

# Protecting America's Immune System: A Reasonable Argument against Homosexual Marriage

by Frank Turek

**Frank Turek** is an author and professional speaker who co-authored two award-winning books: *I Don't have Enough Faith to be an Atheist* and *Legislating Morality*. Frank has appeared on numerous TV and radio programs including: *The O'Reilly Factor*, *Hannity and Colmes*, *Faith under Fire*, and *Politically Incorrect*. Frank holds a Doctorate in Apologetics from Southern Evangelical Seminary and is president of [www.impactapologetics.com](http://www.impactapologetics.com). He and his wife Stephanie are blessed with three incredible boys. [www.FrankTurek.com](http://www.FrankTurek.com).

I grew up in a small, blue-collar, Jersey-shore town where families rarely moved and neighbors knew one another well. My childhood best friend, who lived next door, had an older brother who eventually got involved in homosexuality. That older brother went to New York City and immersed himself so deeply in the homosexual lifestyle that it cost him his life. We buried him eleven years ago at the age of 36—dead from AIDS.

Actually, AIDS didn't kill him. As you know, Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome technically doesn't kill anyone. AIDS destroyed his immune system which made him susceptible to other diseases. Pneumonia and other ailments were the ultimate causes of death. In the end, he became a shell of his former self. On his deathbed, his mind was so tainted by dementia that he cursed his own mother.

His parents were wonderful, loving people, and they did everything they could to love their son. But in retrospect, they made a well-intentioned decision that turned out to be a tragic mistake. In their noble effort to love their son under very difficult circumstances, they failed to distinguish between their son and the *behavior* of their son. They rightfully accepted their son as a person deserving of love, but they failed to oppose his destructive homosexual behavior. Love requires that we stand in opposition to sexual behavior that may likely hurt or kill our loved ones. Yet, after some initial hesitancy, these well-meaning parents endorsed the homosexual lifestyle that ultimately led to their son's death.

This tragic story is being played out right now on the national level. The players are different, but the results could be the same if we make the same mistake. The Massachusetts Supreme Court and homosexual activists want our nation to endorse homosexual marriage. But if we endorse homosexual marriage or civil unions, we risk doing exactly what those well-meaning parents did—we risk endorsing a practice that could destroy our immune system. On the national scale, our immune system is traditional marriage itself.

What do I mean by "national immune system," and how could homosexual marriage destroy it? In this article, I will offer answers to those questions and others as I make a case against homosexual marriage without citing the Bible. Don't get me wrong: I believe the Bible is the inerrant Word of God and have co-authored a new book (*I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*) presenting the evidence why I believe that. I also believe the Bible clearly opposes homosexual behavior, and by implication homosexual marriage. However, on moral issues,

Christians sometimes need to be able to speak the language of the public square in order to convince those who haven't necessarily accepted the authority of scripture. That's my intent here. So here's the line of reasoning we will take:

1. **Traditional marriage is beneficial to the public welfare.**
2. **Homosexual behavior is destructive to the public welfare.**
3. **The law is a great teacher, and it encourages or discourages behavior.**
4. **Legalization of homosexual marriage would encourage more homosexual behavior, which is inherently destructive. It also would weaken the perceived importance of traditional marriage and its parenting role, thereby resulting in further destruction of the family and society itself.**
5. **The law should promote behaviors that are beneficial and restrain (or certainly not endorse) those that are destructive**
6. **Therefore, the law should promote traditional marriage, and it should restrain (or certainly not endorse) homosexual marriage or civil unions.**

Obviously, these points need to be supported with evidence. So let's take each one of them in order:

### **1. Traditional Marriage is beneficial to the Public Welfare**

Marriage is the oldest and most basic of the three building blocks of western civilization (the other two are government and the church). It is the most basic of the three because procreation precedes the need for a government or a church. In fact, without the procreative union of a man and a woman (and forgive me for stating the obvious), no one would exist, including homosexuals. Procreation alone should tell us something about the supreme importance of marriage.

But marriage's value to society goes well beyond birthing children. We all know that marriage provides the best environment in which to *raise* children. In fact, more than ten thousand studies document significant advantages children experience when raised by committed and loving moms and dads.<sup>1</sup> These advantages include:

- A lower poverty rate. (On average, children from never-married homes spend 51 percent of their childhood in poverty compared to only 7 percent for children in married homes.)<sup>2</sup>
- A lower suicide rate. (Children from married homes are six times *less* likely to commit suicide than those from divorced homes.)<sup>3</sup>
- A lower crime rate. (Children from married homes are *less* than half as likely to end up in jail as children from broken homes.)<sup>4</sup>
- A higher health rate. (Children from married homes are generally healthier physically and

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. James Dobson, *Marriage Under Fire*, (Sisters, Oregon, Multnomah), 2004, 54.

<sup>2</sup> See Patrick F. Fagan et al., "The Positive Effects of Marriage: A Book of Charts," The Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/research/features/marriage/index.cfm>.

