

The "same-sex" marriage issue is not about equal rights. The issue is about an unnatural behavior people have chosen to engage in that they now want to be sanctioned by the State. No one is born a homosexual or lesbian. The behavior is not an ethnicity or gender. Historically, this behavior is called sodomy and the practitioners sodomites. Humans are born either male or female. Humans are born with an ethnicity such as Caucasian, Negro or Asian, or an ethnicity which is often defined based upon nationality such as British, Irish, Chinese, etc. Behavior is something a person makes a choice to engage in – either actively or by submission. Sodomy is something a person chooses to engage in. It is not a third gender or some new ethnicity.

The people who have chosen to engage in this behavior do not want to want face the consequences of their behavior. So they pretend they were born with the behavior. Some go so far as to ask “When did you know you were heterosexual?” in an attempt to avoid the fact that it is a behavior they have chosen to engage in. There are many behaviors related to sex that as a society we do not sanction. We have not allowed polygamy since 1862, nor do we do not sanction sexual relations between brothers and sisters, mothers and sons, fathers and daughters, or between 1st cousins. Nor do we sanction pedophilia, prostitution (except for Nevada), or rape. All of these are behaviors a person chooses to engage in.

Sex between a man and woman is a natural behavior. Sex between a man and man, or a woman and woman is not a natural behavior. One does not find any examples of the behavior of sodomy in nature. Some have ascribed various dominance behavior in animals as being an example of sodomy in order to justify their behavior. We see this type of justification of abnormal behavior in people all the time. In the 1970s people were justifying their bad behavior with the statement “The Devil made me do it.”.

Marriage is sanctioned by the State and has been given special status because it is related to the natural sexual behavior of humans when a man and woman come together to procreate. Regardless of whether a child results. Because children are the result of normal sexual behavior, society, through the State, has an interest in insuring children are protected by insuring children have their parents to raise them. This is why marriage has existed for more than 4000 years. There is no Constitutional requirement to give Constitutional protection to same-sex behavior or to relationships based upon same-sex behaviors. The Constitution protects people based upon things that people are born with such as their gender or ethnicity - not their behaviors.

Of course those that have chosen to engage in the behavior will claim otherwise but that is not surprising since they don't want to admit that the behavior they have chosen is unnatural and abnormal. Drug addicts and alcoholics do this all the time - denying their behavioral problem.

---

From Kenneth

The people who have chosen to engage in this behavior do not want to want face the consequences of their behavior. So they pretend they were born with the behavior.

There are a lot of behaviors that are innate or instinctual, others that develop as our bodies develop and mature, and other behaviors that are completely learned. For example cooking food is not something that is innate, but is entirely learned. One could even go so far to say that cooking food is not natural. There are a lot of sexual behaviors that are not natural as well -- oral sex is one easy example that is

practiced by heterosexuals and homosexuals alike.

Whether something is natural or unnatural is immaterial, especially since that label seems to flex depending on who you're talking to. If you say something should be banned because it is an unnatural behavior, then that leaves a lot of things we take for granted open for proscription.

...nor do we do not sanction sexual relations...between 1st cousins.

Tell that to the 20 States that fully allow marriages between 1st cousins. It's not universally allowed, but it's not universally prohibited either. And I believe such marriages are recognized even by the States that don't allow them so long as they were entered into within States that do allow them.

Marriage is sanctioned by the State and has been given special status because it is related to the natural sexual behavior of humans when a man and women come together to procreate.

Marriage is sanctioned by the State through the marriage license purely for control. Something once seen as a religious institution, religious construct, has not been since about the mid 1800s in the United States, mid 1700s for the UK. Marriage is licensed by the State to control it and who may get married.

The Constitution protects people based upon things that people are born with such as their gender or ethnicity - not their behaviors.

Have you read the Constitution, by chance? This statement goes in complete contradiction to the entire Constitution. The Constitution doesn't protect people. It restricts the government. It says what the government can and cannot do. The government shall not infringe in certain rights, shall allow for certain legal privileges if a person is taken into the custody of law enforcement, shall not make certain kinds of laws.

Of course those that have chosen to engage in the behavior will claim otherwise but that is not surprising since they don't want to admit that the behavior they have chosen is unnatural and abnormal.

Again, whether something is "unnatural and abnormal" is not the concern. Whether harm is caused to others (as opposed to oneself) by the behavior is the concern with regard to government. If families want to step in and stage an intervention with regard to, say, a drug addict, then that is entirely the family's concern, not the government's.

