

# Wings

---

*“Those who wait on the Lord shall renew their strength;  
they shall mount up with wings like eagles.”  
Isaiah 40:31*



March 24, 2013

## The Unintended Consequences of Gay Marriage

The current mad rush to embrace gay marriage is driven by emotion, not reason.

It doesn't take much thought to recognize some destructive repercussions of this social revolution.

In recent weeks the momentum in favor of gay marriage has become a tidal wave. Politicians and celebrities are tripping all over each other to jump on the pro-gay marriage bandwagon.

The chief argument for gay marriage is simple: Marriage is about love, so it's only fair that gays be allowed to marry whom they love, whatever their gender. To deny them that right is discriminatory and, well, un-American.

But before we join the stampede, we should step back and think through the implications of this new-found “right,” and the philosophical foundation upon which it rests. Doing so may rescue us from some unintended, but very disastrous, consequences.

Let's begin by acknowledging an unavoidable fact: It is physically impossible for two gays or two lesbians to procreate. The *only* way children can be introduced into such a relationship is to involve a third individual (sperm donor, surrogate mother, adoption, etc.). Inevitably, as these arrangements become more commonplace, the legal system will be forced to deal with situa-

tions involving three people, not two. It's already happening: In a recent Florida case, a judge required that the names of three people be placed on the newborn's birth certificate (the two lesbian mothers and the male donor). The California legislature recently passed a law allowing children to have three legal parents. (The governor vetoed the bill, concerned that “the bill's ambiguities may have unintended consequences.” Good for him.) If you think divorces are ugly now, wait until courts have to untangle the demands of *three* parties.

But why stop with two or three? If, in fact, marriage is solely about love, then why not allow *any* combination of men and/or women to get married? Polygamy should no longer be outlawed. Or if three men and five women who were BFFs in college want to have their friendship permanently recognized by the state, complete with benefits, what's to prevent them? In fact, in 2006 a group of over 300 activists, lawyers, and academics signed a statement entitled “Beyond Same-Sex Marriage” in which they argue for “securing govern-

mental and private institutional recognition of diverse kinds of partnerships, households, kinship relationships and families”—in other words, whatever arrangements people can dream up.

And who stands to lose the most in all this chaos of adults seeking love in their alternative lifestyles? *Children*.

Traditional marriage (one man and one woman in permanent monogamy) is not just about love. It is the engine of societal perpetuation, ideally suited to the creation and training of children. This arrangement, however imperfectly followed, has served as the bedrock of civilization for thousands of years. For our generation to suddenly discover that there is nothing so special about this relationship after all, and that we can replace it with whatever other arrangements we prefer, is to risk civilization's very existence on a wild throw of the dice. Do we really want to go there?

Society is already paying a terrible price dealing with the unintended consequences of divorce, single parenthood, and absent fathers. We can ill afford another disaster heaped upon all the rest.

— David King