<sup>3</sup> Michael J. McManus, "Why Is It in the Government's Interest to Save Marriages?" The Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/research/family/WM80.cfm>.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, Fagan, Chart 17.

emotionally when they reach adulthood than children from unmarried homes.)<sup>5</sup>

If these were the only benefits traditional marriage provided society, it would be reason enough to give marriage privileged legal recognition. But marriage does much more. In fact, traditional marriage serves as a kind of national immune system. When our marriage ethic is strong, our social ailments are few. But when our marriage ethic is weak, our social ailments grow. In addition to the positive effects of marriage listed above, traditional marriage also:

- results in lower welfare costs to society.<sup>6</sup>
- civilizes men and focuses them on productive pursuits. (Unmarried men cause society much more trouble than married men.)
- protects women who have given up or postponed their careers to have children from being abandoned and harmed economically by uncommitted men.
- protects mothers from violent crime. (Mothers who have never been married are more than twice as likely to suffer from violent crime than mothers who have married.)<sup>7</sup>
- lengthens the life span of the man and the woman. (Married men, for example, tend to live nearly 20 years longer than single men.)<sup>8</sup>
- encourages an adequate replacement birth rate, resulting in enough well-developed and productive young people who can contribute to society and provide social security to the elderly. (The United States is a dying nation — without immigration our population would be declining.)

These positive results of marriage are not new to our twenty-first century culture. For 5,000 years, marriage has been the bedrock of human social structure. In fact, British anthropologist J. D. Unwin studied 86 civilized and uncivilized cultures spanning 5,000 years, and found that the most prosperous cultures were those that maintained a strong marriage ethic. Every civilization that abandoned this ethic— including the Roman, Babylonian and Sumerian empires— experienced demise soon after liberalizing their sexual practices.<sup>9</sup>

It's not hard to figure out why this is so. Imagine a society where increasing numbers of individuals have no stable family and must therefore fend for themselves. Without the traditional family—which procreates and provides people with their most basic needs of safety, sustenance and security—social chaos will soon follow. That's why a civilized and productive society cannot long endure when its adults abandon their children and one another in order to pursue their own sexual desires outside of traditional marriage.

## **2. Homosexual behavior is destructive to the public welfare.**

It's been said that everyone is entitled to his own opinion but not his own facts. Unfortunately, homosexual activists act as if they are entitled to their own facts, one of which asserts that there's no appreciable difference between heterosexual and homosexual relationships. Homosexual Marriage advocate Andrew Sullivan writes, “[Gay marriage] says for

---

<sup>5</sup> Dobson.

<sup>6</sup> Fagan.

<sup>7</sup> Robert E. Rector, Patrick F. Fagan, and Kirk A. Johnson, “Marriage: Still the Safest Place for Women and Children,” The Heritage Foundation, [www.heritage.org/research/family/bg1732.cfm](http://www.heritage.org/research/family/bg1732.cfm).

<sup>8</sup> See Frank Turek and Norman L. Geisler, *Legislating Morality* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 132; Jeffrey Satinover, *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996), 54.

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Daniel Unwin, *Sex and Culture* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934).

the first time that gay relationships are not better or worse than straight relationships . . . .”<sup>10</sup>

But Sullivan’s assertion is nonsense. The real fact is that some relationships are better than others. People may be equal but their behaviors are not. Since homosexual behavior is contrary to the natural design and compatibility of the body, homosexual marriage cannot function physically or biologically the same way as traditional marriage; neither can it birth the same benefits. In fact, homosexual marriage would actually hurt society at large. In addition to its inability to procreate, homosexual behavior:

1. Results in numerous health problems to those that practice it (including increases in AIDS, other STDs, colon and rectal cancer, hepatitis).<sup>11</sup>
2. Shortens the median life span of homosexuals by 20-30 years (one study showed the median age of death in the early 40's for gay men and women *without AIDS*).<sup>12</sup>
3. Spreads disease to innocent people (a specific example is Ryan White, the teenage boy who died of AIDS after a blood transfusion; and there are thousands of anonymous heterosexuals who have contracted STDs via sexual contact with bisexuals).
4. Costs Americans millions in higher medical insurance premiums because increased health costs of homosexuals are reflected in those premiums.<sup>13</sup>

The bottom line is that homosexual behavior is unhealthy. All sexual behaviors are not equally beneficial, and some of them can have negative public consequences. Innocent people can and do get hurt.

Most homosexual activists get angry when you cite these facts. But why would anyone get angry over facts? Augustine was right when he said we love the truth when it enlightens us, but we hate it when it convicts us.

However, a few homosexual activists acknowledge negative health effects and then use them as a reason to support their cause. This “conservative” case for homosexual marriage suggests that homosexual monogamy, encouraged by the legalization of homosexual marriage, would alleviate these health problems. Andrew Sullivan writes, “A law institutionalizing gay marriage would merely reinforce a healthy social trend. It would also, in the wake of AIDS, qualify as a genuine public health measure.”<sup>14</sup>

Unfortunately, health problems and life span are not likely to improve significantly in so-called “committed” homosexual relationships.<sup>15</sup> Why? There are at least three reasons. First,

---

<sup>10</sup> Andrew Sullivan, “Here comes the Groom: A Conservative Case for Gay Marriage,” posted online at <http://www.andrewsullivan.com/homosexuality.php>. Accessed on September 22, 2004.

<sup>11</sup> Jeffrey Satinover, M.D., *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth*, (Grand Rapids, MI, Baker, 1996), 51.

<sup>12</sup> See Paul Cameron, Ph.D., William Playfair, M.D., and Stephen Wellum, B.A., 1994. “The Longevity of Homosexuals: Before and After the AIDS Epidemic.” *Omega Journal of Death and Dying*, Vol. 29, Number 3, 249-272. For corroboration of these results, see Frank Turek and Norman Geisler, *Legislating Morality*. (Eugene, OR, Wipf & Stock), 2003 (Previously published by Bethany House, 1998), 259-260 (note 4).

<sup>13</sup> The liberal lobby has induced some states to prevent insurers from asking potential consumers any medical questions, including if they are HIV positive! As a result, every other consumer is paying a higher premium because insurance companies are prevented from identifying clients who engage in high-risk sexual behavior.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, Sullivan.

