

Seeking Normal? Considering Same-Sex Marriage

Jodi O'Brien

Professor of Sociology, University of Seattle

*A lecture presented by the Center for Writing and the
Interdisciplinary Graduate Minor in Literacy and Rhetorical Studies*

Speaker Series

No. 24 * 2004

Kirsten Jamsen, Series Editor

Elizabeth Oliver, Editor

Seeking Normal? Considering Same-Sex Marriage

Jodi O'Brien

Professor of Sociology, University of Seattle

*A lecture presented by the Center for Writing and the
Interdisciplinary Graduate Minor in Literacy and Rhetorical Studies*

Speaker Series
No. 24 * 2004

Kirsten Jamsen, Series Editor
Elizabeth Oliver, Editor

**CENTER FOR WRITING
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
227 LIND HALL
207 CHURCH ST. SE
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455**

Director: Kirsten Jamsen

Associate Director: Pamela Flash

Principal Administrator: Terri Wallace

Research Assistants: Sara Berrey, Kate Edenborg, Erin Harley, Kjel Johnson, Elizabeth Oliver, Jim Oliver

**Copyright © 2004 by the Board of Regents, University of Minnesota
All Rights Reserved**

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance.

Preface

The Center for Writing and the interdisciplinary graduate minor in Literacy and Rhetorical Studies (LRS) sponsors an annual speaker series to engage faculty and graduate students in rich discussions about the uses of language, reading, and writing in the world.

On March 28, 2004, the LRS Minor, the Center, and the University of Minnesota were pleased to welcome Jodi O'Brien as the 24th speaker in the annual series. Her lecture, titled "Sexual Silence and Shame and Good Ol' American Values," discussed what O'Brien calls the typically "American" approach to sexuality, particularly homosexuality. Her talk was a timely one. The year 2004 was filled with controversy over gay marriage rights and sex education standards, with the Bush administration pushing abstinence-only education and legislation to "protect marriage" with the first constitutional amendment legalizing discrimination by banning gay marriages. O'Brien's talk exposed some of the origins of the American attitude toward sex.

O'Brien is Associate Professor of Sociology at Seattle University. She teaches courses in social psychology, sexual politics, inequality, and classical and contemporary theory. She writes and lectures on the cultural politics of transgressive identities and communities. Her book, *Social Prisms* (Pine Forge Press 1999), is a discussion of the paradoxes, tensions, and ambiguities which inform the study of sociology. She also edited a collection of social, psychological, and sociological essays, under the title *The Production of Reality* (Pine Forge Press 2001).

The recording of Dr. O'Brien's talk on that date was, unfortunately, inaudible, so reprinted here is the article on which it was loosely based: "Seeking Normal?"

Considering Same-Sex Marriage,” originally published in *the Journal of Social Justice* (Spring 2004).

We at the Center for Writing believe this Speaker Series will provide new insights for teachers and researchers in the field of literacy and rhetorical studies and beyond. We invite you to communicate with the Center about this publication or any others in the series.

Elizabeth Oliver, Editor

Kirsten Jansen, Series Editor

Introduction

Susan Meyers (student in the LRS Minor): Welcome to the second event in this year's Literacy and Rhetorical Studies speaker series: Dr. Jodi O'Brien on "Sexual Silence and Shame and Good Ol' American Values."

As a student in the LRS minor, I've had the pleasure of attending several of these events during my three years here at the U of M, and I have looked forward each time to the unique perspective that our multi-disciplined speakers give to issues of language, discourse, and pedagogy. Today, I'd like to extend a special thanks to members of the Center for Writing community who have helped make this event possible: Sara Berrey, Liz Oliver, Terri Wallace, Don Ross (DGS), and our director, Kirsten Jansen.

It isn't possible to introduce Jodi O'Brien the scholar without also introducing Jodi O'Brien the teacher, because Dr. O'Brien, Chair of Seattle University's Sociology Department and one of today's most important theorists of sexual politics, is a scholar who consistently blends her theory and her praxis. It is not enough for her to redefine sexual shame and silence, heteronormativity, or homophobia in academic terms; in her community lectures and classroom practices, Jodi O'Brien unpacks these concepts, making them accessible and meaningful in our everyday lives.

