

In Their Own Words:

It's Not About Equality. Homosexual Advocates Desire to Eradicate Marriage/Gender

Scrambling the definition of marriage will be a shock to our fundamental understanding of human social relations and institutions. One effect will be that sexual fidelity will be detached from the commitment of marriage. The advocates of gay marriage themselves admit as much.

“Among gay male relationships, the openness of the contract makes it more likely to survive than many heterosexual bonds,” [Andrew Sullivan](#), the most eloquent proponent of gay marriage, wrote in his 1996 book, [Virtually Normal](#). “There is more likely to be a greater understanding of the need for extramarital outlets between two men than between a man and a woman. ... Something of the gay relationship’s necessary honesty, its flexibility, and its equality could undoubtedly help strengthen and inform many heterosexual bonds.”

The former moderator of the [Metropolitan Community Church](#), a largely homosexual denomination, made the same point. “Monogamy is not a word the gay community uses,” Troy Perry told [The Dallas Morning News](#). “We talk about fidelity. That means you live in a loving, caring, honest relationship with your partner. Because we can’t marry, we have people with widely varying opinions as to what that means. Some would say that committed couples could have multiple sexual partners as long as there’s no deception.”

A recent study from the Netherlands, where gay marriage is legal, suggests that the moderator is correct. Researchers found that even among stable homosexual partnerships, men have an average of eight partners per year outside their “monogamous” relationship.

In short, gay marriage will change marriage more than it will change gays.

Further, if we scramble our definition of marriage, it will soon embrace relationships that will involve more than two persons. Prominent advocates hope to use gay marriage as a wedge to abolish governmental support for traditional marriage altogether.

Law Professor Martha Ertman of the University of Utah, for example, wants to render the distinction between traditional marriage and “polyamory” (group marriage) “morally neutral.” She argues that greater openness to gay partnerships will help us establish this moral neutrality (Her main article on this topic, in the Winter 2001 Harvard Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law Review, is not available online, but she made a similar case in the Spring/Summer 2001 Duke Journal Of Gender Law & Policy).

University of Michigan law professor [David Chambers](#) wrote in a widely cited 1996 [Michigan Law Review](#) piece that he expects gay marriage will lead government to be “more receptive to [marital] units of three or more” (1996 Michigan Law Review).

What is Marriage? Man and Woman: A Defense. Sherif Girgis, Ryan T. Anderson, Robert P. George. N.Y., Encounter Books, 2012.

p. 68 - 70 [Statements are footnoted in the book]

Judith Stacey – a prominent NYU professor who is in no way regarded a fringe figure, testifying before Congress against the Defense of Marriage Act – expressed hope that the revisionist view’s triumph would give marriage ‘varied, creative, and adaptive contours...[leading some to] question the dyadic limitations of Western marriage and seek...small group marriages.’⁴⁴

In their statement “Beyond Same Sex Marriage,” more than three hundred “LGBT and allied” scholars and advocates—including prominent Ivy League professors – call for legally recognizing sexual relationships involving more than two partners.⁴⁵

University of Calgary Professor Elizabeth Blake thinks that justice requires us to use legal recognition to “denormalize [] heterosexual monogamy as a way of life” and to correct for “past discrimination against homosexuals, bisexuals, polygamists, and care networks.”⁴⁶

Andrew Sullivan, the self-styled proponent of the conservative case for same-sex civil marriage who extolls the “spirituality” of “anonymous sex, “ also...thinks that the “openness” of same-sex unions would enhance the bonds of husbands and wives...there is more likely to be greater understanding of the need for extramarital outlets between two men than between a man and a woman...[S]omething of the gay relationship’s necessary honesty, its flexibility, and its equality could undoubtedly help strengthen and inform many heterosexual bonds.”⁵⁰

A piece in *The Advocate*, a gay-interest newsmagazine:

Anti-equality right-wingers have long insisted that allowing gays to marry will destroy the sanctity of “traditional marriage,” and, of course, the logical liberal party-line response has long been, “No, it won’t.” But what if – for once – the sanctimonious crazies are right? Could the gay male tradition of open relationships actually alter marriage as we know it? And would that be such a bad thing?⁵¹

In fact, some revisionists have embraced the goal of weakening the institution of marriage *in these very terms*. [Former President George W.] Bush is correct,” says revisionist advocate Victoria Brownworth, “...when he states that allowing same-sex couples to marry will weaken the institution of marriage....It most certainly will do so, and that will make marriage a far better concept than it previously has been.”⁵³

Professor Ellen Willis...celebrates the fact that “conferring the legitimacy of marriage on homosexual relations will introduce an implicit revolt against the institution into its very heart.”⁵⁴

Michelangelo Signorile, a prominent gay activist, urges people in same-sex relationships to “demand the right to marry not as a way of adhering to society’s moral codes but rather to debunk a myth and radically alter an archaic institution.”⁵⁵ They should “fight for same-sex marriage and its benefits and then, once granted, redefine the institution of marriage completely, because the most subversive actions lesbians and gay men can undertake...is to transform the notion of ‘family’ entirely.”⁵⁶

A federal judge in Utah [in 2011] has allowed a legal challenge to anti-bigamy laws as violations of religious liberty and infringements of equality.⁵⁸