



GAY MARRIAGE

EXTRA:

THE AUTHORS' SOURCES & CITATIONS FOR:

WHY SAME-SEX MARRIAGE *SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED*

SOURCES AND CITATIONS FOR:

- A. *Bill Muehlenberg's* main argument
- B. *Rodney Croome's* rebuttal

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

A. *BILL MUEHLENBERG'S* SOURCES & CITATIONS FOR HIS MAIN ARGUMENT IN **WHY vs WHY™ GAY MARRIAGE**:

The **numbers** below match the note-numbers in the **WHY vs WHY™** book text of *Bill Muehlenberg's* main argument:

1. See for example Bill Muehlenberg, "Deconstructing the family", http://www.marriage.org.au/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=26&Itemid=26
2. Richard Posner, *Sex and Reason*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1992, p. 312.
3. Peter Wood, "Sex and consequences", *The American Conservative*, 28 July 2003, pp. 8-12, p. 10.
4. Douglas Farrow, "Culture wars are killing marriage", *National Post* (Canada), 7 May 2003.
5. William Bennett, "Gay marriage: Not a very good idea", *The Washington Post*, 21 May 1996. See: <http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/washingtonpost/access/9685346.html?FMT=ABS&FMTS=ABS&date=May+21%2C+1996&author=Bennett%2C+William+J&desc=...+But+not+a+very+good+idea%2C+either>
6. Simon Leys, "Teetering on the brink of barbarity", *The Age*, 4 July 1995. See: http://newsstore.theage.com.au/apps/viewDocument.ac?page=1&sy=age&kw=Simon+Leys&pb=sag&pb=age&dt=enterRange&dr=entire&sd=01%2F071995&ed=31%2F07%2F1995&so=relevance&sf=text&sf=author&sf=headline&rc=10&rm=200&sp=adv&clsPage=1&docID=news950703_0198_3952
7. Lewis Terman, *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938, p. 1.
8. Helen Fisher, *Anatomy of Love: The Natural History of Monogamy, Adultery, and Divorce*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1992, p. 65.
9. Kingsley Davis, "The Meaning and Significance of Marriage in Contemporary Society," in Kingsley Davis, ed., *Contemporary Marriage: Perspectives on a Changing Institution*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1985, p. 5.
10. David Murray, "Poor Suffering Bastards: An Anthropologist Looks at Illegitimacy", *Policy Review*, Spring 1994, p. 9.
11. James Q. Wilson, *The Moral Sense*. New York: The Free Press, 1993, p. 158.
12. James Q. Wilson, *The Marriage Problem: How our Culture has Weakened Families*. New York: Harper Collins, 2002, p. 54.
13. C. Owen Lovejoy, "The Origin of Man", *Science*, 211, No. 4480, 1981, pp. 341-350.
14. Matt Ridley, *The Origins of Virtue*. London: Penguin Books, 1997, p. 92.
15. Wood, *ibid.*, p. 12.
16. Bronislaw Malinowski, *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1927, p. 213.
17. Margaret Mead, *Male and Female*. New York: Dell, 1949, 1968, p. 188
18. Wilson, *The Moral Sense*, p. 249.
19. David Popenoe, *Life Without Father*. New York: The Free Press, 1996, pp. 3-4.
20. Suzanne Frayser, *Varieties of Sexual Experience*. New Haven, Conn: Human Relations Area Files Press, 1985, p. 248.
21. David Blakenhorn, *The Future of Marriage*. Encounter Books, 2007, p. 5.
22. Victorian Gay and Lesbian Rights Lobby spokesperson David McCarthy, cited in Andrew Milnes, "Always a bridesmaid", *MCV*, 7 November 2003, p. 1.
23. "Marriage splits NSW lobby", *MCV*, 11 June 2004, p. 3.
24. Amy Lowell, "Do lesbians need marriage?" *MCV*, 4 June 2004, p. 6.
25. Amy Lowell, "Do open relationships work?" *MCV*, 27 August 2004, p. 6.

