

On Same Sex Marriage II

2. Artificial Contraception. All of the early arguments in favor of legalizing artificial contraception were based on the assumption that the legalization would enable married couples to “space” their children out in a rational manner. But we know that this legalization had consequences. Among them is the fact that with the SR, the use of contraceptives by unmarried persons became as widespread as its use by married couples, if not more so. Contraception serves to separate the sexual act from the possibility of children and consequent familial commitment; and if this could be done in marriage why not outside of marriage? Here again we see a law of unintended consequences. “How can my using the pill harm your marriage?” Again, this is not an argument at all. Contraception may not have destroyed marriage, but it has certainly harmed the institution of marriage.

3. Abortion. The celebrants of the SR knew that contraception was not infallible. “Mistakes” happen from time to time. Carelessness with contraception was especially likely when teenagers were having sex, and the Revolution was encouraging enthusiastically an immense expansion of teenage sex. In fact, without the Pill, the SR would have been impossible. It would have been equally impossible without abortion as a backup when it didn’t work. The legalization of abortion was supposed to “help” poor women in cases of rape say, or incest. But soon after we heard of Billie Jean King obtaining an abortion because she was convinced that pregnancy would hurt her chances at Wimbledon. “How does my having an abortion harm your marriage?” is another meaningless question. Abortion has not eliminated marriage, but the institution of marriage is reeling from it.

4. Cohabitation and fornication. The SR enthusiastically encouraged unmarried

cohabitation, which grew in popularity to the extent that in our times it is common, even among Catholics. Cohabitation sends one loud and clear message to young people – that marriage is simply not necessary. You can have all the fun without the responsibility. “How does my cohabitation harm your marriage?” That is not the question. But only a blind man would not see that cohabitation harms the institution of marriage.

5. Out-of-wedlock births. There was a time when bringing a child into the world forced a boy to become a man. But with the SR, out-of-wedlock births have skyrocketed, and each one furthers the separation of marriage and children. “How does my pregnancy outside of marriage harm your marriage?” It might not. But if you believe that it does not harm the institution of marriage, then most likely you cannot grasp the notion of an institution at all.

6. Pornography. As early defenders of pornography howled about “what goes on in the privacy of my bedroom,” so the laws were diluted to the extent that almost any fantasy can be acted out. There are a few successful prosecutions of obscenity, but groups like the ACLU make sure that there is no obscenity. “How can my looking at pornography harm your marriage?” The institution of marriage is damaged by pornography. Every study done on this shows this to be the case. But then again, you don’t need any scientific studies to grasp this truth.

There are other elements to the SR which we could look at...it’s hard to imagine the Revolution taking place without drug abuse. The legalization of marijuana is closely connected to this. The vast majority of human beings need

something to break down their inhibitions, and drugs and alcohol will do the trick.

It's just as hard to imagine the SR without music. All revolutions need music, whether the French Revolution with the "Marseillaise", or the Protestant Revolution with "A Mighty Fortress." The SR needed rock-and-roll. And to go mainstream it needs other forms too, which account for country-and-western now being largely indistinguishable from rock. Your chances of finding rock songs which encourage and extol traditional marriage are pretty slim.

"But how do my joint and my iPod harm my next-door neighbors' marriage?" I would say to this, "Because marriage is a tough vocation, and needs everyone's support, even yours. Real marriage is the opposite of selfishness. And the more people who live in selfishness, the less support there is for marriage, and the more harm there is to the common good."

Look at the cultures of rock and pot and snowboarding and video games and all the pop cultures which occupy such gigantic amounts of our time. None of them, none of them engender self-sacrifice. They all engender self-indulgence. And self-indulgence is directly opposed to marriage.

Proponents of SSM argue that far from weakening the institution of marriage, it will actually strengthen it. In other words, we are told that the SR, after nearly a half-century of undermining marriage, will suddenly do the opposite. This is absurd.

It is unlikely that SSM will be able to silence a voice within most people, not so much a voice of conscience as a voice of nature that says there is something un-

natural about homosexual unions, and something doubly unnatural about SSM. No matter how much political correctness demands that we applaud the idea of SSM, vast numbers of Americans will withhold their applause. The idea of SSM will seem to them as repellant as a grown man with back hair in a spaghetti-strap white wedding dress. The whole thing will seem to be a joke. And if it is a joke, why enter into it seriously, why bother getting married at all?

But with the law of unintended consequences, the permission for SSM will not stay put. If society permits SSM, then it must be expected that it will allow other types of non-traditional marriage. The legal logic is simple: if prohibiting SSM is discriminatory, then disallowing polygamous marriage, or polyamorous marriage, or polyandrous marriage, will also be deemed discriminatory. In fact, such legal maneuverings have already begun.

I can hear at least one retort to this opinion. "Father, are you sure these consequences were unintentional?"

Credit for these thoughts goes to Dr. David Carlin, Community College of Rhode Island, who wrote a good article in the latest *Pastoral and Homiletic Review*. Credit also goes to Laura Wood, and to Dr. Trayce Hansen, a clinical psychologist. If you want references for scientific studies referred to in these inserts, go to her website, www.drtraycehansen.com.