|  |
| --- |
| The Social Consequences Redefining of Marriage |

*This booklet seeks to help politicians, judges and people involved in politics to understand the wider social implications of redefining marriage.*

[Introduction 2](#_Toc442264943)

[Marriage – One Man, One Woman – And how this benefits children 2](#_Toc442264944)

[The Wider, Positive, social consequences of the marital-family 5](#_Toc442264945)

[What Are the Wider Consequences of Redefining Marriage 11](#_Toc442264946)

[Why do so many believe that redefining marriage will create a ‘fairer society’? 18](#_Toc442264947)

[The Social Space for Same-Sex Couples 21](#_Toc442264948)

[Conclusion 22](#_Toc442264949)

Table of Contents

# Introduction

The redefining of marriage looks like a complex social issue. But the two sides of the discussion are divided by a relatively simple to understand concept.

Many people believe that homosexual couples should be given supportive laws and recognition by the State is because of the concept of ‘fairness’. Fairness is a deeply rooted human value. Very young children understand the value of fairness. It plays a very important role in building civilization.

But fairness is a second level value, not a primary one. As humans, we use other values first before we move on to assess whether something is fair. We first ask questions about whether something is right or wrong, whether something creates harm, or whether it is for the benefit for the larger good. If all looks good on this first level then we are free to move on to think about how fair the idea is. So, for example, we do not say it is fair a poor, single mother to steal from a rich person. We say stealing is harmful for society, and then we think about taxing the wealthy so as to redistribute money to her in a fair way so she can feed her children.

So herein lies a problem. If people do not see the potential for future harm that is inherent in the redefining of marriage – then they will move right on to demand fairness. There are those who can see the damage and harm which redefinition causes, and those who can’t. And this creates an immense amount of tension within the social fabric.

At the heart of this discussion then is whether people can see the harm that comes to heterosexuals, children and the wider society if the word marriage is redefined. Those who see the potential for future harm do not want to see that harm happen. Those who seek to keep the traditional understanding of marriage are therefore not intentionally seeking to treat homosexuals differently. They are seeking to protect the wider society. If the redefining of marriage automatically brings about social decay they have a social responsibility to make sure that the word marriage is not redefined.

This booklet, therefore, seeks to help interested parties understand the social harm that occurs when the word marriage is redefined.

# Marriage – One Man, One Woman – And how this benefits children

We all have been created with the capacity to grow and mature different dimensions of love. We have the capacity to learn to express many different forms of love. This is one of the central purposes of our life on earth.

As children we learn to develop our love for our parents (*child’s love*) and then we take that trusting love out into our relationships with our brothers and sisters and into our friendships. There we develop our *brother-sister love*. The constant maturing of both of these forms of love creates a healthy foundation for becoming a partner in marriage. When married, the partners continue the development of their child and brother-sister love, but also mature the realm of *couple love*. With the birth of children the partners then work to mature their ability to express *parental love*. When we are born we hope to find all these forms of love expressed through our physical parents. Their example provides the best foundation for us to understand how we too can grow to become a person who can express love in all its textures.

Men and women have equal value – both are born as children of the universe – both are children of God. Men and women are complimentary but different. They have many similarities but each of the genders also offers something different to the world. And, both the masculine and the feminine dimensions of our humanity play an essential role in building a thriving world.

When children are born they intrinsically want to receive the love of both their biological mother and their biological father. This is part of their natural self. We cannot change this. The mother ideally plays a key role in modelling healthy womanhood – a woman who can express many aspects of the four core types of love to a reasonable level of competence. Such a mother provides the best foundation possible to stimulate the growth of the feminine nature of her daughter – modeling and encouraging her daughter to ultimately become a playful and loyal sister and friend, a loving wife and a nurturing mother. The mother’s completeness also inspires the growth of her son’s appreciation for femininity – the foundation for him to love his sister, his female peers, his future wife and his daughters. The father ideally plays a key role in modeling natural manhood. This creates the best foundation to stimulate the growth of the masculine nature in his son – encouraging the son to grow to become a playful and loyal brother and friend, a loving husband, and a protective and wholehearted father. The father’s completeness also inspires his daughter’s appreciation for masculinity – the foundation for her to love her brother, her male peers, her future husband and future sons.

More than this, the complimentary masculine and feminine natures of a married couple help develop different elements in the children. Research shows that a reasonable father, on average, is better at developing his child’s ability to play and experiment; at encouraging the children to take risks – to get out of their comfort zone and try something new; at protecting the child from a wide range of ways – from bullies to predators; and at encouraging the setting of moral standards - helping the child develop an inner sense of self-discipline, of right and wrong. Mothers too play a crucial and unique role in developing their children. Mothers are especially important during the first two years of life – a time when the mother – through her words and actions – lets the child know they valuable, precious, and appreciated just for being who they are. The unconditional love of the mother therefore creates very important inner-world sentences that the child can draw upon for the rest of their life – “I am lovable”, “I am valuable” and “I appreciate the good in me”.

Thus we find that two opposite-sex partners in a marriage typically create children – and when they do so they provide the optimal environment for the child to grow in – the place where the children are most likely to receive the different dimensions of love – dimensions which allow them fully participate in life. Because of the goodness that is inherent in a reasonably loving marriage, extensive research from around the world now clearly shows us that children raised by their married, biological parents have, on average, the highest levels of emotional stability, extended family support and financial support; the lowest rates of behavioral problems, physical abuse and sexual abuse; the best mental health and educational outcomes; they can best develop their gender identity, they have the highest level of opposite-sex relationship role-modeling, and they have the highest chances of building a successful marital-family of their own. Put simply, the ability for each generation to be at peace within themselves and to love all who they interact with is highly correlated with the health of the marital-family.

We are, of course, talking about averages. Many single parents and step-families, when raising their children, do an incredibly noble job in sometimes difficult circumstances – a better job than many two biological-parent families. But still, on average, the biological two-parent family wins out on every level. Put simply, the loss of input from one of the biological parents might mean that the children face extra risks. The absence of a biological parent can lead to a possible lack of internal and/or external resources within the family system. Thus, as the marital-family norm has declined we find child poverty, self-harm, drug overdoses, people on antidepressants, prison populations, loneliness, etc. – have all increased. We see no end to increases in some forms of social ills. Many of our children are faring very badly.

What does the above mean in the context of same-sex marriage? The key issue here is that with the redefinition of marriage the State typically allows for same-sex couples to adopt, to be allowed IVF, or even for the buying of newly born babies – often from faraway lands. The above analysis shows that there many problematic issues that politicians need to consider here.

* + All children are children of the universe or God’s children. All are born unique, a gift to this world. All are born into the world – helpless. Having been created by two biological parents, these parents have a natural responsibility to ensure the best future for the child they have created. Thus one can say that children have natural rights. They have a natural right, if possible, to be raised by the two people who have created them – for this creates, on average, the best foundation for their lives. One might say this is the most fundamental right of our humanity. However, if a child is raised in a family where both parents are the same-sex then this natural right is denied. Then the child is likely to miss out on some important aspect of its development. The opposite-sex role modeling is missing. The child may well struggle to develop an inner appreciation of one gender, or struggle to develop their own gender. This lack of development might play havoc with the child’s life – especially when they seek to build a marital-family of their own. This is not fair on them. We, as adults, have no automatic right to handicap these children in this way.
  + The same-sex couple may be giving, caring individuals, but the child is born with an innate desire to know the love of both its biological parents. When a child doesn’t receive the love of one or both of its biological parents, the mental distress of the child can sometimes be intense. It can develop a whole range of negative inner-world sentences, all of which can have a profoundly negative affect on the child’s development. “Why did my mother sell me? Didn’t she love me?” “Who is my father? Why doesn’t he try to connect with me? Maybe he doesn’t know I’m even alive. He obviously doesn’t love me because he is not looking for me.” Etc. All these negative sentences can lead to a whole host of long-term, harmful reactions in the child – making it harder for them to become all that they are born to be. All this is cruel to the child – a child who has had no say in what has happened, who would change things if they had a chance. Such a situation has nothing to do with the universe’s hope for that child.
  + Some people make the case that surely a child in an orphanage would have a better life if they were raised by same-sex parents. There is truth to this. But this is not the whole story. First, the only reason there are so many children in orphanages is because the marital-family has been severely neglected by all branches of society for well over 50 years.[[1]](#footnote-1) If society, in general, cared more about marriage (and the children) then much more investment would be made in the marital-family – and society would be a far healthier place than it is now. There then would be far fewer children needing adoption. If the State wants to change laws around marriage it is far more sensible for the State to focus on creating more supportive policies for those who choose marriage as a life-style – thus creating fewer children who need to be adopted in the first place.

