particular set of principles.

The Statement of Principles is the core statement of beliefs of the America First Party. As such, a two-thirds vote of the National Committee is required to adopt any change to the Principles.

The Party Constitution binds both the National Committee and the National Convention to adopt a platform consistent with the Principles. All party leaders are required to support and advance the Principles as a condition of holding a position of trust within the America First Party.

Preserve and Protect Our People and Our Sovereignty

- Support a military whose mission is to protect our nation, not police the world
- Strengthen our borders and promote rational immigration policies
- Protect English as our common language
- Seek friendship with all nations, but avoid entangling alliances
- Work to maintain our nation's sovereignty and oppose all attempts to make our nation subservient to the precursors of global government
- Apply American values to our foreign policy

Promote Economic Growth and Independence

- Restore accountability and Constitutionality to budgets and taxes
- Promote tax policies that adhere to the Constitution, enhance individual freedom, encourage savings and investment, and promote the family
- Eliminate unconstitutional portions of the federal government
- Rebuild our manufacturing base and protect American workers
- Protect our right to fair trade and oppose free trade, exit NAFTA and the WTO
- Help American businesses stay in America
- Promote a Buy American policy
- End taxpayer bailouts of corporations and foreign governments
- Implement a self-sufficient energy policy

Encourage the Traditional Values of Faith, Family, and Responsibility

- Protect and recognize the sanctity of all human life
- Defend the traditional family unit based on one man and one woman
- Promote the primacy of parents in the lives and education of their children

- Respect the free exercise of religion
- Recognize the Judeo-Christian heritage of our shared values

Ensure Equality Before the Law in Protecting Those Rights Granted by the Creator

- Defend the self-evident truth "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"
- Preserve and protect all of the Bill of Rights
- Oppose all quota systems - merit and behavior must prevail
- End judicial tyranny and restore balance to our political system
- Restore property rights and restrict government land confiscation

Clean Up Our Corrupted Political System

- Remove the primary source of corruption by sharply reducing the size and scope of the federal government to its limited powers under the Constitution, and return control over all other matters to the states
- Require that all political donations be promptly disclosed and come from voters
- Enforce fair, uniform standards for ballot and debate access to give voters more choice
- Implement clean election practices—restore paper ballots
- Reform the lobbying system so that the only organizations permitted to lobby are those organizations whose money is acquired strictly from voter donations. Reasonable individual voter donation amount limits must be established
- End lavish Congressional pensions—put them on Social Security
- Ban taxpayer funded Congressional campaign mailings
- Restore the rights of states in the manner of choosing Senators and Representatives and promote the citizen legislator

The Moral Duty to Cut and Run

Why America Must Lose the War in Iraq

By John Pittman Hey

AFP National Secretary/Treasurer

**Then conquer we must,
when our cause it is just,
And this be our motto:
'In God is our trust.'**

*Francis Scott Key
Aboard the HMS Minden
September 16, 1814*

What is a patriot to do when his country's cause is unjust?

Since our government's invasion of Iraq in 2003, that question has been smoldering in the hearts and souls of many thoughtful and patriotic Americans.

Nobody loves this country more than do members of the America First Party. We will defer to no one in our loyalty and love for its Constitution, the spirit of its Founders, or the overflowing bless-



Nobody loves this country more than do members of the America First Party. We will defer to no one in our loyalty and love for its Constitution, the spirit of its Founders, or the overflowing blessings which God has bestowed upon it.

ings which God has bestowed upon it. America is unexcelled in wealth, beauty, majesty, and goodness.

But we are not blind to the faults that have developed of late in our nation. That is why our party fights for our country—to preserve its heritage, to restore those things in need of repair, and to maintain it as a bastion of liberty, opportunity, and greatness. We put our trust in God, that He will be our Helper in this noble enterprise.

But we dare not call upon God to uphold our country in wickedness

and injustice. We ought not seek to conquer when our cause is unjust.

So the threshold question about our invasion of Iraq is this: Is our conduct fundamentally moral and just? Can we justify all the mayhem and destruction and killing we have carried out in Iraq? There are many arguments that have been raised against our conduct in Iraq, but all of them avoid this fundamental question of morality.

For example, there can be no doubt that combat operations in Iraq are unlawful under our nation's Constitution. There is no grant of author-

ity to the President to order armed combat without a Declaration of War by Congress. Neither does Congress have the authority to approve the use of military force without such a war declaration. Since there has been no congressional war declaration against

the country of Iraq, there can be no doubt that our invasion and occupation of Iraq is unlawful *per se*.

It is also true that our actions in Iraq have destabilized the Middle East and created a breeding ground for terrorists. For all his monstrosities, Saddam Hussein was a bulwark against Al Qaeda, which were the mortal enemies of his secular state. Iraq was also a natural check to the ambitions of the Iranian theocratic government, which is now set free to cause additional trouble.

