



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on June 25, 2025

Reversal? On Same-sex “Marriage,” Reps and Dems Now WIDER Apart Than in Decades

When Barack Obama announced in 2014 that he believed the Constitution requires states to recognize same-sex “marriage,” it was said he’d “evolved” — again. But Americans have thus “evolved,” too, with support for faux (“same-sex”) marriage having increased for decades across groups. That is, until now.

In a development no doubt surprising to many, GOP support for faux marriage has actually *declined* in recent years. So much so, that now only a minority of Republicans — 40 percent — support the artificially manufactured institution. And while this shift may not survive older generations’ passing, it presents an opportunity to address an important point.

The marriage issue was never settled rationally, not socially — and not legally.

The Associated Press (AP) [reports](#) on the story:

Recent polling from Gallup shows that Americans’ support for same-sex marriage is higher than it was in 2015. Gallup’s latest data, however, finds a 47-percentage-point gap on the issue between Republicans and Democrats, the largest since it first began tracking this measure 29 years ago.

The size of that chasm is partially due to [a substantial dip in support among Republicans](#) since 2023.



Orbon Alija/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Evolution — or Devolution?

I remember when, approximately 20-25 years ago, commentator Bill O’Reilly confidently proclaimed that Americans would *never* accept faux marriage. This didn’t prove prescient, though, and, in fact, even at the time an ideological shift was underway. The AP presents a historical rundown of the devolution, a summary of which follows.

- In 1988, only about one in 10 American adults supported faux marriage. Seven in 10 opposed it, with Democrats and Republicans mostly aligned on the issue.
- In 1996, support rose to 27 percent of U.S. adults favoring legal recognition of faux marriage, with Democrats almost twice as likely as Republicans register support.
- In 2004, Massachusetts became the first state to legalize faux marriage; four in 10 U.S. adults supported it, with about half of Democrats and 22 percent of Republicans in favor.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on June 25, 2025

- By 2006, at least half of Democrats consistently supported faux marriage, while Independents reached majority support by 2012.
- In 2015, three-quarters of Democrats supported faux marriage, compared to about one-third of Republicans, following the Supreme Court's *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision.
- Between 2010 and 2020, Republican support increased somewhat, reaching a peak, though it lagged behind Democrats, indicating a broader societal shift.
- Between 2020 and 2025, overall public support stabilized at around 70 percent (Gallup) and 63 percent (General Social Survey) since 2020.
- As to the recent decline, Republican support dropped from 55 percent in 2021-2022 to 40 percent in 2025, returning to 2016 levels.

An Unsettled “Settled” Issue

Now, a G.K. Chesterton line could come to mind here. “A fallacy doesn’t cease to be a fallacy because it becomes a fashion,” he observed. Fallacies are especially likely to become fashions, too, when reason is cast aside. And this certainly was the case with the *Obergefell v. Hodges* opinion, which “found” a constitutional “right” to faux marriage.

Relevant here, interestingly, is that plaintiff Jim Obergefell and defendant Rick Hodges have become friends since the 2015 decision. Hodges, the Ohio health department’s head in 2015, [has revealed](#) that he didn’t actually agree with what he was defending. So was his heart in the effort? If not, it may help explain why the courtroom defense of marriage (i.e., one man, one woman) was so lacking.

As I’ve often pointed out, the real issue was, apparently, never understood by judges or explained by defendants. To wit: What if I told you that homosexuals *always* had a “right” to marry?

That is, they have a right to form that union with a member of the opposite sex that we call marriage.

This isn’t just semantics. Before you can debate whether or not there is a right to a thing, you have to know *what that thing is*. What is marriage? If we agree that it’s the union between a man and woman, then there is no argument. For no one is trying to stop any adult American from entering into such a union. Ah, but the anti-marriage side will reject this time-honored definition. And this brings us to the point: The marriage debate is *not* a matter of rights.

It is a matter of *definitions*.

Unraveling a Time-honored Institution

This also brings us to the anti-marriage side’s Achilles’ heel. They would attack traditionalists with the notion that the time-honored definition of marriage is exclusive and discriminatory. But they’d then defend themselves by saying that their agitation for faux marriage won’t lead to polygamy and other conceptions of “marriage” being legalized.

But what is implicit in these claims is contradictory. For if they’re putting forth an alternative definition — such as marriage being the union of any two adults — they’re also being exclusive and discriminatory, as any definition excludes what does not meet it. Yet if they don’t put forth an alternative definition and exclude something, they are including everything. And everything means polygamy and any other conception of “marriage” imaginable. It also contributes to the destruction of the institution. Because the closer marriage gets to meaning anything, the closer it gets to meaning nothing.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on June 25, 2025

This brings us to traditionalists' great mistake: falsely accusing the other side of redefining marriage. They've done *no such thing* because they haven't, in fact, consistently propounded any alternative definition. Yet if the anti-marriage side isn't redefining the institution, what are they actually doing?

They are "undefining" it.

This is why, too, though the marriage issue has faded from the news, it is not settled. It has only been unsettled, and that's a problem.

As Dr. Alan Keyes once pointed out, marriage isn't a matter of individual rights. Rather, it's a vehicle through which spouses are encouraged to fulfill their responsibilities to their children and to each other.

Moreover, as Pope John Paul II emphasized, the family is the central building block of civilization.

And marriage is a central building block of the family.

It is for this reason that marriage is [a pillar of civilization](#).

A Propaganda Pill Can Kill a Pillar

Yet pillars can be eroded, even toppled. The 1989 book *After the Ball: How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90's* [explained how](#) propaganda would be used to convert Americans' hearts and minds on sexual devolutionary matters. And so it has come to pass.

As the AP also reports, only 36 percent of Republicans over 50 support faux marriage. Yet this figure is 60 percent among Republicans *under* 50. And Gallup senior editor Megan Brennan highlighted the generational divide as a predictor of future trends. "I think that's a key to where things will be headed, presumably," the AP quotes her as saying.

So, yes, GOP opposition to faux marriage may not be long for this world. But then there's the more serious matter.

That is, will a civilization that casts reason and virtue to the winds itself be long for this world?



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.