Secondly, the child’s best interest has to come first. If a heterosexual married couple is naturally able to better express the different dimensions of human love then the adopted child will benefit from this. This is not discriminating against same-sex couples. It is the future of the child that we are interested in – and one form of family, on average, is just more naturally able to give the child the wider range of love it needs to grow in fullness.

* + In redefining marriage, politicians typically extend the ability of people to buy and sell children. Corporations grow wealthy as they provide surrogate services for gay couples. The surrogate mothers – some of them die in childbirth – often leaving their own children to suffer without a mother. This rapid increase in the commercialization of children also places mankind on the edge of a very slippery slope and we do not know what is at the bottom of this slope. For example, if children can be bought from the womb of a mother, then they can one day be bought at the age of one-year-old, or two, or six, or twelve. A society where children are bought and sold is an extremely long way away from a healthy democracy. The last time society saw such a scenario was during the period of slavery – and the consciences of people told them clearly that this was not how the children of God should be treated.
  + Lastly, in redefining marriage and offering gay couples the right to children through surrogacy, politicians tell increasing numbers of children that they have no right to know the love and tender care of their biological mother. A few politicians take control over the lives of many children. But politicians have no natural right to separate a child from its mother’s love. When citizens allow politicians to make this law change then the political class gains immense power over the lives of children. This too places society at the top of a slippery slope and we have no idea what is at the bottom. We have no idea how politicians will shape this power to their own political ends. This is unnatural power, and thus can only lead to a future that is ever further from the natural laws that govern a healthy democracy.

# The Wider, Positive, social consequences of the marital-family

Although it hard for us to sometimes recognize, human beings are part of the natural world. Our societies flourish when we follow the laws that are inherent in the natural world and, if we lose sight of these natural laws, our societies decay.

Many species, mainly birds, pair-bond as opposite-sex couples in order to rear their biological offspring. Some species (e.g.; Swans, emperor penguins, prairie voles, gibbons, wolves, albatrosses, etc.) mate for life. Each of these species has found that their offspring do best if both the biological father and mother are there to rear them. Just like these other species, many generations ago, opposite-sex bonding for life became our way to gain best outcomes for our children. Heterosexual marriage is our way to gain best outcomes for the next generation – for future society.

When you look at a bird’s nest, one where two opposite-sex birds have bonded, one where both are giving their best for the sake of their offspring, what is actually happening? Beyond there being some possibility of some form of attraction between the two adults their union also serves several key social purposes; purposes that serve the social good of their species.

Firstly, their attraction to each other creates the grounds for the continued existence of their species through the creation of offspring. Secondly, the birds’ ‘marital’ bond also has the purpose of maintaining their species norms – helping the offspring learn all the skills needed so they too can one day build their own bond and rear their own chicks.

Thirdly, their biological union lays the foundation for lineage improvement and thus for species development. If a bird develops the ability to fly faster, that ability may be passed on down to future generations through its offspring. We all understand today that micro-evolutionary steps can happen over the course of thousands of generations and, when put together, all these small steps make a species more capable of surviving in its present environment. This is how much of evolution happens – through lineage improvement. All these small improvements are passed down through one’s line of descendants and thus, over time, they spread out across the species so the species as a whole benefits.

Because we too are a species, heterosexual marriage has similar social purposes – purposes which are essential for the development of healthy culture over the course of many generations. The attraction that heterosexual partners experience towards members of the opposite sex is just Mother’s Nature way of drawing men and women together so we fulfil these wider social purposes.

Heterosexual marriage, the give and take between a married man and woman, because it plays an essential role in Mother Nature’s plan for the human species, generates important social forces. These forces play an extremely important role in laying the foundation for the maintenance and sustenance of today’s and future society. The heterosexual marital-family sends out ripples which serve and support wider social well-being. The marital-family unit is not just a blessing for themselves, but a blessing for the wider community. The presence of many loving marital-families leads to healthy community building, and many healthy communities lead to a healthy nation.

The core reason why the marital-family, just because of what it is, serves social well-being is because the husband and the wife have the ability to create children. The presence of children triggers a whole chain of positive events and social outcomes – all of which benefit the wider society – both present and future.

Like other species that bond for life in order to create best outcomes for their children, the essential gifts that the marital-family offers society through creating and raising children are existence, continuity and development.

* **Existence**: The act of creating of children provides for many positive benefits for the wider society. For example – the birth of a new child ensures the continuation of the human family. When we keep our natural role within creation – when we respect other species – when we bring love to all species – then we bring to the earth a unique dimension that no other species can fulfil. We have the unique ability to build deep, meaningful, loving relationships with almost every other form of mammal – horses, dogs, dolphins, elephants, tigers and more. With love, we have turned wolves into dogs who can serve human goodness – who enjoy serving human goodness. We can tame lions and tigers with our love. We can also appreciate the amazing beauty that is inherent in all of nature.

The existence of children also encourages the development of a whole host a positive, community-focused attitudes within the new parents – attitudes that think of the good of the whole – protective and nurturing thoughts, self-censoring behaviors, and a movement from selfishness to more altruistic attitudes and behaviors. Today, increasing numbers of adults delay marriage and parenting well into their thirties – or show no desire to have children at all. As a result we see increasing levels of me-centered thinking – “It’s my life” – and to constant increases in community harming behaviors among adults during their twenties (E.g.; Drug abuse, hooking-up, etc.). In turn, this extended-childhood, adult lifestyle, which is only possible because of artificial methods of birth control, is causing many challenges for teenagers and for parents – for parents who seek to protect their children during their teenage years. The altruistic, parental psychological switch hasn’t turned on in many, many adults. As ever increasing numbers of people don’t have children, or only have children in their late 30’s, society becomes increasingly self-centered and suffers increasingly poorer outcomes. A lack of a sense of ‘all pulling together’ starts to occur. When so many people start to think about their own ‘individual rights’ then the wider society also increasingly struggles to act with the public good in mind. Social decay is the natural outcome.

One of the many other social benefits of giving birth to new life is that there will now be a new generation to care for the elderly and the sick. Many developed nations are now facing an unstable future because of their low birth rates. There are not enough children to care for the future rise in the numbers of elder people. Without a reasonable number of children being born the State is left with two, far-from-perfect solutions. One choice is to place a huge financial burden on the next generation of adults and young marital-families. The other is to invite large scale immigration – something that seems to be leading to growing social instability. Neither of these options provides for the slow but sure stable growth of society.

In summary, the act of creating children in the marital-family provides long-term benefits for the wider society – benefits that no other relationship can bring about.

* **Continuity:** The marital-family, just because of what it is, generates forces which support present day community well-being and also maintains the quality of family life across many generations into the future. The marital-home is the natural school of love – the primary place where children (the next generation of citizens) learn important social skills and social norms – norms and skills which allow the children to move forward with their lives – to grow to become people who can make a positive contribution to their community and world. No other relationship has this same capacity for raising wholesome future citizens. The present day health of culture is also determined by the optimal outcomes for children. Also, the desire to protect and nurture children pushes parents out into the world where they seek to create better schools and healthier communities. Of course, many marriages are far from perfect but still, all alternative family structures cannot match the marital-family when it comes to social and community outcomes. One cannot talk of building a successful long-term culture without marriage.

As themarital norm decays in modern societies we typically end up with two main problems. Firstly, we find ever growing numbers of people on the edge of society – people who find it hard to participate in life. Outside the marital-family children, on average, face more risks. These extra risks cause increased levels of difficulties for the children, teens and young adults. Levels of addiction, depression and loneliness rise. More people are in jail and ever increasing numbers of people struggle to build a lasting marital-family. Secondly, the financial cost of dealing with fragile families is immense. Prisons, police, social workers, increased health issues, mental health, and more all add to the State finances. Once a country gets past a certain percentage of single parents the national debt seems to become uncontrollable. A spiral of cuts to all services and ever increasing taxes cannot stop the rising debt. Looked at from another angle, when we find communities where there are a large number of single-parent homes we often find broken community life and sometimes even fear.

