

"Writing the truth
as I see it;
trying not to
offend
those who will
disagree."

The truth as I see it™

Idaho Common Sense™



Craig L. Bosley, MD

Should gay marriage be legalized?

November 24, 2008

On November 4th three more states passed constitutional amendments refusing to legalize gay marriage, raising the total to thirty states with similar amendments. Gays were outraged at the outcome and at those who did not support legalizing gay marriage.

Gay rights activists are attacking the Mormon Church because it backed the initiative against gay marriage. Gays told the church they "will pay a price." Gay rights activist John Aravosis said, "Utah is a hate state ... and Mormons are persecutors." He promises that they will "destroy the Utah brand." Someone even terrorized Mormon temples in Los Angeles and Salt Lake City by sending letters containing a white powder. And, Scott Eckern, artistic director of the California Musical Theater in Sacramento, was forced to resign by gay activists because he donated money to the campaign to not legalize gay marriage.

Is this what Samuel Taylor Coleridge meant when he said, "I have seen great intolerance shown in support of tolerance." Is it unreasonable to expect gays to be tolerant of people who oppose gay marriage? I know there are people who oppose gay marriage who are hateful, like Kansas Pastor Fred Phelps. But as evidenced above, there are gays who are just as hateful. But do either of these fringe elements represent the majority? Would it be best to just debate the issue, rather than attacking anyone who disagrees?

Gays believe they have made their case to justify legalizing gay marriage. They claim refusing to allow gay marriage is legislating morality and violating their civil rights.

But, isn't legislating morality exactly what our legal system does? Look no further than the Declaration of Independence to see that the Founding Fathers established a Christian nation.

Moreover, our judicial system is based on the Ten Commandments. The Founding Fathers did not intend an atheist government; rather a Christian government allowing its citizens to live with one another in the spirit of the biblical Ten Commandments. Legislating morality is precisely the goal of our legal system.

Some individuals compare opposing gay marriage to supporting past laws against homosexuality. But these issues are not at all related. Originally, gays only expected that government stay out of the privacy of their homes. But now they expect society to legally sanction gay marriage and financially subsidize those marriages with company and government benefits like those received by heterosexual marriages. This is quite different from expecting to be left alone to live in peace.

Suppose society does acquiesce to their demands and legalizes gay marriage. What would happen? Would the effect be limited to expanding the definition of marriage to include gay marriage, as claimed? Or might there be a ripple effect that becomes a tidal wave?

Unfortunately, the real outcome would be forcing society to completely abandon any definition of marriage at all. Although I believe this is not the goal of those demanding legalization of gay marriage, it is nonetheless the reality.

Why? Because legalizing gay marriage would not be the final redefinition of marriage; it would only be the first of many. It would open the floodgates, exploding the definition of marriage into oblivion.

Gays believe they are treated in an intolerant, discriminatory way because society will not legalize gay marriage. If that is true, then legalizing gay marriage would require gays to support legalizing other consenting adults'

definitions of marriage as well. In fairness, gays could not assume they would be the only special interest group allowed to expand the definition of marriage. Next in line would be demands to legalize the polygamous marriages of a man with any number of wives. And, of course, all those wives would get company and government benefits paid for by the rest of us.

Wait a minute. What if a woman wanted to have several husbands? Would we not have to accept this, as well? And last, society would have to sanction and support gay polygamous marriages too.

Once you agree one special interest group can redefine marriage to fit their needs, you must allow any group that wants to redefine marriage to do so; or face the accusation that you are being intolerant, hateful, and discriminatory.

This is the endpoint of legalizing gay marriage. You cannot abandon the traditional, historical, biblical definition of marriage without also allowing all other definitions of marriage; each group using the very same arguments gays use. They are waiting in the wings for their opportunity. Once you open the floodgates they will not close.

What do we do? Simple. We do not change the legal definition of marriage. Marriage between a man and a woman is a part of the fabric of our nation. If people choose to live in other arrangements without demanding society sanction and subsidize those arrangements, they should have the right to do so. But, abandoning one of the moral foundations of our country is not the answer.

Dr. Craig Bosley is an emergency physician practicing in Pocatello, Idaho. His column appears in the Idaho State Journal each Monday. If you would like to contact him directly, you can email him at craig@craigbosley.com or visit his Website, www.craigbosley.com where all of his columns are available.