

Healthier Marriages, Healthier Society

Stephen Stacey
December 16, 2012

How Redefining Marriage to Include Same-Sex Couples Will Affect Heterosexual Pair-Bonding and by Implication – Their Children and Society (loveledushere.blogspot.com/2012/12/how-redefining-marriage-to-include-same.html)

Executive Summary:

- When redefining marriage the state has to look at how it will affect heterosexual pair-bonding. If redefining marriage causes fewer heterosexuals to marry or more to divorce, then social decline will continue. Citizens tend to not want to pay higher taxes, have lower pensions, have major cuts in social spending and a more broken society – all of which are likely if heterosexual marital norms decline.
- There seem to be two key areas of concern when we talk about redefining marriage – ‘cultural merging’ and ‘Marriage redefined contains a lie.’ Analysis leads to the conclusion that both these areas of concern lead to a weakening of heterosexual marital norms – and by extension to a more fragile society.
 - ‘Cultural merging’ – As heterosexual and same-sex cultures come together in a marriage redefined world they will seek to find some core values where they can find some common understanding of what marriage now means:
 - Currently heterosexual marriage contains values that are focussed on the quality of the couple relationship but in the majority of marriages the most important values for lasting stability are focussed on staying committed to each other during the difficult moments of the marital life-cycle in order to protect the biological children. Same-sex union values are primarily focussed on the couple relationship.
 - Through cultural merging, we can expect to see same-sex unions taking on some heterosexual marital norms (E.g.; Maybe a stronger commitment to each other leading to more stability). This is well and good.
 - The same positive effect cannot be said to occur for heterosexual pair-bonding. Cultural merging will lead a certain proportion of heterosexuals to see marriage as primarily about the adults’ sense of romantic affection. This will lead to a change in the order of values – with values that encourage parents to ‘stick together during the difficult moments for the well-being of their biological children’ – being demoted. In a metaphorical way – it’s a bit like the difference between socializing and going to work. The only values friends need are ‘How to keep our friendship alive’ – this represents the values that same-sex unions need. People who go to work have to keep good relationships alive and also produce a product – this represents the heterosexual couple relationship and their children. Now, one day, the state says, “The only values we need in society are how to keep friendships alive.” This is fine for same-sex couples. But when you apply this value to the work environment, people just chat all day long – the product (the children) gets put into second place and the business (family) declines. Once the state says the values inherent in heterosexual and same-sex marriages are one and the same – that the primary value in marriage becomes romantic attraction – and we can then expect fewer married heterosexual couples to stay together for the sake of their children during the challenging moments that are a natural part of the marital life-cycle. This will lead to social decline.
 - There is a very high probability that cultural merging will also lead to young adult heterosexuals experimenting with same-sex sex in their friendships – just as happens now in gay and lesbian friendships. With encouragement from Hollywood, this is almost an absolute certainty. If this happens, sexually will increasingly become a part of same-sex heterosexual friendship from teenage years to old age. All analysis of such a world shows very poor outcomes for society as a whole.
 - ‘Marriage redefined contains a false misrepresentation of facts’ – “Any two people, on average, can raise children just as well as the two biological parents can.” The acceptance of this lie by the state seems to have profound, negative, social consequences.
 - As heterosexuals come to accept this lie as truth – this will lead to them making poorer decisions in the area of heterosexual pair-bonding. It will lead some heterosexuals to divorce and remarry in the belief that this will have no negative effect on their children. It will lead some women to believe they don’t need to marry at all because children do just as well if they are raised by anyone. Marriage redefined mandates in law that all forms of parenting lead to

exactly the same outcomes. We cannot see this in the research data. There is a very high probability that children, and future of society will have much poorer outcomes once the lie that is inherent marriage redefined is accepted as social truth. More than this, this inherent lie sets up the legal ground work for accepting polyamorous relationships “If any two people can raise children as well as the two biological parents can; then so can three or more people.”