Put simply, through teaching the children about love and social norms, the marital-family, just because of what it is, provides for future and present day social well-being.

* **Development:** Lastly, the marital-bond, just because of what it is, also lays the foundation for the development of the human race through lineage improvement. If either of the married partners develops themself in some way then this development might get passed onto his or her children – thus allowing the child a more enriched life. These small developments, over time, are passed on down the family tree and are also passed on out into the wider community. It is the process of lineage improvement that has been at the core of our development from struggling, Stone Age tribal communities to today’s advanced societies. Without marriage we would never have developed the advanced social skills that are needed to build complex societies. We understand intergenerational improvement in other areas of human endeavors. This generation of ice-skaters have learnt from and then added to the technical skills of the previous generations. Car makers continually improve on the reliability or safety of cars. As humans we take the level of love skills that our parents could offer and ideally we seek to improve on those skills for the benefit of our children and grandchildren.

When we look deeply at the research we find that the only form of family that does lead to continual lineage improvement is the heterosexual marital-family. It is the only form of family that offers, on average, lineage improvement, and when lineage improvement occurs in many families then the potential for sustained social improvement comes about. All other forms of family have inherent weaknesses, weaknesses which often create the foundation for lineage decline and, by extension, to social decline. Lineage decline might be defined as: “Young adults, despite the enormous investment by their parents and society, have less ability than their parents to build and sustain a lasting marital-family. They have less ability to pass on the strengths of their lineage, strengths that have often taken many generations to develop, to their own children”. We see today that increasing numbers of young adults today are finding it harder to get married and stay married. The rise of single parenting in the previous generation has negatively impacted on this generation and so lineage decline has set in in many, many families. It takes time for cultures to develop – maybe hundreds of years – but if the marital-family norm weakens then a culture may fall to pieces within a hundred years. One can try to hide some of the elements of the decay. The State can lock people in jail, or offer people anti-depressants, or provide homes and money for the young single-mother, or provide extensive support from social services – but the ever rising costs and the growing social problems just make this pathway forward completely unsustainable. In summary, the daily act of seeking to improve the quality of love within the marital-family home provides society with a foundation upon which future development is built. No other form of human relationship provides for lineage improvement in the same way the marital bond can.

So, the marital-family plays an essential role in Mother Nature’s plan for the building of a healthy human society. Whenever we find a great civilization in history – the marital-family norm was at its core – not a single-parenting norm. Of course, all the social blessings that inherent in the marital-family aren’t just freely given. All these blessings depend upon the fulfillment of human responsibility – on how much the husband and wife both invest in their couple relationship and into their relationship with their children. Societies can sometimes rise and fall based on the level of this investment.

In summary, we can say that God or Mother Nature designed heterosexual marriage as a foundational platform upon which ALL other social institutions could be firmly built. Mother Nature might define marriage as a *union which leads to the existence, continuity and development of the human family over the course of many, many generations.* Thus the love and marriage of a heterosexual couple doesn’t just serve themselves – it serves as a foundation for them to bless the wider society. They do this through being best prepared to love, honor and respect their biological children.

There are several other points of note.

* Some may ask: “If marriage is so connected to the creation and protection of children, then are childless couples married.” Yes, of course they are. Marriage and fidelity are different sides of the same coin. They can only exist together. Through the pledge of fidelity the childless, married couple protects children from being born outside the love and protection of two, committed, biological parents. Their pledge of fidelity protects the society and creates wider social good.
* Marriage existed well before the State came along. Abraham in the Bible was married. The word marriage then doesn’t belong to the State – to the political class. This being so, the political class do not own the word marriage. Because they do not have ownership over the word marriage they have no legitimate authority to redefine the word marriage.
* The State – a small group of politicians – doesn’t grant heterosexuals the right to marry, but the State does offer supportive laws. The reason the State offers supportive laws to those who chose marriage as a life-style is not because of the emotional connection between the couple. There are many forms of deep, rich emotional connections between humans that the State does not encourage with supportive laws. The key reason why the State offers supportive laws for married couples is because the couples – through acting responsibly with their sexuality and children – ensure the social goods of existence, continuity and development. It is these foundational social goods that the State values and wants to support. It seeks to support one of the main channels through which blessings enter into the human world.

The core question in this debate is: “These three important social outcomes – the continued existence of the human race, the continuity of the standard of love and ethics across generations, and opportunity for human development through lineage development – are they also a natural outcome of same-sex unions? Do same-sex couples, just for who they are, also create these same three wider social consequences?”

The answer is no. This is because the main social benefits that are channeled into society through a heterosexual married couple come through the couple creating and raising children.

First, the same-sex couple cannot have biological children through same-sex, erotic sex. Thus the same-sex couple cannot offer society the psychological and physical benefits that the creation of new life brings. They can only do so through encouraging IVF or surrogacy – through the violation of the natural rights of children – which, as we have seen, leads to children having sometimes much more complicated lives, and also to lineage and social decline.

Secondly, without biological children, the couple cannot pass on the norms of love and behavior across generations. The couple’s love for each other has no effect on the next generation. As individuals they may do much for society – but all individuals can do much for the wider good – and the State doesn’t reward these other individuals with social status and the same supportive laws that it offers to married couples.

In fact, it may be argued that State acceptance of same-sex marriage leads to a desire to push same-sex eroticism into the heterosexual world – through the school system and the media. Sadly, leading the next generation down such a path doesn’t lead to the maintenance of community. It leads to on-going civic decay within the heterosexual community. Thus, because the legalization of same-sex marriage comes with this push to widen the use of same-sex eroticism, then the State recognition of same-sex unions has the opposite effect on society when compared to the heterosexual marital-family. It leads to wider social decay not sustainability.

Thirdly, same-sex unions, on average, cannot bring about lineage improvement. This is firstly because they don’t have biological children of their own. Also, if a same-sex couple do gain children through surrogacy or IVF – the research clearly shows that many of these children intensely struggle with the fact that they have been separated from the love of one or both their biological parents. Because of this feeling of abandonment these children often suffer from deep depression, or lack motivation to study, or sometimes commit self-harm, etc. Also, as with children in all families where a biological parent is missing, the children are more likely to be sexually abused. Because of these issues, and because of the low levels of opposite-sex role modeling which they experience, the children also find it harder to build their own marital-family. Because of these outcomes then same-sex couples who raise children create, on average, lineage declining family structures, not lineage improving one. A community which started with only same-sex parent families would decay within a couple of generations – the opposite to a community of heterosexual families.

So, even though same-sex couples can love and grow their ability to love each other, they cannot offer lineage improvement, or long-lasting, sustainable communities, or even the continued existence of the human species. Because they cannot fulfill all, or any, of the three key social outcomes that Mother Nature has intended for the estate of marriage then same-sex couples cannot enter into the estate of marriage. This is nothing to do with fairness. It is just a natural result of the natural limitations of their same-sex bond. There are many forms of long-term relationships which endure through an emotional connection – but we don’t call these other forms of relationship ‘marriages’ because they do not bring about the social purposes of marriage.

Some other key points of note:

* Marriage is not a right granted by the State. It is the natural responsibility of parents to take care of the children they bring into the world – to provide for the betterment of the social good. The commitment of the partners to each other is ideally a commitment to be there to raise the children they give life to. Marriage is a part of the natural order – how Mother Nature has designed the human experience in order that love can continue to enter society across generations. Marriage, therefore, is not a right granted by the State. When homosexuals demand equal rights they do already have a natural right to make a commitment to someone of the opposite sex and have children with their partner and stay together to raise these children. No one is denying them their natural right to enter the estate of marriage. They even can freely make a personal commitment to another homosexual – a promise to stand by each other in sickness and health – for life. No one can stop one person making a promise to another. But that promise cannot be called a marriage without totally transforming the role that marriage plays in the social fabric.
* As mentioned above, the politicians offer supportive laws to those who chose marriage because of the social outcomes that the married couple offer society. The question then is: “If the homosexual couple offers nothing extra-ordinary to benefit the wider society – then is the State under any compulsion to offer their relationship special supportive laws?” If it is purely the same-sex partners who benefit from their relationship then why should the State give same-sex couples supportive laws? Is the State under obligation to offer supportive laws to a relationship that offers nothing extra-ordinary to the social fabric? If the State offers supportive laws to a form of relationship which offers nothing extra-ordinary to the wider society then, in fairness, it should offer the same supportive laws to everyone in society. Such a decision would mean that State would then be involved, in a legal form, in every one of our human relationships (E.g.; our friendships, or flat mates living together for a few years). The potential for insincere relationships to form would be immense and the number of court cases held to solve relationship disputes would cause the legal system to collapse.
* Some people feel concern for those children from previous relationships who now find themselves being raised by one of their biological parents and their parent’s same-sex companion. “Surely the children would experience more stability and better outcomes if the couple were allowed to marry.” In the research, however, on average, we find very little difference between a child being raised by a single divorced parent and a child being raised in a step-family. The addition of the new adult can sometimes help, but the new marriage can also bring about worse outcomes (E.g.; The child now realizes that reconciliation between its biological parents is impossible and places the blame on the new parent). The main damage is done. The main thing the child wants, to be raised by its biological parents, is lost. If a child takes this badly, then there is often very little that can be done to repair this feeling of loss. State recognition of same-sex marriage, on average, will do little or nothing to benefit this child.

