

A Case for Defending Marriage in the Public Square - Reasons for Opposing Same-Sex Marriage

Dick Pence – December 12, 2014

“A lie doesn’t become a truth and wrong doesn’t become right and evil doesn’t become good just because it’s popular. Truth is truth. Indeed, promoting truth is the only way to be perennially relevant. No revolution will last, including the sexual revolution...every lie eventually crumbles under its own deception.” [1]

During a recent conversation with an influential local Republican leader, the issue of **how our legislators should respond to the current debate over same-sex marriage** came into sharp focus. We disagreed as to whether this was a lost cause because of recent court actions. But we disagreed more fundamentally about whether same-sex marriage was an issue the State should have interest in. We also differed over whether scripture was vague about some related issues.

Because I believe that this institution is the bedrock of all cultures and because I am confident that this issue will be before the legislators in some form, I have invested here in an attempt to present a case for why marriage needs to be defended in the public square. I acknowledge that this document is not short, but this is a huge issue. My hope is that it will be a resource that will stimulate thought and debate. On the *Big Sky Worldview Forum* website <http://www.bigskyworldview.org/> under Resources, Useful Resources, “The Marriage Debate” you will find several key resources many of which are referenced here.

Recently we have seen significant activity by Lesbian-Bisexual-Gay-Transgender-Queer (LGBTQ) activists, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and Human Rights commissions to push for increased influence by LGBTQ communities. Reliable estimates put this community at 1 to 3% of our population, but this minority has become a **tiny tail wagging a huge cultural dog** in many ways – particularly with reference to the institution of marriage. While much of the current conversation revolves around their push to legalize same-sex marriage, these activists have clearly stated that this is only one step in their path to complete transformation of the moral fiber of our country. Years ago a prominent LGBTQ activists crystallized their agenda when she said this:

“Being queer is more than setting up house, sleeping with a person of the same gender, and seeking state approval for doing so. It is an identity, a culture.... It is a way of dealing with the world... Being queer means pushing the parameters of sex, sexuality, and family, and in the process transforming the very fabric of society... We must keep our eyes on the goals of providing true alternatives to marriage and of radically reordering society's view of family.” [2]

This statement should send a cold chill through our spines. While at this moment in time it appears that same-sex marriage is the inevitable future for America, I do not believe that this battle is lost. If it is, it is only because we were MIA! Painting with a broad brush, the courts

appear to have the case settled, but I will attempt to demonstrate that “the fat lady has not yet sung” – not even close. The Supreme Court has not yet spoken, and they will be under enormous pressure to uphold their own words on these matters as we will see. I believe that they will take up this case and I think we have opportunity to have a voice. [3] Later, as I outline arguments from two judges, **pay attention to how they argue that the people’s voices need to be heard.**

Furthermore, with rare exception, the church has not *engaged* this issue. I would consider *engagement* to be a series of at least three teachings on the history and Biblical perspective of the **institution of marriage**. It would take at least that long (and many hours of study) to “equip the saints” (Ephesians 4:12) to do well with this issue. Teachings on how husbands and wives should treat each other are nice, but not helpful with this issue. This would have to be followed by the spiritual leaders leading the people into the political action.

Unless we remain MIA, much more opportunity is ahead as this issue plays out over **the decades**. It will be important that those who understand the fundamental good that this God-ordained institution brings to culture, mentor others and stay engaged in this debate.

Does the State have a justifiable role to play in defending marriage? My contention is that it is one thing for the State to defend a long-held institution that benefits all of society beyond measure – an institution that is rooted in the moral-value system that built this country. It is an entirely different idea for the State to create (for example) a massive welfare programs that they argue “promotes the general welfare.” Up front I want to remind those who think they are “*the last man standing*” who want to defend the constitution, that **serious minded conservatives - who hold a high regard for this document - may disagree about “the government’s interest” in marriage for promoting the general welfare.**

I will outline eight points for your consideration. Most of these were points of disagreement – I will do my best to fairly represent the disputed points but I believe this discussion involves many Montanans. **The bottom line was that contending for the preservation of one-man, one-woman marriage was not something that should be a priority for our legislators.** Several arguments were made as you will see, but a partial justification was the thinking that **the Republican Party in Montana would be enlarged by staying out of the same-sex marriage debate.** Some of the arguments I will address are **not ones I would anticipate** from most concerned people. But because they entered into the discussion, I feel they need to be engaged in case they are presented on a broader scale in the party.

My bottom line is that marriage is the foundation of culture, losing it would undermine our entire social structure. I would contend that one way to **increase party numbers** would be to present a solid case **for the value of marriage to society.** That will be my goal in the following arguments relative to the points below. (Some key quotations will be highlighted for emphases.)

These were the points of disagreement:

1. **The courts have pretty much settled the issue of same-sex marriage whether we like it or not.** We are better off not to waste our energy on a lost cause.
2. **Society is evolving on the issue of same-sex marriage** and we only alienate those who favor it by getting in the middle of this debate.
3. **By resisting same-sex marriage we lack appeal to young voters.**
4. **Law should not be influenced by religion - much of our law does not carry a moral component and should not be influenced by religious beliefs.** As part of this issue, government has no business being involved in marriage. My argument will be much like Dr. Martin Luther King's, Dr. Norm Geisler and Dr. Frank Turek that **every law legislates morality for one side or the other.** Law is by its very nature moral in base.
5. **Scripture is silent about same-sex marriage, therefore it does not condemn it.** Furthermore, marriage has not been a long, generally held cultural norm across most cultures throughout time.
6. **Christianity's links to Old Testament polygamy weaken its argument against marriage outside of the one-man one-woman tradition because Scripture never condemns polygamy.**
7. *** Does marriage promote the flourishing of all – in particular Children?** While this was not a point we discussed, it is fundamental in the argument. By inference, the above arguments **vacate** the debate for this institution as a preserver of a moral culture and the **betterment of flourishing for all.**
8. **As a subset of point 5, my friend contended that Procreation was not a primary purpose for marriage** and is a poor argument against same-sex marriage. This sub-point will not be examined at length but you will find this issue imbedded in much of the other discussion.

As we look at these issues, the evidence I will present does not fall neatly into these eight categories. Many of the arguments will touch on several of the above issues at once.

Underlying this conversation about homosexuality and same-sex marriage is a shift that has occurred in our society - particularly with reference to conservatives concerning key values.

*“What makes this moral revolution so vast in consequences and importance is this: **the moral dimension has virtually disappeared from the cultural conversation.** This is true, we must note, even among the defenders of heterosexual marriage. [4]*

This is a stinging rebuke suggesting that conservatives have abandoned the cultural debate. Rationalism and pragmatic thinking did not build this country. Principled men stood strong against tyrannical rule at a very high personal price. Make no mistake, we are facing a tyrannical opponent! Sometimes the right arguments just have to be made, even if they do not win at any given hour. The truth will stand the test of time.

