

# The effect of homosexual essay

[Sociology](#), [Women](#)



## **Impact of Homosexuality: The Context of Canadian Society**

Homosexuality has been a contested issue with most of the societies are divided among two viewpoints, i. e. restrictive and inclusive. The term restrictive has been used by scholars to represent those who want to restrict the participation of lesbian and gay in the church. They have opposed homosexuality by arguing that it is a revolt against God's order that will corrupt human lives. They have further developed their line of argument; details of these are beyond the scope of this essay. Inclusive category represents those who do not have objections with including homosexuals in church activities.

Canadian society also faces tensions because of this ongoing debate. Supporters take it as the basis of equality while opponents cast religious, moral, medical, and practical reasons to deny the same. To develop an argument, it is imperative to see significant changes in societal and cultural dynamics after 2005, the year when federal government legalized same-sex marriages. Legalization increased social acceptance towards same-sex marriages. In 2008, only 55 percent Canadians surveyed approved homosexuals to assume public office. The figure raised to 67 percent in 2013. However, numbers of hate crimes motivated by sexual orientation also increased from 88 in 2006 to 218 in 2010. Statistics on crime suggests that homosexuality may be the cause as well as the effect of social tensions. Homosexuals are less happy, and ratios of suicides and child abuse are quite high among them.

A broader perspective of homosexuality, however, raises a plethora of challenges related to health, psychology, and society. Fewer people would

marry, few would remain sexually faithful, more children will grow without mothers or fathers, birth rates would fall, polygamy will increase, and above all medical challenges will increase in the society. Research has stated that 78 percent of homosexuals are affected by sexually transmitted diseases; there are high chances that medical problems will grow with legalizing same-sex marriages.

These adverse effects of legalizing same-sex marriages have been experienced by Canada, Spain, Belgium, and Netherlands. These societies have been reeling under issues of blurred biological sex distinctions, and defeat of religious freedoms. Extinction of sex distinction indirectly means that a male can be legally recognized as a female that would mean infringing the rights of actual females. Hormone replacement and gene therapies have further increased societal and health complications. The author argues that homosexuality has threatened the institution of marriage by opening up other marriage-like options in the society. It has changed the legal definition of marriage that, in the long run, may have a substantial impact on the social institution of marriage. In 2008, Canada experienced the lowest marriage rates. Though researchers have not solely linked it to legalization of homosexuality, the author opines that same-sex marriages do have their impact on marriage rates in the country.

Bradley W. Miller, an associate professor of Law at Western Ontario University, has outlined SSM's( Same Sex Marriages) adverse impacts on religious and human rights in Canada. Those who are in disagreement of the changed social order are considered as opposed to the minority group. As opposing SSM is now seen as a manifestation of hatred and bigotry, public

life participation has changed quickly in the country. Miller argues that the brunt was borne by civil marriage commissioners as many provinces did not allow them the right of conscience in refusing to preside over SSMs.

Religious organizations were fined when they refused to rent their premises for these wedding celebrations(Miller). The author sides with Dr. Miller and opines that incidents reflect an obvious curtailment of human rights of people.

The nation, Dr. Miller says, further experienced restrictions on freedom of speech as statements that were permitted earlier carried risk after legalization. Voicing the dissent now meant investigations by human rights commissions. Overall, the decision to approve SSMs casted serious infringement on rights of general public in the country; it is a clear deformation of existing social order.

Other malicious impacts include gender insanity; Toby's act made all-women gatherings illegal and did not impart protection to female born women under hate crimes. Thus, there aroused the conflict between the rights of women and male born women. Did it mean that crusading for trans issues harmed the women there? Gender rights protections further hampered the safety of women and increased sexual abuse in public places. However, radical feminists made sharp remarks saying that the sexual abuse was a hoax and accused women of making false abuse claims by trans-women. These issues were raised by newspapers actively, though the matter was dropped later. However, these stories reflect an underlying and growing social mess in Canadian society. The protection of gender identity, in one sense, may provide a free hand to trans- woman to mistreat a woman. The author

argues that what is the use of protecting the rights of homosexuals if the rights of other people are infringed? Isn't it an attack on the very right of equality that formed the basis of supporting it? Yes. Protecting the rights of minority at the cost of social disorder can't be considered a good decision. It is, probably, the reason Dr. Miller says that the Canadian case leaves many lessons to learn.

Supporters of homosexuality have argued that SSMs are small in too small in number to put any impact on the general public. Professor Douglas Allen has countered it by saying that there is a legal misfit as homosexual families are fundamentally different from heterosexuals. After legalization, the definition of the natural parent has been replaced by legal parent; its impact on national culture and society will be severely understood a couple of years down the line. Legal parents may not have biological connections with the children as in heterosexual families; these changes are significant to malign the concept of marriage and family. Presently, there is a lack of statistical evidence to suggest that SSMs may hamper marriage stability in the society. It may be because of small numbers of homosexual in Canada. As of now, same-sex couples constitute just 0.8% of total couples. Down the line, society may take any turn; either it may accept the new trend and impart adequate cultural acceptance to it; or it may damage the society for many reasons including curtailed freedom of speech, religious autonomy, changed social order, and the like.

Critics have argued that institutionalization of same-sex marriages may create an indirect acceptance to polygamy. In British Columbia, a polygamist community got emboldened by legalizing SSMs and argued that there were

now no reasons to criminalize polygamy. However, the court did not legalize it; though it did not address the issue of multiple civil marriages. The author opines that it is not necessary for a society to legalize polygamy on the basis of legalizing SSMs. However, there remains the continued pressure on the society as diverse minority groups may take it as a propitious chance to materialize their demands. The example from British Columbia advises that ignoring the underlying principle is the best way to avoid legalizing polygamy. The author does not find it discriminatory to extend marriage rights to homosexuals, but not to polygamists.

Succinctly put, legalization of SSMs has damaged the society to an extent; it has not gone overboard because numbers of same-sex couples are negligible as of now. With increasing numbers, society will devise new ways to restore freedom of expression, human rights, female protection, and parental rights.

## **Works Cited**

Allen, Prof Douglas. The Regnerus Debate. 14 June 2012. 27 October 2014 .

Diane, Hellen Miller. Freedom to Differ: The Shaping of Gay and Lesbian Struggle for Civil Rights. NYU Press, 1998.

Flavelle, Christopher. " What Canada can Tell us About Gay-Marriage Decisions." Bloomberg View 26 Jun 2013.

Gruen, Lori. Sex, Morality, and The Law. Routledge, 2013.

Larocque, Sylvain. Gay Marriage: The Story of Canadian Social Revolution. James Lorimer& Company, 2006.

Miller, Bradley. Same-Sex Marriages Ten Years On: Lessons from Canada. 5 September 2012. 27 October 2014 .

Pew Research Centre. The Global Divide on Homosexuality. 4 June 2013. 27

Oct 2014 .

Schultz, Tammy S. and Huffman, Ford J. Marine Corps University Press. The End of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Government Printing Office, 2012.