<sup>15</sup> One study even found that homosexuals with a long-term sexual partner died one year earlier than those without. See Cameron, Playfair, and Wellum.

monogamy is not the main issue-- homosexual *behavior* is. Homosexual acts are inherently unhealthy, not just multiple-partner homosexual acts. This is especially true of male homosexuality. Does anyone really believe that it is natural and healthy to insert the penis into the rectum-- the organ whose sole purpose is to expel poisons from the body?

Second, coupled homosexuals tend to practice more anal intercourse and more anal-oral sex than those without a steady partner. They also forgo safer-sex practices because they are “in love.”<sup>16</sup> In other words, coupled homosexuals tend to engage in more risky sexual contact than their single counterparts.

Finally, strict monogamy is the exception rather than the rule among homosexuals. A recent survey found infidelity in about 62% of gay couples, which led researchers in the *Journal of Family Psychology* to write, “The practice of sexual nonmonogamy among some gay couples is one variable that differentiates gay and heterosexual couples.”<sup>17</sup>

Andrew Sullivan would not be surprised by this. Even though he asserts that gay marriage might help make homosexuals more monogamous, Sullivan, paradoxically, doesn’t believe monogamy is “flexible” enough for homosexuals. He calls monogamy a “stifling model of heterosexual normality” and thinks homosexuals have a greater “understanding for the need for extramarital outlets.” Incredibly, he believes *heterosexuals* could learn from this gay example. He writes “something of the gay relationship’s necessary honesty, its flexibility, and its equality could undoubtedly help strengthen and inform many heterosexual bonds.”<sup>18</sup>

One wonders how the “flexibility” to engage in “extramarital outlets” could “strengthen” any marital bond, especially of a husband and wife. Certainly the last thing our society needs is for more married men and women to avail themselves of “extramarital outlets!” Moreover, if this is the kind of relationship homosexuals want to extol as marriage, then they need to call it something else.

Mr. Sullivan’s viewpoint on “extramarital outlets” is not surprising. It represents the strong strain of narcissism that runs through the homosexual movement and many homosexual relationships. From his homosexual paradigm, sex is all about him and *his* desires. But traditional marriage isn’t about the narcissistic desires of the individuals in it. While personal desires can certainly be met, anyone married knows that a strong marriage requires you frequently to sacrifice your own comfort and desires for those of your spouse and children. That doesn’t include betraying their trust and their health because you have a desire for an “extramarital outlet.”

Yet, even if homosexuals stopped their “extramarital outlets,” and even if homosexual marriage could reduce some of the health problems of homosexuals, those unlikely possibilities do not justify making homosexual marriage the legal equivalent of traditional marriage. The unique abilities to procreate and parent children should always keep traditional marriage as the only legally and socially-encouraged sexual relationship in our society.

Why does the law matter? Point three. . .

---

<sup>16</sup> David Dunlap, “In Age of AIDS, Love and Hope Can Lead to Risk,” *New York Times*, July 27, 1996.

<sup>17</sup> Quoted in Warren Throckmorton, Ph.D., “Chris Matthews’ Hard Sell: Pay attention to the common Assumptions about Gay Marriage,” online at <http://www.pfm.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=13210>, Accessed September 22, 2004.

<sup>18</sup> Andrew Sullivan, *Virtually Normal*, (USA: Vintage Books, 1996), 202-203.

### **3. The law is a great teacher, and it encourages or discourages behavior.**

Homosexuals understandably want their relationships to have equal social status with those of heterosexuals, and they see the law as their weapon to force that acceptance on the public. Andrew Sullivan writes, “If nothing else were done at all and gay marriage were legalized, ninety percent of the political work necessary to achieve gay and lesbian equality will have been achieved. It’s ultimately the only reform that matters.”<sup>19</sup> In other words, the push for homosexual marriage isn’t really about civil rights— it’s about civil *acceptance*. Legalizing homosexual marriage is the one law that will legitimize homosexual behavior everywhere else.

Sullivan is right about this. He recognizes the power of the law to change behavior and attitudes over the long run. The law is a great teacher. Many people think that whatever is legal is moral and therefore should be accepted. One only needs to look at two of the most divisive issues in the history of our country – slavery and abortion— to see the power of the law to influence attitudes and behavior.

One hundred and fifty years ago, our country was basically split on the issue of slavery. But today virtually everybody believes that slavery is morally wrong. What changed? After the Civil War, the law changed (the 13<sup>th</sup> amendment to the Constitution) which has helped teach each new generation that slavery is wrong.

Unfortunately, a change in the law can also lead new generations astray. When the Supreme Court issued its *Roe vs. Wade* opinion in 1973, most Americans thought abortion was wrong (as evidenced by the laws in each of the fifty states which outlawed or restricted it). But today, the country is about evenly split. What happened? The law changed. In a situation the reverse of slavery, what was once considered immoral (and thus illegal) became sanctioned by the federal government. Legalization led to more social acceptance of abortion and sixteen-fold increase in abortions nationwide. If homosexual marriage is legalized, we will likely see an increase in homosexuality as well.

There is actually a third example of the law’s impact— divorce. Homosexuals are right when they say that heterosexuals have degraded marriage through divorce. But the fact that heterosexuals have degraded marriage through divorce is not an argument *for* homosexual marriage. In fact, the recent history of the law and divorce actually argues *against* homosexual marriage. The vast social problems we’re experiencing since the liberalization of divorce laws should help us realize just how important the law is to the health of the family. It should also help us realize how important traditional marriage is to the health of the country, and why we should protect marriage from the knockout blow homosexual marriage would deliver it. How would homosexual marriage do that? Point four. . .