---

To Kenneth

And all you did was re-enforce what I stated. Stating the US Constitution protects people is an accurate statement as is some of your statements. Neither is inaccurate. But the statement "The Constitution doesn't protect people." is an out-right lie. What do you think Amendments 1 through 10 are about or Amendment 13, 14, and 15 are about? I was not aware 20 States allow direct 1st Cousin to marry - or is it 1st Cousin once or or more removed? But that does not change the point I was making - marriage is not allowed for a lot of different combinations of people. And there is no Constitutional requirement for allowing to individuals of the same sex to create a State sanctioned relationship or "marriage".

It also does not change the fact that people are not born "homosexual". It is not a gender or ethnicity

but a behavior. And keep in mind the word heterosexual was coined in the 1890s as was the word homosexual. They are words used to describe behaviors not gender or ethnicity. It is a behavior a person chooses to engage in. It is only in the last 40 years or so that the practitioners of this behavior have started to pretend it is somehow a gender or ethnicity. They want to force society to accept their behavior and to not have to face consequences for the behavior they have made a choice to engage in.

And just like animals can be trained so can people. People who engage in many different types of behaviors will imprint the behavior on them self. It is why drug addicts, alcoholics, and others who have engaged in questionable behavior often fall back into the addiction. They imprinted the behavior on themselves so all it needs is a trigger to get them to return to the behavior. Even people who run regularly imprint the behavior of running on themselves. If they don't run regularly they don't feel "right".

If you take a look at the current treatment programs for drug addicts and alcoholics you can see the reason many of these programs fail to solve the problems of the addict. They fail to address the basic issue of behavioral imprinting and instead teach "once a addict always an addict". Thus when a trigger is encountered the person falls back into the behavior since they have told it is hopeless to resist since they will always be an addict. And this imprinting applies to gambling addicts as well as a host of other addictive behaviors - both destructive and beneficial.

A recent example of behavioral imprinting is feeding alligators. Feed an alligator food from your hand on a regular basis and put your hand out without food and the alligator will take your hand as food. It is why we talk about behavior and teaching children proper behavior.

And your statement

"If families want to step in and stage an intervention with regard to, say, a drug addict, then that is entirely the family's concern, not the government's."

show a serious lack of understanding. What do you think prisons are for? They are for dealing with bad behaviors. Stealing is a behavior and drug addicts, from your example, are one group that engage in a host of other behaviors, such as stealing, to support their addiction. Which society, through the State, has to deal with.

A society determines what behaviors it will tolerate and most societies do not sanction same-sex relationships. Societies have tolerated them over the years and some societies have actively purged them. This issue is about a behavior that people choose to engage in that society does not have to allow or sanction.

---

From Kenneth - who has no concept of reality.

You've got a nice, rosy perspective on the Constitution. Read the Amendments in question, and while you're at it, focus on the Ninth Amendment. All of them provide for restrictions on the government.

And again, it is fallacious to say the Constitution protects people. The Constitution is incapable of protecting people, just as the law is incapable of protecting people. It is also, in actuality, incapable of restricting the government because the only power it has is what the

People provide to it, which simultaneously requires the government to observe it. And with the amount of force the Federal government can now wield against the people, any observance of the Constitution appears to be merely a courtesy.

A simple demonstration of this is what we are seeing with gun rights and gun control right now. The Senate is seeking to establish further limits on guns and many want an overt ban on firearms in the United States. Nothing is stopping Congress and the President from doing this, from enacting a sweeping gun ban and confiscation program, except the tides of political will. Carrying out that ban and confiscation program requires there be people willing to go along with it, and there are more such people than many would likely want to acknowledge.

But the Constitution does not stop Congress from doing this. The Constitution cannot stop Congress from doing this. The Constitution does not stop anything from happening and cannot stop anything from happening, and therefore cannot be said to be protecting anyone. Being able to do something and being allowed to do something are two completely different things. The government is able to violate the Constitution and your rights all it wants. It is not allowed to do that, but it is completely able to do that, and numerous examples demonstrate this.

Nothing except political will stops Congress from creating a new slavery program and a government agency to implement and regulate it. The Constitution through the Thirteenth Amendment says they are not allowed to do this. But only political will keeps them from being able to do it.

Now to stop you from asking a particular asinine question, I will say this: I am not saying the Constitution is worthless or that we should do away with it. It's a good coda for how the government should operate, but how the government does operate is up to the people within that government.

And there is no Constitutional requirement for allowing to individuals of the same sex to create a State sanctioned relationship or "marriage".

