

Interview with Dr. Allan Carlson and Lee Webster

WSAU (AM 550) News/Talk Radio, "55 Feedback", Wausau, Wisconsin
Oct 26, 2006

Pat Snyder and Tom King – WSAU "55 Feedback" Co-Hosts
Lee Webster – Family Research Institute, Central Wisconsin Branch
Dr. Allan Carlson – President, Howard Center for Family, Religion, and Society

Comments [unintelligible/added].

Subtopics

A Celebration of
Marriage

Pat Snyder – Good morning everyone. Thursday and 55 Feedback. We begin [] in studio with us, ah, from the Family Research Institute [www.fri-wi.org], Central Wisconsin Branch, Lee Webster. And, ah, with us as well from the President of the Howard Center for Family, Religion, and Society... [www.profam.org] Dr. Allan Carlson. As tonight, it will be "A Celebration of Marriage, One Man and One Woman for Life", to be held at the Rose Garden. And ah, he is in town for that. But gentlemen, thanks for coming in today. (Guests – Thanks for having us...pleased to be here.) And welcome to Wausau. (Doctor Carlson – Thank you. Beautiful town.) We're pretty proud of it, so... (Lee – We are.)

Well, Lee, maybe we can kind of introduce the folks who didn't hear us a little bit before about tonight's activity, and the reason Dr. Carlson's here.

Amendment is for
affirming marriage
between one man
and one woman

Lee Webster – Well, ah, what's happening is that there is a proposition on the ballot on November 7th, that will give Wisconsin citizens the opportunity to vote "Yes" for marriage. And basically it'll be an affirmation that marriage is a relationship between one man and one woman. And as part of that, we decided that what we wanted to do was to have a celebration event that would celebrate what the meaning of traditional and natural marriage is. And, so ah, that's the reason for tonight's event, and that's why Dr. Carlson is here.

Pat – Mmmkay. And Doctor, what's the message when you come to events like this, what's the message you want to get across?

Why historically,
naturally, and
necessarily we
limit marriage to
one man and
one woman

Doctor Carlson – Well one message is...first of all I welcome the debate that's going on in this country right now over marriage -- and what it's purposes are, and what it's meaning is. Ah, I think in recent decades we've sort of lost sight of some of that. And ah, actually the challenge of same-sex marriage has forced us to think it through again. So tonight I'll be talking about what I call what the real purposes of marriage are. And, um, again trying to put some clarity on this question, and why...because of these purposes...why historically and naturally and necessarily we do limit marriage to one man and one woman.

Pat – Do you feel that this is a, ya know, in voting "yes", it's discrimination?

State only regulates
intimate heterosexual
relationships because
of the outcome of
children

Doctor – Not at all! I think you have to look at from a very different angle. Ah, consider that many different kinds of human relationships, and many different kinds of human friendships...including intimate friendships. But there's only one kind of intimate friendship that the state has ever felt necessary to regulate, and deal with, and promote, ...ah, and that has been the relationship of heterosexual man and woman.

Why? Well, the answer should be obvious when you stop to think about it. Heterosexual relationships can produce children. This is where children come from. Such relationships of children growing up with their two natural parents are also the best place

Two natural parents is best place for children to grow

for children to grow. Ah, they...any other situation, predictably they're going to have more problems. Ah, so the reason we privilege and burden the heterosexual intimate relationship...privilege and burden it...is because this is where children come from. And it's the best place for them to grow up.

I think that's the way to look at it. Ah, other relationships, other friendships, intimate friendships should not be registered by the government. I mean, ah, in the interest of liberty, in the interest of, of preserving a free society, the government shouldn't know who all my friends are. Ah, we only do it in this one case because children are involved.

Pat – And to the couples, the homosexual couples...same-sex that adopt children...that say they're a loving environment? And ya know, today on the news we heard, ya know, the New Jersey ruling. And they have a little eight-year-old boy saying that it's good my two moms should get what they want, and be married.

Data shows homosexual adoption not a good idea for children

Doctor – Well, it gets into the issue of homosexual adoption, which is another big, big question, whether that's a good idea or not. Actually I think the data suggests that it's not a good idea. Um...um, the children again do best when they're growing up with a father and a mother. Um, actually the ideal circumstances with their natural parents. When you can't have that, again you want the relationship of a man and a woman as a model for the children. It's again where they predictably do the best.

