

Oh, Canada!: Marriage Gets a New Definition - Chuck Colson

David Virtue [DVirtue236 at AOL.COM](mailto:DVirtue236@AOL.COM)

Sat Jun 14 00:24:39 EDT 2003

- Previous message: [Father John, DC evangelist by Terry Mattingly](#)
 - Next message: [Opening Comments 6-20-2003](#)
 - Messages sorted by: [\[date\]](#) [\[thread\]](#) [\[subject\]](#) [\[author\]](#)
-

Oh, Canada!: Marriage Gets a New Definition

BreakPoint with Charles Colson

Commentary

The first line of yesterday's Associated Press story says it all: "An appeals court ruled that Canada's ban on homosexual marriage was unconstitutional, and hours later two Canadian men tied the knot in the country's first legal same-sex wedding."

This is the beginning of a vast social experiment initiated by judicial fiat. Canadian Justice Harry LaForme wrote in his opinion, "The restriction against same-sex marriage is an offence to the dignity of lesbians and gays because it limits the range of relationship options available to them. The result is they are denied the autonomy to choose whether they wish to marry. This in turn conveys the ominous message that they are unworthy of marriage."

The argument, you see, is that to deny homosexuals marriage is manifestly unfair. But it's not unfair. Gays and lesbians are not unworthy of marriage; they are incapable of marriage.

In his wonderful new book, WHAT WE CAN'T NOT KNOW, University of Texas professor J. Budziszewski states that the purpose of marriage is procreation -- the begetting and rearing of children. The future of the human race depends on marriage understood as the union of one man and one woman. Relationships between two men or two women are by their very nature sterile and, thus, not marriage.

Budziszewski writes, "To call procreation the purpose of marriage is not arbitrary; alone among all forms of human union, the union of the sexes produces children . . . A legislature [or a court] can no more turn sodomitical unions into marriages than it can turn dogs into cats; it can only unravel the institution of marriage by sowing confusion about its purpose."

And that confusion is growing. Most people oppose or support homosexual marriage for sentimental reasons. Some can't stomach the idea at all, but they don't know why except for a feeling that it's wrong. Others have friends, neighbors, co-workers, or family members who are involved in long-term homosexual relationships. They enjoy the couple's company; they know that they're in love. Since marriage is all about love, they reason, same-sex couples should be permitted to marry.

Photos of happy gay and lesbian couples getting married as a result of this ruling only reinforce this sentiment. The negative sociological consequences won't be fully felt for years -- when, by then, it will be too late.

Christians must not fall into that sentiment trap, nor can we simply quote Scripture to deny homosexual unions. We need well reasoned arguments based on a biblical worldview. And BreakPoint is committed to helping you make those arguments cogently and winsomely. Call us here (1-877-3-CALLBP); we'll offer you some good resources.

J. Budziszewski is right: We and our neighbors can't not know that marriage by nature is about procreation. And only a man and a woman together -- two becoming one flesh -- can procreate. Same-sex relationships can never be marriage.

A second issue is that those who espouse sexual liberation have defined the issues in the debate. I'll address this on our next broadcast, so stay tuned.

What has occurred in Canada adds fuel to the same-sex marriage movement. Now more than ever Christians must make a well reasoned defense of marriage.

Copyright (c) 2003 Prison Fellowship Ministries

-
- Previous message: [Father John, DC evangelist by Terry Mattingly](#)
 - Next message: [Opening Comments 6-20-2003](#)
 - **Messages sorted by:** [\[date\]](#) [\[thread\]](#) [\[subject\]](#) [\[author\]](#)

[More information about the VirtueOnline mailing list](#)