I offer the following arguments against the point outlined above:

1. **Have the Courts really settled this issue of same-sex marriage?** Are we better off not to waste our energy on these causes? Written between the lines in this argument, you will also hear much about **point two** – has society’s view of marriage evolved? You will hear much relating to **question four** - does government have an interest in protecting marriage. Judge Sutton - who has a reputation for standing for the U.S. Constitution – also touches on **point five** above – is marriage a long standing institution across cultures?

Ryan T. Anderson from the Heritage Foundation is one of the leading scholars of our day on these issues. He offers us a starting platform for relating to how this institution is the underpinning for all cultures.

“Marriage predates government. It is the fundamental building block of all human civilization. Government recognizes marriage because it benefits society in a way that no other relationship does. Marriage has a public purpose that transcends its private purpose. That is why 41 states, with good reason, affirm that marriage is between a man and a woman.” [5 p.1]

There is nothing illegal about two people entering an agreement in a ceremony in their group. What is at issue is whether the government will recognize such relationships as marriages—and then force every citizen, house of worship, and business to do so as well. At issue is whether policy will coerce and compel others to recognize and affirm same-sex relationships as marriages. All Americans have the freedom to live as they choose, but they do not have the right to redefine marriage for everyone else. [5 p.6]

It is at this point, however, where rogue judges have stepped out on their own as activists to legislate rather than interpret law as Al Mohler comments:

“Judges who have ruled against state measures limiting marriage to a man and a woman have acted recklessly imperiling both the rule of law and the institution of marriage... These judges, have substituted their own moral judgment for the rule of law. [6 p.5]

The above referenced article by Dr. Al Mohler Jr., President of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (himself a stout defender of our constitution) **reviews the majority opinion of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals** who upheld their states’ (Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky and Tennessee) rights to ban same-sex marriage. Mohler quotes Judge Jeffrey S. Sutton in what is a landmark challenge to those who desire to reverse our moral base. **This warning by Sutton ought to impose a sobriety in our discussions of this topic.**

“A dose of humility makes us hesitant to condemn as unconstitutionally irrational a view of marriage shared not long ago by every society in the world, shared by most, if not all, of our ancestors, and shared still today by a significant number of the States.” [6 p.4]

The historical precedence is easily documented and will be referenced later. English philosopher G.K. Chesterton put it in even more clearheaded terms.

"This triangle of truisms, of father, mother, and child, cannot be destroyed; it can only destroy those civilizations which disregard it.... One should never tear a fence down unless he knows why it was put there in the first place...this is especially true in the matter of reforming things." [7 p.15 & 22]

Both Sutton and Mohler suggest that the *Rule of Law* and historical-cultural-norm are part of this decision making process. Recognizing the good of cultures (seeking the general welfare) throughout history complements the constitution and has historically been a part of judicial considerations. The consideration here is **do we cave** in to activist Progressive judges who step outside of their constitutional authority **in the short run**? Or, do we remain steadfast in the conversation **in the long run** and elect those who appoint constitutionally minded judges?

Ideas have consequences and these ideas stand in sharp contrast to a statement made by Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall (a liberal JFK appointee and supporter of abortion) when he told a group of his clerks his legal philosophy.

"You do what you think is right and let the law catch up," [8]

That is not a statement that honors the rule of law. It is a statement of judicial imposition – very common in our day - and it is exactly what our legislators will face in increased measure in 2015.

James Madison said *"Those who overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people... are tyrants."*

British historian Edward Gibbon put it this way in *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* – *"The discretion of the judge is the first engine of tyranny."* [9 p.71]

While this type of judicial activism is not new, we need to realize that it will continue and increase unless an informed electorate pushes back both in the voting booth and in the court of public opinion. At what point would Civil Disobedience be proper? If Obama can ignore the law, it suggests some interesting questions?

As suggested earlier, there is reason to be encouraged. There are recent cases that will push the United States Supreme Court to act. They will also have to face the fire of dismissing former Supreme Court opinions as we will see. Judge Sutton's opinion is a triumph of constitutional argument and the defense of common sense. It is a masterpiece of logic and a compelling argument for the rule of law - **he makes five basic arguments:**

#1. Who is making the decisions and what does history say about this?

Sutton noted that *"the speed of the moral revolution that has produced same-sex marriage in many states, is **mostly by judicial action**. From the vantage point of 2014, it would now seem, the question is not whether American law will allow gay couples to marry; it is when and how that will happen..."*

marriage has long been a social institution defined by relationships between men and women. So long defined, the tradition is measured in millennia, not centuries or decades. So widely shared, the tradition until recently had been adopted by all governments and major religions of the world.

This first argument has to do with the fact that the issue is now being decided in the courts. He clearly rejected the idea that a handful of judges should “*make such a vital policy call for the thirty-two million citizens*” who reside within the Sixth Circuit. That is a rare and refreshing statement of judicial humility. Here we see first hints that Sutton does not believe that this issue is settled and also his view that government has a justifiable interest in this issue.

The Supreme Court will have to face its own precedence! Sutton cited the decision of the Supreme Court in 1972 to refuse to take a case about same-sex marriage from Minnesota, stating that the issue did not raise “*a substantial federal question.*” **The Supreme Court may revisit that judgment, Judge Sutton noted, but it has not. Until then, he advised, lower courts are to be confined by that decision.** The recent *Windsor* case [overturning the Defense of Marriage Act], Judge Sutton argued, did not address that decision [*Baker v. Nelson*], and thus the judgment of the Court stands.

He noted, this has not prevented other federal courts from ignoring the precedent. Some of those other courts cited “**doctrinal developments**” (judicial activism and cultural evolution) in making their decisions to strike down state provisions limiting marriage to a man and a woman, but Judge Sutton advised that such a reading of “doctrinal developments” apart from a clear Supreme Court ruling would be “*a groundbreaking development on its own.*”

#2. States have the right to define marriage

Sutton argued that the original intention of the framers was that the states have the right to define marriage as the union of a man and a woman. “*Nobody in this case, argues that the people who adopted the Fourteenth Amendment understood it to require the States to change the definition of marriage.*”

Furthermore, he argued, the Supreme Court ruled just last year by making the **same logical** argument. In the case *Town of Greece v Galloway*, the Supreme Court held that Greece, New York was acting within constitutional bounds when it began its town council meetings with prayer. The Court ruled that the framers of the Constitution would not have understood themselves to violate the Constitution when they opened their own sessions with prayer, as both the House of Representatives and the Senate do even today. Similarly, Judge Sutton argued that the framers of the Fourteenth Amendment clearly did not see that language as requiring states to legalize same-sex marriage.