### **4. Legalization of homosexual marriage would encourage more homosexual behavior, which is inherently destructive. It also would weaken the perceived importance of traditional marriage and its parenting role, thereby resulting in further destruction of the family and society itself.**

#### **How would Homosexual Marriage Hurt Traditional Marriage?**

Homosexual activists maintain that homosexual marriage will not affect traditional marriage. But they are wrong. Legalizing homosexual marriage would degrade traditional

---

<sup>19</sup> Andrew Sullivan, *Virtually Normal*, (USA, Vintage Books, 1996), 185.

marriage especially to future generations. How so?

Right now, the legal benefits given to married couples affirm the fact that we consider traditional marriage to be the most valuable sexual relationship in our society. That is, if sexual relationships were players on a sports team, marriage would get the most valuable player (MVP) award. In sports, that's an esteemed award because it's given only to the player whose performance is truly the most valuable. But suppose the commissioner redefined the qualifications required to win the MVP award to the point where everyone in the league got the award, even those who performed poorly. Would anyone think the MVP award was special? Obviously not—everyone would think it was meaningless! In the same way, the value of traditional marriage will be diminished if the government redefines the qualifications of marriage to include other sexual relationships (especially when it confers the same benefits on those relationships).

We need to face the facts. Just as all players are not equally valuable to a team, all relationships are not equally valuable to a society. Evidence from 5,000 years of human history, the self-evident design of the human body, and the documented-beneficial results of traditional marriage to individuals and our society, prove that the most valuable sexual relationship to any civilization is the union of a man and a woman in the bonds of matrimony. If we allow any other sexual relationship to have the same social and financial status as marriage— be it man-man, woman-woman, man-daughter, man-woman-man, or whatever-whatever— we will degrade marriage itself (just like we degrade the MVP award by giving it to everyone). When we degrade marriage, we will get less of it. And when we get less of it, we will further weaken our civilization. Children will be hurt the most.

### **How would Homosexual Marriage Hurt Children?**

How would homosexual marriage hurt children? Connect the dots: once government endorses the idea that marriage is just a legal contract between consenting adults of any gender (i.e. regardless of procreative realities), then marriage will no longer be seen as a prerequisite for children. Marriage will be seen as nothing more than coupling. In fact, that's exactly how Andrew Sullivan sees marriage now. He writes that "coupling — not procreation — is what civil marriage now is."<sup>20</sup>

If homosexual marriage is legalized, "coupling" is exactly how future generations will see the institution of marriage. If that view prevails, many more couples in our society will forgo traditional marriage and have more children out of wedlock, especially when they can get the financial benefits of marriage without making a marriage commitment. That will hurt children because illegitimate *parents* (there's no such thing as illegitimate children) often never form a family, and those that cohabit break up at a rate two to three times that of married parents. When illegitimacy rises, not only do children suffer, but the rest of us are forced to pay high social costs resulting from it (neglected and troubled children, and increases in crime, poverty, and social spending).

Are these just the hysterical warnings of an alarmist? No. We can look at the results in Norway, a country that has had homosexual marriage (without legal sanction) for about a decade. In Nordland, the most liberal county of Norway, where they fly gay "rainbow" flags over their churches, out-of-wedlock births have soared. In Nordland, more than 80 percent of women

---

<sup>20</sup>[http://www.andrewsullivan.com/index.php?dish\\_inc=archives/2004\\_01\\_25\\_dish\\_archive.html#107526329968381529](http://www.andrewsullivan.com/index.php?dish_inc=archives/2004_01_25_dish_archive.html#107526329968381529). Also quoted by Stanley Kurtz in "Slipping Toward Scandinavia," *The National Review*, February 2, 2004. <http://www.nationalreview.com/kurtz/kurtz200402020917.asp>. Accessed September 22, 2004.

giving birth for the first time do so out of wedlock and nearly 70 percent of all children are born out of wedlock! Across the entire country of Norway, the out-of-wedlock birth rate rose from 39 percent in 1990 to 50 percent in 2000.<sup>21</sup>

Social anthropologist Stanley Kurtz writes, “When we look at Nordland and Nord-Troendelag — the Vermont and Massachusetts of Norway — we are peering as far as we can into the future of marriage in a world where gay marriage is almost totally accepted. What we see is a place where marriage itself has almost totally disappeared.”<sup>22</sup> Homosexual marriage is probably not solely responsible for this growing problem, but it is certainly a contributing factor. “Instead of encouraging a society-wide return to marriage,” says Kurtz, “Scandinavian gay marriage has driven home the message that marriage itself is outdated, and that virtually any family form, including out-of-wedlock parenthood, is acceptable.”<sup>23</sup> When the entry standards for marriage are weakened to include same-sex couples, the perception of marriage will also be weakened; marriage and childbearing will just be considered incidental. That’s one reason why the number of illegitimate parents is exploding in Norway, and it’s a major reason why we shouldn’t bring homosexual marriage to America.

We have enough problems already with illegitimacy in America. We don’t need to add fuel to the fire. Unfortunately, if we go the route of Norway and legalize homosexual marriage, we’ll get the same results as Norway-- a significant rise in illegitimate parenthood and all of the social evils that come from it.

