

Traditional Values

SPECIAL REPORT

Same-Sex Marriages And Domestic Partnerships: Are They Good For Families And Society?

Homosexual activists are urging states to legalize homosexual marriages and to normalize cohabitation as equivalent to marriage. Will this open the door to polygamy?

Every state in the union is facing the challenge of homosexual activists who are seeking to legalize same-sex marriage or its less controversial equivalent known as domestic partnerships.

In fact, it is expected that this year, the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court will legalize same-sex marriage in that liberal state.

In December, 2002, *National Review* published an article on this upcoming decision—and the importance of states and the federal government passing strong constitutional amendments to protect marriage as a union between one man and one woman. *National Review* author Stanley Kurtz observed: “The ultimate outcome of our coming national culture war over gay marriage will either be legal gay marriage throughout the United States, or passage of the Federal Marriage Amendment, which defines marriage as the union of one man and one woman. There will be no middle ground.”

The effort to legalize same-sex marriages has resulted in a significant battle between conservative, Christian organizations fighting to pass Defense of Marriage Acts (DOMA) in each state—and homosexual groups determined to win the “right” to marry same-sex partners.

Thirty-four states currently have DOMA laws in place. These acts typically prohibit the marriage laws of the

state from being changed to include same-sex marriages. Marriage is defined as a union between a man and a woman under state laws. A DOMA law also includes a prohibition against the recognition of any same-sex relationship outside of the state. Under both state and federal DOMA laws, no state is required to recognize same-sex “marriages” from other states.



Homosexuals are not simply working for same-sex marriages, but for a complete transformation of our society to include multiple sex partners—and sex with children.

In 1996, the U.S. Congress passed a federal version of a DOMA law. In it, marriage under federal law is defined as a union between one man and one woman.

Unfortunately, states without a DOMA law are at risk of being forced by judges to legalize same-sex unions. This happened in Vermont in 1999 when the state Supreme Court ruled that it was a violation of the Vermont Constitution to treat same-sex partnerships differently than heterosexual marriages. The Court gave the state legislature two choices: Pass a law legalizing same-sex marriages or a law that legalizes the equivalent to same-sex marriage. The Vermont legislature bowed to the wishes of the Court and passed a “civil unions” bill that provides homosexuals with all of the benefits accorded to men and women in heterosexual marriages.

It is significant that the majority of homosexual civil union certificates have gone to out-of-state homosexuals. In the first year that the civil unions law went into

effect, fewer than 500 Vermont homosexuals registered for civil unions, while more than 1,500 out-of-state homosexuals flew into Vermont to register under the civil union law. These out-of-state homosexuals have returned to their home states. A number of them are currently suing their states to recognize their civil unions as “marriage.” *It may only take one or two of these cases to overturn a state’s marriage law.* A lesbian couple in Georgia sued the state in October of 2001. The couple is also attempting to overturn the federal DOMA law. More of these cases are inevitable because this effort is part of the overall homosexual agenda to legalize “same-sex marriages” in the remaining 49 states.

The Not-So-Hidden Agenda

Homosexual activists who are promoting the legalization of same-sex marriage are bold about their agenda. The goal is not simply to legalize homosexual marriages. It is to completely redefine and alter the concept of marriage in our culture.

Homosexual activist Michelangelo Signorile, writing in *Out* magazine has clearly stated the objective. He told homosexuals that they 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. . . . The most subversive action lesbians and gays can undertake—and one that would perhaps benefit all of society—is to transform the notion of ‘family’ entirely.

Even if homosexual marriages are legalized, homosexuals will still engage in promiscuous sexual activities with other men. Andrew Sullivan, a homosexual and a senior editor at *The New Republic* has written a book in support of same-sex marriages. Writing in *Virtually Normal*, Sullivan says that once same-sex marriages are legalized, straight society will have to develop a greater “understanding of the need for extramarital outlets between two men than between a man and a woman.”

Sullivan refers to traditional marriage as a “stifling model of heterosexual normality” and says that homosexuals cannot be forced into such a restrictive model. Sullivan obviously favors multiple sex partners. He writes:

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.

Sullivan and Signorile are also joined by Paula Ettelbrick, a law professor at the University of Michigan. Ettelbrick is also family policy director for the Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. According to Ettelbrick:

Being queer is more than setting up house, sleeping with a person of the same gender, and seeking state approval for doing so. . . . Being queer means pushing the parameters of sex, sexuality, and family, and in the process, transforming the very fabric of society. . . .

