

# THE LIE:

"Homosexual marriage is none of the government's business."

## Wrong!

*By Robert Colaco, National Chairman of Citizens for a Better America™.*

We have received some interesting responses to our Question 09 on our Candidate Questionnaire that reads, "What is your position on the legalization of homosexual marriage? [ ] Support, [ ] Oppose, [ ] I Don't know, [ ] Other [ ] More." Those responses have been like some of the following:

"Marriage is based on religion, It's status should be determined there, not by government."

"Actually, I believe the best solution would be to remove government from the business of marriage altogether. Marriage should be a sacred trust between two consenting individuals and, if they wish, their families and houses of worship, not individuals and the government. We are treading in very dangerous waters when we ask the government to regulate personal relationships, especially something with the religious overtones of marriage."

"Libertarian position on 'marriage' is that the government has no moral right to decide who should marry whom. We the people should select our own lifetime partners independent of government 'approval' The government may act as an 'independent' third party to record the transactions of 'marriages,' but government should never be allowed to put itself into the position of APPROVING or DISAPPROVING voluntary, personal and peaceful associations and arrangements. To do otherwise, is the same thing as the anti-miscegenation laws in the 19th Century Southern States as well as the 'racial pollution'

laws in Nazi Germany forbidding marriages between Aryans and Jews."

"Government should not be involved in people's life style choices."

"The legal status of partners could be determined by contract between the partners."

"Marriage is a religious institution. Leave it to the churches."

Frankly, if this same thinking was applied to other issues it might sound like the following.

01. Government should not regulate running stop signs and red lights. Because, I ought to be able to do that and it is just between the people involved.

02. Writing checks that you do not intend for your bank to honor. It is between the customer and the merchant and the government ought not be involved in it.

03. Spousal battery. It's just an argument between two people.

04. Polygamy laws. If a man wants to marry more than one wife he ought to be able to do just that. If he wants to marry 10, 20, 50, 100, 200 or even 1000 wives he ought to be able to do just that even if he can not support them or if he does not tell the other ones.

05. Sexual relations with minors. It is up to the people involved even if the parents do not like it.

Many of the responses had comments that this issue was a religious one and ought to be dealt with by religious organizations and churches. One extreme of this kind of thinking is perhaps the argument that government should not have any laws in regard to murder because the Holy Bible says in Exodus 20:13: "You shall not murder." and that makes it a religious issue. So, the government should just let the religious organizations handle issues where murder is involved.

If anyone says to me: "That is so ridiculous, that is never going to happen in America", well, I would have to say that I respectfully disagree.

Just this type of thinking is happening right now in the Republic of the Sudan in the continent of Africa. For several years now the Muslim government of Khartoum

has been enslaving and murdering the Christians in Southern Sudan.

As William J. Murray, the son of Madalyn Murry O'Hair, the woman who had brought a lawsuit to remove prayer from public schools said in April 1999, "President Clinton has ordered the destruction of Yugoslavia to protect Muslim Albanians and help them establish a Muslim nation in Europe. Up to the beginning of the Clinton bombing campaign about 2,000 had died in the Yugoslav civil war. In the Sudan 3.9 million Christians have been murdered by the evil Muslim government since 1989. Why does Clinton do nothing about these millions of deaths? Is it because the victims are Christians or is it because they are Black?" You can see his Internet Web Site at <http://www.rfcnet.org>.

The government of Sudan can do that because the national religion Islam allows them to do it. The government is in submission to the religion of Islam just because they have taken the thinking presented above to the extreme. They have made the laws of the religious organization(s) have supremacy over the laws of mutual governance. This is not to say that government should out law religious expression or that religion should not be allowed to have a proactive part in society and government, but to say that government should not regulate morality is to move toward this type of society.

You can see from the statements I quoted in the beginning there are plenty of candidates out there who want to take our nation just that direction. So, as I said don't try to tell me we won't see that here in America. These candidates may not even see it themselves but in trying to argue in support of homosexual marriage they are arguing for the sacrificing of the founding principle of our great nation, that principle being the principle of self government 'of the people by the people.'

We as a free people have a responsibility to decide what the legal definition of marriage should be and to consider what is best for the nation as a whole. I encourage you to not buy the lie that it is none of government business and go vote in support of Prop. 22 on the California Ballot this March 7, 2000. 