As can be seen from the above, one of the easiest ways to understand the centrality of the heterosexual marital-family to Mother Nature’s plans is to look at human beings as a species – like every other species on earth. Every species of animal has one unambiguous way of ensuring the long-term well-being of their species. Each species has one specific method of insemination and one specific method of rearing their offspring. Each of these specific methods has ensured the well-being of each species over millions of years. Also, if a species quickly moves away from their one, species-specific method of species propagation then their species would *automatically weaken*. For example, if many mother lions decided to rear their cubs away from the protection of the pride, their cubs would have far less chance of reaching adulthood. If the majority of male swans decided they didn’t want hang around to rear the cygnets, if they just wanted to go off fishing with their mates, then their offspring would experience increased risks – and swans as a species would go into decline. These risks might include less protection, less food, less parental role modeling, and less chance of surviving.

So how about us? Are we immune from this species limitation? Do we have a particular species specific-method of insemination and raising offspring that brings about best outcomes for the next generation? If we do then, like other species, do we go into decline when we move away from our species specific way?

The alternative is to say that we are we different from every other species on earth. It is to say that our children can be raised in any form of family constellation and all these different forms of family, on average, create the same outcomes for the children. The research, however, doesn’t show this at all. It clearly shows us the heterosexual marital-family has become, or was created to be, our species specific way of gain long-term positive outcomes for our species. The research clearly shows that as we move away from our specific way, our communities and nations weaken. Mother Nature has created us to gain on-going blessings through one specific means of regeneration and we leave that specific method at our peril.

As we come to the end of this section on natural social outcomes of the heterosexual marital-family we can say that the wider social forces created through the interaction between a man and a woman and between two same-sex partners are very different. The opponents to same-sex marriage are clear about this – that marriage can only be between a man and a woman because only they can create the social outcomes which Mother Nature intended marriage to have. Marriage – one man, one woman – is the saying.

This is the central difference between the two different sides of the argument in this debate. Same-sex activists perceive the emotional and sexual attraction and demand that the State acknowledge this attraction with supportive laws. Activists demand this even though there are many other similar types of long-term, same-sex, companionate relationships which the State does not purposely encourage with supportive laws or honor with social status.

On the other hand, the ‘traditionalists’ are looking at the wider social outcomes that marriage is designed to create. The same-sex couple may have feelings that lead to long term sexual attraction, but to call their union a marriage is to completely change the meaning of the word marriage and its purpose within the social fabric. To equate heterosexual marriage – our species-specific way of maintaining health and well-being in our species across generations – with the sexual attraction felt between two people of the same sex is to equate chalk with cheese.

Marriage was created by Mother Nature – it our species way to gain stability and growth over the course of many, many generations. A few arrogant politicians may erringly claim that they own the word marriage but they don’t. If the word marriage belongs to any group of people it belongs to children. It is the social space where children are afforded the love of both their biological parents and, on average, given the best start in life. It is the one central place in society where the child’s natural *right* to a good start in life is best fulfilled. To redefine marriage, to say marriage is about adults’ rights creates many problems. Marriage cannot be both primarily for the sake of adults and primarily for the sake of children at the same time. When push comes to shove, which comes first? If one says marriage is primarily about adults’ happiness then this leaves no space in the social fabric where child well-being comes first. Such thinking can only lead to ever increasing numbers of children losing their well-being in order to cater for adult happiness. This is a reversal of natural principles. If politicians want to redefine marriage then politicians have to ask the children: “Do you want to be raised outside the love of your biological mother and/or father – be raised by two men or two women”? Very few would say yes to such a violation of their natural heart. And because the word marriage belongs to children – politicians cannot offer the public a chance to vote on whether marriage should be redefined.

Put simply, if the State redefines marriage then the primary focus of marriage moves too. It moves from primarily existing for the well-being of children and the wider society – to become mainly focused on the acknowledgment of the feeling of attraction between adults. But, as we shall see later, the changing of this focus comes about at a tremendous cost to children and to the wider society.

# What Are the Wider Consequences of Redefining Marriage

Because marriage is not like other relationships – because it offers wide ranging, positive, social benefits all across society – if the word marriage is redefined the impact will be felt all across society. Because marriage is one of the central cornerstones upon which civilization is built, redefining the social understanding of marriage can only have profound consequences for all aspects of society.

There are two core problems with politicians redefining the word marriage.

The first, as mentioned above, is that redefining the meaning of marriage within the legal framework moves the focus of marriage away from ‘for the benefit of the well-being of children and wider society’ to primarily become ‘for the sake of the happiness of adults.’ This leaves no place in the social fabric where the child’s well-being takes precedence. This being so, children are the ones who are most affected by this law change. Children will be affected in a range of negative ways because in certain areas of life ‘the right of adults to happiness’ is now seen to be more important than ‘the well-being of children’. In other words, many of the negative consequences of redefinition are not seen immediately. The full consequences will take some 20 to 40 years to become clear.

The second core problem with redefining the meaning of the word marriage is that the word ‘marriage’ now no longer belongs to God or Mother Nature. It becomes owned by politicians and homosexuals – by 1-2% of the population. In the hands of politicians and homosexuals the social meaning of ‘marriage’ is now open to be continually transformed to suit the political goals of politicians and the social desires of homosexuals – even if these goals and desires affect heterosexuals in a profoundly negative way.

The change of the essential meaning of marriage – who defines and owns this meaning – is a deeply important issue to understand. Before same-sex marriage all are free to criticize the State on policies connected with family formation. For example, to say no-fault divorce law was harmful to society does not lead to social banishment. The freedom to criticize the State is based on the acknowledgement that marriage belongs to all of mankind – for mankind’s natural well-being. However, after the redefining of marriage the freedom to comment on government policy reforms in the area of family and marriage is drastically reduced. To criticize the State is not seen to be having an honest dialogue with the State – it is seen to be bigoted – to be homophobic – to be anti-social. Thus challenging new laws in these areas – laws that may well harm society – becomes almost impossible. Without honest dialogue poorer law making takes place. This is why one might say that in redefinition the ownership of marriage transfers from Mother Nature to the political class. All governments have courts and prisons where they can fine or lock up people who disagree with them.[[2]](#footnote-2) Mother Nature doesn't have jails or courts. So the State now owns the social meaning of marriage and can punish anyone who disagrees. Also, before definition, religions could hold their own understanding of marriage. After redefinition, all religions come under increasing pressure to relinquish their Godly interpretation of marriage and accept the legal definition without hesitation. The fact that marriage now becomes a legal construct for politicians to play with is deeply worrying. They are not experts on marriage and family. They have political goals, and sometimes those political goals may be best served through harming the heterosexual marital-family. Thus they may well use their ownership of the legal and social definition of marriage to the detriment of the lives of citizens.

Below we just look briefly at how these two themes – the ownership of marriage and the transferring of the meaning of marriage from ‘being for the well-being of children’ to ‘being for the happiness of adults’ – develop in society after redefinition and how these themes negatively affect heterosexuals, children and the wider society.

