

LINGUISTIC FOCUS : the use of prepositions or not (see underlined phrases)

Ø = no preposition

<http://news.yahoo.com/france-delays-debate-gay-marriage-135723002.html>

## France delays debate on gay marriage

*By The Associated Press | Associated Press – Fri, Oct 19, 2012*

PARIS (AP) — France is delaying debate on a draft law\* (an outline of the law to come = a bill : before law is voted) authorizing gay marriage, as the government grapples with\* (to fight against) increasingly vocal opposition to the idea.

The **legalization of same-sex marriages and adoption** was one of the most contentious\* (controversial, a tricky or a thorny question) points in Socialist President Francois Hollande's election manifesto earlier this year.

Prime Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault first named Oct. 31 as the date when government ministers would present the law, insisting there would be **no backtracking**\* (to backtrack on a promise : to go backwards, to change one's idea).

But his office said Friday that this date has been pushed back to Nov. 7. And the debate in parliament is now expected to last until January.

On Thursday, France's Chief Rabbi Gilles Bernheim joined other religious leaders in opposing Ø the plans, while more than 1,200 French mayors and their deputies have signed a petition protesting Ø them.

-----  
<http://news.yahoo.com/support-gay-marriage-france-declines-government-pushes-bill-123004038.html>

## Support for gay marriage in France declines as government pushes bill

French President Hollande promised **to legalize marriage and adoption for same-sex couples** when he became president. But now that he's following through, the issue is becoming divisive.

*By Bastien Inzaurrealde | Christian Science Monitor – Fri, Nov 9, 2012*

France's government **unveiled a bill** Wednesday to legalize marriage and adoption for same-sex couples amid **heated\* rhetoric** (a hot issue) and **waning\*** (in decline) popular support\* for what appeared to be an uncontroversial issue just a few months ago.

French President François Hollande considers the bill to be **a step toward equality** and a **symbol of progress** for the whole society.

“**The president obviously underscored\*** (didn’t expect) **that this bill was going to open a debate** as we know, [and] **that this debate is legitimate,**” Najat Vallaud-Belkacem, **the government’s spokeswoman**, said at a weekly press briefing, adding that debate “must be kept under control, it must be respectful of opinions and beliefs.”

The bill was presented during the government’s weekly meeting at the presidential palace and **is expected to go to Parliament and become law next year.** The legalization of marriage and adoption for gay couples was **part of Hollande’s political platform during the presidential campaign earlier this year.**

Analysts say that even though introducing the bill now **might not be a good idea politically**, the government has had **no choice but to push it along in order not to** look weak on this issue in the eyes of voters.

Céline Bracq, the associate director of the polling group BVA Opinion, says the French government is pushing Ø the bill now because it wants to convince Ø voters that it still has a left-wing and progressive agenda despite tough\* (hard) economic times. This strategy, however, could be counterproductive as the public wants the government to focus on\* (to concentrate on) economic issues rather than legalize marriage and adoption for gay couples now, she says.

“The idea of the government is to be able to (= can) send messages [to voters] on economic and welfare\* (quality of life) issues\* (problems) but also to send messages on social issues, which are issues that are associated with the left wing\* (political side),” Ms. Bracq says. “Now, is this a good idea to do this so quickly? In terms of public opinion, probably not.”

## HEAVY CRITICISM

Though same-sex couples have had access to a form of civil union created in 1999 called Pacs, which stands for Pact of Civil Solidarity, the unveiling of the bill comes after a series of declarations by some mayors saying they would refuse to perform gay marriage ceremonies if the law was passed. The Catholic Church, which has had a historically influential role in France, is also heavily criticizing the government’s project.

The right-wing opposition [UMP](#) party has made it clear it will not support the bill.

*QUIZ: [How well do you know Europe? Take this \(online\) quiz.](#)*

Jean-Frédéric Poisson, a national lawmaker of the UMP party and the Christian-Democratic Party opposing Ø the bill\* (before a law is voted), has called for a national referendum on the issue and says the government has underestimated the bill’s potential for controversy.

“I believe the debate is starting to take off (to start moving or stirring people’s minds) and the government probably didn’t imagine at the beginning of this operation that this debate would grow\* ” (increase, go up), Mr. Poisson says. “It probably thought that it was a done deal, that the public opinion was, indeed, largely in favor of it and that no problem would be posed by this project. And that’s just not the case.”

