



GAY MARRIAGE

EXTRA:

**BILL MUEHLENBERG'S ON-LINE FURTHER REBUTTAL
to RODNEY CROOME'S REBUTTAL (in the book)**

WHY SAME-SEX MARRIAGE SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED

THIS CONTINUES THE AUTHORS' DEBATE ON THIS HOT TOPIC, & IS PART OF **WHY vs WHY™ GAY MARRIAGE**

BILL MUEHLENBERG:

Much of Mr Croome's reply comes down to nothing more than shooting the messenger and dismissing the evidence. Instead of dealing with the facts and arguments, he simply rejects them, saying he is unhappy with the sources. He calls my case just so much "fear-mongering". Name-calling is always so much easier than actually dealing with the arguments.

There are 124 references in my two articles, a considerable number from homosexuals or from reputable journals and the like. Yet Mr Croome simply dismisses most of them as "discredited" or with something similarly contemptuous. He does this repeatedly.

For example, when Mr Croome does not like reputable government information about homosexuals, he dismisses it as being about "inner-urban" homosexuals and therefore – somehow – not reliable. Yet it is inner-urban homosexual activists who are driving this whole debate!

Mr Croome says that some of the academics I cite are "advocates against same-sex marriage". Yet probably the majority of sources he offers are from homosexuals or those clearly in favour of the homosexual agenda. In large part, Mr Croome simply offers homosexual victimisation sob stories - one after another. Yet somehow we are supposed to accept all this as scientific, academic and impartial!

Indeed, on one occasion he does confess to a biased source, but justifies it by saying that the author "is rigorous" Oh, so it is OK to be biased as long as one is rigorous?!

Mr Croome claims some of my authorities are not credible because of where they line up on the issue of same-sex marriage, and therefore my case must be dismissed altogether. Yet he expects us to accept all his sources – which are mostly quite partial – and to embrace his argument completely!

In the same way, he dismisses hundreds of studies which show conclusively that children do better when raised by their own biological mother and father. He somehow thinks this massive body of research can be discarded because on occasion some religious people have relied on it!

Much of the rest of Mr Croome's rebuttal is red herrings, straw men and glaring furrphies. He claims for example that "marriage has undergone great changes" over time. That is about as honest as saying the recipe for split-pea soup has undergone great changes over time. Just as the basic element of this soup has always been peas, so too the essential and non-negotiable element of marriage has always been one man and one woman. Yes, there have been minor changes to marriage, but it has never been gutted of its fundamental core element.

Also, he ignores the wealth of data (most of it from his own camp) I provide on homosexual promiscuity. Further, he simply ignores the honest homosexuals I quote who freely admit that same-sex marriage will radically transform and eventually destroy traditional heterosexual marriage.

Curt dismissal of the evidence does not an argument make. In sum, Mr Croome has not provided a coherent case nor offered sound social science data to justify the seismic social revolution he proposes.

FOR RODNEY CROOME'S ON-LINE FURTHER REBUTTAL TO BILL MUEHLENBERG'S REBUTTAL (FROM THE BOOK)

PLEASE VISIT: WWW.WHYvsWHY.COM

COPYRIGHT © PANTERA PRESS PTY LIMITED 2010. BILL MUEHLENBERG ASSERTS HIS MORAL RIGHT TO BE IDENTIFIED AS THE AUTHOR.

WHY vs WHY *making sense of everything*™ IS A TRADEMARK OF PANTERA PRESS PTY LIMITED

THIS FURTHER REBUTTAL WAS SUPPLIED BY THE AUTHOR FOR POSTING ON PANTERA PRESS'S WEBSITE

NEITHER AUTHOR'S VIEWS NECESSARILY REPRESENT *PANTERA PRESS'S* VIEWS

[www.WHYvsWHY.com](http://WWW.WHYvsWHY.COM)