

## What Marriage Is, by Ryan Anderson: Q&A

A: Yeah over here.

Q: I uh, I'm not sure; I think my husband may consider it infidelity for me to be here this morning at the conference. I have to check with him when I get home. But, from a public policy point of view, my understanding of, of marriage was that it was more contractual to bring together what a man's daughter would bring into the marriage with what would go to another man and that the reason government was in marriage was for the contractual passing of property from one generation to another one, from one family to another, including the daughter and then eventually just the downward that came with. Not the um, and in those marriages, it, my understanding is there's not a demand that they procreate and have other children. It was a contract to bringing the property together. And I didn't hear you mention that at all. And I'm curious about that.

A: So in the American contexts that's not what marriage policy is about. So I didn't mention it because I don't actually think that's what the purpose of marriage is for or what the public policy purpose is for. I'm sure that in some societies in which you did have a strong emphasis on patriarchy and you had a strong emphasis on dowry's and the joining of families, that marriage played that function. In our society it largely hasn't. And I was talking about American marriage policy. Why is the American state both federal and the fifty states? In the marriage it has much more to do with forming a stable community in which orderly procreation can take place and we know that....

Q: And is that is a requirement of the marriage?

A: No, so, no, I mean, that's a good follow-up. No one has ever insisted that couples have to have children to be married. It's not that every marriage has a child. It's that every child has a mom and a dad. And that marriage tries to maximize the likelihood that that child will be raised by their mom and dad. And so the way that this works is that I want to hold up an ideal that you should get married before you have kids in the first place. Second, you should stay married so that your kids have a mother and a father. That's what the state is trying to do with marriage. And so it's true that some marriages won't procreate, they won't have children. That does nothing to take away from the policy purpose of marriage. Especially if even the infertile couple remains faithful to each other. It's very rare that we have infertility with both spouses. So let's say it's the wife who is infertile but the husband's remains faithful to her. He is not now creating fatherless kids and fragmented families with some other woman. So even in the case of the childless marriage, the public policy purpose of marriage is still being served by having that couple live out the truth about marriage. Uh, we'll go this way.

Q: So, I recognize that this might, hopefully this doesn't detract from your message and what you were saying to us and everything that you've taught us. But I hope you might be

able to address, you talked about how a father figure might be absent and the father figures there. So I was wondering if you could comment a little about what if it was a negative father figure and how that might affect children and how might, you know I realize that the government might not be important in this sort of decision of how this might actually help the situation to make it more positive, but maybe you could just talk about that.

A: Sure. Yeah so the social science evidence that I cited wouldn't rule out the possibility or even the likelihood that bad parenting would have bad results for children. So a bad father figure, a father who abuses his wife, a father who abuses his children. That won't be good for that family. So to a certain extent when I'm talking about marriage in the first part of the talk in the philosophical part of the talk, it's to say that we're encouraging good behavior. So obviously if the spouses aren't actually loving each other, they aren't loving their kids, if they're abusing one another or the children, then marriage isn't going to have some of the benefits that it could. So even that said, when the social scientists do this. They control for various factors; they'll control for income, they'll control for education. But even with the handful of fathers who aren't good fathers, we still see that marriage has these benefits on average and for the most part. But that's not to deny that any given marriage, any given father might actually be doing grave harm both to his spouse and to his children, simply by not loving and I think that gets to Professor Budziszewski's part, you know, that marriage ultimately it's a comprehensive union of love. So if you're not living that part out, you won't necessarily get some of the benefits of marriage. Yep.

Q: Okay. Hello. Um, I'm David. Um and I guess one of my questions was it seems that the crooks of your argument about why the state's interested in marriage is that because children deserve both a mother and a father and that this is the ideal. I guess my question is do we have any like scientific evidence about that? You brought up about like uh, parents, or families without a father, but that could just as easily be explained by just the lack of two loving adults being together.

