

If marriage is a human right then questions arise -

Is it up to the state or the vote of the people to change its meaning?

Is it permissible to extend marriage rights to same sex couples?

Should those who cannot recognise a same sex spouse as a spouse be allowed to be in accord with that belief?

Is same sex marriage a recognition that bodies do not matter in sex but only the quality of the love does?

-----

Many countries have legally accepted the validity of marriage between two people of the same sex or gender.

Homosexuality and heterosexuality are not so much equal as being of the same essence which is to forge and create supreme love between two people. This must be at the heart of any debate about legal protection for sexual relationships. It must be recognised too that the fundamental way to degrade same sex couples is to refuse to socially and legally support their committed union and thus it is extreme and toxic homophobia.

Same sex marriage is to affirm the validity of being LGBT plus and affirm their sexual love. To have the same dignity as others public recognition even if reluctant has to be given to your wedding and marriage as a tangible right. The public has to accept and accommodate your marriage. The dignity of marriage and being treated as marriage comes before any other benefit. No other benefit can come except through that one. No other benefit is really a benefit without it. Same sex legal marriage by default is legally validating and promoting same sex relationships. Apart from that what is legislated for tends to be seen as right and influences many people in all sorts of ways. It sends a message to society and for society.

Liberals argue that same sex marriage is not banning or hurting straight marriage so it should be allowed. That is a very grudging reason to defend same sex marriage. It is like they think it may be rubbish but it does not affect heterosexual marriage so it should be allowed. But it is clear that same sex marriage bans the definition of marriage as being solely heterosexual. It enforces a definition that marriage has nothing to do with sex or gender. I am forced to ensure my child feels supported if his or her ambition is to grow up and marry a person of the same sex. I am forced to consider my child married should such a wedding take place when she or he grows up.

It is not true that same sex marriage has nothing to do with heterosexuals or their relationships. People who think it is not marriage are compelled to write and act as if it is where it counts. So it does affect them and affects what their children are told about marriage in school. Marriage is and it is not a private matter between two people. Marriage would be legally pointless if nobody took it seriously as marriage so legalising same sex marriage is only wise if society will generally treat it as marriage. If you have a child that you cannot rear that child could go to a same sex married couple and you cannot object.

Most people believe that the person you love should be seen as your family though there is no blood relation. They feel there is something right in saying that two unrelated people are family. Is this a fundamental human right? They say it is for love is so important as is having somebody who is virtually your other half. A non-family person becomes your family through marriage. Nobody really believes that a marriage has to result in a child to be a marriage. Old people marry. On this basis, same sex marriage need not imply the right to have a family. It could be said they are married really though they cannot have children. Marriage means you have children if you can - that is all.

Marriage being interpreted as the protection of the relationship involving sex and love between a man and woman for life has always been discriminatory. It technically discriminates against gay people who wish to marry. It gives less benefits to single people even if they are parents. Asexual people and those who do not believe in marriage are discriminated against.

Is all that bad? Yes if marriage can be done without. People say marriage was not introduced to discriminate. If so then the discrimination side of it is a necessary evil. One thing for sure is that same sex marriage reduces the potential for discrimination a bit. At least two people who love each other and who belong to the same sex can avail of it.

Too many supporters of same sex marriage seem to argue that as LGBT people suffer bullying and abuse from homophobes that same sex marriage should be brought in to address this. But while it is okay to say same sex marriage will help, a real

believer in same sex marriage holds that it is a right even if in the ideal world there was no homophobia. Failing to see it as a fundamental human right risks making LGBT people unhappy in their marriages or to feel that they are only given marriage rights for the sake of peace.

The objections to same sex marriage boil down to: "Marriage is not just about the love between two people. It is about being open to procreation. It is about procreative love." But marriage is about the love between two people. Because they love one another they might create a family and adopt or have children. Remember the word might. They don't have to. The love between two people embraces children where possible. It is just about the love - meaning love that does not wish for children and love that does. A couple who have no children and think only of themselves and don't want to love children are as much married as a couple that has twenty children. A marriage not based on love whether gay or straight is not a marriage but a prison.

People a few decades ago decided that the law of the land should cease from punishing homosexuals. The chief argument was that it is an evil that should be tolerated because homosexuality involves consenting adults. Nowadays, any implication that homosexuality is evil is strenuously opposed by the media and the political world. Nowadays, instead of toleration acceptance of the homosexual is endorsed. Same sex marriage would only happen if enough people believe that full acceptance of homosexuality and homosexuals is necessary.

Marriage needs to be just marriage so even talking about same sex marriage is a problem.

APPENDIX - Catholics claim they are not against same sex marriage but pro-natural marriage

The Catholic Church and many other Churches claim to care about the family. If so why do they have no problem providing marriage for immature people, sixteen year olds, and people who may be unsuitable for raising children? The Catholic Church condemns single mothers but nothing was said about Pope Pius IX taking a Jewish boy from his parents and raising him himself.