

# *Faithful Catholics and the Defense of Marriage*

Father Roger J. Landry  
Legatus Meeting, Grand Rapids Michigan  
June 5, 2007

## A. Introduction

### 1. Title – Faithful Catholics and The Defense of Marriage

#### a. The defense of marriage

##### 1. Marriage needs to be defended. It is being assailed by various trends.

a. Cohabitation – Many treat marriage as irrelevant. There are much higher rates of cohabitation. Quadrupled between 1970 and 2004. Higher rates of domestic violence, sexual infidelity, and instability, divorce later, etc. Consequences for kids in terms of educational failure, physical abuse, sexual abuse, chances for being raised in a single-parent home.

b. Illegitimacy – Many no longer look at marriage as the proper vehicle through which to bring children into the world. From 1960-2003, illegitimacy has risen from 5-30 percent. Most children born outside of marriage will spend the majority of their childhood in a single-parent home. Also harms for men and women. Dropout rates, poverty, finding good marriage partner.

c. Divorce – Divorce rates have skyrocketed since 1960. The push for no-fault divorce laws have weakened marriage and undermined public support for the commitments one has made. Less protection for marriage than for almost any business contract. It has also left many children without a dad or without a mom, and the studies of children growing up without fathers shows very significant damage in general. There's also an increased rate of poverty, depression, substance abuse and poor health among adults, and educational failure, teenage pregnancy, and criminal activity among children.

2. All of these are doing harm to the institution of marriage, but none of them really changes what the ideal of marriage is.

3. But there's one new trend that portends far greater damage, because it is a frontal conceptual attack on what marriage is: that's the push for same-sex marriage.

a. This is a means to try to change altogether what the meaning of marriage is, and through changing the meaning of marriage, changing the meaning of family, the correlation between motherhood and fatherhood, male and female.

b. As this attack happens, the ideal is changed and everything else changes as a result.

i. In Massachusetts, marriage no longer includes both a man and a woman, a husband and a wife. No longer husband and wife – party A and party B.

ii. No longer mother and father – progenitor A and progenitor B

iii. No longer a preference that a child should be raised by a mother and a father.

iv. No longer a preference for male-female relationships. Kids are learning about two princes kissing in public school kindergarten, about alternative families. Discussion of sexuality, marriage, family all needs to be changed to show an equivalence between marriage and same-sex unions.

v. No longer a connection between marriage and parenthood, that a child is welcomed and loved by the man and woman whose physical union made the child.

vi. Such changes require changes in all the laws that gave legal preference to the committed publicly entered union of a man and a woman.

vii. It's a battle for far more than a name, but a reality.

c. I'd like to spend our time focusing mainly on the defense of marriage against the threat of its thorough redefinition.

- b. Faithful Catholics, not just nominal Catholics.
  1. Legatus members are by definition faithful Catholics who want to act in accordance with the faith. This is directed mainly toward you, although I hope what I say will be of interest both to non-Catholics and of light to Catholics who simply are not yet with the Church on this issue.
  2. Faith without works is dead, as St. James says. The purpose of this talk is to talk about how those with living faith should respond to the phenomenon of same-sex marriage.
  3. Some might view this topic as obvious, but it's really not, because:
    - a. Some within the Church, including some priests, religious and several lay Catholic public figures, have sown confusion about the issue. Often this is because they are supporters of – if not participants in – the gay lifestyle.
    - b. Many other leaders in the Church have not given clear guidance on the topic. They have remained mute. Perhaps the greatest reason for this reticence is because this topic is controversial and very politically incorrect, and many leaders of the Church are simply afraid of controversy.
2. There are two main ways to approach the issue, both of which are valid.
  - a. Ad-intra – to those inside the Church.
    1. This is an appeal to people's faith.
    2. Focused on Jesus' words and deeds. Not just WWJD, but WDJJ.
    3. Built as well on the tradition of the Church and the trust in Jesus' words that he would send the Holy Spirit to guide the Church into all truth and prevent her from erring, even once, on what we need to know (faith) or do (morals) to please God and enter fully into his life.
    4. This intra-ecclesial appeal is meant to motivate Catholics with faith to act with on this current and pressing issue.
  - b. Ad-extra – to those outside the Church
    1. This is an appeal not to faith but to reason and to common sense.
    2. It seeks to persuade people of sound mind and good will that the redefinition of marriage will be harmful for society and for individuals.
    3. This will focus on some of the consequences we've already seen as well as those that are foreseen.
    4. These data and arguments are particularly important to equip faithful Catholics with the arguments they can take into the public square to persuade others who may not share our faith.
    5. It's also important for another reason. Those in favor of same-sex marriage try to reduce the arguments against it to religious issues, and to one group's trying to force their notions of morality on the whole. That's why these ad-extra arguments are crucial, so that faithful Catholics can respond with arguments that have nothing to do with faith, but simply with brains, with reason.
  - c. These two can be summarized simply as arguments from faith and arguments from reason.
3. I will try to speak on each of these briefly for about 15-20 minutes, so that I can leave some time for your questions. I will begin with the arguments from reason and then head to the arguments from Revelation, which fortify what we know from reason and give us greater motivation.
4. For more information, please consult the following websites:
  - a. [www.winst.org/princetonprinciples/](http://www.winst.org/princetonprinciples/)
  - b. David Blankenhorn, *The Future of Marriage*, Encounter Books, 2007.
  - c. [www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\\_con\\_cfaith\\_doc\\_20030731\\_homosexual-unions\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20030731_homosexual-unions_en.html)
  - d. [www.voteonmarriage.org](http://www.voteonmarriage.org)
  - e. [www.marriagedebate.com](http://www.marriagedebate.com)
  - f. [www.family.org/cforum/fosi/marriage/](http://www.family.org/cforum/fosi/marriage/)
  - g. [www.nogaymarriage.com/information.asp](http://www.nogaymarriage.com/information.asp)