We must keep our eyes on the goals of providing true alternatives to marriage and of radically reordering society’s view of reality.

According to Signorile, traditional marriage is a “myth” and an “archaic institution” that must be altered. Sullivan believes that homosexuals are not normal and must not be prohibited from engaging in sex with multiple partners. Ettelbrick says homosexuality is all about pushing the limits of sexual activities as a way of reordering our culture and even our view of reality.

Is Same-Sex Marriage A Bad Idea?

William Bennett devoted an entire chapter to the issue of same-sex marriage in his book, *The Broken Hearth: Reversing The Moral Collapse Of The American Family*.

“The most subversive action lesbians and gays can undertake—and one that would perhaps benefit all of society—is to transform the notion of ‘family’ entirely.”

— Michelangelo Signorile

According to Bennett, for our society to accept same-sex marriage would be to “accept that marriage is an arbitrary social construct that can be and should be pried apart from its cultural, biological, and religious underpinnings and redefined by anyone laying claim to it.”

Bennett believes that once same-sex marriage is legalized, it will open up our culture to an unlimited number of other challenges. Once marriage—the union between a man and a woman—is redefined, there is no reason why two brothers can not marry or why society can deny a marriage license to three men who may wish to marry each other. Likewise, there would be no persuasive arguments against a father marrying his own daughter.

Peter Singer, Princeton University's Professor of Bio Ethics, writing in an essay, "Heavy Petting," published on a pornography magazine web site in 2001, sees no problem with people having sex with animals, he just

"Repeal of all legislative provisions that restrict the sex or number of persons entering into a marriage unit; and the extension of legal benefits to all who cohabit regardless of sex or numbers."
— 1972 Gay Rights Platform

doesn't want us to eat them. Singer's views may end up as Zoophile public policy. Hundreds of Zoophile web sites exist, giving bestialists networking capabilities.

Here Comes Polygamy

The effort to legalize same-sex marriages will not be limited to one partner. In 1972, the National Coalition of Gay Organizations issued its "1972 Gay Rights Platform." This platform lists every major homosexual goal and it has been followed consistently ever since 1972. One of the major goals listed is: *"Repeal of all legislative provisions that restrict the sex or number of persons entering into a marriage unit; and the extension of legal benefits to all who cohabit regardless of sex or numbers."*

Notice that the objective isn't simply to legalize homosexual marriages between two individuals but to legalize marriage among *any number* of individuals or sexual combinations. This homosexual goal was listed just below another long-time objective of the homosexual movement: *"Repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent."* (Traditional Values Coalition's Special Report, "Homosexuals Recruit Public School Children" details the efforts of homosexual activists to gain access to children for sexual activities and initiation into the homosexual lifestyle.)

The 1972 the Gay Rights Platform also calls for the abolition of all laws prohibiting transvestism and cross-dressing. Today, this objective is being accomplished by homosexual activists encouraging legislators to pass laws protecting the "gender" nonconformity of "transgender" individuals. These are men and women who suffer from a Gender Identity Disorder. There are a growing number of individuals in our society who are being taught that their sexual confusion is actually a fixed sexual orientation that deserves legislative protection.

Transgenders are individuals who believe they are actu-

ally the opposite sex or who think they have no sex at all. These individuals are demanding to have sex change operations paid for by their insurance companies and are also demanding that they be allowed to wear non-gender conforming attire to work. In addition, they are lobbying for the right to "marry."

According to some in the homosexual movement, the transgender issue is one of the main methods they will use to legalize same-sex marriages. It has already happened. In September, 2001, a lesbian couple were legally married in San Antonio, Texas, because one of them had undergone a sex change operation to become a woman. Jessica Wicks married Robin, a male-to-female transsexual. After the ceremony, Robin said, "What's sad is that the world doesn't let all the people that love each other to marry, because love is all there is."

The couple legally married because an appeals court had ruled that only individuals of the opposite sex could marry under Texas law. While this is the correct decision, the transgender and homosexual movement took advantage of this to enable two lesbians to marry each other.

Gay Sex Is Unsafe

While homosexuals argue that they should be free to "love" whomever they wish on an equal basis with heterosexuals, the truth is that homosexual sex acts are unsafe for the individuals who engage in such behaviors and for the entire culture.

As a society, we have the duty to campaign against behaviors that destroy individual lives and the lives of others. We discourage drugs, smoking and drinking among our teenagers. We discourage overeating and encourage a healthful lifestyle for all Americans. Likewise, we should not encourage sexual behaviors that frequently result in the death of those who engage in unsafe sex acts.