#3. The biological basis of natural marriage, based in the complementarian nature of the male-female union, is a natural and lawful concern of the state. “*The state is within its proper domain in defining and limiting marriage to the uniquely procreative union of a man and a*

woman. A society has the right to establish ground rules for marriage and most especially a need to create stable family units for the planned and unplanned **creation of children.**”

“What we are left with is this: By creating a status (marriage) and by subsidizing it (e.g. with tax-filing privileges and deductions), the States created an incentive for two people who procreate together to stay together for purposes of rearing offspring. This does not convict the States of irrationality, only of awareness of the biological reality that couples of the same sex do not have children in the same way as couples of opposite sexes and that couples of the same sex do not run the risk of unintended offspring. This explanation, still relevant today, suffices to allow the States to retain authority over an issue they have regulated from the beginning.”

#4. Why is marriage still to be defined in terms of monogamy?

“If it is constitutionally irrational to stand by the man-woman definition of marriage, it must be constitutionally irrational to stand by the monogamous definition of marriage,” he stated. He also recorded that in the oral arguments the attorneys arguing for same-sex marriage had been unable to answer this question. They could not, he stated, because the only argument they could advance was moral tradition. **They could not** cite moral tradition as the authority for monogamy because **they argued that moral tradition was not a rational basis for law when it came to limiting marriage** to a man-woman union. Judge Sutton also noted that the Supreme Court has not defined any “fundamental right” for same-sex couples to marry.

#5. Should judges interpret the Constitution as a “living document”, recognizing the evolution of moral judgment in the larger society?

“If society is really evolving on this issue then the advocates of same-sex marriage should allow the democratic process to work. If morality is really evolving, then the matter will be settled democratically on the basis of the new morality. The only justification for going to the courts to deal with the issue is a lack of confidence that the society is actually evolving on the question.” Furthermore, the “living constitution” arguments really rest on the **evolving judgments of judges, not of the people**. The theory of the living constitution, rests on the premise that every generation has the right to govern itself. If that premise prevents judges from insisting on principles that society has moved past, so too should it **prevent judges from anticipating principles that society has yet to embrace.**”

Then, Judge Sutton offered an even more powerful assertion: “If, before a new consensus has emerged on a social issue, federal judges may decide when the time is ripe to recognize a new constitutional right, surely the people should receive some deference in deciding when the time is ripe to move from one picture of marriage to another.” [6]

But alas, the Sixth Circuit is not the only court arguing that this case is not settled and we should move on. In October United States District Judge Juan Pérez-Giménez [upheld Puerto Rico’s law](#) defining [marriage as the union of a man and a woman](#). He concluded that the U.S. Constitution does not require [the redefinition of marriage](#).

Notably, Pérez-Giménez becomes the [first Democrat-appointee to the federal bench to uphold marriage law](#) since the [Supreme Court's Windsor decision on the Defense of Marriage Act case](#)

Some of his reasoning was similar to that of Judge Sutton as you will see from a cross section of his comments:

The Supreme Court's *Windsor* decision is the one that Pérez-Giménez highlights as to why **states** have constitutional authority to make marriage policy: ***"The Windsor opinion did not create a fundamental right to same gender marriage nor did it establish that state opposite-gender marriage regulations are amendable to federal constitutional challenges. If anything, Windsor stands for the opposite proposition: it reaffirms the States' authority over marriage, buttressing Baker's conclusion that marriage is simply not a federal question."***

Pérez-Giménez goes on to cite *Windsor*: *"the definition of marriage is the foundation of the States' broader authority to regulate the subject of domestic relations with respect to the 'protection of offspring, property interests, and the enforcement of marital responsibilities.'"*

The judge also appeals to an earlier Supreme Court case, *Baker v. Nelson*, where the Court rejected a challenge to a state's marriage law because, the Court said, the challenge lacked a *"substantial federal question."* Pérez-Giménez explains: (As did Judge Sutton)

"Contrary to the plaintiffs' contention, Windsor does not overturn Baker; rather, Windsor and Baker work in tandem to emphasize the States' "historic and essential authority to define the marital relation free from federal intrusion."

Pérez-Giménez also points out that *"his Circuit Court has cited the authority of Baker: The First Circuit expressly acknowledged—a mere two years ago—that Baker remains binding precedent unless repudiated by subsequent Supreme Court precedent."* And, the judge points out, he *"cannot see how any 'doctrinal developments' at the Supreme Court change the outcome of Baker or permit a lower court to ignore it."*

Indeed, the judge has harsh words for other judges who have struck down state marriage laws: ***"It takes inexplicable contortions of the mind or perhaps even willful ignorance—this Court does not venture an answer here—to interpret Windsor's endorsement of the state control of marriage as eliminating the state control of marriage."***

"Just so. And if state [marriage laws ever make it back to the Supreme Court](#), this is precisely what the Court should rule. Indeed, Pérez-Giménez highlights what other courts have frequently forgotten about [the rationale underlying marriage laws](#):

"Recent affirmances of same-gender marriage seem to suffer from a peculiar inability to recall the principles embodied in existing marriage law. Traditional marriage is "exclusively [an] opposite-sex institution . . . inextricably linked to procreation and biological kinship." Traditional marriage is the fundamental unit of the political order. And ultimately the very

*survival of the political order depends upon the **procreative potential** embodied in traditional marriage.”*

Those are the well-tested, well-proven principles on which we have relied for centuries. The question now is whether judicial “wisdom” may contrive methods by which those solid principles can be circumvented or even discarded. [10]

My conclusion is that this issue is not yet settled in the courts. While there is disagreement about the “States role in marriage”, these judges contend that it has a role. While this discussion is playing out - in the meantime - our voice against same-sex marriage is important. The idea that our Legislators should not engage in this conversation is irresponsible and reckless. At a most fundamental level, this is conceding to Progressive Politics.

2. Is society really evolving in favor of same-sex marriage to the extent many are claiming?

Much of the above argument casts this question in dubious light! While it is true that our culture has been becoming more apathetic about marriage in general and same-sex marriage in particular (this is especially true with younger voters) the majority of voters still favor bans on same-sex marriage. In fact, in the last few months there has been a reversal in trends – same-sex marriage may be taking a hit in terms of its rising popularity. Perhaps people have been shocked out of their slumber as they are seeing the LGBTQ agenda being played out across America in so many ways. While we do live in an apathetic society - social media, the internet, and alternative media sources have exploded the distribution of cultural news. As militant activists have attempted to bully their way to dominance, they have exposed their agendas even to the more uninformed. The Houston event and other cases have exposed, even to the touchy-feely crowd, the reality that LGBTQ troops are not the innocent little victims they pretend to be.

The fact still remains that in the majority of states, there have been bans on same-sex marriage. Those that have been overturned have been the result of *Judicial Fiat*.

You also have to factor into this equation the *information base* our culture is exposed to. It is no secret that public education has been demonstratively pro LGBTQ for decades and has promoted the homosexual life style and same sex marriage with diligence. Massachusetts public schools began teaching grade-school students about same-sex marriage in 2006, defending their decision to redefine marriage, because they are “*committed to teaching about the world they live in.*” An appellate court ruled that parents have no right to exempt their students. [5 p.11]

Reference 11 sited below coupled with the University of Texas study sited under **point 7** bring into sharp focus how effective indoctrination is with respect to this behavior. In fact, public

education has acted as a “recruiting tool” endorsing the homosexual life style. The following quote is representative of the agenda of much of our public education system.