## B. Arguments from Reason

1. The importance of marriage and the vital role it plays in preserving the common good and promoting the welfare of children.

- a. What marriage is
  1. We begin by defining our terms.
  2. Marriage is not just any relationship between human beings. It has traditionally been the legally sanctioned union of one man and one woman with the internal purposes of mutual support and the protected structure for the raising of children.
  3. Sexual complementarity and fruitfulness belong to the very nature of marriage.
- b. The public purposes of marriage
  1. First, marriage is the institution through which societies seek to organize the bearing and rearing of children; it is particularly important in ensuring that children have the love and support of their father.
  2. Second, marriage provides direction, order, and stability to adult sexual unions and to their economic, social, and biological consequences.
  3. Third, marriage civilizes men, furnishing them with a sense of purpose, norms, and social status that orient their lives away from vice and toward virtue.
- c. The public goods of marriage
  1. It creates bonds of fidelity
    - a. It creates clear ties of begetting and belonging, ties of identity, kinship, and mutual interdependence and responsibility. These bonds of fidelity serve a crucial public purpose, and so it is necessary and proper for the state to recognize and encourage marriage in both law and public policy.
    - b. Families are themselves small societies, and the web of trust they establish across generations and between the spouses' original families are a key constituent of society as a whole.
    - c. The network of relatives and in-laws that marriage creates and sustains is a key ingredient of the "social capital" that facilitates many kinds of beneficial civic associations and private groups.
  2. It fosters a school of freedom and responsibility across the generations
    - a. A free society like ours depends upon citizens to govern their private lives and rear their children responsibly, so as to limit the scope, size, and power of the state.
    - b. Strong, intact families stabilize the state and decrease the need for costly and intrusive bureaucratic social agencies.
    - c. Families provide for their vulnerable members, the newborn, the elderly, and ill and the needy.
    - d. The virtues acquired within the family – generosity, self-sacrifice, trust, self-discipline – are crucial in every domain of social life. Children who grow up in broken families often fail to acquire these elemental habits of character.
    - e. When families break down, crime and social disorder soar; the state must expand to reassert social control with intrusive policing, a sprawling prison system, coercive child-support enforcement, and court-directed family life. Society is harmed by a host of social pathologies, including increased poverty, mental illness, crime, illegal drug use, clinical depression, and suicide.
    - f. Without stable families, personal liberty is thus imperiled, as the state tries to fulfill through coercion those functions that families, at their best, fulfill through covenantal devotion
  3. The economic benefits to the common good are incontestable
    - a. Marriage is a wealth-creating institution, increasing human and social capital
      - i. The modern economy and modern democratic state depend on families to produce the next generation of productive workers and taxpayers.
      - ii. It is within families that young people develop stable patterns of work and self-reliance at the direction of their parents, and this training in turn provides the basis for developing useful skills and gaining a profession.
      - iii. More deeply, marriage realigns personal interests beyond the good of the present self, and thus reduces the tendency of individuals and groups to make rash or imprudent decisions that squander the inheritance of future generations.