Pat – Okay. 845-2155 if you have questions you would like to ask Dr. Allan Carlson and Lee Webster.

Are marriages that do not produce children not viable?

Tom King – If procreation is the main reason why marriage between a man and a woman should be the only recognized form of marriage...what about men and women who choose not to have children? What about marriages of older Americans who won't have children? I mean, are those marriages that should not be recognized in your mind?!

Doctor – Well, ah, clearly we all I think instinctively understand that when two twenty-five year olds get married, ah, something much more is at stake then let's say when two people who are seventy-five years old get married. Ah, the marriage of the twenty-five year olds...a much bigger deal is made about it. And I think for obvious reasons.

We have to protect the form of marriage that by nature produces children

On the other hand, um...do you really want the government to be in the business of fertility testing? Ah, ah...the...even those couples who say when they get married (younger couples say), "We're not going to have any children", often times change their mind. Um, infertility is ah, an inexact science. I've known many (I say many I actually do mean many) couples who I were told by eminent medical authorities they couldn't have children. Low and behold, a child comes out.

Ah, ah... (Tom – Well, it makes it sound...) What I'm getting at...what I'm getting at is that we have to recognize and protect the form, ah, that again...the only place where on a natural basis []...children can come from is on a heterosexual relationship. That's again why we focus on that, and that's why marriage has been instituted as a civil, as a civil institution.

Tom – But it makes...it makes it sound, in my mind you're making it sound like a marriage that does not produce children is an unsuccessful marriage.

Gov't gets involved because children are involved

Doctor – Well no. That's not what I'm getting at. I'm saying the reason the state is involved in this, and the only reason, is because children are involved. If children weren't involved, then the state would have no business in regulating intimate heterosexual relationships.

Pat – And not only that, I haven't met too many couples that decide to get married and don't have children in the future sometime. They say, "We're going to get married, but neither one of us...we want our careers first." There's a few out there, but not many that I know of. I mean, most people want kids.

Marriages naturally and normally produce children
Doctor – And most...and again I say most people change their minds or things happen. Um, we're dealing with...human sexuality is a powerful tool...a powerful thing. And sometimes children emerge despite the best intentions of the couple who wants to remain childless. And, um, that's again why the state is involved. Ah, and that's why we have, ah, privileged marriage for one special kind of intimate friendship.

Pat – All right. We'll come back here. Let's take a quick break gentlemen, as we're with Allan Carlson, and Lee Webster tonight, "A Celebration of Marriage" at the Rose Garden, which gets underway at 5:30p.m. And Dr. Carlson will be a speaker there. It's put on by the Family Research Institute, the Central Wisconsin chapter. Back with your questions at 845-2155.

----- BREAK -----

Pat – And welcome back here to "55 Feedback". Ah, Doctor Allan Carlson, and also Lee Webster in. We're talking about the Marriage Amendment, and tonight at the Rose Garden they have "A Celebration of Marriage", where Dr. Carlson will be a speaker. 845-2155.

New Jersey Court rules for homosexual marriage
Interesting too...yesterday, the ah New Jersey Supreme Court came out and ah, ruled that ah, ya know, they basically said that marriage...the homosexual marriages...I guess you can't discriminate against it. They come out with the reasoning...you have I forget how many days -- six months, or...

Tom – Well New Jersey doesn't have a statute that defines marriage, so they're giving the Legislature, I think it was 60 days (Pat – 60 days, or...) (Doctor – 180.) (All – 180 days!) (Lee – I think it was 180.)

Without amendment, Wisconsin open to similar court action
Pat – 180 days to come up with ah, with ah that, and let the Legislature...they say that the Supreme Court, ya know, the court shouldn't be the one doing it. So they passed it off that way. But there it is. Ah, they must not even have...I guess, some people are saying without this amendment, that leaves Wisconsin open to court action as well.

Wisconsin Governor vetoed bill that would have precluded need for amendment
Lee – Absolutely! I think that's the case. In 2003, what happened was there was a bill presented to the Governor, ah, that would have defined marriage as one man, one woman. The governor of the state just chose to veto that bill. It would have...it was one vote short of overriding his veto. At that point it became very, very clear that the...that the agenda of the homosexual group is to change the marriage statute. Wisconsin does not have a protection. It defines marriage as a relationship between a husband and wife. But does not clearly define that as being one man and one woman.

