

Gay Marriage

Good news, everyone! We here at **The World** fully recognise same-sex marriages. We oppose any discrimination in law between same-sex and different-sex marriages .

Indeed, unlike many who take those views, we go further. We also oppose any discrimination in law between married people and single people.

In other words, we think that the state should gradually phase out its relationship-validating and -invalidating business. If two (or more) people want solemnly to declare that they will never leave each other no matter how much they may later want to, that should be their right. If holy men and women set up in business to endorse or deprecate such declarations, that too is their right. But the state should not enforce such declarations (beyond what would be required by ordinary contract law) nor set up legal penalties or rewards for those who make them.

That President Bush should be expending time, energy and political capital on this issue in wartime would be reprehensible even if he were on the right side of it. It can wait. And we therefore say also to campaigners who are on the right side of the issue – such as **Andrew Sullivan** – remain calm; it can wait.

One more thing. Since we have recently made several criticisms of President Bush, perhaps it's worth stressing that we unequivocally endorse him in the forthcoming Presidential election, and not just because the other candidates are hopelessly bad. We agree with **Condoleeza Rice** that posterity will regard Bush as one of the great Presidents. We are just sad that he isn't greater.

Tue, 06/15/2004 - 13:48 | [digg](#) | [del.icio.us](#) | [permalink](#)

Rights??? Slightly off-topic

If two (or more) people want solemnly to declare that they will never leave each other no matter how much they may later want to, that should be their right

This idea is not quite clear to me. If I marry someone and, in addition, declare that I will never ever leave my spouse that I should be obliged to keep such promise? I thought that certain types of contract conditions should be void under modern

legislation. If I want to sell myself into slavery and noone forces me to do so but nevertheless I wish to sign for it - this condition should also be void by any means. Even if I signed it, even if I got money in return for that - still noone should be able to enforce it. Catholic marriage, slavery, peonage etc. are inhumane things and shouldn't be considered as valid conditions under any circumstances. If two same sex people sign for an eternal marriage - it doesn't change a thing.

Is there anyone to disagree on this issue?

by a reader on Wed, 06/16/2004 - 08:34 | [reply](#)

I have been struggling with t

I have been struggling with this issue for a few months now and i cant seem to find a defensible position on either side of it.

One the one hand, a couple who are in love and wish to share their lives together really should have at least some legal rights as married people do now. On the other hand, if simple desire to be together is sufficient for two people to gain legal status and protection then why should not a brother and sister (both of legal age) be forbidden to marry for instance, or even parent and child? This may sound like its getting a bit off topic but how do you say that two peoples respective desire to live together is more or less important than any two other people. I'm sure there is a good argument to settle this, i just haven't heard it yet.

At the moment a marriage, in theory, is the union of a man and woman to create children. ignoring that this is not always the case, it is none the less the ideal case and the reason for the institution to exist. If that reason no longer applies as the guiding principle then it would seem to be morally impossible to refuse the union of any two people, regardless of their status or reasons.

by a reader on Wed, 06/16/2004 - 13:07 | [reply](#)

certain types of contract conditions should be void

Indeed they should.

by [Editor](#) on Wed, 06/16/2004 - 13:27 | [reply](#)

Re: I have been struggling with - why marry?

You don't even need to marry if you are going to have children.

At the moment a marriage, in theory, is the union of a man and woman to create children.

No, it is not for quite a while already. Marriage is a union of two people. Full stop. Official marriage gives you legal rights and practical conveniences in a number of situation. The examples are numerous: inheritance of property and share of property when divorcing, immigration and travel, adoption, mutual health care -

when you are allowed to visit your spouse in hospital, make decisions on possible treatment etc., taxation as long as it depends on marital status and number of children. In all these areas same sex couples would be deprived of something quite important for them. Most people just ignore these issues and say something very simplistic like "if you want to live together just do it".

by a reader on Wed, 06/16/2004 - 17:04 | [reply](#)

damn subject line

the world said people should have the right to make marriage vows, not that they should literally be a legally enforceable contract.

brother and sister or parent and child **should** be able to marry legally for tax etc purposes. i don't see that happening though. more realistic is just not having marriage effect taxes etc anymore.

also, i don't see why living together should have anything to do with it. who to live with is a lifestyle choice and shouldn't have anything to do with taxes.

and yes if you enact my changes, we will have two straight brothers who are businessmen who live on opposite sides of the country "marry" to abuse the tax system. this reveals not a problem with my changes, but a problem with the whole idea of changing tax law for "married" people.