“The fear of the religious right is that the schools of today will be the governments of tomorrow. And you know what, they’re right. If we do our jobs right, we’re going to raise a generation of kids who don’t believe the claims of the religious right” [11 p.47]

The argument of “wanting to be on the right side of history” - and assuming that **we know how this will work in the long run** - stands in contrast here to being “on the wrong side of truth.” Some arguments need to be made even if they don’t win the day... today. Many who are so sure we should leave this argument alone as a lost cause, were not even born when Roe vs. Wade occurred. They have only seen the discussions that have occurred lately. They are unaware that people like Francis Schaeffer and others were laying the groundwork for arguments we are now starting to see turn in our favor. *The Long Run* - where were they when resources like *Whatever Happened to the Human Race – Exposing our Rapid Yet Subtle Loss of Human Rights* (about abortion and life) - 1979), *How Should We Then Live – The Rise and Decline of Western Thought and Culture* (1976), and *A Time for Anger – The Myth of Neutrality* (over abortion) - 1982 were laying the foundations for the Pro-Life debate across America?

And that, I would contend, is the biggest error that these Republicans arguing for us to “stand down” on this issue are missing – **the long run. What will be the result to a culture who plays loose with this truth?** I think Chesterton has already defined it for us.

Writing in a blog for the National Organization for Marriage (**NOM**) Brian Brown reiterates the majority opinion, written by Justice Jeffrey Sutton and how he argues forcefully that courts should leave a decision about changing "such a fundamental social institution" as marriage to the American people and the democratic process. **But he also challenges the idea that the battle for public opinion is lost.**

The Sixth Circuit was certainly correct to frame the question before them as 'who decides'?

“We wholeheartedly agree that the American people should decide this issue. But the majority is wrong to suggest that voters have changed their minds. In fact, in the vast majority of states that now have redefined marriage, it's been judges and not voters who have done this. The movement to redefine marriage does not benefit from having momentum, it benefits from the exercise of raw political power by federal and state judges and politicians bent of imposing their politically-correct view of the world on the American people.”

Our thinking stinks if we forget how easily public opinion changes like the wind! It is fickle! Too often, we see public opinion influenced by what is in the news media and what so called public polls say. Often these polls are not representative of reality. *What should we do* - is often tainted by an attitude that *just gives into* what seems inevitable.

NOM pointed to several recent developments to show that support for same-sex marriage is waning.

"Just look at what's happened in just the last few days, [Nov. 6, 2014] In Ohio, advocates of gay 'marriage' have pulled a ballot petition because of the fear they will lose. In North Carolina, a poll last week showed that support for traditional marriage stood at 72%, an eleven point increase over the 61% of voters who passed their marriage amendment."

Marriage just played a central factor in the defeat of both U.S. Senators Kay Hagan (NC) and Mark Pryor (AR), not to mention numerous other candidates, including several Republicans, who favor redefining marriage. **And an NBC election-day survey found that support for redefining marriage had plateaued while opposition had increased by two points.** The reality is that same-sex marriage is entirely a creation of the elite in boardrooms and courtrooms and not something that is supported by the American people." [12]

My conclusion is that while public support for same-sex marriage has increased over recent years, recent trends are pointing in the opposite direction. The Montana Family Foundation recently said they have seen a 4% reversal in these trends. Polling last summer showed that Billings did not favor an NDO – that alone suggests that the public is not buying the LGBTQ propaganda. As the Progressives have over-played their hand, the public is beginning to awaken. **In the long-run, we have opportunity to reverse these trends,** but the church is going to have to become salt and light and this means educating.

3. By resisting same-sex marriage, do we in fact lack appeal to young voters?

Millennials tend to be skeptical of institutions and authority, idealistic about culture, egotistical about their belief systems, and self-centered in their desires. Many of them have observed marriage to be problematic. They also trend towards a lower acceptance of moralistic norms. However, they are **motivated to be involved in bringing solutions.** They want to make a difference. And, they generally have a **desire to be mentored by someone older who they trust.** [13]

As one involved in educational efforts pertaining to worldview issues, it is frustrating when grown people suggest that we should follow the dictates of young people who have limited exposure rather than accepting the charge to mentor and guide them. Listening to them and respecting them is one thing, following is another.

I am aware that this demographic tends to favor same-sex marriage more than others. This is primarily because they have not seen marriage done well and its value has not been communicated well. Barna Research suggests that their moral values also taint their opinions about sex in general. If your focus is on "short-run-results" then downplaying resistance to homosexual marriage would be the right thing to do to get their vote.

But beware, another key characteristic with this group is lack of TRUST. If they figure out that you USED them and kind of lied to them by not being straight with them - you will lose them. They may be opinionated and egotistical, but they detest being treated like they cannot learn, grow, and make a difference. They have a high opinion of their opinion, but at the same time they want to do the right thing. If you're interested in their welfare and the welfare of society then you have to ask two questions:

First why are Millennials OK with same-sex marriage and second is it in their best interest in the long run?

If you consider the **three information sources** they are exposed to, it is little wonder that they have no opposition. We have already alluded to the reason for the first part. If you are at all in tune with what our **education system** has been serving up for decades then you understand why they are just fine with homosexual marriage. Clearly, they have been evangelized by the educational system. **Second**, if realize how much of our media portrays same-sex marriage then you know that for decades, the LGBTQ activists have been in bed with media sources to purposely **promote same-sex programming** and positive attitudes towards this life style. This is especially true in programming that relates to family life style focused on Millennials. **Third**, (once again) the church has not addressed the institution of marriage, the pathologies of homosexuality and same-sex marriage, or any other part of this issue in a way that would **equip young adults to responsibly examine these issues**. Millennials have not been mentored well and deep down, they know it. **They just see our condemnation of homosexuality, same-sex marriage** and they are very sensitive to this attitude. When it comes to fairness (Social Justice) most of them "drank the Kool Aid."

The second question would appear to be a no-brainer – is it in their best interest? Studies from numerous conservative sources have documented what our culture will be like if we cave in to the homosexual agenda. If you believe what George Washington and other Founders said - that a Representative Republic cannot be sustained without a moral base - then you have to face the reality that our kids will not enjoy liberty if the vocal LGBTQ crowd gets their way. They are out to destroy our moral base. *The Overhauling of Straight America*, [14] is an eight page manifesto written by LGBT activists in 1987 <http://www.hawaiiexpress.com/ArticlesMain/tabid/56/ID/2017/The-Overhauling-of-Straight-America.aspx> In this document they have plainly stated that their goal is to radically transform the moral fabric of America. **Marriage is just an intermediate step along the way.**

My conclusion is that we need to work with young adults to have good conversations about this important issue. First we must understand this issue in considerable depth. You ask yourself - what kind of future do you want for the young people that you love?