Furthermore, our actions in Iraq, whether moral or not, have enraged many of its citizens, as we ought to



Pentagon policy bars media coverage of returning coffins of our soldiers cut down in the fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. This photo was smuggled out and widely re-published all around the world.

have predicted. People naturally hold a grudge against countries that invade their homeland, destroying so many lives and so much property. Around one million Iraqi citizens have been killed as a result of our invasion, with several million being driven out of their country as refugees.

It is also true that this war has cost our country many of the precious lives of our people. Almost 5000 of our men and women have lost their lives, with tens of thousands suffering permanent maiming, and hundreds of thousands suffering from head trauma-related brain injuries and psychological damage.

Since there has been no congressional war declaration against the country of Iraq, there can be no doubt that our invasion and occupation of Iraq is unlawful per se.

Our conflict in Iraq has also cost us trillions of dollars in direct expenses and economic disruption, including the destabilization of the oil

production of the Middle East with concomitant skyrocketing in energy costs, crippling our entire economic system.

The conflict in Iraq has been used to justify a vicious assault by the President and Congress against our precious constitutional liberties. We are treated like suspects whenever we travel; our personal and private information is rifled through by a government that spies on us without court authority; our conversations are unlawfully intercepted and analyzed; our people are subject to kidnapping, rendition, torture, and the denial of basic habeas corpus rights; our courts have been converted into star cham-

bers in which the accused is not permitted to see the evidence or even read the arguments made against
(Continued on Page 6)

It's the Economy, Stupid!

By J. C. Schweingrouber
Abingdon, Virginia

“It’s the Economy, Stupid!” was a phrase made popular during Bill Clinton’s first run at the presidency. At the time, the U.S. was going through a mild recession and his public attention to economic issues gained the attention of American voters. Once again, the U.S. economy is showing signs of buckling under decades of terrible economic policy from both parties, and the presidential candidates are starting to sound off on economic issues. Just like in 1992, American voters are listening as the strain on their wallets continues to grow.

As we head into the fall presidential election, Americans have many economic issues confronting them. The biggest concerns are: job security in the wake of a sluggish economy and continued erosion of our manufacturing base, as companies send U.S. jobs to foreign lands; meeting mortgage payments or buying a home in the midst of a credit crisis which is plaguing the financial and housing sector; and the escalating inflation concerns that have sent gasoline and food prices skyrocketing.

A closer examination of the economy shows that the sub-prime mortgage lending practices that spurred a huge run on the housing sector created an enormous economic bubble, somewhat similar to the technology bubble created by the huge growth in the number of internet and technology companies in the late 1990s. As the interest rates on home mortgages are beginning to adjust, nearly 7 million families are at risk of losing their homes over the next 18 months.

Banks all across our nation have been forced to write off losses in the billions of dollars due to high risk loans. The result of that has been a tightening of lending practices, also

referred to as the “credit crunch.” Banks are very reluctant to lend any money during this time, even to those with spotless credit. This only accelerates the slow-down of the U.S. economy. Financial institutions such as Citigroup, various brokerage firms, and banks across the country have begun to lay off workers in order to protect their profit margins. We have even witnessed one of America’s most successful companies, Bear Stearns, collapsing under the strain of the problems.

Lately, we have seen the price of gas nearing or exceeding \$4.00 a gallon, something many of us hoped we would never see. The price of a barrel of oil has nearly doubled over the past year, recently peaking at over \$145 per barrel. That has forced the price of food at the grocery store to rise. The price of a dozen eggs has nearly doubled, milk has increased over 40% in many markets, and the price of a small meal at a fast food restaurant is even beginning to adjust quickly to their higher costs. For most Americans, food and energy

Our nation is headed for possible economic catastrophe because that is where our elected officials have brought us.

(the two elements left out of government inflation reports) are the two biggest expenditures for the household. Some analysts even expect the price of a pound of hamburger to reach \$5.00 in the next few months. In addition to the costs of fuel running up prices, the diversion of corn production to ethanol (a costly endeavor in and of itself) has only added to the inflation problem.

The value of the U.S. dollar in relation to other major currencies seems to hit a new all-time low every day. That has added to our inflation at home. The only bright spot that should be seen with the low value of the dollar would be a huge increase in the number of exports of Ameri-



The New York Stock Exchange on Wall Street.

can made goods. The only problem with that is that we do not make much in America anymore. Our trade deficit has not reaped the benefit of the low dollar. However, many analysts blame the low dollar on the high price of oil. Some claim that a strong dollar policy would actually lower the price of oil by about \$30.00 per barrel.

Terrible trade agreements, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement and the Central American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA and CAFTA) have sent millions of our high paying manufacturing and technology jobs to foreign countries, and these have not been sufficiently replaced. Instead, we have seen the low paying service sector employment increase greatly.

Add to these problems the outrageous national debt brought at the hands of politicians in both major parties, our ever increasing trade deficit, no solid national energy policy and our growing dependence on foreign oil, and you have the recipe for a financial meltdown. Mean-

while, the leadership in Washington, D.C. plays politics as usual.

The Federal Reserve even recently lowered its expectation for economic growth and increased its expectation for inflation and unemployment. It cited its outlook as “severe” in the short term. Billionaire investor Warren Buffet recently said, as cited on Yahoo Finance News, that he believed the recession would be much longer lasting and a lot deeper than most analysts expect.