A: That's a great question. So let me say a couple of words in response. We now have about 40 or 50 years of robust social science showing the importance of a married mother and father for children. And what this 40 or 50 year tradition of social science has looked at, is that they compared the married biological mother/father intact family to several alternatives including single parenting, including cohabitation, including divorce and including divorce with re-marriage. And only recently have they started looking at same sex couples. So let me first speak just to those first alternatives, that we have about 40 or 50 years of robust social science on. So this is the married, intact biological mother/father family compared to single parenting, divorce, divorce and re-marriage and cohabitation. On more or less every factor that they could measure the child and the married biological mother/father family has an advantage over the child in any of the alternatives. Over and over and over again, with large random representatives, samples that were also longitudinal so they tracked the same child through time. The results came back just like this. So much so that we actually saw liberal scholars willing to change their mind on this. The way that most academic change happens is that one generation of scholars die off and then a new

generation of scholars writes different articles. This was actually an interesting case where you had the cover story of the Atlantic Monthly run an article with the title "Dan Quail Was Right". And remember what Dan Quail had done? He had criticized Murphy Brown in the television show for glamorizing single motherhood. He said we shouldn't be sending that message, because it might be the case that Murphy Brown can be successful at this because she is a business elite, she was an anchor of a news program and she had the financial resources to pick up the pieces herself of not having a husband or a father for her child. That if we sent this message for most Americans who don't have the luxury of money, we're setting them up for a much more challenging road in life. And you know, he was vastly criticized for his. But then over time as more and more of the social scientists looked at the data, they were like "Wow", divorce has not been good for children, it's not been good for mothers. Cohabitation is not good for children or for mothers because the man in that, it's like a revolving door, he never actually commits. Even divorce and remarriage has no difference compared to just divorce. So that gets to your question about is it just the two incomes, or the two people there. Even when you get the second income back in the family through divorce and remarriage, it doesn't seem to make a difference. And so then the question is why? And so one of the things that the social science called it is that there are three mechanisms that seem to explain why marriage matters. It's biology, it's gender and it's stability. And so having a biological connection with both parents to the child seems to make a difference. And this is the case, because even when they look at adoption of infants, at birth, still seems to be a difference between a child being raised by their biological mother and father and then being raised by someone that's not biologically related. And they're not entirely sure of all of the reasons why. They know that mothers tend to be able to hear their own child's cry with greater sensitivity than some other child's cry. So they don't know if it's because nine months in the womb or because the genetics of it, you know the baby's vocal cords resonate better with the mother's ear. How it works? But they know that biological connection matters. They also know that for daughters puberty is delayed on average by about a year, by having their biological father in the house then by having a biologically unrelated male in the house. It has something to do with the pheromones that are sent. Brad Wilcox has published on some of this. And it's something that social biologists are starting to look at what are the biological explanations for this. But we know that biology matters. We then know that gender matters. And this gets to the quote that I had read you from David Popino that having both a mother and a father in the household matters because mothers and fathers interact with children in distinct and complimentary ways. And then we know that stability matters and this is why cohabitation and divorce in particular produce poor outcomes for children because they are unstable relationships and for each transition that a child goes through it can produce poor outcomes. Because each one of those transitions is internalized much more intensely by the child than by the adults. And we know that divorce can be traumatic for the adults all the more so for the children. So that was more or less a consensus of social science up until about a decade ago. And then we got a series of social science studies that claimed that there were no differences with same sex parenting and with married moms and dads. And this was interesting because it actually showed that lesbians were the best parents of all; and that a relationship with two mothers raising a child produced outcomes for children that were even better than children who

