

The Health Implications of Same-Sex Relationships in The Society

Mrs. Sagrika Goswami
SOMC, Sanskriti University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id- sagrikag.somc@sanskriti.edu.in

ABSTARCT: *When compared to the general population, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community in the United States experiences significantly poorer health care delivery, as well as severe health consequences. Whenever LGBT individuals are subjected to social discrimination in a heterosexist culture, they are more likely to suffer from a condition known as "minority stress," which has severe mental and physical health consequences. Based on research published in the medical and social sciences literature, it appears that the legal and social acceptance of same-sex marriage has had a positive impact on the health of this at-risk community. Improved outcomes are expected as a result of increased access to health care provided by marital benefits under federal or state law, as well as a result of reducing the impact of institutionalized stigma on the sexual minority community.*

KEYWORDS: *Discrimination, Health Benefits, LGBT, Minority Stress, Same-Sex Marriage.*

1. INTRODUCTION

This organization recognizes that exclusion from civil union or marriage results in inequalities in health care for members of same-sex households; works to reduce disparities in health care among members of same-sex households, including minor children; and supports policies that provide equal-sex households with the same rights and privileges to health care and health insurance as heterosexual households. In spite of the fact that the debate over this resolution took place during a State Medical Association Convention held in Indiana — a historically conservative state — the contentious issues raised are relevant at the national level, as lawmakers and courts in every state grapple with the social consequences of marriage equality for same-sex couples and the wider implications for all households affected by dynamic relationships. From the perspective of public health, the LGBT community represents a large number of individuals who are considered to be at high risk for adverse health outcomes[1].

American National Survey data on lesbian, gay, and bisexual prevalence in the United States revealed that approximately 8.8 percent of US citizens identify as gay or bisexual. According to Indiana University studies, 7 percent of females and 8 percent of men in the United States identify as homosexual or bisexual. Approximately 770 000 same-sex couples live in the United States, according to data from the 2005 census.

They are represented in more than 99 percent of US counties. Evidence and expert opinions on whether it is reasonable to expect that marriage equality for same-sex couples will have a positive effect on the health outcomes of the LGBT community have only recently begun to appear in the medical and social science literature, and only recently have they begun to do so. Second, however, it is necessary to consider how such findings may be adversely influenced by social discrimination in the workplace[2].

1.1 Minority Stress:

The recent spate of teen suicides linked to anti-gay bullying provides a good starting point for understanding the gravity of the public health crisis confronting this country and its LGBT sexual minority community. Our political authorities, courts, and mass media, as well as the predominance of same-sex families and attempts to protect human rights, provide the very core of gay people's never-ending debate, according to them.

They are the target of slang words and offensive jokes that are demeaning and derogatory, and they are frequently the targets of such slang words and jokes. In the absence of current medical and social scientific literature on the homosexual community, individuals and organizations that are uneducated or uninformed about it often question their own morals and value as human beings.

Legislation or constitutional amendments affecting LGBT people are also subject to the Protection of Marriage Act of 1996, which defined marriage as a civil union solely between a man and a woman. The obvious inference is that same-sex marriage is somehow less valuable than heterosexual marriage; the underlying concern is that it could have a negative impact on marriage equality in the long run. Being portrayed in such a negative light adds

significantly to the condition known as "minority stress," which members of this group experience in our heterosexist society as they seek acknowledgment and acceptance for their contributions[3].

Minority stress resulting from social discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender or disability is distinct from other types of minority stress in that one's sexual orientation is typically invisible to those around them. As a result, LGBT people are constantly subjected to indirect, inadvertent, or insensitive attacks on the very core of their being, often by people who express no contempt or disrespect for them, on top of being the target of explicit discrimination." Suppose someone has a lesbian coworker but does not know her sexual orientation.

An innocent inquiry, such as "Do you have a boyfriend?" instead of "Do you see someone special?" conveys a judgement of what is "normal." In this case, the question is inappropriate." Even when the "other" is unseen, faceless, or nameless, it is typical for people in power to overlook the reality of the other's existence and the difficulties that the other must overcome in order to survive. This interplay of power and bias, whether visible or hidden, is exemplified by the phenomenon of heterosexism, which is defined as Prejudice and sexism, which were prevalent throughout earlier generations' civil rights campaigns, have striking resemblances to the current situation.

