

**#Ten Reasons to Stand Up in Defense of Marriage and in Support of Proposition 8
By Lynn D. Wardle**

*The professional opinions expressed are those of the author who speaks for himself not any institution with which he is affiliated.

*Presented to the Burbank Stake Fireside
Sunday, September 7, 2008*

Introduction: TY Pres Klenk, & Pres Ainain,

TY, DLW, my son and a member of your stake, for taking initiative since my wife and I happened to be in So. Cal. for a family wedding this weekend.

The timing of this invitation could not have been more appropriate with the debate over Proposition 8. I will present both secular and spiritual reasons to stand up in defense of marriage.

Humor: I have been asked to address a serious subject and you have been called to engage in a serious effort, but lest we take ourselves too seriously it should be taken with a bit of humor.

1) Bumper sticker on soccer mom's minivan: "Sometimes in the morning I wake up grumpy, but usually I just let him sleep."

2) Cartoon: 2 women talking: one says "John & I agreed to have the wedding at 7 a.m.. That way, if it doesn't work out, we won't have wasted the entire day!!"

3) (Non Seq) cartoon: Govt' office with 3 services windows marked: "Marriage Licenses", which is next to the "Restraining Order" window, which is beside the "Divorce Filings" window. Clerk at "Marriage License" window says to man in line: "Or you can save time and money by getting all three forms at once; we call it the California Package."

4) NYorker cartoon: 50-ish mom to her 30-ish daughter: "I don't know what's wrong with you, why you still aren't married. By the time I was your age, I'd been married & divorced twice!!"

[[5) NYer: one 30-ish man to another: "People should get married unless they've been married."

[[6) B) Lawyer to a witness:

Q. What is your name? A. John O'Hara

Q. What is your marital status? A. Oh, I'd say it's "fair to middlin."]

#I begin with THREE PRELIMINARY PTS:

I begin w/ 3 preliminary points:

#(1) *THANK YOU, THANK YOU, THANK YOU!* for all you are doing. You find yourselves on the front lines of a tremendously important public policy battle over the meaning of marriage in the law. It will have enormous impact upon and "wake-effect" implications for the rest of the country and much of the world. As goes California on the issue of legalization of SSM, so will go a large part of the United States and most of the western world in the next decade. For example, legislation to repeal the MASS' L forbidding persons to marry in MA if they could not marry in their own state of residence had been proposed for years, and was rejected by the legislature just a year ago. But just weeks after the CA S CT ruled that CA must provide SSM, the MA legislature repealed that 95 year old law which had prevented the exportation of MA SSM into nearly all of the other states. Likewise, bills to legalize SSM had been proposed for years and had been pending in Norway a long time; but one month after CA SCT mandated SSM that the upper house of the Norwegian legislature approved the law, and Norway became 6th nation to legalize SSM. CA is a bell-weather jurisdiction, as CA goes on this issue, much of the nation and much of the world will follow. So thank you, TY, TY, TY!

#(2) *We Cannot Avoid This Issue.* We did not seek this controversy, or want it, but advocates of radical redefinition and deconstruction of marriage and the marital family have aggressively taken steps to change public law & policy and have forced the issue upon us. Under those circumstances, we cannot duck the issue. We must "stand up for something." In the words of #Gordon B. Hinckley in the book, *Standing for Something*:

“The time has come for good people everywhere to demonstrate that they stand for something – something that is virtuous and clean and worthwhile.” *Standing* at 178.

#Elder Neal A. Maxwell likewise declared:

" Latter-day Saints . . . have no choice but to stand up and to speak up whenever the institution of the family is concerned, even if we are misunderstood, resented, or brushed aside.

Neal A. Maxwell, "Take Especial Care of Your Family," *Ensign*, May 1994, at 89.

#(3) *It's About Marriage!* **Proposition 8 is about marriage; it is *not* about homosexuality.** The issue is whether the basic social institution of marriage should be radically redefined. It is **not** about homosexual relations, which have long existed without needing (or wanting) to be called “marriages.” It’s not about gays or lesbians, or same-sex attraction, or nature-vs-nurture, or civil rights for individuals with any sexual orientation. *It is not about homosexuality*; it is solely about protecting the institution of marriage. We all have close friends or families who consider themselves gay or lesbian or have at some time lived or are living LGBT lifestyles. This battle is not about them or their lifestyles or sexualities.