26. Cited in James Norman, "The gay conservative and other queer couplings", *The Age* A2, 11 March 2006, p. 20. See: <http://newsstore.theage.com.au/apps/viewDocument.ac?page=1&sy=age&kw=The+gay+conservative+and+other+queer+couplings&pb=all ffx&dt=selectRange&dr=10years&so=relevance&sf=text&sf=headline&rc=10&rm=200&sp=nrm&clsPage=1&docID=AGE0603111B7HE78GRIV>
27. Ron Thiele, "Gay marriage? Just say no", *B.News*, 6 March 2008, p. 8.
28. Dennis Altman, "Misconstrued comment", *B.News*, 13 December 2007, p. 8.
29. Rev. T. Turner, "Is gay marriage selfish?", *B.News*, 13 December 2007, p. 8.
30. Clifford Kraus, "Free to marry, Canada's gays say, 'Do I?'", *The New York Times*, 31 August 2003, sec. 1, p. 1. See: <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/08/31/international/americas/31CANA.html?scp=1&sq=Free%20to%20marry,%20Canada%E2%80%99s%20gays%20say&st=cse>
31. Jim Rinnert, "The trouble with gay marriage", *In These Times*, 30 December, 2003. See: http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/493/the_trouble_with_gay_marriage/
32. Sotirios Sarantakos, "Same-sex marriage: Which way to go?" *Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 24, no. 2, April 1999, pp. 79-84, p. 82.
33. Cath Pope, "Marriage, right?" *MCV*, 27 May 2005, p. 1.
34. Maggie Gallagher and Joshua K. Baker, "Demand for same-sex marriage: Evidence from the United States, Canada, and Europe", *Institute for Marriage and Public Policy*, vol. 3, no. 1, 26 April 2006, p. 2.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
36. Jonathan Rauch, *Gay Marriage: Why it is Good for Gays, Good for Straights, and Good for America*. New York: Times Books, 2004, p. 71.
37. Rodney Croome, "Let no wedge tear gay unions asunder", *The Australian*, 29 April 2004, p. 11.
38. Marshall Kirk and Hunter Madsen, *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Hatred and Fear of Homosexuals in the 90s*. New York: Plume, 1990, p. 165.
39. Miranda Stewart, "It's a queer thing", *The Alternative Law Journal*, vol. 29, no. 2, April 2004, pp. 75-80, p. 78.
40. Maggie Gallagher, *The Abolition of Marriage*. Washington: Regnery Publishing, 1996, p. 131.
41. Andrew Sullivan, *Virtually Normal: An Argument About Homosexuality*. London: Picador, 1996, p. 202.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 203-204.
44. Richard Mohr, *A More Perfect Union*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1994, p. 50.
45. Paula Ettelbrick, "Since when is marriage a path to liberation?", *Out/Look*, Fall 1989, p. 8.
46. Michelangelo Signorile, "Bridal wave", *Out*, December-January 1994, p. 161.
47. Thomas Stoddard, "Why gay people should seek the right to marry", in William Rubenstein, ed., *Lesbians, Gay Men and the Law*. New York: The New Press, 1993, p. 400.
48. Charles Silverstein and Edmund White, *Joy of Gay Sex*. New York: Crown Pub., 1977, cited in Cal Thomas, "Behavior Does Not Deserve Special Protection", *The Los Angeles Times*, 4 Feb 1993.
49. *Ibid.*
50. *Ibid.*
51. An anonymous respondent, cited in Karla Jay and Allen Young, *The Gay Report*. New York: Summit, 1979, p. 250.
52. Thomas Schmidt, *Straight & Narrow: Compassion & Clarity in the Homosexuality Debate*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1995, p. 101.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
54. Guy Baldwin, cited in Doug Sadownick, "Open door policy", *Genre*, April 1994, p. 34.
55. Bill Mann (and Tim Hube), cited in Sadownick, *ibid.*, p. 35.
56. Ross Jacobs, "Is monogamy the death knell of relationships?" *MCV*, 9 January 2004, p. 6.
57. Dennis Altman, *The Homosexualization of America*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982, p. 17.
58. Dennis Altman, *AIDS in the Mind of America*. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1986, p. 159.
59. Altman, *The Homosexualization of America*, p. 187.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 188.
61. David McWhirter and Andrew Mattison, *The Male Couple: How Relationships Develop*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1984, pp. 252-253.
62. Maria Xiridou, et. al., "The contribution of steady and casual partnerships to the incidence of HIV infection among homosexual men in Amsterdam", *AIDS*, vol. 17, no. 7, May 2003, pp. 1029-1038, p. 1031.
63. *Ibid.*
64. Alan Bell and Martin Weinberg, *Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978, p.308.
65. Garrett Prestage, et. al., *Sydney Men and Sexual Health*. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications, 1995.
66. Prestage, *ibid.*, Report C.2, "Sexual identity and sexual behaviour with both men and women in a sample of homosexuality-active men in Sydney, Australia", p. 34.

