Anthony NGUYEN Wronging rights No justifying anti-homosexual acts

A close friend from California called last week and the first words out of her mouth were "Anthony, I'm a person, right?" Lauren is a lesbian.

On Tuesday, the Senate voted 50-49 to kill the Non-Discrimination Act and 85-14 in favor of the Defense of Marriage Act. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott defended these actions as "non-prejudicial." Sure seems prejudice to me.

But, some claim that discrimination against homosexuals is justifiable because it is based on sexual orientation, not other uncontrollable factors (like race). Or more insidiously, it's not discrimination, but a prevention of perversion.

Suppose, though, if prior to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (when segregation was alive and kickin') that some southern legislature had decided to pass a Defense of Marriage Act of 1950? This act would define marriage as being between one white man and one white woman - obviously prejudicial. But a proponent of this legislation could claim they were preserving the "traditional" view of marriage as between two members of one race - that's why we have distinct races. So interracial marriages would be "unnatural."

What if legislation said that all minorities had no protection in the workplace? We know this is wrong. So why do some of us still think it's OK to do this to homosexuals?

RELIGIOUS

One of the basic concepts of the U.S. Constitution is that social policy cannot be made solely for religious reasons. The current legislation against homosexuals has been supported with such "facts" as the Bible says homosexuality is wrong. Well it seems we're ignoring atheists, agnostics and non Judeo-Christians. Most importantly, if the immorality we invoke is on religious grounds, are we not violating a certain commitment to some of our citizens?



NATURAL

This is the common argument: "Homosexuals willingly choose to engage in this 'unnatural' behavior and so are immoral." So what is natural?

If we hold natural to the strictest sense — not deviating from nature — then don't we all have unnatural lives?

I drove to school. That can't be natural. A friend flew to California. Flying sure as hell isn't natural for people.

But if something unnatural is something "gross" (as many call homosexuals), then what about actions people do which are natural to them, but which might "gross" some of us out — women who don't shave for instance — are we to morally condemn them?

Or maybe "natural" means fulfilling a certain function? Opponents of homosexuals say that the function of genitalia is for procreation. But the problem with this line of thought is that we have body parts which have a number of functions — some certainly not the main function — but we aren't immoral for using them in other ways. The mouth's function is to allow intake of food — yet we can use it for talking, oral sex and yawning — so are we unnatural and immoral?

But, some may argue, "aren't homosexuals willfully the way they are?"

Hey, if choosing to go to UNL meant you'd be beaten, spit on, denied jobs, stigmatized and abhorred by people, you probably wouldn't have chosen to come here, huh? But my friend faces these problems on a daily basis — so why hasn't she "chosen" to become heterosexual? It's not a choice. I've been attracted to women since junior high. But did I wake up one day and say "today, Anthony, is the day you become heterosexual"? Nope, but I'm attracted to women. Did Lauren wake up and tell herself "today, you're going to be homosexual"? Nope, but she's attracted to women.

If you truly believe choice is involved, then please tell, on what day did you make that choice? Or was it just a "feeling"?

CORRUPTIVE

Corruption of family values and society. That's why we should stop the homosexual agenda.

Hey look, we haven't had "Leave It To Beaver" families in a long time (if ever) so I don't see how homosexuals are making families crumble.

It certainly is easier to blame external forces than look into the mirror. Homosexuals are stereotyped as sex-crazed maniacs, and our government deems it necessary to protect our virtues. But when a father rapes his daughter, no one condemns heterosexuals; but when a child is molested by a homosexual, it is considered indicative of all homosexuals.

Once I had a fellow College Republican at Boston University say to me during a meeting that if his kid was gay he'd tell him not to be a teacher, a politician or some position of influence. Problem: If my professor is gay, I'm not gonna say hey, I admire and respect him, so I'll be gay too. How many of your professors wear their sexuality on their sleeves? Most people, heterosexual and homosexual alike, don't.

Our society, even with its gains in minority civil rights, is still prejudicial toward homosexuals. Don't brush it under the rug, I want to be able to answer Lauren's question. A phrase comes to mind: "...with liberty and justice for all." For all.

Nguyen is a senior biochemistry and philosophy major and a Daily Nebraskan columnist.