The leaders in the Democrat and Republican parties are overseeing an economy of their own making, as they have spent decades spending the people’s money with reckless abandon, promising more government socialism than We the People can possibly pay for, and squandering taxpayer dollars on one unconstitutional project after another. Our nation is headed for possible economic catastrophe because that is where our elected officials have brought us. They have led us to the river to drink one more time, only this time the river has run dry.

Let’s not fool ourselves. Anyone reading this article should know exactly what the government’s response will be in the wake of an economic meltdown of our own making. We

(Continued on Page 11)

The Moral Duty to Cut and Run

(Continued from Page 4)

him; and our citizens are denied access to the courts by the so-called "state secrets privilege" to obtain relief from the spying, kidnapping, and torture ordered by the President and carried out by his agents.

Finally, the conflict in Iraq has driven a degradation in the morality and conduct of many of our country's officials, police, attorneys, military officers, and enlisted men, as they are led to engage in disgraceful and immoral conduct while carrying out the unlawful orders of the President. The blackening of the hearts of so many hundreds of thousands of government personnel under the leadership of our President and Congress will bear bitter fruit in the years to come, as these people turn upon the civilian population with all the fury and rage that persistent violent and unconscionable conduct brands upon the human psyche.

The blackening of the hearts of so many hundreds of thousands of government personnel under the leadership of our President and Congress will bear bitter fruit in the years to come, as these people turn upon the civilian population with all the fury and rage that persistent violent and unconscionable conduct brands upon the human psyche.

But all these arguments sidestep the root issue: that our invasion and occupation of Iraq, with the concomitant violence, bloodshed, and destruction, are fundamentally immoral and dishonorable from the very beginning.

If this is true, then we should view all the horrible consequences and practical objections previously cited against our government's actions in Iraq to be but the judgment, the temporal punishment, and the bitter fruit that comes from our government's fundamental immorality and injustice in this matter.

That our government's actions in Iraq are fundamentally immoral and unjust is simple to deduce. It is a basic tenet of the Judeo-Christian moral tradition that murder is pro-

hibited as unjust and immoral. The Scriptural basis for this may be found in Genesis 9:6, where the Lord God commanded Noah and all his progeny that "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed, for God made man in his own image" (English Standard Version). All men everywhere know the evil of murder, for it is the law written upon the heart.

From this it is readily deduced that war, which is the taking of many lives and the destruction of much property, may only be justified as a defense and response to aggression that threatens the lives and liberty of a people. Wars of aggression and conquest are merely mass murder writ large. Indeed, this is why wars of aggression have been called the ultimate war crimes.

We repudiate the notion that simply because our government wages a war of aggression, it should some-

how be called something more euphemistic than the mass murder and war crime that it is.

There can be no reasonable doubt that our invasion of Iraq is a war of aggression against that nation, for Iraq posed no imminent threat against our country or its people. It had not the ability, nor even the intent, to jeopardize our existence. We had no serious cause of disagreement with Iraq to justify war.

Quibbling over some minor inflections or extravagant talk by Saddam Hussein does not overcome this objection. Bloodshed of any sort must always be the last resort in time of dispute or even violence. A nation may only resort to war when it is the last possible alternative to death or enslavement. This is especially true



United States Army photo from Abu Ghraib prison showing Pvt. Lynndie England holding a leash attached to a prisoner collapsed on the floor, known to the guards as "Gus."

when the war will result in the death of many innocent civilians.

Nor does Iraq's supposed pursuit of so-called "weapons of mass destruction" let our nation off the hook, for a country is entitled to obtain such weapons when necessary to prevent an attack from its neighbors. The fact that one country would like to prevent another country from arming itself is an insufficient reason to resort to mass murder to achieve that goal. In the end, there are dozens and dozens of countries with weapons of mass destruction today, including some that are hostile to the United States, but that provides us no excuse to launch a war of aggression against them. The bleak irony is, the United States assisted Iraq in the acquisition of chemical weapons and encouraged their use against Iran during the 1980s.

Wars of aggression and conquest are merely mass murder writ large. Indeed, this is why wars of aggression have been called the ultimate war crimes.

The fact that Saddam Hussein was a tyrant and butchered many of his own people does not excuse an invasion and occupation of Iraq. Were that the case, there are plenty of other countries that would be at the head of the line for attack before Iraq.

Indeed, following such a line of argument, Iraq would have been

morally justified in invading the United States and deposing our government, which has arranged the butchering of over 40 million helpless babies in the last 35 years. Our own Supreme Court is arguably the most destructive terrorist cell presently roaming free inside our borders, completely eclipsing in malignity any straggler terrorists that may have operated under Hussein's nose in Iraq.

In the run-up to the invasion of Iraq, President Bush and his warmongering lackies played the classic "burning bucket" con on the American people. They claimed to have all sorts of intelligence about Saddam Hussein's big plans regarding weapons, and they hinted darkly at some connection between Iraq and 9/11. The war hawks had us so agape at all these monstrous claims that

most of the country failed to ask the essential question: so what?

