

To whom it may concern,

The proposed Bill for same-sex marriage should be rejected. I attach my understanding and reasons why the Bill should be rejected.

Marriage between a man and a woman is a natural institution, part of the natural order/natural law and existed before the State.

The State has no authority to change the definition of marriage and has an obligation to uphold and support the current definition of marriage.

Government has already undermined marriage by legislation such as the family law act which is having significant consequences for our society, particularly children.

An exorbitant amount of time is being wasted on the minority issue of same-sex marriage claims. The recent Queensland state election indicated the low priority of legal recognition of same-sex relationships by the community - the Labor government had introduced the civil partnerships bill, the LNP had indicated it would repeal the legislation - the election result was a landslide loss to the Labor government.

Instead government would make better use of its time and resources addressing the marriage crisis in heterosexual relationships in our society.

Professor Parkinson of the Sydney Law School highlights this crisis in his January 2012 paper – ‘Another Inconvenient Truth: Fragile Families and the Looming Financial Crisis for the Welfare State’. Parkinson identifies the seriousness of a society based on an increasing serial polyamorous like culture.

A copy of Parkinson’s paper may be obtained at the following link-

[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1992740](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1992740)

Parkinson makes conclusions including:

That there are multiple detrimental effects for many children in single parent families.

Family breakdown has impacts on the elderly.

The weakening of family ties has cast additional burdens on the public purse.

Fragile families lead to broken hearts.

Fragile families threaten the wellbeing of the community as a whole.

Parkinson’s concludes his paper “Turning this around will require a herculean effort, but we cannot afford not to make the attempt”.

# Submission to Senate inquiry - Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010

This document has been prepared by Michael Ord for a submission to the Senate Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010 inquiry. In this review the following headings are addressed:

1. The importance of marriage to our society.
2. Important truths about the homosexual agenda and propaganda.
  - a. What is the homosexual agenda?
  - b. What is homosexuality?
  - c. Understanding sexual orientation
  - d. Is homosexuality “normal” for “homosexuals”?
  - e. Statistics about homosexuality
  - f. Diversity
  - g. Discrimination
  - h. What is homophobia?
  - i. Tolerance
  - j. Taking advantage of Christians
  - k. Homosexual strategy for dealing with opponents
3. Queensland’s Civil Partnerships Bill 2011 – an incremental strategy to achieving same sex marriage.
4. Legalising same-sex civil unions/marriage will degrade our society.
5. False claims of human rights and equality.
  - a. Universal human rights
  - b. Confusion of modern society over human rights
  - c. Equality claims
6. Examples of misrepresented approval of the homosexual agenda.
7. Conclusion

# 1. The importance of marriage to our society

**The significance and importance of marriage will be reviewed highlighting that marriage is an important a social good rather than a personal desire of individuals**

A review of the Marriage Act highlights that whether marriage by a minister of religion or authorised celebrant marriage has the following important features:

- The binding nature of the relationship
- The union of a man and a woman voluntarily entered into for life.

These common features are a social good for our society and in particular for the raising of children. The heterosexual relationship is how our species reproduces itself. Marriage is also fundamental to a child's right to be raised by his or her own biological mum and dad.

According to Cooper a marriage scholar, marriage and marriage vows have major significance for our society. Cooper refers to John Paul II's great catecheses on marriage and the theology of the body and discusses the context of the vows made by a Christian couple when they get married [1].

Two things stand out about these vows. First, they express exclusivity, reciprocity and permanence – precisely those characteristics which ... are part and parcel of our deepest yearnings as far as human relationships go.

The second thing to notice is how these vows are expressions of spoken language. At one level, they describe what this marriage, here being contracted, is going to be all about. Yet as many thinkers have noted over the centuries, marriage vows are not just descriptive statements: they don't just describe an already existing state of affairs, or even what will be. Rather they are what philosopher John L. Austin called performative statements: They do not simply describe. They enact. They create. The statements 'I do' or 'I will take you ... to be my wife, my husband' are performative word-enactments. They actually bring a new reality into existence, a reality characterised by exclusivity, reciprocity, and permanence. "I take you as my wife/husband, and I promise to be faithful to you always, in joy and in sorrow, in sickness and in health, and to love you and honour you all the days of my life."

These features of marriage are important because they create a natural family which teaches task sharing, mutual reliance, responsibility, commitment and self-control. When marriages breakdown or marriage is not respected the opposite occurs which is very expensive to the state. Thus through marriage the state stands to prevent a great deal of dysfunction and associated cost to our community.