Wisconsin is very, very vulnerable to judicial action without amendment
And ah, contrary to some of the information that's been out in the TV ads, and coming out from the press from the other side, we are very, very vulnerable to a judicial action. And it could certainly happen here in the state of Wisconsin. (Pat – Mmmkay.) But that's consistent with the kinds of ads that we've been seeing from the "Fair Wisconsin" side. They've been, they've been very misleading, and very, very deceptive! And actually, the truth is a long ways from a lot of the things that they're saying.

Pat – Well, they're saying that voting "No" would not change anything in Wisconsin. Is that a truthful part?

A "Yes" vote is voting yes for natural marriage

Lee – Absolutely not! That's exactly the kind of example that I'm talking about. A "Yes" vote on this amendment is voting "Yes" for natural marriage...the way we've understood it for thousands of years. And that ad is absolutely a deceptive manipulation on the part of the other group.

Pat – Mmmkay. Dr. Carlson, there are people out there saying, "Well, ya know, it's not my business if two, ah, same-sex want to marry each other. Ah, that I should stay out of that." What would be in your mind...the reality, if suddenly this was suddenly at equal level...same-sex marriage equal level with heterosexual? Ah, what sort of things would you ponder happening?

If homosexual marriage was legally considered normal -- schools would have to teach it as normal

Doctor – Well again, we have to go back and focus on the needs of children. Ah, the...once there's a legal equivalence, ah, written into law...either put into law by activist judges, ah, between heterosexual and so-called same-sex marriage, ah, that's going have to be something that the schools will have to reflect. It's going to have to be taught in the schools to the degree they touch on these issues at all.

Um, the...as we're seeing already in Massachusetts, ah, school systems are responding to the Massachusetts same-sex marriage situation by, by teaching children that this is in fact...ah, these are equivalent ways of living. Ah, no difference between the two. Um, and...and, what we're doing, and what Massachusetts has already done, and what New Jersey is near doing, is putting their children at serious risk.

Marriage primarily for procreation and rearing of children, not primarily for partners

Ah, for the whole of human history, um, in every known human society, marriage has been a privileged institution, focused on the procreation and rearing of children. Um, the ah...this attempt to somehow radically transform this institution into something else – something mainly focused on the happiness and pleasure of the partners, ah, is to radically change the...is to radically change the institution, and I would say again, put children at serious risk of harm.

Pat – Okay, let's go to the phones. Mary in Wausau.

Mary – Hi...Good morning. I was wondering, um, do we have any ads on the television, or plan to have any ads go on the television?

Pat – They do have radio ads saying, "Vote 'Yes' for the marriage amendment."

Significantly more funding going toward homosexual marriage

Lee – We do have a number of radio ads. No, we do not have...at this point we do not have any television ads. Television ads cost a lot of money. And, ah, the budget for the group that is trying to oppose this amendment is somewhere between 3 and 5 million dollars. They have deep pockets, and they're trying to buy, ah, their position on the amendment by money, most of which is coming from out of state.

Mary – Right. Well, I believe that amendments can be bought, definitely. Um, so whether through honest or deceptive ways. And so I was wondering if there was any way to put an ad on television that stated, um, ya know..."If you vote 'Yes' that there will be no change in the laws." Um...

Lee – Absolutely, there would be. And go to the website for "Vote 'Yes' for Marriage" [www.voteyesformarriagewi.org], and encourage your friends, and make some big donations. And I'm sure that that could happen.

voteyesformarriagewi.org

Pat – They/I don't have the funding for the TV ads.

Mary – Well, if you voted “Yes”, isn’t it true that nothing really would change?

Voting “Yes” would solidify and protect marriage institution

Lee – Well, in a sense if you voted “Yes”, nothing would change as we know it right now...yes. The marriage institution would be solidified and protected in the state of Wisconsin. And actually, we’d be protected not only against, ah...against, ah, other same-sex marriage, but there would also be a very clear definition that would say that other relationships that were similar to marriage would also be protected. So we wouldn’t be in the situation for example that the judges in New Jersey have put their legislature in right now.

