

MARRIAGE FORMATS

BY RICHARD LUTZ

FEBRUARY 2012

TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE BEST SERVES SOCIETY

Reducing the public institution of marriage to a mere vehicle with which to validate private romantic relationships is, to borrow from George Orwell, so absurd a proposal that only an intellectual could believe it.

The traditional man-woman family format is the core social building block, a small and vulnerable unit which secular societies rightly support via positive discrimination.

The contemporary marriage equality movement is led by the anti-liberal left, which is defined by the radical universalism of its principles. Its advocates want to end marriage discrimination involving consenting adults even when doing so harms children and society. Namely, discrimination relating to gender, consanguinity and the number of participants by legalizing same-sex marriage (SSM), close relative marriage (CRM), and group marriages like polygamy.

Polygamous relationships complicate and damage familial ties, undermine the dignity and rights of women, and produce a diffusion of responsibility for offspring; while violent jealousies naturally arise among wives and half-siblings, to say nothing of the social friction such relationships cause when some men cannot find wives.

Close relative relationships also complicate and damage familial ties and often result in inbred children. Such relationships are validated by CRM, which normalize incestuous relationships and inbreeding.



Same-sex parent families have much the same problems as single parent families, as many children are semi-orphans deprived of the love, socialization and guidance of the missing parent at a critical stage in their development.

Children in same-sex parent families may know the absent mother or father, as is the case with most children in single parent families, but they are rarely a parent to the child in any meaningful sense. This damages familial ties, while many children suffer the trauma of feeling neglected or abandoned by the absent parent or deprived of them by their same-sex parents.

SSM advocates endlessly assert there is no evidence that the same-sex family format harms children, which is like saying there is no evidence that the single parent family format harms children, thus a good example of the 'big lie' propaganda technique. It is self-evident that SSM validates a dysfunctional family format that naturally damages children and society, but most studies are conducted by sympathetic researchers who

fail to include proper controls, rely on small samples, self-selected subjects, and use unreliable or invalid measures; just like the studies that found the single parent family format did not harm children.

A parliamentary inquiry into same-sex parenting in South Australia was led by a gay rights advocate, Mr Ian Hunter MLC, who wrote: "The committee heard no persuasive evidence that children are disadvantaged by being raised by same-sex parents" (*MPs push for same-sex parental rights*, The Advertiser, 18.05.11).

Impartial research into single parent and same-sex parent families has revealed what is only common sense; namely that minors without a biological mother and father in their home are more likely to be abused and become abusers, suffer a mental illness, self-medicate, self-harm and harm others; due to the developmental and emotional damage as a result of having little or no contact with their mother or father. This is most damaging when the missing parent is of the same-sex as the child, who is their role model.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The traditional man-woman marriage format is the best environment for offspring.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Restrict marriage and associated benefits to the traditional man-woman couple format.

LIBERAL VALUES

"Rightful liberty is unobstructed action according to our will within limits drawn around us by the equal rights of others."

- Thomas Jefferson

YOUTH SUICIDE

Same-sex marriage advocates exploit youth suicides to further the legalization of SSM by asserting that prohibition increases the suicide rate among homosexual youths (a group with a high incidence of incurable STDs: HIV, HPV, Hepatitis B and genital herpes); but legalization has not had any discernible effect on the suicide rate of any nation. Some marriage equality advocates say we must legalize close relative marriages and group marriages like polygamy in order to reduce youth suicides.



MARRIAGE FORMATS

Lucy Sullivan found the traditional family is the prime source of the socialization that imbues the values that provide the internal constraints against crime, and found a strong correlation between rising crime rates and rates of divorce, ex-nuptial birth and sole parenting (*Rising Crime in Australia*, CIS, 1997).

Alex Greenwich, the national convener of Australian Marriage Equality, said legalizing SSM will be “extremely beneficial to the economy” and have “no negative impacts” (*Same-sex weddings ‘worth millions’*, The Australian, 26.12.11). Legalizing SSM would boost the economy, as would legalizing polygamy and CRM, but at the cost of damaging countless children and society.