Today, tragically, marriage and marital families are under great pressure today and are many marriages fail, but legalizing same-sex marriage will not solve or reduce that serious problem. Rather, by altering the meaning and reducing the expectations of marriage, by applying the “marriage” label to gay and lesbian relations, which have an even higher rate of instability than heterosexual couples, legalizing SSM will only substantially worsen the problem.

I will identify ten reasons to stand up for marriage and to support Prop 8. These reasons fall into two categories which I call: “The Best of Times” and “The Worst of Times” (thanks to Charles Dickens’ *A Tale of Two Cities*).

[“It was the best of times it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of light it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us we had nothing before us” – Charles Dickens, A Tale of Two Cities (1859).]

The Worst of Times

#1) Globally and in the United States, marriage and the marital family are under besieged by social and ideological influences that threaten and have greatly weakened these foundational social institutions.

A century ago, the major challenges facing the family were *external*: poverty, illiteracy, inadequate medical treatment, infant mortality, low life expectancy, lack of economic and social opportunity, restricted political liberty, perpetual warfare (which profoundly harms families), etc. In the past century, especially that past 60 years, most of those external dangers to the family have been dramatically reduced in most of the nations on earth.

[For instance, internationally infant mortality rates have dropped considerably in most countries and life expectancy continues to increase in nearly every country. Enrollment rates for primary and secondary education have risen globally and literacy rates have increased in every country, developed and undeveloped. In most countries wealth per capita and standards of living have increased greatly. While there are still great disparities in these external conditions between nations, and between the richest and the poorest within each nation, yet in nearly all the world these external conditions are tremendously better today than they were one hundred years ago.]

Today, 100 years later, while external conditions have never been better for families in the world, *internal* conditions for families in many parts of the world have seriously degenerated.

Paradoxically, as external circumstances have improved, the infrastructure of the family has begun to deteriorate severely in many countries, especially (and most ironically) in the nations in which the external conditions are the very best. Family formation, family stability, family continuity, and family integrity have experienced severe declines in the most affluent nations of the world. The flight from the marital family has been stunning and the prospects for stability and happiness in family life in many nations are more grim than ever been.

[For example, rates of marriage have been falling in many of the most affluent countries, while rates of non-marital cohabitation have reached unprecedented levels, rates of childbearing out of wedlock have soared, rate of divorce has dramatically heightened or stabilized at historic levels in many countries including the USA, rates of abortion have skyrocketed, and same-sex relationships and parenting and other alternative family styles unheard of fifty years ago seem to be growing in popularity.]

#Today, the greatest challenges to the family today are from *internal* disintegration rather than *external* deprivation. None of contemporary dangers facing families are more threatening to the institution of marriage than the movement to legalize same-sex marriage, which would change the very meaning, legal implications, human understanding and social expectations of the foundational social institution of marriage.

As President Hinckley wrote: “[Of] all the problems our society faces, the most serious is the breakdown of the family.” Hinckley, *Standing* at 132.

~[ADD Stats re CBOW, Cohab, Div, Juv crts.]

#2) *When Marriage and Marital Families Disintegrate, Society and Individuals Suffer, Struggle and Are Vulnerable.*

The reason was explained succinctly by President Kimball 30 years ago:

“When the home is destroyed, the nation goes to pieces. There can be no question about this, and all historians or those who have followed a historical line of thought have come to the same conclusion.”

-- Spencer W. Kimball, *Ensign*, May 1978, 4-9

In his 60 Minutes Interview with Mike Wallace President Hinckley said: “A nation will rise no higher than the strength of its homes. If you want to reform a nation, you begin with families”

-- President Gordon B. Hinckley, (Interview with Mike Wallace), *Ensign*, November 1996, at 48-49

#Elder L. Tom Perry further explained: “

“[M]uch of the confusion and difficulty we find existing in the world today is being traced to the deterioration of the family. . . .”

-- L. Tom Perry, *Ensign* May 1994, 36-38

#He also said: “[S]trong marriages produce strong families. The breakup of the family is causing serious social problems that are destroying our communities - including increases in poverty, crime, and delinquency.

-- L. Tom Perry, *Ensign*, May 1995, 72

#The Proclamation on the Family states: “[W]e warn that the disintegration of the family will bring upon individuals, communities, and nations the calamities foretold by ancient and modern prophets.”