4. Is it correct to assert that not all law should be influenced by religion?

Does it hold that not all law carries moral component? Another part of the discussion

referenced in the beginning related to whether the church was to judge outsiders. (I Corinthians 5:12) Is this assertion relevant to this issue?

The words of a well-respected Reformer are perhaps a helpful guide here:

“There is not a square inch in the whole domain of our human existence over which Christ, who is Sovereign over all, does not cry: ‘Mine!’” (Abraham Kuper 1837-1920)

One of the central issues of the Reformation was a truth we have lost hold of - the idea that **there should not be a separation in our thinking between the sacred and the secular**. Every part of life and culture should be touched by ideas from our faith. Those who would accuse that this is *theocracy thinking* badly misunderstand the difference between being **influencers and being dictators**. **The alternative to this is what has become common in the church and is known as *The Sacred-Secular Division***. Unquestionably, this error is in play here though it is not easily discerned or admitted.

Charles Colson and Nancy Pearcey move this thinking forward when they put it to us this way: *“To engage the world... requires that **we understand** the great ideas that compete for people’s minds and hearts [because] ideas have consequences. It is great ideas that inform the mind, fire the imagination, move the heart, and shape the culture. History is little more than the recording of the rise and fall of great ideas, the worldviews, that form our values and move us to act.”* [15 p. 17]

The issue in the public square then becomes whose ideas are going to win the day – day by day? If we are not in the conversation then the outcome is certain.

At primary issue in this debate is does the government have any business in marriage?

The Heritage Foundation has much to say about this. They have certainly been counted as those supporting the constitution and small government. But they also recognized that law has a place in the issue of marriage:

*“Why does marriage matters for policy? Government recognizes marriage because it is an institution that **benefits society in a way that no other relationship does**. Virtually every political community has regulated male–female sexual relationships. This is not because government cares about romance as such. Government recognizes male–female sexual relationships because these alone produce new human beings.”* [5 p.4]

Digressing for a moment to consider the accusation that our “interference with same-sex marriage” is **judging the world** (I Corinthians 5:12). Does this fit the context in any way? **Obviously, it is a complete misunderstanding of the salt-light principle**. This is not about condemning individuals, it is about what the moral base of society will look like. Judging the morality of the LGBTQ life style as outside of the will of God and detrimental to society is something we are clearly called to do. **It is an entirely consistent then to contend in the public**

square for whose ideas that will shape culture – including the defense of the institution of marriage.

Returning to the central issue, **is there any idea or law that has no moral component? The big lie has long been “you can’t legislate morality.** Well, news flash, the Left has been doing a stellar job at it for decades. Just take a look at the welfare legislation they imposed before 1994 that so disadvantages married couples!

Think for a minute about what Jefferson addressed in the Declaration of Independence. There was “taxation without representation” and now we legislate that all the time. There were issues about fair trade, but we legislate unfair trade now all the time. Why, because the other sides ideas prevailed! Norman Geisler and Frank Turek - two of America’s leading Christian apologist - have written a book about this. Here is their conclusion about the Declaration of Independence.

*“When you really get down to the heart of the matter, the principle reason the colonists declared their independence was because they believed the king of Britain was not legislating morally... the edicts of the king were simply wrong... Their objection was not about legislating morality – they realized that **all laws declare one behavior wrong and another right**. Their objection centered on whose morality was being legislated.” [16 p.18]*

In fact, if there is not some sort of injustice under consideration at the moment we consider a law, why would we need that law or limitation in the first place? These authors up-the-ante when they say...

In the Declaration... Jefferson didn’t appeal to the Bible... to prove the monarch was wrong. Instead he recognized that the same fairness that came instinctively to him also came instinctively to the rest of the world... thus he appropriately referred to Natural Law. [16 p. 19]

They believed that rights are God given, universal, and absolute – they are the rights of all people in all places at all times, regardless of nationality or religion. Again, while these are biblical truths, Jefferson did not appeal to the Bible, but to Natural Law.

For those inclined to object that I am **still appealing to some sort of higher authority** here, I confess they are right. But to **what and who** do you think the LGBTQ crowd is appealing to for their rights? Think long and hard before you strip this justification from us because **there are only two sources of truth** – only two!

Jefferson and the founders did not begin the Declaration with the words “**we hold these opinions to be self-evident.**” And they did not apologize for holding to a godly source for their truth – must we?

“These men believed so strongly in the right to establish morality through legislation that they promised to die for it. However, it is critical to recognize that the founders were not pledging

their lives to restore someone's revealed religion, but everyone's self-evident morality." [16 p. 20]

The founders avoided the extremes of developing a government based on religious doctrine or secular ideas. They developed a third alternative to the religious/secular dilemma by calling on **moral law of inalienable rights** (the Laws of Nature and nature's God) that they believed all people understand. [16] And, I would add that this is consistent with what Paul writes in Romans – these laws are written on their hearts – whether they acknowledge them or not.

For those inclined to think you can't legislate morality, consider the 13th amendment that outlawed slavery - think that caused any waves? We could go on naming legislation – some good, some bad including Roe vs. Wade – but I think you would be **hard pressed to find any that was morally neutral.**

For those inclined to de-link government from marriage I highly recommend that they first read *Marriage and the Public Good: Ten Principles* www.princetonprinciples.org © 2008 from by The Witherspoon Institute. [17]

I would also urge them to thoughtfully read section 7 here considering the flourishing of children. This goes to the interest of the state in "promoting the general welfare." While I recognize that this clause has been used to **justify all sorts of legislative mischief**, we must at the same time recognize that it does apply in some cases. Is this one of them?

Marriage cannot survive or flourish when the ideal of marriage is eviscerated. Radically different understandings of marriage, when given legal status, threaten to create a culture in which it is no longer possible for men and women to understand the unique goods that marriage embodies: the fidelity between men and women, united as potential mothers and fathers, bound to the children that the marital union might produce. Maintaining a culture that endorses the good of marriage is essential to ensuring that marriage serves the common good. And in a free society such as our own, a strong marriage culture also fosters liberty by encouraging adults to govern their own lives and rear their children responsibly. [17, p.21]

"As honest advocates of same-sex marriage have conceded, to abandon the conjugal conception of marriage—the idea of marriage as a union of sexually complementary spouses—eliminates any ground of principle for limiting the number of partners in a marriage to two. It would open the door to legalizing polygamy and polyamory (group marriage), and produce a culture in which marriage loses its significance and standing, with disastrous results for children begotten and reared in a world of post-marital chaos." [17, p. 21]

My conclusions are that we should avoid the thinking that plays to a sacred-secular division. While we must be careful about the States' interest in marriage, there is good reason for it to have interest both from the point view of the constitution and its application throughout history. The idea that all law is not influenced by morality argues against common sense. A simple question can be asked – whose' morality will be benefited by this law? Multiple

arguments suggest that advocating against same-sex marriage is the position we should hold fast to for the individual and the common good.