## DECLINE IN APPROVAL FOR SUPPORTING GAY RIGHTS

A Nov. 3 survey by BVA Opinion showed a **sharp\*** (important) **decline in the support for** gay marriage and adoption **among the population** compared with 2011. However, a majority of those surveyed were still in favor of the measures.

The poll found 58 percent of those surveyed supported legalizing marriage for gay couples, down from 63 percent in 2011.

By contrast, the proportion of those against gay marriage went up from 33 percent in 2011 to 41 percent. Some 50 percent of respondents\* (people who answered the surveys or the polls) said they supported adoption for gay couples, while 47 percent of those surveyed said they opposed it. In 2011, 56 percent of those surveyed supported adoption for gay couples while 40 percent opposed it.

## WEEKS OF RALLIES...

More than 1,000 supporters of the bill gathered Wednesday evening near the National Assembly, France's lower chamber of Parliament, holding banners\* (boards in which are written messages) demanding equality between straight\* (heterosexual people) and gay couples. The participants formed a rope\* (to stand on line) made of children's clothes on the public square where they gathered\* (joint). They raised\* (lift, put up) their arms and held the clothes above their heads to signify that the children of gay couples are so far invisible in the eyes of law.

"What do you want?" shouted an organizer to the protesters, who shouted back, "Equality!"

"When do you want it?" the organizer then asked. "Now!" the crowd responded.

Marie-Claude Picardat, the co-president of the Association of Gay and Lesbian Parents and Future Parents, says her group is "extremely happy, extremely moved" by the unveiling\* (publication, release, display) of the bill but she wishes **the government would add more measures, such as medically assisted procreation** – including artificial insemination and in vitro fertilization – for lesbian couples.

"Our disappointment, however, is extremely strong because a law of this kind will not allow\* (permit) a real recognition of gay families with children," Ms. Picardat told the Monitor at the rally. "It will not facilitate the constitution of families, and it doesn't allow, in spite of everything, a strict equality between gay and straight people."

Caroline Gallais, a humanitarian worker from [Paris](#), says she attended the rally "to defend my right to marry the woman I love and have children with her."

Pro-life\* group (being against abortion) Alliance Vita held several demonstrations against marriage and adoption for gay people across France on Oct. 23, with over 700 people attending a rally in Paris' business district La Défense.

## ... AND PROTESTS

At the heart of the anti-equality protests, which included choreographed skits\* (a parody at theatre), the message was clear: **A child should be raised by both a mother and a father.**

Women dressed in white sat on one side and men dressed in black sat on the other in a large public square. Many held a pink banner reading; “A Dad. A Mom. You don’t lie to children.” An actor wearing a full-length\* (complete) grey bodysuit and holding a green cardboard wing labeled “Dad” in his right hand and a pink wing labeled “Mom” in his left one, stumbled down\* (to hesitate) the aisle\* (on the side) between seated women and men. The actor kept stumbling\* (hesitating and pretending to fall off), as if he was going to collapse, but his pace grew steady\* (really) as the group of men shouted “Mom!” and the women shouted “Dad!”

This choreography was repeated multiple times as the group’s delegate general Tugdual Derville warned the crowd\* (the people gathered in there) against the dangers of gay marriage.

“Here is a bill that aims **to disturb the father-mother balance** inside the couple of parents even though you well know that this balance is the best structure offered to the child in order for him or her to grow up,” Mr. Derville said.

The bill is expected to pass next year because the Socialist Party has a majority of seats in both parliamentary chambers.

LINGUISTIC FOCUS : the use of prepositions or not (see underlined phrases)

Ø = no preposition

<http://www.gaystarnews.com/article/france-delays-gay-marriage-law-debate201012>

## France delays gay marriage law debate

French Prime Minister Jean Marc Ayrault has delayed\* (to postpone, to put it later) the same-sex marriage debates by a week, prompting\* (provoking, causing) fears the government is backtracking\* (going backwards)

20 OCTOBER 2012 | BY [JOE MORGAN](#)

France is delaying the debate on a draft law authorizing gay marriage, prompting\* fears the government is backtracking\* on the issue. Prime Minister Jean-Marc Ayrault first named 31 October as the date when government ministers would present the law.

However, on Friday (19 October), his office said talks have now moved to a week later on 7 November.

Parliamentary debates are now expected to last until January, the Associated Press reports.

Ever since President Francois Hollande and Ayrault announced they were going **to introduce same-sex marriage laws to France**, right-wing political parties and the Catholic Church have spoken out in fury (to show discontent).

