

Analyzing Arguments in the Same-Sex Marriage Debate

Esther Yue L. Ng (PhD, University of Aberdeen, Scotland)

Introduction

In the current debate raging in many states, advocates of same-sex marriage brandish slogans such as freedom, anti-discrimination, equality before the law, the appeal of love, etc., and see themselves as champions of America's best values. Meanwhile they picture their opponents as religious bigots and out-dated, "pathetically imposing their subjective thinking on others." But is it true that these advocates are free from subjective thinking and that those who oppose same-sex marriage can only appeal to the Bible¹ and tradition? It is high time that we analyze the arguments of both sides objectively with reference to well-documented studies instead of merely making emotive appeals.

Justice, Equal Protection and Non-discrimination for Same-sex Partnerships?

One argument for same-sex marriage appeals to justice, equal protection, and non-discrimination for all. To adherents of this position, there is no moral ground to restrict marriage to the union between a man and a woman and to deny it to same-sex partners.²

However, on close observation, this argument lacks cogency. For in most areas of life, equality is in terms of potentiality only, namely, as equal chances, while much depends on the nature of the matter being considered. Not all can qualify for a specific job; much depends on the requirements inherent in the job. Nobody would automatically label such restrictions as inequality or discrimination.³ Thus for the success of the "equal protection argument" for same-sex marriage, one has to argue in addition that same-sex unions fulfill entirely the requirements of marriage traditionally understood.

Now traditionally, marriage has been understood to involve:

- (1) love expressed in sexual intercourse;
- (2) a covenant or contract for those concerned consenting to stay together for life;
- (3) between one man and one woman (not of the immediate family) with the potential for procreation;
- (4) with the potential for nurturance of children.

Because of the advantages of traditional marriage in securing the propagation and welfare of future generations, in most societies married persons have been given special privileges, e.g. medical insurance coverage for the spouse, inheritance of social security benefits at death, etc. For single persons without spouse and children, social security benefits would not accrue to their family, relatives, or friends on the point of their death, even though they have worked all their lives as hard as married persons.

With such an understanding, same-sex union that has no potential for producing children (except by a previous heterosexual marriage, adoption, or artificial insemination) is clearly different from traditional marriage.⁴ To refuse to call it "marriage" is not discrimination, but perfectly acceptable, unless we are prepared to argue that single people (sexual orientation to celibacy) should not be discriminated against and should be given the same privileges as same sex partnerships; after all, singles can also adopt and single women can give birth by artificial insemination or by sexual intercourse.

Actually for the current advocates of same-sex marriage, equality in sexual orientation clearly is not their only concern, because in their redefinition of marriage, they have merely modified (3) above to read one man and another man, or one woman and another woman, and have kept (1) and (2) little changed. But if equality were their only concern, why continue the “discrimination” against incest? Why insist on marriage as one person with another person, and discriminate against polygamy and polyandry? Doubtless others have the sexual inclination for more than one partner at one time! Why discriminate against marrying with minors who consent? At present there is the North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) that advocates man-boy love. Then, why insist on consent and not non-dissent? Why discriminate against marrying with a pet to obtain tax benefits? (It is alleged that Peter Singer, the protagonist for animal rights, does not object to sex with animals, so long as the animal is not eaten). If equality were the only criterion, any sexual inclination and object of marriage should be permitted. Also, why insist on life-long commitment? Why discriminate against short-term contracts of marriage? To argue for same-sex marriage on the basis of equality alone is thus inadequate and highly problematic: it will open the lid of the Pandora Box; if its logic is applied consistently, this will lead to moral decay and social chaos.⁵

Love, Commitment and the Ordinary Human Person in Same-Sex Partnerships?

In fact, even though the radical gay agenda aims eventually to revamp the marriage institution to allow for all kinds of living arrangements with no consideration for their effects on society,⁶ same-sex marriage proponents at the present stage emphasize the love and commitment between same sex couples, to prove that, other than the homosexual aspect, their unions are no different from traditional marriages.⁷ In short the argument of equality is not about sexual orientation alone, but also about the quality of the relationship, i.e. loving commitment, as no different from heterosexual marriages.

