

CON: Mich. Court's Rule to Strike Down Same-Sex Marriage Ban is 'Tragedy in the Making'

Editor's note: This article came in first place of the three winners selected in the competition for Christian Life Missions' Walker Journalism Award. You can read more about the competition [here](#).

I'd be ignorant to think Friday's overturning wasn't inevitable for the state of Michigan. The Court of Appeals offered a ripple of hope on Saturday, but the tidal wave that is the LGBT agenda is too great. It's only a matter of time before same-sex marriage will be recognized nationally.

This is a tragedy in the making.

Government is defining a covenantal union. This is very concerning because marriage has never been defined by man. It is an inherently biblical, historical concept, established in pre-historical times. Whether you like it or not, you are destined to end up reading Genesis 2:24 when searching for marriage's roots. Every time you utter the very word, you are breathing out a union first and foremost defined by God. Heck, before America existed, marriage existed. Its roots are timeless. Before government as an institution even existed, marriage existed.

Our fundamental belief in the U.S. is that all men are created equal by their creator. Some of us love the created idea of equality, but ignore the creator who endows those unalienable

rights. But if equality is central to an argument, it must be observed in the context of the creator who breathed equality into existence. You can't separate concept from creator. That is, unless you want to be your own god, borrow from objectivity and transmogrify it into a subjective experience that caters your own desires.

So when a judge says this violates the equal protection of the law, he or she is putting him or herself in the place of God – he is perverting the constitution. Because who really makes laws? Who really defines morality? All law is based on morality. And all morality is based on theology.

But now we are in an era where marriage's definition is fluid, subjective. The problem is, whenever an entity is deviated from its original purpose, consequences will emerge. And the magnitude of those consequences are only accentuated with the scope of the topic at hand. It really doesn't get much more significant than a union that is meant to bring forth life.

We cannot afford to underemphasize the weight family bears on a society. The most basic groundwork of mankind is the family. It has been so for hundreds of thousands of years. The left vastly underestimates how much this change in human fundamentalism will warp the greater ethical framework.

I'm not saying homosexual behavior should be criminalized. What I am saying is that it is imperative for marriage to have a statutory definition. Just consider the legality involved, in particular, with children. Heterosexual sexual union usually brings forth children. Homosexual sexual union does not. That says something about the inherent responsibility one man and one woman have in raising children.

Pro-gay rights activists are correct in that many of the effects of legalizing same sex marriage are unforeseen. But one thing is for sure—consequences are inevitable, and it could very well begin with the criminalization of Christians.

We are sliding down a very slippery slope.

Realize the degree of change you are asking for by institutionalizing gay marriage and embedding it into the legal framework of this nation. It's vastly more than a matter of acceptance; it's redefining what is fundamental to human existence.

If the definition of this covenantal union changes now, it will continue to change. It will continue to conform to future impulses of culture and feeling.

There are some matters that must be clear-cut. We're dealing with one of them.

The separation of church and state is often used as a counterargument to repel the use of the Bible in defense of marriage. This is a gross misrepresentation. Separation of church and state was never meant to limit religious expression, but to prohibit the federal government from establishing a national church or require sectarian policy to be forced on an individual state or government. To use this phrase to justify the ignorance of the Bible is ultimately self-defeating.

I realize when I ink words like this, some might be offended. Again, look at the objective truth, not Derek Kim. I've endeavored to emphasize the former. History testifies every society that has gone down this path has failed to the point of no return.

I can only say so much in one column. That is why I hope you get a chance to read my previous column on this very issue. Disagreement is not synonymous with hate. Agreement is not synonymous with love.

I happen to have close friends who deal with same-sex attraction. I don't treat them as any less of a brother or a sister. How awful that would be. But we agree marriage is

exclusively designed for one man and one woman and that any misrepresentation of that is detrimental.

Marriage is objective, and furthermore, objective truth exists. Truth endures. Thus, standing firm to the biblical definition of marriage is far from hateful; it's loving—redeeming.

Derek Kim is a journalism junior. Reach him at kimderek@.