### **How would Homosexual Marriage Hurt You?**

Homosexual activists ask, “How would legalizing homosexual marriage hurt you?” Most conservatives have failed to answer this question, but it’s not hard to foresee several negative consequences on all Americans:

1. **Your income taxes may be increased** to make up for the marriage tax benefits given to homosexual couples, and to pay for the social costs resulting from the increase in illegitimacy. (We provide financial benefits to married couples because they produce and care for children. Providing financial incentives for homosexual unions would be doubly counterproductive. First, taxpayers would be subsidizing, and thus encouraging, destructive behavior. Second, we would be paying for the results of that behavior in the form of increased medical and social costs.)
2. **Your social security taxes may be increased (or benefits decreased)** in order to pay survivor support benefits to homosexual “widows” and “widowers.”
3. **Your medical insurance premiums may rise** to offset the higher health care costs associated with homosexual behavior (i.e., AIDS, colon cancer, hepatitis and other diseases) which will likely become more prevalent if we legally endorse homosexual marriage. Medical premiums would rise further if insurance companies are mandated to cover fertility treatments for lesbian couples (there’s sure to be some judge somewhere to

---

<sup>21</sup> Stanley Kurtz, “The End of Marriage in Scandinavia,” *Weekly Standard*, February 2, 2004,

[Http://www.weeklystandard.com/content/public/articles/000/000/003/660zypwj.asp](http://www.weeklystandard.com/content/public/articles/000/000/003/660zypwj.asp).

<sup>22</sup> Kurtz, “Slipping Toward Scandinavia.”

<sup>23</sup> Kurtz, “The End of Marriage in Scandinavia.”

order that).

4. **Your employee benefits may be reduced** as employers are mandated to spread their limited benefit dollars to homosexual partners. (Limited benefit dollars given to homosexuals must come from somewhere; indeed, they are taken away from everyone else-- married couples raising children).
5. **Your ability to adopt children may be hindered** as homosexual couples are given legal preference to adopt due to their inability to procreate.
6. **Your children will be indoctrinated** with or without your consent to accept homosexual behavior and homosexual marriage as the moral and social equivalent of heterosexual behavior and marriage (we are seeing this in our public schools already).
7. **Your workplace will attempt to indoctrinate you** to the same ends—and if you refuse, you will either lose your job or not be considered a “team player.” (This is already happening through “diversity” training in many companies; it will become universal if homosexual marriage becomes law.)
8. **Your place of worship may lose tax exempt status** if they refuse to hire homosexuals.
9. **Your free speech rights may be curtailed** as any opposition to homosexuality is declared illegal “hate speech” (as it is now in Canada).

These short-term negative effects are indeed significant. But as we have seen, the most dramatic impact will come upon future generations. That’s because homosexual marriage will change the way future generations think about homosexuality and marriage itself.

**5. The law should promote behaviors that are beneficial and restrain (or certainly not endorse) those that are destructive.**

Some homosexual activists apparently think the government exists to validate their desires regardless of the consequences such validation would have on others. But that’s not the purpose of government-- the main purpose of government is to protect its citizens from harm. That’s why good laws endorse behaviors that are beneficial to the public welfare and restrain behaviors that are destructive to it.

I’ve argued that traditional marriage is beneficial while homosexual marriage would be destructive. If you’re still not convinced, consider this: What would be the effect on society if everyone lived faithfully in traditional marriage? It would result in a dramatic reduction in crime, welfare, abortion and child abuse. On the other hand, what would be the effects on society if everyone lived faithfully in homosexual marriage? It would be the end of society and the human race itself.

Simply put, homosexuality is not good for individuals or societies. And while governments cannot feasibly restrain all negative behaviors, they certainly can avoid endorsing those that are. At the very least, our government must avoid endorsing homosexual behavior and homosexual marriage.

**6. Therefore, the law should promote traditional marriage, and it should restrain (or certainly not endorse) homosexual marriage or civil unions.**

The conclusion regarding homosexual marriage follows logically from the premises. But why not accept the compromise position of “civil unions”? Because civil unions would still give government endorsement and financial benefits to a destructive behavior. Playing word games will not alleviate the negative effects of such endorsement.

## **Conclusion: Protect our National Immune System**

How should we respond to the call for homosexual marriage? If we allow our emotional affection for our gay friends and relatives to interfere with sound reasoning, we risk making the same mistake that my friend's parents made—endorsing behavior that will hurt our loved ones. But our mistake will not hurt one person just once—it will hurt future generations repeatedly. Legalizing homosexual marriage will teach future generations the *false* ideas that:

1. Homosexual behavior is just as moral and healthy as heterosexual behavior;
2. Homosexual marriage is just as moral and beneficial as traditional marriage;
3. Moms and dads offer nothing uniquely beneficial to the care and development of children (homosexual couples *always* deny children either their mom or dad);
4. Marriage is no longer about procreation, just coupling. Therefore, if you want to have children, there's really no reason to get married.

These are false and dangerous ideas. Those that accept them stand to hurt themselves and others.

We must face the facts of nature-- homosexual relationships can not produce the benefits of heterosexual unions. Therefore, our laws should not be changed to pretend otherwise. After all, laws can't change the facts of nature. A new law can't magically transfer the natural procreative abilities of men and women and the benefits of traditional marriage to homosexuals. Nor can it erase the serious health problems that result from homosexual behavior. A new law legalizing homosexual marriage would only serve to *deceive* people into thinking that homosexual marriage and traditional marriage are equally beneficial. Such legally-endorsed deception would be a dangerous teacher to new generations. Yet that deception is exactly what homosexual activists are counting on to validate their lifestyle.