67. Garrett Prestage, et. al., *Sydney Gay Community Periodic Survey*. Sydney: HIV AIDS & Society Publications, 1996, p. 16.
68. Clive Aspin, et. al., *The Melbourne Gay Community Periodic Survey February 2000*. Sydney: National Centre in HIV Social Research, 2000, p. 19.
69. Andrew Grulich, et.al., "Homosexual experience and recent homosexual encounters", *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2003, pp. 155-163, p. 158.
70. Lance Spurr, "Sexless in the city", *B.News*, 3 January 2002, p. 8.
71. Jonathan Rauch, *Gay Marriage: Why it is Good for Gays, Good for Straights, and Good for America*. New York: Times Books, 2004, pp. 146-147.
72. Robert Michael, et. al., *Sex in America: A Definitive Survey*. Boston: Brown, Little & Company, 1994, pp. 101-107.
73. *Ibid.*
74. Michael Wiederman, "Extramarital sex: Prevalence and correlates in a national survey," *Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 1997, p. 170.
75. Gunnar Andersson, et al., "Divorce-risk: Patterns in same-sex 'marriages' in Norway and Sweden," paper presented at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America (April 3).
76. Stanley Kurtz, "What is wrong with gay marriage?" *Commentary*, September 2000, pp. 35-41, p. 37.
77. Emma-Kate Symons, "Block on gay marriage is just like apartheid", *The Australian*, 27 April 2004, p. 1.
78. Keith Boykin, "Whose Dream? Why the black church opposes gay marriage", *Village Voice*, May 18, 2004. See: <http://www.villagevoice.com/2004-05-18/news/whose-dream/1>
79. Glenn Stanton and Bill Maier, *Marriage on Trial*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004, p. 37.
80. Dale O'Leary, *One Man, One Woman*. Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 2007, p. 247.
81. National Coalition of Gay Organizations, *The 1972 Gay Rights Platform*, Chicago, 1972. See: <http://www.article8.org/docs/general/platform.htm>
82. Judith Levine, "Stop the wedding! Why gay marriage isn't radical enough", *The Village Voice*, July 23-29, 2003. See: <http://www.villagevoice.com/content/printVersion/176727>
83. Stephen Bertman, "The transformation of marriage", *The Futurist*, March-April 2004, pp. 44-47, at p. 47. See: <http://www.allbusiness.com/professional-scientific/scientific-research/751698-1.html>
84. *Ibid.*, p. 44.
85. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
87. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
88. William Bennett, *The Broken Hearth*. New York: Doubleday, 2001, p. 115.
89. David Frum, "Modern Marriage, Modern Trouble", in Katherine Anderson, Don Browning and Brian Boyer, eds., *Marriage: Just a Piece of Paper?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002, p. 364.
90. See for example, Sotirios Sarantakos, "Children in Three Contexts", *Children Australia*, vol. 21, no. 3, 1996, pp. 23-31.
91. Michael Ebert, "Joseph Nicolosi, PhD., is the Fugitive", *Focus on the Family Citizen*, 20 June 1994, pp. 10-12.
92. Glenn Stanton and Bill Maier, *Marriage on Trial*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004, p. 71.
93. *Ibid.*
94. Cited in Don Feder, "Dangers of Gay Parenting are Underrated", *The Boston Globe*, 27 September 1993.
95. Testimony of Suzanne Cook before the Oregon State Senate, 3 April 1997.
96. Patrick Smellie, "Mum no more", *The Australian*, 24 January 1995.
97. Sarantakos, *ibid.*
98. Paul Cameron, "Homosexual parents testing 'common sense' – A literature review emphasizing the Golombok and Tasker longitudinal study of lesbians' children", *Psychological Reports*, 85, 1999, p. 282.
99. Robert Lerner and Althea Nagai, *Out of Nothing Comes Nothing: Homosexual and Heterosexual Marriage Not Shown to be Equivalent for Raising Children*. Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 2000.
100. David Demo and Martha Cox, "Families with young children: A review of research in the 1990s", *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, Nov. 2000, pp. 876-895, at p. 889.
101. Lynn Wardle, "The potential impact of homosexual parenting on children", *University of Illinois Law Review*, 1997, No. 3, pp. 833-920, p. 835.
102. Judith Stacey and Timothy Biblarz, "(How) does the sexual orientation of parents matter?" *American Sociological Review*, 66, 2001, pp. 159-183.
103. P.A. Belcastro, et. al., "A review of data based studies addressing the affects of homosexual parenting on children's sexual and social functioning", *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 20, 1993, pp. 105-106.