As her former student from 1997-1999, I can attest to the ways in which Jodi O'Brien gets her students on the front lines not just of sociology, but of life. Always taking an interdisciplinary approach, Jodi has introduced Madonna videos, coming-out novels, and visits from transsexuals into what would otherwise be "standard fare"—and no doubt far less interesting—sociology courses.

Beyond the walls of her classroom, I once found myself standing absolutely still in the middle of a crowded grocery store for ten minutes "doing nothing" in order to test people's reactions to cultural biases toward anti-productivity. Later, I was calling every adult I knew to survey their definitions of love, romance, and—god forbid—sexual attraction. I also walked into several sex shops in downtown Seattle to interview the staff—and only once got thrown out.

All this just to get my homework in Dr. O'Brien's class!

But the outcome was, of course, that I had to think not just about the concepts presented in class, but my own reactions to and feelings about real world applications.

And, not surprisingly, what I came up with was a whole slough of new questions: Why is it, for example, that a business can support itself selling images of women's bodies, but if a woman walks in the door, the store clerk gets nervous? And why, at another sex shop I visited, did the cashier tell me he was quitting as soon as he got the chance? He hated working there, he said, because all the customers were hostile—too ashamed of what they were buying to make small talk with the guy ringing up their purchases.

It wasn't too difficult, after experiences like these, to understand Dr. O'Brien's classroom message about America's simultaneous obsession with and repression of sexual expression.

Jodi O'Brien's perspective on teaching is evident in her pedagogical lectures and articles, such as "Teaching as a Moral Vocation," "TA/Professor Relations: Power, Diplomacy and Effective Advocacy," and "The Paradox of Value-Neutrality: Responsibility and Authority in Teaching." And her commitment is likewise apparent

through her contributions to the textbook field, such as *The Production of Reality* and *Exploring the Architecture of Everyday Life*.

In the community, Jodi has extended her interdisciplinary approach to discussions of prejudice and hate crimes with a Washington state police department, a lecture on religion and sexuality at Seattle First Baptist Church, and even a few pre-performance remarks about Richard Wagner at the Seattle Opera. As Jodi will tell you, gender and sexual identities have as much to do with economics, religion, art, and politics as they do with physiology or individual expression.

Likewise, Jodi O'Brien the scholar works actively at the margins of social scientific research, considering questions of queer Christian identities, internet sexuality, and gay and lesbian family rights movements. Her recent publications and projects include *Social Prisms: Reflections on Everyday Myths and Paradoxes* and *How Big is Your God? Ethnography of Queer Christian Religiosity*.

Throughout all of this work, Jodi has continued to pursue questions that keep us at the intersections of thought and life. Why, for example, are Americans so ashamed of sexuality? Why do we put so much stock in romantic love? And why do rhetorics of "family values" and "protecting marriage" emerge in policy meetings and electoral debates?

These are the types of inquiry that motivate Jodi O'Brien's work, and keep her on the cutting edges of social scientific and rhetorical research. But it is her humanity that I think you will best remember Jodi O'Brien by. Through her inquiry into the whys and hows of social life, she always brings us back to praxis. And in doing so she leaves us all

thinking more deeply about our lives, the beliefs we create, and the stories we tell ourselves about them.

Please join me in welcoming Dr. Jodi O'Brien.

SEEKING NORMAL? CONSIDERING SAME SEX MARRIAGE

(Reprinted here with permission from the *Seattle Journal of Social Justice*, originally appearing in the spring 2004 edition.)

Jodi O'Brien: Like many lesbians and gay men, until recently I'd given little personal thought to marriage. It was just another one of those cultural institutions that didn't apply to me. As a sociologist, I am well-versed in the discourses by which marriage is deconstructed in order to reveal its patriarchal (read inequitable and unjust) foundations. As a sexualities scholar, I am also well aware of the many economic and legal benefits that accompany state-sanctioned definitions of family. When discussions of marriage have come up in my own long-term relationships, the impetus has been consideration of these benefits. Like many same-sex couples, my partner and I have spent thousands of dollars to file legal papers that would enable us to act on one another's behalf, secure legal recognition of our joint property, and grant power of decision in matters such as a living will. Each of these considerations is focused around worst case, "what if" scenarios (what if one of us dies and the family tries to take away the house from the living partner? what if one of us is terminally ill and the other is not allowed to participate in medical decisions?).