But is same-sex partnership really equivalent to traditional marriage? Now it is inadequate to point to isolated instances of stable partnership among homosexuals. Undoubtedly such examples may and do exist.⁸ Nor can it be denied that divorce is rampant in heterosexual marriages. What is more important is, rather, the general pattern or majority cases. Here the answer is clear that homosexual partnerships are generally very much different from heterosexual marriages. 1) Many surveys show the much shorter duration of same sex partnerships, lasting a few years only on average, whereas a survey showed that 67% of heterosexual marriages lasted over 10 years, and 50% over 20 years.⁹ 2) Whereas at least 75% of husbands are faithful to their wives, among homosexual (especially gay) unions, “extra-marital” sex is very prevalent and less than 25% are faithful to their partners.¹⁰ Moreover, in gay unions, there is a much higher number of sexual partners (including strangers) involved in addition to the primary relationship.¹¹ 4) Same-sex partners engage in very different kinds of sexual activities (e.g. oral sex, anal sex, oral-anal “rimming”, fisting, sado-masochism, and even urinating on the sexual partner, and eating feces).¹²

This shows that for many homosexual couples, long term commitment is far less than heterosexual marriages. Moreover, even in long term partnerships, sex is divorced from

“love” and “commitment”: especially in the case of gays, extramarital outlets (in the words of homosexual author Sullivan¹³) are often numerous. Hence their partnership is different from the traditional understanding of monogamous marriage. Consequently if we say that homosexual partnerships exhibit the same kind of love and commitment, we are deceiving ourselves.

We also deceive ourselves if we think that marital disharmony is only prevalent in traditional marriages but not in same-sex unions. In a 1988 survey involving 6779 people, 4.9% men and 6.2% of women in traditional marriages reported oral disputes escalating into violent aggression, whereas in a survey of gays and lesbians at about the same time 46% reported using physical aggression for conflict resolution.¹⁴ Thus statistics show that violence, physical and sexual abuse are much more frequent among same-sex partners than in traditional marriages. In addition to the greater frequency of violence, there is also greater severity of violence, sometimes resulting in death.¹⁵

In view of such facts, it is unreasonable to claim that same-sex unions are equivalent to traditional marriages. It is also ridiculous to claim that “legalizing same-sex unions would strengthen traditional marriages”.¹⁶

Freedom, Rights and Privacy for Same-Sex Partnerships?

Granted the failure of the equality and love argument, what about other ideals of democratic society, such as freedom, rights, and privacy? If homosexuals are entitled to education, housing, and jobs as responsible individuals in society, why deny them the freedom and right to enjoy marriage with whomever they want regardless of the sex of their partner? After all, what two mature persons consent to do in private is no other people’s business, as the Lawrence Against Texas ruling has established.

However, this argument likewise cannot stand. For in theory, most people (whether libertarians or adherents of social contract theories) would agree that nobody has the freedom to harm or offend others. Consequently, no matter how much a government respects the freedom of individuals, it would legislate against people harming others. By “harm” here we simply refer to adverse effects (both immediate and long term) on physical and psychological health. In addition, no matter how much a government respects individual freedom, to a greater or lesser extent it would prohibit, or try to stop, people (especially minors and those unable to control their actions) harming themselves, or at least encourage people to take good care of themselves. For instance, as long-term smoking harms oneself and others, we have laws prohibiting smoking in many public places and against minors buying cigarettes; cigarette packs are also required to state warnings on health. Likewise consumption of alcohol and many drugs are regulated by the government. Thus in state legislation concerning same-sex partnerships, the question should not be whether there is infringement of the freedom and privacy of homosexuals, but rather whether there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the lifestyles of same-sex marriage is harmful for the individuals concerned, the children connected with them and for society as a whole. In addition, if certain lifestyles are harmful, how prevalent are they, and are they inevitably adopted by homosexuals?