Voting “No” could change marriage institution, resulting in a Massachusetts or New Jersey situation

Tom – But you can’t categorically say that nothing would change for people...unmarried heterosexual people who live together...ah, you can’t categorically say that nothing would change for them! I mean, there are, there are laws that are followed by married folks in, in the state of Wisconsin that ah, that could change! I’m not saying they would, but they could. (Mary – But that...) You can’t categorically... (Mary – But Tom! That’s the same thing you could say for the voting “No”. It could change...ya know, everything could change. So that’s, ya know, that’s irrelevant.)

Lee – I think...I think the answer is that if you vote “No”, and if that were to pass, it is very, very likely that what will happen is that we will have the same situation we had in New Jersey, and in Massachusetts...that the judicial arm of our government will make a position, and Wisconsin will fall because we don’t have a good protection.

Less divorces? More changes?

Tom – Considering Massachusetts has the lowest divorce rate in the country, that wouldn’t be a horrible thing, now would it! (Pat – Tom, I don’t think...(laughs)) (Mary – Tom! If you vote...if you vote “No”, things are more likely to change, then if you were to vote “Yes”.

Pat (chuckling) – Tying the divorce rate in with that?! That’s really good Tom. (Tom – You’re building up...) Nice job.

Tom – You’re building up heterosexual marriage as this panacea! And let’s face it, in today’s society heterosexual marriage has all kinds of problems!

More divorces?

Pat – Tom, the divorce rate will go up! (Mary – Can I make a point?) (Tom – It didn’t in Massachusetts!) It will! (Mary – Can I make a point here?) Go ahead Mary as we shut up for you.

Mary – Tom’s changing...(laughs) ...well, Tom’s changing the argument because he knows it’s a...he’s arguing the wrong...

Tom – Mary, all I’m saying is that Lee just made the comment that things would not change if you voted “Yes” for this amendment! And he can’t categorically say that because it’s not true!

More changes to marriage if you vote “No”

Mary – But it’s more not true if you vote “No”! Do you know what I mean? (Pat – Right.) It’s more likely to change if you vote “No”! And that’s how it’s dishonest. And people...and I, I think it’s more likely to change if you vote “No”! And so I think it’s terribly misleading and dishonest. And I think if you put that on a television ad, um, I think...ya know, you would get your point across a whole lot more and faster. Um... (Pat – Again, you don’t have the money so that’s a moot point...so...sorry.) Okay.

Pat – All right, thanks Mary. I got your point, but there just...when you don’t have the funds you can’t do it...so... Ah, Wisconsin Rapids. John, thanks for holding.

If gay marriage normal, how would that affect workers’ benefits?

John – Yes, ah, interesting discussion. Ah, my question is as a business man, if this say gay marriage, ah, and civil union thing is passed...ah, am I going to have to offer benefits to, ah, the partners of my workers? And ah, what’s to keep a worker from entering into a gay marriage or civil union with someone, ah, just for convenience so they can get

benefits? I know the federal government scrutinizes marriages between U.S. citizens and, ah, aliens. Ya know, people who are trying to get U.S. citizenship, and just on a sham basis. So where would that scrutiny be at the state level?

If gay marriage normal, eventually businesses would be forced to provide benefits to partners

Doctor – It seems to me if there's an equivalence between ah...a legal equivalence between a heterosexual and homosexual, ah, relationships under the label "marriage" – yeah, I don't see how eventually...eventually you wouldn't be forced to provide benefits on an equal basis. It's... (Pat – It would be discrimination.) (Tom – Many, many forward thinking companies are already doing it. So I mean, it's not going to change for them.) Well, he asked if he would be forced to do it, and I think the answer is he would be eventually. (Pat – Yeah.)

Pat – There wouldn't be any choice in the matter is what he was trying to say...so.... And with health care, and everything else...costs going up...he's looking at the bottom line. But he'll probably get categorized as something that's, ah, being homophobic or something...rather than looking at his economic standpoint of everything. Ah, 845-2155. Ah, as we can see, a volatile situation here, as this ah...