The relevance of marriage ceremonies in my own life has involved the weddings of my six siblings. All lavish affairs, I attended each in arm with my partner (and had her introduced as such to family friends and relatives). When I was contemplating a break-

up, my Mormon mother (who opposed the break-up) reminded me sternly, “This is just like a divorce, you know.” My parents became much more open and accepting of my sexuality as soon as I found a nice girl with whom to take up housekeeping. Although it would never have occurred to any of my family members that I should seek marriage, my partner and I at least felt some comfort in this family recognition. We were acknowledged, yet we were still separate—separate in culture and law, and separate as two lesbians in an extended family of prolific heterosexual Mormons. Separate and acknowledged is certainly not separate but equal.

The trouble with this equation, as many lesbian and gay families have discovered through difficult legal and social entanglements, is that when a situation of inequality exists, “acknowledgement” is at the whim of those who hold power. To borrow a phrase from the poet June Jordan, “there is difference and there is power; who has the power decides the meaning of difference.”¹ The current “marriage wars” can be viewed and analyzed as a battle for the power to define complete inclusion in U.S. culture. For many supporters of same-sex marriage, the battle is about the simple justice of being able to define one’s own family and have this definition recognized and respected as a basic human right, as Paula Eittlebrick points out in this issue.² For others, the battle is about who holds the power to determine justice in any form—what some observers have referred to as the “just-us” justice defined by those who see themselves as the keepers of a pre-determined cultural truth.

¹ June Jordan. *Technical Difficulties* p, 197. Boston: Beacon (1994).

² Paula Eittlebrick & Julie Shapiro, “Are we on the Path to Liberation Now?: Same-Sex Marriage at Home and Abroad.” *Seattle Journal of Social Justice* 2:475 (2004).

Radical or Assimilationist?

The so-called struggle for gay marriage is additionally complicated by the fact that homosexuality is not a monolith. Lesbians and gay men represent a full spectrum of colors, creeds, political and religious affiliations and economic circumstances. There are lesbian and gay Republicans, lesbian and gay criminals, lesbian and gay ministers, lesbian and gay parents, and yes, some lesbians and gay men who would like to have their committed unions recognized by the state and possibly even blessed by their church. One of the long-standing debates in lesbian and gay studies and social movements centers on the question of “seeking the normal.” There are two well-recognized discourses framing this debate. One is the argument that as marginal members of society, lesbians and gay men should push the boundaries of acceptance as far as we can by demanding recognition for even the queerest among us. The other is that assimilation is the best and most politically and socially rewarding route to general acceptance.

Both positions are strongly represented in lesbian and gay history. For instance, ACT-UP protests strove to focus public attention on the rights of HIV-positive gay men who were being discriminated against in health care on the basis of a distinctly non-normative sexuality. At the same time, Madison Avenue was actively courting lesbian and gay dollars by featuring same-sex relationships in mainstream advertising. This marketing era, now known as the “gay media marketing moment,” is credited with providing an economic basis for mainstream awareness and increasing tolerance of homosexuality. In the United States, purchasing power is one route to increased political

and public acceptance.³ As advertisers realized that gay dollars were just as green as straight ones and just as likely to increase sales, mainstream media became bolder in the portrayal of lesbians and gay men. We moved from being background characters usually intended to draw laughs or convey moral missives to front-and-center TV-land companions. The appearance of shows such as *Ellen*, *Will and Grace*, *Queer as Folk*, and *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* brought lesbians and gays into the living rooms of middle America and paved the way for mildly edgy straight-based identities such as the “metrosexual” and “lesbian chic.” Around this time, in the early 1990s, some queer studies scholars began to note that the original ACT-UP chant, “we’re here, we’re queer, get used to it,” was beginning to look more and more like “we’re here, we’re queer, let’s go to IKEA.”⁴

