

"i performed in other
states as binding
within



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

" I Do" or " Please Don't": Hawaii's Same Sex Marriages" I Do" or " Please Don't": Hawaii's Same Sex Marriages

With the recent decision by the Hawaii courts regarding the legalization of marriage between same-sex couples, a political debate across the United States has begun. Many people believe that this is a monstrous step to legalizing same-sex unions country wide, especially since legal tradition recognizes marriages performed in other states as binding within every other state, but also because Hawaii is known for it's liberal, ground-breaking first steps that the other states often follow the model of. If the states have any will, however, they will not fold to the pressure put on them by this state and the gay rights groups, they will continue to not recognize a man and man or a woman and woman as a man and wife.

What is marriage anyway? Isn't it the union of two people who love each other to prove their commitments to one another for the future? Yes, but there is more. Webster's Dictionary defines marriage as: " a) the state of being joined together as husband and wife, b) the state of joining a man to a woman as her husband or a woman to a man as his wife." Legally, however, marriage is more than just a statement of love. Marriage comes with economic and legal benefits that one cannot receive alone.

For example, joint parental custody, insurance and health benefits, the ability to file joint tax returns, alimony and child support, and inheritance of property and visitation of a partner or a child in the hospital. In fact, the Hawaii Commission on Sexual Orientation itself concluded that denial of marriage licenses to same-sex couples deprived applicants of these legal and economic benefits. So, are homosexuals fighting for the right of marriage to

state their love as the gay rights groups suggest or are they pushing for the right of marriage because of the many benefits that come with it? The answer is obvious they are fighting for the benefits that come along with marriage. If they were fighting for love, then where would we stop these "feelings?" If homosexuals were allowed to marry because they love each other and they consent, then couldn't a pedophile marry a younger child as long as both parties fully consented? If homosexuals were allowed to marry because they love each other, then couldn't one man marry many wives because he loved each one and they each loved him? If homosexuals were allowed to marry because they love each other, then couldn't a son and his mother, or even a brother and a brother, marry because they love each other? As one member of the Episcopal Laity Group said, "a line must be drawn and it must never be crossed. Marriage is for a man and a woman, and that's the way marriage will always be.

"The gay rights' activists claim that this denial of love, in the form of marriage, is a form of discrimination. These gay rights' activists claim that this denial of love is similar to when slavery was being defended, women's voting rights were being denied, or even more specifically and more related, the anti-miscegenation laws of a few decades back. This is clearly an attempt at tugging at the nation's heart chords by comparing the struggle for same-sex unions to several notable, if not the most notable, equality struggles in the history of the United States. The comparison to the defense of slavery or the denial of women's voting rights by gay rights' groups is simply unfounded.

Homosexuality has never been considered morally "good," and it is a tremendous jump from saying that black-skinned people should work for white-skinned people just because of skin color or women can't vote just because of sex to saying that homosexuals can't marry just because of their sexual habits. There is a clear distinction. First of all, Colin Powell once noted that skin color (and gender in this case) and sexual behavior are completely different and incomparable. Skin color and gender are born into, and they have absolutely no effect on conduct or character, sexual behavior on the other hand, has everything to do with character, morality, and society's basic rules of conduct.

If anything, homosexuality is comparable to smokers, compulsive gamblers, pornography fanatics, sex addicts, and pedophiles because these are all people whose traits (whether inborn or not) directly effect society. This also directly relates to interracial marriages because a person's skin color does not produce a certain effect on conduct or character. If polled at the time of the respective movement (anti-slavery, women's rights, or interracial marriages), a majority of the United States population would have supported the movements (population includes those who are directly involved), but in the United States today, over 2/3rds of the population are against same-sex marriage (according to national polls run by Newsweek and CNN). On top of that, along with marriage goes the assumption of sexual activity.

The sexual activity of one homosexual with another (sodomy) is illegal in many states and allowing gays to marry would be turning a head to this illegal act. Whether sodomy is illegal or not, it is still practiced, claim the gay right's activists. While this is concedable, they also say that

<https://assignbuster.com/i-performed-in-other-states-as-binding-within/>

monogamous relationships are safer in the homosexual community than polygamous relationships. This is one of those statements that sounds good, because it is true in the heterosexual community, but the facts prove otherwise, because the homosexual community is not the heterosexual community. The general feeling among gay right's activists is that with the threat of AIDS and other diseases among promiscuous, homosexual men, it is a "societal good" to encourage homosexual monogamy. However, in cities where homosexual monogamy is already being encouraged, AIDS and other sexually-transmitted diseases are actually soaring! (Survey from the Centers of Disease Control report by Associated Press, "HIV Found in 7 Percent Gay Young Men: Education Fails to halt Spread," The Washington Times, February 11, 1996, p A-3; Michael Warner, "Why Gay Men Are Having Risky Sex," Village Voice, New York, January 31, 1995, Vol. XL., No.

5) AIDS is most likely transmitted in unsafe sex acts, and an English study recently published that the most unsafe sex acts occur in homosexual steady relationships. Men in steady relationships practiced more anal intercourse and oral-anal intercourse than those without a steady partner. Said one former homosexual, William Aaron, "in the gay life, fidelity is almost impossible. . .

the gay man must be constantly on the lookout for new partners . . . the most homophobic 'marriages' are those where there is an arrangement between the two to have affairs on the side . . ." (OUT Magazine) So, the myth that homosexual marriage will decrease the number of gay AIDS patients because of less promiscuity is completely unfounded. The myth by these gay right's activists show how common sense in the heterosexual

<https://assignbuster.com/i-performed-in-other-states-as-binding-within/>

community must not be applied as common sense in the homosexual community, and vice versa, because they are two different communities.

In fact, the gay right's activists use of this myth simply shows how they want to play on the heterosexual community's fear of AIDS in order to gain something advantageous for themselves. The fear of AIDS, discrimination, and denial of love are all tactics used by those in support of same-sex unions, but clearly all of them are ineffective arguments when examined. In it is painfully obvious that the only advantage to same-sex unions for homosexuals is the legal and economic benefits, but it is at this point that the homosexuals are receiving favoritism rather than equality. When two people are allowed to marry just because of legal and economic reasons, regardless of whether or not they are marrying in the traditional sense, it is clearly being discriminatory against those in the heterosexual community who are marrying for love.

It is giving gays an advantage rather than equality. Homosexual unions should not be allowed in the United States, and as a representative of St. Athanasius Roman Catholic Church said, " marriage is a privilege not a right."

INTERVIEWEE Episcopal Laity Group, 1-800-307-7609 St.

Anthanasius Roman Catholic Church, 703-759-4555