- The insertion of a lie into the legal definition of marriage leads to strong social division between the state and those people in society who refuse to accept this lie. People who refuse to accept this lie are called bigots for believing something true – for continuing to believe that “Children, on average, have the best outcomes when raised by their two married biological parents”. In a marriage redefined world people who refuse to accept this inherent lie will ultimately be seen as lawbreakers, may well be fined, and may even be banned from holding any position within the state, all for believing what is true.
- Redefining marriage to contain a lie within the law sets the state in direct opposition to almost all religions – for almost all religious texts contain the belief that children do best when raised by their two, married, biological parents. Through mandating this lie in law the state starts to see religions and religious leaders as a corrupting influence on society – as bigots – and teaches the youth of society to see religion in this way. This leads to the decline of religion. Redefining marriage to inherently include a lie turns these two key social building institutions into adversaries.
- Just as religions decline through being labelled as bigots for believing what is true – so the quality of lawmaking starts to decline as the state cuts itself off from the religious values upon which democracy stands. Without a religious base, the state is highly likely to create some kind of Orwellian future. It already starts to step in this direction through fining and banning people from public office for believing what all research data shows to be true. State truth becomes more valid than reality. Once the precedent is set, the state might then feel it has the right to go after people who hold other views that the state deems to be unhealthy – and ban them from fostering children or holding public office (E.g.; you disagree with abortion; you disagree with a multicultural society, etc). More than this, once this lie is eventually accepted as social truth – there are just a few small steps left to be taken before the state might be able to legislate: “that children will do better when raised by people who have healthier political or religious views than their biological parents do.” A totalitarian leader’s heaven ensues – and it all starts from this lie.
- An unhealthy precedent towards the weakening of democratic processes also seems to be embedded in the whole process of legalizing same-sex marriage – for example - The Conservatives in the UK came to power only because they hid their plans to redefine marriage from their support base, and the final decision on legalizing same-sex marriage was made even before the public consultation process even began. In the USA, where DOMA was passed, the present president feels free to ignore it. All this sets very unhealthy precedents that will take years to repair.
- In summary, mandating a lie into law – and forcing people to accept the lie under threat of fines – sets in motion a future where there is a high probability of both social decline and more state control over every aspect of human life – a future where fewer marriages take place and where rights to freedom of speech are ever more denied. All this inherent in marriage redefined. Why? Because the state wants society to accept that heterosexual marriage – the family unit that has, throughout history, been responsible for long-term social health and well-being, the family unit where children are created – is exactly the same as same-sex marriage – a family unit where children can’t be created, a family unit that never survived more than a few decades in any world culture, a family unit that would die out in one generation if it were not for the support of the wider heterosexual society. The more it forces people accept these two quite different forms of relationship are one and the same, the more Orwellian the state has to become. Also, a definition of marriage that focusses purely on the feelings of attraction between two consenting adults has no use for the majority of heterosexuals who will become parents – so less will marry and social decline becomes inevitable. Since politicians are paid to introduce laws that improve social well-being and strengthen democratic processes, to make laws that do the exact opposite – and do so against the will of the majority of the population – can only lead to harming of some of the most precious aspects of democratic society.
- The legalizing of same-sex civil partnerships (rather than marriages) – and offering such partnerships the exact same rights as married couples, leads to exactly the same future as shown above. Other alternatives are possible. They are discussed in the full article.
- Instead of creating laws that consistently weaken the marital unit, the state needs to work with the concept of marriage, to learn to how it might strengthen and support it, for heterosexual marriage is still the goal that most tax-paying citizens aspire to in order to find meaning in life – and it is the family unit that brings about best social outcomes.

Main Article

When the state, over 200 years ago, decided that it wanted to create laws around the institution of marriage, there must have been a good reason for singling out this particular relationship for special status. The only reason that makes sense is that the state recognized that when children are raised by their two, married biological parents then the children, on average, have the best outcomes.

