



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 3, 2009

Faux (Same-sex) Marriage Bill Passes Vermont House

Vermont has long been a hotbed of secession, with much talk during the Bush administration years of separating from the union. Now it has served notice of its wish to secede from tradition and morality as well, with the Vermont House voting on Thursday 95-52 to pass a bill legalizing same-sex "marriage."

This was the first of two headline-grabbing setbacks for defenders of marriage this week, with the Iowa Supreme Court ruling unanimously today that hewing to the correct conception of marriage — that is, limiting it to only one man and one woman — is unconstitutional (we will have a full-length piece about the Iowa court's usurpation on Monday).

As for Vermont, there is some good news as well. The 95-52 margin is not sufficient to override a veto by the governor, Republican James Douglas. Gov. Douglas, taking the populist position and straddling the civil-union fence, opined in a written statement last week, "I believe our civil-union law serves Vermont well and I would support congressional action to extend those benefits at the federal level to states that recognize same-sex unions. But, like President Obama and other leaders on both sides of the aisle, I believe that marriage should remain between a man and woman."

While the governor is certainly correct to say he has allies in this fight, the reality is that the forces arrayed against the defenders of marriage in the Green Mountain State are formidable, with the faux-marriage bill having passed the Vermont Senate last week by a staggering 26-4 margin. These activists are also passionate and, consequently, do not feel the need to match Gov. Douglas' circumspection. As an example, CNN.com tells us, "Vermont Senate President Pro Tem Peter Shumlin, the main sponsor of the bill, has described Douglas' decision as 'cowardly.'"

'You cannot veto love and commitment between two people,' the Democrat said. 'This is a civil-rights issue. It is time for the governor to show some courage.'

This writer agrees. Ideally the governor should step up to the plate and defend tradition unabashedly and without compromise. Of course, this would mean opposing civil unions as well, as they are simply a





Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on April 3, 2009

transitional phase between historical normalcy and faux marriage. After all, would we even be talking about them were it not for the activism of the homosexual lobby?

While I won't hold my breath waiting for comprehensive principle (not the correct kind, anyway) from a New England politician, marriage's defenders will need passion to win this battle. Because their opponents certainly have it, and they are attempting to muster the majority necessary to override a veto. Said Beth Robinson, spokesman for the faux-marriage activist group "Vermont Freedom to Marry," "We know we've got more work to do in the run-up to the override vote."

If the defenders of marriage don't want her work to work, they'd better get busy themselves.



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