Now, as mentioned earlier, same-sex couples *per se* cannot produce children. Thus, from the perspective of human propagation, same-sex unions should not be treated as equal to heterosexual marriages and granted the same material benefits, unless there is over population and drastic measures are needed to reduce the population.

Then in the above discussion on domestic violence, we have already seen evidence that same-sex couples may harm each other physically and psychologically much more than heterosexual couples. But the harm they do to each other and to society as a whole is far beyond this by virtue of their sexual proclivities. Thus owing to their habits of oral and anal sex, their frequency of intercourse, and their numerous sexual partners, there is a much higher incidence of sexually transmitted diseases, hepatitis, gay bowel syndrome, HIV, AIDS and anal cancer among gay men.¹⁷ In fact steady relationships may make matters worse because of the false confidence of the persons concerned leading to unsafe sexual practices.¹⁸ While lesbian couples are generally less promiscuous, they are likewise not immune from various diseases because of their sexual habits.¹⁹ Since homosexuals are at greater risks from serious diseases, their average life span is shorter than that of heterosexuals by decades.²⁰ Moreover, it has been estimated that 10% of the accidental deaths among young men in San Francisco resulted from sadomasochistic sex.²¹

While physical diseases and early death are alarming, studies from various countries reveal that homosexuals also suffer from depression, suicide, psychiatric disorders and substance abuse at a much greater rate than heterosexuals.²² Now psychologists and psychiatrists sympathetic to homosexuals generally blame this phenomenon on the stress experienced by homosexuals as a result of society's discrimination against them.²³ However, this phenomenon is also reported in the Netherlands which has been highly tolerant of homosexual behavior and was the first country to legalize same-sex marriage.²⁴ Thus it is inadequate to blame the psychiatric disorders on discrimination and homophobia. Furthermore, a study in Britain shows that heterosexuals likewise experience discrimination and violence in adolescence.²⁵

In view of the diseases and problems engendered by the homosexual lifestyle, a far greater amount of tax payers' money has been spent by society on homosexuals out of proportion to their numbers. Endorsing same-sex marriage would not alleviate this financial drain. It will make matters even worse.

Nor is the problem only connected with adult individuals and tax payers' money.²⁶ The next generation is being victimized unwittingly. For one thing, many men and women have left their original heterosexual marriages to start same-sex unions,²⁷ undoubtedly causing much pain to the children of their former marriages. As same-sex unions are much more volatile, children reared in such families experience instability and difficulty in their sexual identity, contrary to the statements of advocates of same-sex marriages.²⁸ In fact, owing to the lack of sexual inhibition (so-called "sexual creativity and diversity") of some gays and lesbians and their wish to "recruit" a next generation of homosexuals, children in such settings may be molested by their step parents early in their lives²⁹ and turn out to be homosexuals or bisexuals later.³⁰ Even if spared such misfortunes, children

brought up by same-sex couples have been found to be less able to relate to people of the opposite sex of their care-takers.³¹ This way there will be segregation and polarization of the two sexes to the great detriment of society as a whole. Conversely numerous social studies have shown that traditional two-parent families provide the best environment for children to grow up.³²

In short, same-sex couples cause much harm to themselves, to the future generation, and to the majority of the society. What they do “in private” actually affects the public! Thus society should not just consider the freedom of choice of adult individuals but must strive to create by legislation where necessary an environment favorable to the healthy development of children. It is even unethical to help people create untraditional families that rear children.³³

Compassion to Victims of Society?

Another argument frequently raised by advocates of same-sex marriage is that homosexuals cannot help their sexual orientation as it is inborn, and they have been victims of homophobia just as people have suffered in the past due to the prejudice against interracial marriages. What is urged is compassion to fight for them as heirs and beneficiaries of the civil rights movement.