B. RODNEY CROOME'S SOURCES & CITATIONS FOR HIS REBUTTAL IN WHY vs WHY™ GAY MARRIAGE

The numbers below match the note-numbers in the WHY vs WHY™ book text of Rodney Croome's Rebuttal:

1. Not her real name, at her request; from a submission to the Australian Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee inquiry into the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2009.
2. In the Introduction to Mr Muehlenberg's main argument, and his 1st section, *Because it negates what marriage is, and what it is for*
3. In Mr Muehlenberg's 1st section of his main argument, *Because it negates what marriage is, and what it is for*
4. In Mr Muehlenberg's Introduction
5. For example, sociology professor David Popenoe of Rutgers University works with the National Marriage Project which has been criticised for misrepresenting research to pursue a political agenda (for a detailed critique see: Alternatives to Marriage Project, April 2002, at <http://www.unmarried.org/10-problems.html>).
James Q. Wilson was a professor at Harvard University and UCLA, but today he is a professor at a religious university, and a leading American political conservative.
As well as being an anthropologist, Peter Wood, is a leading American political conservative who has written that same-sex marriage will mean "young boys will be a much greater target of erotic attention by older males". See: P. Wood, "Sex & Consequences", *The American Conservative*, 28 July, 2003, <http://www.amconmag.com/article/2003/jul/28/00008/>.
David Blakenhorn admitted having no relevant academic qualifications or undertaken any relevant research to back up his many claims about the dangers of same-sex marriage under cross-examination during a recent high profile American same-sex marriage court case, Perry vs. Schwarzenegger. For more see, <http://joemygod.blogspot.com/2010/01/protect-marriages-disastrous-final.html>.
People like Lewis Terman, Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead were highly respected experts in their fields, but they worked long ago, well before it was considered appropriate to write about same-sex relationships. Terman was of another age entirely. In 1916 he wrote, "High-grade or border-line deficiency (in intelligence)... is very, very common among Spanish-Indian and Mexican families of the Southwest and also among negroes. Their dullness seems to be racial, or at least inherent in the family stocks from which they come..." (Termin, L., *The Measurement of Intelligence*, 1916, p. 91-92)
6. Most of the academics Muehlenberg cites on the issue of marriage refer to its universalism and to the benefits which flow from it. None of what they say excludes same-sex couples from participating in this institution or reaping these benefits. But by seamlessly interspersing their views with more partisan commentators, who use the same language and cite the same evidence but add their own personal views against same-sex marriage, Mr Muehlenberg gives the impression that science speaks with one voice.
7. For an over view of same-sex relationships in different historical and cultural contexts see W N Eskridge, *The Case for Same-Sex Marriage*, pp 15-51
8. Boswell, J., *Same-sex unions in pre-modern Europe*. Random House, New York, 1994. Other work in this field includes recent research into "affrèments", legal, marriage-like contracts between same sex and other partners in late mediaeval France. See: "Are Homosexual Civil Unions A 600-Year-Old Tradition?" *Science Daily*, August 25, 2007, see: <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/08/070823110231.htm>
