

Submission on Same-Sex Marriage  
Bill Muehlenberg, Secretary, Family Council of Victoria  
March 2012

The battle over same-sex marriage is perhaps the most momentous and far-reaching debate we face at the moment. There is very much at stake in this attempt to redefine marriage out of existence. It is a social shift which is of seismic proportions. Here I offer eight reasons why we must resist same sex marriage.

One. There is not a great demand for SSM

The truth is, there has been a huge debate amongst homosexuals over the question of homosexual marriage. Some are in favour, some are opposed, and there are many options in between. Plenty of leading homosexuals have made clear their disdain of marriage. As one said: “When it comes to same-sex marriages, John Howard has got us pretty well summed up. We’re not cut out for it. . . . [Heterosexuals are] welcome to it.”

Or as another admitted: “[F]ull recognition for same-sex marriages will encourage all those shallow promiscuous gay men to settle down in Box hill with Mr Right and breed shitzus. Speaking as a shallow promiscuous gay man, I remain sceptical about this. Straight men, it seems, are quite shameless in their perverted desires, and in their enthusiasm for illicit sex of all kinds. And this after 2,000 years of the civilising influence of Christian marriage! On the evidence so far, I think it will take more than the Ontario Supreme Court [and its support of same-sex marriage] to get the majority of gay men to get married and settle down.”

Perhaps the best way to see just how desirable same-sex marriage is, is to see how many homosexuals have actually availed themselves of it when it has been available. Consider the Netherlands where same-sex marriage has been legal since 2001. Studies have shown that only around four per cent of Dutch homosexuals have gotten married during the first five years of legalisation.

Two. This will not be marriage as we know it

The activists have made it perfectly clear that they intend to radically alter, and effectively destroy, the institution of marriage. The truth is, for all the talk about same-sex marriage, few homosexuals actually have in mind the same thing that heterosexuals have in mind. Most seek to radically expand and alter the common understanding of marriage. Long-term monogamous fidelity is seldom part of this new understanding.

One leading homosexual writes that if homosexual marriage contracts come into force, they would have to be “different”: that is, they would have to allow for “extra-marital outlets” and other major changes. Of course that undermines the very essence of marriage, which is the covenant of life-long sexual faithfulness.

Another says that he does not want to be like straights, nor embrace their marriage: “We get equality, but at a price. The cost to our community is the surrender of our unique, distinctive queer identity. The unwritten social contract at the heart of law reform is that lesbians and gays will behave respectably and comply with the heterosexual moral agenda. No more cruising, orgies or sadomasochism!”

And in countries where SSM has been legalised, a very discernable negative spill-on effect has been noticed. Marriage as an institution suffers when these counterfeits are allowed to come along and claim to be on a par with marriage. Many of the Scandinavian countries for example offer us a mountain of evidence in this regard.

Three. Monogamy is not part of the equation

Both the data on homosexual monogamy, as well as their own words, makes it clear that the idea of one partner for life is seldom desired. It is the exception to the rule. Consider just a tiny fraction of the data. One major Australian study found that 26 per cent of homosexual men had 21 to 100 partners in a lifetime; nearly 41 per cent had 101 to 1000 partners; and 17 per cent had over 1000 partners.

Another major study reported similar findings. It found that 43 per cent of male homosexuals had engaged in sex with 2 to 10 partners in the previous six months; 21 per cent had engaged in sex with 11 to 50 partners in the last six months; and 5 per cent had engaged in sex with more than 50 partners in the past six months.

And the more honest homosexuals are quite happy to concede this point, and even affirm it. Two American homosexual activists proudly state that “the cheating ratio of ‘married’ gay males, given enough time, approaches 100%. Men are, after all, as said earlier, more easily aroused than women, who tend to act as a relatively stabilizing influence; a restless gay man is more apt to be led astray by a cute face in the subway or the supermarket. Two gay men are double trouble, arithmetically squaring the probability of the fatal affairette.”

One former homosexual explains why concepts such as “monogamy” must be redefined by homosexuals: “In the gay life, fidelity is almost impossible. Since part of the compulsion of homosexuality seems to be a need on the part of the homophile to ‘absorb’ masculinity from his sexual partners, he must be constantly on the lookout for [new partners]. Consequently the most successful homophile ‘marriages’ are those where there is an arrangement between the two to have affairs on the side while maintaining the semblance of permanence in their living arrangement.”