However, this argument is woefully misleading. Unlike race, homosexual orientation is not genetically determined. So far all the studies that purport to demonstrate a genetic basis for homosexuality have been found to be wanting.³⁴ Meanwhile there are cases after cases of people changing from a homosexual orientation to become heterosexuals.³⁵ So the analogy of prejudice against interracial marriage is irrelevant. Those who continue to use the analogy are either ignorant or deceptive.

Moreover, gays and lesbians are not victims in terms of social position and income as demonstrated by studies in the U.S.A., the Netherlands and Britain. In fact a number of studies have found that homosexuals often enjoy higher professional status.³⁶

While we should respect and love all people irrespective of their sexual orientation, we must be aware of the agenda of homosexual activists out to change marriage as an institution. In the past they have interfered with the deliberations of psychiatrists³⁷ and today they try to perpetuate lies in the name of science (such as “homosexuality is inborn and unchangeable”),³⁸ infiltrate into policy-making bodies and use various tactics to achieve their agenda.³⁹

Conclusion

Concession to same-sex marriage is irrational when their logic is flawed. It is blind not to see that endorsement of same-sex marriage would lead society to go down a slippery slope ending in chaos. It is also irresponsible not to rein in the destructive lifestyle of homosexuals when there is so much evidence of the harm of homosexuality (even in steady relationships) to the people concerned, to future generations and to society as a whole. When government officials and supreme court judges actively promote same-sex marriage without consideration of the societal consequences of their actions, they are

inexcusable. When their subordinates comply with their irresponsible behaviors, they are equally reprehensible. As for the silent majority, this is not the time of laissez-faire, for inaction will spell the disintegration of society. Let all who are concerned unite to preserve traditional marriage! For Christians, let us remember that the complementarity of the sexes is God-ordained and good, while endorsing same-sex marriage is tantamount to rebellion against God. Nevertheless, let Christians also fall on their knees and pray for God's mercy on all those adversely affected by the homosexual movement!

¹To those who accept biblical authority, the Bible clearly prohibits homosexual behavior; see Gen.19:1-11 (compare 2 Pet. 2:6, 9; Jude 7); Lev. 18:22-24; 20:13; Judges 19:1-30; Rom. 1:24; 1 Cor. 6:9-10; 1 Tim. 1:9-10. Some scholars who support homosexuals allege that the Bible only objects to pagan male prostitutes, or promiscuous, adult homosexual activities with children. However, such explanations cannot stand close scrutiny; see Peter Gagnon, *The Bible and Homosexual Practice: Text and Hermeneutics* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2001); William J. Webb, *Slaves, Women and Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2001).

² It is on such a basis that Mayor Newsom of San Francisco (March 2004) and the superior courts of Massachusetts and California (2003, 2008 respectively) regarded the ban on same-sex marriage as discriminatory.

³ Thus theoretically anyone born in the U.S.A. can run for the presidency, but only people with certain qualifications can actually be a candidate.

⁴ Even though some states (e.g. Vermont and California) currently permit Domestic Partnerships and Civil Unions, it is inappropriate to treat these as equivalent to traditional marriages, or else society would no longer have any institution that symbolizes and engenders respect for the transmission of human life. It is true that certain people in traditional marriages refuse to have children, and some women enter marriage well past the age of child-bearing, yet these marriages do not damage the reproductive symbolism of marriage in the way that same-sex marriages would. See Margaret A. Somerville, "The Case Against 'Same-Sex Marriage,'" pp. 3-4, downloadable from <http://www.narth.com>

⁵ In fact, in the Netherlands and Sweden that legalized same-sex marriage a number of years ago, incest is legalized, and bestiality was once legal in the former country. At present sexually transmitted diseases are rampant in the Netherlands, and half of babies born in Sweden live without fathers. For such information, see <http://www.tfcus.org>, Yes on Prop. 8.

⁶ See statements by homosexual activists William Eskridge and Michelangelo Signorile in "The Case for Same-Sex Marriage" (1996), and "Bridal Wave" *OUT* (December-January 1994) respectively, cited in Alan Sears and Craig Osten, *The Homosexual Agenda: Exposing the Principal Threat to Religious Freedom Today* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2003), p. 96.