This assimilationist trend has had many critics. Some critiques focused on the raced (white), classed (upper-middle) and gendered (predominantly male) demographics of those featured in the positive media representations of lesbian and gay characters.⁵ Others noted the increasing polarization between legions of lesbians, gay men, and transgendered persons who don’t fit the assimilation mold (i.e., young runaways, poor, “too butch” or “too feminine” or “too queer”) and those who were buying homes, expensive vehicles, and planning to have children. Critics of various lesbian and gay task forces and rights groups observed that these groups seemed increasingly concerned with

³ Betsy Reed and Amy Gluckman. "Lost in the Gay Marketing Moment: Leaving Diversity in the Dust." *Dollars and Sense*. Nov./Dec. 1993.

⁴ See e.g., John Gallagher. "Ikea's Gay Gamble," *Advocate*, May 3, 1994; see also Suzanna Walters, *All the Rage: The Story of Gay Visibility in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (2003).

⁵ Many of these critiques also note the absence of sexuality or sexual affection in many mainstream portrayals. Presumably, one price of acceptance is the continued “closeting” of the main dimension of difference, sexual behavior.

winning “mainstream” assimilation battles (e.g., same-sex adoption rights, military service, and religious participation) than in fighting the longstanding battles against forms of brutal discrimination that mark the daily lives of many queer folk. The mainstreaming of some aspects of lesbian and gay life were accompanied by an increased distancing among self-described queers; those who either did not relate to these representations of “normalcy” or who felt obligated to actively resist the narrow definitions of acceptability these representations reinforce.

Mainstream inclusion as portrayed in media and popular culture has also not only drawn resistance from some queers, but has resulted in a growing tide of backlash rising among heteronormative groups, most notably evangelical Christians. These anti-gay groups perceive the arrival of lesbians and gay men in the media and the winning of some basic anti-discrimination legislation as signs of the proliferation of a radical “gay agenda.” This backlash has escalated into a full-blown social movement organized around attempts to legislate political and cultural exclusion. Most recently, anti-gay groups, who fear a persistent gay advancement on the cultural terrain, have drawn the line of acceptance at marriage. Amidst this climate of overt hostility and attempts to create legal discrimination, many lesbians and gay men have felt compelled to redraw the battle lines and call for a unified fight in the struggle for matrimony. The battle for legal marriage, even more than the issue of gays in the military, has forced many uneasy alliances among otherwise widely diverse individuals who claim no other commonality than shared discrimination along the dimension of (non-normative) sexuality. Ironically, to the extent that a “gay agenda” does exist, it can be defined as the collective spirit of defense that has coalesced *in response to* an anti-gay political movement. Most

individuals who share a marginalized social position (race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexuality) understand the quandary presented by the call for solidarity that such “anti-movements” provoke.

The tyranny of solidarity and rhetorical ambivalence

In the case of same-sex marriage, the quandary of solidarity is manifest among lesbians and gay men who begin conversations by claiming, “I really don’t believe in marriage, *but . . .*” and then attempt to justify why all lesbians and gays must fight for the *right* to marry. The most common justification is framed in economic and legal terms. To date, there are 1,138 federal benefits automatically bestowed on legally married couples.⁶ Certainly this is a compelling instance of social injustice that should be addressed. Nonetheless, my own observations indicate that the rush for marriage is about much more than the economic and legal benefits the union provides. Long before questions about legalizing same-sex marriages appeared before the courts, lesbians and gay men were seeking the blessing of religious communities for committed unions.

In recent months much talk has been spun among proponents of same-sex marriage about the legal and economic benefits that accompany state-sanctioned definitions of the family. Intriguingly, less has been said about the seemingly more obvious and long-enduring symbolic aspects of marriage. Yet, it is the symbolic, or cultural, meaning of marriage that is the central point of struggle for those opposed to

⁶ Materials prepared by the *Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund* use information from a list based on a 1997 response from the General Accounting Office to a request by Representative Henry J Hyde. Hyde was chairperson of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and asked the General Accounting Office “to identify federal laws in which benefits, rights, and privileges are contingent on marital status.” The GAO response lists 1,049 benefits. This response is available online at <http://www.gao.gov/archive/1997/og97016.pdf>. Lambda Legal Defense recently revised the list to 1,138 (2004).