We can link that to D&C1:17-18 where the Lord explained why he has given the marvelous outpouring of revelations to the Prophet Joseph and others in this dispensation:

“Wherefore, I the Lord, knowing the calamity which should come upon the inhabitants of the earth, called upon my servant Joseph Smith, Jun., and spake unto him from heaven, and gave him commandments;

And also gave commandments to others, that they should proclaim these things unto the world”

#Marriages and marital families are the basic teaching, care-giving, value-transmitting, support-providing units in society, and serve as the cornerstones in the foundation, the basic infrastructure of any society. When marriages fail to form, dysfunction, or fail, society must pick up the pieces and the public incurs huge social burdens and huge fiscal costs. [such as for increased mental health treatment, increased medical services, increased juvenile delinquency, impaired education, and reduced labor productivity.]

Elder Neal Maxwell explained it this way:

“As parenting declines, the need for policing increases. There will always be a shortage of police if there is a shortage of effective parents! Likewise, there will not be enough prisons if there are not enough good homes.

. . . How can we value the family without valuing parenting? And how can we value parenting if we do not value marriage?

As the number of dysfunctional families increases, their failures will spill into already burdened schools and streets. It is not a pretty scene even now.”

-- Neal A. Maxwell, *Ensign*, May 1994, at 89-90.

Evidence for that is undeniable One recent example: A study by a Business School professor published this Summer (2008) by the Institute for American Values and the Institute for Marriage and Public Policy reports that the public costs – costs to American taxpayers -- of family marital break-up and of non-marital child-bearing (CBOW) in the United States, total at least \$112 billion each year for American taxpayers, \$70 Billion federal tax dollars and \$42

Billion state and local tax dollars each year. In California the state and local costs attributed to family fragmentation amount to 11.5% of the total state and local tax burden, or \$4.829 billion in taxes per year.

So there is a huge public interest in protecting and strengthening the institution of marriage. There is a huge fiscal danger to legalizing same-sex marriage if it weakens the institution of marriage.

The institutions of marriage and marital families are endangered by SSM. It is no mere coincidence that the movement to legalize alternative forms of adult intimate association, including SSM, exploded a generation after the adoption of the unilateral no-fault divorce laws in most American states led to the most dramatic rise in divorce in our nations' history, a condition almost unprecedented in known history. Think of the connection between children of divorce whose lives & family identities were disrupted by divorce of their parents and the growth of alternative lifestyles when those children of divorce became of age to mate and marry. The consequences of weakening the institution of marriage and marital families increase until they ripen after a full generation and young people who have been hurt by and lost confidence in marriage try to sort out how they will live their adult intimate lives. It is no wonder that many of them are drawn to experiment with alternative forms of human intimate relationships.

#3) Globally and in the United States, there is a strong movement to legalize SSM.

#In the past eight years, 6 nations in the world and 2 US states have legalized SSM.

<CHART>

#Additionally, thirteen nations and six other states have legalized same-sex civil unions with legal status and benefits comparable to male-female marriage.

#In this country, the movement to legalize SSM has been the result of a litigation campaign to persuade courts to judicially order that SSM be legalized. At least 10 different American courts have ordered the legalization of SSM.

#Since constitutional interpretations cannot be overturned by legislative action, advocates of SSM focus primarily on constitutional arguments. Nearly a dozen constitutional arguments have been asserted to force the constitutional legalization of SSM. Remember, it takes only one of them to override all statutes, rules, ordinances and case precedents protecting marriage as the union of a man and a woman.

#4) Same-Sex Marriage Damages Marriage & Harms Individuals, Families & Society

The questions “what’s the harm?” is perhaps most frequently asked question in the debate over same-sex marriage. You will hear people say things like “The Netherlands, Canada & Massachusetts have legalized same-sex marriage and the sky didn’t fall, so what’s the harm.

There are three flaws with this argument. First, it is an attempt to switch the burden of proof about harm to those who defend marriage rather than those who are proposing a radical change. Second, it diverts attention; the enduring harms of same-sex marriage become evident over decades, not overnight. It will take as long to clearly document the detrimental consequences of legalizing same-sex marriage, just as it took to document clearly the harm of unilateral, no-fault divorce on demand which many American states adopted 30-35 years ago. Third, Already we can identify some harms.

Perhaps the best quick answer to the “what’s the harm from legalizing SSM” is – that it will harm you and your family and your community the same way that legalizing polygamous marriages with 13-year-old girls or legalizing marriage between fathers-and-daughters would harm you and your family and your community.