- iv. Families also provide networks of trust and capital that serve as the foundation for countless entrepreneurial small-business enterprises (as well as some large corporations), which are crucial to the vitality of the nation's economy.
  - v. In addition, devoted spouses and grown children assist in caring for the sick and elderly, and maintain the solvency of pension and social-insurance programs by providing unremunerated care for their loved ones, paying taxes, and producing the children who will form future generations of tax-paying workers.
  - vi. Without flourishing families, in other words, the long-term health of the modern economy would be imperiled.
4. Ordinarily, both men and women who marry are better off as a result
    - a. Married men gain moral and personal discipline, a stable domestic life, and the opportunity to participate in the upbringing of their children
    - b. Married women gain stability and protection, acknowledgment of the paternity of their children, and shared responsibility and emotional support in the raising of their young.
    - c. Together, both spouses gain from a normative commitment to the institution of marriage itself – including the benefits that come from faithfully fulfilling one's chosen duties as mother or father, husband or wife.
  5. Children are clearly better off as a result
    - a. Marriage protects and promotes the well-being of children
      - i. The family environment provided by marriage allows children to grow, mature, and flourish in a relationship of love and trust.
      - ii. It is a seedbed of sociability and virtue for the young, who learn from both their parents and their siblings
      - iii. The married family satisfies children's need to know their biological origins, connects them to both a mother and father, establishes a framework of love for nurturing the young, oversees their education and personal development, and anchors their identity as they learn to move about the larger world.
      - iv. . These are not merely desirable goods, but *what we owe to children as vulnerable beings filled with potential.*
    - b. Children do best when reared by their mothers and fathers in a married, intact family.
      - i. Although there is overlap in their parental talents, men and women bring different strengths to the parenting enterprise.
        1. Mothers are more sensitive to the cries, words, and gestures of infants, toddlers, and adolescents, and, partly as a consequence, they are better at providing physical and emotional nurture to their children. These special capacities of mothers seem to have deep biological underpinnings: during pregnancy and breastfeeding women experience high levels of the hormone peptide oxytocin, which fosters affiliative behavior.
        2. Fathers excel when it comes to providing discipline, ensuring safety, and challenging their children to embrace life's opportunities and confront life's difficulties.
      - ii. Educational benefits
        1. Children reared in intact, married homes are significantly more likely to be involved in literacy activities (such as being read to by adults or learning to recognize letters) as preschool children, and to score higher in reading comprehension as fourth graders.
        2. School-aged children are approximately 30 percent less likely to cut class, be tardy, or miss school altogether.
        3. The cumulative effect of family structure on children's educational performance is most evident in high school

graduation rates. Children reared in intact, married households are about twice as likely to graduate from high school, compared to children reared in single-parent or step-families. One study found that 37 percent of children born outside of marriage and 31 percent of children with divorced parents dropped out of high school, compared to 13 percent of children from intact families headed by a married mother and father.

iii. Emotional benefits

1. Children from stable, married families are significantly less likely to suffer from depression, anxiety, alcohol and drug abuse, and thoughts of suicide compared to children from divorced homes
2. One recent study of the entire population of Swedish children found that Swedish boys and girls in two-parent homes were about 50 percent less likely to suffer from suicide attempts, alcohol and drug abuse, and serious psychiatric illnesses compared to children reared in single-parent homes.
3. A survey of the American literature on child well-being found that family structure was more consequential than poverty in predicting children's psychological and behavioral outcomes.
4. Yale psychiatrist Kyle Pruett's research shows that children reared without fathers have an unmet "hunger for an abiding paternal presence, whereas children who are reared by their married biological parents are more likely to have a secure sense of their own biological origins and familial identity.
5. In general, children who are reared by their own married mothers and fathers are much more likely to confront the world with a sense of hope, self-confidence, and self-control than children raised without an intact, married family.

iv. Developmental benefits

1. For Girls

- a. Teenage girls who grow up with a single mother or a stepfather are significantly more likely to experience early menstruation and sexual development, compared to girls reared in homes headed by a married mother and father.
- b. Partly as a consequence, girls reared in single-parent or step-families are much more likely to experience a teenage pregnancy and to have a child outside of wedlock than girls who are reared in an intact, married family.
- c. One study found that only 5 percent of girls who grew up in an intact family got pregnant as teenagers, compared to 10 percent of girls whose fathers left after they turned six, and 35 percent of girls whose fathers left when they were preschoolers.
- d. Research also suggests that girls are significantly more likely to be sexually abused if they are living outside of an intact, married home – in large part because girls have more contact with unrelated males if their mothers are unmarried, cohabiting, or residing in a stepfamily.
- e. David Popenoe's work suggests that a father's pheromones influence the biological development of his daughter. Moreover, a strong marriage provides a model for girls of what to look for in a man and gives

- them the confidence to resist the sexual entreaties of their boyfriends.
2. For boys
    - a. Research consistently finds that boys raised by their own fathers and mothers in an intact, married family are less likely to get in trouble than boys raised in other family situations.
    - b. Boys raised outside of an intact family are more likely to have problems with aggression, attention deficit disorder, delinquency, and school suspensions, compared to boys raised in intact married families.
    - c. One study found that boys reared in single-parent and step-families were more than twice as likely to end up in prison, compared to boys reared in an intact family.
    - d. Clearly, stable marriage and paternal role models are crucial for keeping boys from self-destructive.
  2. The consequences when marriages break-down or are weakened is enormous and well-documented
    - a. Children suffer
      1. Children whose parents fail to get and stay married are at increased risk of poverty, dependency, substance abuse, educational failure, juvenile delinquency, early unwed pregnancy, and a host of other destructive behaviors.
      2. Child-poverty – One recent Brookings survey indicates that the increase in child poverty in the U.S. since the 1970s is due almost entirely to declines in the percentage of children reared in married families, primarily because children in single-parent homes are much less likely to receive much material support from their fathers.
      3. Adolescent well-being – especially in school, an enormous difference in teen pregnancy, depression and high school dropout rates, suicides, suspensions. (Penn State’s Paul Amato)
    - b. Other consequences
      1. The equality gap widens
      2. Our justice system is strained
      3. Increases the size and scope of governmental power.
  3. Why same-sex unions should not be equated with marriage and marriage should not be redefined.
    - a. What is at stake
      1. At issue is not only the value of marriage itself, but the reasons why the public has a deep interest in a socially supported normative understanding of marriage.
      2. The public goods uniquely provided by marriage are recognizable by reasonable persons, regardless of religious or secular worldview, and thus provide compelling reasons for reinforcing the existing marriage norm in law and public policy.
      3. Given the clear benefits of marriage, the state should not remain politically neutral, either in procedure or outcome, between marriage and various alternative family structures
      4. It is not just a question of benefits to individuals or to relationships, but we are witnessing a conceptual attack on marriage itself, in university communities and other intellectual centers of influence that will have consequences.
      5. Law and culture exhibit a dynamic relationship: changes in one ultimately yield changes in the other, and together law and culture structure the choices that individuals see as available, acceptable, and choice-worthy.
    - b. Homosexual unions do not fulfill the purpose for which marriage deserves special categorical recognition.
      1. Because married couples ensure the succession of generations and are therefore eminently within the public interest, civil law grants them institutional recognition and special benefits.
      2. Homosexual unions, on the other hand, do not need specific attention from the legal standpoint since they do not exercise this function for the common good.