Homosexuals (especially males) routinely engage in a number of activities that spread diseases and the AIDS virus. In *The Gay Report*, by Jay and Young, these homosexual researchers surveyed the sex habits of homosexuals. They discovered that 99% had engaged in oral sex; 91% had engaged in anal intercourse; 83% engaged in rimming (mouth to anus contact); 22% had fisted their sex partners; 23% admitted to golden showers (urinating on a sex partner); 76% admitted to group or public sex; 4% admitted ingesting feces. These behaviors are breeding grounds for a whole variety of serious intestinal parasites, viruses, and bacteria known collectively as "Gay Bowel Syndrome." In addition to

these intestinal diseases, homosexual males are also at high risk for anal cancer. Dr. Stephen E. Goldstone, the medical director of Gay Health.com says that 68% of HIV-positive and 45% of HIV-negative homosexual men have abnormal or precancerous anal cells.

Professor Joel Palesky at the University of California, San Francisco clinical research center says that active homosexuals have a much higher risk of anal cancer than heterosexuals. The rate of anal cancer for heterosexuals is 8-10 per 100,000; it is 35 per 100,000 in homosexual men; 70 per 100,000 in HIV-positive homosexual men.

In addition, homosexuals are at high risk for HIV infection from both oral and anal sex. The ***“The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases ‘HIV/AIDS Statistics’ fact sheet notes that 60% of all new HIV infections are homosexual men...”***

Centers for Disease Control (CDC) says that there are 40,000 new HIV infections each year—due to large numbers of younger homosexuals engaging in unprotected sex. The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases “HIV/AIDS Statistics” fact sheet notes that 60% of all new HIV infections are homosexual men; 25% through injecting drugs; and 15% through heterosexual sex. Of all newly-infected individuals, half of them are under 25 years of age. Homosexuals are at risk for getting HIV from oral sex as well. A report released by the CDC and University of California, San Francisco in 2001 indicated that oral sex was implicated in at least 8% of all HIV infections.

These statistics alone should be sufficient reason to discourage homosexual sex acts, homosexual marriages, or domestic partnerships. These relationships are breeding grounds for diseases and death.

These behaviors should not be normalized nor should our children be taught in public school that homosexuality is no different than heterosexual “love.”

Domestic Partnerships Fail

One of the ways that homosexuals are working to gain approval for same-sex marriages is through “domestic partnerships.” California’s homosexual-dominated legislature, for example, has passed domestic partnership laws that provide equivalent benefits for unmarried homosexual and heterosexual co-habiting individuals. California’s aggressive homosexual legislature is also

lobbying for approval of Vermont-style “civil union” legislation. According to lesbian activist Jean Harris with the California Alliance for Pride and Equality, the battle for same-sex marriage will be won piece-by-piece and that “all of these tactics are extremely important” in gaining the objective of same-sex marriage. Harris says she and her allies will not rest until they have “the same basic rights across the board, whether we use the civil union approach or the domestic partners approach.”

Is the passage of domestic partnership legislation good for children and for our culture? Should our culture promote cohabitation as a positive social good? Research indicates that cohabiting partnerships are damaging to children and to the partners themselves.

David Popenoe and Barbara Dafoe Whitehead published their research findings on the dangers of cohabitation in ***“Should We Live Together? What Young Adults Need To Know About Cohabitation Before Marriage,”*** for the National Marriage Project. The report is available online at: <http://www.smartmarriages.com/cohabit.html>.

Based on their research, the authors observe: *Despite its widespread acceptance by the young, the remarkable growth of unmarried cohabitation in recent years does not appear to be in children’s or the society’s best interest. The evidence suggests that it has weakened marriage and the intact, two-parent family and thereby damaged our social well-being, especially that of women and children.*

These researchers discovered the following:

- Those who cohabit before marriage have a 46% higher chance of divorce than those who do not cohabit.
- Cohabitors report lower levels of happiness, lower levels of sexual exclusivity and sexual satisfaction, and poorer relationship with their parents than non-cohabitators.
- Women who cohabit are three times as likely to suffer physical abuse than married women.
- Children living with cohabiting biological parents are 20 times as likely to suffer physical abuse as children in married homes.

These and other findings clearly show that our society must not approve of domestic partnerships. Societal approval of same-sex marriages is likely to lead to the increased spread of disease and death from HIV infection, the normalization of pedophilia, and polygamy. Our society must not approve of behaviors that destroy the lives of women and children.