So what if all the intelligence was as Bush claimed? So what if Hussein tried to buy yellowcake? So what if he had portable anthrax labs? This evidence and these reasons, even if they were true, were not sufficient to

(Continued on Page 9)

The Threat of Gay Marriage

(Continued from Page 1)

joint federal tax return, because their relationship does not fit the federal definition of marriage provided by DoMA.

At that time, it may have seemed like a minor affair. However, since then, the battle for gay “marriage” has raged more heatedly. Since 1996, the issue has emerged in many states, whether in the form of bills in the legislatures, voters' referendums, or state constitutional amendments. To date, the normal legislative and elective process has not legalized gay “marriage” in any state. In every case, the voters or legislatures either struck down proposed legislation to allow gay “marriage,” or affirmed that marriage can only be between a man and a woman. In most cases, the margin of victory was overwhelming: over 60 percent in favor of traditional marriage, and less than 40 percent in favor of allowing homosexual unions. Thirty-eight states have laws banning gay “marriage”; 26 of those states have constitutional

pal clerks' offices throughout the state to begin issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples in May 2004.

At the same time, a few “rogue” jurisdictions in other states—including San Francisco, CA and New Paltz, NY—began issuing gay “marriage” licenses in defiance of state law. Although officials eventually ceased their activities under court orders, gay-rights activists continued their efforts.

California became the second state to legalize gay “marriage” when, on May 15, 2008, the state's Supreme Court ruled that state laws against gay “marriage” were unconstitutional. It ordered the state to begin issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples within 30 days. A number of conservative lobbies, including the Alliance Defense Fund and American Family Association, petitioned the court, requesting a stay on the court's order. Ten attorneys general from other states likewise requested a stay, as the court's decision



A “gay marriage” ceremony in the Netherlands. Scenes like this could soon become all too common in our own country.

to recognize gay “marriages” from other states, and one of only three that recognizes gay “marriages” from other countries.

At the same time, a law-enforcement raid on a polygamous cult in Texas was in the news for a few days. Over 400 children were removed from their homes by the state and placed in foster care. However, a court eventually ordered that the children be returned to their homes. While some may argue that the raid was illegal or unconstitutional, the problem with the court's ruling was that the judges determined that the children were not injured physically or emotionally by living in polygamous households.

and a nine-year-old girl? Or a man and his goat, dog, cat, etc.? My wife sometimes jokes that I am married to my computer: why can't a guy marry an inanimate object? The logic may seem far-fetched, but it just goes to show that sensible people would expect some limitations.

Radical libertarianism is impossible. One cannot say that everybody must have their rights, because people's views of what they are entitled to often clash. When slavery was abolished in the 1860s, people of African descent in America gained a large number of rights. However, white plantation owners lost something that they considered to be their right. The Declaration of Independ-

California became the second state to legalize gay “marriage” when, on May 15, 2008, the state's Supreme Court ruled that state laws against gay “marriage” were unconstitutional.

amendments prohibiting such unions, although some of them allow certain rights for homosexual couples.

Meanwhile, several other nations legalized gay “marriage.” Norway began recognizing civil unions in the 1990s; in 2001, the Netherlands extended this to gay “marriage.” Several other “Western” nations have joined them, including Canada, Belgium, and South Africa.

In 2003–04, several events opened the floodgates for gay “marriage” in the US. First, the Massachusetts Supreme Court ruled that the state's laws limiting marriage to heterosexual couples were unconstitutional, and ordered the state legislature to pass laws providing homosexual “marriage” rights within the state. Although no state law was formally passed by the legislature, Gov. Mitt Romney ordered municipi-

would create problems in other states. A new referendum regarding the issue is on California's ballot in November.

The first same-sex “marriage” licenses under the court's order were issued in mid-June. However, within that interim, events in other states showed how the possibility of gay “marriage” was spreading. New York Governor David Patterson ordered agencies throughout the state to revise rules and policies to recognize same-sex unions solemnized in other states. At this time, two opposing bills are currently working their way through the New York State Legislature. One would allow homosexuals to “marry” in New York State, while another bill would prohibit the state from recognizing gay “marriages” solemnized in other jurisdictions. Currently, New York is the only state

Why not allow one man and four women to consider themselves a married set? Or even three men and two women? Or a 65-year-old man and a 9-year-old girl?

The Texas case raises an important question in the gay-rights debate: Is there any limit to a libertine definition of marriage, that does not restrict who may consider themselves “married”? If it is not limited to one man and one woman, why should we stop at “two consenting adults”? Why not allow one man and four women to consider themselves a married set? Or even three men and two women? Or a 65-year-old man

ence argues that our nation is founded on the principle that men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Perceived “rights” will come into conflict at times. Our nation's Judeo-Christian heritage provides an objective standard for determining what to do when those rights come into conflict.