same-sex unions. Lesbian and gay rights activists are correct in their focus on the discrimination that is inherent in state-sanctioned benefits that accrue through adherence to one – and only one – culturally accepted definition of family. We miss the mark however when we assume that U.S. legal and economic policy is grounded solely in rational arguments based on the discourse of individual “rights.” The mistake often made in such debates is a conflation of “is” and “ought.” According to advocates of same-sex marriage, the U.S. government “ought” to protect individual citizens from unequal treatment. In reality, however, U.S. economic and legal policy has always reflected (and often protected) cultural hierarchies of inclusion and belonging.⁷

Thus, the two sides currently represented in the marriage debate are not arguing about the same thing. Anthropologically, marriage is one of the only uniformly recognized rites of passage and signs of cultural achievement and social inclusion in U.S. society. In its ideal form, the union is recognized by the state and blessed by a church, symbolizing its deeply rooted cultural significance and legitimacy. Opponents of same-sex marriage are scrambling to conserve/preserve this symbolic institution of inclusion and belonging precisely because there are so few symbolic achievements that cut across the many cultural divides that define the landscape of U.S. society.⁸ Proponents of same-sex marriage are arguing for governmentally recognized access to the economic and legal

⁷ Cf. Jacobsen and Pellegrini, *Love the Sin: Sexual Regulation and the Limits of Religious Tolerance*. New York: New York University Press (2003).

⁸ Another primary cultural function of marriage in U.S. society is a “performance” of appropriate gender roles. Sexual preference more generally can be seen as one among many forms of behavior through which the individual performs her or his gender. Same-sex marriages muddy this otherwise clear cultural script. Some scholars have proposed that much of the resistance to same-sex partnerships can be attributed to the (semi-conscious) drive to maintain traditional gender lines. Appropriate gender performance, which culminates in marriage, is indicative of full cultural comprehension and belonging.

benefits that accompany marriage without (appearing to be) paying genuine homage to the cultural institution itself.

The preponderance of marriage = rights/benefits rhetoric can be interpreted as an expression of the lack of consensual solidarity among lesbians and gay men regarding cultural assimilation and normalcy. Queers who have never given much thought to the cultural institution of marriage, precisely because it doesn't seem to apply to us, now feel compelled to fight for the rights of same-sex couples to marry, but are only willing to do so within a framework of "equal access to benefits" logic. At the same time, many lesbian and gay couples are seeking not only the related economic benefits of marriage, but the full cultural package. And why wouldn't they? Culturally, we are saturated with the notion that marriage is truly the pinnacle of inter-relational attainment (the "happiest moment of your life"). Given similar acculturation, it stands to reason that many lesbians and gay men would grow up desiring the same cultural rites of belonging. If, for the sake of argument, we assume that lesbians and gays want to win the battle for same-sex marriage, then the problem, from a political/rhetorical perspective, is not whether lesbians and gays should seek this form of cultural belonging, but the failure of same-sex marriage proponents to fully acknowledge the cultural significance of marriage and the desire of some queers for the full cultural belonging that marriage represents.

My interpretation is that lesbian and gay activists have been slow to engage in this line of defense ("we really do want to belong as fully as we possibly can") precisely because it requires articulating a desire for normalcy that many lesbians and gay men are loathe to acknowledge. Many of the activists at the front line of this debate are ambivalent about the level of cultural normalcy they want for themselves. Many are

long-time critical feminists who have been key voices in deconstructing the normative family.⁹ At the same time, as cultural acceptance and belonging has increased for these individuals – largely oriented around economic, professional, and family achievements – they find themselves enjoying more and more of the cultural benefits of inclusion and belonging. It makes sense that they would want the full recognition (legal and even religious acknowledgement) that completes this cultural package. Is this radical? Will it revolutionize, or even reform, current cultural hierarchies of belonging? That's another question entirely.

