

www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/letters/chi-110304higgins_briefs,0,875307.story

chicagotribune.com

Gay marriage leads to cultural damages

2:34 PM CST, March 4, 2011

Yesterday, the Tribune celebrated - again - the passage of the civil union bill as well as Obama's decision to order the Justice Department to stop defending the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA).

On Feb. 23, 2011, Attorney General Eric Holder announced that President Obama had divined that the Defense of Marriage Act is unconstitutional and has ordered the Justice Department to cease defending it. Obama ordered the DOJ to stop defending DOMA in court even though the DOJ is specifically charged with the responsibility of defending federal laws.

However did DOMA's unconstitutionality escape the notice of the 85 senators and 342 representatives who voted for it in 1996? And however did its unconstitutionality escape the notice of the man who signed it into law: President Bill Clinton, attorney and Rhodes Scholar?

The intellectual vacuity of the Tribune's position is best illustrated in the claim that "the sky didn't fall" following the passage of the civil union bill. What they mean is that Illinois has seen no cultural cataclysm since the bill was signed into law. The Tribune wins this sophisticated skirmish: I will concede that the bill, which was signed into law six weeks ago and doesn't take effect until June, has not resulted in climatic catastrophe.

It has, however, darkened the sky for Jim Walder, a bed and breakfast owner in Paxton, Illinois who is being sued by a homosexual couple for not renting his facility to them for their civil union and reception.

But most of the cultural damage will not be seen for years to come. Any thinking person understands that cultural change rarely happens instantaneously. For example, Stanley Kurtz has documented the destructive impact same-sex marriage has had on heterosexual marriage in Scandinavia--changes that did not appear in a period of weeks or even months. The Tribune editorial board continues its assault on marriage without ever feeling the need to engage the fundamental and fundamentally flawed analogy upon which the entire homosexuality-affirming movement, including the effort to radically transform marriage, is built. The entire house of cards is built on a specious comparison of race to homosexuality, and yet, I cannot recall reading a single editorial defending with evidence the ways in which race and homosexuality are ontologically analogous or equivalent.

advertisement



I also can't recall the Tribune editorial board wrestling intellectually with the fundamental question that Princeton Law Professor Robert George recently debated with homosexual journalist Kenji Yoshino, which is: What is marriage?

-- *Laurie Higgins, Director of School Advocacy, Illinois Family Institute*

Copyright © 2011, [Chicago Tribune](#)