

Same - Sex Marriage and Human Rights in Contemporary Society

Nguyen Hung Vuong¹, Ngo Khac Son², Tran Phan Hieu³

¹Ph.D., University of Foreign Language Studies, The University of Danang

²Ph.D., Academy of Politics Region III

³M.A., University of Science and Education, The University of Danang

Abstract: *Same-sex marriage is becoming a hotly debated social issue in the society today, an important part of social agendas in Western countries. Currently, there are several countries in Europe that recognize same-sex marriage as a human right and enshrined in the constitution. However, most are still skeptical about this recognition process and the implications behind same-sex marriage in public interest. The article analyzes and evaluates the views in favor of and against same-sex marriage, the reality of same-sex marriage in Vietnam, and views on the marriage regime in the context of contemporary society.*

Keywords: LGBT, same-sex marriage, human rights

1) Raised the issue / put the problem

In the past, when it came to marriage and family, we always assumed that monogamy was the natural family structure. But now, this issue has been causing a lot of controversy, forming a movement demanding equal rights for the gay, bisexual and transgender community (LGBT). This is not just a dilemma in Western society, and similar discussions are raging, having a significant impact on our society. Faced with that fact, the research and discussion on same-sex marriage is an important and meaningful activity, meeting the research requirements in order to contribute to the improvement of the legal system, building and strengthening the role of the state government. Socialist rule of law country Vietnam today.

2) Global trend of same-sex marriage

It can be said that same-sex marriage is a big global trend. At the beginning of the 21st century, the wave of same-sex marriage began to appear publicly, creating a movement for equal rights for gay, bisexual and transgender people around the world. This movement has had a clear impact on the political and social life of Western countries, forcing some countries to re-discuss the constitution. Specifically: In 2001, the Netherlands was the first country to recognize same-sex marriage, followed by Belgium (2003). The same year, the Supreme Court of Ontario, Canada ruled that banning same-sex marriage was discriminatory and violated the Canadian constitution. The federal government has discussed and proposed a new definition of marriage, the definition: "Marriage is the union between one man and one woman" has been changed to: "Marriage is the union between two people". By the end of 2005, Canada was the third country to recognize same-sex marriage and make it legal. In the United States, many states have laws that prohibit anal sex. But in June 2003 the supreme court ruled that the act was unconstitutional, under which homosexuals were constitutionally guaranteed equal rights to homosexual acts. However, the United States does not impose same-sex marriage on the federal level, depending on the degree of autonomy of the states, so some US states have recognized same-sex marriage, for example. Minnesota, Hawaii, Vermont, Massachusetts, Maine and Washington City

(Jeffrey S. Siker, 2007, pp. 147-148). Several subcommittees conduct referendums to introduce legislation banning same-sex marriage. Up to now, same-sex marriage is recognized in Spain (2005), South Africa (2006), Norway and Sweden (2009), Portugal (2010), ... Especially, on June 26, 2014 The United Nations has officially recognized the right to same-sex marriage with more than 43,000 employees globally, including homosexual "marriages" and "civil unions". Previously, the marital status of UN staff was determined by their nationality, but from now on, the United Nations will recognize the legality of all same-sex couples who have entered into a marriage in a country where same-sex marriage is legal, regardless of their nationality (United Nations, 2014). In Vietnam, in the 90s, the organization of same-sex couples to get married challenged the gap in the law on homosexuality and same-sex relationships. In 1997, the first public wedding between two people of the same sex was held (Nguyen, Tien; Lam, Tran and Le, Tom, 1999). Two men held a wedding ceremony at a large hotel in Ho Chi Minh City despite the protests of the people. In 1998, the wedding of two women in Vinh Long province was canceled as soon as it started because the consent of the local government had not been obtained (France-Presses, Agence, 1998). In the years 2000 to 2002, a number of media channels in our country declared that same-sex marriage was considered a social evil, a crime compared with gambling and prostitution, creating a deep stigma in society with gay people (CDC National Prevention Information Network, 2014). However, this perception was quickly changed, in 2006 the National Assembly discussed and said that homosexuals are a high-risk group that should be prioritized for protection in HIV prevention programs (Government of Viet Nam). Nam, 2006). In 2012, Minister of Justice Ha Hung Cuong announced his disapproval of prejudice against homosexuals and mentioned the controversial issue of same-sex marriage (Leach, Anna, 2012). He said that the flaw in the draft Law on Marriage and Family in 2000 was that it did not mention that same-sex couples living together will make it difficult for same-sex couples. These debates have opened up the process of debate and reform of the law on marriage and family in Vietnam. In November 2013, Vietnam legalized same-sex