A comparison with recent social movements in lesbian and gay participation in mainstream religions is instructive in terms of both political/rhetorical frames and the question of assimilation. For more than a decade lesbians and gay Christians have actively sought recognition as “out queers” within their religious congregations. Self-described Christian queers often experience struggle and contradiction not only in their religious community, but among fellow lesbians and gay men. In mainstream Christianity, homosexual behavior is typically defined as an irredeemable sin. At the same time, many queers question why someone would want to participate in an institution that, by definition, excludes lesbians and gays from full acceptance. In contrast to the battle for same-sex marriage whereby many lesbians and gays are pitted against heterosexual Christians, the “open and affirming” movement in Christian congregations has included heterosexual and homosexual church members fighting side by side. This battle has sometimes been waged between congregants, some fighting for inclusion, others for exclusion. More recently however, the news-making battles are

⁹ See, e.g., Julie Shapiro “A lesbian-centered critique of second-parent adoptions.” *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* 17-39 (1999).

between congregations (predominantly heterosexual) who are locked in doctrinal debates with institutional (denominational) leaders regarding lesbian- and gay-affirming practices such as ordination, taking of sacraments, and performing commitment ceremonies at the congregational level. There is literally a social movement taking shape within the pews. In this instance, queers and straight allies are struggling side by side to stretch the Christian definitions of god and love to broader, more inclusive dimensions.¹⁰

In terms of political rhetorical frameworks, it's worth noting that in the case of queer religiosity, both sides fully acknowledge the significance of the cultural institution—Christianity—and its meaning in their lives. Although it would be possible to do so, no one has made the claim that religious belonging conveys particular social benefits from which lesbians and gays should not be excluded. The battle is entirely about the parameters of inclusion within a cultural institution that all agree is significant. Lesbians and gay men who participate in mainstream Christian religions experience a great deal of conflict and also grapple with hostility both from fellow Christians and fellow queers. Paradoxically, as fellow congregants get to know their lesbian and gay members and watch them in their struggle for acceptance, they often feel as if their own faith is strengthened. In this particular case, the struggle for acceptance reaffirms and reinforces the cultural institution. As one Baptist parishioner phrases it, “to see them (lesbian and gay congregants) remain faithful while putting up with so much prejudice, well, you just have to believe that God is big enough to love us all.”¹¹

¹⁰ Jodi O'Brien, “Wrestling the Angel of Contradiction: Queer Christian Identities.” *Culture and Religion*, 5:179-196 (2004).

¹¹ This quote is taken from an interview I conducted while researching a project on religion and homosexuality from 2000-2002. Consistent with ethnographic convention, this interview was taped and transcribed and has been catalogued by the author. See O'Brien; *supra* note 10 for methodological details.

It's noteworthy that many Christians do not see lesbian and gay religious participation as a threat, but rather as an affirmation of their own religiosity. Fellow worshippers view the motivation for participation among lesbians and gay men as indicative that the church is deeply valued. Why is it so difficult to make a similar case for marriage? Obviously, if lesbians and gays are clamoring to participate in an institution that has long been in decline as well as under critical attack (e.g., divorce rates, media mockery, high rates of co-habitation, scholarly deconstruction) then it must be meaningful. Or so one would think.

Here again the tension between assimilationist and radical positions provides a basis for interpretation. Non-religious lesbians and gay men are deeply suspicious and often overtly hostile regarding religion. There have been no lesbian and gay task force initiatives fighting for the "right to equal worship." In fact, secular lesbian and gay activist groups have largely ignored queer Christianity. When there has been comment, it has often been in the form of questioning what are perceived to be the assimilationist motivations of queer Christians. Ironically, queer Christians seem both more aware of, and articulate about, the full reasons for their desire to participate in religious groups than do many secular lesbians and gays who are seeking marriage. Queer Christians know that their battleground is a sacred terrain of cultural significance and meaning and its power to convey a sense of belonging. They know that their quest for prideful acceptance within Christianity is fraught with contradictions. Is the quest for acceptance in Christianity radical? Assimilationist?