9. American Anthropological Association, Statement on Marriage and the Family, February 26, 2004. See: <http://www.aaanet.org/issues/policy-advocacy/Statement-on-Marriage-and-the-Family.cfm>
10. Thomas Schmidt openly states he writes as "an evangelical Christian" (<http://www.ivpress.com/cgi-ivpress/book.pl/code=1858>)
11. The Mattison and McWhirter study Muehlenberg relies on only had 156 participants all drawn from inner-urban gay ghettos
12. Studies like the Gay Community Periodic Surveys and the Sydney Men and health study deliberately draw their sample from gay and bisexual men who attend inner-urban bars, STI clinics and sex clubs, because the researchers are specifically looking at what causes HIV infection risk and how to reduce that risk
13. Prominent sexual health researcher, Dr Anne Mitchell, has explained why so many studies focus on those gay men who have high numbers of sexual partners: "...the research, particularly the research done in Australia, is all funded with HIV prevention money and therefore it is very directed at being able to recruit the people who may be at risk of HIV... But it doesn't take account of the much wider gay community who is not of interest to social researchers because they are not at any risk of HIV... They are just living their lives in suburbia as monogamous couples with no sorties out to the gay saunas or anything at the weekend and they are no more at HIV risk than any other person in the community, in fact less than a lot of heterosexuals I would suspect. (T79, Cain v Australian Red Cross Blood Service, Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Tribunal, 2008. See: http://www.magistratescourt.tas.gov.au/decisions/anti-discrimination_decisions/c/Cain_v_The_Australian_Red_Cross_Society_2009_TASADT_03
14. 30% of heterosexual men have had ten or more partners in their lifetime, A Grulich et al, "Heterosexual experience and recent heterosexual encounters", *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, Vol 27, No 2, 2003, p146.
15. Grulich, A., et al, "Homosexual experience and recent homosexual encounters", *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, Vol27, No 2, 2003, p160
16. See, Kinsey Institute, data on numbers of partners, <http://www.kinseyinstitute.org/resources/FAQ.html#number> and Michael W. Wiederman, "Extramarital sex: prevalence and correlates in a national survey", *Journal of Sex Research*, Spring 1997, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2372/is_n2_v34/ai_19551967/
17. The same selectivity emerges when Mr Muehlenberg cites divorce rates among same-sex couples in civil unions. He refers to Sweden and Norway where same-sex couples are more likely to separate, but ignores Britain where civil partners have a much lower divorce rate than married couples (see: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divorce_of_same-sex_couples#Divorce_rates). He also ignores Denmark, where same-sex relationships have been recognised longer than anywhere else in the world and where straight couples are more than twice as likely to split up than gay couples. See: Jones, M., "Lessons from a Gay Marriage. Despite stereotypes of gay relationships as short-lived, gay unions highlight the keys to success." *Psychology Today* magazine, 17 Nov 2006, first published May 1, 1997, <http://www.psychologytoday.com/articles/199705/lessons-gay-marriage>

