

## Testimony In Support of Wisconsin Constitutional Amendment Affirming Marriage

by: Timothy J. Dailey, Ph. D.

Testimony in support of:  
LRB 4072/2  
Constitutional Amendment Affirming Marriage

Timothy J. Dailey, Ph.D.  
Senior Fellow, Center for Marriage and Family Studies  
Family Research Council  
Washington, DC

I serve as the Senior Fellow at the Center for Marriage and Family Studies at the Family Research Council in Washington DC. I have written numerous research papers on the homosexual lifestyle and homosexual marriage, including *The Negative Health Effects of Homosexuality*, *Homosexual Parenting: Placing Children at Risk*, *Homosexuality and Child Sexual Abuse*, and others.

This past year a book I wrote on the subject of the gay lifestyle, entitled *Dark Obsession: The Tragedy and Threat of the Homosexual Lifestyle*, was released.

Most recently The Family Research Council published a book I co-wrote, entitled *Getting it Straight: What the Research Shows about Homosexuality*.

I am proud to be a Wisconsin native, born and raised in the great Dairy state.

It is not by choice that I have devoted so much time to this issue. Pro-family organizations like the Family Research Council and many others have been forced to address this issue for one reason: radical homosexual activists are determined to undermine the historic understanding of marriage that has been the bedrock of Western civilization.

In the interests of time, I would like to make a few remarks based on our perspective in being involved in this issue on a national level.

1. There exists a powerful and growing national movement to protect the definition of marriage that enjoys broad public support. Over the past several months poll after poll has shown tremendous support for defending marriage and against gay marriage. Just this past week, a Time/CNN poll found a resounding 62% of respondents said they oppose the legalization of same-sex marriage, while less than a third favor gay marriage. Every national poll that we have tracked over the past six months has registered similar results.

2. The populace of the state of Wisconsin closely mirrors the national trend. A University of Wisconsin Survey Center poll in December, 2003, found the following:

a. 54% consider "sexual relations between two adults of the same sex" basically wrong.

b. While the poll respondents indicated they were not in favor of laws criminalizing homosexual behavior, they clearly draw the line at gay marriage. In the words of the UW report: "Gay marriage extends beyond the legality of private behavior to its endorsement by society and certain public policy consequences." Accordingly, when asked about gay marriage, state residents disapproved by a 62% to 30% margin.

c. Interestingly, when asked about so-called "mediating position" of whether homosexuals should be permitted to form "civil unions," 48% disapproved, with 44% approving.

d. The poll showed that opposition to homosexual behavior and gay marriage has only strengthened since last summer, once again, following a national trend.

 printer-friendly page

 email this item

order testimony via:

u.s.  
mail: free

Summary:

Testimony in support of Wisconsin Constitutional Amendment Affirming Marriage (LRB 4072/2). Presented By Timothy J. Dailey, Ph.D. on February 16, 2004.

3. The argument that gay marriage is a civil rights issue is patently false. Homosexuals and lesbians enjoy the same rights as other citizens. They also have the right to marry. However, like the rest of us, they face restrictions based on the common good as to whom they can marry. I cannot marry my sister, or my daughter, or two women, or, as a man in Missouri wishes, a horse, no matter how beloved. There are good reasons for such restrictions, which have been honored by major cultures and civilizations since the beginning of time.

4. I recently completed a research paper comparing so-called "committed" homosexual relationships with married couples. The evidence indicates that such relationships are radically different than married couples in several key aspects:

a. Relationship duration: While a high percentage of married couples remain married for up to 20 years or longer, the vast majority of homosexual relationships are short-lived and transitory. This has nothing to do with alleged "societal oppression." A study in the Netherlands, one of the most "gay-tolerant" nations on earth, and which has legalized gay marriage, found that the average duration of a homosexual relationship was 1.5 years.

b. Monogamy vs. promiscuity: While a high percentage of married couples remain faithful to each other, homosexual couples typically engage in a shocking degree of promiscuity. The same Dutch study found that "committed" homosexual couples had an average of 8 sexual partners (outside of the relationship) per year. This is not anti-gay rhetoric, these are statistics published in the respected journal AIDS.

c. Children raised in homosexual households: Contrary to the popular misconception, a small minority of homosexual couples choose to raise children. Data from the 2000 U.S. Census and other sources indicates that less than 10% of homosexual households choose to raise children. One reason for this is that the raising of children is inimical to the typical homosexual lifestyle, which all-too-often involves a revolving bedroom door.

d. Intimate partner violence: Homosexual and lesbian couples experience by far the highest levels of intimate partner violence. Lesbians, for example, suffer more than 4 times the level of violence as do married women.

e. All of this-and much more that time prohibits from discussing-forms a sound rational basis for society not affirming and celebrating sexual relationships that give every evidence of being toxic by their very nature.

5. I do, however, agree with the homosexual activists that in one sense this is indeed a "civil rights" issue: It is a question of whether the civil rights of the majority, which desires to preserve the common, historic understanding of marriage, will be trampled upon in the rush to grant special rights to a small percentage of the population that defines themselves by their unnatural sexual behavior.

6. What we have seen on a national level is a growing realization that what radical homosexual activists are demanding is to overturn the very institution of marriage. The national awakening was fueled by the ill-conceived decision by four justices in Massachusetts to impose gay marriage not only upon that state, but inevitably-unless they are stopped-on the other 49 states of the union.

Largely as a result of the Massachusetts court decision last week that virtually assured that gay marriage licenses will be issued in that state, lawmakers in no fewer than 13 states-including Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin, are considering bills to amend their state constitutions to recognize only traditional marriage. I might add that there exists a strong movement in the state of Massachusetts to amend that state's constitution as well.

What is remarkable about this national movement to protect marriage is that it exists in the face of massive public indoctrination in the media and elsewhere to present homosexuality-and gay relationships-as normal and healthy. It is a genuine grassroots movement, and like all such movements that follow a noble ideal, it will not be denied.

I do not have to remind you, sirs, that this movement is composed of voters, who are fired up and energized like nothing we have ever seen. And the eyes of these voters are upon you, to see if you will take steps to protect the most fundamental institution. I would remind you of the experience of the state of Vermont, where several legislators who voted for civil unions were removed from office by voters in the following election cycle.

In closing, the legislature of the state of Wisconsin faces a historic choice: to cater to the demands of a well-heeled, powerful cadre of homosexual activist organizations determined to radically alter the definition and nature of

marriage, or to listen to the voice of people across this great state, who want only to preserve marriage as the wellspring of society and culture for themselves and their families for generations to come. Thank you.