

† The twists and turns led to marriage equality



Photo by Michael Jerch
of Marcie and Chantelle Fisher-Borne

...e-gender
...arry, the
...stitutional
...man and
...marriage
...its two
...to grant
...resulted
...il unions
...ge at the
...d of the
...with civil
...ermont,
...ioned" in
...e to find
...he State
...oodridge v.
...through
...the state's
...e-gender
...judicial
...g-awaited

1993
Courts in Hawaii rule that not allowing same-gender couples to marry was unconstitutional. Law soon passed defining marriage solely between one man and one woman.

2003
The Massachusetts State Court rules that the state's refusal to issue marriage licenses to same-gender couples is unconstitutional.

1996
President Clinton signed the Federal Defense of Marriage Act -- defining marriage as between one man and one woman and stating same-gender marriages in one state did not have to be recognized in another.

2004
San Francisco Mayor orders the County Clerk's office to begin issuing marriage licenses to same-gender couples.

decision in *Lawrence v. Texas*. Indeed, just as the rabidly homophobic Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia predicted, the destruction of sodomy laws across the nation proved to be the first step towards paving the long road towards marriage equality. Using *Lawrence v. Texas* to support the extension of marriage law to include same-gender couples may seem incoherent to some people. However, it becomes clear how this is reasonable when it is understood just how potent an effect sodomy laws had on stigmatizing LGBTIQ people. Anti-sodomy statutes deem all sexual interaction between same-gender couples criminal activity; therefore all LGBTIQ people could then be considered potential

continued on page 14

Commentary

Marriage:

Sacred? Says who? Immutable? Hardly.

By Doug Dukeman

Once again, the U.S. debate surrounding marriage has made headlines. The 2004 Presidential candidates already are being asked questions about their support of same-gender marriages, civil unions, domestic partnership benefits and a number of other questions concerning LGBTIQ rights. The answers politicians give fall into three categories. Most Democrats give their support to ideas of civil unions and domestic partnership benefits, emphasizing that the decision should be left up to individual states. Most Republicans refuse all recognition of same-gender marriages. The third camp includes people like the Democratic Presidential candidate Rep. Dennis Kucinich and the Democratic Presidential candidate the Rev. Al Sharpton

continued on pages 15,16

What exactly are we fighting for?

By Sarah Carucci

Back in October, George W. Bush joined a coalition of ultra-conservative groups in attacking the LGBTIQ community by issuing a proclamation declaring the existence of "Marriage Protection Week." One of the main goals stated by "Marriage Protection Week" coalition representatives was to garner support for the Federal Marriage Amendment, a divisive measure that seeks to permanently deny civil marriage to same-gender couples, and a measure to which Bush has recently pledged his full support. Through rhetoric teeming with homophobia and paranoia, this band of hyper-fundamentalists has painted an imaginary world where the traditional heterosexual institution of marriage is teetering on the edge of extinction. They profess that because same-gender marriage has become a legal possibility, the traditional concept of matrimony may face utter annihilation.

Indeed, the rhetoric they use is masterful in making it appear that the LGBTIQ population of the United States could pose some sort of threat to the heterosexual standard of living. The "Marriage Protection Week's" mission statement reads that the "institution of marriage is under attack. There are those who want to redefine marriage to include two men, or two women,

continued on page 14