We know today from research from around the world that there is no family constellation that has as many positive outcomes for men, women, children and society as the institution of marriage. This being so, a marriage based society is something that the state had an interest in encouraging. (See data from USA www.americanvalues.org/pdfs/dl.php?name=wmm3-30-conclusions and the UK www.oneplusone.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/when-couples-part-executive-summary.pdf)

Also, because this way of raising children has intrinsic advantages over other forms of family constellation at the start of the 20th century every major world culture was a marriage centred culture. Any major culture that went the way of denying the marital norm quickly weakened and was gobbled up by its more pro-marriage neighbour. (See Value of Marriage to Society Slide show video vimeo.com/25021989)

One of the key challenges of the 20th and 21st century is to remember that human beings only have one gold standard when it comes to passing on the best of ourselves onto the next generation – and that is for the two biological parents to be there to love and nurture the children they brought into the world. Mother Nature gave us this form of family unit for best outcomes. We are not like turtles, or lions, or ants – we are like swans and eagles who bring about lasting health for their species through pair-bonding for life. But it's hard to remember this for several reasons

.One of the key reasons is that politicians seem to forget it. Ideally politicians, who are paid to bring about ever-improving outcomes for society, should be asking how they can continually support, strengthen, and enhance the marital unit – the family unit that the majority of their taxpaying citizens still aspire to – for this will bring about best outcomes for society as a whole. But sadly, they don't seem to be able to do this.

In fact, when they pass laws about marriage and family they seem to consistently weaken marriage. The end result is that today we have the lowest number of children on record being raised by their two, married, biological parents – and people using terms such as 'broken Britain' to describe the direct effect that the collapse of the marital norm has caused.

One has to ask oneself is same-sex marriage actually more of the same poor law-making around the issue of family – something that will actually lead to even less heterosexuals deciding to get married or stay married, and by extension more social decline. Is redefining marriage just going to lead society down the road of even more state debt, lower pensions, higher taxes, and more people in jail – just because the state doesn't understand the consequences of its actions.

This being so, its important to recognize that the current debate about same-sex marriage should not only be about equality of rights, but the state also has to ask itself how redefining marriage will affect heterosexual pair-bonding. Heterosexuals use the current definition of marriage to guide the building of their most important life relationship and for the raising of their children.

The current social and legal definition of marriage is something like: (a) Union of a man and a woman; (b) Who desire to make a commitment to each other and to offer sexual exclusivity towards each other in order that (c) their biological children benefit from their commitment, teamwork and the varied love. Inherent in the current definition of heterosexual marriage are also core attributes that guide and protect the marital life-cycle and the children. These include “We are willing to make sacrifices so our children have a better future”, or “Or we promise to stay together during the tough times that are inherent in the marital life-cycle for the sake of our biological offspring,” and “We acknowledge that our children will do best if we honour their natural and intrinsic right to be raise by the two people who brought them into the world.”

After redefinition, marriage becomes something like: “The union of any two people who wish to make a public declaration of commitment based on their feelings of attraction.” The first thing one can't help but notice about this new definition is that it is solely to do with honouring the adults' feelings of attraction. This being so, all the child focussed attributes, attributes that are so important in helping heterosexual adults stay together across the course of some 50 years or more, seem to have been weakened or stripped out of the new legal definition of marriage. The attributes that are connected to the well-being of the children are missing from the picture. One has to ask if this will cause married heterosexuals to act differently.

Heterosexual marriage gives rise to children being born and these children have an intrinsic and natural right to be raised by their two biological parents. These intrinsic rights of the children have pushed heterosexuals to develop a range of attributes that they associate with marriage, attributes that help them move on past the natural challenges that being married for life and having children entail. Gay and lesbian marriages don't need these same attributes because they are just two adults. The attributes that hold their relationships together are different; maybe "We'll stay together as long as we're happy;" or "We have no kids so let's live for the now."

When society starts to call the three different forms of marriage by the same name people have to seek to understand what now might be the new core attributes of marriage. It's a bit like two cultures coming together, with each culture naturally taking on some of the attributes of the other culture in order to find some common understanding.

One might say there are positive outcomes for gays and lesbians if they are offered marital rights, for this might help them take on some of the attributes normally associated with heterosexual marriages (E.g.; maybe a greater sense of stability or permanence) – and for this reason there is support for the redefining of marriage for their sake. But sadly the same cannot be said for heterosexuals taking on attributes that might normally be associated with gay and lesbian committed relationships. Put simply, "We'll stay together as long as we're happy" or "Let's live for the now" are really unhelpful attributes when children are involved. If heterosexual marriages take on these attributes, they can only become even more unstable.

