

10 reasons why same-sex marriage is a bad idea essay sample

[Family](#), [Marriage](#)



1. Gays & lesbians make poor parents.

Assertion: The State of Hawaii and court petitioners representing the Roman Catholic Church and The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints claimed that gays and lesbians in committed relationships make inferior parents. The best way to assure that children get the best possible upbringing is to require spouses to be of different genders. Rebuttal: All of the witnesses in *Baehr v. Miike* — both for the plaintiffs and the defense — said that, on average, gay and lesbian couples are as loving as are opposite sex couples, and are equally as competent as parents. Since that court hearing, there have been many additional studies of the competency of gay and lesbian parents.

Those conducted by groups opposed to same-sex marriage have generally found that homosexual parents are inferior; those conducted by groups that support same-sex marriage, or which have no preconceived position have generally found that gay and lesbian couples are equal or superior to opposite-sex parents. 8 Children parented by lesbians or gays have been found to be no different from those raised in an opposite-sex household "... on measures of popularity, social adjustment, gender role behavior, gender identity, intelligence, self-concept, emotional problems, interest in marriage and parenting, locus of control, moral development, independence, ego functions, object relations, or self esteem." Also, no significant differences have been observed in regard to " teachers' and parents' evaluations of emotional and social behavior, fears, sleep disturbances, hyperactivity, and conduct differences."

2. Children need to be raised by their biological parents:

<https://assignbuster.com/10-reasons-why-same-sex-marriage-is-a-bad-idea-essay-sample/>

Assertion: Children are better off when raised by their biological parents. In a same-sex marriage, at least one parent would be genetically unrelated to the child. Rebuttal: With a divorce rate approaching 50%, a large minority of children are parented by a genetically-unrelated adult at some time in their lives. This inevitably happens in the case of a step family. If the state is to deny gays and lesbians, on this basis, the right to marry the partner that they love and have made a commitment to, then the state should logically deny divorced persons with children the right to remarry the person that they love. 3. A child with same-sex parents will be subjected to hate:

Assertion: Raising a child in a home with gay or lesbian parents in effect punishes the child, because they would be exposed to homophobia by the public. Hatred directed at the child's parents would spread to the child.

Rebuttal: Using the same argument, one could suggest that all inter-racial marriages should be banned and that all individuals of mixed-race ancestry should not be allowed to marry because their children will be of mixed racial ancestry and may experience racism from racial bigots. Other people's racism or homophobia should not be used to deny fundamental human rights to gays, lesbians, inter-racial couples and persons of mixed-race ancestry .

Marriage is only feasible if the couple is monogamous; same-sex couples cannot be: Assertion: Because of monogamy, marriage is an stable institution. This is apparently a reference to the state's belief that homosexual couples cannot be monogamous. Rebuttal: It is important to realize that most opposite-sex marriages are not monogamous. The percentage of heterosexual spouses who engage in at least one extra-

marital “ fling” approaches 50%. The percentage of opposite-sex marriages in which both partners are monogamous is less than 50%. 8. Homosexual activity is a capital offense in the Bible:

Assertion: There are at least a half-dozen references to homosexuality scattered throughout the Bible. All are negative. Leviticus 20: 13 states that “ The penalty for homosexual acts is death to both parties. They have brought it upon themselves.” (Living Bible): The New Living Translation says: “ The penalty for homosexual acts is death to both parties. They have committed a detestable act, and are guilty of a capital offense.” How can we allow gays and lesbians to marry if the Bible calls on them to be executed?

Rebuttal: Those are accurate quotations from two of the more popular English translations of the Bible. However, they are also excellent examples of how translators allow their own personal prejudices to affect their judgment.

The Living Bible and New Living Translation refer to homosexuals — i. e. to male gays and lesbians. But the original Hebrew refers only to two men having sex. Lesbians do not appear in the Hebrew Scriptures (a. k. a. Old Testament). So, based on this passage, there would be no objection to two lesbians marrying. There are many similar verses in Leviticus which describe the Mosaic Code and use the Hebrew word “ to’ebah” to condemn certain behaviors: sharing a meal with a person of another religion, eating shrimp or lobster, getting a tattoo, wearing a cotton and polyester shirt, planting a mixture of grass seeds in your front lawn, etc. None of these

behavior are still considered “ ritually impure” today. The passage may well be null and void. 9. Almost everyone agrees that homosexuality is immoral:

Assertion: The vast majority of the faith groups in North America — over 1,500 strong — condemn homosexual behavior as a serious sin, hated by God. We cannot reward such behavior by allowing gays and lesbians to marry.