To say there is a requirement that same sex individuals must be allowed to marry is like saying there is a Constitutional requirement that everyone must be allowed to marry. And no such requirement exists. Marriage originated as a religious construct until the States took it upon themselves to become the sole licensing authority for marriage, turning marriage into a legal construct.

Government also provides certain rights, privileges and benefits to married couples. Now if government was not the licensing authority for marriage, there would be no debate about gay marriage. If a religion allowed gay marriage, the government would also have to recognize that marriage as valid and extend to that marriage the same rights, privileges and benefits -- the First and Fourteenth Amendments would require it.

As such what is being sought is a limitation on the government's licensing authority, namely a

limitation on the restrictions the government can provide. If government was not providing any rights, benefits or privileges to married couples, this entire discussion and debate on gay marriage would be moot.

Now one could say that civil marriage licensing is a violation of the First Amendment, but that's a discussion for a different day.

This issue is about a behavior that people choose to engage in that society does not have to allow or sanction.

True that society at large does not have to allow a particular behavior. But the question comes down to whether rights originate with the individual, or collectively with a society. If they originate with the individual, then the philosophy that my right to swing my fist ends at your nose comes into play, but I can punch myself in my own face all I want. If rights originate with society... say goodbye to your guns if society says you can't have 'em.

Either rights originate with the individual, or they originate with society, but not both.

What do you think prisons are for? They are for dealing with bad behaviors.

Prisons are for removing people from society, depriving them of their liberty, for either a specified period of time or permanently. That's it. Nothing more.

Those who populate State-sanctioned prisons are individuals who have violated some specific statute defined by the government. To say prisons are for dealing with bad behaviors is a nice, rosy way of looking at them, but they don't serve such a purpose.

Petty theft and larceny are crimes commonly perpetrated by drug addicts. But with which behavior should the government intervene: the larceny/theft, or the drug addiction? If you say both, you're looking for a government to control behaviors as opposed to merely prosecuting actions that demonstrably harm another person.

Drug addiction is self-destructive, as is alcoholism and gambling addictions. But is government the best way to handle that? Absolutely not. Should government handle that? I'd hope you'd agree with me in saying No.

But, then, we don't restrict alcoholics and drug addicts from being able to get married. We don't stop gambling addicts from getting married either. There are a lot of self-destructive behaviors that do not disqualify people from being able to obtain a marriage license. Many call homosexuality self destructive, yet it seems to be the so-called "self destructive" disqualifier for a marriage license.

Hell some would say my caffeine addition is self destructive as well. But I wasn't stopped from being able to obtain license to marry my wife due to that addiction.

It also does not change the fact that people are not born "homosexual". It is not a gender or ethnicity but a behavior.

Homosexuality is not a behavior unto itself. There are behaviors characteristic of homosexuality, but homosexuality is not itself a behavior, and some of the behaviors of homosexuals are practiced by individuals who are not homosexual or bisexual. And homosexuals need not exercise any of the behaviors seen as characteristic of homosexuality.

But then if you're looking to restrict marriage based on the behaviors or actions of individuals.... that can be a very slippery slope. I mean why stop with homosexuals? Heck, let's strip felons of their ability to get married. Now there are others who fall outside the boundaries of incest that also cannot get married, but that typically requires a contractual incapacity.

Plus science has already shown that people **are** born homosexual. Recent studies have shown that it isn't genetic as first thought, but instead comes about during fetal development in utero. Google it.

---

And I don't disagree with you point that the document can not "protect". That is why people need to know what the Constitution states and means. I know what the Constitution states and what the purpose of the Amendments are. Unless the people follow it it just meaningless words. You are spinning since you don't like the statements. This is one reason people push the living document garbage - it allows them to justify violations of the document that defines what our Federal, State and Local governments are allowed to do. Words having meaning and every since the early 1900s what we call the Left has been violating the document on a regular basis.

As for the your spin on the nature of sodomy - the proper term for the behavior - it is a behavior. Just like prostitution is a behavior and pedophilia is a behavior. I cite these two since like sodomy or "homosexuality" they are behaviors a person makes a choice to engage in. There is no science that shows people are born homosexual. That is pseudo-science trying to justify the behavior so people can justify their behavior. All one has to do is to look at the people who practice the behavior and then stop. Just like addicts stop being addicts. You are just repeating the classic "The Devil made me do it" justification. Only now the claim is "I was born that way". And as pointed out before there is no requirement anywhere to sanctions a relationship of two individuals of the same-sex. All you are doing to trying to find a reason to pretend that "homosexuality" is a gender or ethnicity so the behavior can be justified and the people who practice it avoid the consequences of their behavior.