1. **Children bought and sold:** In redefinition a few politicians push the door open wide for the buying and selling of children against their natural will. Children are bought from the wombs of mothers by wealth gay men. IVF treatment for lesbians leaves children without the love of their father. We have no idea where this slippery slope will take us. There will be ever-increasing numbers of children raised outside the natural family – many of whom will the suffer the emotional trauma of feeling abandoned by at least one of their biological parents, many of who will grow up with gender confusion, and many who will find it harder to build the successful heterosexual marital-families they once had the potential to build. There is no chance of a healthy society existing when so much damage is being done to so many of the next generation of citizens. We already see this damage being done to children in the first sets of research data. This is real damage, not a hypothetical possibility.[[3]](#footnote-3) [[4]](#footnote-4) [[5]](#footnote-5) [[6]](#footnote-6) [[7]](#footnote-7)

*I grew up surrounded by women who said they didn’t need or want a man. Yet, as a little girl, I so desperately wanted a daddy. It is a strange and confusing thing to walk around with this deep-down unquenchable ache for a father, for a man, in a community that says that men are unnecessary. There were times I felt so angry with my dad for not being there for me, and times I felt angry with myself for even wanting a father to begin with. There are parts of me that still grieve over that loss today…*

*But children of same-sex parents haven’t been given the same voice. It’s not just me. There are so many of us. Many of us are too scared to speak up and tell you (our same-sex caregivers) about our hurt and pain, because for whatever reason it feels like you’re not listening. That you don’t want to hear. If we say we are hurting because we were raised by same-sex parents, we are either ignored or labeled a hater (of homosexuals).[[8]](#footnote-8)*

One has to seriously question politicians on this issue. Where do they believe they gained the right to violate the natural rights of tens of thousands of children. Who gave politicians the right to say: “You will have a more traumatic life, a less fulfilling life, just because we say so.” These politicians go off and retire on gold plated pensions and leave these children to suffer their whole lives – a hole missing in their hearts – missing the love of the biological parent(s) they never knew. Politicians do not have this natural power – but if they claim it then society can only suffer more harmful outcomes.

1. **Growing rates of infidelity:** In redefining marriage the other side of the coin in marriage – fidelity – also becomes weakened. This happens in a range of ways. The future advent of polyamorous marriages affects fidelity. Also, when people don’t see the wider, positive, social outcomes of marriage they are less likely to see the wider, negative, social consequences of infidelity. And the law change itself. When marriage law is changed to include same-sex marriages then politicians usually decide to remove the term infidelity from marriage law – as grounds for divorce, as being socially harmful. Because infidelity is connected with sexual intercourse – with the potential to create new life – then same-sex couples can’t commit infidelity through having erotic sex with other same-sex friends. In the new law infidelity is now typically hidden out of sight under irreconcilable differences – usually not even mentioned. The State stops acknowledging the wider social harm that infidelity brings about. In other words, the State now says it is for the couple to decide whether infidelity is of harm to their marriage. If it is not an irreconcilable difference for the couple, then it’s OK for the couple to have other sexual partners. Such an understanding of fidelity lays the foundation for the growth of open marriages. It is for each couple to decide. Thus the social stigma against infidelity declines. Who are we to judge the couple if they both accept it? Of course, damage is still caused to society in a range of ways.

Once again, it is children who are the ones who are most likely to suffer the consequences – for they are more likely to grow up without the love and support of their biological parents. We already see a growth in the acceptance of infidelity in today’s society. This law change only hastens the process.

And once again the political class abuse their authority by saying that marriage and fidelity are not naturally connected. Who are they to say this?

1. **Heterosexuals experimenting with same-sex eroticism:** Probably the biggest problem with the redefining of marriage is that the law change now freely allows same-sex activists to push same-sex eroticism into the heterosexual world. In redefining marriage, same-sex sexuality comes to be taught in school to children who are just forming their sexual identity. Teachers who oppose the change, teachers who feel that teaching same-sex sex to children is a harmful social experiment, are usually barred from teaching sex education classes. Teachers who are much more aligned with the same-sex activist agenda often take over. That which almost no parent would teach their children is now taught in many schools. Parents are not allowed to withdraw their children – fines or even imprisonment are used as threats.

The media also encourages heterosexual children to think about experimenting with same-sex sexuality. The children are at an age where hormones cloud their judgement. They are also not taught about the very negative diseases that abound in the gay community, nor about the psychological difficulties that are often found amongst those who practice same-sex sex. The end result, as we already see in some countries, is increasing numbers of normally heterosexual children experiment with same-sex, erotic sex. The diseases which are caught and/or the negative psychological consequences both later affect the children’s ability to build their own heterosexual marital-family. Many children’s lives are harmed because of politically, irresponsible behavior.

It’s not just the children who are encouraged to experiment. Adults too are also facing increasing levels of persuasion to encourage them to experiment. It just takes very small increases in such behavior over several years before some 10%-20% of the heterosexual population would call themselves actively bisexual. Of course, no judgment of such behavior is allowed, no matter how much social harm all this behavior creates. In such an atmosphere the heterosexual marital-family can only decline. Once again, children are the ones who suffer. They are more likely to grow up without the love of their biological parents.

Some people find it hard to understand that heterosexuals have the ability to exhibit bi-sexual behavior. If the cultural climate is right, heterosexuals can do this. We have seen this many cultures across history.


*The consequences of same-sex “marriage” in Canada include: restrictions on freedoms, forced sex education, sexually confused children, sexual experimentation among children, muzzling and debilitating the Church, more births out of wedlock, more in-vitro fertilizations, more abortions, more poverty, more misery, more disease, more addictions and higher health care costs. [[9]](#footnote-9)*

*Terrence Prendergast, Archbishop of Ottawa, 2012*

1. **Fewer heterosexuals get married:** When the State redefines marriage to include same-sex couples, because the same-sex couple’s relationship in and of itself doesn’t bring about wider social benefits, then the political class sends a subliminal message to society that marriage does not serve wider social purposes – that marriage is solely about honoring the bond of sexual attraction between any two people. This being so, heterosexuals become increasingly disconnected from how Mother Nature has designed our species – how we are designed to gain ongoing social blessings through the marital-family. If marriage is purely about the acknowledgement of couple love, well, the heterosexual couple already have couple love. They don’t have to marry to obtain this.

As heterosexuals lose their sense that marriage serves important social goals, they see less reason to marry in order to best protect social cohesion. As the belief grows that marriage and fidelity are no longer connected, fewer people marry. As growing numbers of heterosexuals move towards experimenting with erotic sex fewer people marry (E.g.; How many women would marry a man who is exploring his sexuality?). Put simply, people progressively lose their sense of social responsibility, and thus errantly act irresponsibly with their sex lives and with the marital-family norm.

We have already have seen a massive trend in this direction over the last fifty years but this law change can only make things worse. Thus more heterosexual couples will enter into much more fragile cohabitation rather than marry. Once again, children are the ones who are most hurt. Future society becomes even more complex and dysfunctional. In almost all countries where marriage has been redefined we already see marriage rates substantially decreasing. If heterosexuals see fewer reasons to marry – or feel less social pressure to marry in order to protect their children – then fewer will marry.[[10]](#footnote-10) [[11]](#footnote-11)

 More than this, before redefinition, marriage was seen to be a gift from God, or a gift from Mother Nature, a gift freely given for our well-being. In redefinition, the political class now owns the word marriage and start to act as oppressive, domineering owners. “You have to agree with our legal meaning of marriage or else.” “We will teach your children that they have to agree with what we believe marriage is, even if you don’t like it.” Etc. Citizens do not like being oppressed by the political class. Some citizens then turn away from marrying just because they sense that it is no longer a free gift – that it comes with authoritarian ways attached.

*“[Former President George W.] Bush is correct, when he states that allowing same-sex couples to marry will weaken the institution of marriage…. It most certainly will do so, and that will make marriage a far better concept than it previously has been.”[[12]](#footnote-12)*

1. **The growth in political correctness:** After redefinition Christian churches – and Christians – face increasing challenges. They are now bigots in the eyes of the government and in the eyes of many in the wider society. The Bible clearly says that marriage is between a man and woman; that a same-sex couple cannot enter into marriage because their union doesn’t produce the social benefits of marriage. The Bible is also clearly hints at the social decay that happens when same-sex erotic sex is promoted amongst the population. The Christian stand, as seen from the above, is truthful. But that doesn’t stop the State, the media and the education system from constantly trying to attack the Christian church and weaken its role in society.[[13]](#footnote-13)

One of the key problems here is that many, many laws in the Christian world are based on Biblical morality. But when the Bible is seen to be bigoted writing, and when the Church is seen to be increasingly irrelevant, then Western society loses the basis for its moral code. This then allows for politicians to create a new moral code for society. This makes politicians the new spiritual guides of the nation. Since politicians are not known to have a high level of spiritual enlightenment such a future is extremely worrying. Laws are increasingly made without any reference to historically sound moral values. Some laws are solely passed in order to achieve political ends. What the politicians say goes – even if vast numbers of citizens totally disagree with these new laws and the moral values that they embody. The sense that politicians are passing laws which have no grounding in natural or religious morality leads to increasing sense of oppression and frustration. The politicians have the courts and the police on their side – and many people feel they have to hold their tongues in order to not say something that can destroy their career or see them ending up in jail.