Legalizing SSM changes a critical social institution, and changes the common understanding of what that social institution is, and changes the script for marriage and for how

we expect to live our lives when we marry, it changes the social understanding of the responsibilities we undertake by entering the institution of marriage.

It changes the meaning of marriage by the transformative power of inclusion; it weakens and lowers expectations of marriage by accepting/including gay-lesbian lifestyles as marriage; it undermines the principle that children deserve to have both mother and father.

The morality and behavioral expectations of gays and lesbians differ markedly from married men and women. For example, promiscuity, infidelity, multiple sexual partners, and dangerous sexual practices are the behavioral norms among gay couples (and also, to a lesser extent, lesbian couples), rather than monogamy and sexual self-control which are the norms fostered by and nurtured in heterosexual marriages.

#For example, a study by Dutch AIDS researchers, published in 2003 in the journal AIDS, reported on the number of partners among Amsterdam's homosexual population. They found:

- 86% of new HIV/AIDS infections in gay men were in men who had steady partners.
- Gay men with steady partners engage in more risky sexual behaviors than gays without steady partners.
- Gay men with steady partners had 8 other sex partners ("casual partners") per year, on average.
- The average duration of committed relationships among gay steady partners was 1.5 years.

Numerous other studies confirm that same-sex relations do not conform to the social expectations of male-female marriages but differ in terms of fidelity, monogamy, stability, promiscuity, domestic violence, alcohol and drug abuse. Including same-sex unions as legal marriages will transform the meaning and social expectations of marriage in negative ways for the stability and integrity of all marriages.

One of the best summaries of the harm of SSM comes in a book published recently by David Blankenhorn, entitled *The Future of Marriage*. Using a poll of data reporting interviews with 50,000 adults in 35 nations, Blankenhorn created four categories of countries according to their laws regarding same-sex unions and analyzed attitudes towards marriage. He reports:

The correlations are strong. Support for marriage is by far the weakest in countries with same-sex marriage. The countries with marriage-like civil unions show significantly more support for marriage. The two countries with only regional recognition of gay marriage (Australia and the United States) do better still on these support-for-marriage measurements, and those without either gay marriage or marriage-like civil unions do best of all.

In nations without gay marriage, people are twice to say married people are happier than in nations with gay marriage, and nearly twice as likely to say that people with children ought to marry.

#If you'll forgive a reference to a book I edited, I convened an academic conference at BYU Law School in 2006 in which experts from multiple disciplines (law, political science, business, psychology, family studies, history, humanities, etc.) were invited to respond to the question: does legalizing same-sex marriage harm individuals, families society? Most of those papers have just been published by University Press of America in a book entitled "What's the Harm?" just off the press August 26. The papers are published in four parts and to keep the discussion more rounded, at least one paper was added to each of in each part arguing that that there is no harm, or that lack of same-sex marriage causes harm. I dislike money-changing in our chapels but since I have pledged my royalties to subsidize distribution of the books, and I think the book will be helpful to people wanting to read up on the issue, I mention it.

Moreover, the harm of same-sex marriage threatens the work of the Lord. Just as establishment of a nation of religious liberty was necessary for the restoration of the gospel, a

society of strong families is needed for the gospel to flourish in the lives of men and women and children.

As Elder Perry put it: The union between husband and wife is not something to be trifled with. The marriage covenant is essential for the Lord to accomplish His divine purposes.”

-- L. Tom Perry, *Ensign*, May 1995, 72

President Monson quoted Stephen L. Richards in General Conference and declared:

“: ‘I believe in the home as the foundation of society, as the cornerstone of the nation, and as the primary institution of the Church. I cannot conceive of a great people without great, good homes. I believe that the first calling of man and woman is to form a good home.’”

- Thomas S. Monson, “The Mighty Strength of the Relief Society,” *Ensign*, November 1997, p. 95-96

#5) *Same-Sex Marriage Threatens Individual Civil Rights Including Religious Liberties.*

To create new same-sex marriage liberties comes at the expense of reducing and weakening the institution of conjugal marriage and the liberties of all other Americans to continue to enjoy the blessings of that institution undiluted and untransformed by the inclusion of same-sex unions.

Marriage is one of the most important concerns of religion. It is also a critical element in hundreds of civil laws (according to the GAO marriage or marital status is a factor on 1138 federal statutes (not counting federal regulations) and several studies of state laws indicate that between 300-500 state laws uses marital status as a factor. Legalizing SSM will effect all of those laws.