1.2 Positive Effect on Health:

Increased access to health care is widely acknowledged to be associated with a reduction in mortality. Uninsured adults had a 40 percent higher relative risk of death than insured adults. partnered gay men and partnered lesbians had slightly lower odds of having employer-sponsored dependent benefits (42 percent versus 28 percent, respectively) than their married heterosexual counterparts, according to a recent study by Ponce et al. assessing the impact of differential access to health insurance in California for same-sex partners.

Furthermore, unlike dependent benefits obtained by employers through heterosexual marriage, benefits obtained by intimate partners, civil union spouses, and same-sex spouses are treated as taxable earned income by the federal government and the majority of affected states. In addition, Ponce et al. point out that "the effect of restrictive, differential treatment of same-sex relationships pushes costs into the public domain," with HIV-positive men being twice as likely as non-HIV-positive men to rely on public insurance due to a lack of access to affordable insurance, as noted by Ponce and colleagues[4].

Labor specialization, decreased transition costs, economies of scale, and health insurance and survivor benefits, to name a few, were detailed in testimony at the Perry v Schwarzenegger trial, in which a federal judge heard a lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of Proposition 8, which amended the state constitution to ban same-sex marriages in California. However, for married couples, the psychological aspects of the situation can be even more significant.

Following the passage of marriage equality legislation in Massachusetts, expert witnesses cited the self-perceived benefits of marriage equality identified by gay and lesbian married couples, as reported by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health: 72 percent felt more committed to their spouses as a result of the legal recognition of same-sex marriage, and 70 percent felt more accepted by their families, while 93 percent of children of same-sex marriages felt more accepting of their parents.

The testimony and findings of those witnesses are confirmed as a result of the accumulation of evidence-based literature. The researchers compared the findings of 216 lesbians and 123 gay men who were in civil unions in Vermont to the findings of 166 lesbians and 72 gay men who were not in civil unions. Gays who work in trade unions have had significantly more interaction with their families and friends, as well as social and emotional support, than those who do not. The likelihood of them remaining in their long-term committed relationship was higher if it was a legally recognized partnership. Consequently, they had greater access to more affordable health insurance and medical services, as well as more consistent family support, which is critical to one's mental health[5].

After conducting a study on 239 people who were involved in same-sex marriage, researchers discovered that social acceptance and legal recognition of same-sex marriage were significantly associated with individual and relationship outcomes, compared to heterosexual marriage. Specifically, they discovered that legally recognized same-sex marriage provided the same advantages experienced by heterosexual couples making the move from cohabitation to legal marriage.

Many of those who were married reported significantly lower levels of anxiety and depression, as well as higher levels of psychological well-being. Because it was carried out in public and included members of a support group, social formalization helped to reduce feelings of stigmatization and marginalization. When legal formalization posed a barrier to separation, the gay couples polled reported higher levels of relationship satisfaction and a stronger sense of commitment to one another, according to the results of the survey.

Such a dedication has realistic health benefits. Data from a survey of 2881 homosexual men in four major metropolitan areas in the United States were analyzed by researchers and conclude that "same-sex male civil trade unions are related to lower risk behaviour for HIV and other STDs indicating that social and legal recognition affects safe sex behaviour." Thus, regardless of the sexual orientation of the persons concerned, legalized marriage provides important health benefits.

The functional dimensions of legalized marriage create major financial protection and stability. The social consequences of officializing one's devotion to another in public form part of a support group that offers advantages far beyond those available to couples who live alone. The increased psychological well-being provided by such help clearly has a positive impact on the well-being of these individuals[6].

Marriage is not only correlated to favorable health benefits for all individuals regardless of sexual identity; in addition, the institution of heterosexual marriage has not been shown to adversely affect same-sex marriage. In 2007, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported that the divorce rate in all five states allowing same-sex marriage was almost 20 percent lower than in the rest of the country. Longer experience with same-sex marriage in Scandinavia and in the Netherlands supports these reassuring figures.