We have seen political systems that created new laws without any reference to a religious moral code before. They became very oppressive countries (e.g.; the USSR and Nazi Germany). Right and wrong were determined by the whim of the political class. People became afraid of being found to be on the wrong side of the new, politically correct morality – no matter how ridiculous or socially harming this morality was.

In this law change we already see politicians creating new standards of morality. Now, people who wish to protect society from the negative outcomes that are inherent in redefining marriage, people who are trying to protect children, are now seen as bigoted, as socially malevolent. And those who wish to bring in a law which seriously harms many children and future society are now seen to be champions for goodness. Christians, who do much social good through volunteerism and more, are now bullied by the State – made to be seen as socially harmful people. If the State can malign good people – people who create a lot of goodness to society – then it can ultimately make anyone or any group into an enemy of the State – as worthy of social exile. Such power is a natural part of an authoritarian State.

1. **Redefinition lays the foundation for group marriages:** In redefinition, marriage is completely separated from its nature roots – a man and a woman taking responsibility for the children they bring into the world. It now becomes a political construct – a political tool that can be shaped by both politicians and homosexuals to meet their own various goals.

Thus, as many traditionalists have said, once the State redefines marriage to say that it is “State acknowledgement of the attraction between any two people”, then there is nothing to stop the State redefining marriage again so as to include polyamorous marriages of three or more people. Once politicians have errantly stated that Mother Nature’s blessings come to earth across generations through the act of erotic sex between two men, then there is nothing to stop one from saying God’s blessings come to earth across generations through the relationship of four men, or three women, or two men and a woman. All the tools are there in place for them to do so if they feel their political goals could be enhanced through such a redefinition. To not allow 3 or 4 bisexuals or homosexuals to marry will be seen as bigoted.

Also with the above social damage being done over the course of the next several years – the increasing numbers of children growing up sexually confused, the growth of political correctness (e.g.; the loss of he and she – and demand for ze; the growing demand that people be labeled by their changing sexual preferences rather than their physical identity; etc.) and the advent of three or four people birth certificates and more – all increase the likelihood of group marriages happening in the next few years.

And there are signs in several countries that show that this is the next goal of same-sex activists. Three people marriages have already taken place in Holland, Brazil and between three American gay men. No one has stepped in to stop this.

Group marriages will be legalized in a small country first, and then spread from there. The heterosexual marital-family will collapse in the moral confusion that follows. Controlling husbands will ‘encourage’ their weaker partners to accept another woman into the home. Equality between the sexes will become harder to achieve. Maintaining a monogamous marriage will become increasingly harder once group sex between ‘married’ partners is shown on the TV every evening – something that will happen once group marriages are legal. Once that happens, there is no hope of maintaining civil society.

And, again, children will be the ones to suffer. There is considerable data out there on the extra potential risks that occur when children are raised by a group of ‘parents’ who are sexually involved.[[14]](#footnote-14) [[15]](#footnote-15) And again we see the political class overstepping its authority and abusing its ownership of the word marriage – redefining marriage again for the sake of political goals – not worrying about the damage they are causing to the real lives of many, many people.

1. **The growth of an authoritarian state:** Lastly, society is seriously harmed because in the redefining of marriage vast amounts of power is passed from citizens into the hands of a very few politicians. This is because marriage is one of the major channels through which Mother Nature’s blessings enter into the human fabric. Marriage and child-raising create much of society – so if politicians own the definition of marriage they can also control many other aspects of society too.

The increase in unnatural power comes in many forms. First, the word marriage now belongs to the political class, not to God or Mother Nature or to children. Now a small group of politicians have the power to take marriage and family norms in any direction they wish in order to achieve their political ends (no matter how much this harms the wider society). Next, because the Christian church is involved in marrying people the political class now can persecute, fine, and seek to control church doctrine. In Scandinavia the State forced pastors to marry same-sex couples against their consciences. In Canada, pastors who preach about the negative outcomes of redefining marriage are hauled up in front of a tribunal and fined. The State can threaten to take away the church’s tax free status, and much, much more. Some are even seeking to ban the Bible as hate speech. Thus the politicians can use the State apparatus to unduly influence spiritual leaders and religious followers – never a good omen. It is meant to be the other way around – where God uses religious leaders or followers to warn politicians of the harm that their law making might bring.

Next, children in many ways are now owned by the political class – not by parents. The political class now feels free to educate the children against the will of the parents. They also feel free to allow for the buying and selling of children - completely against the child’s natural will. Lastly, with politicians saying that same-sex marriages bring about a healthier society when, in reality, their promotion brings about social decline, then politicians also now become the new author of morality. In many ways the political class becomes not just the ‘owner’ of the meaning of the marriage, but a powerful force in defining right and wrong too. As we saw above, politicians can now define good and evil in ways that are completely at odds with historical or religious reference, for their own political ends.

Thus, the political class, in taking control of marriage, in owning the definition of a central channel through which social well-being is determined, now has under its authority, many other aspects of society. Social power should be broadly spread across society so that no one class gains the upper hand over the rest. Any future group of politicians can now use this new power for their own ends if they so choose. This is why many people feel a growing sense of oppression after the law change. People of religious conviction lose some of their natural rights.[[16]](#footnote-16) Parents have lost natural rights. Children have lost natural rights. Churches are losing natural rights. And morality becomes increasingly politically correct by the day.[[17]](#footnote-17)

If one were to summarize what has taken place one would have to say that a political coup has taken place – one where the politicians have gained enormous powers over the citizenry. It has all the hallmarks of being a Marxist coup in nature – not a quick revolution – but a slow python-like grip one, one where the politicians consolidate their power by the year. But no society can flourish with a political class that becomes increasingly powerful and oppressive by the day.[[18]](#footnote-18)

As can be seen, the redefining of marriage comes with serious consequences – for everyone. The decay comes slowly but surely. If we look at society twenty years from now we can expect to see:

* Increased numbers of children, having been raised by same-sex parents, becoming adults – and many of these adults will have psychological issues and gender confusion
* Increased numbers of children, having being raised in single parent homes because of the growth infidelity, becoming adults – and a considerable number of these adults will have psychological issues and behavioral problems
* Increased numbers of children, having being raised in single parent homes because their parents felt no social responsibility to marry in order to protect their children and society, becoming adults – and a considerable number of these adults will have psychological issues and behavioral problems
* Growing numbers of teens, having been persuaded by the media and the education system that erotic sex is something they might enjoy, becoming adults – and a considerable number of these adults will carry life threatening diseases, or will have psychological disorders or will, due to their sexual lifestyle, have less capacity to build the marital-families.

Any one of these is a concern for society. Together they form a firestorm, and the harm done to all these children now spreads out to negatively affect many other people’s lives. Over time, we can expect that one day at least some 10-20% of the population will experience far more harmful life outcomes. This is in contrast to some 1-2% of the population (i.e.; homosexuals) feeling a bit better about themselves if marriage is redefined. *The wider social damage incurred far, far outweighs the benefits that the status of marriage bestows upon homosexuals.* In essence, the redefining of marriage embeds the future decay of society into law. After marriage is redefined no amount of politicking can change this harmful future.

And herein lies a problem. If society doesn’t redefine marriage then a sense of ‘unfairness’ remains – one where some people feel that homosexuals are seen to be second class citizens. The other future is a marriage redefined one – one where homosexuals gain a sense of status and belonging – but this comes at the expense of social decay.

One of core problems with the redefining of marriage is that it is an unsustainable legal outcome. With the redefining of marriage one can argue that once the social decay reaches a certain point then there will be a negative reaction from people who do not wish to live in a society that is falling to pieces around them. At that point homosexuality once again might be banned, subject to jail or, if a radical group takes power, even death. Put simply, the redefining of marriage creates an unsustainable future – one where we will be brought full circle back to where we started – but only after much pain and suffering has been experienced by many, many people. Because of this it is best for everyone if we find a more lasting solution today.