Changing the core definition of marriage in the law will lead to clashes between those law and religion. Religious organizations may be compelled to provide support for and service for same-sex married couples or be punished for not doing so. Individuals with religious convictions have been and will be forced to put aside their religious convictions or suffer

punishment, or discrimination. Civil liability or exclusion from government benefits may be imposed on religions and religious believers that decline to accommodate same-sex marriage. These are what I call the “wake-board” effect of legalizing SSM.

From soup kitchens to homeless shelters, from hospitals to social services, religious organizations provide a variety of services to the public and participate in many public service programs that may be shut down or censored if they do not accommodate same-sex marriage. Religious universities have been forced to provide housing to gay and lesbian couples in violation of core religious principles, and shelters may be similarly treated.

In Massachusetts since same-sex marriage has been legalized Boston Catholic Charities, which provided adoption services to Catholic families for a century had to shut down because a law required all adoption agencies to place children with gays and lesbians, in violation of the strong moral principles of the Church. The state refused to grant a religious exemption.

In California, non-discrimination laws were used to force a Protestant adoption agency to provide adoption services to lesbian couples, and to require an Arizona online adoption agency (adoption.com) to cease doing business in CA with Californians. The implications for LDS Family Services are obvious.

Last month, the Ca Supreme Court ruled in a suit against a clinic and Catholic doctors who declined on grounds of religious convictions to give assisted reproduction services to a lesbian even though they tried to mitigate by referring her to another physician. The court held that there was no religious exemption, and rejected their defense of free exercise of religion and freedom of expression.

The Catholic Church’s Georgetown University was required to allow the Gay Rights Coalition and their programs to promote homosexual lifestyle with the same access to facilities and the same university support, resources and services as it provides

to its own church-doctrine-supporting groups.

In Canada, the Knights of Columbus was held liable and forced to pay damages by the British Columbia Human Rights Commission after it cancelled (very politely, promptly) rental of its hall for a marriage celebration, when it learned that it was for a lesbian wedding. In the United States, the Boy Scouts who require their members to be “morally straight” have been denied privileges and the use of public facilities and lands. The most recent example of this is in Philadelphia, where the Scouts have been ordered by the openly gay City Solicitor to vacate a building that they built with their own funds nearly eighty ago and donated to the city in return for a lease in perpetuity.

Since hospitals are regulated public institutions, church-owned hospitals and teaching clinics may be forced to offer procedures (like sex-change) and teaching (about gay lifestyle) that violate church doctrines. In the United States, this has occurred in the abortion context, so we must expect it to occur with same-sex marriage, also.

Educators and schools are vulnerable. Religious schools that refuse to approve, subsidize, perform or endorse SSM could lose access to public facilities, programs, and tax exemption (even be prosecuted). In Massachusetts since same-sex marriage has been legalized there already have been numerous controversies about curriculum, assemblies, classes, clubs, and parents’ rights to protect their children from exposure to gay propaganda. In British Columbia, Canada, the government accrediting agency denied accreditation to Trinity Western University, sponsored by the Evangelical Free Church of Canada, for its Teacher Training Program because the school requires students to sign an honor code manifesting their belief in Bible verses that condemn homosexual behavior as immoral, and the provincial supreme court affirmed.

Elsewhere, free speech rights also have already been abused. In Sweden Pentacostal Pastor Ake Green in Sweden was prosecuted, convicted, and forced through years of litigation for quoting from the Bible against homosexual relations. He finally won in the Swedish

Supreme Court, where the prosecutor argued that since there were other translations of the Bible that did not use strong condemnatory language, the Pastor had no right to quote from the traditional version. Many similar cases have been reported in Canada and England. In Ireland, during public debate over legalizing same-sex unions, the Irish Council for Civil Liberties warned that Catholic Bishops and clergy who distributed a Vatican publication opposing homosexual relations could be prosecuted for violating a hate speech act.

The “wake-effects” of legalizing SSM are profoundly harmful to persons of faith and religions. It will also be especially harmful to children, because it is simply undeniable that marriage provides the most beneficial, advantageous environment in which to raise children. Marriage provides the most critical legal bond and strongest social connections that ties parents to children. Only male-female couples are capable of procreation, and only male-female marriage is best capable of sending the message and reinforcing the natural bonds between biological parents and children. All children deserve to be raised by their father and mother who love each other and love them, and marriage sends and reinforces that critical message and value.