All 20 states approved (71% ave) their marriage amendments

It is amazing that 20 states have come up and...and [all] 20 of the folks have all voted marriage amendment and pro-marriage. Ah, a lot of force is being thrown into Wisconsin.

Lee – That's right. Not only have they voted in 20 states, but the average number of U.S. citizens that have voted in those states has been 71% for the natural marriage.

Majority of people want traditional marriage

Democracy at stake

Courts may ignore will of the people

Doctor – And even states like Oregon which were ah...people were surprised. Even the state of Oregon, which is known as a fairly liberal state, had I think 58% in favor. And um, I think again it reflects the reality that, um, the issue here partly is democracy. Who will be deciding? Ah, do we have faith in democracy? Ah, will the people...who are in a sense I think trying to defend an institution which they understand...an institution that is seen as vital to the future of their country, to the future of this state. Ah, they're defending it against, ah, a movement that has mainly relied on, on judges. Has mainly relied on judicial activism to achieve its goals. So democracy is also at stake here.

Pat – All right. Let's get one more call before we, ah, move to news. Ken in Merrill.

Making much ado about nothing

People living together without God's consent

Ken – Hi. Ah, I guess I gotta react to this whole concept. It seems to me that the guy is saying that it's going to create problems for the working class individuals, or somebody goes through a sham marriage to have, ah, health care. What difference does it make? The employer is going to pay for a married couple one way or another. And it just seems to me that this whole thing of...the right wing conservative concept of "well, we've got to stop this", and you're making much ado about nothing. Because there are people that are living, ah, without the consent of God for example in terms of the marriage.

Pat – Okay, but they're not married. (Okay, Ken gave up.) They're not married though. They might be living that way. There's a lot of things we live at without the consent of God. But, in any case they're also not recognized by the state of Wisconsin.

California's Marriage Amendment honored by Supreme Court

Ah, we'll come back. We'll pick up on that. We've got to do a newsbreak here, and ah, we'll come back...pick up on that. California – they had an amendment in their constitution. When it was challenged the Supreme Court said, "No. The voters said ah, 'Man and woman'". And ah, struck it down. But they had an amendment in their constitution to uphold a lower court's overturning a case in California. So make note of that.

----- NEWSBREAK -----

[Pat – And we're back again with ah, Dr. Allan Carlson and Lee Webster of the Wisconsin Family Research Institute, talking about the Marriage Amendment, as it ah, is being voted on, ah, November 7th. Um, ya know, years ago most everyone believed in traditional marriage of one man and one woman. Ah, yet ah, over the last couple of decades some have, um, drifted away from that belief, particularly it seems, ah, among Democrats...though I still think most Democrats believe in traditional marriage and ah, want to protect it. How do you see that Doctor?]

Many Democrats want to protect traditional marriage

Doctor – [] ...through the ah, well into the 1960's. It was the party that stood for small communities, for family...ah, for ah, a very traditional, small ah, small scale society. It was the party of the common man. That changed to some degree, but there still are a lot of pro-family Democrats out there, particularly voters. I think you're right. They understand instinctively that something very critical is at stake here.

Last 10 years has seen effort to change course of history by changing marriage

No solid evidence to support change

Lee – I think it's really sad that the issue has become as politicized as it has. I mean, it's a social issue, it's a moral issue. There's many factors that are involved. This major institution, primary institution in our culture that, ah...it doesn't make any sense to try to change something that for thousands of years of history that has proven its value and benefit.

And within a ten-year period of time all of the sudden we have this big move to change the course of history without any solid evidence to support those kinds of changes! I mean, at best it is a vast social experiment. Don't call it right wing! For heaven sakes, I've been counseling with people for 40 years, and I absolutely am convinced I know, that I know beyond any measure of doubt, that the best environment for children is the environment with a natural father and a natural mother!

Pat – All right. Let's take a phone call. I believe is this Bob in Eland?

God doesn't teach intolerance and prejudice

Bob – Yeah. (Pat – Hi.) Hi. I would just like to mention...somebody mentioned God, all right? I never knew God taught segregation and looking down on people and this kind of stuff that the guy was talking about. I never knew God taught stuff like that. I thought He taught -- Accept everybody as they are, everybody as their brother...that type of thing.