5. **Is Scripture silent about same-sex marriage therefore not condemning of it?** A part of this issue is history – is marriage a long, widely held institution in most cultures? If it is, this would play in concert with the scriptural argument... *from the beginning*.

First, what about the history of marriage? The Judges had some things to say, now let's look at what conservative scholars have to say:

"The understanding of marriage as the union of man and woman is shared by the Jewish, Christian, and Muslim traditions; by ancient Greek and Roman thinkers untouched by these religions; and by various Enlightenment philosophers. It is affirmed by both common and civil law and by ancient Greek and Roman law. Far from having been intended to exclude same-sex relationships, marriage as the union of husband and wife arose in many places, over several centuries, in which same-sex marriage was nowhere on the radar. Indeed, it arose in cultures that had no concept of sexual orientation and in some that fully accepted homoeroticism and even took it for granted. [5 p.3]

There are perhaps no more well informed individuals in America on marriage – it's history, what it is, and its benefits - than Ryan T. Anderson with the Heritage Foundation and Dr. Robert George at Princeton. Anderson writes frequently on it, George is a well-respected scholar across many denominations. They make it very clear that marriage has been accepted in nearly all cultures from the beginning.

"There is a distinct form of personal union and corresponding way of life, historically called marriage, whose basic features do not depend upon the preferences of the individual or cultures." [18]

These authors go on to make it clear that this is currently *the will of the people* in America (as of 2012 at this writing)

"All told the people of 44 states have affirmed the conjugal [traditional] view of marriage by direct vote or through their representatives." [18 p. 4]

Marriage as defined by Webster's 1828 Dictionary is:

"The act of uniting a man and woman for life; wedlock; the legal union of man and woman for life. Marriage is a contract both civil and religious... Marriage was instituted by God himself for the purpose of preventing the promiscuous intercourse of sexes, for promoting domestic felicity, and for securing the maintenance and edification of children."

Webster was himself a well-informed Christian who felt it his calling to produce a dictionary. His opinion is obviously reflective of that background. Before he wrote any definition, he would compare numbers of definitions from esteemed men. This definition would have had to be consistent with his opinion of scripture.

What is true about marriage... “from the beginning?” What was God’s intent in creation? Did Jesus speak about marriage? In Matthew the Pharisees ask Jesus a less-than-sincere question about when divorce is allowable. As He often did, Jesus moved past their question to the heart of the matter - revealing that there is **something more fundamental about marriage that they are missing** in Jewish law. Here Jesus showed that He cared about marriage as well as the form marriage takes. Therefore we should too!

“Have you not read that He who created them from the beginning MADE THEM MALE AND FEMALE?” (Matthew 19:4 - NASV)

In light of all God did to bring the first man and woman together, Genesis 2 closes with a definitive statement that this created norm is forever embedded by God into the human story. So it is in harmony with this conclusion that Jesus continues with God’s created intent for marriage - framing his reply to the Pharisees with the language of Genesis 2:24 –

“For this cause a man shall leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife and they shall become one flesh. Consequently, they are no more two, but one flesh. Whatever God has joined together, let no man separate” (Matthew 19:4-6)

In this God-given, Jesus-endorsed design we find three essential characteristics of marriage:

- ✚ Marriage is a man and woman becoming one in every way. Marriage is oriented toward procreation – not only companionship and pleasure. In the Genesis context, the act of two becoming one flesh reasonably assumes God’s intent of filling the earth - procreation.
- ✚ Marriage comes with the expectation of permanence.
- ✚ It is not reasonable from the context about “one flesh” that Jesus is suggesting anything but one man and one woman. It is also untrue to scripture to suggest that Jesus and St. Paul are out-of-step with each other. In the first chapter of Romans, Paul clearly warns of the dangers of homosexuality. The *“red letter Bible mentality”* that suggests that Jesus himself has to say that homosexuality and same-sex marriage are outside of His will in order to make valid this claim, is inconsistent with conservative scholarship.[\[7, see discussion - p.35 &40\]](#)

Numerous places, scripture speaks with great warning about the homosexual life style. Romans chapter one could not be clearer. Without going further in that discussion, it is reasonable to assert that if **homosexuality** is outside of the will of God and is **detrimental to the individual** and culture. How then can the union of two homosexuals be anything but worse – for them, **for society**, and for their children?

My conclusion is that throughout the history of the vast majority of cultures - and the church - marriage has been seen as the union of man and woman. Scripture is not silent about marriage nor is Jesus. Genesis speaks of them becoming “one-flesh” as does Jesus. To suggest

that Jesus has to speak specifically against homosexuality to make valid its condemnation is to suggest that He and the apostle Paul were in disagreement about the issue.

6. **Is it true that polygamy was common in former times and that God sanctions it?** Is it then correct to argue that one-man with one-women is **the ideal**, but not the necessary God-approved pattern? Does it follow then that the argument of those who contend - from a religious point of view - for one-man one-woman marriage as an exclusive institution have **no solid historical or scriptural grounds** from which to persuade? Would this then also open the door for other types of marriage, even same-sex marriage?

Does the frequency of Polygamy in the Old Testament suggest that God was OK with it? In a conversation with a young pastor friend who has respectable theological credentials, his remark was...

*"This is theology 101. This is a misunderstanding of the **sovereign will of God vs. his permissive will**. It is a basic misunderstanding of scripture to think that God approved of Polygamy."*

Dr. R.C. Sproul comments on this contrast saying...

*"The distinction between the sovereign will of God and the permissive will of God is fraught with peril and tends to generate untold confusion. In ordinary language, the term permission suggests some sort of positive sanction. To say that God "allows" or "permits" evil does not mean that He 'sanctions' it in the sense that He approves of it. It is easy to discern that God never permits sin in the sense that He sanctions it in His creatures. What is usually meant by divine permission is that God simply lets it happen. That is, **He does not directly intervene to prevent** its happening. Here is where grave dangers lurk." (Exposing the Permissive Will of God from [R.C. Sproul](http://www.ligonier.org/blog/exposing-permissive-will-god/) May 02, 2010 Category: [R.C. Sproul](http://www.ligonier.org/blog/exposing-permissive-will-god/) <http://www.ligonier.org/blog/exposing-permissive-will-god/>) [19] John Calvin in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, book one, chapter 8 gives similar warning of confusing these two principles.*

The point being advocated by my friend was that that polygamy was **sanctioned** by God in the account where Nathan confronted David about adultery with Bathsheba. The suggestion was that what Nathan said to David in essence was "if you wanted more wives, God would have given you more of them" **thus proving God's sanctioning of polygamy**. But let's look at what II Samuel 12:8 says and what it does not say...