So much for the bad news. It is also the best of times for marriage and that gives us some powerful reasons to protect the institution of marriage.

Best of Times

#6) *Globally There Is A Movement to Give Constitutional Protection to Conjugal Marriage and Marital Families That Surpasses the Movement for Same-Sex Marriage.*

Today, there is more widespread legal recognition of the unique value and social importance of male-female marriage than ever before in world history.

#The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted 1946, the foundation of modern international human rights law, recognizes that “[t]he family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.” Similar statements

declaring the foundational importance and specially-protected role of families are found in dozens of other international conventions, compacts, treaties, and instruments.

#145 nations (/191 sovereign nations in the world) have Constitutional Provisions Protecting and giving special status to “family.” This includes 83 Nations (/191) Have Substantive Constitutional Provisions Protecting “marriage.”

#Additionally, nearly 20% of the 191 sovereign nations recognized by the United Nations have adopted explicit protection for marriage as the union of a man and a woman in their national constitutions.

#Let me show you a couple of examples.

By contrast, not a single nation has explicit language in their national constitution defining marriage to expressly include same-sex unions, and courts in only two (of 191) nations have interpreted their national constitution to require SSM.

#7) In the United States There Is A Grassroots Movement to Give Constitutional Protection to Conjugal Marriage and Marital Families That Surpasses the Movement for Same-Sex Marriage.

#In the past decade, the people in twenty-seven states have enacted amendments to their state constitutions to provide constitutional protection for marriage as the union of a man and a woman. Voter approval for these amendments has been 69% overall.

#Minorities, including African-Americans, have strongly supported such amendments, often by larger percentages than in the general population.

As the Reverend Walter Fauntroy, who marched and worked with the Rev. Martin Luther King, put it: “I am one of gay rights’ strongest advocates . . . [b]ut . . . it’s a serious mistake to redefine marriage as anything other than an institution between a man and a woman.”

General Colin Powell described the difference between black civil rights claims for equality and gay rights claims for equality. “Skin color is a benign, non-behavioral

characteristic; sexual orientation is perhaps the most profound of human behavioral characteristics. Comparison of the two is a convenient but invalid argument.”

California usually has been a leader in law reform movements, but due to legislative partisan politics it has lagged behind in protecting marriage.

[[Because of politics in highly partisan state legislatures (and CA’s legislature which when I was growing up here was the best most collaborative in the nation, but has become one of the most partisan, radical bodies in the nation) many of these amendments resulted from citizens petitions and popular initiatives to circumvent hostile, partisan politics.

These constitutional amendments recognize that marriage is a gender uniting institution, combining the complementary differences of men and women. *Men and women are different, and the union of a man and woman still creates a different kind of union than the union of 2 men or 2 women.* Men and women are different in a universe of complementary ways and aspects. The gender integrative union of a man and a woman is different than the gender apartheid union of two men or two women. The union of man and woman in marriage creates a unique and uniquely valuable union much greater than the sum of the parts. Conjugal marriage contributes more to society than other form of intimate adult relationship. As Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg wrote in a famous decision: “Physical differences between men and women. . . are enduring: ‘The two sexes are not fungible; a community made up exclusively of one [sex] is different from a community composed of both.’” *United States v. Virginia*, 116 S.Ct. 2264, 2276 (1996)

#8) *We Have the Chance to Stand Up for A Great Cause That Truly Matters.*

As President Hinckley wrote in *Standing for Something*:

“We go to great lengths to preserve historical buildings and sites in our cities. We need to apply the same fervor to preserving the most ancient and sacred of institutions – the family.

What we *desperately need* today on all fronts . . . are leaders, men and women who are *willing to stand for something*. We need people . . . who are willing to *stand up* for decency,

truth, integrity, morality, and law and order . . . even when it is unpopular to do so – perhaps *especially* when it is unpopular to do so.”

Pres. Hinckley told the students at BYU:

“You are good. But it is not enough just to be good. You must be good for something. You must contribute good to the world. The world must be a better place for your presence. And the good that is in you must be spread to others. . . .

“In this world so filled with problems, so constantly threatened by dark and evil challenges, you can and must rise above mediocrity, above indifference. You can become involved and speak with a strong voice for that which is right”

-Gordon B. Hinckley, Brigham Young University devotional, Marriott Center, 17 Sept. 1996.

