

## Op/Ed

## Should the constitution permit same-sex marriages?

*Both straights and gays pay taxes, holds jobs and vote. Why should they be denied a right to have the same legal marriage benefits as a heterosexual married couple?*

Left



Wing

Right



*The Constitution is meant to protect freedoms, and that is what this amendment will insure. It will give heterosexual couples the freedom to enjoy the time-honored, and dare I say, God ordained tradition of marriage.*

**Jennifer Menster**  
Pilot staff

Since the Massachusetts Supreme Court ruling to authorize gay marriages, a trend has swept the nation — a good trend. Hundreds of gay couples have finally been able to take the plunge that so many heterosexuals don't think twice about every day. And there is only one difference between these people — their sexual preference. Both straights and gays pay taxes, hold jobs and vote. Why should they be denied a right to have the same legal marriage benefits as a heterosexual married couple?

President Bush has recently proposed a constitutional amendment banning gay marriages. What is Bush trying to pull now? Maybe our leader is freaking out a little because he's down in the polls despite cutting taxes and becoming a wartime leader. Now, he wants to start a cultural war on his own territory?

In five states — New York, California, New Jersey, Oregon and Washington — gays and lesbians have been married since the Massachusetts ruling.

San Francisco mayor Gavin Newsom gave the go ahead to the city clerk to perform marriage rites to anyone despite gender. This caused a lot of controversy between those for and against it. But at the same time, it brought a lot of joy into people's lives and everyone deserves happiness no matter their sexual orientation.

Republican California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger has admitted on national television that he would be "fine" with same-sex marriage if that is what California people voted. Schwarzenegger has also said that he does not support fellow

Republican Bush on the amendment to ban gay marriage.

Funny. Someone from Bush's own party doesn't even support him on this issue. But maybe he's used to that since in the last year, he has lost two top officials because they disagree with his foreign policy and war on terrorism.

Last year, California passed a domestic partner law allowing same-sex couples to have all the rights of a marriage without using the term. Why deny them the term but give them all the rights? It is unreasonable.

The San Francisco mayor argues that he is not violating the California law by granting same-sex marriages. He believes he is upholding the law, which outlaws discrimination.

President Bush is wasting his time. Even conservatives know that the ban would not receive a two-thirds backing in the current Senate. Besides the founding fathers made it so difficult to amend the constitution for a reason — they believe it should be amended only in the direst of circumstances.

Prohibiting people in love to wed based on their gender certainly does not rank as a dire situation. In fact, incorporating this amendment would only bring discrimination into the constitution. In the past, amendments have been brought in to end discrimination — the 14th amendment to allow all citizens equal rights and the 21st amendment to allow women the right to vote. Now Bush is pushing an amendment to bring bias back into the constitution.

Do everyone a favor and leave this issue alone, Bush. You have already caused enough controversy and destruction with the war on terror; don't bring a cultural war into your own homeland.

**Jacob Conley**  
Pilot Staff

There has been much debate concerning President Bush's proposed constitutional amendment affirming marriage. The debate, however, should not even occur.

The fact that it does take place just goes to show how much the moral fiber of America has changed. For example, even as recently as twenty years ago, people such as Olympic swimmer Greg Lukanus were afraid to admit that they were gay. Now they flaunt their sexual orientation and the liberal media is treating them like martyrs.

This is why President Bush is trying to more concretely define marriage as an institution between a man and a woman. Without the amendment, the concept of marriage could become so warped and twisted it might disappear all together. Can you imagine our history books in the year 2024 if this were to occur? In the glossary, marriage could be defined as: An antiquated custom held to by an outdated moralistic faction. That's a scary thought.

While this notion may seem far-fetched and ludicrous, it isn't. In the name of progress NOW (National Organization of Women), has launched an all out blitzkrieg of propaganda attacking George W. Bush's leadership.

NOW president, Kim Gandy, calls the amendment, "The anti-gay act." And even has launched a website called, [thetruthaboutgeorge.com](http://thetruthaboutgeorge.com). This site is filled with misrepresentations, misquotations, and outrageous feminist and liberal rhetoric. One of NOW's platforms is equality for lesbians. This statement in itself is a logical fallacy. If NOW truly wanted equality, wouldn't they strive for equal rights for gays as well as lesbians. By their own defin-

ition, because they only have a platform supporting only lesbianism and not gays, NOW is as narrow-minded as they claim George Bush to be.

Opponents of the amendment say that they want equal rights for everyone in marriage. This means that they want equal benefits and other amenities granted to married couples. Hypothetically, however, if marriage is not defined as the union between a man and a woman, it could be seen as a union between anyone or anything. So therefore someone could possibly say, "I really love my truck. I think that we should get married, and we are entitled to the same insurance benefits and we can file taxes together." While this hypothetical situation seems ridiculous, it is even more ridiculous to oppose this amendment.

Another complaint that liberal organizations have with the amendment is that they say that the Constitution is meant to protect freedoms, not inhibit them. I agree with this statement. The Constitution is meant to protect freedoms, and that is what this amendment will insure. It will give heterosexual couples the freedom to enjoy the time-honored, and dare I say, God ordained tradition of marriage. They will no longer have to live in fear of this sanctified act being defiled by a group who is vehemently opposed to Judeo-Christian values.

Even though I strongly support President Bush's opposition to gay marriages, I do not harbor hatred toward this group. To borrow a quote from my pastor, I believe that Christians should, "Hate the sin, but love the sinner." Maybe if more people adopted this attitude, homosexuals would receive the love they need from Christians not from their partners, and the amendment affirming marriage might no longer be needed.