Then there is the issue of fidelity, another core attribute of marriage – will this be sustainable in a marriage redefined world? Because same-sex sex produces no children, adults in same-sex marriages might not value fidelity in marriage in the same way the heterosexuals do. Previous research on same-sex couples in committed relationships showed that fidelity was often not a priority. As yet, we have no idea how being married will change their priorities in this area.

In the end, when so many core attributes are stripped out of the social understanding of marriage, some heterosexuals will come to see that marriage redefined has no clear social attributes left in it – it provides no clear social expectations as how to one builds a successful, lasting family – so fewer will marry. And if fewer heterosexuals marry or stay married, redefining marriage can only lead to continual negative decline in social well-being. Some might dispute this, but when one looks at countries that have legalised same-sex marriages, marital norms have declined faster than average in all these countries. In Canada the decline has led the state to stop collecting data on divorce rates.

How many future born children will become tragic victims of this law change no one knows? All we can be pretty sure of is that redefining marriage will absolutely not strengthen marital norms (Leading article in The Times, UK, 10/12/2012), or not even stabilise them, but leave us with a high probability that the population will have to live with even deeper cuts in their standard of living as fewer and fewer heterosexual parents are there to raise their own children. All this is a natural consequence of defining marriage so it becomes meaningless as a guide for heterosexual pair-bonding and parenting.

On top of this, we have no idea how far the two different sexual cultures will merge together in the new world of marriage redefined. For example, with the teaching of all three forms of marriage at school, and Hollywood – for the sake of a bit of cheap titillation – seeking to encourage heterosexuals to try same-sex sex, will this also lead to cultural cross-over – with some of the next generation of heterosexuals going down the path of experimenting with same-sex sex in their friendships, just as now happens in gay and lesbian friendships? This possibly might lead to many healthy platonic friendships turning into highly charged sexual relationships where jealousy and pain become common affairs. The concept of having a sleep over with a heterosexual friend may come to have a very different meaning than it has now. In a marriage redefined world, who knows how many arguments between parents and children will take place over this issue. Who knows how far same-sex sex between heterosexual friends will permeate society. We only can know for sure that a world where every form of relationship can have a sexual dimension to it is not a world most of us would like to raise our children in. And we can know for sure such a culture will decline to the point of being lost in history. Even though many cultures in history have experimented with same-sex sex, none survived as major world cultures into the modern era.

But it is not only social decline that comes about through making marriage meaningless for heterosexuals that we have to worry about. Another thing one can't help but notice is that marriage redefined contains a deep misunderstanding. Basically it states: "We're married = Any two people can raise children just as well as the two biological parents can." Nobody who understands research on family health and well-being could ever make such a claim.

When children are raised in family constellations other than the traditional marital home they almost always encounter extra risk factors, any of which might harm the well-being of both the child and the future descendants. These extra risk factors for children can be parent centred (e.g. no parental modelling of how one maintains a healthy opposite-sex, marital relationship) or child centred (e.g.; the possible

negative psychological reaction of the child when being raised in a home where at least one of the adults is a non-biological parent). Any child raised from birth in a gay or lesbian marriage will automatically be faced with an extra layer of risk factors and these extra challenges will lead, on average, to poorer outcomes for the children who are raised there. Some same-sex parents will make wonderful parents, but there's just more potential for things to go wrong for the child (See "How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships?")

[www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X12000610] by Mark Regnerus, University of Texas – a study where the children of parents who entered same-sex relationships were asked about their experiences in such homes). Put simply, when the state redefines marriage, the social institution that defines so much about social health becomes based on an untruthful representation of the data. The politicians who seek to redefine marriage typically do so in good faith, little knowing this is happening, but this 'forcing of the population to accept something that isn't true' has profound, deep and very negative social consequences.

The first of these consequences is that once again we see a weakening of the attributes that are essential for long-term heterosexual, pair-bonding. What the state believes – "Any two people can raise children just as well as the biological parents can" – will eventually become social truth for many people. If any two people can raise the children just as well as me and my husband, then I can divorce and remarry, and the children will do just as well (We cannot see this in the data). Or I can divorce, and live alone – for if any two women can raise a child just as well as the biological parents can – then any one woman can. Or why marry in the first place? I, a single woman, can do just as well as two women. The falsehood breeds more misunderstanding.