18. The authors of the Vermont study agreed with the approach of Dr Anne Mitchell (see note 13), that most previous studies were of gays and lesbians “who are visible and concentrated”, producing “a body of literature about homosexual lives that tends toward the ‘exceptional’ ” See, Elder, G., “The Non-significance of Significant Others: a National Geography of Gay and Lesbian Coupledness”, report from the University of Vermont, referred to in “Gay Unions Are Not-So-Dangerous Liaisons, New Data Show,” <http://www.newswise.com/articles/view/518987/>
19. “Relationship values transcend gender, sexual orientation in young people, U of M study finds”. See http://www1.umn.edu/news/news-releases/2009/UR_CONTENT_143061.html
20. In Mr Muehlenberg’s 1st section of his main argument, *Because it negates what marriage is, and what it is for*
21. In Mr Muehlenberg’s 7th section of his main argument, *Because it is not good for children*
22. Glenn Stanton and Bill Maier, are employees of US evangelical lobby group, Focus on the Family. Lynn Wardle, is a professor at a Mormon University and long-term anti-equality advocate. Commentator, Don Feder, has condemned Disney for promoting “sodomy” and “atheism”.
23. Attempts to turn gays straight through “reparative therapy” as practiced by Dr Joe Nicolosi have been criticised by the American Psychological Society and the American Psychiatric Association. (For more on these organisations’ views on “reparative therapy” see American Psychological Society, “Insufficient Evidence that Sexual Orientation Change Efforts Work, Says APA” at <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2009/08/therapeutic.aspx>; and “Position Statement of the American Psychiatric Association, Therapies Focused on Attempts to Change Sexual Orientation (Reparative or Conversion Therapies)”, March and May 2000 at <http://www.psych.org/Departments/EDU/Library/APAOfficialDocumentsandRelated/PositionStatements/200001.aspx>
- Dr Paul Cameron was expelled from membership of the American Psychological Association in 1983 for lack of cooperation with its Committee on Scientific and Professional Ethics and Conduct (although he claims he had resigned from the organisation the previous year). He has also been criticised by several North American psychological and sociological associations for misrepresenting research on homosexuality. (For more information, see: http://psychology.ucdavis.edu/rainbow/html/facts_cameron_sheet.html.)
- Also see Dr Cameron’s own bio on the website of the Family Research Institute he works with: <http://www.familyresearchinst.org/about-2/>
24. In Mr Muehlenberg’s 7th section of his main argument, *Because it is not good for children*. Not surprisingly, some of the researchers he refers to who have pointed out these “shortcomings” are also linked to conservative Christian lobby groups. For example, Lerner and Nagai work with the Marriage Law Project, an initiative of the Catholic University of America.
25. “I am gay. Should I worry how this will affect my children?” *Healthy Children*, website of the American Academy of Pediatrics, <http://www.healthychildren.org/English/family-life/family-dynamics/types-of-families/pages/Gay-and-Lesbian-Parents.aspx>
26. Statement approved by The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry in June 1999 in “Lesbian & Gay Parenting” American Psychological Association, 2005, page 71. Patterson, CJ, *Lesbian & Gay Parents & Their Children: Summary Of Research Findings*, <http://www.apa.org/pi/lgbt/resources/parenting.aspx#>
27. *Ibid*, page 6, footnote 1
28. *Ibid*, page 6, footnote 1
29. In Mr Muehlenberg’s 7th section, *Because it is not good for children*
30. In Mr Muehlenberg’s 2nd section, *Because there is little actual demand for it*
31. Mr Muehlenberg cites a study by one of American’s leading campaigners against same-sex marriage, Maggie Gallagher, in which she found that only a tiny minority of same-sex partners in Spain and the Netherlands have tied the knot. What he doesn’t tell us is that Gallagher only looked at the first year same-sex marriages were allowed in both countries. If we look, instead, at what percentage of marriages are between same-sex couples we find that in the Netherlands that figure (2.5% based on yearly rates: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Same-sex_marriage_in_the_Netherlands#Statistics) is actually slightly higher than the estimated percentage of homosexuals in the Netherlands (Gallagher cites about 2.2%). By this measure, homosexuals are just as interested in marriage as heterosexuals. The interest many gay men and lesbians have in marriage is also illustrated by Australian research I cited in section 6 of my main argument (in the flip-side of this book). It showed that 80% of same-sex partners support their right to marry and a majority - 55.4% - would marry if they had the choice.
- Given that I have criticised Mr Muehlenberg for quoting biased sources, I should disclose that one of this study’s co-authors, Sharon Dane, is also a Board Member of Australian Marriage Equality and therefore one of my colleagues. Dane may not be a disinterested academic, but she is rigorous. Her study, which looked at attitudes within the LGBT community to a range of issues meets the high methodological standards set by the University of Queensland. Her academic contribution to the marriage debate is solid research, not opinion like too many of those Mr Muehlenberg cites.
32. An important but unspoken assumption underlying Mr Muehlenberg’s argument is that people choose to be homosexual. He talks about legal equality sending the message that homosexuality is “desirable” or “preferable”, about homosexuals “eschew(ing) male-female relationships”, and about “coming out of” “the homosexual lifestyle”. But as I’ve noted above, the idea that an individual’s sexual orientation can be changed, even by intensive therapy, is now discredited. An increasing number of biologists are convinced that sexual orientation has a genetic basis.
33. In Mr Muehlenberg’s 5th section, *Because claims of discrimination and denial of equal rights are spurious*
34. For more see R. Kennedy, *Interracial Intimacies*, Random House. New York, 2002
35. For a summary of the comparisons between opposition to same-sex marriage and opposition to interracial marriage see “Gay Marriage Opponents Mimic Objections to Interracial Marriage, Forde-Mazrui Says, October 4, 2004 at http://www.law.virginia.edu/html/news/2004_fall/forde.htm. For a summary of the religious arguments against interracial unions