Gay “marriage” will impinge on the rights of others. Has anyone guar-

(Continued on Page 8)

The Threat of Gay Marriage

(Continued from Page 7)

anted that clergy will always have the right to refuse to perform a wedding ceremony if the union violates their religious beliefs? The Canadian experience suggests that this is not likely. Canada has legalized gay “marriage” and strong hate-crimes legislation. In several cases, people have been fined, jailed, or ordered to refrain from criticizing homosexuality. In one current case, a Roman Catholic priest named Rev. Alphonse de Valk has been charged with a hate crime for quoting the Bible and church tradition when addressing the issue of gay “marriage” in Canada. In light of the cultural similarities between Canada and the US, it is unlikely that the First Amendment will survive the “right to marriage” for homosexuals.

The threat is not limited to clergy. Even if homosexuals decide to have their weddings at City Hall, a justice of the peace or other civil official will

within a culture, suffers. Before Norway legalized same-sex civil unions (with virtually all of the benefits and restrictions of marriage) in 1993, the nation had a very low out-of-wedlock birth rate. Since then, the number of children born to unmarried women has skyrocketed. The same pattern is repeating in countries that have legalized gay “marriage.”

With single parenthood comes a litany of other problems. Children from single-parent households, and adults who grew up in single-parent households, are more likely to:

- be convicted of a crime and sentenced to jail;
- be victims of abuse and domestic violence;
- engage in substance abuse;
- live in poverty.

Regis Nicoll, in an article entitled “The Dangers of Same-Sex ‘Marriage’” (www.breakpoint.org/listing/article.asp?ID=2342) writes, “In addition, studies compiled by Peter

So-called “marriage license” issued in San Francisco in 2004.

the Norwegian experience. Norway still allows “civil unions” and will begin to use the term “marriage” for homosexual couples in 2009.

Jennifer Morse, responding in the National Review (www.nationalreview.com/comment/morse200405200926.asp) to the institution of gay “marriage” in Massachusetts, observes that such notions view marriage as a contract instead of an act of “self-giving abandon” where both parties seek their common good. Contracts are based on the notion that each party has an obligation to the other and, if either party violates one term of the agreement, the entire deal is null and void. “The idea that marriage is a contract has undermined more heterosexual marriages than anything, with the possible exception of adultery,” she writes.

She adds in another article that the Massachusetts Supreme Court, in its ruling, claimed that government creates marriage. Instead, she observes, marriage is a “pre-political institution.” Government cannot create or define it; its only role is to provide legal protections for it.

So, what are our choices when

confronted with gay “marriage”? Many have argued that a constitutional amendment, defining marriage as limited to one man and one woman, may now be our only option. President George W. Bush observed in 2004 that, if state referenda that were passed by overwhelming majorities cannot withstand the wrath of activist judges, the Defense of Marriage Act is not safe either. Representative Paul Broun (R-GA) has introduced the Marriage Protection Amendment of 2008 (H.J. Res. 89) to accomplish this goal.

The platform of the America First Party states, “The America First Party strongly supports the traditional family as ordained by God and built upon the marital union of one man and one woman. The institution of marriage is a sacred value upon which the traditional family is based. Therefore, we believe there should be a constitutional amendment to protect marriage as being a union between one man and one woman only.” Since marriage and family is the foundation of society, it needs to be preserved if we hope to resolve the other problems facing our culture.

So, who does gay “marriage” hurt? The answer is plain: children and, by extension, future generations; and taxpayers who are forced to pay for incarceration of criminals and social programs to minimize the symptoms of social ills.

have to officiate at the ceremony. Many religious Americans will face a choice: perform a ceremony that violates my religious beliefs and conscience; refuse to perform the ceremony, in violation of state legislation or a judge's order; or resign from my job. A person whose religious beliefs prohibit him from supporting homosexual behavior may be forced to refuse to seek public office because he would be expected to perform homosexual “weddings.” In essence, gay “marriage” will create a religious test for public office (Article VI of the Constitution).

Thus, gay “marriage” will trample on one of the original articles of the Constitution, as well as the First Amendment.

On a societal level, gay “marriage” creates a slippery slope effect whereby family, as an institution

Sprigg and Timothy Dailey show that children raised by gay couples risk a fifty times higher incidence of incest, a two times incidence of domestic violence, and perform worst in nine out of twelve social and academic areas, as compared to children in other family types.”

So, who does gay “marriage” hurt? The answer is plain: children and, by extension, future generations, and taxpayers who are forced to pay for incarceration of criminals and social programs to minimize the symptoms of social ills.

Some have argued in favor of civil unions, which grant many of the rights (although some states or countries grant fewer rights) of marriage without using the term. However, the social impact of gay “marriage” is not significantly minimized by changing the terminology, as seen by

Cut and Run

(Continued from Page 6)

justify the launch of aggressive war.

How humiliating for our country's honor that, in the end, almost all of the intelligence claims used to justify the invasion of Iraq were false. Indeed, many of them, it turns out, were known to be false by the administration at the very time they were breathlessly repeating them to a gullible electorate.

All along, our nation was preoccupied with the wrong question, and therefore never noticed the unstated, untrue undergirding assumption: that our nation is morally entitled to invade another country on the other side of the globe and kill countless people who pose no viable threat to our nation's existence and safety.