marriage and empowered same-sex couples to live together through Decree No. 110/2013/ND-CP dated September 24, 2013 effective from November 12, 2013. On January 1, 2015, the revised Law on Marriage and Family 2014 took effect. The National Assembly removed the regulation prohibiting marriage between people of the same sex in the Law on Marriage and Family in 2000 and replaced Article 8, Clause 2 as: "The State does not recognize marriage between people of the same sex". Thus, according to the above provisions, same-sex marriage is no longer prohibited. Gay men can get married and live together, but according to the law, they are not considered husband and wife and cannot register their marriage with a state agency. This is the result of many years of social mobilization and discussion, leading to more and more legislators being more active about the right to marry, and the equal rights of same-sex and same gender couples. Currently, despite many challenges, the LGBT community in Vietnam is growing strongly. Many civil society organizations that support LGBT rights have been established such as the Institute for Social, Economic and Environmental Research (iSEE) established in 2007; Center for Population and Health Initiatives (CCIHP) established in 1999; and the Center for Research and Applied Science on Gender, Family, Women and Adolescents established in 2001. In 2008, with the establishment of the Center (ICS), the first civil society organization of the LGBT people work in the field of human rights of the LGBT community, the activities of the LGBT community have gone beyond the traditional focus on HIV. In addition, many studies have been carried out, providing a closer and more accurate view of the LGBT community and the challenges they are facing. The results of the research are made available to the media, communities, policy makers, and even government to advocate for legal and policy reforms that gradually improve lives gay life.

3) Some views on same-sex marriage

In the reality of social life, same-sex marriage has attracted great attention from the community, creating a protracted debate that has so far not reached a consensus. A national survey (2013) conducted by the Institute of Sociology, the Institute of Health Strategy and Policy, and the Institute for Social, Economic and Environmental Research in 68 communes and wards of 8 provinces and cities. streets in Vietnam to ask people's opinions on same-sex marriage. The survey provided an overview of social attitudes about the legalization of same-sex marriage, the rights of same-sex couples, and the possible social impact if this form of marriage is recognized by law. Survey results have shown that the LGBT community really exists and is quite attached to the social community when up to 30.4% of respondents know gay people. In addition, 27.4% of people know about the phenomenon of "two people of the same sex living together as husband and wife" directly from homosexuals (Institute of Sociology, 2014, p. 7). The majority believe that legalizing same-sex marriage does not affect families (72.7%), individuals (63.2%) and 33.7% of people support legalizing same-sex marriage (Institute of Sociology, 2014, p. 8). Regarding the recognition of the right to live together as husband and wife of the same sex, the number of supporters and protesters are quite similar, 41.2% and 46.7% respectively. Up to 56% of people support same-sex couples adopting and raising children together; 51% are in favor of

