

business owner, would be forced to bear the expense of subsidizing homosexual relationships—including their higher health care costs.

### **Schools would teach that homosexual relationships are identical to heterosexual ones.**

A lesbian who teaches 8<sup>th</sup> grade sex education in Massachusetts told NPR that she teaches her children how lesbians use “a sex toy” to have intercourse. If anyone objects, she says, “Give me a break. It’s legal now.” One father was *jailed* after protesting because his son—a *kindergarten* student—was given a book about same-sex couples.

### **Freedom of conscience and religious liberty would be threatened.**

Religious schools and colleges could be forced to admit and employ homosexuals. Churches and non-profit organizations could be stripped of their tax exemptions and religious psychologists, social workers, and marriage counselors could be denied licensing if they “discriminate” against homosexuals.

*Haven't you read, [Jesus] replied, "that at the beginning the Creator 'made them male and female,'" and said, "For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh"?*

Matthew 19:4-5 (NIV)

### **Family Research Council**

801 G Street NW • Washington, DC 20001  
1-800-225-4008 • [www.frc.org](http://www.frc.org)

Printed in Partnership with American Tract Society • [ATStracts.org](http://ATStracts.org)

Photo by iStock Photo • Printed in USA • ©2006

71042

Family Research Council

What Harm Would  
Same-Sex  
"Marriage" Do?



Peter Sprigg

Some advocates of same-sex “marriage” scoff at the idea that it could harm anyone. Here are eight ways in which society could be harmed by legalizing same-sex “marriage.”

### **Fewer people would marry.**

In Massachusetts, only 43% of same-sex couples who live together have even bothered to “marry.” Among opposite-sex couples, the comparable figure is 91%. In the Netherlands, the figures are even lower, with only 12% of homosexual couples having entered legal civil “marriages.” Giving the option of same-sex “marriage” would tell society that marriage in general is “optional,” not normative, and fewer people would marry.

### **Fewer people would remain monogamous and sexually faithful.**

One study in the Netherlands showed that homosexual men *with a steady partner* had an average of eight sexual partners per year. Another has shown that the average lesbian has more lifetime *male* sexual partners than the average heterosexual woman. If these behaviors are incorporated into what society affirms as “marriage,” then fidelity among heterosexuals would likely decline as well.

### **Fewer people would remain married for a lifetime.**

The same Dutch study that showed the high rate of homosexual promiscuity also showed that the average homosexual male “partnership” lasts only 1.5 years. As the transience of homosexual relationships is incorporated in society’s image of

“marriage,” we can expect that fewer heterosexuals would maintain a lifelong commitment as well.

### **More children would be raised without a married mother and father.**

Social science has proven clearly that children do best when raised by their own married biological mother and father. Yet legalizing same-sex “marriage” would put an official stamp of approval on the deliberate creation of permanently motherless or fatherless families. It would require legalization of homosexual adoption and forbid giving preference to mother-father households.

As scholar Stanley Kurtz says, *If, as in Norway, gay marriage were imposed here by a socially liberal cultural elite, it would likely speed us on the way toward the classic Nordic pattern of less frequent marriage, more frequent out-of-wedlock birth, and skyrocketing family dissolution. In the American context, this would be a disaster.*

### **Demands for legalization of polygamy would grow.**

If a person’s choice of spouse cannot be limited based on the *sex* of one’s partner, it is hard to see how it could be limited based on the *number* of spouses either. At least one lawsuit has already been filed making this argument.

### **Taxpayers, consumers, and businesses would be forced to subsidize homosexual relationships.**

If same-sex marriage were legalized, *all* employers, public and private, large or small, would be required to offer spousal benefits to homosexual couples. You, as a taxpayer, consumer, or small