were being raised by their mothers and fathers. And so this set off alarm bells for some social scientists. They said this doesn't pass the SNIFF test. That a child who grows up in a divorced, but remarried home with a mom and a dad doesn't turn out well but a child growing up with two moms is the same, even a little bit better. So absentee dads matter for the single mother, matter for the divorced, don't matter for lesbian family. They said something doesn't seem to be up with this. So they looked into these studies and not a single one of them used large or even random samples. And so if you don't have a random sample to begin with, you can draw exactly nothing as a conclusion about the population as a whole. Only from a sample that's representative of a population can you make conclusions about the population. The methodology of most of these studies was something known as snowball sampling. They would hang up signs in book stores or coffee shops, saying were conducting a study on same sex parenting, call this number if you want to participate. So for one of the studies when the scholar went through and he just looked at the 44 studies at the American Psychological Association had relied on when they issued a statement saying there's no difference between same sex parenting and married parenting. He said one of these samples, it was all upper middle class women living in San Francisco and New York City. You know double income, double college degrees living in elite urban areas. From that sample you can't draw any conclusion about a population as a whole. This is why having representative samples and then controlling for education, income and occupation matters for that 40-50 year consensus of social science. So then, I'll say that we've now had three studies that have used large random representative samples. Two of those came to the conclusion that there are differences. One was Doug Allen's study using the Canadian Census data and Canada back in 1997, started giving all of the same legal benefits to same sex couples and in 2005 actually had same sex marriage. He just measured just one outcome in particular, and it was educational achievement and that children that were raised by parents in same sex relationships had a significant underperformance. And you saw that it mattered whether it was a boy or a girl and whether they were in a same sex lesbian or a same sex male relationship. He saw that gender mattered even here. That the lesbian relationship and the gay relationship have different outcomes for boys and for girls.

Q: Excuse me, will you be taking further questions?

A: Uh, can you not interrupt me while I'm answering that question? I'm going to finish this question and then we're going to get to other questions. Thank you. And we have half an hour, so there's no need. You will get your chance.

So anyways, the point here is that, what they saw with this is that the outcomes were different and it mattered based upon both the gender distribution of the parents and the on the children. And then there was the Mark Regnerus study. This is the study that got the most headlines and the most kind of over the top reaction from scholars. He did the first study that was large, and random and representative. He didn't identify many same sex couples who were in 18 yearlong relationships. And he put this up front. This is one of the challenges of doing large random representative sampling, is that you won't find many couples like that. But he did find couples who were in same sex relationships and who were

raising kids and he reported what the outcomes were and he found I think it was 13 of the 20-some outcomes that he measured, there were differences. So anyway, then there's one study by a scholar at UC-Berkeley or is it UCLA, I forget what school Doug Rosenfeld. And he saw that there were no differences other scholar and said actually your controlling for the differences. And so there's some dispute about the methodology there just like there's dispute about the Regnerus methodology. All this is to say to the question about scientific evidence. When it comes to same sex parenting, we know very little. Because it's a relatively new phenomenon in human existence but there's very little reason to think that the same sex parenting relationship wouldn't follow the general pattern of what we know from 50 years of good robust social science that biology matters, gender matters, and stability matters. It looks like you actually got up to the mic, so you probably want to ask a follow-up?

Q: Well, yeah. I guess when you're talking about, I mean, I guess you brought up several other um, instances with the divorce parent who gets remarried, cohabitation, but it seems that if two men or two women who are married, and love each other faithfully, they have something that those other things lack and that maybe that's the thing and...

A: Yeah so that's a possibility. So it could be the case that the reason that cohabitation and divorce and divorce and remarriage have these poor outcomes, is because they are not stable. Um but that same sex relationships, if they were stable, wouldn't have those problems. I'm open to that being a possibility but it still seems that it wouldn't address the biological connection or the gender connection. But there are preliminary reasons to be skeptical about that. So what we know right now is that lesbian relationships are the most unstable of all. And it has nothing to do with homosexuality, it just has to do with gender distribution again. Women initiate 2/3 to 3/4 of all divorces in America. So when you have a double female relationship, it tends to be the least long lived; not because of homosexuality, but just because of two women. And one way to illustrate this is when was the last time that you heard a guy say "my emotional needs weren't being met so I broke up with her"? That's not a typical...