joint ownership and 47% are in favor of inheritance. This shows the trend that the majority of Vietnamese people support the protection of human rights by law (Institute of Sociology, 2014, p. 9). However, some people believe that this is a matter of choosing between right and wrong, so they need to protest to the end, which goes against the laws of nature. Some people with university degrees and above think it's not a big deal, it's just two individuals' business, has nothing to do with us. Not only that, they also argue that the objections reflect a lack of understanding of the concept of human rights, or that it is a discriminatory prejudice based on religion and outdated moral concepts. We believe this view over-simplifies the complexity of the same-sex marriage debate. For us, same-sex marriage is a social issue, not just a private matter. There are many views that gay people can't get married means that the two can't be together forever, so you accidentally or intentionally interfere in their private life, that's an inhuman act. But this seems like a huge misunderstanding, because in fact, you can call your friends and lovers husband or wife if you want to. No one or the law forbids your actions. But what we are asking is that the struggles for same-sex marriage have been institutionalized, which means that traditional monogamy will be overthrown. This will certainly bring about major changes in the value system and overall culture of the society. It cannot be morally neutral and is closely related to everyone. So it's not just a matter of freedom for gay people (they had a lot of freedom). The recognition of same-sex marriage represents a certain value. Once same-sex marriage is institutionalized, this value will be imposed on everyone - whether that person believes in homosexual behavior or not. In addition, changes in family structure will directly affect the growth and well-being of children, which is one of our top concerns. If same-sex marriage directly or simply has an adverse effect on the development of children, then it is natural to be concerned about same-sex marriage. John Gray is a libertarian, but he has had opposing criticisms of the liberal school. What he says has thought-provoking value, especially for those who accept fundamentalist liberalism without considering introspection. He said that "homosexuality is by no means a personal choice that does not pose any moral problems" (Gray 2007, p. 32). We support a tolerant policy that allows homosexuals to have full personal liberties and civil rights with the view that "nobody should bear a burden when the other does not" (Gray 2007, p. 32). But that doesn't mean we have to recognize same-sex marriage, if we follow this path it means that sooner or later it will also lead us to individualism, which is worse. A possible scenario is the danger of abolishing the traditional marriage system and replacing it with a chaotic tolerance regime (Gray 2007, p. 38). One of the points we want to note is that same-sex marriage and issues after same-sex marriage cannot be value neutral. If we agree that same-sex marriage is against the basis of religious doctrine a violation of the principle of neutrality, wouldn't the call to recognize same-sex marriage be a matter of neutrality? Our answer is no. We agree that homosexuality is not a moral issue, but it is also a concrete point of view that is not only inconsistent with the values of many non-religious people, but also in direct conflict with the beliefs of many major religions. If public policies are consistent with religious views it is not neutral, but conflicts with religious views are neutral. So what is logic? In fact, same-sex marriage not only contradicts some other views

such as monogamy, but also contradicts some avant-garde views (polygamy or abolition of marriage). Polygamy holds that, regardless of the number of couples, as long as they have reached adulthood and agree to come together without conflict, the government should allow them to register their marriage. M. Sandel supposed that "Distinguishing the purpose of a social system is to distinguish which virtues that social system should promote and honor. This debate is essentially a debate about whether same-sex relationships in our society deserve to be honored and recognized by the government. Therefore, it cannot avoid the ethical problems behind it" (Sandel, 2011, p. 283). That means the marriage regime cannot be neutral, and the recognition of same-sex marriage forces us to redefine marriage, so the fact that some people call for the recognition of same-sex marriage because it's neutral is just a cover-up. In short, it is necessary to maintain traditional monogamy, respecting the values of citizens to a greater extent than hastily admitting or adding to the issue of same-sex marriage. This will be suitable for the spirit of democracy, for the sake of social harmony. In addition, same-sex marriage also has certain negative effects on social morality, family system, children's welfare and the rights of others, especially the right to freedom of religion. It is acceptable for others to express concerns about the matter.

For supporters, they have made a point of contention about human rights in contemporary political life. Supporters of same-sex marriage argue that we need to face the human rights issue of homosexual. However, there is a big problem with this statement as to why same-sex marriage must be considered from a human rights perspective? What is the rationale? Faced with this, it is indeed not easy for us to oppose same-sex marriage in this day and age, because according to them "same-sex marriage is a human right", which is unquestionable, over time, it becomes the truth of political correctness. However, this issue should be considered a hypothesis in favor of same-sex marriage, while in international legal practice these words are a mistake. Because, in Article 16 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it states: 1) Men and women of full age, have the right to marry and to found a family without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. 2) Marriage is valid only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses. 3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

In addition, Article 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights also states: 1) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State. 2) The right of men and women of marriageable age to marry and to found a family shall be recognized. 3) No marriage shall be entered into without the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

Thus, marriage is recognized by international law as a union between a man and a woman, not between a man and a man or between a woman and a woman. The clause clearly mentions: "male and female", if in marriage there is no need to mention gender, then this reference is completely redundant. In 2004 to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the United Nations International Day of Families in Doha,

Qatar, the International Conference on Families was organized and issued the "Doha Declaration", which was signed by 149 member states of the United Nations. The Doha Declaration reaffirms Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirms the family as a natural unit of society, which must be protected by society and the nation. Articles 4 and 13 of the Doha Declaration confirm, a family consists of husband and wife which is the voluntary union of a man and a woman. This is consistent with the interpretation of the Human Rights Commission on the right to marry in 2002.