Edmund Burke said: “All that is necessary for evil to prevail is for good men to do nothing.” So we will have an influence by what we do or by what we fail to do.

This is an historic time. In future generations historians will identify the controversy over public meaning and legal definition of marriage and family as the critical social issues which shaped American society and the world for the next century. You are blessed to be able to leave a legacy by your actions on this issue that will outlive your time on earth.

Some argue that we should not try to legislate morality. That is a familiar but simplistically inapt sound bite. The laws in any democracy reflect the common morality of the people and the moral order of the citizens of that society. As Michael Gerson recently wrote: “Religious values should not merely be tolerated out of politeness; they are, in American history, inseparable from the search for justice. They assert a divine source of human dignity – a firm basis for human equality – that no law or tyrant or prejudice can erase.” (Michael Gerson, *Don't Underestimate the Moment*, August 27, 2008 available at

http://townhall.com/columnists/MichaelGerson/2008/08/27/dont_underestimate_the_moment ,

seen 080828.)

This cause is as important to our nation as was the Revolutionary War, the abolitionist movement, and the racial equality movement, which were all movements led by clergy, religions, and men and women of faith. Those were the challenges of other generations; this battle over protection of marriage and marital families is the comparable historic challenge of our generation. It is our honor to stand up on this issue.

#9) *We can make a difference by our example.*

We can make a difference. President Monson once said:

“Too frequently, women under-estimate their influence for good. . . .

- Thomas S. Monson, “The Mighty Strength of the Relief Society,” *Ensign*, November 1997, p. 95-96

President Hinckley said to the Latter-day Saints:

“This entire people have become as a city upon a hill which cannot be hid. . . . If we are to be that which the Lord would have us be, we must indeed become 'a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that [we] should shew forth the praises of him who hath called [us] out of darkness into his marvelous light.' (1 Pet. 2:9.)”

~ Gordon B. Hinckley, [A City upon a Hill, Ensign, July 1990, 4](#)

This reminds me of something I read recently in a biography of David Ben Gurion, the Geo. Washington founder of the state of Israel. Ben-Gurion reflected that the Jewish state was based on the Mosaic command that the people be “*amsagolah*,” which Ben-Gurion said meant: “Israel was to spread morality throughout the universe. It was to do so not by conquest but by example.”

I learned an important lesson about the of example when I was in college. In summer 1970 I found myself in Army Basic Training (boot camp) at Ft. Knox, KY. All trainees had to attend a 20-hour map-reading class (four one-hour lessons per day for five days). The 4 platoons in our company (Charlie company) attended the class together, so there were about 160 soldiers plus about 15-20 supervising officers and NCOs. The sergeant assigned to teach the class would lecture for 50 minutes, then give us a 10-minute break. He started each hour with a very dirty joke. His jokes were crude, degrading, and immoral. After a couple of his hourly filthy jokes, some of the men (many of whom were LDS) were privately complaining about the crude jokes during a break, and an officer overheard them and he told the teacher.

When the next class hour started, the sergeant began: "I've been told that some of you college boys are offended by my little jokes. . . ." He paused for effect, and some of the more crude college men in the class began yelling "no way," and "who's the wimp" and " we want more jokes" and things like that." Getting the reaction he wanted, the sergeant played to the crowd a little longer, getting them worked up, and then he said: "So, what I'm going to do is take a vote, and if anyone - even just one person - objects to my telling my jokes, I'll stop telling them." That got some soldiers even more worked up, with lots of guys jeering and threatening things like "nobody had better stand up" "we'll fix them" and things like that.

But the sergeant's crude attempt to intimidate anyone who disliked his dirty jokes really irritated me, and I decided that I was going to stand up to him. I wish I could say that I was acting out of noble or virtuous principles, but the truth is that I was just mad at his blatant attempt to bully people and I was determined to show him that I wouldn't be intimidated. So when he said: "Now, if anyone objects to my jokes, let him stand up now," I stood up. It was almost an automatic reflex, but as I was getting on my feet, the thought came to me "What are you doing??!!!" As I got to my feet I could still hear some rowdy jeers, so I looked around hoping to see that I wasn't alone. And over my left shoulder I saw than another man had also

stood up. When I saw him, I knew that I was OK. Alone, I might have been shouted down, but with two of us, we were strong. Then the most amazing thing happened. One-by-one other men began to stand up, until there were about 30-40 of us standing, about one-quarter of the class, staring down the sergeant. Then, suddenly, the jeering and catcalls ceased, and the room got very quiet. The sergeant turned beet red, and quietly began his map-reading lecture, and he never told us another dirty joke.