see "Interracial Marriage: The Fundamentalists Were Wrong" on *Fundamentalists, Repent!* website, <http://www.fundamentalistsrepent.com/interracial.html>

36. In Mr Muehlenberg's 6th section, *Because this is the thin edge of the wedge*

37. An example is the social and cultural barriers to recognising polygamous marriages. In none of the countries which allow same-sex marriage are polygamous marriages officially solemnised, even though some of them, like Spain and the Netherlands, have large religious minorities that traditionally allow it. In places that allow polygamy, like Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan and Nigeria, not only can't homosexuals marry, they are put to death. This is not a coincidence. Polygamy is generally about a man controlling the lives of several women. It is an arrangement that comes from a time when women were considered less valuable than men, restricted to the house and to childrearing, and made their husband's property*. Wherever values like this prevail, same-sex marriage is inconceivable. Where all husbands are legally dominant and all wives mere submissive extensions of their husband, it is absurd and profoundly threatening for there to be an official union between two husbands or two wives. Where marriage is the union of a bread winner who must always be male and a child-carer who must always be female, it is economically unsustainable for people of the same sex to marry. Same-sex marriage only begins to make sense in a society where there is a degree of social and economic equity between men and women and legal equality between marriage partners. It only becomes possible for two men or two women to marry if men and women are already free to choose how they lead their lives regardless of their gender.

* It is an irony in the marriage equality debate that Australian law recognises overseas polygamous marriage (to protect the legal rights of women in these marriages), whereas overseas same-sex marriages are not recognised at all.

38. In Mr Muehlenberg's 3rd section, *Because there is another agenda at work here*

39. In Mr Muehlenberg's 3rd section, *Because there is another agenda at work here*

COPYRIGHT © PANTERA PRESS PTY LIMITED 2010.

BILL MUEHLENBERG & RODNEY CROOME ASSERT THEIR MORAL RIGHTS TO BE IDENTIFIED AS THE AUTHORS.

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

THESE NOTES WERE SUPPLIED BY THE AUTHORS FOR POSTING ON PANTERA PRESS'S WEBSITE

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

www.WHYvsWHY.com