This line of inquiry constitutes a sort of truth trap wherein there is only one answer: it's both. The fact is, if nothing else, these struggles compel individuals to

become engaged in reflection and discussion about the meaning of otherwise taken-for-granted cultural institutions. Why, really, are we so propelled toward marriage in this culture? Ultimately, successful struggles expand the range of choices for marginalized individuals who have been denied the opportunity to fully author their own lives, either through narrowly inscribed stereotypes perpetuated through cultural hierarchies (“the sexually deviant cannot have normal family relations as defined by culture and law”) or through tyrannies of solidarity (“how can you be a good queer and also want to be religious/married?”). In this regard, successful battles for inclusion stretch the boundaries of cultural institutions and simultaneously reinforce/strengthen their cultural significance. Given this, it is imperative never to lose sight of the question: successful for whom, and on what terms?

Considerations and Complications

Legal and political recognition of same-sex unions is probably inevitable in the near future.¹² Whether it be in the form of civil unions or the full recognition of legal marriage as currently defined, this struggle will expand the repertoire for many lesbians and gay men regarding the freedom to choose “normalcy” if they so desire. At the same time, the institution itself, which stands as a citadel of normalcy, will have its walls of inclusion stretched while simultaneously strengthening and polishing its standing as the ultimate icon of cultural belonging. In this regard, the recognition of same-sex couples will be both radical and assimilationist.

¹² As I write this, the United States Supreme Court has just declined to intervene in the State of Massachusetts’ recognition of gay marriages (decision rendered May 13, 2004).

At the same time, I don't expect that this expansion will change anything at all for single parents who are poor or for extended families with dependent relatives who do not qualify for healthcare and related benefits under current guidelines for "dependency." Same-sex unions will not alter the current political/economic arrangement whereby an average individual has access to healthcare only through corporate employment or its equivalent for one or more family members recognized as such through the legal definition of marriage/family. Most middle-class and working poor citizens will still bear a disproportionate tax burden relative to benefits received. Should so many economic and legal benefits be connected, uncritically, to the cultural institution of marriage? As Kramer¹³ argues in this issue, and as Polikoff¹⁴ and Fineman¹⁵ have argued convincingly, welfare states (of which the United States is one) should define and convey benefits and assurances based on realistic estimations of dependency.¹⁶ To this end, Kramer, Polikoff, and Fineman call for a complete redefinition of the family as a basis for assessing economic households.

I appreciate these more complicated analyses and add that the question of the same-sex marriage, particularly as it is sometimes framed in terms of the implications of "seeking normal," needs to be problematized more complexly still on at least two

¹³ Zak Kramer, "Exclusionary Equality and the Case for Same-Sex Families: A Reworking of Martha Fineman's Re-visioned Family Law," *Seattle Journal of Social Justice* 2:505(2004).

¹⁴ Nancy D. Polikoff, "Why Lesbians and Gay Men should Read Martha Fineman." *American University Journal of Gender Social Policy and the Law*. 8:167(2000).

¹⁵ Martha Fineman. *The Neutered Mother, The Sexual Family, and Other Twentieth Century Tragedies*. New York: Routledge (1995).

¹⁶ For a comparative analysis of welfare state policy and family definitions, see Manuela Naldini, *The Family in the Mediterranean Welfare States*. Independence, KY: Frank Cass Publishers (2003).

dimensions: we should seek more comprehensive/comprehending analyses of the *significance* of cultural institutions in shaping lives and in reinforcing cultural hierarchies that are a basis for resource allocation; and we should interrogate the methodological and rhetorical practices by which implications regarding “radical” and “assimilationist” are falsely dichotomized. I conclude with a brief discussion of each of these points.

1) We need to pay more attention to the meaning and significance inscribed in particular cultural institutions, in this case, the institution of marriage. Whether one agrees with this meaning, it is empirically unsound and politically foolish to ignore cultural significance. Feminist scholars, myself included, have been deconstructing the institution of marriage for decades; successfully demonstrating the tremendous social and economic burden this small unit (the “couple”) carries in corporate capitalist economy¹⁷ as well as its tremendous “compulsory” grip on our sense of self and accomplishment.¹⁸ Despite these insights, we have not done the best job at achieving an additional feminist methodological creed, comprehending the “field of relations” on its own terms. Clearly marriage stands for more than 1,138 federal benefits. We do ourselves and our work an injustice when we fail to explore the very complex, and often contradictory, reasons for the tenacity of marriage in its current cultural form.

