



## How does same-sex “marriage” affect you or your marriage?

By the same token, a person could also ask, “How does my polygamous marriage affect your marriage?” or “How does my incestuous marriage affect your marriage?” In other words, this is the wrong question. The actual question is, “How will this public policy shift alter society in terms of the accumulation of such individual decisions?” True, fabricating a right to same-sex “marriage” might not induce someone personally to leave his or her spouse, but that’s not the point. We are talking about how redefining marriage affects society—children especially. Marriage should be defended because marriage benefits society. Redefining marriage would only serve the agenda of a few while hurting society as a whole. How?

The logic that leads to the conclusion that society should fabricate same-sex “marriage” starts with this assumption: “My quest for personal satisfaction in this area is more important than the well-being of other people or uniform societal norms. Therefore, I can abandon my wife and kids if I am ‘unsatisfied.’ I can demand that societal laws and policies change to accommodate me.” And what matters is not whether everyone will do this but whether the policy shift makes possible and encourages this type of societal harm. People are going to choose different pathways to “personal sexual satisfaction,” so exploitation or abandonment of others is inevitable.

Here are some of the more specific harms that one can foresee:

- **Children raised without a father or without a mother by design.** Who is not necessary to raise a child: the father or the mother? The significant social problems that President Obama decries in the inner city come from children lacking fathers. They are living out the full consequences of the norm that “personal sexual fulfillment is the ultimate goal for each individual.”
- **Religious liberty and rights of conscience.** With same-sex “marriage” in place, the government (through laws, policy, licensing, accreditation, speech codes, school curricula, etc.) must make everyone agree that each individual is free to define marriage however he or she wants—and the government, every business, every individual, etc., must accept and accommodate all of those choices. Whenever the law says something is “equal,” the law sooner or later treats those who disagree as bigots. So, same-sex “marriage” will unavoidably affect those who disagree.
- **Fewer marriages between one man and one woman.** This is what has happened in Scandinavia and Holland where same-sex “marriage” has been fabricated. Because a policy that allows same-sex “marriage” is based on the notion that every person’s ultimate fulfillment comes from self-defined sexual satisfaction, there is no reason to “save oneself for marriage.” Marriage is merely a personal preference. To pick unmarried cohabitation over marriage is no different than picking stamp collecting over coin collecting. It is a choice of no consequence based merely on personal preference.

Those who wish to redefine marriage demand that society fabricate a right to same-sex “marriage” unless those defending marriage can show with irrefutable certainty that there is immediate, devastating harm that occurs in every same-sex “marriage” situation. They know this gives them an advantage because it is an impossible standard to meet. However, it is one society in general never meets when it enacts laws involving other things deemed dangerous to society. Again, what matters is not whether harm will happen in each and every situation but whether destructive societal harm is being promoted in general.

The definition of marriage as the union of one man and one woman is an objective reality that predates the existence of federal and state government. It is not an arbitrary arrangement that the government is at liberty to redefine as it pleases. The duty of the law then is to recognize and support this reality for the common good and protection of society as a whole.