Q: Very recently actually.

A: Male response, so when you have the double female relationship, this can explain why when the social scientists look at gay male relationship, lesbian female relationships and then male/female relationships why is it that the lesbian relationships tends to be the shortest? Because both participants have a very high threshold for emotional satisfaction, so they tend to be the shortest lived. The gay male relationships tend to be the most open. And it has nothing to do again with homosexuality, it just has to do with men. Men tend to be the most promiscuous, and so when you have a double male relationship, you tend to get the most sexual openness. Neither of which suggest that the relationships are inherently very stable. So that's why we even think have reason to be skeptical about the stability but I'm open to see what happens. But I do think we have good reason to be skeptical and the preliminary science is supporting these conclusions.

Q: Supporting which conclusions?

A: So I think the Doug Allen study in Canada and the Mark Regnerus study here in America are completely in keeping with the 40 year tradition. So once we had studies that were using large random representative sampling, those conclusions were perfectly in keeping with the previous 40 years; unlike the small convenient snowball sampling that actually came to the conclusions that lesbian relationships produced the best outcomes. And the other thing odd about that is that we know absolutely nothing about intentional mother child rearing. We don't have a single study of same sex gay parenting. Whenever we hear about single parenthood, it's always single mothers. Whenever we hear about same sex parenting it's always lesbian relationships. So we don't know that much scientifically about single father parenting or gay male parenting. I'm going to go to this lady so we can get to your question.

Q: Uh, Jeff let me go first. Thank you. Thank you for your talk Ryan. Um, often I hear the argument about interracial marriage brought up. You know saying that these same exact arguments are made saying interracial marriage is dangerous for the children, for the society. So how do you suggest that we best show that there really isn't a comparison between the same sex gender and interracial marriages?

A: Great question and I'm wondering if someone put you up to this, because just yesterday I just published a paper on this question. So if you want, you can google my name. It's a 5000 word paper just on the history of bans on interracial marriage and why they have nothing in similarity either historically, philosophically, or theologically with the near human universal view is that marriage is a male/female relationship. So the title of that paper was something like "Marriage, Reason and Religious Liberty, Much to Do about Sex, Nothing to Do with Race". And so here's the summary of what I found when I was researching this. The US colonies, Maryland in particular were the first political community in history to ever ban interracial marriage. And the reason it did so, had nothing to do with marriage, it only had to do with racism and perpetuating the wicked regime of raced based slavery. So in America we had slavery, it was based classified on race and in order to perpetuate a class of human beings that were being subjugated as slaves, you had to keep the races apart. And so they redefined marriage to make it based on a race in a way that marriage had never been understood to be; precisely so that they could avoid the creation of interracial children that then would make a race base slavery more difficult. When slavery was finally abolished, we then perpetuated this with our Jim Crow system; we also had bans on miscegenation, bans on interracial dating and interracial marriage. Again trying to support a wicked regime of white supremacy. None of this had anything to do with marriage though. And so if you look through the great thinkers in human history, whether it's Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Agustin, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Lock, Cont, Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr.; whenever they talk about marriage, they always talk about male and female, husband and wife, mother and father. They never talk about black and white. Because race has nothing to do with what marriage is. So if you go back to the first section of my talk this morning when I was going

through what is marriage? You never heard skin color or ethnicity or race enter into it because it has nothing to do with what marriage is. So the bans on interracial marriage were unjust precisely because of what marriage is. But that's why defining marriage of the union of a man and woman is just precisely because of what marriage is. A man and a woman can unite in the marital act regardless of their race. Children need a mother and a father irrespective of the parent's race. Marriage is about uniting the two halves of humanity, the male and the female; where as racist laws kept the races apart for no reason at all. So marriage all has to be color blind it can't be gender blind.