Furthermore, same-sex marriage does not reduce the chance of good parenthood. It is well known that children raised by the same sex parents have a positive relationship to other children in every measured performance criterion; an integrated two-parent family is the most significant indicator of successful child-breeding.

Pediatricians, physicians, psychologists, anthropologists and social workers have long known that the social environment plays an important role in assessing one's psychological health. The position statements of various professional societies also support an argument that the LGBT community would receive substantial health benefits if committed same-sex marriage were given social validation and legal status for committed heterosexual relationships[7].

2. DISCUSSION

Eleven Member States of the European Union, several US and Australian states, and Canada have now introduced marriages or registration for same-sex civil partnerships. In Great Britain, civil partnerships became law in 2005. However, on moral and religious reasons, there has been and continues to be strong resistance to such reforms. Prejudice against homosexuality differs, as is often regarded as unnatural and morally perverse, from that against race or sex. The United States Senate discussed the Federal Marriage Amendment, a failed attempt to prohibit homosexual marriage through federal law, in July 2004. More recently, the Supreme Court of California "revoked" 4000 marriages sanctioned in San Francisco because they were considered in violation of the State Law of 1977 which defined marriage as the marriage between a man and a woman.

The Vatican is a combination of the same sex with different behaviour. The health implications of marriage 56% of people in the U.S. and 51% in the UK are married and live with their wives. While many studies do not clearly distinguish between marriage and coexistence, married people appear to be better than single people on a physical and psychological level. Unmarried people have increased all-cause mortality rates in comparison with married people[8].

Some of this advantage is because healthy, well-adapted people make more attractive partners and can be more likely to endure difficulties and stay in marriage. However, there is significant evidence that marrying leads to improved physical and mental health and longevity. Social relationships have long been good evidence of a positive influence on health through practical and emotional support, and marriage can be the most common and possibly strongest of social bonds.

In Western countries, however, up to one out of two weddings ends in divorce and troubled marriages can have negative health implications, possibly mediated by hostility effects on cardiovascular activity, changes in stress hormones and immune changes. There have also been debates on whether, based on economic autonomy and

gender roles, the effects of marriage vary between men and women. Marriage appears to lead to higher death rates among men than women, and marriage is better for the mental health of men than that of women[9].

In an Italian case study, married women were more likely to be admitted to depression than their individual counterparts - the reverse of the situation for men. Longitudinal studies, however, did not support this conclusion and negative psychological implications appear to be greatest for women when they look after young children. A recent Canadian study followed a sample of more than 11 000 men and women for over two years, confirming the benefits of marriage to both sexes and indicating that women are not more susceptible to psychological distress in and out of marriage than men.

The quality and durability of same sex, coexistence relationships appear to be very different. Lesbian partnerships can vary from gay men, not least because lesbians are most likely to be responsible for children, which has an impact on the nuclear couple and creates a variety of personal imperatives. Male, same-sex relationships are generally assumed to be less enduring than heterosexual ones. This may involve a lack of public recognition and a consistent social framework within which such relations can be established.

The stability of same sex relations depends, however, on a complex range of factors, in addition to social and legal recognition. We don't know whether gay male relationships are less durable because of anything that is inherent to a man or gay male, the gay male society that promotes numerous partners, or because their relationships are not socially recognized. The "social experiment" provided by civil unions will enable us to distort the health and social impacts of this complex issue.

Civil unions will be important legally, socially and financially and will be held within a defined social ritual. They are likely to enhance social and family support for same-sex couples and enable them to solve inevitable challenges rather than simply leaving a connection. Their impact and personal significance are therefore different from informal coexistence. Since this type of legislation is new, the long-term stability of the civil partnerships of the same sex is not known. Countries or states with the longest-term partnerships are a good point of departure for research.

