

# COALITION Traditional Values SPECIAL REPORT



## *Homosexual Marriage = Civil Unions = Domestic Partnerships*

**Homosexual activists** have been working for decades to push for the normalization of same-sex relationships through local, state, and federal governments. One of the first strategies was to gain approval of "domestic partnerships" in government, schools, and corporations. The second strategy called for the pushing of "civil unions" as an alternative to legal marriage; the third strategy is to push for legalization of same-sex marriage. As can be seen from the following comparison of these relationships, they all basically legalize homosexual marriage.

Since California has been a bellwether state on the aggressive homosexual movement, we have drawn upon a pro-homosexual analysis of civil unions and domestic partnerships written by lawyers Saskia Kim and Drew Liebert, lawyers for the California Assembly Judiciary Committee in 2001. We have also drawn upon other sources for defining homosexual marriage.

**DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS:** In 2000, California's first domestic partnership law went into effect. This law defines domestic partners as "two adults who have chosen to share one another's lives in an intimate and committed relationship of mutual caring." Only homosexuals can register for domestic partnerships in California. They have the right to adopt children, make health decisions for the partner, be appointed as guardian of the partner's estate, use employee sick leave to visit an ill partner, and more. A domestic partnership can be dissolved easily and neither partner is legally responsible for

**CIVIL UNIONS:** In July, 2000, Vermont became the first state to pass a civil union law for homosexuals. According to Kim and Liebert, "Parties to a civil union are given all the same benefits, protections, and responsibilities under law, whether they derive from statute, administrative or court rule, policy, common law, or any other source of civil law, as are granted spouses in a marriage." The Vermont law grants ho-

**HOMOSEXUAL MARRIAGE:** The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court ruled in November, 2003, that the state had to pass a law granting homosexuals the "right" to marry. The court discovered this non-existent right in the Massachusetts Constitution, which was written in 1780 by John Adams.

In February, 2004, the court also ruled that the Massachusetts legislature cannot pass a civil union as a "compromise" posi-

tion. The court is insisting that state laws on marriage must be changed to grant this alleged "right" to marriage to homosexuals. The judges claimed that denying full rights to homosexuals will exclude them "from the full range of human experience." The Massachusetts legislature convened a Constitutional Convention in February to debate passage of a constitutional amendment defining marriage as a one-man, one-woman union. Only passage of such an amendment will protect marriage.

the other after a "dissolution." Many national corporations provide domestic partnership benefits to homosexual couples. This is homosexual marriage "lite." While domestic partnerships do not provide for spousal or child support after the break up of a relationship, it confers basically the same rights and privileges to homosexuals as do laws dealing with traditional marriage.

*The effort to gain passage of domestic partnership laws was an incremental step in pushing for total legalization of same-sex marriage.*

*A civil union is clearly same-sex marriage. Calling it a civil union instead of marriage is merely a smokescreen used by homosexual activists so they can claim that passing a "civil union" law is a "compromise" position for politicians.*

mosexuals 300 state benefits given to married couples. All laws pertaining to traditional marriage also apply to civil unions. (These benefits may vary from state to state.)