The goal of politicians has to be the creation of a sustainable, blossoming future. This is impossible if marriage is redefined. Politicians can only support the definition of marriage as presented by history – that of husband and wife. If homosexuals themselves understand the two alternative futures, for sure the majority would agree with our position. When both sides understand the challenges involved it is possible to think of a lasting agreement being agreed upon by both sides for the sake of future development.

It is to be acknowledged that many who support the redefinition of marriage will reject the idea that redefinition will cause social harm. But it is at least a step forward for same-sex activists to understand that the rejection of redefinition is not based on bigotry but based on concern for the future of society. This can at least help reduce the antagonism that is expressed. This allows for better, healthier debate and for the possibility of research to show who is right.

# Why do so many believe that redefining marriage will create a ‘fairer society’?

There are several reasons why so many people today believe that the redefining marriage brings about a happier, more tolerant society – even though it doesn’t. We will review the two main ones.

Firstly, people are not experts on marriage and family thus it is relatively easy to get them to accept half-truths or even lies. In this debate the same-sex lobby puts out statements – many of which look as they are reasonable and true. In reality, many of the statements have only a pinch of truth to them – but behind the truth, if one looks closely, there is often a socially harmful lie. If one accepts the small truths without doing the work needed to find the lies hidden beneath, then one falls for the lies – and then one sees no harm in the redefining of marriage. But, with the media or most of the education system refusing to do the work of uncovering the lies, each person has to do this truth digging by themselves. This takes personal hard work and most people do not wish to put in the work needed. Here are some of the many lies told.

* **“Same-sex couples can raise children just as well as the biological parents can”.** What is true is that they can make an equal investment of love – but this is not the whole story. The psychology of the child is involved. Another way of saying this lie is: “Biological parents are totally replaceable – unnecessary – because any two people can do just as good a job.” Such a statement is totally unsupportable in the research. We find nothing like this in the data. The lie is extremely worrying. If society truly comes to believe that any two people can raise children just as well as the biological parents can – the potential for political abuse becomes massive. For example, politicians with political goals in mind might feel they can take children away from parents who hold ‘politically incorrect views’ – and the public will be led to believe this is for the social good. The fear of losing one’s children will keep all but the bravest parent from dissenting against the abuse of political power.
* **“The redefining of marriage will have no effect on heterosexuals”.** As we have seen above, in the redefining of marriage, many heterosexual children are seriously affected in a negative way and the next generation of adults also struggles to find it harder to find a reason to marry. On top of this, there are now, in the USA, after the redefinition of marriage, some 30 different court cases going through the court system – all of which ask for some new ‘freedom’ for the LBGT community – and all of these new politically correct freedoms come at the expense of the natural laws that sustain health democracy.
* **“The State grants heterosexuals the right to marry so they can also grant homosexuals the same right.”** Marriage came about as a result of adults taking responsibility to fulfil the rights of their children. *Marriage is adult’s being responsible – responsible in their duty to fulfill the child’s natural rights.* Marriage is not about an adult’s right to pensions or to health insurance or government sanctioned social status. None of these were around when marriage became our way to sustain our species. Marriage is about taking responsibility for each other as partners in order to best protect our biological children. The State supports this responsible behavior. There is nothing in natural law that says the State has to provide special, supportive laws to a form of relationship which provides nothing more to society than a good friendship does. There is no natural responsibility of the State to offer supportive laws because there is no extra, natural responsibility.
* **“The redefining of marriage will not lead to it being redefined again”.** Every time the State passes a law that supports behavior that lies outside of Mother Nature’s design for our species in the area of marriage and child-raising, the State redefines the social understanding of the role of marriage in society. This then weakens the ability of Mother Nature’s blessings to come to society. There are now probably some 50 laws that exist which weaken society precisely because they cause even more children to be raised without the love and protection of their two, married biological parents. For example, when the State sanctioned IVF treatment for single women they redefined marriage – politicians moved citizens away from understanding their responsibility to their children. Because new, socially harming laws are passed every year in this area, the idea that marriage won't be redefined again is just false. All that has happened is that, in redefining marriage to include same-sex couples, the politicians now have an even greater range of ways to negatively impact on the marital-family. All that happens is that a new range of laws are now possible – all of which may possibly lead society ever further away from future stability and growth.
* **“People who disagree with the redefining of marriage are bigoted against homosexuals”.** No. This issue has very little to do with homosexuals. The argument of the traditionalists is with the State, a State that is over reaching its authority to redefine a word that it doesn’t own and to redefine the word marriage for its own political ends – to the detriment of the wider society. Traditionalists are worried about what redefining marriage does to heterosexuals and democracy.
* **"When the State offers the status of marriage to homosexuals the institution of marriage will be strengthened."**
* **“Children who are raised in by same-sex couples would do better if their ‘parents’ were given the right to marry”.**
* **Etc.**

As one can see, there are a lot of falsehoods here. Fighting these falsehoods can be hard work. But fight them in one’s mind – one must – or one will be dragged into the falsehood that redefining marriage is good for society.

The second reason why people believe that redefinition will lead to a fairer society – as mentioned at the start – is because people can’t see the damage that redefinition causes the social fabric. They cannot see how, in redefinition, politicians become the owners of the word marriage and can now constantly reform marriage to suit their political ends – even if it harms social welfare. And they cannot see how children get hurt in a wide range of ways. Without seeing the damage, people move right on to believing that redefinition brings about a healthier, fairer society.

This is not the first time society has been in such tension around the concept of fairness. We’ve seen it before in the communist revolutions that took place around the world from 1917 onwards. The communists said it was not fair for people to work the same number of hours and yet get paid vastly different salaries. It was not fair that the rich profited from the poor. Things had to change. But those who advocated for change on the basis of fairness did not see the harm that would take place to future society if communism was implemented. The social experiment led to millions being killed for being ‘bourgeois’, to the death of the entrepreneurial spirit, and to decaying societies. And are these countries fairer today? The social experiment failed. Communism was not in harmony with the natural laws that are an essential part of our humanity. Communism created too much oppression; too much power was held by the political class and the God given, unique spirit of most individuals was crushed under this oppression.

We have exactly the same dynamic happening here. The redefining of marriage leads to vast amounts of power being transferred to the political class. In this new world some people are sent to re-education camps for sensitivity training.[[19]](#footnote-19) Some people are sent to the equivalent of Siberia – the death of their career if they challenge the new status quo. Research at top universities showing homosexuals in a negative light is called hate speech and they refuse to publish it. As in all authoritarian states most of the mainstream press follows the party line.[[20]](#footnote-20) People are fined oppressive, over-the-top, sums of money - $100000 or more – for civil disobedience (E.g.; When bakers refuse to make a cake for a same-sex wedding – for a form of wedding the baker knows will bring about harm to society). This is to be compared to far smaller fines for people who do actual bodily harm to others. And there are the same plans for ‘communist’, same-sex marriage expansion all over the globe through the UN and its various branches.[[21]](#footnote-21)

So:

* If people don’t look at the data that shows that harm that is being done to children who are being brought up by same-sex parents
* If people don’t think about the inherent danger that lies in the policy of normalizing the buying and selling of children
* If people don’t see the long-term danger of encouraging normally heterosexual children to experiment with same-sex erotic sex
* If people don’t see how the redefining marriage to focus on the couple relationship means that certain groups of heterosexuals find no reason to marry in order to protect their children
* If people don’t see how the redefining of marriage weakens the hugely important social prohibition against infidelity
* If people don’t see how the redefining of marriage leads to a high probably that it will be redefined again to include group marriage – something that will cause the heterosexual marital-family and society – to collapse
* Etc

Then many people will walk right on into agreeing with the redefinition of marriage to include same-sex unions on the grounds of fairness. And society can only go down the road of becoming increasingly authoritarian in nature – classing all those who see the potential for damage as intolerant and uncaring citizens. As the State seeks to hide the damage that is being done, as it seeks to punish dissenters, as it seeks to force all citizens to follow the party line – then society cannot even talk about or assess the damage that is being done. People are told a fairer society has been achieved. All the while the next generation of children experience increasingly poorer outcomes and the marital-family norm becomes increasingly harder to maintain. And higher taxes to pay for all the damage are, out of necessity, forced upon those who seek to act responsibly in the marital-families. It is communist, State mandated redistribution of wealth by a different form – one that exists solely on the foundation of many, many people living at way below their full God given potential.