I believe that most men and women, like so many of the soldiers in that class, want to do what is right, want to live up to high ideals, but none of us want to stand alone. We are looking for someone to stand up with us so that we know we won't be standing alone. Often, others are just waiting for an example, a companion, and when they see that they will not be alone, then they are willing, even anxious to stand up for right, also.

#10) You Are Not Alone; Be Of Good Cheer.

In his book, *Standing for Something*, President Hinckley wrote:

“[The family] is . . . the most fundamental and basic unit of society. And it deserves – no, it *demand*s – our combined focus and attention.

“We go to great lengths to preserve historical buildings and sites in our cities. We need to apply the same fervor to preserving the most ancient and sacred of institutions – the family.”

“We cannot effect a turnaround in a day or a month or a year. But with enough effort, we can begin a turnaround within a generation, and accomplish wonders within two generations – a period of time that is not very long in the history of humanity.”

-Gordon B. Hinckley, *The Family, We Can Save Our Nation by Saving Our Homes* in *Standing for Something* 143-45 (2000)

In his Nobel Prize speech, Elie Wiesel, the Auschwitz survivor & great writer said:

“I swore never to be silent We must take sides.”

We too must speak up and get involved.”

Wiesel reflected:

“There is so much to be done, there is so much that can be done. One person – a Raoul Wallenberg, an Albert Schweitzer, a Martin Luther King, Jr. – one person of integrity can make a difference, a difference of life and death.”

We know that there must be opposition in all things (2 Ne. 2:11) and that blessings come only after “the trial of your faith.” This great cause will be no different. We must work with all our heart, might, mind and strength. And then, after we have done all that we can ourselves, withholding nothing from the work we must do, then, it is in the Lord’s hands and we call upon Him to accept our sacrifice and influence the outcome.

Repeatedly in the Doctrine and Covenants, the Lord encourages those engage in His work to have faith, be of good cheer, be confident and trust Him. He said: “Wherefore be of good cheer and do not fear, for I the Lord am with you and will stand by you” (D&C 68:6), and “I will lead you along,” (D&C 78:18), and “Let thy heart be of good cheer . . . Contend thou . . . morning and night; and day after day let thy warning voice go forth . . .” (D&C 112:4-5)

The bear testimony of atonement of Jesus Christ. Through his love and sacrifice, even serious mistakes can be corrected, and serious evils will be overcome. We do all we can to help set things right, and have faith that in his love and power and due time, He will reconcile all things with the will of His Father.

**May you be blessed as you take heart, and with good cheer stand up for
marriage I pray itnoJC, Amen**

Selected Partial Bibliography

The Divine Institution of Marriage (Salt Lake City, Aug. 13, 2008),

at www.newsroom.lds.org/ldsnewsroom/eng/commentary/the-divine-institution-of-marriage

What's the Harm, Does Legalizing Same-Sex Marriage Really Harm Individuals, Families or Society? (Lynn D. Wardle, ed., University Press of America 2008)

The Future of Marriage by David Blankenhorn (Encounter Books 2007)

Setting the Record Straight: Mormons & Homosexuality by A. Dean Byrd, Ph.D., M.P.H. (Millennial Press Inc. 2008)

The Natural Family, A Manifesto by Allan C. Carlson & Paul T. Mero (Spence Publishing 2007)

The Meaning of Marriage (Robert P. George & Jean Bethke Elshtain eds., Spence Publishing 2006)

Power Over the Body, Equality in the Family by Charles J. Reid Jr., (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing 2004)

Marriage and Same-Sex Unions, A Debate (Lynn D. Wardle, Mark Strasser, William C. Duncan & David Orgon Coolidge, eds. Praeger 2003)

Homosexuality and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints by A. Dean Byrd, Ph.D. (Cedar Fort 2001)

The Case for Marriage by Linda J. Waite and Maggie Gallagher (Doubleday 2000)

What' the Harm -

Available at the BYU Bookstore at

<http://www.byubookstore.com/ePOS/form=item.html&item=0761843160&store=439>.

Also available from the publisher at

<http://www.univpress.com/Catalog/SingleBook.shtml?command=Search&db=^DB/CATALOG.db&eqSKUdata=0761843167>