3. The benefits have not been given to any relationship between two adults who love each other, but to a relationship between adults with a specific public purpose that society has seen fit to promote for the sake of the common good. There are lots of loving commitments that are not marriage. Friends are committed to each other, a parent is committed to a child, grandparents to their grandchildren, and people are committed to their pets. All of these are forms of love. All of them result in commitments. None of them is marriage.
  4. Differentiating between persons or refusing social recognition or benefits is unacceptable only when it is contrary to justice. The denial of the social and legal status of marriage to forms of cohabitation that are not and cannot be marital is not opposed to justice; on the contrary, justice requires it.
- c. It is not necessary to redefine marriage in order to accord many of the rights those with same-sex attractions are seeking.
1. In fact, it would be gravely unjust to sacrifice the common good and just laws on the family in order to protect personal goods through a redefinition of marriage.
  2. In Massachusetts, there is the Benefits Fairness Act.
    - a. Benefits Fairness Act
      - i. The purpose of this legislation is to create a new category of contractual relationships entitled "reciprocal beneficiary contracts." It recognizes that situations exist where people are in interdependent mutually supportive relationships who are ineligible for marriage but who nevertheless would benefit from a status similar to next-of-kin status. The bill defines specific benefits that would accrue to people who enter into a reciprocal beneficiary contract.
      - ii. This bill establishes a new Chapter 209E, "Reciprocal Beneficiary Contracts." It includes definitions and eligibility requirements, and defines the process of creating or terminating a Reciprocal Beneficiary Contract with the Secretary of State.
      - iii. Other sections of the bill amend existing laws to extend the following rights and benefits to reciprocal beneficiaries:
        1. Hospital visitation rights
        2. The right to designate a reciprocal beneficiary to make health care decisions in the event the other reciprocal beneficiary is unable to do so;
        3. Automatic revocation of a health care proxy upon the termination of a "Reciprocal Beneficiary Contract";
        4. The right of the surviving reciprocal beneficiary to authorize organ and tissue donations unless the deceased reciprocal beneficiary has specifically and previously indicated otherwise;
        5. The right to make funeral arrangements for one another;
        6. The right of insurers to include reciprocal beneficiaries, like relatives:
          - a. In a liability insurance contract;
          - b. As recipients of annuities under a group annuity contract;
          - c. In a group life insurance contract;
          - d. As recipients of life insurance proceeds in the event no designated beneficiary is alive;
          - e. Under any general or blanket accident or health insurance policy;
        7. The right to have health coverage extended for a period of 39 weeks, when a policyholder of a group medical insurance becomes ineligible because of involuntary layoff or death;
        8. The right to create a tenancy in common or joint tenancy with survivorship for a home;