Although the Doha Declaration is not yet considered international law, it has been signed by 149 countries of the 191 member states of the United Nations, including the United States, South America, Asian countries, Africa and the Middle East, approved with a 78% approval rating, measuring it as the voice of nations around the world on the issue of same-sex marriage.

In addition, human rights conventions indicate that the family is not only a socially established system, but also a natural social unit. Looking back at the development of the world over thousands of years, many people think that just looking at the natural order, even the male and female body structure, it is clear that male and female are a natural compatibility. This is also reflected in many Eastern and Western philosophical traditions and world religions, which believe that homosexual behavior is against nature and human nature, or even immoral. This "natural law" argument is controversial in philosophical circles (John Finnis, 1994). This fact proves that same-sex marriage is not a matter of human rights, but in the current context, same-sex marriage can be more and more favorable in international law as well as in the international legal systems of Western countries. Does that mean that sooner or later we have to recognize same-sex marriage as a human right?

To answer this question, we would like to point out that although human rights are now considered a legal concept, when looking at it from a legal perspective or based on existing laws in a country national or international is clearly not enough. The above views reflect the positivism of legal philosophy, which accepts that the law must ultimately be based on institutions and social conventions. Similarly, the basis of international human rights is based on the conventions of the international community (Declaration of International Human Rights 1948, 1966). According to this logic, human rights appear with the formation of community conventions, so there is no objective position before and outside of the conventions. So, can it be said that the atrocities committed by the Nazis before the enactment of the Bill of Rights were not a violation of human rights? Moreover, if human rights are achieved by consensus, for countries that have not signed the International Convention on Human Rights, does the Convention mean nothing to them? We can also question why the United Nations resolution has sacred and sacrosanct status to individuals in different civilizations and societies. They have their own identity and worldview, they did not participate in the discussion and drafting of these Human Rights Conventions?. Finally, if the international community no longer agrees on human rights in the future, or changes a

concept that is contrary to the current concept of human rights, will the human rights that we hold today disappear?

As for the consensus on human rights, it is clearly overblown. When it comes to sex, the family, and the Christian view of homosexuality, libertarians will immediately point out the pluralism of these concepts, but they will not address the plurality of human rights because they do not want to undermine their call to be self-evident. In fact, there are differences in understanding of human rights at many levels. From the perspective of international political philosophy or human rights philosophy, Western scholars mostly view human rights from the point of view of libertarianism and individual rights, but socialist countries will support Marx's view on human rights. Even in Western political philosophy, different schools have different understandings of human rights, many have pointed out the limitations of the theory of total human rights, and we can see at least four schools of speech on the matter are classical liberalism, modern liberalism, communism, and conservatism. Finally, even in the judgment of the courts, the judgments in different years and in different countries are different, in the same court, the judgments of different judges are also different, in the federal or state supreme courts of the United States also exist many problems. In recent years, some trends in the recognition of same-sex marriage have developed, but consensus is still far from being reached. However, thanks to the cultural strengths of Western countries, and when it comes to "trends", Westerners immediately think of something more progressive than harmful. So, how can we conclude that a new trend or "consensus" is correct?

As James Griffin has pointed out, "The ultimate authority in international court decisions are the Conventions. But we need to ask: Is the list of human rights in the conventions correct?" (Griffin 2008, p. 204). We do not base ourselves solely on the declaration of the European Convention on Human Rights, but acknowledge the existence of human rights. It is also easy to lead us to mistakes, so we must pay attention to the standard of right and wrong... need to know how to resolve conflicts about human rights. International law can create positive rights, but "the creators of international law did not say (and cannot reasonably say) that what they thought human rights were actually human rights, or that they are faultless on the subject" (Griffin, 2008, p. 54). In practice, "There is a lot of doubt about some civil rights. Some people object to the excesses of certain welfare rights. Some people completely deny the existence of human rights. These criticisms have reasonable force and cannot be simply dismissed as they appear in international conventions. In fact, part of the ambition of international law is to include a number of rights that exist independently of positive law" (Griffin, 2008, p. 204). In summary, what rights are considered real human rights has been and is still a matter of widespread debate. Therefore, we need to have ethical thinking to make correct judgments. Because there are pluralistic views on human rights in the "secular realm" the question is how can we assert that same-sex marriage is a human right, even if we have put aside the point of view of faith? At the very least, advocates must demonstrate their understanding of human rights and interpret in this way how rights can be created for same-sex marriage. They should not