The America First Party's opposition from the very beginning was always rooted in this fundamental

ideals of our nation, to basic principles of morality and justice, and to the peace and security of the United States." We promised that, should the President proceed with his unlawful and immoral plans, we would call for his immediate impeachment and removal from office. And in October 2003, we did just that.

Three particularly insidious ideas that seek to mitigate the clear moral argument against wars of aggression need to be swatted down.

First, some seek to justify aggressive wars by recasting them as "pre-emptive wars"—that is, by claiming that it is proper to start a war to forestall potential attack in the future. This justification, however, ignores the requirement that massive bloodshed may be resorted to only as a last resort to resist annihilation and enslavement. The justification of pre-

We declared that the President's plan to launch an unjustified war against Iraq "is repugnant to our Constitution, to the principles and ideals of our nation, to basic principles of morality and justice, and to the peace and security of the United States."

moral argument. On August 10, 2002 at its founding convention in Orlando Florida, party leaders adopted a resolution condemning the proposed invasion and occupation of Iraq.

Our party stated at that time "that the making of war by the United States of America may only be justified when the safety and security of our people and our homeland are imperiled." The party mourned prior wars in which we had "shed innocent blood." We concluded that "this nation has no cause for war with Iraq, her people, or their leaders, unless they seek to harm our people or this beloved land." We further held that "unless and until the nation of Iraq lifts its hand against our people, our homes, or our countryland, there can be no just, moral, legal, or practical cause for armed conflict between us." We declared that the President's plan to launch an unjustified war against Iraq "is repugnant to our Constitution, to the principles and

emption has long been the fig-leaf of respectability snatched up by bloodthirsty men to adorn their wars of naked conquest and aggression.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt put it this way: when you find a rattlesnake in your yard, you crush its head immediately, before it can strike out at your little children at play. FDR, well known for his inability to distinguish right from wrong, apparently failed to notice that rattlesnakes were not created equal with all men, nor were they endowed with the unalienable rights of man.

At its root, pre-emption seeks to upset the equipoise that exists between the natural rights of all men everywhere. There can be no moral basis for waging war out of fear of future attack. If there were, Iraq would be entitled to attack the United States pre-emptively for fear of our pre-emptive attack against Iraq for fear of the possibility that one day

Resolution of the National Convention To Condemn any Unlawful and Improper War with Iraq

(Adopted by overwhelming vote of the National Convention of the America First Party on August 10, 2002)

Whereas, the United States Constitution vests the power to make war exclusively in the United States Congress; and

Whereas, the making of war by the United States of America may only be justified when the safety and security of our people and our homeland are imperiled; and

Whereas, our nation has experienced the bitter fruit of adventurous and undeclared wars that have sullied the rightness of our cause, damaged our reputation abroad, imperiled our brave fighting men and

Now therefore be it resolved by the National Convention:

That it is not the business of the United States to solve the world's problems, babysit bickering factions abroad, or defend the interests and safety of any nation other than our own; and

That this nation has no cause for war with Iraq, her people, or their leaders, unless they seek to harm our people or this beloved land; and

That unless and until the nation of Iraq lifts its hand against our people, our homes, or our countryland, there can be no just, moral, legal, or practical cause for armed conflict between us; and

That we deplore the growing efforts to foment hatred and fear of the nation of Iraq solely for the purpose of fanning the flames of war hysteria; and

That calls for armed attack against Iraq are at present unjustified; and

That the President's plan to launch an unjustified war against Iraq without the mandatory Congressional Declaration of War is repugnant to our Constitution, to the principles and ideals of our nation, to basic principles of morality and justice, and to the peace and security of the United States; and

That should the President institute unlawful and improper use of the armed forces of the United States, the America First Party shall call for his immediate impeachment and removal from office.

Iraq might attack the United States. This is a recipe for an endless regress of perpetual war. Only an imminent threat of attack and invasion could morally justify a country striking first in war.

A second, perhaps even more despicable justification often raised for this war of aggression against Iraq is that it is better to fight the terrorists in Iraq than have them come to fight in our own country. A simple analogy will reveal the depravity of such an argument.

Suppose you do not get along with your next door neighbor. There has been a dispute about a fence, and

words have been exchanged, and mean looks traded. Then one day, a household of thugs moves in across the street and the next thing you know, they have shot out your front window.

Your response? Collect your guns, call all your friends, stockpile supplies, and then one night, head next door to your neighbor's dwelling, kick in the door, kill his wife and children, and commence to blaze away from his living room window at the thugs across the street.

After all, better they should fight you at your neighbor's house than to

(Continued on Page 10)

The Moral Duty to Cut and Run

(Continued from Page 9)

trash and destroy your own house and threaten your own family!

There is no doubt that our presence in Iraq has attracted many terrorists to fight against us there. The terrorists have killed many times more innocent Iraqi civilians than American soldiers, and it is all our fault for bringing them there. We invaded a sovereign nation, destroyed its infrastructure and government, killed many of its people, and made it into a battlefield for a dispute that did not even concern the people of Iraq.