On Thursday (18 October), [France's Chief Rabbi Gilles Bernheim joined other religious leaders in opposing Ø the plans.](#)

He said marriage needed to be protected as an institution 'solely between men and women'.

Bernheim slammed the proposed bill which is popularly known in France as 'marriage for all' saying it was 'nothing but a slogan'.

'The argument that marriage is for all of those in love does not hold — it is not because people love each other that they systematically have the right to marry,' he said.

[More than 1,200 French mayors and their deputies have signed a petition Ø protesting marriage equality](#), demanding a 'withdrawal\* (to withdraw : to take back, to cancel) clause' for elected leaders who do not want to perform\* (to make) ceremonies for same-sex couples.

[Catholics also revived a centuries old tradition, the 'Prayer for France', to specifically attack the government plans.](#)

In a recent poll, it was revealed 65% of French people back gay marriage, and 53% agree with adoption by same-sex couples.

<http://beyond.blogs.france24.com/article/2012/10/27/french-minister-out-gay-homosexual-historic-figures-school-textbooks-rim-0>

## [The French Observatory](#)

Watching France watching the world

Sat, 10/27/2012 - 13:24

### **Shhh! Homosexuality still in the closet in French classrooms**

A French minister opened an educational bees' nest\* (a problem, an issue) this week with **her proposal to "out"\*** (to make people's coming out : to say they were gays) **historic figures in school textbooks**. Socialist Minister for Women and Government Spokesperson Najat Vallaud-Belkacem said that **the homosexuality of gay authors and icons should no longer go ignored, especially when their sexuality played an important part in their work**.

"Today, school textbooks persist in **remaining silent** about the gay, lesbian or transsexual orientation of certain historical figures or authors, **even when it explains a large part of their work,**" she said, **citing 19th century poet Arthur Rimbaud as an example**.

Not surprisingly, Vallaud-Belkacem's proposal was **met with a chorus of disapproval from French conservatives**. One political commentator on chat radio RMC suggested that Vallaud-Belkacem was **mentally confused**, claiming that **"Rimbaud would be reduced to only his homosexuality,"** while secretary general of the conservative UMP party Bruno Beschizza accused her of **"trying to impose a certain vision of family by rewriting the history of literature"**. Conservative author Benoît Rayski **called the idea "laughable"** \* (to be laughed at, to be mocked).

In response, Vallaud-Belkacem – who is incidentally a keen\* (strong) supporter of the Association Rimbaud, **a support and awareness group for young victims of homophobia** – called on her critics to "take into consideration the suffering of [LBGT school children] who consider themselves abnormal".

#### **'Impossible for teachers'**

But even on the website of progressive magazine *Nouvel Observateur*, a blog posted by

teacher and centrist political activist Yves Delahaie ruled out the proposal as nonsense. Arguing that the mere suggestion of “outing Ø gays in textbooks” would make the Socialist government look crazier than ever, Delahaie also maintained that in practical terms, it would be impossible: “Imagine the teacher, struggling to change the subject, falling suddenly into an improvised, unstructured and undoubtedly counter-productive debate on sexual orientation in the middle of a French or history lesson.” (NB Belkacem used a French school textbook on poet A. Rimbaud, as an example).

Delahaie argues that the only proper way to normalise sexuality in society is to grant homosexual citizens exactly the same legal rights as their heterosexual counterparts. Well, the Socialist government is certainly working on that front. But as a secondary school teacher, Delahaie’s apprehension of bringing up sexuality in class only proves how far there is to go.

### **Taboo**

**This “don’t ask don’t tell” attitude** seems to stem\* (to stop the course of, to prevent) from France’s obsession with shunning (secretive, eluding) data on ethnicity, sexuality, wealth and background (it is actually illegal to do so). But strangely, the French are the most avidly curious – and the most indiscreet – when it comes to these issues within an informal environment. Countless times\* (many times) I have heard black friends quizzed\* (ask questions) on ‘their origins’ at a party, despite having already said they were American or Swedish; others asked whether they are gay because of a zany\* (funny, strange) dress sense; another whether she is Jewish ‘because of her big nose’. It’s staggering\* (amazing, stupefying) to begin with, but you get used to it.

