

Talking Points on the Supreme Court Decision Redefining Marriage and Adding a New Fundamental Right to the Constitution

Under the Constitution, the Court is supposed to protect liberty, not create it.

In time, the Court's decision will go down in infamy, along side Dred Scott, and Plessy v. Ferguson

The Court decision rejects the idea that human dignity is innate (Decl. of Independence)

- Court says instead that it comes from the government (i.e., from the ink in the justices' pens)

The Court decision undermines and threatens democracy and good governance under the rule of law

- The Constitution expressly provides a process for amending the Constitution if the people wish to add fundamental rights. Five lawyers wearing black robes dictatorially commandeered that process.
- The Court decision ominously claims super-legislative power not authorized in the Constitution
- In a free nation, the people of the various states debate and enact policy concerning marriage and family in a politically accountable constitutional process. An imperial judiciary arrogantly shut down that debate and dictatorially imposed its personal view on the American citizenry.
- Prior to the Court's mandate we were a nation of law, governed by the will of the people – now we are a nation governed by an imperial judiciary where five lawyers wearing robes create and enforce national policy.
- By usurping the legislative role and involvement by the people, the Court discounted much of the American citizenry. Thus, even those who agree with the Court's conclusions will in the end find that the Court's decision undermines any legitimacy that might exist for SS marriage. Even they will come to regret the way an unelected judiciary, politically accountable to no one, deemed it into existence without the normal discussion and consideration of the people that the new policy affects.

The Court decision reveals the justices utter disdain for the First Amendment

- Under the Court's decision, religious views are no longer protected
- Under the Court's decision, the free exercise of religious conscience is no longer safe from government action in this country

Let it be clear, contrary to the remarks of the justices, those who disagree with the Court's decision are not uninformed and they are not bigoted. Such name calling by the justices writing the decision is beneath the dignity of the Court – and bullying opponents into silence is evidence of a political agenda by the justices that they know they cannot achieve when the issues are debated openly in the marketplace of ideas.