⁷ Thus many TV news broadcasts show lesbian and gay couples getting married and the stories often emphasize that the two have been together for many years, with the blessing of each other's parents. Celebrities such as Barbara Streisand and the Mayor of Chicago have commented on the love between same sex couples, while others have stressed the ordinariness of the gays and lesbians in partnership just like heterosexual persons.

⁸ For one such study, see Susan E. Johnson, *Staying Power: Long Term Lesbian Couples* (Tallahassee, FL: Naiad Press, 1990).

⁹ The statistics for heterosexual marriages come from a 2001 report of the National Center for Health Statistics; see <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/ad/ad323.pdf> (also reported in Amy Fagan, *Washington Times* 7/11/2003). In contrast, one study of 8000 couples in America showed that male couples lasted on

average three and a half years, and lesbian couples, 2.2 years; see P. Plumstein and P. Schwartz, *American Couples: Money, Work, Sex* (NY: William Morrow & Co., 1983). A recent study of gay couples in the Netherlands reported the average as one and a half years; see Maria Xiridou in *AIDS* 17 (May 2, 2003): 1029-1038. A report in 2004 showed that in Norway and Sweden, divorce is about 50% more likely in male homosexuals, and 200% more likely in lesbians; see G. Anderson, T. Noack, A. Selerstad, H. Weedon-Fekjaer, "Divorce-risk Patterns in Same-sex 'Marriage' in Norway and Sweden," PAA2004 Annual Meeting, Boston 4/13/2004, cited in Family Research Council, "Same Sex Marriage," p. 2 (www.familyresearchinst.org).

¹⁰In a study of heterosexual couples, 75% (men) and 87% (women) indicated faithfulness to their partners. See D.C. Atkins *et al.*, "Understanding Infidelity Correlates in a National Random Sample," *Journal of Family Psychology* 15/4 (2001): 735-49. By contrast, homosexuals claiming to live together in a monogamous relationship are less than 25% (17% among 2500 gays in U.S.A. 1994; 12% in Toronto 1990; 23% in Australia 1991); see Family Research Council, "Same Sex Marriage," p. 2.

¹¹ In the above-mentioned Dutch study, gay men in steady partnerships averaged 8 sexual partners per year. (According to some surveys, gays may have hundreds and even up to a thousand sex partners in their life time.)

¹² For a detailed report of the various kinds of sexual activities of homosexual people in general, see K. Jay and A. Young, *Gay Report* (NY: Summit Books, 1979). See also John Diggs, "The Health Risks of Gay Sex," http://www.corporateresourcecouncil.org/white_papers/Health_Risks.pdf. For British lesbians, see J.V. Bailey, C. Farquhar, C. Owen and D. Whittaker, "Sexual Behavior of Lesbians and Bisexuals" *Sex. Transm. Inf.* 79/2 (April 1, 2003): 147-50)

¹³ Andrew Sullivan, *Virtually Normal: An Argument about Homosexuality* (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995), pp. 202-203, cited in Sears and Osten, *Homosexual Agenda*, p. 95.

¹⁴ See respectively S.B. Sorenson *et al.*, "Violence and Injury in Marital Arguments: Risk Pattern and Gender Differences," *American Journal of Public Health* [cited hereafter as *AJPH*] 86/1 (1996):35-40; E.E. Kelly and L. Warshafsky, "Partner Abuse in Gay Male and Lesbian Couples, 1987," cited in Claire M. Renzetti and Charles H. Milney (eds.), *Violence in Gay and Lesbian Domestic Partnerships* (Binghamton, NY: Hawarth Press, 1996), pp. 2-3. See also Gregory L. Greenwood, *et al.*, "'Battering Victimization' among a Probability-based Sample of Men who Have Sex with Men," *AJPH* 92/12 (2002):1964-69; P. Cameron, "Domestic Violence Among Homosexual Partners," *Psychol. Reports* 93 (2003): 410-16..

