

On Same-Sex Marriage

Edward D. Duvall

5 Jul 2015

- 1 **Background**
- 2 **The Objectives**
- 3 **What We Can Do**

1 **Background**

The U. S. Supreme Court issued a ruling on 26 Jun 2015 decreeing that so-called "gay marriage" shall be legal in all fifty states, having been recognized previously by state court edicts in 34 of them. The homosexual lobby and their supporters have claimed that this effort is nothing more than an extension of equality to homosexual persons akin to the civil rights movement of the 1960's. The couples lining up for gay marriage certificates are not the problem; as Vladimir Lenin would say, they are merely the useful idiots. The true objective of the entire gay liberation movement is part of a much larger plan.

Even the most primitive of societies recognize an institution of "marriage" as being between one man and one woman. All of the major religions also adhere to this common concept, including the dominant religious institutions in America, the Judeo-Christian heritage. At first, this ruling appears to be nothing more than a change in the dictionary definition of words: while by tradition and religious doctrine, marriage has always meant one thing, and now it means another. But consider an old joke told frequently by Abraham Lincoln: "How many legs does a dog have, if we agree to count the tail as a leg?" The answer is of course, four: counting the tail as a leg does not actually make it a leg. Likewise, calling a legal union of two persons of the same sex a "marriage" does not make it so. It is simply a moral fiction (although a legal reality); they are gay/fake pseudo marriages, not to be confused with the normal ones. So far this ruling leaves existing normal marriages unaffected. If this were the end of it, then those of us who adhere to the traditional definition could say to ourselves: let them have their gay/fake pseudo marriage victory, and be done with it. The problem is that the homosexual lobby and their funding sources have not declared victory, packed, up and gone home. The reason is obvious: there is no reason to go home. This is the first victory for them in a series of planned legal battles. For them it is only the beginning.

2 **The Objectives**

The homosexual lobby and their supporters have assured us, along with Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy (who wrote the majority opinion), that the First Amendment protection of freedom of religion is preserved entirely. But if the Court can redefine "marriage", surely it can redefine "religious freedom". The effort to make gay/fake pseudo marriages a legal reality did not start and end with a few homosexual couples seeking the same legal status as normal marriages. On the contrary, this was a well-thought out campaign, engineered and funded by a large legal team devoted to the cause. I suspect the funding came from organizations whose real aim is to intimidate or embarrass religious people into abandoning allegiance to God in favor of allegiance to government. Since the homosexual lobby and their supporters have nothing to lose and everything to gain, I expect that there soon will be several legal challenges to religion in general and Christianity in particular.

First, there will be a movement to require churches and synagogues to perform gay/fake pseudo marriages, even though their doctrines prohibit it. They will carefully omit to impose this requirement upon mosques, out of fear of being called Islamophobic. The claim will be that Jewish and Christian religious institutions (as the dominant ones in America) cannot discriminate against homosexuality any more than commercial businesses can. They will claim that: a) since marriage is a legal function of the state, and b) since clergy conduct marriages by license from the state; therefore: every member of the clergy licensed

to perform marriages must do so in accordance with the legal definition, which now includes gay/fake pseudo marriages. Those religious institutions that fail to do so will have three choices: a) stop performing all marriages, b) perform gay/fake pseudo marriages on an equal basis with normal ones; or c) lose their tax-exempt status under the tax code. As can be readily observed, any of those options is a victory for the homosexual lobby and their funding source. The homosexual crusaders are not going to file suit against the Catholic Church, or the Mormons, or the Missouri Baptist Synod. Those organizations have the means to fight and win. No, the crusaders will find some small non-denominational Christian church and make an example of them as small-minded bigots. A small church will be no match for the legal power of the crusaders. They will attack Judaism and Christianity, but will make an exception for "recognized minorities" like the Moslems.

The second attack will build upon the first: an attack on the religious texts themselves. The argument will be that since doctrines concerning marriages are contrary to the now altered legal definition of marriage, adherence to them violates the principle of equality under the Constitution, and is *ipso facto*, proof of hate speech. Anyone holding those beliefs will be designated a "hater", discriminator", and "enemy of equality", thus forfeiting their rights under the First Amendment. Likewise any institution promoting the traditional definition of marriages will be branded a "hate group". The lawsuits will pile very high; the goal being to bankrupt both individuals and institutions under the anti-discrimination laws and to cause religious institutions to lose favor and membership. The end goal is to promote government as a higher class of morality and thus enhance loyalty to government in place of loyalty to God.

The ultimate objective is to get the Bible and Torah banned as "Haters' Handbooks". They will carefully omit any reference to the Koran out of fear of reprisal. Even the most hardened Marxist proponent of gay/fake pseudo marriages will likely admit the difficulty here. But Marxists and others who worship government have time on their side, and with courts willing to arbitrarily redefine the dictionary definition of words, religious freedom faces an uncertain future.

3 What We Can Do

The fact that gay/fake pseudo marriages are legal does not mean that individuals are required to believe that they are legitimate. They are legally recognized, nothing more. The first thing to be done is to consistently call gay/fake pseudo marriages what we believe them to be: fake and artificial. Let them prove otherwise.

Secondly, recall that what goes around comes around. There is no reason why those of us who "cling to our Bibles" cannot play the same game of changing the dictionary definition of words. Henceforth, the words "gay" and "lesbian" shall not mean "homosexual"; they shall both mean "child molester". See how simple that is?

Third, we should try to pre-empt the legal challenges against churches and synagogues by encouraging our state legislators to pass appropriate legislation. I have taken the liberty of sketching out the legislation:

Whereas the U. S. Supreme Court has seen fit to extend the title of "marriage" to persons of the same sex;

Whereas each State is obliged to permit the establishment of marriage between persons of the same sex, which shall have the same full legal rights as traditional marriages;

Whereas the power to regulate who shall have authority to perform said same-sex marriages falls to each State;

Resolved: same-sex marriages shall be performed only by paid employees of a State, County, or Local government, to wit, Judges, Justices of the Peace and the like -- except:

Other persons not employed directly by the State, County, or Local government, but otherwise authorized to perform traditional marriages, may apply in writing to be granted such power to perform same sex marriages.

The regulation shall provide:

- a. There shall be no fee for the application;
- b. The application shall be immediately granted by the Secretary of State upon receipt;
- c. No additional encumbrances shall ensue to holders of the same-sex marriage authority;
- d. The same-sex marriage authority shall not be transferable to other persons
- e. No person shall be required to make an application so described.

Fourth, and most important, recall that ultimately God is the judge of all things. It is not our place to judge people for homosexuality, or to judge them for desiring some legal recognition for it. It is our duty to first practice the faith and secondly to preserve our right to do so under the U. S. Constitution.