Rebuttal: While it is true that conservative religious groups condemn homosexual behavior, refuse to conduct union or marriage ceremonies for same-sex couples, and refuse to ordain active homosexuals to the clergy, this is not true of all faith groups. In fact liberal groups such as the Unitarian Universalist Association, United Church of Christ, American Humanist Association, American Atheists, etc. promote equal rights for persons and couples of all sexual orientations. Many mainline churches are actively debating their stand on these matters. 10. Same sex marriage would be a radical change to society:

Assertion: When same-sex marriages were considered in Hawaii, a conservative Christian organization, Hawaii’s Future Today (HFT), filed a brief with the court in opposition. They said, in part, that same-sex marriage would introduce “ a radical reform in the basic institution of marriage, jettisoning long-recognized cultural values and drastically redefining the fundamental structure of our society...” They stated that the government has a compelling interest in “ the historical and time-honored protection of traditional marriage as the fundamental structure in Hawaiian society that advances basic societal goals and values.” Rebuttal:

The essence of this argument is that because we have not allowed same-sex couples to marry in the past, that we should not allow them to marry in the future. If this logic were followed, slavery would still be practiced, men would be able to rape their wives with impunity, women would be prohibited from entering many professions, and non-virgin brides would be stoned to death today in North America. Author Andrew Sullivan wrote: “ The introduction of gay marriage would not be some sort of leap in the dark, a massive societal risk. Homosexual marriages have always existed, in a variety of forms; they have just been euphemized. Increasingly they exist in every sense but the legal one. As it has become more acceptable for homosexuals to acknowledge their loves and commitments publicly, more and more have committed themselves to one another for life in full view of their families and friends.

A law institutionalizing gay marriage would merely reinforce a healthy trend.” 11. The government has an interest in preserving the status quo: Assertion: The government has a compelling interest to preserve the status quo in marriage — to reserve it as a special privilege of opposite-sex couples and to deny it to same-sex couples. The brief by Hawaii’s Future Today, also stated that the government has a compelling interest in “ the historical and time-honored protection of traditional marriage as the fundamental structure in Hawaiian society that advances basic societal goals and values.” Rebuttal: The status quo in North America has shifted since 2003-JUN-10. On that date, a court in Ontario Canada declared that marriage licenses could be obtained by any adult couple — same sex or opposite sex. So, in Ontario at least, the

status quo allows same-sex marriage. British Columbia followed suit on JUL-9. Laws must always be viewed by the court from the perspective of the claimant. The existing marriage legislation clearly discriminated against the same-sex couples who brought the lawsuit. Should same sex marriage be legalized in the Philippines?

I assume we are all aware of the legalization of same sex marriage in different countries. Members of the lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgender (LGBT) groups have been widely accepted in society, media, and even in politics. The question for the Philippines now is: Should same-sex marriage be legalized or not?

Same-sex marriage should not be legalized in the Philippines because if we allow it, it is legalizing something immoral, and this means legalizing a crime.

Legalizing same-sex marriage is not practical. Doing so would mean revising the Constitution, the Civil Code, the Family Code, and the concept and nature of marriage. Our country cannot afford such big change in the laws. It would not be easy for everyone, because legalizing such act would affect the people governed by such laws.

The problem of our country is not social, political or economic. The problem of our country is more on the moral aspect.

Yes, many countries, even religious ones, have accepted and legalized same-sex marriage, but legalizing it does not make it moral. Imagine if same-sex

marriage was legalized here. What would be next? Legalization of marijuana and prostitution?

The legalization of same-sex marriage will start the corruption of the minds of the people, especially the children. If we do not show the proper values and principle to the young generation, who else will? The younger generations will be the hope of the Philippines. How can our country be progressive and successful if the people governing the nation have corrupted minds and low morality?

It is our duty to serve as their role models and teach and show them proper values and principles in life so that our country in the future would reap the good things we, today, have done. *Here is my constructive speech AGAINST SAME SEX MARRIAGE. I hope it could help some people.

Good day to every one of us! Good day, ladies and gentlemen. It wouldn't be surprising for anyone of us today if I, as a member of the negative side, would use the Bible to dispute the same-sex marriage. It would actually be a bit a commonplace that, in these kinds of topics requiring moral arguments, the Bible is quoted. But, we cannot get away from the Bible since the Bible is one of the authorities of our morality in this Christian world. I'd like to remind you, not tell you because this is already a common knowledge to us all, that the cities of Sodom and Gomorra were destroyed by fire by God because people there are engaging into same-sex intercourse – sexual intercourse between the same sexes. (Gen. 19: 4 -5)

This is a clear proof that God is against same-sex marriage. As I have mentioned a while ago, the BIBLE is only one of the authorities of our morality. Another authority to our morality as citizens of the Philippines is our culture. For so long, we have observed and preserved the moral standard that marriage is between a male and a female. This culture of marrying only between a male and a female has caught our habitual obedience for many, many years and has defined to concrete sense our definition and perception of marriage. I, as a Filipino, upon hearing the word MARRIAGE, form in my mind an image