9. Certain rights under the Homestead Protection Act which protects home ownership in the event of personal bankruptcy
  10. Inheritance rights when there is no will;
  11. Next of kin status for the reciprocal beneficiary of a mental health patient;
  12. Right to recover damages arising out of injury to the reciprocal beneficiary.
- b. People who love each other can still commit themselves to each other, but with this BFA, it's not marriage and it does not come from any legal recognition of their relationship (which comes with social approbation) but from their rights as citizens.
- d. But do not those who have same-sex attractions have the right to marry?
    1. Yes, they do, but according to the law.
    2. The law restricts us from marrying our children, those under a certain age, those who are already married, or anyone if we're still married. No one has a right to marry whoever he or she wants. Society has never recognized a right to marry those of the same-sex, because she recognized that it was not what marriage was.
    3. This is not about access to marriage. It's about redefining marriage to be something it has never been.
  - e. Why the redefinition of marriage would harm the common good.
    1. Damage to the institution and understanding of marriage
      - a. Legal recognition of homosexual unions would obscure certain basic moral values and cause a devaluation of the institution of marriage. If everything is marriage, than marriage is nothing.
      - b. If, from the legal standpoint, marriage between a man and a woman were to be considered just one possible form of marriage, the concept of marriage would undergo a radical transformation, with grave detriment to the common good. The law is a teacher, instructing the young either
        - i. that marriage is a reality in which people can choose to participate but whose contours individuals cannot remake at will,
        - ii. or teaching the young that marriage is a mere convention, so malleable that individuals, couples, or groups can choose to make of it whatever suits their desires, interests, or subjective goals of the moment.
      - c. A marriage culture cannot flourish in a society whose primary institutions – universities, courts, legislatures, religions – not only fail to defend marriage but actually undermine it both conceptually and in practice. *But law and public policy will either reinforce and support these goals or undermine them.*
      - d. 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.
      - e. These concerns are only reinforced by the legalization of same-sex marriage in Belgium, Canada, the Netherlands, and Spain – and its legalization in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
        - i. Same-sex marriage has taken hold in societies or regions with low rates of marriage and/or fertility
        - ii. For instance, Belgium, Canada, Massachusetts, the Netherlands, and Spain all have fertility rates well below the replacement level of 2.1 children per woman
        - iii. These are societies in which child-centered marriage has ceased to be the organizing principle of adult life
        - iv. Seen in this light, same-sex marriage is both a consequence of and further stimulus to the abolition of marriage as the preferred vehicle for ordering sex, procreation, and childrearing in the West



- f. Moreover, the redefinition of marriage would not just allow different understandings, but likely force everyone dramatically to alter our definition of marriage and family, in schools and in public language.
    - i. Same-sex marriage would further undercut the idea that procreation is intrinsically connected to marriage, or make it a husband-less or wife-less institution. Party A and Party B.
    - ii. *The law* will teach our children and grandchildren that there is nothing special about mothers and fathers raising children together. Parent A and Parent B, instead of mother and father. Parenthood would consist of any number of emotionally attached people who care for kids.
    - iii. Those who support the traditional, historic understanding of marriage will be called bigots in the public square.
    - iv. If one doesn't think this will occur, just look at what has happened in Massachusetts since the legalization of same-sex marriage.
      - 1. David Parker, who was arrested because he wanted to know what his kindergartener was being taught about transsexuals and same-sex couples.
      - 2. Parents who were not told about reading assignments about fairy-tales with princes kissing.
      - 3. Heather Has Two Mommies and other such literature.
  - g. While there are surely many unknowns, what we do know suggests that embracing same-sex marriage would further weaken marriage itself at the very moment when it needs to be most strengthened.
2. Harm to children
- a. Because children growing up in same-sex homes is still a new phenomenon, no one can definitively say at this point how children are affected by being reared by same-sex couples. We do not yet have any large, long-term, longitudinal studies that can tell us much about how children are affected by being raised in a same-sex household.
  - b. Yet the larger empirical literature on child well-being – discussed above – suggests that the two sexes bring different talents to the parenting enterprise and particularly need the presence of a father.
    - i. The empirical literature strongly suggests that children reared by same-sex parents will experience greater difficulties with their identity, sexuality, attachments to kin, and marital prospects as adults, among other things.
    - ii. If SSM becomes common, most SS couples with children would be lesbians. This means that we would have yet more children being raised apart from fathers.
    - iii. Among other things, we know that fathers excel in reducing antisocial behavior/delinquency in boys and sexual activity in girls.
    - iv. USC study about sexual promiscuousness in teenagers.
  - c. Same-sex marriage would undermine the idea that children need both a mother and a father, further weakening the societal norm that men should take responsibility for the children they beget.
  - d. Anecdotal evidence from Dawn Stefanowicz, in an article by Gail Besse in the National Catholic Register:
    - i. "I grew up with my homosexual father in Toronto. I was exposed to the "gay-lesbian-bisexual-transgendered" subcultures and explicit sexual practices. Even when my father was in what looked liked monogamous relationships, he continued cruising for anonymous sex, so I was at high risk of exposure to contagious STDs. Alcohol, drugs, gay bars and parties were common."
    - ii. "We went to vacation spots that weren't typical family places. One was a gay nude beach at Hanlan's Point, Toronto, which often was raided by police, but now it's legally 'clothing optional.' By age 10, I was exposed

to a sex shop and a gay cruising area. The boundaries between private and public sex were broken. There was cross-dressing, and gender-neutral aspects. I grew up feeling very confused about my own sexuality."