treat their human rights views as unquestionably universal, that is just what a pluralistic society means. Arguing that the right to same-sex marriage is a "fundamental" human right and that it is at best a contemporary understanding of human rights, opposing this understanding of human rights cannot be seen as "anti-human rights". Furthermore, we doubt the neutrality of secular human rights theory, on the one hand, how to infer human rights from the secular worldview that constitutes a theory is a very difficult question; on the other hand, the fact that the human rights movement has become increasingly secular in recent years has created many issues that need to be discussed widely.

Now, everyone likes to say this is their human right, no matter what they are fighting for, no matter if this so-called human right is based on international laws, conventions and ethical principles. Inherently, human rights refer to some extremely important inherently human things that we can claim. However, the language of human rights today is infinitely extended, and the scope of human rights has spanned the whole world. On the contrary, the importance of basic human rights can be obscured, it is difficult to reach consensus on the concept, and the definition of human rights has become fertile ground for other interest groups each other in society. Human rights can be said to be the political card of modern politics, the sword of liberalism in the fight to defend individualism. In our society today, everyone is taking advantage of human rights, for example those who possess drugs, use drugs, use cell phones while driving, ... all justify it as their human right. So students can say they don't like going to school, don't want teachers to assign homework, children don't want to take care of their parents in old age... because that's their human right? So what standard to define human rights? Without standards, human rights would have no meaning. Example: In Scotland, a 15-year-old schoolgirl used the Local Education Commission alleging that her school's detention during lunch violated her human rights and violated the European Convention on Human Rights. In fact, arresting students in Europe is not entirely impossible, but you must apply in advance (Ruston, 2004, p. 6). It is understandable that students do not like being confined. But whether the school's disciplinary methods are appropriate should also be discussed, but is it an exaggeration to say that this is a violation of human rights? Or a recent story in our country, a female student in Dong Nai was expelled from school for showing off a tattoo on her chest, is this a violation of human rights? Obviously we need standards to define.

A serious problem that is losing the trust of Vietnamese consumers is that fake goods are rampant in the market. This is also the same for human rights theory, a large number of theorists and journalists are operating in the name of fake human rights in society, making arguments to deceive public opinion, the popular class to carry out personal political intrigues. This has lost people's trust in human rights, making genuine human rights gradually lose their value. Liberal scholar Steven Kautz also acknowledges that so-called human rights are often just disguised conflicts of interest. He said, "Demand for rights is spreading at an unprecedented rate. This shows that we are increasingly unable to distinguish between real and fake rights" (Steven Kautz, 1995, p. 25). In addition, human rights scholar Carl

Wellman wrote a book called "Real Right", which shows that it is not easy to distinguish between real human rights and fake human rights and that the current legal philosophy does not provide a sound theory of human rights, allowing us to clearly distinguish what are human rights and where is not the rights. He believes that the language of human rights is being abused to increase social conflict (Wellman, 1995, p. 244).

A key issue is that universal human rights are built on the dignity of human nature and not on certain behaviours. Therefore, universal human rights do not mean that all acts must be treated equally. For example, smokers and non-smokers have equal qualities. In life, they all have the same freedoms, freedom of speech, protection in a democratic society, performance of obligations for the state... However, smoking creates harms to one's own health, themselves and others, their behavior is not encouraged by society, so smokers have limited rights in many respects compared to non-smokers, which is reasonable, but that does not mean that society or the law denies the equal dignity of smokers.

