

INVALID ARGUMENTS FOR TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE

Written by Calvin Fox

Friday, 19 April 2013 18:27 - Last Updated Friday, 19 April 2013 18:31

Jennifer Roback Morse of The Ruth Institute defends traditional marriage to young people. These are her major arguments taken from a World e-zine interview along with my response.

http://www.worldmag.com/2013/04/traditional_marriage_apologetics

[W.] How do you approach the issue?

[M.] "Often with young people I'll start off with no-fault divorce. [As a result] marriage is no longer presumed to be permanent. It's a huge structural shift and young people have already been wounded by divorce. You go on any college campus, religious or not, and kids in that audience have been hurt by two or three divorces, or their mom going through a series of boyfriends."

[CF] *I do not see how this works as an argument for traditional, ie- heterosexual Marriage*

[W] You've said that the cultural left is determined to abolish marriage and gender differences. Why? And what are the "fiscal and freedom" consequences of this agenda?

[M] "Let's start with the second question. I saw as an economist that the whole society is depending on the family getting the job done. If children have been in too much foster care or in orphanages too long often they have difficulty developing a conscience and developing attachments to other people. If that happens, you've got a person who is a real social problem, very expensive to deal with. By one estimate we're spending over \$100 billion dollars a year on dealing with the consequences of out-of-wedlock childbearing and family breakup and family breakdown [through] the criminal justice system and the cost of welfare, health, and education."

INVALID ARGUMENTS FOR TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE

Written by Calvin Fox

Friday, 19 April 2013 18:27 - Last Updated Friday, 19 April 2013 18:31

[CF] Again, how is this an argument for heterosexual Marriage over same sex Marriage?

[M] "Now to get back to your original question. For people on the radical left, equality is their primary value. But it doesn't even make sense to think about families in terms of equality because babies are never the equal of the parents and men and women can never be equal in the sense of baby-making and child-rearing and development.

"So if egalitarianism is your biggest thing, this whole enterprise of baby-making is offensive and disruptive to your ideology. [Marxist theorist] Friedrich Engels saw monogamous marriage as just as oppressive as private property and capitalism. In fact, he saw them as related, so some see the home in terms of class struggle. The home itself becomes politicized. To level all differences between men and women they have somehow to sterilize the sexual act, which is why so many of them see abortion and contraception as absolute values."

[CF] While all of that is interesting, how is this relevant to the argument against gay Marriage?

Arguments against no-fault divorce, dysfunctional families, abused children and radical left wing rants against "baby-making", monogamy or Marriage itself simply do not stand as valid arguments against committed relationships between same sex couples. The fundamental argument for Biblical Marriage remains a high view of the Bible and its authority as the Word of God.