

# WHERE SAME-SEX MARRIAGE IS HEADED

In light of New York recently passing a law allowing homosexuals to marry, we commented on where we see the issue heading.

Whenever the American people have had a chance to approve gay marriage, they have rejected it. In the more than 30 states that have put this issue to a vote, homosexuals have never won. The only arenas they have been able to score a victory in are some state legislatures and courts. In other words, this is a classic case of the people vs. the elites.

Ultimately, this issue will not be resolved in the courts, including the U.S. Supreme Court: it will be decided by a constitutional amendment. Though the Federal Marriage Amendment prevailed in the House in 2006 by a margin of 236-187, it failed to achieve the necessary 290 votes required to pass a constitutional amendment; two-thirds of both chambers of Congress, and three-fourths of the states (38), are needed.

Standing in the way of a constitutional amendment is the legitimate reluctance on the part of federal lawmakers to decide what many believe to be a matter for the states. But given that we are left with the scenario of the people vs. the elites, we are quickly reaching a tipping point. When that happens, chances are good that this issue will be resolved by a constitutional amendment.

Currently, 30 states have constitutional language defining marriage as being between a man and a woman. At the federal level, the Defense of Marriage Act also defines marriage in the traditional sense. But unless there is a constitutional amendment, we will continue to have an uneven playing field,

one that is ripe for further exploitation. Once marriage is separated from procreation, and Tom and Dick are allowed to marry, there is no principled reason why Tom, Dick and Harry can't do so. After all, wouldn't it be discrimination to say no to Harry?