Q: Well thank you for your speech today. My names Marvin and I have a question concerning your first question to the audience which was 'why would the government be interested in same sex marriage'. And one of the things you keep mentioning is that this notion that, well in the beginning you mentioned marriage by cloacal stance right now is that it's the most important person relationship, right, and the priority is on the activities of adults and not on children. However, this, and it doesn't differentiate between companionship. However, I think that marriage very much does differentiate from companionship in that even though you deny it had to do with like a dowry or other things like that, there is very much like contractual obligation to another person in this permanence of marriage. And one of the many reasons that people do get married is because they say to each other that they are going to be together for life right? And this goes beyond the notion of child rearing when it goes to like, tax rights, it goes to medical rights like next of kin, and it does have to do with whose going to inherit my like property and also when we go in together to buy a house or any property that we do own, you know, there's a whole bunch of entanglement that comes together from a permanent relationship. And thus when you go into marriage, you go into these laws that protect you and serve you as somebody who's going through life as a permanent couple. And how that would benefit the government is that it creates a system in which people are encouraged to live together to become more economically viable, when you have two incomes right? You put more into society, you have more ability to put into your job and all kinds of things?

A: So what's the question?

Q: So the question is, the question is, so you actually asked us is...

A: But the question that I asked you, explain to me that basic argument you just gave, why does it have to be only between two people in a sexually exclusive relationship and only in a permanent relationship? Because you could get the economies of scales for the five year commitment. So I could have a contract from the Government in which we pledge to be with each other just the two of us and exclusively, but for five years and we can get many of the same economic benefits that you talked about, and we could co-inherit property and we could visit each other in the hospital. So like the question that I asked was explain to me why it would be a union of two and only two in an exclusive union and a permanent commitment that the government cares about once you get rid of the male/female aspect. And so I haven't heard that yet.

Q: No you haven't. And actually my question is more of a um, I actually have a response in this that like, you asked why the government would be interested in having marriage between same sex couple and I just gave you those arguments for that. Not necessarily why it can't be a "thrupple" or why it can't be "monogomish" and things like that. I really don't have an answer for that. But I do have an answer for...

A: So it seems to me that you're saying that the government has an interest in contract law.

Q: Yeah it does.

A: And contracts can come in as many different sizes and shapes as consent comes in. So it sounds to me that your actually arguing for the abolishment of marriage. And I think that's the logical conclusion of getting rid of the male/female aspect. That if you don't think marriage is about uniting male and female, husband and wife, mother and father, then you don't really think marriage exists. You think it's just contract law. And that's actually one of the consequences, the 2<sup>nd</sup> consequence that I had mentioned; is that if we go down this road, it will lead us down this line of thinking of that we should just have contracts for consenting adults and whatever sizes and shape.

Q: (01:20:28 inaudible) I didn't answer. Thank you.

A: No, no. This is good. Yeah.

Q: So my question, I guess it's pretty timely, because April 15<sup>th</sup> is just around the corner. So my question is really about the governments interest in taxes and sorry, the governments interest in marriage which I think the government is pretty interested in taxes, if I'm wrong, please correct me.

A: They're too interested in taxes, that's the problem.

Q: I agree. So my question is if, why should I not have the right to file a joint tax return? Why should I pay more taxes than a straight couple simply because I'm a minority? How is that not discrimination?

A: Sure. And that's a fair question. What if we were to say why should I not be able to file a joint tax return just because I'm in a 'thrupple' or a 'quartet'. So it seems to be what you're suggesting is that we just shouldn't have the tax code recognize marriage? No? So then you think we should have same sex marriage for same sex couples, but would you also extend marriage equality rights to the 'thrupple'?

Q: So my question really is why should I as a gay man be denied the same right to file a joint tax return with my potential husband that a straight couple has?



A: I just want to play out what principle your acting. I would hope that you're not just doing special pleading. That you want protection for your rights but not for all Americans rights. So I hope that you wouldn't be saying that you want special tax treatment but I don't care about the 'thrupple'. So I want to see what principle you're acting on. And does the principle that your hoping to vindicate to protect your right's also extend to protect the rights of the 'thrupple'.