Also, if we look at countries such as Brazil and the Netherlands who have already legalised same-sex marriages, we see the Pinocchio factor occurring right in front of our eyes: "If any two people can raise children just as well as the biological parents can, then any three or more people can too." Thus marriage redefined is just as short step away from legalising polyamorous relationships – legalising a form of marriage that, without very strong social and religious norms to guide its life-cycle, has historically been linked with the abuse of women and children. All this messiness and ongoing social decline is inherent in the logic of marriage redefined.

But there is also another area of society where this misrepresentation of the truth has an even more profoundly disturbing effect. In a marriage redefined society, society has to deal with the fact maybe over half of the population have automatically been made to feel like lawbreakers because they believe what is true; for believing that redefining marriage will lead to poorer outcomes for society. This, in turn, will probably lead to good people who value marriage being unfairly barred from holding public office, or any position in the state whatsoever – maybe not even a bus driver! We don't want lawbreakers in the state bureaucracy. This eventually leads to poorer lawmaking, especially around the area of family law where there will be a complete absence of those who value heterosexual marriage.

If this wasn't disturbing enough, marriage redefined also turns almost all religions into lawbreaking institutions when they preach what is in their holy texts – that children are best raised by their two biological parents. When they do so they are going against what the state has deemed to be right and are seen to be lawbreaking bigots; even if they are teaching what all family life research shows to be true. Of course, this leads to a decline in religions. Very few young will want to join an institution that will get them labelled by their peers as a 'bigot'.

Sadly, no society in history has lasted long without some form of religious core values to both guide the development of the individual's conscience and ensure basic human rights within that society. Without us believing we have rights bestowed on us by a benevolent creator, man takes things into his own hands, and deems what thoughts are worthy of respect, and what aren't. And citizens have to live in fear if they don't hold the state sanctioned viewpoint.

This is exactly what is happening when the state doesn't see the falsehood in marriage redefined and decides that it has the right to override natural law. Because the state doesn't see the falsehood in its premise it mandates that all people have to believe that one type of relationship that can produce children is exactly the same as a relationship that can't; the state mandates all people have to believe that a relationship that brings about the long-term nurturing and well-being of society is exactly equal to another form of relationship that would automatically die out if it wasn't for support from the wider society; the state mandates we all have to believe that the state has the power to override what Mother Nature has deemed best for us; and if we don't accept marriage redefined, we have to accept the state mandated consequences.

This being so, after the redefinition of marriage, there will eventually be the development of a body that goes around trying to silence people who continue to say what is true – "That children are best raised by their married, biological parents". After redefinition in Canada a special body was set up to make sure no one rocked the new human centred order (see "Same-Sex Marriage Ten Years On: Lessons from Canada" by the Witherspoon institute, Nov. 2012 www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2012/11/6758/). Anyone who

dissented was fined until silenced. By enshrining a falsehood in law the only way to maintain it was through overbearing encouragement from the state. Free and open debate around this issue was sadly closed down. Through the acceptance of a falsehood, the state grew to feel it knew better than the religious wisdom of bygone ages. It's amazing that one small falsehood - 'on average, anyone can raise children as well as the two biological parents can' - has the power to destroy religion, human rights and free speech and take away the inalienable rights that divine wisdom has bestowed on us all.

There is an interesting historical issue here. If marriage is redefined will this lead to the end of the Christian era of world history? Does the redefinition of marriage cause Christianity to go into a fatal and irreversible decline from this point on? The current pressures to redefine marriage are occurring all across the Christian world. Does this show that within Christianity itself there isn't the inner strength or thought processes needed to help people understand the value of marriage to society?

When Mother Nature sees this, can she not help but leave it, and post-Christian society, to their own, self-inflicted decay? If we, with all the data we have available, cannot see by now that society only works when the overwhelming majority of children of children are raised by their two, married, biological parents, and even the state refuses to acknowledge support to the one family unit that brings about best outcomes for heterosexual men, women and all children, then what can God or Mother Nature do but leave us to go our own ways.