A recent study has compared 212 lesbians and 123 gays with 166 lesbians and 72 gay men from friends without civil unions and 219 heterosexual married women and 193 heterosexual married men who had recruited from siblings and spouses of civil union participants. Heterosexual pairs were together longer and had a more traditional division of labor and childcare in both types than lesbians and gay men. Civil unions in the same sex were more open about sexual orientation and closer to families of origin than in non-civilian unions in same sex couples. Sadly, there was no coexistence of the heterosexual group to complete the comparisons. Although the authors concluded that the visibility of homosexual unions led to the greatest advantages in terms of changed attitudes, it is hard to know whether these attitudes allowed couples in the first place to join civil unions[10].

3. CONCLUSION

As per Buddhism, "Just because you have read something does not mean that you believe in it." Do not trust anything just because a lot of people are talking about it or spreading rumors about it. Trusting something just because it is written in your holy scriptures is not a good enough reason. You shouldn't rely only on the authority of your instructors and elders when it comes to important decisions. Despite the fact that rituals have been handed down for many years, do not believe in them. But if you discover anything that is consistent with reason and is beneficial to the general welfare and profit of everyone, after careful observation and research, you should embrace it and live up to it."

Although the institution of marriage is evolving, this was true even before the legalization of same-sex marriage. A century ago, marriage was defined traditionally as the legal union of two people of the same race or religion or social class and encouraged an unequal relationship dominated by men; today, marriage encompasses interracial and interreligious relationships with blurring gender norms, which is in stark contrast to our forefathers' marriage. Heterosexuals gain from formal, legal marriage regardless of race/ethnicity, religion, or financial position since it increases their chances of survival. According to the most current medical and social science studies mentioned below, the same holds true for homosexuals and lesbians who are given the opportunity to engage into a legally recognized marriage.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. L. Hatzenbuehler, A. R. Flores, and G. J. Gates, "Social Attitudes Regarding Same-Sex Marriage and LGBT Health Disparities: Results from a National Probability Sample," *J. Soc. Issues*, 2017, doi: 10.1111/josi.12229.
- [2] D. M. Frost and A. W. Fingerhut, "Daily exposure to negative campaign messages decreases same-sex couples' psychological and relational well-being," *Gr. Process. Integr. Relations*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1368430216642028.
- [3] A. J. LeBlanc, D. M. Frost, and K. Bowen, "Legal Marriage, Unequal Recognition, and Mental Health Among Same-Sex Couples," *J. Marriage Fam.*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/jomf.12460.
- [4] M. L. Hatzenbuehler, K. A. McLaughlin, K. M. Keyes, and D. S. Hasin, "The impact of institutional discrimination on psychiatric disorders in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: A prospective study," *Am. J. Public Health*, 2010, doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.168815.
- [5] S. R. Schwartz *et al.*, "The immediate effect of the Same-Sex Marriage Prohibition Act on stigma, discrimination, and engagement on HIV prevention and treatment services in men who have sex with men in Nigeria: Analysis of prospective data from the TRUST cohort," *Lancet HIV*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/S2352-3018(15)00078-8.
- [6] K. Zivi, "Performing the Nation: Contesting Same-Sex Marriage Rights in the United States," *J. Hum. Rights*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/14754835.2014.919216.
- [7] B. G. Everett, M. L. Hatzenbuehler, and T. L. Hughes, "The impact of civil union legislation on minority stress, depression, and hazardous drinking in a diverse sample of sexual-minority women: A quasi-natural experiment," *Soc. Sci. Med.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.09.036.
- [8] R. Donnelly, D. Umberson, and R. A. Kroeger, "Childhood Adversity, Daily Stress, and Marital Strain in Same-Sex and Different-Sex Marriages," *J. Fam. Issues*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0192513X17741177.
- [9] C. O. Odimegwu, N. De Wet, S. A. Adedini, N. Nzimande, S. Appunni, and T. Dube, "Family demography in sub-saharan Africa: A systematic review of family research," *African Popul. Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.11564/31-1-1023.
- [10] N. Cabrera, L. C. Sayer, N. Cabrera, and L. C. Sayer, *Gender and Couple Relationships*. 2016.