**So why so shy in the classroom?** It seems archaic, not to mention **detrimental, for kids to be discouraged from discussing sexuality at school**. Like other former “curiosities”, homosexuality **should no longer be treated as a taboo** in an educational environment. The fact that James Baldwin was black, that Virginia Woolf was female, that Anne Frank was Jewish... **Can you imagine if school textbooks had to forgo\*** (to renounce, to give in) **all mention of these “curiosities”?**

The very reason Vallaud-Belkacem used Rimbaud as an example was due to the fact that **his work was influenced massively by his sexuality. If teenagers are deterred\*** (discouraged) **from discussing that, what message does that send them about their own sexuality?**

<http://www.marriage-ecosystem.org/gaymarriagefacts.html>

## **Inspiring People to Defend the Marriage Ecosystem**

Our goal is to help everybody think about marriage in a new way, from a holistic, organic, and natural perspective. This perspective supports a free society for all, including future generations.

Personal reasons for marriage (such as love) are valid *as personal reasons*, but they serve as a poor foundation for public policies about marriage.

Donations from people like you help defend the ecosystem of marriage! Your tax-deductible donation gets you:

- Our weekly e-newsletter, packed with information about the marriage movement
- Our printed educational mailings, designed to keep you updated on important developments regarding marriage
- Donations of \$100-\$999 receive our *Ambassadors Packet*, packed with educational materials about marriage, freedom and society.
- Donations of \$1,000 or more become *Friends of Ruth* and receive all of the above and more!

## **Preserving the Ecosystem of Marriage**

### **Why are we doing this?**

Why is preserving the ecosystem of marriage important? It depends on your goals. If you believe in true freedom with minimal government intervention, then you should support the marriage ecosystem.

If you believe that true human freedom can coexist with government intervention in family life, then preserving the ecosystem of marriage is not important. Like the mega-corporations defiling our natural resources with profits as their sole motive, the only reasons for redefining marriage are personal reasons. Future generations will have to clean up the mess created with redefining parenthood as a side effect of redefining marriage. Since the mega-corporations don't care about future generations, those who destroy the marriage ecosystem will join their ranks decades from now as they are vilified by new generations who have to live with the consequences.

We hold that preserving the ecosystem of marriage is important. Marriage serves as a significant building block of western civilization. If marriage becomes completely redefined, our civilization will eventually collapse. This is not an attack on anybody; rather, it is a defense of future generations who we believe will want marriage to remain as it is, so that parenthood can remain as it is.

The gradual re-[definition of marriage](#) is contributing to poverty, reduced economic opportunity for women who bear children outside of marriage, reduced educational levels



for children, and many other ill effects we will discuss on these pages. Preserving the ecosystem of marriage is vitally important for future generations.

Furthermore, we have identified many of the methods being used by the Left. Such methods include:

1. **Making their opponents look bad at every opportunity.** Here's a page from their playbook:

***Step 5:** At a later stage of the media campaign for gay rights-long after other gay ads have become commonplace-it will be time to get tough with remaining opponents. To be blunt, they must be vilified. (This will be all the more necessary because, by that time, the entrenched enemy will have quadrupled its output of vitriol and disinformation.) Our goal is here is twofold. First, we seek to replace the mainstream's self-righteous pride about its homophobia with shame and guilt. Second, we intend to make the antigays look so nasty that average Americans will want to dissociate themselves from such types.*

Taken from [The Overhauling of Straight America](#), by Marshall K. Kirk and Erastes Pill. If the link no longer works, here is a [cached version](#).

This piece was later expanded into a book, called [After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90's](#)

Example: [GLAAD list from 2012](#).

2. **Lack of argument.** There are two components to this.

- **Lack of sociological argument.** There is no coherent, sociologically based argument for gay marriage or marriage equality. Going forward, we would like all of our readers to examine news stories, youtube videos, blog posts, etc related to gay marriage and see if they are based on overarching sociological reasons, or on private and personal reasons.

For example, there was a YouTube video making the rounds in early 2012 during the Washington State vote on same sex marriage, with Republican legislator Maureen Walsh telling why she decided to vote to redefine marriage. I honestly believe most people are simply ignorant of the non religious reasons to support marriage as being defined only between one man and one woman, including Ms. Walsh. Like many others, she has no idea that voting to redefine marriage leaves the door wide open to redefine parenthood. But apart from her ignorance, my jaw dropped at the end, when she gave a personal reason for her vote as the capstone of her speech: she wants to throw a wedding for her gay daughter.