See Genesis Chapters 1 & 2

Doctor – I think you ought to read Genesis 1 and 2, where God clearly institutes the, ah, marriage. Ah, [Genesis 1:27-28] "And God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. And God said, 'Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth.'" Ah, [Genesis 2:24] "Therefore a man leaves his parents, and cleaves to his wife; and they become one flesh." Ah...

Bob – So He does teach intolerance and prejudice.

God teaches marriage focused on children

Doctor – No, He teaches marriage. And He teaches marriage focused on, ah, on children. That's what God teaches. That's ah...

Bob – And also you mentioned this was going to harm children. Are they going to start falling off of swings more...are they going to start bumping into walls more...get more diseases? Ya know, how is it going to harm the children?

Research shows traditional marriage least harmful to children

Lee – What we know is the best environment for children, is if they're brought up by two biological parents. That's absolutely documented in research study, after research study, after research study. Ah and, and any other situation does harm, potentially harms children. In addition, if you normalize a behavior that has proven itself to have many detrimental

effects on individuals, children are going to experiment with that. And you're going to create a whole different derange in our culture. Yes, there are some real major problems!

Now I want to go back to that other question that you brought up, and it's basically this. I'm a grandfather. I have 10 grand kids. I love those grand kids. I accept them in every...I think they're just absolutely precious kids!

God set rules and guidelines for what is best for people and for culture

But let me tell ya! As a loving father, and grandfather, I also know when they're about to do things that are dangerous or harmful to them. And in those instances I protect them by setting up rules and regulations. Sometimes I punish and discipline them.

And to think that my God, or God is any different, that all He does is give license to things that would be potentially harmful to people is absolutely...it makes no sense to me! He sets rules, He sets guidelines for what's best for people, for what's best for culture. And ah, that's just the way it is! And this ridiculous idea that you can go around and tolerate anybody doing anything that they want at anytime makes absolutely no sense to me!

Why care?
Because it will protect our children

Bob – Well nobody said that. Nobody said that at all. (Lee – That's what you implied.) And I'll...so I...if a man in Milwaukee wanted to get married, it doesn't affect me at all! Not at all! Not a bit! Why should I be worrying about what somebody else is doing?

Lee – Because there's a legacy that you're going to leave for your kids and your grandkids.

Bob – I see (laughs).

Pat – All right. Thanks, all right. 845-2155. Ah, let's see here. I think we've got Chad. Is this Chad? (Chad – Yes it is!) Hi Chad.

If find some predisposed to homosexuality, how difficult to change amend?

Chad – Hi, how are you doing? Um, for your guests, um, he was talking about activist judges before. And just by looking at history we've had activist judges who have intervened for the minority before. I'm just wondering, ya know, if we were to pass this amendment, what would it take to overturn it if ten, twenty years from now we find genetically that, ya know, homosexuality is predispositioned [predisposed]. And that we are now legally discriminating against, ah, part of our population? (Pat – Another amendment, wouldn't it?) (Doctor – Well...) What would it take to overturn... I'm familiar with it at the national level, but what at the state level would it take to...?

Wrong question: Marriage is not about relationship of two people

Doctor – Well, what's been done by an amendment could be undone by an amendment. But I don't think that's the real issue. Even if um, even if the so-called gay gene is finally conclusively found and proven, it still wouldn't justify ah, ah the extension of marriage! It, it would be overwhelming compelling evidence for eliminating all other forms of discrimination. But ah, marriage is not about the relationship of the two people. More...mostly it's about the needs and the protection of children. And ah, that would not change. Ah, again, homosexual relationships are by definition sterile.

Marriage is about needs and protection of children

Chad – Okay. Um, also...well ah, this marriage amendment, what is the difference (I'm kind of uneducated here but), what is the difference between a civil union and a marriage? Is the marriage amendment saying that...I guess, um...the civil union is a legal agreement and it has no bearing on the church. I mean, it would...this amendment would (...I don't know how to say this exactly)...um...

Pat – You're worried that the amendment, that this amendment might make civil unions illegal?

Chad – Yeah. I, I'm really concerned if we are going to put this in our Constitution, and then we find out later that, ya know, we're...it's kinda like, um...African Americans and Whites, ya know, in the South. Back in the days, in the '40's and '50's, when not legally were...it was found...illegally for them getting married. And, ya know, we had to go through this legal mess, ah, to reverse that. And, I'm really hesitating, ya know, to put the will of the majority over this very small minority.