Only traditional marriage can secure a healthy future for our children and our entire civilization. Therefore, it alone deserves privileged legal support.

So despite what our homosexual loved ones may want, we must not make the mistake of my friend's parents. Love requires that we stand firm. And the most loving policy for them and the rest of our country is to legally protect marriage--our national immune system. Due to an activist judiciary, a Constitutional Amendment appears to be the only way we can ensure that marriage remains solely the union of one man and one woman.

## **Answering Objections**

### **What about equal rights?**

**Answer:** First, everyone in America has the same rights. We all have the same right to marry any qualified person from the opposite sex. What homosexuals want is *special* rights-- the special right to marry someone of the same sex. But why stop there? If homosexuals have a right to get married, then how can they say a man has no right to marry his daughter, his dog, his father, or three women and a poodle? Should bisexuals be permitted to marry two people?

Second, the government is not taking away the "rights" of homosexuals to have relationships. Homosexuals can relate any way they want, but they have no "right" to have that relationship recognized by the state. That's why the homosexual marriage movement has more to do with respect than rights. Greg Koukl puts this very well: "Same-sex marriage is not about civil rights. It's about validation and social respect. It is a radical attempt at civil engineering using government muscle to strong-arm the people into accommodating a lifestyle many find

deeply offensive, contrary to nature, socially destructive, and morally repugnant.”<sup>24</sup> Homosexual marriage advocate Andrew Sullivan understands this. He writes, “Including homosexuals within marriage would be a means of conferring the highest form social approval imaginable.”<sup>25</sup>

Indeed. Homosexuals want the courts to grant them legal and, therefore, social approval for their lifestyle because they know that they cannot win such approval by a fair vote of the people. Until the Massachusetts Supreme Court overstepped its authority, “we the people” have decided which sexual relationships are worthy of legal recognition and which are not. And “we the people” have done so not on arbitrary grounds, but in light of the natural biological design and compatibility of a man and a woman and all of the benefits that come from their union. In other words, we legally recognize and confer benefits on marriage because marriage benefits our society at large. Americans, like virtually every civilized people before us, have put marriage alone in privileged class because marriage alone is supremely beneficial.

Finally, while proponents of homosexual marriage cast this as a moral issue (that’s why they use the word “rights”), they lack any moral authority for their position. By whose standard of morality must homosexual marriage be legalized? Certainly the Constitution says nothing about homosexual marriage. Is there a standard beyond the Constitution? Yes, God-- but God is the last subject homosexual activists want to bring up. If they appeal to God and His absolute Moral Law— the Moral Law the Declaration of Independence says is “self-evident”— then they have to make the case that God believes homosexual marriage is a right. That’s anything but self-evident as the entire history of religion, human civilization, and the design of the human body attests.

### **Opposition to homosexual marriage is a violation of the Separation of Church and State**

**Answer:** Even if one were to accept the erroneous, court-invented claim that the constitution requires a strict separation of church and state, it would not mean that state opposition to homosexual marriage violates the constitution. Churches also teach that murder, rape and child abuse are wrong, but no one says laws prohibiting such acts comprise a violation of the “separation of church and state.” In fact, if the government could not pass laws consistent with church teachings, then all criminal laws would have to be overturned because they are all in some way consistent with at least one of the Ten Commandments.

Second, there are churches on both sides of this issue. In other words, some churches actually *support* homosexual marriage. So if there is a strict separation of church and state, then I suppose we can’t put the *pro*-homosexual marriage position into law either, right? Homosexual activists don’t want to go there.

This separation-of-church-and-state objection involves a failure to distinguish between religion and morality. Religion involves our duty to God; but morality involves our duty to one another. Our lawmakers are not telling people how, when, or if to worship—that would be legislating religion. But lawmakers cannot avoid telling people how they should treat one another— that’s legislating morality.

Contrary to popular opinion, all laws legislate morality. Morality is about right and

---

<sup>24</sup> Greg Koukl, “Same-Sex Marriage—Challenges and Responses, ” May 2004, posted on-line at [www.strradio.org](http://www.strradio.org), accessed September, 15, 2004

<sup>25</sup> Quoted in Greg Koukl, “Same-Sex Marriage—Challenges and Responses, ” May 2004, posted on-line at [www.strradio.org](http://www.strradio.org), accessed September, 15, 2004.

wrong, and every law legally declares one behavior right and its opposite wrong. So the question is not whether we can legislate morality. The question is, “Whose morality should we legislate?”

For thousands of years, we’ve legislated the self-evident truth that man is meant for woman. Now suddenly homosexuals—long critical of conservatives for trying to “legislate morality”—are trying to legislate their *own* morality in the form of homosexual marriage. They want to ignore self-evident truths and impose their own moral position on the entire country. The only question is, should we continue to legislate the morality that nurtures the next generation (traditional marriage), or the new one that entices it to destruction (homosexual marriage)?

### **Don’t write Discrimination into the Constitution**

**Answer:** Too late. It’s already there. In fact, all laws discriminate. But it’s discrimination against *behavior*, not persons; and it is discrimination *with cause* not without. For example, the First Amendment’s freedom-of-religion protections discriminate against the *behavior* of Muslims who want to impose Islam on the entire nation, but it does not discriminate against Muslims as persons. And the Thirteenth Amendment discriminates against the *behavior* of some businessmen who might like to improve their profits through slavery, but it does not discriminate against businessmen as persons. Likewise, our marriage laws discriminate against the desired *behaviors* of homosexuals, polygamists, bigamists, adulterers, and the incestuous among us, but they do not discriminate against them as persons.