Nathan is speaking **for** the Lord here..."*I also gave you your master's [King Sual's] house and your master's wives into your care, and I gave you the house of Israel and Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have added to you many more things.*" (NASB)

Conservative Old Testament scholars comment here that "at 2 Sam 12:8 **your master's wives** - *"This phraseology means nothing more than that God in his providence had given David, as king, everything that was Saul's.* [20]

The discussion here is not whether David had more than one wife, it is a general comment on how God had blessed David and would give him even more. We see no clear reference to suggest that God would be happy to give David more wives thus endorsing polygamy. This is a form of interpretation known as *eisegesis* (the process of interpreting a text in such a way that you *introduce one's own presuppositions, agendas, or biases* into and onto the text) versus the acceptable scholarship of *exegesis* – *drawing out of the text what is plainly intended*. This style becomes a particularly dangerous practice when one goes about to establish a *doctrine* or truth, **especially without other supporting texts** for the idea. I

If one was casually reading through II Samuel and ran across this verse, the idea of God endorsing polygamy would probably not jump out at you unless you were looking for it.

Another argument put forth for polygamy (and pointing towards our inability to condemn other forms of marriage) was the qualifications put forth in scripture for elders or deacons. The suggestion put forth was that leaders should only have one wife but polygamy would be acceptable for others believers. Specifically Elders be ***“the husband of one wife.”*** However, this would literally read *“a one-woman man.”* (I Timothy 3:2 & Titus 1:6) While there are various arguments made for the interpretation here, the most common interpretation is *“the husband of only one living woman or only one woman at a time.”* [21] (*The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, Dr. Ralph Earle and Dr. Edmond Hiebert

Some commentators have seen these verses as a *prohibition of polygamy*, but a polygamist would not even have been allowed to be a church member, much less a leader [20 p. 2539]

The highly esteemed group at GOT QUESTIONS has this comment relative to polygamy and God's approval.

“Are there some instances in which the allowance for polygamy would still apply today? Perhaps, but it is unfathomable that there would be no other possible solution. Due to the “one flesh” aspect of marriage, the need for oneness and harmony in marriage, and the lack of any real need for polygamy, it is our firm belief that polygamy does not honor God and is not His design for marriage.” <http://www.gotquestions.org/>

In all my travels and listening to Christian teachers, reading, etc. I have never heard a respected expositor (or anyone else) even suggest that God ever *sanctioned* polygamy though he *permitted* it in the sense R.C. Sproul suggests.

My conclusion is that arguing that God approved of polygamy and the New Testament never condemns it is poor scholarship. Further, to argue that this somehow would then cloud our argument against homosexual marriage is beyond reasonable. Even if God did approve of Polygamy, it would be a quantum leap to go from there to a comparison of same-sex marriage being some sort of parallel or comparison to polygamy. Homosexuality is consistently condemned throughout scripture.

7. * **Marriage promotes the flourishing of all – in particular Children** When it comes to the issue of flourishing of children, marriage is hands down the major factor both in terms of traditional or same-sex marriage.

*“Children who grow up without a father are five times more likely to live in poverty and commit crime; nine times more likely to drop out of schools and twenty times more likely to end up in prison... The core messages it that **“the wealth of nations”** depends in no small part on the health of the family.” [5 p.5]*

The Heritage Foundation has documented beyond argument the fact that marriage is the largest component in the flourishing of youth. On average, single parent families and mixed marriages are not promoting flourishing for their children as well as marriages where children are with both biological parents [22]

As we consider the flourishing enjoyed by children from same-sex families, logic would suggest the question - do they enjoy the same advantages as children from intact traditional families?

While this was not a point of discussion in the aforementioned debate, NOTHING is more important in the debate about same-sex marriage than the flourishing of the children that is involved. **This is true first in terms of the justice to the children. It is also true to the general wellbeing of the society.**

A recent study – **the New Family Structure Study (NFSS)** - by University of Texas sociology professor Mark Regnerus demonstrated that **children raised by parents who at some point had a same-sex partner** were more likely to be on welfare, experience depression, have less education, and have a history of sexual abuse more than children raised by heterosexual parents. A bit later, we will look at some of the conclusions of this study put out by Focus on The Family. [23]

Decades of social science research, including the latest studies using large samples and robust research methods, show that children tend to do best when raised by a mother and a father. As suggested earlier, this is particularly true when the child is the biological offspring of both parents. The confusion resulting from further delinking childbearing from marriage will force the state to intervene more often in family life and expand welfare programs. Redefining marriage would legislate a new principle that marriage is whatever emotional bond the government says it is. [5 p. 2-4]

During the recent NDO debate in Billings, it became clear that definitions of sexuality are now “fluid” with Progressives and those that favor the LGBTQ life style. That is to say that sexual life styles are defined by “how I feel about myself today and what I want to define myself as.”

All the loud shouting by LGBTQ activists will not change the well documented fact that the majority of their so called “long term relationships” do not last. Homosexual men in particular

tend to have many - often hundreds – of partners. While conceding that divorce is a major issue with heterosexuals, the patterns and outcomes for homosexual split-ups is even worse. The **NFSS** study as well as other studies conducted by lesbian activist scholars, find that lesbian relationships are dramatically more likely to break up than those in heterosexual homes.

[23 p.3]

Redefining marriage does not simply expand the existing understanding of marriage, it rejects the anthropological truth that marriage is based on the complementarity of man and woman, the biological fact that reproduction depends on a man and a woman, and the social reality that children need a mother and a father. Redefining marriage to abandon the norm of male–female sexual complementarity would also make other essential characteristics—such as monogamy, exclusivity, and permanency—optional. **Marriage cannot do the work that society needs it to do if these norms are further weakened.** Redefining marriage is also a direct and demonstrable threat to religious freedom because it marginalizes those who affirm marriage as the union of a man and a woman. [5 p. 6]

Why is this redefinition important? Because as we have argued, societies have recognized for millennia that conjugal marriage assists in raising good citizens. That in turn is of obvious interest to government if it is truly interested in “promoting the general welfare.”

Research clearly demonstrates that family structure matters for children, and the family structure that helps children the most is a family headed by two biological parents in a low-conflict marriage. Children in single-parent families, children born to unmarried mothers, and children in stepfamilies or cohabiting relationships face higher risks of poor outcomes. There is thus value for children in promoting strong, stable marriages between biological parents.

The NFSS study at the University of Texas demonstrated that children raised by parents who at some point had a same-sex partner were disadvantaged as the data below summarizes.

While this study has been challenged harshly by LGBTQ activists, Regnerus’ fellow professors affirmed that his research was done according to solid university standards. Studies done by LGBTQ advocates suggest that there are no differences, but these studies have been completely discredited. Furthermore, logic would suggest that these results are not surprising and are consistent with findings about other types of parenting studies as we have documented.

Below is a summary of Regnerus findings from a Focus on the Family report:

Compared with off-spring from married, intact mother/father homes, children raised in same-sex homes are markedly *more likely* to...