Watch it here:

[Maureen Walsh on her vote to legalize same sex marriage](#)

- **Always play offense, never play defense.** Instead of making a positive argument *for* one of their positions which they would then need to defend, they "play offense" by always discrediting the conservative side. And I do mean ALWAYS. As in, that's ALL some sites do - their entire focus and mission is to discredit all who disagree with the gay agenda. These same sites NEVER put forth their own sociological based reasons preserving the ecosystem of marriage.

For example, the [Philadelphia Inquirer](#) recently published a series of articles attacking Bob Patterson, who was a welfare adviser to governor Corbett in Pennsylvania, and also serves as editor of the [Howard Center's Family in America](#) publication. Instead of putting forth a positive argument, such as "Our welfare system is fine and here's why," the Inquirer devised a campaign to smear Mr. Patterson, and they got him fired from his adviser job because of it.

There are many, many websites and blogs that do this. **It's a smoke screen. Don't fall for it.**

3. **Not careful about source citations.** Sometimes you will see accusations made without any sources cited. Other times you will see second hand sources cited.

Here is a good example: [Open Letter to Starbucks, Warning about NOM](#).

If you read the article, you'll notice that the author embeds many links to backup his claims against NOM. But if you click the links, they take you to other LGBT (or related) sites, not to NOM sites. This is an example of using a second hand source instead of an original source. As an author it's often easier to use a second hand source than an original source, but as a reader it should raise a red flag in your mind when you see this.

4. **Ignoring the arguments.** If they ignore our arguments about preserving the ecosystem of marriage, fewer people know about them. This is a very smart tactic on their part.
5. **Playing the "bigot" card.** This is usually done in conjunction with #2. Instead of addressing the arguments in a logical manner, they cry "bigot." This tactic is very effective.
6. **Attacking people for what they did not say.** This is also called [Straw Man](#).
7. **Smoke screen.** Confusing the sociological perspective of marriage with the personal perspective of marriage; trying to make personal reasons for marriage the basis for not preserving the ecosystem of marriage.
8. **Putting a taboo on the instruments of critique.** For example, many proponents of gay marriage will try to dismiss Natural Law as if it's an outmoded or archaic way of thinking. If they can convince you that Natural Law is not valid, they have won.
9. **Do all gays want gay marriage?** They often speak about gay marriage without mentioning that there are vocal gays who oppose it. [Gays against gay marriage](#) (YouTube video).
10. **Preserving the ecosystem is not important** - creating a new one is. The entire thrust of the Left is to create a new sort of society, and the nuclear family must be destroyed or at least severely weakened in order to bring this about.
11. **Pretending that ALL gays were born that way.** I am not going to debate whether or not there is a "gay gene." What I want to point out is that SOME people who practice the homosexual lifestyle have chosen that lifestyle later in life. I don't not know how many or what percentage, but I know it's true. Many gay blogs and websites NEVER discuss it, because then readers might start to wonder, "Well, if SOME have chosen that lifestyle, HOW MANY have chosen that lifestyle?" And that subject is totally off the table anymore.

## Part 1: The [Definition of Marriage](#)

The definition of marriage is important. It serves as part of the foundation of western civilization. Many conservatives lament that our civilization is in decline; one reason may be that marriage has begun to be redefined.

There are several components of how western civilization has historically defined marriage. While it is important that married couples be happy and suitable for one another, personal reasons such as these serve as a poor foundation for determining how we define marriage as a society. Historically, the overarching, sociological reasons have been:

- Marriage is between two people of opposite sexes. Occasionally this definition would include polygyny, or even rarer polyandry, but for the most part it was defined as between one man and one woman.
- Marriage is for life. No getting out of it except under very extreme circumstances such as adultery, abuse, abandonment, and the like.
- Marriage serves as the basis for bearing and raising children.
- Marriage serves as the basis for establishing paternity. Determining the mother is easy: the baby comes out of her body! From a legal standpoint, the father is the man that the woman is married to.
- Because of the natural procreative capacity of man/woman marriage, marriage connects the generations to one another.

The legal concept of [no fault divorce](#) removed the permanent aspect of marriage. [Contraception](#) and the new sexual mores brought about by the [sexual revolution](#) changed the notion that children should be raised by their biological parents who are married to each other. Gay marriage (aka marriage equality) is changing the idea that the people need to be different sexes. It will also change how we define "parent" - it will remove the biological basis for parents, and replace it with a subjective, state defined basis.

Check back for [updates](#). We will be including many articles from well known authors on this subject. You can subscribe to our RSS feed above, and you will get our site updates automatically.