Some liken opponents of dysfunctional marriage formats like SSM to racists who cannot see the value in the lives of their victims; a charge that can also be levelled at supporters of marriage formats that naturally damage children, who are indifferent to the rights and needs of children.

Most opponents of non-traditional marriage formats like SSM, polygamy and CRM are motivated by a concern for children, not hatred for adults whose heartfelt needs have blinded them to their duty to help protect vulnerable children; as occurred when Elton John and David Furnish deprived their baby son of a mother because they could not stand the idea of sharing him with a woman.

Thus the need for laws and policies that help inform and guide adults whose desires are antagonistic to the natural rights and needs of children.

The arguments in favour of these non-traditional marriage formats all share at least one fatal flaw, shared by the child marriage format. Namely, they do not acknowledge that marriage is rightly a public duty relating to the protection of children by validating the optimum family format for raising children; not an individual right with which to validate private relationships.

The universality of the mother-father family unit stems from the superior child-rearing environment it provides; while the promotion of children’s best interests makes it entirely appropriate for the state to preference the traditional marriage format.

If we accept the core SSM argument that marriage is now about validating romantic relationships, not protecting children, and diminish the public institution of marriage to a mere vehicle with which to validate private romantic relationships involving consenting adults; then natural justice demands that we legalize all marriage formats involving consenting adults, including group marriages like polygamy and close relative marriages like half-sibling marriage (legal in Sweden along with SSM).

Allowing such marriages would confirm the desire of adults to choose a family format that suits them at the expense of the rights and needs of vulnerable citizens we all have a duty to protect.

Marriage equality advocates can point to happy looking children who seem unaffected by SSM, polygamy and half-sibling marriage, and would have us believe the only damage suffered by such

children is the social stigma bigots attach to such relationships, as if depriving children of their mother or father and inbreeding had no impact on their lives, and the violent jealousies that naturally arise in polygamous relationships among wives and half-siblings were figments of a bigoted imagination.

Restricting marriage to the traditional format is a form of positive discrimination designed to help children (not their parents) by validating the optimal family format to help ensure they become healthy citizens, not hurt anyone.

Most adults in non-traditional relationships are loving spouses and caring parents, but that does not mean we should legalize like marriages, as the damage or danger visited on children is implicit in the nature of the dysfunctional family formats they validate, no matter how caring an individual parent.

We need to do more to protect children, notably ensure they have a mother and a father in their family unit who are not close relatives, ideally the biological parents, not make the situation worse by allowing marriage formats that validate dysfunctional family formats that naturally harm or endanger children we all have a duty to protect.

Protecting the weak is a bedrock principle of a civilized society. If we believe in civilization we are duty bound to take steps to protect this principle regardless of our personal preferences.

Our duty to protect children must be our primary concern, not real or imagined rights that undermine that duty. *Primum officium.*

SELFISH VALUES

“Regarding studies which show children do best when raised by both a mother and father, I suggest they might say more about the social stigma attached to alternative family arrangements than anything else. In any case, arguments for changing the meaning of marriage to include same-sex couples do not rely on such questions.”

- Ben Adams (*Social stigma*, The Advertiser, 24.08.11).

PRIMARY SOURCES

Children as Trophies?, Patricia Morgan, The Christian Institute, 2002.

The Fall of Marital Stability and the Rise of Juvenile Delinquency, Lynn D. Wardle, Journal of Law & Family Studies, Vol. 10, 2007, pp.83-109.

No Basis: What the Studies Don’t Tell us About Same-Sex Parenting, Robert Lerner & Althea Nagai, Marriage Law Project, 2001.

The Prince’s Trust Macquarie Youth Index, Prince’s Trust, 2010.

Rising Crime in Australia, Lucy Sullivan, The Centre for Independent Studies, 1997.