- ✚ Experience poor **educational attainment**
- ✚ Report overall lower levels of **happiness, mental and physical health.**
- ✚ Have **impulsive behavior**
- ✚ Be in counseling or **mental health therapy** (2xs)
- ✚ Suffer from **depression** (by large margins)

- ✚ Have recently **thought of suicide** (significantly)
- ✚ **Identify as bisexual, lesbian or gay**
- ✚ Have **male on male or female on female sex partners** (*dramatically* higher)
- ✚ Currently **be in a same-sex romantic relationship** (2x to 3x more likely)
- ✚ **Be asexual** (females with lesbian parents)
- ✚ As adults, be **unmarried**; much more likely to cohabit
- ✚ As adults, **more likely to be unfaithful** in married or cohabiting relationships
- ✚ **Have a sexually transmitted infection (STI)**
- ✚ Be **sexually molested** (both inappropriate touching and forced sexual act)
- ✚ Feel **relationally isolated** from bio-mother and -father (Although lesbian-parented children *do feel close* to their bio-mom – not surprisingly – they are not as close as children with a bio-mom married to father)
- ✚ Be **unemployed or part-time employed** as young adults
- ✚ As adults, currently be on **public assistance** or to have been sometime in childhood
- ✚ Live in **homes with lower income levels**
- ✚ Drink with **intention of getting drunk**
- ✚ **Smoke tobacco and marijuana**
- ✚ Spend more time **watching TV**
- ✚ Have frequency of **arrests**
- ✚ Have pled guilty to **minor legal offense**

Why is this study important? Because He is primarily addressing what he calls the “**no difference**” thesis that is presented in the existing gay family literature and **has become a near truism in the current public discussion**. This refers to the so-called finding of no differences found between same-sex and mom/dad families. **This is important in Montana because Judge from Great Falls who overturned our ban on same-sex marriage referenced these LGBTQ studies in support of his conclusions to overturn the voice of the people!**

My conclusions? Childhood flourishing as impacted by the marital status of the parents is far from irrelevant in the debate of whether same-sex marriage impacts the social good. It may be the most important long-term factor in this discussion and in the argument for the interest of the State in this debate.

8. Procreation was not a primary purpose of marriage:

Because there have been frequent comments on this issue above, I will limit my comments here.

Whenever one enters into a serious examination of a subject, the first things they will want to do is to review the literature on the subject. With that in mind, I will simply say that in most any treatment on marriage from a conservative perspective, you will see as a first purpose of marriage in all cultures, the advantage of procreation. To argue that procreation is not a first justification for the good of traditional marriage to culture is to champion the literature from the Progressive camp, not the beliefs of Christians throughout history. **This fact is so self-evident, that the burden of proof lies with those who maintain that procreation has not always been a key purpose in marriage and thus a strong argument against same-sex marriage. As we have seen, it is also a frequently used argument for the interest of the State.**

While there are several benefits to marriage, procreation stands out as a primary concern for this institution. There was reason for why - in the context of their creation - in the first chapter of Genesis (1:28) Adam and Eve were told to multiply (procreate) and fill the earth .

End Notes: - This List is also a good “Suggested Reading”

[1] *Many Faiths, Common View on Marriage: Men and Women Are Created for Each Other*
NOVEMBER 26, 2014 AT 10:40 AM BY RYAN T. ANDERSON

[2] (Paula Ettelbrick, former Executive Director of the International Gay & Lesbian Human Rights Commission formerly a lawyer at Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, Executive Director of the International Gay & Lesbian Human Rights Commission)

[3] *Why the Supreme Court Might Agree to Hear a Same-Sex Marriage Case After All.* Andrew Kloster, the Daily Signal from the Heritage Foundation, Dec. 7, 2014

[4] *Bracketing Morality - The Marginalization of Moral Argument in the Same-Sex Marriage Debate* Dr. Albert Mohler, his blog of April 1, 2013

[5] *Marriage: What It Is, Why It Matters, and the Consequences of Redefining It*
Ryan T. Anderson March 11, 2013 <http://report.heritage.org/bg2775>

[6] *In Defense of Marriage and the Rule of Law — The Importance of Making the Right Argument* November 11, 2014 The Briefing Dr. Al Mohler
<http://www.albertmohler.com/2014/11/11/in-defense-of-marriage-and-the-rule-of-law-the-importance-of-making-the-right-argument/>

[7] *Same-Sex Marriage – A Thoughtful Approach to God’s Design for Marriage*, Sean McDowell and John Stonestreet

[8] Quotation from Justice Thurgood Marshall, see [Deborah L. Rhode, “Letting the Law Catch Up,” *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 44](#), (Summer 1992), pp. 1259-1265.

[9] *The Second American Revolution*, John W. Whitehead)

[10] *Democrat-Appointed Federal Judge: No Right to Same-Sex Marriage* - Ryan T. Anderson / October 22, 2014 /

[11] **Speakers at the 1999 Gay, Lesbian, Straight Educational Network Conference (*The Homosexual Agenda – Exposing the Principle Threat To Religious Freedom*, Alan Sears and Craig Osten).**

[12] *National Organization for Marriage Praises 6th Circuit Ruling On Marriage; Urges US Supreme Court to Follow Suit* November 6, 2014
<http://www.nomblog.com/39821/#sthash.MUoQnAqa.dpuf> Brian Brown

[13] *You Lost Me – Why Young Christians Are Leaving the Church... and Rethinking Faith*, David Kinnaman, CEO, Barna Research Group

[14] *The Overhauling of Straight America – Blueprint for Transforming Social Values* - Manifesto written by LGBT activists in 1987
<http://www.hawaiifreepress.com/ArticlsMain/tabid/56/ID/2017/The-Overhauling-of-Straight-America.aspx>

[15] Charles Colson & Nancy Pearcey, *How Now Shall We Live?* Tyndale, 1999, p17

[16] *Legislating Morality – Is It Wise, Is it Legal, Is it Possible?* Dr. Norman Geisler and Dr. Frank Turek

[17] *Marriage and the Public Good: Ten Principles* www.princetonprinciples.org © 2008 The Witherspoon Institute.

[18] *What Is Marriage? Man and Women: A Defense*, Sherif Girgis, Ryan T. Anderson, Robert P. George

[19] *Exposing the Permissive Will of God* from [R.C. Sproul](#) May 02, 2010 Category: [R.C. Sproul](#)
<http://www.ligonier.org/blog/exposing-permissive-will-god/>

[20] Macarthur Study Bible, p. 623. Compellation of several scholars.

[21] *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, Dr. Ralph Earle and Dr. Edmond Hiebert

[22] *Marriage: America's Greatest Weapon Against Child Poverty*, Robert Rector, the Heritage Foundation, Sept. 16, 2010

[23] *Focus on the Family – Where Research Meets Common Sense MEMO Summary of the Frist Wave of New Family Structure Studies*, Glenn T. Stanton Director of Global Family Formation Studies at Focus on the Family, author of *Secure Daughters, Confident Sons: How Parents Guide Their Children into Authentic Masculinity and Femininity* and *The Ring Makes All the Difference*. June 2013