If this is the case, this leaves Christian based societies up a creek without a paddle for their democratic values are underpinned by their long held religious values, and once society gets rid of its religions (You're all bigots for believing that kids do best when raised by their two biological parents), then we human beings tend to make up our own values. Governments start deciding what people should believe and what they shouldn't. There is little room for free speech – 70 years of communism shows us what happens when the state kills off religion.

We already see the stirring of this new found power within the organs of the state in the UK after the legalising of same-sex partnerships. There are already signs that the state believes it can now control who and who cannot raise children based on their political or religious beliefs (e.g.; "No you can't foster children because you believe that allowing same-sex unions to be called marriages will lead to heterosexuals to marry less – and thus cause social decline"; this one day might lead to "No you can't raise your own biological children because you hold political or religious views that the state deems to be unhealthy for your children"). Who knows what kind of Orwellian future is unleashed through the religion bashing, freedom-of-speech destroying, Mother Nature denying, empowered statehood world of marriage redefined.

By continuation it seems that in a marriage redefined era societies might enter a period where they can quietly slip into totalitarianism, social decay and crushing state debt. And all this was caused by well-meaning leaders who felt they were trying to make society a healthier place. But they were trying to do so based on a lack of understanding.

Eventually, as in all extreme environments of social decay, the opposite extreme always looks attractive to certain groups in the population. Put simply, if the Christian world cannot find a way to honour heterosexual marriage for what it is – to honour heterosexual marriage as the place where a child's intrinsic right to be raised by its committed, biological parents supersedes all other claims for adults' rights – to honour heterosexual marriage as the way God or Mother Nature designed humanity's reproductive process – then society might eventually reach such a tragic point that sane, rational people might be willing to join forces with those who call for families to live under strict religious mandates – e.g.; under radical Islam – in order to bring about some kind of social sanity. Sadly, no gay or lesbian person would be free from tremendous persecution in such a society.

Some may believe that if the state uses the term civil partnerships to define same-sex committed unions, this will in some way protect the word marriage, and its core attributes, for heterosexuals to use to guide their pair-bonding. This viewpoint, sadly, is based on a false premise.

Once the state has mandated in law that civil partnerships equals marriage in every area except in name, then pressures already build up in the system for it to be called marriage. Also, heterosexuals cannot stop themselves from inheriting the new legal understanding of what is of primary value in the family system – that commitment is about the romantic happiness of two people – and eventually social decay happens.

By granting three quite different forms of family constellation with quite different social outcomes the same legal rights just causes heterosexuals to take their eye off the ball. It stops society from clearly seeing the way to restore of social health – that is, finding a way to make sure that each year, ever more children are raised by their married, biological parents.

If civil partnerships are not the answer, then what is? The only other possible way to solve this dilemma is for states to create a space to honour some form of companion or friendship rights. Under such a system,

any two or more people who felt a need to grant each other some form of rights based on their feelings of affection could sign one or more pre-ordained “rights granting contracts” based on government guidelines. Such “rights granting contracts” might include ‘hospital visitation’ rights; or ‘rights to become an equal partner in the raising of an already existing child’; or a ‘we’re living together in a committed relationship’ contract with prior agreement as to how finances would be dealt with in the event of a parting of ways. Some of these contracts could have possibly have respectful names – for example: “We’re regaled” = We’re in a committed same-sex friendship.

But of course, these rights would apply to everyone, no matter whether they had sexual relationships or not. It’s not perfect but it is the only possible alternative to social annihilation. This would then free the government to focus on finding new ways to make sure that every year ever more children are raised by their married, biological parents – to support a goal that the overwhelming majority of heterosexuals still aspire to.

For those in the USA, it’s clear some would like to make an amendment to the constitution to say that marriage is solely between a man and a woman, believing this would protect society from the legalising of same-sex marriage. But this too is just a short-term measure. It doesn’t stop social decline. The only way to reverse current social decline would be to place an amendment in the constitution such as: “We believe that all children have the inalienable and natural right to be raised, if at all possible, by their two, committed, biological parents. In all areas of family law making, the inalienable right of the child supersedes the supposed rights of adults.” Whether the USA is ready for such a change is debatable. It’s that, or going down the road of continual fiscal and social decline.