There other similarities between the redefining of marriage and economic communism. In economic Marxism, the State said people should be rewarded for how much time they invested in their work. Everything else was irrelevant. Market forces, demand, innovation, creativity, personal skills and talents, the usefulness of the product or their investment, etc – all the forces that lead to better outcomes in society – were to be denied a place in determining a person’s salary. People worked 8 hours therefore everyone should get the same salary – street cleaner and engineer, those who worked hard on their education and those who didn’t. So we have the same scenario here in the redefinition of marriage. Same-sex activists demand that the State recognize and reward the investment of love between the same-sex couple. They are not looking at the social outcomes of that investment. Politicians have a responsibility to look at the value a relationship offers to the wider society – and factor that in when deciding whether the relationship should be supported in various ways through legislation. To not do this can only lead to there being ever increasing numbers of badly thought out laws.[[22]](#footnote-22) [[23]](#footnote-23)

Also, in promoting economic communism the activists believed that, after the revolution, the entrepreneurs and investors would still invest in society out of a feeling of unity with their new comrades. We are all brothers and sisters in socialism. They couldn’t see how those who were at the heart of creating a growing economy would give up on investing in their businesses for the sake of the social good. They couldn’t see the social decay that would follow when entrepreneurs lost their passion to be creative due to political oppression. This blindness also affects same-sex activists. They cannot see how marriage is now turned from being a free gift from God into a political tool – a political tool through which the State now increasingly oppresses, manipulates and controls citizens. Same-sex activists believe that people will believe in and be inspired by inclusiveness and tolerance. But the reality is many heterosexual couples do not want to be part of something which is being used as a tool for oppression. They turn away from investing in their marital-families, something that leads society to suffer terminal decline.

# The Social Space for Same-Sex Couples

In the natural world we do not see within any of the animal species a same-sex, companionate relationship which involves constant ongoing sexual arousal and the rearing of children. Mother Nature has deemed such a form of relationship to be an unsuitable channel through which a species might maintain health and well-being. There are many forms of raising children which Mother Nature can bless – but a sexually erotic, same-sex companionate relationship is not one of them. This being so, there is no natural place to locate same-sex couples within the social fabric. Wherever we place them, it feels uncomfortable.

This being so, the push for State acknowledgement of same-sex unions – to call their unions marriages – automatically creates a struggle for humanity. The same-sex couple does not naturally fit in anywhere. There is always a tension, a feeling by some that they are in the wrong place. In such a situation there is no natural right answer to their situation.

The two main choices are State recognition and State support, or for the couple to be treated as we treat all the other forms of long-term, same-sex companionate relationships – to leave them in peace to get on with their lives. There are a range of supportive laws available to all people who live in companionate relationships.

We’ve seen that the redefinition marriage has real potential to undermine future well-being. So let us briefly look at the alternative.

When looked at from the perspective of outcomes homosexual couples offer, on average, nothing more to society than two widows living together for companionship do, or nothing more to society than two single mothers who are living together for an extended period of time. So under what justification can the State offer supportive laws to the homosexual couple and yet deny the same benefits to these other long-term, same-sex, non-sexual companionate relationships? Under what criteria can the State distinguish between the different forms of long-term, same-sex companionate relationships?

The homosexual partners promised to commit to each other for life? Well, most widows live together for the rest of their lives – sometimes for 30 years or more.

The homosexual partners have affection for each other? Well, many live-in-the-same-house companions have deep affection for each other.

Because the homosexual partners promise each other that they will remain sexually faithful to each other? The vast majority of gay, married partners have extra-marital relationships. Research clearly shows that faithfulness if not an essential element of their marriage culture.[[24]](#footnote-24)

The homosexual partners enjoy erotic sex together? Well, many heterosexual, same-sex companions enjoy shopping together, or gardening together, or playing games together – much more than they enjoy sex with someone – so erotic sex as grounds for marital recognition and support is irrelevant.

Put simply, there are no logical grounds for the State honoring one form of long-term, same-sex, companionate relationship over other forms. On average, all companionate couples, in their daily lives, can offer the same ‘goods’ to society. None of these relationships offer society the same blessings that heterosexual married couple do through the act of creating and raising children.

This being so, the only way that society is fair to everyone is for the State to treat same-sex couples in the same way as we treat these other long-term, same-sex companionate relationships. There may be some justification for the State thinking about what laws might best support all long-term, same-sex companionate relationships – but that is a completely separate issue. And one cannot call them marriages without causing major social decay.

Lastly, there are some who believe the solution to the problem is civil partnerships – State recognition of same-sex unions under a different name. But, sadly, this solves almost none of inherent challenges. Almost all of the above negative, social outcomes still happen. Ever increasing numbers of children are still bought and sold against their natural will. Same-sex eroticism is still taught in schools. People who see the inherent dangers of the legislation are still shunned or have their careers ruined. And the State still gains enormous unnatural power which future politicians, if they so choose, can use to undermine the social good.

# Conclusion

As can be seen, the redefinition of marriage is a complex issue. Because of its complexity it is to be acknowledged that, if one already supports the law change, then it can often be a long, challenging process to re-educate one’s brain to see the validity of the argument against redefinition.

It is also to be acknowledged that it is hard for many politicians to understand that they have no natural right to redefine marriage.

But Mother Nature created the human species to be sustained and to develop through the sexual interaction between two, opposite genders. We, in humility and honesty, cannot change this natural principle without also disconnecting ourselves from the principles which sustain cultures over many generations.

If the State – politicians – redefine anything in this area, they need to redefine their relationship to marriage and redefine their relationship to those who chose marriage as a lifestyle. If marriage is one of the essential channels through which social well-being is maintained then politicians have a duty to better support it. Right now, there are many laws that make it harder for couples to marry or to stay married. Such laws just cause social decay. These laws need reforming. Also, there is little support from the State when it comes to helping citizens be best prepared for marriage – and there is little support for struggling married couples. Instead, single parenting and the divorced single mother are given vast amounts of support. This dynamic has to change. Current policies are only leading to more and more single mothers and to growing national debts.

When all is said and done, politicians do not hold their position in society in order to make people happy. They hold in their hands the responsibility to create laws which lead to a lasting, positive, sustainable future. The redefining of marriage does not bring about such a future. Politicians are paid to do a job. They should do it well.

1. Web search: “The long, legal road to marital anarchy” [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Stella Morabito: LGBT Activists Arm For Further War On Free Speech [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. www.frc.org/issuebrief/homosexual-parent-study-summary-of-findings [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. www.familystructurestudies.com/outcomes/ [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Search: “Please don’t tell me I was lucky to be adopted” [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2015/10/15409/ [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See: http://anonymousus.org/stories/ - stories from IVF kids [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Search: “Dear Gay Community: Your Kids Are Hurting” [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. www.crisismagazine.com/2015/totalitarianism-sex-marriage [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. http://loveledushere.blogspot.fi/2015/04/graphs-how-redefining-marriage-in.html [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Robert George and David Tubbs: Redefining Marriage Away [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Victoria A. Brownworth in “I Do/I Don’t: Queers on Marriage”, ed. Greg Wharton and Ian Philips, 2004, pp. 53 and 58–59 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Search: Catholicism – A Hate Crime in Canada? [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2012/05/5338/ [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Search: The abuse of power in polygamy [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. http://c4m.org.uk/downloads/30cases.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Dawn Stefanowicz: A Warning from Canada: Same-Sex Marriage Erodes Fundamental Rights [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. www.crisismagazine.com/2015/totalitarianism-sex-marriage [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Search: NY couple ordered to complete re-education to contradict religious beliefs about marriage, Jan 27th, 2016 [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See: Ninth edition of GLAAD’s media “guidebook” to understand media obedience to regulation of speech and press demanded by the LGBT lobby [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2016/01/16281/ [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Search: ‘Alberta, Canada's Progressive New Government Bans the Words Mother and Father in Schools’ [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Search: ‘Confusing and harmful "transgendering" - no place in UK primary schools’ [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Search: Many Successful Gay Marriages Share an Open Secret [↑](#footnote-ref-24)