- iii. "These experiences did not teach me respect for morality, authority, marriage or paternal love. Youth and good looks were stressed. People were treated like disposable commodities. I often felt abandoned as my dad would go off to be with his partners for days."
  - iv. "I felt worthless, as my dad could not show affection or affirmation to females. I vowed never to have children. I was 19 when I began questioning women's roles."
  - v. "It's important that a little girl sees her gender valued. Little boys need to see how their father relates to their mother. If they don't, they grow up with the wrong understanding of women."
  - vi. "Because of new reproductive technology, same-sex adoption and situations like mine, more children will be traumatized. Kids are cut off from at least one biological parent and often from an extended family. It's very lonely for them, and if their parent identifies with the gay political agenda, there's pressure on the child to accept this. People who are struggling with their sexuality need the freedom to seek healing."
  - vii. "Sitcoms and the media paint this issue in such unreal ways. Our experiences traumatized us long-term, and yet the general public gets watered-down pabulum fed to them from many gay activists who don't want you to know the unsavory details of the lifestyle."
3. It would open the path to polygamy.
    - a. 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.
    - b. 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.
  4. It would damage religious freedom, especially of the Catholic Church and of those who believe in the Biblical understanding of the immorality of homosexual activity.
    - a. In Massachusetts, the Catholic Church has been forced against her faith to give children to same-sex adoptive couples or get out of the adoptive business.
    - b. Christian Justices of the Peace, like one in Worcester, needed to resign or preside over same-sex marriages.
    - c. Church will need to give health care benefits to same-sex spouses. Contraception case in New York of last week.
    - d. As has happened in Canada and in the Sweden, those preaching on the Bible will be susceptible to prosecution for hate speech.
  5. Many adoption laws and preferences will become instantly obsolete. There is no way to favor an intact married husband and wife.
  6. Foster care programs will be impacted dramatically in the same way.
  7. There will also be direct economic consequences that will go beyond the harm done to the economic generator of the intact traditional family.
    - a. Business insurance programs would be affected.
    - b. Health care systems will have to assume vast new charges.
    - c. Social security programs will be stressed.
  8. "How will my same-sex marriage harm you or your marriage?" In all of these ways!

### C. Arguments from faith

1. The founts of the Church's teachings on faith and morals are Sacred Scripture and the living Tradition of the Church. Both are relevant to the issue of marriage.

2. The first thing to admit is that same-sex marriage was not really an issue in the ancient world.
  - a. Though there was the practice of homosexuality — and we find homosexual activity condemned in both the Old Testament and the New — the phenomenon of those of the same-sex attempting to marry as heterosexuals have throughout time is very new.
  - b. That's why we should not be surprised that we do not find explicit statements against it in Scripture and the first nineteen centuries of the Church's tradition — just as we don't have explicit condemnations of computer hacking, or the use of nuclear weapons, or in-vitro fertilization, or cloning, We simply cannot expect that we will find explicit condemnations in Scripture and among the fathers of the Church of things that did not yet exist nor could people at the time legitimately see on the horizon.
  - c. Homosexuality itself was not a feature of Jewish society during Jesus' day. Same sex relationships could lead to death according to what is found in the book of Leviticus.
  - d. When the Church encountered homosexuality in Greece, though, it spoke out against it forcefully.
3. So while there is no explicit denunciation of same-sex marriage in Scripture and tradition, there is much implicit, in both what is taught about marriage as well as what is said about homosexual activity.
4. Jesus' teaching on marriage
  - a. Perhaps the clearest statement on marriage is given by the Lord himself, when the Pharisees came to question him about divorce.
  - b. In response, Jesus took marriage back to the beginning, and the principles that he enunciated about marriage are easily applicable to the question of same-sex unions.
  - c. We find this teaching in Mt 19 and Mk 10:
    1. Mt 19:3 Some Pharisees came to him, and to test him they asked, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife for any cause?" 4 He answered, "Have you not read that the one who made them at the beginning 'made them male and female,' 5 and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'? 6 So they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let no one separate."
  - d. We see quickly the following principles:
    1. Jesus says that in the beginning God made them, not male and male, or female and female, but male and female — God does everything for a reason, and hence there is great meaning to our original differentiation. Whether we're male or female is not incidental to who we are, like our hair color, or eye color. Because we are body-soul composites, and our bodies obviously impact our soul, our sex clearly influences our personality.
    2. For this reason a man shall leave, not his two mommies or two daddies, but his father and mother — Jesus has a clear notion of the family.
    3. And cling, not to whomever he wishes, but to his wife — There is a clear directionality in marriage in God's plan.
    4. And the two shall become one flesh. So they are no longer two, but one flesh — Often, people think this 'one-flesh' union refers to the ephemeral conjunction of two bodies in sexual activity. But it's much deeper. Their flesh becomes truly united when his flesh and hers, his chromosomes and hers, become fused in a child, who is the fruit and sign of their one-flesh union.
      - a. We can say, in fact, that the whole purpose of the differentiation of the sexes in the beginning by God was to allow this type of one flesh union, this type of fruitful communion of persons, so that through this love, man and woman can cooperate with God in the continued creation of the human race.
      - b. This type of one-flesh union, capable of increase and multiplication, is obviously impossible to those of the same sex.
    5. Therefore what God has joined, let no one separate — God has done more than join a particular man with a particular woman in the one-flesh bond of marriage, but prior to that, has willed to join in marriage man and woman in general. To divorce man from woman in marriage, to make marriage a husband-less or wife-less institution, is done only at peril.