This is similar to homosexuality and heterosexuality having equal personal dignity and equal basic human rights. It is very natural that people in society have different views and assessments about them. The pros and cons of homosexual acts have the right to have their own opinions, this is also the right to freedom of conscience. Forcing non-gay people with homosexual behavior to change their views is not only human rights but also a lack of respect for the freedom of conscience of others. Therefore, those who want to rationalize the law discriminating between sexual orientation and same-sex marriage compared to the concept of equal rights are confused about "equality of dignity" and "equality of life". Human rights are the foundation of a free society. However, to maintain order and progress of any society, we also need responsible and dedicated citizens. This depends on the citizen's sense of identity for the society as a whole, and establishing a sense of identity often requires common sense. A culture of human rights is not enough to foster a sense of responsibility, dedication, identity, and shared values among citizens. We are faced with the fact that human nature is prone to fall, if the state is neutral to moral ideals and talks only about individual rights in everything, then there is really no reason to expect most people to choose an altruistic lifestyle. In a free society, vulgarity will often drive away the noble, and the valueless will replace the valuable. From the conceptual point of view, human rights and responsibilities are not opposite, but in reality, a society that respects human rights often has problems of human rights abuse. Pushing human rights to extremes will create various problems, such as the collapse of society (the weakening of families, the chaos in neighborhoods, the decline in the number of charity clubs, disrespect for the law, ...); and leads to political dysfunction (citizens feel that they are incompetent, alienated from the government, manipulated, etc.). In this way, it is very difficult to establish a cohesive community for good. The above issues show that the reflection and transformation of human rights is really urgent, and the unlimited expansion of the content of human rights will do more harm than good to society.

4) The issue of same-sex marriage for justice and good

As analyzed, many people believe that same-sex is a human right, a legitimate equal right, however, among scholars who have studied it seriously. On this issue, this view has not yet received a consensus. For example, when M. Sandel discussed the issue of same-sex marriage, he did not expressly support or disapprove of same-sex marriage and also not consider it a human right, but he pointed out that the act of liberalism justifying same-sex marriage stems from an unacceptable concept of "equal rights" (Sandel, 2011, p. 143). He believes that "to decide whether the government should recognize same-sex marriage, how does this issue not only have for the first time a moral debate with the purpose of marriage and the moral status virtues of homosexuality?" (Sandel, 2011, p. 282). That said, Sandel was right on the issue of marriage, which is how he adopted an approach based on the public good. He points out that marriage as a social system does not mean that some people have the same basic interests as others, but rather to give "honor and recognition" to a way of life. Certainly, it is a kind of admiration and commendation, which must consider the good qualities and promote that way of life, which are worthy of recognition and praise (Sandel, 2011, p. 282).

Looking at the marriage system from a fair perspective reveals a lot of problems: adults can get married but young people can't, or the marriage system itself is not fair. And is it true that all combined methods are the same? What about love and polygamy? Is society also exploiting them economically? Can we get married with Hello Kitty, computers, robots? Why not? If it is argued that marriage should be a union of two people and that it was the original intention of the marriage, then it means that marriage has a certain nature and not just a convention. But if only "fairness" is taken into account, there should be no boundaries, and the argument that "gay is an equal right" will eventually lead to the collapse of the marriage system. Sandel also points out that if you exercise your right to equality and insist on values being neutral and equal in value, you should accept the "collapse" of the marriage (Sandel, 2011, p. 285). Sandel also asserted "I would like to support the legalization of same-sex grounds that it does not make moral judgments, mainly based on the concepts of non-discrimination and freedom of choice. However, these concepts alone are not enough to constitute the normalization of same-sex marriage (Sandel, 2011, p. 285). For if the government accepts immoral intimacy and voluntariness, the government will lose its role and position, and polygamy will have grounds for legalization (Sandel, 2011, p. 286). In other words, if an equal rights approach is taken, different restrictions on marriage will be difficult to establish, which will eventually lead to the disappearance of the marriage system, but this is absolutely unacceptable. Therefore, for the problems of family structure, an equal rights approach should not be used. In contrast, an approach based on the common good does not have such dire consequences, it fits our age-old marriage system and culture, and should be preferred. Therefore, when considering whether same-sex marriage should be legalized, we should question whether doing so can promote the greatest good. So "the main point is that choice is not free, but while same-sex couples are worthy of recognition and recognition by the community, how can values and honor be distributed? equal? What values should be recognized by

