

SPECIAL REPORT

Homosexual Civil Unions

Homosexual activists explain why 'civil unions' are just as good as 'same-sex marriage' in the battle to undermine the traditional family.

January, 2005 — Homosexual activists are openly strategizing on how to gain all of the legal benefits of marriage under state-passed "civil union" legislation.

Dale Carpenter, a homosexual writer for the Independent Gay Forum (11/25/2004), for example, has described the "California Model" to gain the legal status of marriage—without calling it marriage under state laws. **The objective is to gain marriage status through incrementalism.** This is the strategy followed in California.

Domestic Partnerships: Homosexual Marriage By Incrementalism

According to Carpenter, homosexuals first introduced domestic partnerships in 1999. "That first year, the program created few tangible protections. Domestic partners were given hospital-visitation rights. And cities in California were allowed, but not required, to offer the domestic partners of their employees the same benefits as spouses. That's it," said Carpenter.

independent Gay Forum

About | Authors | Mailbag | Subjects | Subscribe | Support IGF

The California Model: Spousal Rights by Increments

By Dale Carpenter

First published November 25, 2004, in the Bay Area Reporter.

The two guideposts in the battle for gay marriage in the coming years must be federalism and incrementalism. *Federalism* means focusing on the states.

Incrementalism means taking things slowly. Fortunately, we have a successful template for the recognition of gay relationships. While others were grabbing headlines with dramatic judicial victories, gay Californians were quietly and patiently persuading state legislatures to experiment with increasing degrees of legal protection for gay couples. There's still no gay marriage in California, but we're getting awfully close. Here's how it was done.

When first created in 1999, California's domestic partnership program was little more than a formal registry. Two adults of the same sex could sign up as domestic partners if they lived together, agreed to be responsible for each other's basic living expenses, and promised "to share one another's lives in an intimate and committed relationship of mutual caring." A domestic partner could terminate the partnership simply by writing a note to the other partner.

That first year, the program created few tangible protections. Domestic partners were given hospital-visitation rights. And cities in California were allowed, but not required, to offer the domestic partners of their employees the same benefits as spouses. That's it.

The next year, 2000, voters in California passed the Knight Initiative, which banned gay marriage. Progress in adding to the rights of domestic partners that year was exceedingly modest. Domestic partners were permitted to secure housing in specially designed accessible residences for the elderly. The legislature also passed a bill allowing domestic partners to use family medical leave to care for a sick partner, but Gov. Gray Davis vetoed the bill, insisting on an "off-season" for gay-related legislation.

The following year, 2001, saw more dramatic progress. Among many other advances, domestic partners were given the right to use stepparent adoption procedures; to sue for the wrongful death of a partner; to make medical decisions for an incapacitated partner; and to use sick leave to care for an ill partner. The state also agreed not to tax the value of domestic partner health insurance coverage.

In 2001, legislators also proposed to treat a domestic partner as a "spouse" for purposes of inheritance when a partner dies "intestate," that is, without a will. But the idea was shelved when Davis threatened to veto it.

In 2002, in the wake of the September 11 attacks, Davis reversed his position and signed the intestacy bill. Other minor progress was made that year, including a law allowing

Homosexual activists hope to win all of the legal benefits of legalized same-sex marriage through the expansion of domestic partnership laws and the creation of homosexual "civil unions." Both domestic partnerships and civil unions will give homosexuals the victory they desire even if states pass bans on "gay marriage" without banning all of these counterfeits of marriage.

However, as the years have passed, homosexuals in the California legislature have slowly, but surely, expanded the so-called "rights" of homosexuals. Carpenter proudly says: "What started as almost nothing for gay partners in 1999 will have become shadow marriage by 2005. Yet there has been no great public outcry in the state, in contrast to the political upheavals that followed the revolutionary judicial victories in Hawaii (1993), Vermont (1999), and Massachusetts (2003).

Carpenter attributes this success to the fact that domestic partners were created democratically in the legislature—and "California's gay lobbyists and openly gay legislators proceeded incrementally. They compromised, backing off when necessary."

Carpenter says this incremental strategy makes it difficult for opponents to oppose "any single one of the benefits and responsibilities that comprise the legal status of marriage." **Incrementalism "also gives the public time to adjust to each advance. ... Proceeding by degrees, we can demonstrate that measures to shore up gay families do not threaten heterosexual ones."**

Homosexual Civil Unions: Same-Sex Marriage By Another Name

John Corvino, a homosexual activist and teacher at Wayne State University, penned a commentary on homosexual civil unions for the Pride Source web site (www.pridesource.com).

According to Corvino, homosexual activists should be aggressively pushing civil unions at the state level because they can provide homosexuals with “ALL of the legal incidents of marriage (albeit under a different name).

Corvino says: “Our best strategy (in most states) for securing the tremendously important legal incidents is to fight for them under the name civil unions.”

He says this will gain social endorsement of homosexual marriage and people will eventually begin calling these civil unions what they actually are: homosexual marriage. He notes that this same strategy was implemented in Scandinavia to normalize homosexual marriage under different names—and it’s worked.

Corvino warns that trying to push social endorsement of same-sex marriage too quickly will result in a backlash “resulting in state constitutional bans not only on gay marriage but also on civil unions. The upshot would be to delay BOTH the legal incidents and the social endorsement.”

Corvino argues that any civil union legislation should contain all of the legal benefits of marriage in order



Homosexual activist and university teacher John Corvino, says that civil union legislation will give homosexuals both the legal benefits and social endorsement of marriage.

for it to be effective.

States Must Ban All Homosexual Marriage And Any Counterfeit Marriages

The Traditional Values Coalition opposes same-sex marriage, domestic partners, civil unions, or any other synonym used to describe the legalization of two individuals of the same sex in counterfeit marriage.

We can only support a constitutional amendment that fully protects marriage with no civil unions or any other legal arrangement that allow homosexuals or transgendered couples to marry.

Marriage is a God-ordained institution that pre-existed nations and must be preserved as a union between one man and one woman in the United States.

Homosexual activists ask how same-sex marriage will affect traditional marriage. The answer is that that homosexual activists have openly stated that they are pushing for legalization of same-sex marriage as a way of destroying the institution of marriage altogether. In fact, homosexuals also have no intention of remaining monogamous.

Homosexual activist **Michelangelo Signorile**, for example, says that homosexuals should: “fight for same-sex marriage and its benefits and then, once granted, redefine the institution of marriage completely ... To debunk a myth and radically alter an archaic institution.” (Out! Magazine, Dec/Jan., 1994)

Homosexual activist **Andrew Sullivan** says that heterosexuals will have to develop an understanding of the need for homosexual males to have extra-marital relationships: “The truth is, homosexuals are not entirely normal; and to flatten their varied and complicated lives into a single, moralistic model is to miss what is essential and exhilarating about their otherness.” (Virtually Normal, pgs. 202-203).

Traditional Values Coalition Resources On Same-Sex Marriage

The Traditional Values Coalition has published dozens of reports on the homosexual agenda and homosexual marriage. Here are just three of our free online resources:

**Do Homosexuals Really Want The ‘Right’ To Marry?
Homosexual Marriage = Civil Unions = Domestic Partnerships
50-State Survey Of Marriage Protection Amendments**