¹⁵ See Marshall Houts, *Where Death Delights* (NY: Coward-McCann, 1967), in which Dr Helpern recounts his experience after having done over 60,000 autopsies. In 1996, Susan Holt, coordinator of the domestic violence unit of the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Center, remarked that "domestic violence is the third largest health problem facing the gay and lesbian community today and trails only behind AIDS and substance abuse . . . in terms of sheer numbers and lethality." (cited in Family Research Council, "Same Sex Marriage," Fact 3)

¹⁶ Stanley Kuntz, "The End of Marriage in Scandinavia: The 'Conservative Case' for Same-sex Marriage Collapses," *The Weekly Standard* 9/20 (2/2/2004).

¹⁷ See above-mentioned article by John Diggs; Jeffrey Satinover, *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), ch. 3; Sanny Y. Chen, *et al.*, "Continuing Increases in Sexually Risky Behavior and Sexually Transmitted Diseases Among Men with Men in San Francisco (1999-2001)," *AJPH* 92 (2002): 1387-1388a; Beryl A. Koblin, *et al.*, "High-Risk Behaviors among Men Who Have Sex with Men in 6 US Cities," *AJPH* 93/6 (2003): 926-32. Binh An Diep, *et al.*, "Emergence of Multidrug-Resistant,

Community Associated, Methicillin Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Clone USA300 in Men Who Have Sex with Men,” *Annals of Internal Medicine* 148/4 (2/19/2008): 249-57; Center for Disease Control “Trends in HIV/AIDS Diagnoses Among Men Who Have Sex with Men – 33 States, 2001-2006,” *MMWR Weekly*, 57/25 (June 27, 2008):681-86 (=http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5725a2.htm)

¹⁸Thus in the recent study in the Netherlands (see Maria Xiridou mentioned above in f.n. 9), 86% of the new infections of HIV occur in steady relationships. Similar findings have been reported in the U.S. as well; see G.L.Wagner, R.H. Remien, & A. Carballo-Diequez, “Extramarital” sex: Is there an increased risk for HIV transmission? A Study of male couples of mixed HIV status, *AIDS Education & Prevention* 10 (1998): 245-56. The same observation is also made by Sanny Y. Chen (see f.n. 17). Studies in 1980’s and 90’s showed a similar picture for gays in Italy, England and Spain; see Family Research Council, “Same Sex Marriage,” p. 3.

¹⁹ see G.R. Bauer and S.L. Welles, “Beyond Assumptions of Negligible Risk: STD and Women Who Have Sex with Women,” *AJPH* 91/8 (2001): 1282-1286.

²⁰Paul Cameron, “The Longevity of Homosexuals: Before and After the AIDS Epidemic,” *Omega: Journal of Death and Dying* 29 (1994): 249-272; Satinover, *Homosexuality and Politics*, p. 69; P. Cameron, K. Cameron, W.L. Playfair, “Does Homosexual Activity Shorten Life” *Psychol. Reports* 83 (1998): 847-66.

²¹ As reported in the 1980 CBS-TV documentary “Gay Power, Gay Politics.”

²² T.G.M. Sandfort *et al.* “Same-Sex Sexual Behavior and Psychiatric Disorders: Findings from the Netherlands Mental Health Survey and Incidence Study (NEMESIS), *Archives of General Psychiatry* 58 (2001): 85-91; Theo Sandfort *et al.*, “Sexual Orientation and Mental and Physical Health Status,” *AJPH* 96/6 (2006): 1119-25; S.E.Gilman *et al.*, “Prevalence of DSM-III-R Disorders among Individuals Reporting Same-Gender Sexual Partners in the National Comorbidity Survey,” *AJPH* 91(2001): 933-39; Susan Cochran, “Emerging Issues in Research on Lesbians’ and Gay Men’s Mental Health: Does Sexual Orientation Really Matter?” *American Psychologist* 56/11 (Nov. 2001): 931-947; R.M. Mathy, “Suicidality and Sexual Orientation in Five continents: Asia, Australia, Europe, North America and South America,” *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies* 7 (2002): 215-25; Michael King, *et al.*, “Mental Health and Quality of Life of Gay men and Lesbians in England and Wales – Controlled, Cross-sectional study,” *British Journal of Psychiatry* 183 (2003):552-58.