society”(Sandel, 2011, p. 287), things like “legal marriage is not only an important commitment between two people, but also a public celebration, honoring togetherness, companionship, intimacy, loyalty and the ideal family” (Sandel, 2011, p. 283). “Non-discrimination and freedom of choice are not sufficient reasons for consent. In deciding who has the legal right to marry, one must think about the purpose of marriage and what virtues it promotes” (Sandel, 2011, p. 289). This is also the conclusion to our point of view. Of course, the above argument only outlines what should be applied, but the approach and approval or disapproval of same-sex marriage is still a matter that needs more thought.

5) Conclusion

Is the concept of human rights justice in our time correct, thousands of years of human experience and wisdom have no reference value at all? Many anti-conservatives have the inherent ideology that conservatives are not good, only openness and progress are good, but true conservatives have their own insights and wisdom, they understand the complexities of social problems, although it is a long tradition of wisdom. It is not absolute, but it cannot be taken lightly. As a result, they have preserved and preserved the good sides of society and culture better than the liberals and extreme egalitarians. We think that, in this day and age, maintaining monogamy is also a form of active conservatism. Any change will come at a cost to society, so the burden of proof rests with the revolutionaries, who must prove that the new system they propose is clearly better than the old one. In addition, we also show that monogamy is a socially accepted and encouraged system, and it is not mandatory. No one really forbids alternative combinations. For example, two men (or one woman and two men) can be together for life. Since monogamy is not a mandatory system, but rather encouraged, as long as monogamy has significant advantages over other systems, support for monogamy is reasonable.

References

- [1] Blankenhorn, David (2007), *The Future of Marriage*. New York: Encounter Books.
- [2] Dailey, Timothy (2003), *Dark Obsession: The Tragedy & Threat of the Homosexual Lifestyle*, Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- [3] Finnis, John (1994), *Law, Morality and Sexual Orientation*, *Notre Dame Law Review*.
- [4] Gray, John (2007), *Enlightenment's Wake: Politics & Culture at the Close of the Modern Age*, London: Routledge.
- [5] Griffin, James (2008), *On Human Rights*, Oxford University Press.
- [6] Hendin, H (1995), *Suicide and homosexuality, Suicide in America*, New York: William Warder Norton.
- [7] Mohler, R. Albert (2008), *Desire & Deceit: The Real Cost of the New Sexual Tolerance*, Colorado: Multnomah Books.
- [8] Kautz, Steven (1995), *Liberalism & Community*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- [9] Ruston, Roger (2004), *Human Rights and the Image of God*, London: SCM Press.
- [10] Sandel, M (2011), *Justice - A Journey of Thought*, Yayan Publishing.
- [11] Siker, Jeffrey (2007), *Homosexuality and Religion: An Encyclopedia*, Greenwood Press.
- [12] Institute of Sociology (2014), *Results of the people's poll on same-sex marriage*, Publishing National politics.
- [13] Waite, Linda & Maggie Gallagher (2000), *The Case for Marriage*, New York: Doubleday.
- [14] Wellman, Carl (1995), *Real Rights*, Oxford University Press.
- [15] United Nations (2014), *United Nations recognizes gay marriages for staffers*, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2014/07/07/united-nations-gay-marriage/12312917/>
- [16] Nguyen, Tien; Lam, Tran and Le, Tom (1999), *Gay Life is Persecuted and Condemned in VIET NAM; GayVietVoice*, San Francisco, 7 July 1999. http://www.asylumlaw.org/docs/sexualminorities/VIE_TNAM2SO.pdf (accessed 27 April 2013).
- [17] France-Presses, Agence (1998), *VIET NAM orders lesbian marriage be annulled*, *The Nation*, 4 June 1998. <http://news.google.com/newspapers?id=Pa0pAAAAIBAJ&sjid=CTIDAAAIBAJ&pg=6148%2C1070834> (accessed 27 April 2013).
- [18] CDC National Prevention Information Network (2014), *VIET NAM Media Call Homosexuality Social Evil, Vow Crackdown*, *The Body*, 19 April 2002. <http://www.thebody.com/content/art22986.html> (accessed 1 April 2014).