Homosexuals want to be considered a special class of people that deserves special legal rights. But if we begin to classify people according to their desires or personality traits, where does it end? Should we have a special class for shy people? After all, they’re at a social disadvantage to extroverts. No, that would be absurd.

If we start to classify people by what they desire to do sexually, then we would have to give all sexual preferences and all sexual behaviors special legal status, including polygamy, incest, pedophilia, bestiality, adultery, rape, etc. “But those behaviors are harmful!” you say. Exactly, and so is homosexuality. So why is it legitimate to carve out a special case for homosexuality but not for those other behaviors?

Perhaps we should use our common sense and classify people according to the way they were designed—male and female. In other words, we should be classified by our humanity and gender, not our feelings. We are men and women, not hetero-or-homosexuals. Therefore, limiting marriage to a man and a woman does not discriminate against people of any kind because our population consists of only two kinds of people: men and women!

### **Preventing Homosexual Marriage is Bigotry.**

**Answer:** Opposition to homosexual marriage is not based on bigotry, but on good reason. Consider murder, rape and incest. Our laws rightly discriminate against those *behaviors* because those behaviors are harmful. Imagine murderers, rapists or the incestuous calling us “bigots” for enacting those laws. Such laws are the antithesis of bigotry. Bigotry involves pre-judging something for no good reason. But laws against murder, rape, and incest are based on good reason. Namely, we reasonably conclude that the health and welfare of the public are higher values than allowing individuals to do whatever they want.

The same holds true with preserving marriage. The health and welfare of the public are higher values than allowing individuals to marry whomever they want. We don’t discriminate in favor of traditional marriage and against homosexual marriage out of “bigotry” or bias, but because we are sensible human beings who draw on thousands of years of evidence to conclude

that one sexual relationship is more beneficial than any other. Some *behaviors* are better than others. That's not bigotry, but wisdom!

Of course, proponents of homosexual marriage will continue to call us bigots, which may be considered evidence that their case is flawed. Since they can't win on the merits, their only recourse is to divert attention through name calling.

By the way, the bigotry charge is another case of selective morality on the part of homosexual activists. While resistance to homosexual marriage is clearly not bigotry as they claim, we might ask them, "Why is bigotry wrong? From what moral standard are you arguing? Why can you recognize that bigotry is absolutely wrong, but refuse to admit that homosexual behavior is wrong as well?" Indeed, homosexuals acknowledge the Moral Law when it comes to the immorality of bigotry, but they conveniently ignore it when comes to their own homosexual behavior.

### **Homosexual Marriage is Like Interracial Marriage.**

**Answer:** No, interracial marriage was opposed without any valid grounds. Opponents hid their prejudice with false speculation about birth defects and the like. But since all "races" interbreed, there is no such thing as interracial marriage. Actually, there is only one race—the human race. At best, there is inter-ethnic marriage which is still between men and women. Homosexual marriage is between man-man or woman-woman. That's completely different. Interethnic couplings are benign—the man and woman are still designed for one another. But homosexual couplings are harmful because they go against the natural design. In other words, ethnicity is irrelevant to marriage—gender is essential to it.

Ironically, it's homosexual marriage *proponents* who are reasoning like racists. Instead of asking the state to *recognize* the preexisting institution of marriage, homosexuals are asking the state to *define* marriage. Well, that's exactly the line of reasoning racists used in their effort to prevent inter-racial marriage. Racists wanted the state to *define* marriage as only between same-race couples, instead of having the state *recognize* what marriage already was—the procreative union of a man and a woman regardless of their racial/ethnic background. While racists and homosexuals may want to alter the legal definition of marriage, they cannot alter the laws of nature that helped produce the recognition of legal marriage in the first place.

### **Homosexuality is Like Race.**

**Answer:** No, it's not. *Sexual behavior is always a choice, race never is.* You will find many former homosexuals, but you will never find a former African-American.

This analogy falsely assumes a homosexual act is a condition rather than a behavior. Skin color is a condition; a sexual act is behavior. Someone could be a "homosexual" in the sense of having gay feelings, but not act on them. The same can be said of a celibate person with heterosexual feelings. So technically speaking, there are no heterosexuals or homosexuals-- there are only males and females. For convenience we call people heterosexuals or homosexuals, when it would be more accurate to refer to such people as "people who desire to engage in heterosexual acts" and "people who desire to engage in homosexual acts." In other words, we are males and females by condition, and heterosexuals or homosexuals by behavior.

### **But Homosexuals Were Born that Way!**

**Answer:** If there is a real genetic component to homosexual desires, it has not been discovered. But even if there is a genetic component to *desires*, that would not give license to *behavior*. All

of us have desires that we ought not act on. There have been genetic links made to a desire for alcohol, but who would advocate alcoholism? If someone has a genetic attraction to children, does that justify pedophilia? What homosexual activist would say that a genetic predisposition to violence justifies gay-bashing? Desires do not justify behaviors. In fact, there's a word we use to describe the disciplined restraint of destructive desires— it's called *civilization*.

But homosexual activists will have none of this. Instead of restraining negative behaviors, homosexual activists are asking us not just to tolerate, but to endorse them. If we adopt their narcissistic demands—as J.D. Unwin documented by his study of 86 civilizations-- it will be just a few generations before our nation is destroyed from within.

### **But Homosexual Marriage is About Love.**

**Answer:** Even if that were true, so what? Our culture associates marriage with love, but love is not the central purpose the state recognizes marriage. The state recognizes marriage because it is the best way to produce children and propagate a stable society. Homosexual unions by nature cannot do that.