It has been piously claimed by supporters of the Iraqi invasion that America never seeks the land or resources of the countries she fights. In Iraq, we have put the lie to that defense, for we have taken a whole

nocents and destroying hundreds of billions of dollars in property.

The moral and legal consequences of this conclusion are staggering and soul-sickening. Our President is a mass murderer and war criminal. And Bush is not alone in his genocidal bloodguiltiness. Vice President Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of State Colin Powell, and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice all put their hands to this murder as well.

The leaders of the House and Senate, and most of the members of those two bodies, passed an illegal resolution purporting to enable this act of aggression and murder. Most telling is their continued culpability in authorizing funding to keep the bloodshed and mayhem going.

mostly in good faith, they may be charged with a measure of responsibility for the murders, to the extent they were aware of the unjustified nature of the war. Certainly, any soldier who reads and understands this essay can no longer avoid moral culpability should he continue to participate in the killing and destruction of Iraq.

As invaders in an aggressive war, our fighting men have no moral right to defend themselves or their comrades from the justified attacks by Iraqi citizens fighting to defend their homeland and their families. Just as a robber has no right to self-defense from an enraged and frightened homeowner, so our soldiers are bereft of any moral cloak for their own actions of self-defense.

What is the proper response of a nation which finds itself engaged in the wholesale murder that accompanies an unjust war of aggression? Clearly, at a minimum, that proper response must be immediate and unconditional withdrawal. The first step a conscience-stricken mass murderer takes is to stop his killings.

Defenders of our unjust war call this “cutting and running,” but such a phrase presupposes the mass murder and mayhem are somehow honorable and ought to be sustained.

The reality is, we ought to be ashamed, humiliated, and disgraced at what we have been implicated in, and our only beginning course of action should be to lay down our arms and leave Iraq at once. Most certainly, we do have the moral duty to

Our President is a mass murderer and war criminal... [and] Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Colin Powell, and Condoleezza Rice all put their hands to this murder as well.

country without its consent and turned it into an endless killing field upon which we hope to destroy all our enemies from afar.

A third attempt to justify our continued occupation of Iraq is that, having destroyed law and order, we are obliged to remain until peace is restored. Of course, that also means we are “obliged” to continue killing those Iraqis who continue to resist our murderous occupation of their beloved country.

Some have put this another way: we broke it, now we own it. But that destroyed country and all those dead innocents are not just some broken piece of pottery fallen from a shelf due to our carelessness. That is a country we stole; those are people we murdered. There is no moral basis for our remaining to continue the lawless course we first set out to achieve.

There is only one possible conclusion to be drawn from this: that the United States government has engaged in an unlawful, immoral, and unjust war of aggression against the people of Iraq and continues to do so to this day, murdering countless in-

At Nuremberg, the nations of the world established that execution is the only just penalty for those leaders who wage wars of aggression. It is unlikely that we will ever see justice brought down on the heads of any of these people—at least in this life. However, there is a Judge whose Court they will not escape.

In the meantime, there are other consequences almost too painful to face. For one, each of us bears some portion of the bloodguiltiness, be-

At Nuremberg, the nations of the world established that execution is the only just penalty for those leaders who wage wars of aggression. It is unlikely that we will ever see justice brought down on the heads of any of these people—at least in this life.

cause under our republican form of government, those who authorized the murders are our servants, and we therefore share in their culpability.

This debacle also leaves the members of our armed forces in a horrible moral and spiritual conundrum. Though they followed orders,

cut and run from our illegal and unjust war against Iraq. We must lose the war in Iraq if we are to have any hope of restoring morality, decency, and justice to our nation.

After that, we have a duty to pay reparations to the country and the people we have destroyed. After that,



President George W. Bush



Vice-president Dick Cheney



Former SecDef Donald Rumsfeld



Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice

those of us who stood against the war from the very beginning must continue to seek justice against those ringleaders and warmongers who brought us to this despicable end.

Beware those who would take comfort in the illusion that the “surge” is working. The purpose of the surge is, at least in part, the suppression of

(Continued on Page 11)

It's the Economy, Stupid!

(Continued from Page 5)

have been here before. The status quo answer has always been, and continues to be, more government bailouts at taxpayer expense. They will propose more government control and regulation. That is the blueprint. However, anyone who loves liberty and is at least somewhat well-read on American history should know that a bigger government is a danger to liberty.

Bigger government means less freedom for the rest of us. It has always been in times of uncertainty that those on the left (in both major parties) grab power from the people under cover of fear and economic desperation. It will happen again if our economy teeters on the verge of collapse.

It has always been in times of uncertainty that those on the left (in both major parties) grab power from the people under cover of fear and economic desperation.

The America First Party clearly falls on the side of liberty in such a circumstance, as should those elected officials who took their oath to uphold the Constitution, an oath they break daily. It is because of liberty that the platform of the America First Party calls for a strict adherence to the Constitution, an allegiance to freedom, and calls for common sense in all of our economic affairs.