Q: Sure. So I'm acting on civil rights. So the rights that are applicable to male and female couple are applicable to a male and male couple. And that's my question. How is that not discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation?

A: Right. So, part of the answer is that because the same sexual couple isn't a marriage. So that we want marriage equality to treat all marital relationships in the same way and given the understanding I've presented of what marriage is, same sex relationship isn't marital. But I'm trying to ask you about the equal protection argument you're making, would it apply to all consenting adult romantic relationships. So why would you want the same sex couple to file jointly for taxes but not the same sex 'thrupple' or the opposite sex 'quartet'?

Q: Sure, sure, I appreciate that and that's not the, I'm sorry but that's not actually my question, my question is why should I be denied the right to file....

A: Right. So sorry. So I'll just answer your question. The reason that you should not have the option of filing a joint tax return is because you can't get married.

Q: But I live in California. I can get married.

A: You can be issued a marriage license in the State of California, but you can't actually get married. And I'm sorry to say it that way but given what marriage is.....

Q: And it's not discrimination?

A: And it's not discrimination because everyone is equally eligible for entering into the marital relationship where you understand marriage as a union of sexually complimentary spouses. A permanent exclusive union of man and women, husband and wife, mother and father. If you're not interested in entering into that sort of a union, you're not being discriminated against. What you're asking us to do is to redefine marriage to include the adult relationship of your choice. And the adult relationship of your choice happens to be a same sex couple. There are other adults who want to have marriage redefined to include the relationship of their choice which may be the same sex 'thrupple' or the opposite sex 'quartet'. So what I'm asking you in response is what principle are you appealing to when you say this is discrimination to vindicate your rights but not their rights? Because it seems to me that your position ultimately leads to simply the dissolution of the marital union.

Q: Sure so um, there's other speakers in line so we can always talk at lunch. But I just want to clarify, you just told, I just heard you do not have the right to get married. So if you could tell

me why I don't have the right to get married, that would be my final question.

A: I feel like I've, we have five minutes left, so I'll say this again briefly. I feel like I've already answered that. It's not that you don't have a right to get married, it's that you aren't seeking out marriage. Marriage is by nature a union of sexually complimentary spouses. A union of man and woman, husband and wife, mother and father and just based upon what you've said about yourself, it doesn't sound like you're interested in forming that sort of a union. It sounds like you're interested in forming a union with another man and that's not a marriage. And so that's why I don't think the law should treat the relationship that you want to form as a marriage. Who is next? How about we do this; how about we take both questions at the same time so we can get both questions in and then I'll answer both and then we'll go to lunch. Yeah. We'll just group the questions, so you'll ask, then you'll ask and then I'll try to answer both simultaneously.

Q: Yeah, so one of the things I liked about your presentation a lot is that you explain some of the benefits of having a father and some of the consequences of not having a father. But to make your argument complete, I mean, you know, you could say fatherhood is so good, so why not have two of them. So you have to explain why uh, you know, it's so important to have a mother as well. So I was wondering if you could maybe explain more the benefits for a child of having a mother around and what maybe some of the consequences would be of not having a mother.

Q: Uh, I guess mine is a little bit different and probably more like the practical consequences of if we go the road where we do afford everybody their right, for example the gentleman before me, the right to get married; you talk a lot about social impact in the social consequences. Um, I think we're dealing a lot with how much this is going to cost in the future. So I'm wondering if we could just take that type of a view, of like, well let's suppose quantitatively we have a number of people who want to redefine marriage and so it becomes the case that it will be redefined. How would we adjust? How do we adjust and prepare and solve the problems that maybe people can't agree what the cause of the problem is but it needs to be solved. So children need parenting. A: Both questions great. We don't know as much from kind of a robust social science perspective about mothering. Partly because we don't have very many instances of children growing up without mothers. So what I mentioned earlier whenever a child is born a mother is close by and that most of the instances of single parenting are actually single mothering. So we know much more about what's like to grow up without a father because unfortunately there a huge portion of the American population in that situation. So the scientists have been able to study that particular situation with greater delicacy than mothering. We do know that on average the mothers tend to be the more nurturing, the more compassionate, the more supportive. We can know biological things only mothers are the ones who can nurse a child, so far, men cant. But there was an earlier question about nanotechnology and what we're going to do...So who knows. But so far there are biological differences in which the mother, one will more likely to be nursing the child but also she tends to be the more nurturing of the two. So if you are looking at this, what would happen if you grew up without a mother. Maybe you would have all of the problems of typical