As one Australian homosexual admitted, “monogamy is not a realistic choice for many of us . . . we don’t find one partner sufficiently fulfilling. People who argue that there would be no problem if all gay men would just be monogamous are ignoring both medical and emotional realities; with an unknown number of people already exposed to ‘the virus’ and an unknown incubation period, such advice is just too restrictive.”

#### Four. High risk lifestyles should not be given official endorsement

Countless studies have documented the high-risk and unhealthy nature of the homosexual lifestyle. So why should governments be endorsing and promoting such activity? Various studies show that homosexuals account for the majority of new cases of sexually transmitted diseases.

For example, a male homosexual is 14 times more likely to have syphilis than a male heterosexual, and eight times more likely to have hepatitis. And of course HIV/AIDS remains an overwhelmingly homosexual disease in Australia, with the overwhelming number of cases due to male homosexual activity, or intravenous drug use.

But don’t take my word for it. Consider what the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association (GLMA) have said about this. They have issued two publications warning of the health risks associated with both homosexual and lesbian lifestyles. Each one lists ten major areas of concern.

As to male homosexuals, the GLMA says that they have “an increased risk of HIV infection” and have “an increased risk of sexually transmitted infection with the viruses that cause the serious condition of the liver known as hepatitis”. Also, they “use substances at a higher rate than the general population” and “depression and anxiety appear to affect gay men at a higher rate than in the general population”. It also says that “gay men have higher rates of alcohol dependence and abuse than straight men” and that “gay men use tobacco at much higher rates than straight men”.

#### Five. Everything will change

Legalising SSM is not a small, inconsequential move. It changes everything. If homosexual marriage were to be legalised here, it would be one of the final nails in the coffin of heterosexual marriage and family. We only have to go to those countries or states which have legalised SSM. The radical ramifications for everyone else are clear to see.

The American state of Massachusetts legalised SSM in 2004, and it has been all downhill there ever since. So much negative fallout from this has occurred that I cannot even begin to document it here. The best way to see what horrors have befallen the people of Massachusetts is to see this incredible document:

[http://www.massresistance.org/docs/marriage/effects\\_of\\_ssm.html](http://www.massresistance.org/docs/marriage/effects_of_ssm.html)

And all those who have objections to this lifestyle or this new version of marriage will be forced nonetheless to acquiesce and embrace these things, even if it means going against one’s conscience or one’s faith. Consider just a few recent headlines on this:

- “Canadian Court: Marriage officials must marry homosexuals”
- “Army: court-martial Chaplains for ‘religious, conscience’ objection to homosexuality”
- “Tory MP calls for churches to be banned from holding marriages if they refuse gay couples”
- “MPs vote to stop civil servants refusing to carry out gay weddings”
- “Dutch MPs voted on Tuesday afternoon for a change in the law to prevent civil servants refusing to conduct gay marriages.”
- “Lesbian couple mulls action against Christian wedding cake baker”
- “Gay rights activist calls for boycott of Salvation Army Christmas fundraiser”

- “Attorney Says School Threatened, Punished Boy Who Opposed Gay Adoption”
- “Case of counseling student forced to undergo pro-homosexual ‘sensitivity training’ goes to court”
- “Macy’s fires woman for refusing ‘transgender’ man access to women’s fitting room”
- “All Ontario teachers will be forced to undergo ‘diversity’ training by 2013: minister”

There would be hundreds of such examples which have occurred in just the past few years. Legalising SSM is not a victimless crime. It will adversely impact every single one of us.

#### Six. It will unleash the slippery slope

Clearly, the very same arguments used for legalising SSM could be used to argue for legalising incest, polygamy, and any number of other sexual combinations. If a man wanted to have a long-term sexual relationship with his daughter, or if three women wanted to do the same, how could any society argue against it, if it has already overturned the traditional understanding of marriage?

Logically, one could argue for all sorts of combinations and permutations if we swallow the idea that same-sex couples have a right to marry. What about a bisexual who really does love both a man and a woman? Cannot this threesome qualify? The truth is, all boundaries are smashed when we redefine marriage.

One very obvious example of this is polyamory (group marriage). In fact, it has become a new cause, championed by both grassroots groups and academic supporters. A quick search of the Web will reveal just how popular the idea of polyamory is becoming. Family law reformers for example are increasingly promoting this new sexual cause.

And it is remarkable how the polyamory and polygamy advocates are simply latching on to and extending the very arguments made by advocates of same-sex marriage. They are rightly saying that if same-sex marriage is legalised, then certainly group marriage must be legalised as well.