To solve our economic dilemma and get Americans out of harm's way (created by our elected officials), we must first recognize that so-called free trade agreements are essentially a race to the bottom of the economic

ladder. NAFTA and CAFTA must be rejected and we must revert to constitutionally mandated trade policies. Tariffs would provide a great source of income that could eventually replace the income tax altogether. Our economic advantages must be protected, not given away.

An overhaul of our current tax system is necessary. At current tax rates, many Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. There is no incentive to save, but every incentive to consume to the maximum. Our current tax system is more akin to serfdom than to economic freedom and increased liberty. The abusive and bloated tax system is a hindrance to the growth of the American economy. Its only purpose is to serve to

grow the size of the federal government, not the economy and freedom of American citizens. It is completely at odds with the framers' intent.

Furthermore, our federal government is out of control. Its scope, size, and power are reckless and unconstitutional. It needs to be reigned back in immediately in order for our economy to flourish and our liberties to stand. To stop our elected officials from spending like drunken sailors, we must enact a Balanced Budget Amendment. Since they have no concept of self control, or feel no sense of fiscal responsibility with the people's money, they must be forced



1.2 million square foot IRS headquarters in New Carrollton, MD.

to operate under the same standards of all 50 states.

The federal debt needs to be paid down as quickly and prudently as possible until all bondholders are paid in full. This will ensure that the taxpayer does not have to pay hundreds of billions of dollars each year on the interest alone. Budget surpluses need to be applied with fiscal responsibility, something that Washington currently lacks. After the elimination of the federal debt, we should apply surpluses to the improvement of our military and defensive capabilities, funding tax reductions to spur further economic growth. In no circumstance shall budget surpluses be used to expand entitlement programs or create new ones.

The America First Party urges that all federal programs include cost estimates, a mechanism for tracking actual costs, and provisions for scaling back the program if costs exceed these estimates. Further, a quantifiable expected benefit should be clearly stated, a benefit that shall accrue to the taxpayer. Any program

that does not achieve 75% of its stated benefit should be a target for elimination. Most federal programs could be handled much more efficiently and effectively at the state and local level anyway.

These are only a few of the fiscally prudent positions of the America First Party. Many more can be found by visiting our web page at www.americafirstparty.org. Among the issues that would help the economy flourish are our goals for energy independence, the elimination of whole departments and programs that are unconstitutional including the National Endowment of the Arts, elimination of funding for the United Nations, and the elimination of all foreign aid.

Given the strong economic platform of the AFP, it is obvious that we are the only party which has clear and fundamental ideas to lead our nation into an economic boom, not an economic bust. It is time to call your elected officials and demand adherence to sound economic principles.

The Moral Duty to Cut and Run

(Continued from Page 10)

Iraqi patriots who seek to expel the invaders from their country. Were it to succeed, it would merely confirm our country in her wickedness. It would validate those warmongers among us who demand continual escalations of bloody acts of conquest. It would reward evil and encourage its repetition in the future. The failure of the surge,

on the other hand, would provide our nation with a practical and salutary serving of the bitter fruit of waging wars of aggression.

During the early days of the American Revolution, the great patriot Patrick Henry assured his fellow-countrymen that "there is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations." How sad it is for Amer-

ica that such a declaration today can only bring to us the dread and fear of judgment, not of salvation.

The America First Party has stood bravely, if feebly, from the beginning against the war hysteria, and has raised a moral standard against murder and lawlessness in the matter of Iraq. But without a renewal of the principles and values upon which

America was founded, all hope is lost for our beloved land.

That is why we must continue to build a strong party, a party that can fight to put America First, so that maybe next time, we will be able to stop our government before it kills millions more in some future unjust war of aggression.



Support and Promote the AMERICA FIRST PARTY

Fighting for Faith, Freedom and the Constitution to Put America First!

Now you can show your pride in putting America First, while you promote the party and help spread our message to your friends and neighbors. Here are some of the items available from the Party Store.



AFP Bumper Sticker - Now you can advertise the America First Party with this colorful, 11 inch long vinyl bumpersticker. It is made of colorful vinyl and stands out quite well on your vehicle or in a window.



AFP Trifold Brochure - Use these brochures, which contain the Party's Principles, to recruit your friends and neighbors to our Cause!



AFP White T-shirt
This white pull-over tee shirt comes with the party logo and name emblazoned on the front. Made in the USA and available in a very wide range of sizes.

AFP Business Cards

This color business card is great to pass out on the street or anywhere you encounter a potential party member or supporter. On the back is listed a number of important positions of the Party.



AFP Introductory Newsletter

This glossy, eight page full-color newsletter is a complete introduction to the America First Party. It presents a professional, vibrant image of the party to prospects.



AFP Coffee Mug

Advertise the America First Party with your friends and co-workers with this attractive AFP Coffee Mug. The front bears the AFP minuteman logo, while the reverse displays the party slogan and contact information.



How to order these items and more!

- Order online by credit card from our party store website at store.americafirstparty.org.
- Write to us for a store leaflet and order form at 1630 A 30th St # 111, Boulder, CO 80301.
- Call us at our toll-free number (866) SOS-USA1 and request a store leaflet and order form.