²³ Thus Susan D. Cochran and Vickie M. Mays, “Mental Health Correlates of Perceived Discrimination among Lesbians, Gay, and Bisexual Adults,” *AJPH* 91/11 (Nov. 2001): 1869-1876.

²⁴For the Dutch study , see Sandfort 2001 in f.n. 22 above.

²⁵For the British study , see King in f.n. 22 above.

²⁶Insurance companies and other companies may also incur financial losses: according to a report of the Corporate Research Council, in 2001 one insurance company paid 17.1% more for partners of same-sex couples compared to heterosexual couples in a small group plan in California, and sooner or later the burden of such costs will be passed onto those companies that promise to pay insurance coverage for the same-sex domestic partners of their employees. See Michael E. Hamrick, “The Hidden Costs of Domestic Partner Benefits,” http://www.corporateresearchcouncil/white_papers/Hidden_costs.pdf .

²⁷ According to a report by Boston Globe on June 29, 2003, nearly 40% of the 5700 homosexual couples who entered into “civil unions” in Vermont have had a previous heterosexual marriage.

²⁸For the untruths promulgated by advocates of same-sex parenting and their rebuttal, see Paul K. Cameron, "Did the American Psychological Association Misrepresent Scientific Literature to Courts in Support of Homosexual Custody?" *Journal of Psychology* 131/3 (1997): 313-332; Warren Throckmorton, Testimony given before the Senate Finance and Financial Institutions Committee of the Ohio Senate on January 20, 2004 (www.drthrockmorton.com/domasenatetestimony.html). See also Susan Golombok and Fiona Tasker, "Do Parents Influence the Sexual Orientation of Their Children? Findings from a Longitudinal Study of Lesbian Families," *Developmental Psychology* 32 (1996): 3-11; J.M. Bailey, et al. "Sexual Orientation of Adult Sons of Gay Fathers." *Developmental Psychology* 31 (1995):124-29; and the discussion in Throckmorton, "Testimony" ; George Rekers and Mark Kilgus, "Studies of Homosexual Parenting: A Critical Review," *Regent University Law Review* 14 (2002?):343-84; A. Dean Byrd's Testimony in English Court Case Regarding Same-Sex Adoption, February 2007, pp. 9-12 (www.narth.com); J. Stacey and T. J. Biblarz, "(How) Does the Sexual Orientation of Parents Matter?" *American Sociological Review* 66/2 (2001): 158-83.

²⁹ A report shows that homosexuals are three times more likely than heterosexuals to engage in pedophilia; see K. Freud and R. I. Watson, "The Proportion of Heterosexual and Homosexual Pedophiles among Sex Offenders against Children: An Explorative Study," *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy* 18 (Spr. 1992): 34-43. This applies to homosexual step-parents as well; see Paul Cameron and Kirk Cameron, "Homosexual Parents," *Adolescence* 31 (1996): 757-74; Paul Cameron, "Gay Foster Parents More Apt to Molest," *Journal of the Family Research Institute* 17/7 (Nov. 2002). It is not surprising, therefore, that a study found psychologists less likely to refer an adoptive child to a gay couple over a straight couple; see I. Crawford et al., "Psychologists' Attitudes toward Gay and Lesbian Parenting," *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 30 (1999): 394-401, cited in Throckmorton, "Testimony."

³⁰ Cameron and Cameron, "Homosexual Parents," p. 764; Lynda Doll et al., "Self-reported Childhood and Adolescent Sexual Abuse among Adult Homosexual and Bisexual men," *Child Abuse and Neglect* 16/6 (1992): 855-64.

