



## **Turning Back the Clock on Homosexual Activism**

By Robert Knight

The Summer of 2006 was a tough one for people who want men to “marry” men and women to “marry” women.

A homosexual-themed magazine has turned back its “clock” five years for full achievement of their political agenda, citing losses in marriage court cases in the states of New York and Washington in July.

*The Advocate*'s September 12 edition depicts a clock face from June 2006, with 15 more years to go before “full equality for LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered) Americans.” A clock from August 2006 shows the hand backed up to the 20-year mark.

Not mentioned were court decisions upholding marriage amendments in Georgia and Nebraska, and a state law in Connecticut. Judges also ruled that amendments could go forward in Massachusetts, Arizona and Tennessee. Massachusetts' proposed amendment must be passed by the full Legislature in two concurrent sessions before going to the voters at the earliest in 2008.

As of this writing, the New Jersey Supreme Court and a California court had not yet ruled on marriage cases that could prove pivotal.

A federal Marriage Protection Amendment has twice fallen short of the required two-thirds majorities in both houses of Congress, but supporters have vowed to bring it up again. In August, Rep. Louie Gohmert (R-Texas) introduced a federal marriage amendment consisting of a single sentence: “Marriage in the United States shall consist only of the legal union of one man and one woman.”

So far, 20 states have passed marriage protection amendments, with 28 other states having statutes protecting marriage.

In November, seven more states – Arizona, Idaho, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, Tennessee and Wisconsin – have marriage protection amendments on the ballot. A proposed amendment is pending in Colorado.

In previous amendment balloting, the average approval rate was a whopping 70 percent.

Homosexual activists are hoping to crack the defensive wall around marriage by filing lawsuits in a number of states, and eventually bringing down the federal Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), which defines marriage for all federal purposes as the union of a

man and a woman, and allows states under the Full Faith and Credit Clause not to be forced to recognize unions not legal under their own laws.

“Their strategy is to win the ‘right to marry’ in several state courts before they make a head-on challenge in federal court,” said Jan LaRue, chief counsel for Concerned Women for America. “Even the win in Massachusetts hasn’t given them a basis to challenge the federal Defense of Marriage Act because Massachusetts’ law limits same-sex marriage to couples who reside there.”

Marriage protection activity at the state and federal levels surged after the decision by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court to legalize same-sex “marriage” beginning in May of 2004. So far, more than 4,000 same-sex couples have “married” in Massachusetts, most of them doing so in the first year.

Ironically, Julie and Hillary Goodridge, whose lawsuit triggered the marriage ruling, announced their separation on July 20. Last December, Carolyn Conrad and Kathleen Peterson, the first lesbian couple to obtain a civil union certificate in Vermont, announced their breakup.

Undaunted by their losses, homosexual activists have created a new movement, anchored by an organizing statement: “Beyond Same-Sex Marriage: a New Strategic Vision for All of Our Families and Relationships.”

The signers of the statement, consisting of “lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) and allied activists, scholars, educators, writers, artists, lawyers, journalists, and community organizers,” demand not only homosexual “marriage” but an end to restrictions on the number of marital partners or even blood relationships.

A petition on the coalition’s Web site calls for, among other things, “Legal recognition for a wide range of relationships, households and families – regardless of kinship or conjugal status.” In practice, this means that brothers could “marry” their brothers or sisters or even their parents.

In other words, if their agenda is enacted, marriage would be utterly meaningless. Several people could be given a marriage license, as has already occurred in Holland, where a man “married” two women.

The petition gives several examples of “nonconjugal” relationships that deserve equal status with marriage, including “Queer couples who decide to jointly create and raise a child with another queer person or couple, in two households.”

As the states move to enact more measures protecting marriage, homosexual activists are moving even farther to the fringe. As of now, there’s no stopping point in sight.

*Robert Knight is director of the Culture & Family Institute, an affiliate of Concerned Women for America.*