

TRANSADVOCATE

More Gay Marriage-Primacy Prattle

By Kat

Published January 23, 2011 | Updated March 31, 2026

https://www.transadvocate.com/more-gay-marriage-primacy-prattle_n_2854.htm

Abstract

Now its Joe Fudgepacker Dan Savage: I'm not an idiot Yeh, well, I hope you weren't hoping for 100% agreement from the masses on that one Dan. But I digress already. Now that the Republicans hold the House, only wishful thinkers and the deeply delusional expect to see any movement on the lesbian, gay, bisexual [...]

Article

Now its Joe Fudgepacker Dan Savage:

I'm not an idiot

Yeh, well, I hope you weren't hoping for 100% agreement from the masses on that one Dan. But I digress already.

Now that the Republicans hold the House, only wishful thinkers and the deeply delusional expect to see any movement on the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender legislative agenda this year or next. Nevertheless, President Obama should address gay rights in his State of the Union speech this week, and he should tackle the biggest, most meaningful right of them all: the right to marry.

Of course, it all depends on whose perspective is taken into account when making a declaration as to what right is "most meaningful."

Now, to be fair to the Savage extortionmeister, he does appear to have the ability to walk the gay marriage walk and chew other things at the same time.

Gay Americans are eventually going to win on marriage just like we won on military service, the president should tell Congress, so why not save everyone on both sides of the debate a lot of time, trouble and money by approving the entire gay rights agenda? Send the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, the Student Non-Discrimination Act, the Uniting American Families Act and the repeal of the odious Defense of Marriage Act to his desk for his signature.

But my dogs - yes, including the one who eats the other's poop - know a dogwhistle when they hear it.

That NY Times column wasn't really about gay marriage and Obama and the SOTU; it was about gay marriage - period.

The gay rights carafe is somewhat full, but those who have some control over what resources are subsequently expended - and on which liquids and, of course, into which container they're poured - want

it to be fully filled...

before the empty trans rights styrofoam cup is ever put into a position to receive any liquid of any kind.

When he was a candidate for the Illinois State Senate in 1996, Mr. Obama told a gay publication that he supported “legalizing same-sex marriages.” Twelve years later, right about the time he decided to run for president, he came out against marriage equality. But, as the president likes to say, “The arc of the moral universe is long but it bends toward justice.”

And the arc of gay bullshit bends toward a fake historical narrative that tokenizes trans people into rhetorical fluff by privileging a campaign promise about a gay-specific issue over a subsequent trans-inclusive legislative track record on an issue that, ultimately, has benefited far more people in Illinois than gay marriage ever will. From the session of the Illinois Legislature immediately following the campaign of 1996:

AN ACT to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act by changing Sections 1-102, 1-103, 3-103, and 3-106 and the heading of Article 1 and adding Section 1-101.1.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly:

...

(O-1) Sexual orientation. “Sexual orientation” means having or being perceived as having an emotional, physical, or sexual attachment to another person without regard to the sex of that person or having or being perceived as having an orientation for such attachment, or having or being perceived as having a self-image or identity not traditionally associated with one’s biological maleness or femaleness. “Sexual orientation” does not include a physical or sexual attachment to children by an adult.

That one didn’t become law, but during his last session in the Illinois Legislature one did - and he had co-sponsored one with the trans-inclusive definition of “sexual orientation” that session (though, due to some odd legislative maneuvering, the one that did become law didn’t gain traction until after Obama had left the Illinois Senate for the U.S. Senate, so he didn’t have the opportunity to actually cast a vote on it.)

Yes, I’m frustrated that this aspect of Obama’s history doesn’t weigh on the President more and push him to make a legitimate federal ENDA more of a priority - and, in this sense, I’m aligned with Savage, et. al., in frustration over Obama’s decade o’ apparent retreat on marriage because, after all, I’m not against gay marriage.

I’m against gay marriage smothering everything else...

including bits o’ history like the one I just provided to supplement Savage’s ‘Gay Obama Marriage History Moment.’

Conservatives can’t get rid of us, but they can hear less from and about us. They just have to bend toward justice.

Gays who want gay marriage can’t get rid of us - even when they attempt to erase us.

But, they can hear less from us when they stop subverting the needs of working-class trans people (and most LGB people for that matter) by obscenely privileging the desires of certain gays and lesbians for marriage.

The chances that those who are demanding gay marriage in Maryland or New York will be willing to ‘compromise’ by accepting - much less proposing or even tolerating discussion of - a trade: give up on

*gay marriage for now in return for legitimately moving forward on trans rights?
Probably the same as the Dallas Cowboys playing in the Super Bowl on their home turf in two weeks.*

Suggested citation

Kat. "More Gay Marriage-Primacy Prattle." TransAdvocate, January 23, 2011.
https://www.transadvocate.com/more-gay-marriage-primacy-prattle_n_2854.htm