

Homosexual Marriage Will Not Compromise the Institution of Marriage

CHRISTY KIMBALL
News Editor

I would like to preface this article with a response to a letter from Brandi Kraus, which appeared in last week's issue. My opinions are independent of the *Herald* and the Meredith Community, however, I am a member of the campus therefore my cartoons are on the Campus Opinion page. Additionally, there is no other appropriate place for them. Regarding the "horns" on President Bush, they were intended to be ears. Caricatures are not my forte, I am more adept in comic book characters. My cartoons are meant to be satire, not substitutes for an in-depth news article. However, national news is my muse.

Recently, in the midst of the controversy surrounding the surge of same-sex marriages in San Francisco and the debate over state

court jurisdiction, President Bush made an announcement calling for a constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage. Former president Bill Clinton passed a similar act eight years ago: The Defense of Marriage Act defining marriage for federal purposes as a union between a man and a woman.

Some states recognize same-sex civil unions, but only a few are beginning to recognize same-sex marriages. The difference between civil unions and marriage, which both have most of the rights of state civil marriage, are no federal benefits for civil unions such as Social Security.

It seems that the focus of the proposed constitutional amendment is not so much whether or not to grant federal benefits, but preservation of the "sanctity" of marriage. President Bush in his remarks on February 24,

2004, mentioned several times that the amendment will "prevent the meaning of marriage from being change forever" and it will be "protecting marriage as a union of a man and woman as husband and wife."

Bush does not define what "the meaning of marriage" is, nor does he explain how the heterosexual marriage would be compromised. I do not believe the motivation behind the desire for gay and lesbian couples' to be married is to usurp heterosexual marriages. Same-sex marriage is not a predator from which heterosexual marriage needs "protecting".

President Bush also states, "Our government should respect every person and protect the institute of marriage. There is no contradiction between these responsibilities."

I disagree with his assertion that there is "no contra-

diction between these responsibilities". How can every person be respected and yet only a particular demographic have the right to receive federal benefits from marriage?

The basic element of the Constitution is securing our civil rights and freedom. How is amending the Constitution to discriminate against a particular demographic, consistent with its purpose? If this amendment is passed, will there be more discriminatory amendments to follow?

I feel that same-sex marriage should not matter to those in opposition to it. It is really not any of their business to condemn other people's personal lives. The divorce rate for heterosexual couples is 54.8%. Banning same sex marriage will not change that.

Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor,

I am confused as to what point the 2/25 "Beauty for the Body and Spirit" article was trying to portray. I thought the column was very nicely written until I read the last half of the article, which was dedicated to informing readers about Christ. While I know that religion plays a large role in many girls' lives here at Meredith, I do feel that the article was inappropriate. Borum should have entitled this column "Beauty for Non-Thinking Fundamentalists" as far as I'm concerned. Religion is something that should be kept private in all areas of the paper, with the exception of an opinion page. Miss Borum should

not be touting biblical verses in a school newspaper beauty column--especially when it is totally irrelevant. I know if I were to write a beauty column encouraging my atheist viewpoints, I'd be criticized to no end. Therefore, I would never do such a thing to insult my fellow readers. So let's be considerate of all readers and put an end to this nonsense. Keep your religion to yourself!

Anonymous

Dear Editor,

Sunday I was walking through Joyner, giving my grandfather, mother, and younger brother a tour of campus, showing them where I work and go to class. I was appalled to be greeted, upon looking at the College Republican board, with a picture of an aborted fetus. I understand that it is a powerful picture to be used, and some don't see why it could be considered offensive, but I do. I did not see a purpose for its placement--the College Republicans were not sponsoring the abortion debate on Monday night and were merely advertising the debate on their own. The official posters for the event did not resort to using that picture, instead choosing to use a cartoon based on discussion, a wise move by the club on such a controversial issue. Also, there

is no option not to look at this portrait, damaging emotionally to some. What about consideration for those women on our campus that have had an abortion? It could be hard for a woman who has had an abortion to pass by this prominent board without being reminded of her own experience. I have not had an abortion myself, but even I was disturbed, having to see this picture everyday. Though trying to make a point, I feel this picture was placed up on the board in poor taste and should at least have a paper over it, giving people the option to look at the picture instead of forcing them to look at it. There are far more effective ways than shock value to prove a point.

Kathryn Bailey '05

Deadline for all Submissions for the Herald is Friday prior to publication.

For advertising information email Herald@meredith.edu or call 760-2824 and ask for an Ad Manager.

The Herald encourages all readers to submit letters to the editor for possible publication.



All letters must be signed but may be published anonymously. The Herald reserves the right to edit letters for length and/or offensive content. All letters must be received by **Friday at 1 p.m.** Submit letters by email to Herald@meredith.edu or place them in the submission box outside of the publications suite in 208 Cate.