

# Opinion: If love is love, why can't this poor lady marry her chandelier?



by [Peter Heck](#) · Apr 21st, 2020

When a rational human being reads the lead paragraph of this Guardian [story](#), they're confronted with a number of potential reactions to what it portends for the future of civilization: double-take, eye-roll, agitation, lament, or my personal choice – the biblical trifecta of weeping, gnashing of teeth, and rending of garments.



Behold the state of the modern West:

A British woman in a long-term relationship with a 92-year-old German chandelier has been told that her attraction to historic light fittings is not considered to be a protected sexual orientation.

Attempting to concoct a scenario where that sentence would even appear coherent to a reader just two or three decades ago will reveal, in all its stark horror, the degree to

which those "slippery slope" arguments we eagerly dismissed at the behest of cultural revolutionaries and their media allies have been proven deadly accurate. We aren't just slipping down the hill to moral oblivion, we're in a full barrel roll.

After all, with as flatly absurd as it is to believe that a thirty-something woman can legitimately be in a romantic relationship with an indoor light fixture she has named "Lumiere," given the rules for what defines love and sexual orientation that our culture, in deference to the wise counsel of the LGBT political movement, has adopted, upon what grounds do we deny her claim?

The confused woman, appropriately named Amanda Liberty (she was previously in love

with the Statue of Liberty, you see, and [changed her last name](#)), self-identifies as an "objectum sexual" – someone who is romantically and sexually attracted to inanimate objects. If that seems ridiculous to you, there's a reason. It is ridiculous. Nevertheless, in the brave new world that Western society was duped into entering, every argument that would be leveled against the validity and authenticity of her claims has been rendered null.

To illustrate what I mean, consider more from the article:

The newspaper said that it did not doubt that her attraction – to chandeliers was genuine, however it said that sexual orientation in the context of the press regulation code covered people who were attracted to people of the same sex, the

opposite sex, or both. Since Liberty was not legally able to marry the chandelier, it would not be legally discriminatory to prevent such a marriage.

Now, exchange the word chandeliers for "same-sex partner" and you could have easily seen that exact paragraph written in the 1990s. But what happened?

When opposition to same-sex marriage coalesced, it chose the unfortunate terminology of resisting the redefinition of marriage. In truth, what was taking place was not the "re" defining of the institution, but the "un" defining of it. Moral boundaries for what constituted marriage were uprooted on the grounds that they were capricious and arbitrary, or that they had been narrowly drawn on the basis of religious beliefs that not everyone shared. Who were we to deny someone the romantic and sexual expression that they believed would bring them fulfillment?

What mattered was how someone felt. Ellen DeGeneres famously [argued](#) it to thunderous applause in dressing down vice presidential nominee Sarah Palin:

"We need to learn to love people for who they are, and let them love who they want to love."

Few noticed at the time, but Ellen was committing the same offense that she condemned in Palin. Notice she said, "let them love *who* they want to love."

Who is Ellen to decide that a person can't love a *what* instead of a *who*? Maybe that isn't her personal expression of love, but it's arbitrary and capricious for her to deny it to someone like Amanda Liberty, is it not? If #LoveIsLove as we were told, why does it not apply to people like Amanda?

Why can't this poor lady marry her beloved chandelier?

The newspaper in this story claims that they dismissed her complaint on the basis that their code applies to "other persons and not to objects," and that "attraction to an object 'did not fall within the definition of sexual orientation.'"

How is their code and definition not unjustly discriminatory towards Ms. Liberty? Just cut and paste her name (in bold) into Justice Anthony Kennedy's gay marriage [ruling](#) and see for yourself:

To ***them***, ***objectum sexual*** would demean a timeless institution if the concept and lawful status of marriage were extended ***a person and inanimate object***. Marriage, in their view, is by its nature ***a union of two people***. This view long has been held—and continues to be held—in good faith by reasonable and sincere people here and throughout the world.

***She*** acknowledges this history but contends that these cases cannot end there... It is the enduring importance of marriage that underlies ***her*** contentions. This, ***she*** says, is ***her*** whole point. Far from seeking to devalue marriage, ***she*** seeks it for ***herself*** because of ***her*** respect—and need—for its privileges and responsibilities. And ***her*** immutable nature dictates that ***objectum sexual*** marriage is ***her*** only real path to this profound commitment.

At the time, many of us thought God was wiser than us and we should stick with His divine plan for marriage. But culture knew better. They've made our bed, and now we get to lie in it. With our chandeliers.