Majority could be legally discriminating against minority

And um, if we were to do that, what would it take to reverse...ya know, it's a huge process to reverse an amendment. And we would have this in our Constitution that we were legally discriminating against this very small minority. And to overturn that it's...you have to get like...I mean, federally it's 66% just 'ta...2/3's of the states would have to agree. And ah, ya know, I...I just think it would be, ya know, decades before it would be reversed.

Lee – Well, in the first place, ah, we would not be having a Constitutional amendment movement in this state right now if the Governor a few years ago would have signed the documentation that defined marriage as a relationship between one man and one woman...as the Legislators presented it to him! And in fact, it has been the activist judges, and the way that the matter's been approached...the judiciary that has forced us into this position where we need to write that.

Activist judges and governor caused need for amendment

If amendment passes, Legislature could still pass laws benefiting partners

Now, you talk about civil unions. There's nothing in this statute that (or amendment) that will in any way prevent the Legislature from giving limited benefits to certain relationships in unions. And those would be things that would have to be approached through the Legislature and voted on by legislative move. (Chad – Okay, so then...) (Tom – The second part of it...) it could be taken care of it...

Tom – The second part of the question wouldn't ah...wouldn't ah, take care of that uh? The second part of the question...which ah, is the big argument about civil union, as to whether or not they would be able to be ah, recognized in the state of Wisconsin.

Legislature could still recognize civil unions

Lee – According to our current Attorney General (who is very, very opposed to this amendment by the way), and by separate legislative counsel, it does not...there is nothing that says that they would not...Legislature would not be able to perform...create other forms of civil unions. That's one of the red herrings unfortunately that's being put out there by the opposition.

Tom – Well let's face it!! The Legislature, if this passes, if going to do nothing to ah, to go against what was passed because most of the Legislature is gutless when it comes to this stuff!! And they're not going to go against ah...

Would they?

Pat – I don't know about [not] giving rights, and giving benefits. I don't know if they'd do that....go that far Tom. I don't think they're vindictive...so... Ah, thanks. I want to get one more call in here ah, before we ah, let these guys go. Ah, Michael in Wausau.

God made one man and one woman for marriage

Don't mix spiritual beauty of marriage with today's politics

Michael – Yes, good morning everyone. Ah, basically a couple of comments. If, ah, like you say the big issue here of course is homosexual marriage. If the ah, two men, two women want to be together, do what they do together, that would be great. But you don't mix the beauty, and spiritual beauty of marriage in there. Too many laws...too many amendments involved. And, ya know, they're fighting so that they can actually say they're married. You don't do that because God made one man, one woman. It started with Adam and Eve. If they can prove that they were two of the same, then yes! But you don't mix religion with politics to that nature.

Religion and science
defend traditional
marriage

Doctor – I would also underscore that not only is this a religious understanding, but science is on the side of those who would defend marriage. The recent work of paleoanthropologists looking at human...early human history...have found that something very much like marriage has existed for over two million years. Ah, it is in fact the defining characteristic of the human species. And ah, what I just want to underscore is that it's not just a religious view that marriage somehow is innate to human nature. It's also the view of modern science.

Pat – All right. Thanks for your call. All right. Ah, well ah, gotta let the guys go. Ah, tonight is there still a possibility of folks coming up and registering?

Lee – We did reserve some tables for walk-ins, so it's first come, first serve. We'd love to have people.

Pat – All right. We'll let you guys go. Thank you Doctor Carlson. (Doctor – Happy to be here.) All right. [] You're listening to "55 Feedback" on WSAU.

-----End of Program-----

This transcript was produced and provided by VFF21 -- Veterans and Friends for Freedom 21. Copies may be made with no alterations. Additional copies are available at vff21.info, and by e-mail at revereradio@vff21.info.

WSAU Information

WSAU News Radio (AM 550)
557 Scott St.
P.O. Box 5595
Wausau, WI 54403, USA

Phone: 715.842.1672 or Call-in to 715.845.2155
Fax: 715.848.3158
E-mail: wsau@wsau.com
Web Site: www.wsau.com