

Morality at the Ballot Box: Vote “Yes” and Vote for Marriage

In her statement regarding North Carolina’s golden opportunity to vote in the primary for marriage as “marriage” and not against marriage as “marriage,” it is sad that Senator Kay Hagan makes this moral issue subject to state economics, “North Carolina is one of the most business-friendly states in the nation, and this amendment would harm our state's ability to recruit the innovators and businesses that are driving our economic recovery.” She could use her leadership in this area to promote what is morally good for our society and for all the males and females who live in it.

While one could argue that wholesomeness, like honesty and integrity, never hurt a business or the economy, the greater truth remains that we live in God’s creation that is still subject to His making man male and female (“man” in the generic sense as in human beings). When we make laws and enforce laws regarding marriage as “the union of one man and one woman” we are following His institution, which has been universally accepted for the entire history of the world in virtually every culture. Unfortunately the intent of marriage being the “lifelong” union of one man and one woman is not included in the amendment.

That divorce rates are so high among us and that divorce is so easily accessible in our society since the late ’60’s does not diminish the goodness of God’s holy institution. That single parent families are so numerous and that unwed motherhood is encouraged among us socially and economically today does not bode well for the future of our nation. The goodness of marriage is undeniable. A study several years ago claimed that for children “A Bad Marriage Is Better Than a Good Divorce.” Thankfully the mercy and goodness of God in Jesus Christ can work through both when people repent of their sins, believe in the forgiveness won by the risen Savior of the world, and go and sin no more.

There are records of nations and communities which have perished in which homosexuality has played a negative part. Are there records which show that the upholding of God’s institution of marriage as “marriage” has led to the demise of a society or nation? I do not think so. Such records would have to be artfully “created” and I do not deny that that is being done on the university level where truth in matters of morality carries little or no weight.

Richard Weaver, writing in 1948 in his book Ideas Have Consequences, argues, “Yet to establish the fact of decadence is the most pressing duty of our time . . . and our most serious obstacle is that people traveling this downward path develop an insensibility which increases with their degradation.” [p. 10] As you can imagine, the idea that our citizens would allow within the definition of marriage the union of two males or two females has consequences.

On the one hand, it will give public license to a lifestyle that is rightly discouraged—as nature itself discourages it and as God forbids it (Romans 1:26-28; 1 Corinthians 6:9-10; Old Testament references are in Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13; Genesis 18:16-19:29; Judges 19-21). More importantly it will further denigrate marriage, which is the necessary unit of a strong society. By our nation’s laws marriage has already been partly redefined: it is no longer the “lifelong union” it was meant to be. Divorce without cause is now the norm. “Until death parts us” now carries the weight of “until a judge parts us.” No one is the better off because of this, certainly not the children whose father and mother no longer love and support and cherish and forgive and live with each other.

Marriage is neither invented nor defined by the law. It is a naturally occurring institution “built-in” to the fabric of God’s holy creation: Adam said, “This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. She shall be called ‘woman’ for she was taken ‘out of man.’ For this reason a man/male shall leave his father and his mother and be ‘united with’ his ‘woman/female.’” It is all by divine design so that males and females naturally enter into lifelong unions of one male and one female. Divorce is unnatural. It is the opposite of being “united with.” It is the death of the “one flesh” union. Homosexuality is totally unnatural and in fact against nature. Two males or two females can never become one. To use a simple example: a bolt and a nut can become one unit, useful and connected. Two bolts can never become one unit; neither can two nuts naturally. They remain two. In marriage man and woman do become one in accord with God’s creation: a oneness that is physical and emotional and intellectual and familial!

Let no one ignore the central truth of marriage: that it is built on sex roles [Men and Marriage by George Gilder, p.14]. There is rhyme and reason to God's institution. The very essence of marriage, even according to anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski, is not structure and intimacy as some would have us believe, it is parenthood and above all maternity. Margaret Mead maintained that the male role in every known human society is to provide for women and children! Gilder concludes that marriage is not simply a ratification of an existing love. It is the conversion of that love into a biological and social continuity, the very essence of which is children (even though fewer in these days than before).

Homosexuality destroyed communities in ancient days. In our day its worst effect so far is on our young boys. A homosexual has tens of partners and sometimes hundreds. Furthermore, most homosexual men are always looking for a fresh (virgin) young man. Does not sound too wholesome or beneficial to society to me! Neither can one blame the whole thing (or perhaps anything) on "homosexual desires." Otherwise unsuspecting boys and young men are drawn and lured into the homosexual world by the predators, now also through the ever present porn of the internet. Thank you candidate Santorum for at least mentioning it! Without the curbing effect of the law worked by both Christian parents and society as well as biblical education and the influence of one's own conscience, and the regenerative power of Baptism to drown the Old Adam, such is the sinful nature of the unbridled male—to have many partners and (for those so "groomed" at a young age) partners of every sort. Gilder looks at the male/female relationship based on human experience and well writes:

The power of a woman springs from her role in overcoming these socially and personally self-defeating ways of men. She can grant to the man a sexual affirmation that he needs more than she does; she can offer him progeny otherwise permanently denied him; and she can give him a way of living happily and productively in a civilized society that is otherwise oppressive to male nature. In exchange modern man gives his external achievement and his reluctant faithfulness. It is on these terms that marriage—and male socialization—are based. [page 17]

Senator Hagan would have us turn society even more upside down than social engineers have already tried to make it. Allowing our marriage laws to fit the unnatural exceptions of "committed homosexual relationships" will result in chaos, in which business never thrives. (Consider that a few former Europeans among us would like to drive on the left side of the road instead of the right side. For the sake of the few, let us make driving either way on the highway permissible! What sort of insanity is that.) We all must live under laws that support the common good. How much more with regard to the basic building block of the entire human race—marriage!

More and more the State would criminalize the natural God-given beliefs held by the majority of the members of our society. In this case, the natural God-given belief is that homosexual unions are wrong and always will be, no matter what laws are passed or what relationships are allowed. The ungodly are near accomplishing that goal of criminalizing God-given beliefs with respect to the unborn and abortion.

It is common today to try to heap guilt upon our citizens for believing that the United States is a uniquely wonderful place—which people around the whole world declare as thousands and thousands swarm here each year. The U. S. is but one nation among many is what we are to believe. Now in the area of human sexuality Americans are put down for being "like" the rest of the 186 nations in the world who do not recognize gay marriage, when only 10 nations do (or a mere 6% of 196 nations). I believe the government has done enough to destroy marriage in our land already with its encouragement of single motherhood, its easy access to divorce, its legalized abortion and its obsession with homosexual rights. An affirmation of marriage as "marriage" might stop the bleeding for a while.

Senator Hagan would defend the "equal right" of two males to "marry" each other or two females to "marry," as though such unions could ever equal the union of one man and one woman. "'Equality' is found most often in the mouths of those engaged in artful self-promotion" [Weaver, p. 41]. What influence the strong homosexual lobby has on Hagan that she suggests that affirming marriage as only "the union of one man and one woman" would be detrimental to our community. For our children, grandchildren, nation and people we must not be silent. God bless the family and God save the State!