Consider how one Australian university academic makes the case for polyamory in an article entitled, “Poly is the new gay”. She makes it clear that just as society has welcomed homosexuality and same-sex marriage, it is now time to welcome polyamory. This is how she puts it: “The more aware and accepting of diversity in relationships the more healthy our society is. . . . I look forward to a society where any loving family, irrespective of how many people it includes or what sex they are, feels safe to be open about who they are.”

Opening the door to SSM will of necessity lead to all these other radical sexual combinations as well.

#### Seven. Children will be put at risk

Fifty years of social science data have made it absolutely clear that children need a mother and a father. The evidence is simply overwhelming: by every indicator, children do best when raised by their own biological mother and father, preferably cemented by marriage.

Many thousands of studies from the world over have made this overwhelmingly clear. Any other household structure simply does not compare. Obviously with homosexual couples, any child brought into that arrangement will be disadvantaged from the very start.

And a number of studies have also shown that children raised in same-sex households do suffer on a number of levels. Children deserve better. But the interests of the child seem to be the last thing being considered in this debate. Indeed, today everyone is demanding rights to do this and that, but very few seem to realise that rights must be balanced by responsibilities.

Among other things, children need to see how men and women interact together. A homosexual or lesbian union cannot provide that role model. The right to have a child must be balanced by the rights of the child. Children should be given the first priority, and not be allowed to be used as a political football by the homosexual lobby in their efforts to seek legitimacy for their lifestyle. For the sake of our children, we should not be embracing homosexual adoption and SSM.

As one leading international authority has boldly asserted: “In three decades of work as a social scientist, I know of few other bodies of data in which the weight of evidence is so decisively on one side of the issue: on the whole, for children, two-parent families are preferable to single-parent families and step-families [and by logical implication,

homosexual families as well]. If our prevailing views on family structure hinged solely on scholarly evidence, the current debate would never have arisen in the first place.”

Eight. This is just part of a bigger radical agenda

Why is homosexual marriage even wanted? Just why is it that some homosexuals are so insistent on marriage rights? As many homosexuals themselves admit, a major reason why they want marriage is not so much to be like heterosexuals, or because they want to abandon their more free and promiscuous lifestyle, but because of its symbolic value.

It will give them public recognition, approval and acceptance. This has long been the overriding goal of the homosexual lobby: complete social and public endorsement and approval. Thus by getting marriage rights, and, in turn, the last hurdle for homosexuals, full adoption rights, homosexuals will have achieved their longstanding goal: legitimizing the homosexual lifestyle.

As even *Time* magazine admitted, in an article on same-sex marriage, the real goal is complete social acceptance and validation: “Ultimately, of course, the battle for gay marriage has always been about more than winning the second-driver discount at the Avis counter. In fact, the individual who has done most to push same-sex marriage - a brilliant 43-year-old lawyer-activist named Evan Wolfson - doesn't even have a boyfriend. He and the others who brought the marriage lawsuits of the past decade want nothing less than full social equality, total validation - not just the right to inherit a mother-in-law's Cadillac. As Andrew Sullivan, the (also persistently single) intellectual force behind gay marriage, has written, ‘Including homosexuals within marriage would be a means of conferring the highest form of social approval imaginable’.”

One leading Australian homosexual activist puts it this way: “The argument is quite simple: marriage is the ultimate legitimization of equality, according same-sex relationships the same status as heterosexual ones. Essentially this is a symbolic claim, for there is a whole raft of ways in which the state regulates relationships outside formal marriage.”

Indeed, the bottom line of all homosexual activism is ultimately just that: complete social acceptance and approval. As some American activists put it back in 1989, “to gain straight tolerance and acceptance is not just a legitimate goal of gay activism, it must be the *principal* goal.”

In sum, same-sex marriage is a bad idea. It is bad for society, bad for marriage, and bad for children. The concept is oxymoronic, and it confers no benefits to society. Indeed, as shown above, it will in fact be harmful to society. As David Coolidge summarises:

“If one believes that a good society requires a critical mass of healthy male-female marriages with children, then any policies that redefine, and thereby weaken, that basic unit are a bad idea. I believe that same-sex marriage is a bad idea, not because same-sex couples are bad people, but because same-sex marriage is not marriage. A genuinely pluralistic society must do justice to individuals. But it must also do justice to marriage.”

Note: All of the references and complete documentation for the above material can be found in my new book, *Strained Relations: The Challenge of Homosexuality* (Melbourne: Freedom Publishing, 2011).