-- Elliot Temple
<http://www.curi.us/>

by [Elliot Temple](#) on Wed, 06/16/2004 - 17:56 | [reply](#)

Maybe it oughta be a law

Everyone should marry and adopt x number of dependents and open Roth IRAs to pay for their future educations. The current personal income tax system would then collapse under the weight of bliss or become ever more burdensome upon those unable or unwilling to wed a spouse.

by a reader on Wed, 06/16/2004 - 22:18 | [reply](#)

Taxation can be quite a diverse thing

The point was not about having less burden of taxes for officially married couples. Taxation is a huge area nowadays. If I want to make a present to a friend then in some countries you pay tax from the gift you receive. However relatives pay less. It happens because in some countries they consider gifts as income. Tax systems can be very complicated and tricky. Also, taxes from inherited property can be different depending on whether you are in relation or not. Childless people pay tax for not having children in some countries too. Of course, if you stand for abolishing all taxes then it is pointless to even argue about it. But this is what I meant by taxation in my previous post - as long as some tax makes any

difference to married/unmarried status same sex couples are deprived (or favoured) of something. And after all, you have overlooked other important differences and other kinds of deprivation which may be much more important.

I find ridiculous not to be able to join my spouse in other country for several years - that is what majority of western "highly-civilised" countries force people to do. But it is even worse not to be able to join your spouse at all.

by a reader on Thu, 06/17/2004 - 08:45 | [reply](#)

Same sex marriage

According to editors of this site, the above issue 'can wait'. The reason cited? We are in wartime. Gee, can't we do more than one thing at a time? Let's hold off everything!! No no, let's get to increasing cancer research funding later, it can wait, we are in wartime. Let's put off fixing main-street - we are in wartime, it can wait. Hell, let's throw every resource we have into this 'war on terror' - because it's the only thing worth worrying about right now. Everything else can wait.

How long do we wait for? How long will we wait for the war to be over? How long until our friends in Fallugia are 'free'? We just wait. They'll just wait.

I think there is an argument for the view that trying to solve things quickly, with a shite-load of 'collateral damage' as is being done in Iraq, is, perhaps not the best way for ensuring freedom. This 'imposed revolution' might seem in retrospect to be the way we have made terrorists more dangerous - because they hate the west more. Perhaps better is what is happening in China - it's not a revolution of freedom - but an evolution of western values. The youth there and the freedom-lovers no longer stand before tanks, rising up against powers they are too weak to withstand. Instead western values just 'slowly' seep into the nation. In this sense, waiting is worthy. It's worthy because the light at the end of the tunnel might be a little further off, but at least we don't have to crawl over quite so many bodies and shattered lives as we do right now in Iraq, claiming the light is just around the corner.

Personally, I reckon the length the tunnel in Iraq is a hell of a lot longer than the one in China. Moreover it's going to be clogged with a lot more blood.

Whatever the case, we're going to be waiting along time. And with all that time let's do somethign productive rather than destructive...like, I don't know...give rights to people in democratic nations who are at the moment being discriminated against, like singles and gays.

by Brett on Sun, 11/28/2004 - 02:13 | [reply](#)

Re: Same sex marriage

According to editors of this site, the above issue 'can wait'. The

reason cited? We are in wartime.

You're right. We should have stressed that it is the fact that this issue is *divisive*, as well as non-urgent, that makes it wrong to force controversial changes of policy through during wartime.

We did so in a later post, [here](#).

by **Editor** on Sun, 11/28/2004 - 02:29 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2008 Setting The World To Rights