

Submission to the Senate Enquiry

On the Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2012

The proposed Bill is deeply flawed on many grounds, in terms of what it seeks to do, and in terms of what its consequences would be for Australia.

Overview:

There can never be “equality” between a sexual union which has a capacity to transmit life, and one which can never have such a capacity. Biology is immutable.

There is zero evidence that the majority of homosexual persons want this legislation.

Arguments used in favour of SSM invariably focus on desires of adults presented with emotive rhetoric, which is a subjective approach.

An objective approach to the debate is to consider all aspects, especially the welfare of children, and what the consequences of this legislation have been in other parts of the world. The determining factor is reason, not emotion.

There is an abundance of irrefutable evidence that, wherever either same sex “marriage” or civil unions, have been enacted, the consequences are deleterious for rights of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of religion and conscience, and parental rights. With the abolition of inalienable rights, countries which formerly enjoyed democratic freedom have been turned into dictatorial police states, controlled by bureaucratic thought police.

Every child has a right to be raised by his or her own biological parents. A mother and a father are equally important to the child.

Rights of same-sex couples:

Same-sex couples already receive the same benefits as heterosexual couples.

If such couples wish to pledge a commitment to each other, and to hold a ceremony to mark such a commitment, they are already free to do, on a social level, with the help of “gay friendly” celebrants and caterers. No legislation is necessary.

Homosexual persons already have an opportunity to marry, if they choose to marry a person of the opposite sex. Marriage by its very nature is a public acknowledgment of responsibility for the upbringing of such children as may be born of the union.

As same-sex couples can not procreate children of their own, such a pledge of responsibility is irrelevant. Their relationship is different from marriage. That does not make them “second class citizens”, any more than a person who chooses to remain single is a “second class citizen”. Difference does not indicate inferiority.

The word discrimination properly understood means an exercise of a faculty of human reason to distinguish between two seemingly similar circumstances. Such discrimination may be just or unjust. It is just discrimination to exclude children and persons who suffer from some forms of disability from holding a driver's licence. However the meaning of the word has been changed to imply that making such a distinction is always unjust – hence the phrase “discriminate against”. This has led to “anti-discrimination” legislation, which, in some cases, is not based on reason or justice. Recognition of a factual difference does not mean that anyone is treated unjustly.

Same-sex couples who claim “equality” do not want to marry, but to change the definition of marriage to include a union which is not, and can never be, marriage. Lobbyists claim that allowing such couples to “marry” does not have any negative impact on heterosexual marriage, or on the lives of other citizens. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Why same-sex “marriage” or civil unions would be deleterious for Australia:

We can not ignore overwhelming factual evidence of the consequences of such legislation in places where it has been enacted.

Secular as well as religious celebrants have complained about being compelled to officiate at same-sex “weddings”. Those who hire out venues, caterers, and all who are engaged in wedding ceremonies are likewise coerced into participation.

School children are subjected to compulsory indoctrination in homosexuality, in violation of parental rights. Such children have been exposed to pornographic images, and parents are powerless to withdraw their own children.

Any who protest against such injustice, or who express any disagreement, however mild and inoffensive, on the grounds of conscience and family values have been charged with a so-called “hate crime”, for which the penalty in some cases is imprisonment.

Adoption and foster care agencies have been forced to close because they could not in conscience place children with same-sex couples.

Freedom of conscience has likewise been violated in other ways, such as boarding house proprietors who could not in conscience provide double room accommodation to a homosexual couple. They lost a court case in defence of their means of a livelihood.

Same-sex couples have freedom to avail of all these services from those who are willing to provide them. Yet those who, for reasons of conscience, can not comply, are compelled to do so or to suffer serious consequences. It is not a matter of seeking access to those services, but of using coercion to compel universal affirmation of a homosexual lifestyle as being not only “natural” and in every way praiseworthy, but in need of being widely promoted.

This is neither tolerance nor diversity. True tolerance is based on mutual respect for those whose belief systems are irreconcilable. It is the opposite of equality that same-sex couples are free to teach children in their guardianship whatever they choose, yet married heterosexual couples who do not want their children to be indoctrinated in homosexuality have no redress.