male misbehavior just compounded on each other. You would be more of an insensitive jerk because you didn't have your mother to soften you. That's what happen to me, I don't have any sisters. I only have brothers. And I think it's the same actually, I think siblings have a huge impact on us as we grow up.

A: For the other question. I'll answer this in two ways. One is that I think to a certain extent whatever happens in law and policy, we as free citizens will always be capable of living out the truth about marriage in our own lives. And so I think to the certain extent the best defense of marriage are healthy, happy marriages. And the best way of protecting the rights of children is by being a good parent, a good mother or a good father to your own children, and helping your own children grow up to be good spouses to their husband or wife and good parents to their children. So in this sense, no matter how the law defines marriages, our individual communities whether it's a religious community, educational community, a civic society, whatever sort, could be encouraging men and women to commit to each other permanently and exclusively and to raise their kids. So marriage prep programs at churches, Pre-cana programs, marriage saver programs, there is a host of opportunities for us to get involved to try to recreate a marriage culture. On a college campus I think it's actually something like the Anscombe society that's taking a lead in doing that here at Stanford. Doing that in terms of educating students about the importance of marriage, educating students in terms of Dr. Budziszewski's talk about the importance of the virtue of chastity, about preparing yourselves now as an 18 or 19 year old so that when you're 25 and you're getting married you can be a faithful spouse, you can be a good husband, a good wife, be a good mother, a good father. Those habits are either developing now into virtues or developing now into vices. So I think that the work that Judy and Irene and other students are doing here at Stanford is one way in which we can do that.

The last thing I'll say is if we get a string of bad court rulings, if the law and politics go against us, I think here we just take a lesson from the pro-life movement. In 1973, February of 1973, a month after the Roe V. Wade decision, it would have been easy for students at a place like Stanford, to say we'll we've lost, let's just give up. But they didn't. So Professor Bryson was one of the Pro-life leaders here probably what, 20 years after that leading the Pro-life movement here. But there have been pro-life leaders for the past 40 years who have refused to accept Roe V. Wade as the truth of the constitution when it comes to unborn children, or the truth about unborn children. So for 40 years we've had philosophers and embryologists and biologist and lawyers making intellectual arguments indicating the rights of the unborn. We've had statesman like Henry Hyde and Ronald Regan, and Ed Niece crating the public policy and the legal policies. We've had advocacy groups like Silent No More and Susan B. Anthony List and Americans United For Life and National Right to Life. And we've had crisis pregnancy centers all across the nation doing everything they can in different ways and forms. Artistically, culturally, intellectually, legally, bearing witness to the truth of life. And at 1973 public opinion was rapidly shifting against pro-lifers. At one point it was 67% pro-choice, 33% pro-life. You had all of the elites saying the pro-lifers were on the wrong side of history and you had politicians who were pro-life initially, people like Ted Kennedy, Bill Clinton, Al Gore and Jesse Jackson evolved to become pro-choice. But over the past 40 years all of that work that has been done with the

pro-life movement, your generations now more pro-life than your parents' generation. And a majority of Americans now support the right to life for the unborn. And so the same thing that happened 40 years ago with the right to life movement would need to happen politically on the marriage issue. And so it's that twin factor of culture efforts and political efforts. That's what we have to do in the marriage issue. Thank you.