Read our 8 part series called, *The Libertarian Case for Man/Woman Marriage*. Part 1 is called "The [Definition of Marriage](#)."

Part 2: [What is Marriage](#) and why do we need it?

Part 3: Gay Marriage Facts (you are here)

Part 4: [Marriage equality](#) creates new inequalities

Part 5: [Marriage Laws](#): How Should the State View Marriage? (you are here)

Part 6: [History of Marriage](#)

Part 7: Gay Marriage means [Genderless Marriage](#)

Part 8: [Government and Marriage](#)

---

## **Part 3 Gay Marriage Facts**

Here are a few gay marriage facts Libertarians need to be aware of before deciding to support the privatization of marriage.

Redefining marriage to the union of any two persons abandons three principles we now take for granted:

1. Children are entitled to a relationship with both parents.
2. Legal parenthood ordinarily tracks biological parentage.
3. The state recognizes parentage, but does not assign it.

Here's how it works. Let's start with the state's role toward marriage.

### **What is the proper posture of the state toward marriage?**

The proper posture of the state toward marriage should be, and has historically been, to facilitate the attachment of mothers and fathers to their children and to one another. Attempting to create one legal institution that treats same sex couples identically with opposite sex couples is inconsistent with this posture. We can see this by looking at legal disputes between same sex partners over child custody, disputes that are already redefining parenthood.

### **Gay marriage facts #1: Same sex marriages separate children from one of their biological parents *by design*.**

The typical legal case involves a lesbian couple, one of whom has a baby through artificial reproductive technology. Usually the father is an anonymous sperm donor. The sexual relationship between the two women breaks down. The mother no longer wants her former sex partner to have anything to do with her child. The former lover never legally adopted the child. The former lover goes to court to obtain parental rights. She is not related to the child, either by blood or adoption. *The legal issue at stake is whether the court can assign parental rights to a non parent.*

In response to these situations, the courts are defining "[de facto parenthood](#)" as a new category of parenthood. Determining whether someone qualifies as a "de facto parent" usually involves multi-part tests. The court inquires into things like how much care the non-parent provided and whether the child called her "mommy." The court scrutinizes family life to decide whether a non-parent counts as a parent.

Redefining marriage redefines parenthood. Redefining marriage expands the state into homes like never before seen. Furthermore, the natural mother in these situations undergoes a legal battle resulting in legal consequences and legal precedents not seen by mothers in straight custody cases. The reason why should be clear: it's because mothers in straight custody cases can establish biological paternity quite easily.

## **Gay marriage facts #2: The state's role should be to recognize the natural reality of biological parenthood.**

The concepts of "mother" and "father" are pre-political concepts. Up until now, the state has seen its role as simply recording this natural reality. Custody disputes, bitter as they sometimes can be, do not typically involve the state deciding whether someone counts as a parent in the first place. Now parenthood is becoming the creation of the state.

Rather than attaching children to their biological parents as marriage does, the legal institution of "same sex marriage" separates children from a biological parent. More than that, the state is beginning to stand against the natural family. In the wake of marriage redefinition in other states, courts are saying things like, "the traditional notion that children need a mother and a father to be raised into healthy, well-adjusted adults is based more on stereotype than anything else." This statement made by the Iowa Supreme Court in *Varnum v Brien* is false. Mountains of data show that children do need their mothers and their fathers, and that children care deeply about biological connections.

## **Gay marriage facts #3: Same sex marriage marginalizes sex roles, which minimalizes fathers.**

By legalizing same sex unions, the government declares that mothers and fathers are interchangeable. When mothers and fathers are interchangeable, it is fathers who will be pushed aside. In Canada, where same sex unions have been legal since 2005, the birth certificates reflect this. Each birth certificate in British Columbia has a place to mention the biological mother. The second parent is listed as "father or co-parent."

To complicate things, there's not even a check-off box to indicate which is being listed, the father or the co-parent! Check it out right here:

[Birth Certificate of British Columbia](#)

One might say that the birth certificates are purely symbolic, and that we could solve this problem by recording Parent A and Parent B instead. Suppose we do that. The state would record two individuals as parents, without taking note of which has a biological relationship to the child.

*This suggestion makes plain how deeply redefining marriage alters our idea of parenthood.* The biology of parenthood has to be suppressed and eventually replaced. Now the state decides who counts as a parent. Libertarians should be quite alarmed at this, since it takes the pre-political concepts of marriage and parenthood and places their definitions into the subjective hands of the state.