Likewise, lesbians and gay men (and all heterosexuals for that matter) should reflect more critically on the reasons for wanting marriage. A desire for cultural

¹⁷ Many critics of same-sex marriage recognize that increasing corporatization and decreasing collective/community ties are placing an unrealistic burden on the individual family unit (e.g., responsibilities for economic welfare, nurturance, companionship, cultural reproduction of values and knowledge, etc.) For a complete analysis, see Jodi O’Brien 1998, “Family Equations: Whose Family? Whose Values?” in *Social Prisms: Reflections on Everyday Myths and Paradoxes*, 162-93. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press (1999).

¹⁸ Adrienne Rich. “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Experience.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5:631-60 (1980).

acceptance and belonging is understandable, but we do ourselves an injustice when we fail to fully explore the meaning and implications of participation in any highly significant cultural institution. To the extent that marriage is seen as a pinnacle of cultural achievement and a marker of acceptance, same-sex marriages will do nothing to alter this equation except in allowing for the possibility that the two-person unit (who is now responsible for most social and economic welfare of the “family”) can be a same-sex unit. Certainly, in a gender-role obsessed society such as this, same-sex marital units will be radical. But, in terms of more general cultural equations connected to hierarchies of belonging and used to determine who gets what, we shouldn't fool ourselves into believing that same-sex unions will pose much of a challenge to the existing status quo.

2) We also need more complicated discourses about who seeks belonging and what that reflects and, in turn, what consequences it carries in terms of change to cultural institutions. We need classed/gendered/raced analyses of who is seeking belonging in so-called “normalizing” institutions. We need nuanced, complex studies of variations among these groups (e.g., gay Christians) before any conclusions can be drawn about what is and isn't radical. One noteworthy consequence of the debate over the *right* to marry for lesbians and gays is that it cuts across other cultural fault lines. The resulting shifts are causing some interesting shake-ups and creating some bridges across long entrenched fissures of difference. For instance, many traditionally conservative parents of lesbian and gay men find themselves speaking out in favor of same-sex marriage. They imagine the cultural acceptance it will convey on their otherwise ostracized child and end up breaking stride with long-established political, religious, and cultural allies. Even the *Economist*, the top-buttoned British news weekly, covered the story complete

with glossy front picture. Its stance? “What’s all the fuss about?” From the libertarian perspective, which the magazine espouses, this position makes perfect sense. It doesn’t sit so well, of course, with cultural conservatives who consider themselves economic libertarians. But it has been a reminder to many fence-sitting Republicans that it is possible for them to be more libertarian in their political views than they are conservative in their cultural commitments.

And my own stance? Some will find it contradictory, but that’s often a consequence of the critical feminist inquiries I attempt to practice. Just as I understand why someone could find meaning and a sense of belonging as a queer practicing Christianity, I understand the considerable cultural draw of marriage. I believe the earnest statements of lesbian and gay couples who claim that their Canadian, Massachusetts, or (now rescinded) San Francisco marriages have had a discernible effect on how they felt about one another and their relationship. I comprehend the significance of this cultural institution to spin a binding web of commitment to one another and to convey a deeper sense of belonging in society generally. However, this is not the form of inclusion I seek. While I understand the desire of many lesbians and gay men to have their unions recognized by state and religion, I prefer the recognition, acceptance, respect, and love granted me by my (Mormon) family, my colleagues, students, and friends. Personally, I have never been compelled by the marriage bug. But I would be disappointed if my family did not understand the need to support same-sex marriage legislation as it has been currently framed—i.e., one is either pro- or anti-gay human rights. To this end, I support the fight for everyone to make choices regarding how they wish to author their own lives and the meaning they seek for themselves and those they

wish to define as “family.” Simultaneously, I want to work to educate others about the fundamental need to forge a strong disconnect between culturally accepted definitions of “family” and political economic assessments of the distribution of benefits and assurances for U.S. citizens. In contemporary U.S. society, the power to define difference and the power to define economic well-being rest too strongly in the same “family.” The dismantling of this particular union is long overdue.