

Debunking the Myths

Myth #1

Those who oppose same-sex marriage are bigoted, ignorant, homophobes who lack compassion and seek to impose their fundamentalist religious beliefs upon others.

This argument, though effective, has little basis in fact. The tactic here is to silence opposition by imposing labels that activists know people are afraid of. No one wants to be labeled a bigot or to be thought of as an ignorant fundamentalist.

To disagree with the strategy to redefine, indeed to overthrow, the fundamental building block of 6,000 years of civilization is not an act of bigotry born of ignorance and fear, but an act of prudence based on right reason. Ask yourself the question: of those you know among your circle of friends and colleagues who oppose same-sex marriage, do they fit the description above? I don't know anyone who fits that description. In fact, those I know who do oppose it have no animus against homosexual persons and would prefer to avoid such battles altogether, but they have been forced by the gay activists themselves to take a stand to defend the institution of marriage. Some do it on the basis of religious belief, others do it because of the obvious fittedness of gender differentiation and sexual complementarity inherent in that difference. That is, they cannot bring themselves to deny the facts of nature. There is no compassion without the truth. To deny one's conscience, that is, to deny what one knows to be true in order to appease the desires of others, is to consciously act against the good of the other.

Myth #2

By denying legal recognition of same-sex marriage to homosexual partners, the state is exercising unjust discrimination toward gay couples.

The state has no compelling reason to recognize same-sex marriage. By granting legal recognition and benefits to married couples, that is, to one man and one woman joined in lifelong union, the state is acting in its own self-interest. The government exists to promote the general welfare of its citizens. The state rewards those institutions that promote that general welfare. The state recognizes in traditional marriage the best means to insure its own survival. The begetting and raising of children is a good which the state seeks to protect and promote. Studies repeatedly show that the best way to raise healthy, happy children, and to prepare them to become productive citizens is in the traditional family. No other means of raising children has proven to be as effective. In fact, statistics consistently show that all other forms of raising children are deficient in one way or another, especially when compared to the traditional family. Is the state required to promote and grant legal protection to forms of family life known to be detrimental to children?

On what basis should the state grant legal recognition to same-sex couples? If the primary purpose of the new definition of marriage is not procreation and the raising of children, but "personal happiness" and companionship, or the recognition of relationships of duration and dependence, how will the state distinguish between homosexual and non-homosexual couples who make the same claim? Or as one astute commentator put it, why should couplings have a privileged place over other relational arrangements, such as groupings of three or four people

joined together in committed relationships? Such relationships may benefit the couple or groupings personally, but how are such unions promoting the general welfare of the state?

Acting in its own self interest, and for the general welfare of its citizens, the state fulfills its responsibility by extending benefits and legal protection to couples within a traditional marriage. The Supreme Court Justice Stephen J. Field, in *Murphy v. Ramsey* (1885) recognized the unique place of traditional marriage within the state: “For, certainly, no legislation can be supposed more wholesome and necessary in the founding of a free, self-governing commonwealth...than that which seeks to establish it on the basis of the idea of the family, as consisting of one man and one woman in the holy estate of matrimony; the sure foundation of all that is stable and noble in our civilization; the best guarantee of that reverent morality which is the source of all beneficent progress in social and political improvement.”

Myth #3

Homosexuality is genetic and on that basis alone homosexual couples should be granted legal recognition in marriage if they so desire.

Despite what popular opinion, gay organizations and some media pundits may want you to believe, there has been no scientific discovery of a “gay gene” or a genetic origin for homosexuality. At best it is one factor among others. The “gay gene” is a myth that has been said enough in the press that it is now considered a fact by many.

Researcher Dean Hamer’s 1993 study which sought to find a genetic cause for sexual orientation was hailed by the press as the breakthrough that finally found the genetic source for homosexuality. Hamer never made such a claim. In an interview in *Gene* magazine he made the following statement: “We have not found the gene—which we don’t think exists—for sexual orientation...there will never be a test that will say for certain whether a child will be gay. We know that for certain.”¹

The theory of genetically determined behavior does not coincide with scientific assessment of the role of genes. As Neil and Briar Whitehead put it, “Science has not yet discovered any genetically dictated behavior in humans. So far, genetically dictated behaviors of the one-gene-one-trait variety have been found only in very simple organisms...But if many genes are involved in a behavior, then changes in that behavior will tend to take place very slowly and steadily (say, changes of a few percent each generation over many generations, perhaps thirty). That being so, homosexuality could not appear and disappear suddenly in family trees the way it does.”²

Myth #4

Homosexuality is an immutable state.

The myth that homosexuals cannot change their orientation has also been shown to be false. Dr. Jeffery Satinover of the National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (NARTH) testified before the Massachusetts Senate Judicial Committee in April 2004 on various issues surrounding the subject of homosexuality and the family. In his presentation he addressed the question of immutability. In his presentation he discussed the work of Dr. Robert Spitzer which I will quote here:

“Dr. Robert Spitzer, the prominent psychiatrist and researcher at Columbia University has been the chief architect of the American Psychiatric Association’s diagnostic manual and he was the chief decision-maker in the 1973 removal of homosexuality from the diagnostic manual. He considers himself a gay-affirmative psychiatrist, and a long time supporter of gay rights. He has long been convinced that homosexuality is neither a disorder nor changeable. Because of the increasing heated debate over the latter point within the professional community, Spitzer decided to conduct his own study of the matter. He concluded: ‘I’m convinced from the people I have interviewed, that for many of them, they have made substantial changes toward becoming heterosexual...I think that’s news...I came to this study skeptical. I now claim that these changes can be sustained.’ When he presented his results to the Gay and Lesbian committees of the APA, anticipating a scientific debate, he was shocked to be met with intense pressure to withhold his findings for political reasons. Dr. Spitzer has subsequently received considerable ‘hate mail’ and complaints from his colleagues because of his research.”³

¹ For the source of the quotes, cf. Whitehead, *Gene*, 135,146-147.

² Whitehead, *Genes*, 209.

³ Satinover, J. [NARTH Scientific Advisory Board Member Testifies Before Massachusetts Senate Committee Studying Gay Marriage](http://www.narth.com) www.narth.com