



Same-sex “Marriage” and Republicans

The issue of so-called same-sex “marriage” will soon come before the Supreme Court. I am no betting man, but if I were, I would gamble every dime to my name that before long, “gay marriage” will be the law of the land. I would further bet that those right-leaning politicians and their allies within the alternative media who have insisted upon preserving the heterosexual character of marriage will succumb to a deafening silence not long after that.

In the annals of the human race, it is not often that we witness the particularities of time and culture giving way to a consensus on a moral issue. Yet whether understood as a historical institution or as a spiritual and moral ideal, there is no group of people the world over that has failed to recognize marriage for the intrinsically heterosexual union that it is.



But alas, leave it to our generation to see to it that this state of affairs doesn’t last. The problem is that it will indeed succeed at detonating “the general bank ... of nations and of ages,” as Burke famously described the wisdom of “the species.”

It isn’t just that leftist activists and the Democratic Party are resolved to make their dream of same-sex “marriage” a reality. More importantly — and more tellingly — it is that the proponents of traditional marriage have no one who is willing to fight on their behalf.

As the base of the GOP reevaluates its party in the wake of the losses it suffered last month, it is imperative that among the realizations at which Republican voters arrive is that Republican rhetoric on this issue is just that.

To this, some may object that, in fact, Republicans have done more than talk. After all, Republicans have advocated a constitutional amendment expressly defining marriage as the union between a man and a woman, right? What about that? This question is best met by another: Yes, what about that? We no longer hear about this proposal to amend the Constitution because it was never, and was never meant to be, anything but a gimmick, albeit one with strategic value.

Republicans have always known that their amendment proposal had zero chance of gaining any traction, much less achieving passage. But in advancing it, they could temporarily appease their base while eluding the real work necessary to stop “gay marriage.”

While it controlled both chambers of Congress and the presidency, the GOP most certainly could have done much in this arena.

According to Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution, the Supreme Court has jurisdiction over all those



Written by [Jack Kerwick, Ph.D.](#) on December 11, 2012

cases, and only those cases, for which Congress makes allowances. The provision states that the Court's authority is "under such regulations as the Congress shall make." Translation: If a Republican-dominated Congress didn't want liberal judges to declare a constitutional right to "gay marriage" (or abortion, or suicide, or interspecies loving, etc.), then it would have needed to have done nothing other than invoke this constitutional provision. As the late Sam Francis remarked: "With a stroke of the congressional pen, 'judicial activism' could be ended."

But it isn't just that Republican politicians have failed to resist the imposition upon the country of "gay marriage." They have actually encouraged it.

Republicans routinely express support for "civil unions" for homosexuals. However, when marriage is considered just one more type of secular association — as it must be so considered from the perspective of our secular government — then in what, pray tell, could the difference between a marriage and a civil union be said to consist? From talk radio-show hosts to Beltway politicians, Republican critics of "gay marriage" are at pains to reassure gays that all of the benefits that they would reap from marriage are just as surely secured to them by way of civil unions. The only difference between these two contracts, such Republicans explain, is the name.

But what's in a name? If the difference between a civil union and a marriage is only nominal, then there is no real difference at all.

In the very near future, homosexuals will have found themselves a constitutional right to marry other homosexuals. When this happens, the country can thank not just the left-wing activists who fought tirelessly for it.

It can thank Republicans as well.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

[Subscribe](#)