But even if love is seen as a reason for marriage, we must ask, “What kind of love typifies a homosexual relationship?” Are there men who really feel drawn romantically to other men? No doubt. Are there men who really have a deep sense of commitment to other men, wish to care for them, and be intimate with them? No doubt.

But the same might be said of a man and his daughter, a man and a child, or three men and a woman. Should those people act on their sexual desires? If they did, would their actions truly be seeking the ultimate good of the person or persons they were trying to “love?” No. Sometimes sexual acts can be unloving. In fact, even sexual acts *inside* of marriage can be unloving—when they are medically dangerous for example. This is the very case with homosexual acts. They are medically dangerous. When sex is medically dangerous, the most loving thing you can do is *not* have sex with that person.

Some may argue that, “When two adults consent to engage in homosexual acts they are each seeking the good of the other. Each person wants it and chooses it.” But if you truly love someone, will you do something that will seriously hurt or kill them? Having homosexual sex with someone does just that. It's been documented to cause disease and to shorten life spans dramatically (one study showed the median age of death in the early 40's for gay men and women *without AIDS*<sup>26</sup>). With the consequences so severe, if a man really “loved” another man, he wouldn't engage in homosexual acts with him. Besides, sex isn't the only way you can demonstrate your love for someone. Men can demonstrate their love for one another without having sex. In fact, most of our loving relationships are non-sexual.

### **I Know Loving Homosexuals Couples with Children Who Have Been Together For Years**

**Answer:** Yes, some homosexuals live long healthy lives, and some homosexuals turn out to be better parents than some heterosexuals. But the data shows that such people are the exception

---

<sup>26</sup> Paul Cameron, Ph.D., William Playfair, M.D., and Stephen Wellum, B.A., 1994. AThe Longevity of Homosexuals: Before and After the AIDS Epidemic. @ *Omega Journal of Death and Dying*, Vol. 29, Number 3, 249-272. For corroboration of these results, see Frank Turek and Norman Geisler, *Legislating Morality*. (Wipf & Stock, Eugene, Oregon), 2003 (Previously published by Bethany House, 1998), 259-260 (note 4).

rather than the rule. *And laws cannot be based on exceptions.* For example, we don't stop warning people about the dangers of smoking just because some smokers outlive non-smokers. Nor should we stop warning people about the dangers of homosexual behavior just because some homosexuals outlive some heterosexuals. And if we're not going to warn them, at the very least, we ought not endorse homosexual behavior.

If laws were based on exceptions, we would have to do away with virtually every law we have. It would require that we do away with all laws against running red lights because sometimes you can run a red light without hurting anyone. It would also require that we do away with all laws against theft because a starving man may need to steal a loaf of bread to feed his family. In fact, it would require that we do away with marriage itself because spouses in some marriages abuse one another and their children. But in doing that we'd be throwing the baby out with the bathwater. Traditional marriage, as a whole, is great for society. We can't let its exceptions prevent us from experiencing the overall benefits it produces. So, traditional marriage must remain our legal norm despite any exceptions to the rule.

### **Some Marriages Do Not Produce Children**

**Answer:** Yes, but that is the exception rather than the rule. The state recognizes marriage because marriage *in general* procreates and provides the most stable and nurturing environment for children. But by the facts of nature, no homosexual act can do this.

Second, sterile heterosexual marriages still affirm the connection to childbearing because sterility is not generally known on the wedding day. And on those few instances where sterility is known (e.g. with older couples), the man-woman union still symbolizes what is generally a procreative relationship.

Furthermore, since it would not be possible or desirable for the state to attempt to determine which men and women are capable of procreation and which are not, it allows all men and woman to marry. But since no homosexual relationship produces children, no homosexual relationship deserves to be called a marriage.

### **Opposition to Homosexual Marriage is Hate Speech**

**Answer:** Nonsense. If that were the case, then homosexual activists would be guilty of hate speech toward *heterosexuals* for trying to change the definition of marriage. Political disagreement is not hate speech. And disagreement with the radical gay political agenda does not make someone an enemy of homosexuals. I am opposed to the legal endorsement of a particular *behavior*. I am not opposed to the *people* who engage in that behavior. Just because we disagree about political ends, does not mean we ought to demonize those who disagree with us.

Ironically, those of us who are reasonably pointing out the known dangers of homosexual activity should be considered friends of homosexuals, not foes. After all, we're the ones trying to spare homosexuals from further disease and death by telling the truth about the issue. The activists who are suppressing that truth are their real enemies.

### **The President is Politicizing the Constitution**

**Answer:** President Bush didn't create this controversy because he wanted to "energize his base." Four members of an activist Massachusetts Supreme Court have created the need for a constitutional amendment by making up rights that aren't in their constitution. Their ruling now has the potential to become the law of every other state through the full faith and credit clause of the United States constitution. Think of that—four unelected justices can change the laws of the

entire country! Talk about discrimination—that’s discrimination against the other 300 million people in this country who are entitled to govern themselves!

It’s bad enough when courts act as legislatures. But it’s downright ridiculous when they legislate the unnatural. The court’s ruling on homosexual marriage legislates the unnatural. Given this ruling, it’s not hard to imagine, as I mentioned above, the courts mandating preferential adoptions and fertility and surrogate-mother insurance coverage for “reproductively-disadvantaged” gay couples.

When any court oversteps its bounds by legislating from the bench, the only sure remedy is what the President has suggested-- a constitutional amendment. Impeachment of those justices should also be conducted.