- e. Tinkering with the concept of marriage is enormously consequential, and Catholic faithful need to recognize this.
1. Marriage, this union of man and woman in a fruitful communion of persons in love, is the most important image of the Trinitarian God in the world. "God created mankind in his own image, in the image of God he created THEM; male and female he created them." If we don't understand marriage, a loving union of two persons so strong that it can generate a third person, then we will have far greater difficulty understanding who God is, in whose image man and woman in marriage were made.
  2. It will throw off our understanding of the meaning of our masculinity or femininity and therefore of our bodies. Whenever we do this, we either exaggerate or minimize the meaning of the body, leading us, respectively, either to hedonism or to disembodied spiritualism.
  3. It will also throw off the whole understanding of Christ's relationship to his Church, which is spousal in a heterosexual sense. Christ is the Bridegroom, the Church is his Bride. The Church is called therefore to be receptive to the seeds the Lord wants to plant, his word, his teaching, his grace, his very body and blood.
5. Church teaching on same-sex marriage
- a. Benedict XVI, June 6, 2005 to Diocesan Convention of Rome
    1. "Today, the various forms of the erosion of marriage, such as free unions and "trial marriage", and even **pseudo-marriages between people of the same sex**, are instead an expression of **anarchic freedom** that are wrongly made to pass as true human liberation. This pseudo-freedom is based on a **trivialization of the body**, which inevitably entails the trivialization of the person. Its premise is that the human being can do to himself or herself whatever he or she likes: thus, the body becomes a secondary thing that can be manipulated, from the human point of view, and used as one likes. Licentiousness, which passes for the discovery of the body and its value, is actually a dualism that makes the body despicable, placing it, so to speak, outside the person's authentic being and dignity.
  - b. CDF, June 3, 2003, *Considerations Regard Proposals to give Legal Recognition to Unions between Homosexual Persons*
    1. The difference from real marriage
      - a. "There are absolutely no grounds for considering homosexual unions to be in any way similar or even remotely analogous to God's plan for marriage and family. Marriage is holy, while homosexual acts go against the natural moral law. Homosexual acts "close the sexual act to the gift of life."
      - b. "The Church teaches that respect for homosexual persons cannot lead in any way to approval of homosexual behavior or to legal recognition of homosexual unions. The common good requires that laws recognize, promote and protect marriage as the basis of the family, the primary unit of society. Legal recognition of homosexual unions or placing them on the same level as marriage would mean not only the approval of deviant behavior, with the consequence of making it a model in present-day society, but would also obscure basic values which belong to the common inheritance of humanity. The Church cannot fail to defend these values, for the good of men and women and for the good of society itself."
    2. Duties of Catholic Citizens
      - a. "Where the government's policy is *de facto* tolerance and there is no explicit legal recognition of homosexual unions ... moral conscience requires that, in every occasion, Christians give witness to the whole moral truth, which is contradicted both by approval of homosexual acts and unjust discrimination against homosexual persons."
      - b. "In those situations where homosexual unions have been legally recognized or have been given the legal status and rights belonging to marriage, clear and emphatic opposition is a duty. One must refrain from any kind of formal cooperation in the enactment or application of such gravely unjust laws and, as far as possible, from material cooperation on the level of their application. In this area, everyone can exercise the right to conscientious objection"

3. Duties of Catholic politicians
  - a. "If it is true that all Catholics are obliged to oppose the legal recognition of homosexual unions, Catholic politicians are obliged to do so in a particular way, in keeping with their responsibility as politicians."
  - b. "When legislation in favor of the recognition of homosexual unions is proposed for the first time in a legislative assembly, the Catholic law-maker has a moral duty to express his opposition clearly and publicly and to vote against it. To vote in favor of a law so harmful to the common good is gravely immoral."
  - c. "When legislation in favor of the recognition of homosexual unions is already in force, the Catholic politician must oppose it in the ways that are possible for him and make his opposition known; it is his duty to witness to the truth. If it is not possible to repeal such a law completely, the Catholic politician, "could licitly support proposals aimed at limiting the harm done by such a law and at lessening its negative consequences at the level of general opinion and public morality", on condition that his "absolute personal opposition" to such laws was clear and well known and that the danger of scandal was avoided. This does not mean that a more restrictive law in this area could be considered just or even acceptable; rather, it is a question of the legitimate and dutiful attempt to obtain at least the partial repeal of an unjust law when its total abrogation is not possible at the moment."
4. The evil and harm of same-sex adoption
  - a. "As experience has shown, the absence of sexual complementarity in these unions creates obstacles in the normal development of children who would be placed in the care of such persons. They would be deprived of the experience of either fatherhood or motherhood."
  - b. "Allowing children to be adopted by persons living in such unions would actually mean doing violence to these children, in the sense that their condition of dependency would be used to place them in an environment that is not conducive to their full human development. This is gravely immoral and in open contradiction to the principle, recognized also in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, that the best interests of the child, as the weaker and more vulnerable party, are to be the paramount consideration in every case."
6. Confronting with truth and love same-sex activity in Scripture and Church tradition and teaching.
  - a. Faithful Catholics need to try to be 100% faithful to Christ's teachings as well as 100% faithful to his command to love others.
    1. This obviously goes for those with same-sex attractions.
    2. It is only the truth that will set them free to love, and we find that truth in Sacred Scripture and Tradition.
    3. We don't need to get into all the Scriptural sources and citations from the Fathers of the Church. Suffice it to quote from a recent document of the CDF that summarizes the position:
      - a. "Sacred Scripture condemns homosexual acts "as a serious depravity... (cf. *Rom* 1:24-27; *1 Cor* 6:10; *1 Tim* 1:10).
      - b. This judgment of Scripture does not of course permit us to conclude that all those who suffer from this anomaly are personally responsible for it, but it does attest to the fact that homosexual acts are 'intrinsically disordered'.
      - c. This same moral judgment is found in many Christian writers of the first centuries and is unanimously accepted by Catholic Tradition.
    4. When deliberately and freely chosen, same-sex activity is mortally sinful. It harms people in this life and may harm them eternally. (The Church has never said that same-sex attractions, although disordered, are sinful).
  - b. To love those with same-sex attractions means to want what is best for them.
    1. On one level, we can say in truth that this battle is not about marriage, but about same sex activity. They want to change the definition of marriage in order to preserve the fiction that same-sex activity and attraction is a normal and unchangeable variant of acceptable humanness.