The citizens of the UK probably wouldn’t be facing the culturally divisive issue of same-sex marriages if the government had more academic experts on marriage to turn to for advice. But marriage experts in academia are extremely hard to come by. Unwisely, there is no department of marriage and family in the whole of the university system – and yet students can study gender studies at least six universities. Such a poor understanding of the role of marriage in society can only lead to constant and ongoing decline in national well-being. Many couples struggle in their marriages on a daily basis, and yet there are very few experts in the UK who can offer advice to the state as to how to help such families.

Meanwhile, universities are producing many graduates in the area of gender issues – graduates who advise the government on how to promote the rights of gay and lesbians. This leads to many in the population feeling that the state is completely out of touch with the real needs of people. And when it comes to discussing same-sex marriages in the UK, one side of the argument is severely hampered by a lack of experts to present the case against and it is instead left to religious leaders to make the case. From such biased representation of the facts comes very poor lawmaking. Such a vacuum of knowledge is the root cause behind Mr. Cameron’s audacious statements – and his belief that same-sex marriage is good for society – even if it ultimately leads to the destruction of his own political party (In a world of distressed families, the last political party they would vote for would be one that might threaten their state benefits).

In summary, over the last 40 years, heterosexuals have done a pretty good job at destroying marital norms just by themselves. For example, no fault divorce was an extremely poor solution to the struggles between husbands and wives – for it produced a situation where the pain of a parent was, through divorce, quite often passed on to the children, the extended family and to society – and so the number of people in jail has just kept rising and the ability of the next generation to build lasting relationships keeps falling.

Meanwhile, even in an era of tremendous economic growth, national debts have spiralled out of control, in a large part because states have felt a need to pick up the pieces of increasing levels of family distress and increased rates of purposeful single parenting (e.g.; family distress is said to cost the state some £40-50 billion a year in the UK. In the last 20 years, this spending has cost the UK the same amount as its current national debt. www.globalchange.com/rising-price-of-love-chapter-8.htm). But if nation states redefine marriage, this will be the final nail in the coffin of traditional marriage – the death of the one place left where biological children could hope to get the love and attention they have an intrinsic right to; the death of the family unit that brings about best outcomes for heterosexual men and women, for children and for society. Marriage redefined to become “The union of any two people who want to make a public declaration that enables them to be called married” is meaningless to heterosexual parents.

Why did marriage die? It died because the politicians decided that they wanted to keep redefining the legal definition of marriage, and this led to the social understanding of marriage changing too – and in the end the legal and social definition of marriage contained no inherent attributes that heterosexuals could use to guide their life-long pair-bonding. Marriage also died because we all probably could have worked harder at loving our husbands and wives. There are well over a hundred good books out there to help us with almost any problematic issue we have in our marriages – but some of us find it hard to even want to try and learn how to do better. Marriage also died because Christians themselves often failed to invest into marriage strengthening initiatives for their own followers.

Marriage also died because when marriage is legally redefined to include same-sex unions this is almost irreversible; only reversible when the social decline caused by the breakdown of heterosexual marriage has run its course and people become so desperate that they force through change as in a coup. Marriage redefined may suit gays and lesbians – but it fails to offer heterosexuals the core attributes and social understanding they need in order to bond and stay together as they raise their biological children.

The state, ideally, should be heading the other way – seeking to ensure that each year ever more children are raised by their two, married, biological parents. It's a slow journey forward, but it the surest way to rebuild social health and reduce national debt. As governments work at learning how they can better support the marital unit across the life-span, they are being the kindest they can be for future generations of adults and children, and going down the most sensible road towards building social well-being and financial stability.

If Mother Nature has deemed that humanity works best when as many children as possible are raised by their committed, biological parents, we need to humbly accept this, honour this process and seek ensure that heterosexuals have a word that brings together attributes that are helpful when raising children. And this word is marriage. To call three quite different forms of pair-bonding by the same name leaves heterosexuals – some 95-98% of the population – without word with essential core attributes – and heterosexuals are then lost as to how they can bring about best outcomes for themselves, their children and society. For these and the many reasons mentioned above, nation states should stay well away from redefining marriage to include same-sex unions.