³¹ Stacey and Biblarz, "Sexual Orientation?" p. 171; Sotirios Sarantakos, "Children in Three Contexts: Family, Education and Social Development," *Children Australia* 21 (1996): 23-31, cited in Jane Chastain, "Trophy Children" <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=12864> (World Net Daily, 2/21/2002). For general remarks by the children of some American and British gays and lesbians, see respectively, L. Rafkin, *Different Mothers: Sons and Daughters of Lesbians Talk About Their Lives* (San Francisco: Cleis Press, 1990); L. Saffron, *What About the Children: Sons and Daughters of Gay Parents Talk about Their Lives* (London: Cassel, 1996).

³²See, e.g., Linda J. Waite and Maggie Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People are Happier, Healthier and Better-off Financially* (New York: Doubleday, 2000); W. B. Wilcox, et al., *Why Marriage Matters: Twenty-six Conclusions from the Social Sciences* (2nd ed., New York: Institute for American Values, 2005); Robert P. George and Jean Bethke Elshtain, eds., *The Meaning of Marriage: Family, State, Market and Morals* (Dallas: Spence Publishing, 2006); A. Scott Loveless, ed., *The Family in the New Millennium* (3 vols., Westport, CN: Praeger, 2007). For a concise summary, see Dean Byrd, "Testimony" Part I: Traditional Marriage: Benefits and Detriments.

³³For a discussion on children's rights versus adult freedom, see Somerville, "Case Against 'Same-Sex Marriage,'" p. 5.

³⁴See Stanton L. Jones and Mark A. Yarhouse, *Homosexuality: The Use of Scientific Research in the Church's Moral Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), ch. 3, 5 ; S.L. Jones and A. W. Kwee, "Scientific Research, Homosexuality, and the Church's Moral Debate: An Update," *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 24/4 (2005): 304-16, N.E. Whitehead, "Latest Twin Study Confirms Genetic Contribution to SSA is Minor," www.narth.com It is instructive to note that in a pamphlet produced in 2008 (Answers to Your Questions for a Better Understanding of Sexual Orientation and Homosexuality), the American Association of Psychology, for long a supporter of homosexuals, states that scientists up till now have not

found any single factor, whether genetic, hormonal, or environmental, as solely determinative of sexual orientation.

³⁵ Joseph Nicolosi *et al.*, “Retrospective Self-Reports of Changes in Homosexual Orientation,” *Psychological Reports* 86 (2000): 1071-78; Robert Spitzer, “Can Some Gay Men and Lesbians Change Their Sexual Orientation? 200 Participants Reporting a Change from Homosexual to Heterosexual Orientation,” in J. Frescher, K. Zucker, eds., *Ex-Gay Research: Analyzing the Spitzer Study and Its Relation to Science, Religion, Politics, and Culture* (NY: Harrington House, 2006), pp. 35-66; Stanton Jones, Mark Yarhouse, *Ex-Gays: A Longitudinal Study of Religiously Mediated Change in Sexual Orientation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2007).

³⁶ This is true of the studies reported by Sandfort, and King respectively in f.n. 22. The same picture emerges from the *Statistical Abstract of the U.S.*, 1990.

³⁷ For an account of how, under pressure from homosexual activists such as Robert Spitzer, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from the psychiatric manual of mental disorders in 1973-74, see Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (NY: Basic Book, 1981), pp. 3-4; Satinover, *Homosexuality*, pp. 32-35; Jones and Yarhouse, *Homosexuality*, pp. 97-98.

³⁸ In addition to the 1997 article by P. Cameron, see also Warren Throckmorton, “Testimony”; Dale O’Leary, Dean Byrd, and Richard Fitzgibbons, “The Non-Factsheet” (August 2008) (<http://www.narth.com>).

³⁹ As enunciated by Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen in “The Overhauling of Straight America,” *Guide Magazine* Nov. 1987 and *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90’s* (NY: Doubleday, 1989). For an account of the Homosexual Platform, see Sears and Osten, *Homosexual Agenda*, pp. 16-27. In northern Europe and Canada which have legalized same-sex marriage, pastors who preach against homosexuality are liable to be prosecuted.