2. Although those with same sex attractions may want stability, love and family life, creating a simulation of marriage is not in their best interest.
3. Greater stability in this relationship is not good for them, because same sex relationships are founded on the personal dysfunction of the partners.
  - a. The partners use one another in an attempt to resolve their unmet needs and childhood traumas. If they have not dealt with the traumas or unmet needs which put them on the path to same-sex attraction, they will lack the affective maturity.
  - b. Therefore a same-sex relationship will keep them in an unhealed state.
  - c. It is a covenant with their disorders, a promise not to seek healing and therefore not in the best interests of either.
4. We're against same-sex marriage not just because it will hurt our children, weaken marriage, and threaten our freedom of religion, *but also because it will hurt persons with SSA and children in their care even more than it will hurt us.*
- c. Part of our love for them must be a strict condemnation of unjust discrimination against them or hatred.
  1. According to the teaching of the Church, men and women with homosexual tendencies "must be accepted with respect, compassion and sensitivity. Every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided" (Catechism).
  2. But we also have to admit that not every opposition is based on irrational fear or hatred. There are obvious reasons to oppose the gay agenda.
- d. All of these teachings were taken up in the U.S. Bishop's document "Ministry to Persons with a Homosexual Inclination: Guidelines for Pastoral Care," published in November.
7. The stakes looked at from the point of view of the faith
  - a. Many say that the issue is really about marriage, not same-sex attractions or activity.
    1. From the point of view of those trying to defend marriage, that is true. Many are motivated not out of any disapproval of same-sex activity, but to defend marriage at a time of particular weakness.
    2. But we have to add that from the point of view of those pushing for the redefinition of marriage, the issue is not really marriage, but the normalization of the gay approach to sexuality, which will then be pushed against those who disagree.
  - b. The gay agenda is more than simply a series of myths; it is a frontal attack on everything the Catholic Church stands for, especially in terms of the meaning of our sexuality (masculinity and femininity), the meaning of marriage, the meaning of family, the relationship between marriage and openness to procreation.
  - c. The gay approach to human sexuality is the anti-thesis of the teaching of the Church, which was given to us by God for our own good. We have been created to love, and if our approach to love is distorted, our whole approach to life will be distorted.
  - d. Faithful Catholics are called to be involved not just out of love for those with same-sex attractions, therefore, but for all people, because, to some degree, the most fundamental issues of life, love and human understanding are at stake.

#### D. Brief political remarks and conclusion

1. Activists in favor of same-sex marriage think that time is on their side.
  - a. They believe that most heterosexuals do not really like to think or to talk about same-sex attractions and activity and would rather the whole issue go away.
  - b. They also think that same-sex marriage remains only one of many issues for typical traditional family advocates, while for same-sex advocates, it is among the most important issues.
  - c. They think that all they have to do is to continue to battle, because eventually they will win a war of attrition, because they're more committed to their side than they think traditional marriage advocates are to theirs.
2. This points to the crucial need for perseverance on our side.
  - a. The same-sex side is fundamentally sterile and unstable. It is vastly out-numbered.
  - b. The bottom line is that we are destined to win — provided that we first stay committed to the issue, and then practice what we preach.
  - c. We clearly need people who are able to speak the truth with love in the public square.

- d. But we also need Catholic families to live fully the Church's teaching about the meaning of love, marriage, sex and family.
  1. There's a reason why same-sex marriage takes root in places where there are negative birth rates, where the procreative aspect of marriage is underemphasized by heterosexuals.
  2. We need to LIVE the teaching of the Church relative to marriage and family and preach this message by our eloquent body language.
3. Perseverance and practice of the faith are what is needed.
  - a. The Church is in this battle until Christ comes again.
  - b. She hopes you will be there with her.