It is a basic inalienable right that all citizens be free to live their lives, and raise their children, in those values which are most deeply and sincerely held, whether religiously based or otherwise.

What a cruel irony that measures to rob citizens of fundamental rights masquerade under a banner of “freedom”, “tolerance” and “human rights”. The rights being violated are enshrined in the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights

namely freedom of opinion (Article 19), freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 18), and parental rights to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children (Article 26.3)

Indoctrination of children with what is in fact political propaganda has no place in a democratic society. It is already taking place, largely surreptitiously, in some schools, unbeknown to parents. Persons who do not agree with a homosexualist agenda are already being silenced.

Radical lobbyists are unwilling to engage in logical debate, but instead make defamatory accusations of “bigotry”, “hatred”, and “homophobia” against any who would disagree with them. Every effort is made to deny a platform to those who support marriage between one man and one woman. It happens regularly in a public forum that such speakers are drowned out with clamour and bullhorns. Everyone has a right to speak, and a right to be heard.

If same-sex unions (whether “marriage” or “civil union”) are given a stamp of legality, radical activists will receive unprecedented political power to abrogate the inalienable rights and freedoms of all citizens.

SSM lobbyists have no authentic warrant to speak for homosexual persons:

It is fallacious to assume that the majority of same-sex couples want this legislation. There is a dearth of evidence to support such a claim. We hear only from a very small number of highly vocal supporters of the lobby, who seek to elicit sympathy that they are not permitted to “marry”. Most homosexual persons are indifferent, and would not avail of the legislation if it were in place.

A homosexual opponent of SSM, Richard Waghorne, has written a very illuminating article, which speaks for itself:

He says, “Explaining that you oppose gay marriage as a gay man tends to get a baffled response at first. This is understandable given how quickly the debate on gay marriage can collapse into **allegations of homophobia**. The message, explicit or implicit, is often that being anti-gay marriage means being in some way anti-gay. I have watched with growing irritation as principled opponents of gay marriage have put up with a stream of abuse for explaining their position”.

Rights of children:

No couple, even a heterosexual married couple, has a right to a child, although a child may be desired. But every child has an inalienable right to a mother and a father. Each natural parent is equally important to the child. Their roles are different, but complementary.

In the light of scientific fact every child who will ever be born has a mother and a father. Conception by artificial means in order to provide a child to meet desires of adults, at least one of whom bears no relationship to that child, deprives the child of a right to know, and be loved by, his or her own natural parents.

Such a practice reduces a human being to the category of a product.

All studies have shown that the best environment in which to raise a child is that of the shared responsibility of natural parents in a stable married relationship. Of course there are exceptions.

In cases where it is not possible for a child to be raised by his or her natural parents, others may substitute. The primary purpose of adoption is to provide a child with a substitute mother and a substitute father. A desire of a childless couple is merely secondary.

Others, e.g. family relatives, may care for a child very lovingly, but that is not a paradigm for child rearing.

It is an entirely different situation when a child is deliberately cut off from knowledge and love of his or her natural parents. It is worse still when a child is purposely brought into existence to be used as a guinea pig in a cruel social experiment.

Let the people decide:

No issue could be more far reaching than this on every aspect of the lives of all citizens. If the Bill were enacted, it would change our way of life in an unprecedented way. A loving parent-child relationship would be damaged by governmental intrusion into family life. Our means of a livelihood would be at risk if we dared to express a divergent opinion. We would not even have a soul to call our own with abolition of conscience rights and freedom of religion.

The only democratic way in which a matter of such vital importance could be resolved is by a referendum. Of course the SSM lobbyists would make every effort to deny the people a voice. That is not difficult to understand in view of the fact that in every part of the world (to date without exception) where the people have been permitted to vote, the result has been for marriage between one man and one woman.

Conclusion:

It is to be hoped that the Senate Committee will base its findings on factual evidence, not on emotive rhetoric. Homosexual persons are not treated unjustly by continued recognition of the institution of marriage which has existed from time immemorial

throughout recorded history among peoples of a wide range of cultural and religious backgrounds.

The stability of our society and of our future generations rests on the family, which the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights described as “the natural and fundamental group unit of society, which is entitled to protection by society and the State”. (Article 16)

Thank you for an opportunity to participate.

Kathleen Jakovcevich