# 2. Important truths about the homosexual agenda

**The homosexual agenda is devilishly clever at using terms and concepts such as homosexuality, sexual orientation, diversity, multi-culturalism, inclusiveness, discrimination, homophobia and tolerance**

Truths about these terms are outlined below drawing generally from Dr Scott Lively's textbook as noted by the references.

## What is the homosexual agenda?

The homosexual activists say their goal is social acceptance. However, in all of the Bible based religions (Judaism, Christianity) sexual conduct is forbidden outside of monogamous heterosexual marriage. So to achieve acceptance, homosexuals must promote an anti-Biblical morality. To achieve this aim the agenda is therefore to defeat Christianity [2].

## What is Homosexuality?

Prior to mid 1980's homosexuality was almost universally defined as same-gender sexual conduct. By extension, a homosexual was defined as anyone who engages or desires to engage in such conduct. This definition was embraced by the 'homosexual' movement and the term 'homosexuality' had meaning only in relation to same-gender sexual behaviour. After the mid 1980's the 'homosexual' movement began to

redefine homosexuality as a normal and immutable condition equivalent to heterosexuality, a state-of-being completely independent of conduct. [3].

A series of recent studies in Sweden, Denmark, Finland and the United States have supported that the homosexual lifestyle is a voluntary preference and not innate. These studies reveal that the primary factors associated with male and female homosexuality are environmental, not genetic, and include such conditions as permissive social atmosphere, residence in an urban environment during one's teen years, separation from the same-sex parent, and for women, a college education [3].

The question of immutability is important because if homosexuality is not innate it must be acquired. And if it can be acquired, we ought to not allow homosexuality to be legitimised to our children. While there remains any shadow of doubt as to the cause of homosexuality, we must err on the side of protecting our children. Therefore we must actively discourage children from viewing homosexuality as safe and normal, when in fact it is demonstrably neither safe nor normal [3].

## **Understanding sexual orientation**

An 'orientation' describes the perspective of a subject toward an object. A sexual orientation therefore describes a person (subject) by the object toward which they are sexually attracted: a homosexual is someone orientated toward someone of the same sex, a bisexual toward both sexes, a paedophile towards children etc [4].

By definition, there are an unlimited number of sexual orientations. However, the 'homosexual' movement generally recognises only four orientations – heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, and transgendered. Why? Because to recognise other orientations — paedophilia, for example — would draw attention to the importance of distinguishing between orientation and conduct, when a major purpose of sexual orientation theory is to legitimise and protect homosexual conduct by obscuring this distinction [4].

Obscuring this distinction is most clearly seen in anti-discrimination policies that include sexual orientation. Government and corporate policy makers include sexual orientation in anti-discrimination policies in order to protect freedom of thought and speech on the basis of the claim that sexual orientation is nothing more than a state of mind. The practical effort of such policies, however, is to legitimise and protect any sexual conduct associated with an orientation, and, ironically, to suppress the thought and speech of those who object to the promotion of homosexuality [4].

The distinction between orientation and conduct is important because sexual conduct has serious public health consequences which society has both a right and an obligation to regulate. In contrast, there are no public health implications to a properly defined sexual orientation. Policy makers could respect public health considerations by adding one sentence to existing anti-discrimination laws: "*This policy shall not be construed to legitimise or protect any sexual conduct deserving of regulation in the public interest.*" The right to claim a sexual orientation should not automatically grant a license for sexual conduct [4].

Another purpose of 'homosexual agenda' sexual orientation theory is to create a context in which homosexuality and heterosexuality hold equal status. The notion of equivalency between homosexuality and heterosexuality is very important to 'homosexual' arguments because it neutralises health and safety arguments against the legitimisation of homosexuality [4].

## **Is homosexuality "normal" for "homosexuals"?**

"Homosexuals" are not created differently from everyone else. They have heterosexual bodies, with reproductive organs which are designed to make babies. Their sexual urges originate in the same chemical processes in their reproductive systems as everyone else. But for various reasons their sexual "orientation" gets focused in the wrong direction. Orientation is a state of mind, not a biological imperative [5].

## **Statistics about homosexuality**

Reliable sources of statistics on homosexuality appear to indicate the homosexual population is in the order of 1-2% and not 10% which is claimed by some homosexual groups.

Salt Shakers a Christian Ethics Action Group based in Melbourne has assembled statistics on same-sex relationships and homosexuality [6]. They make reference to a "2003 'Sex in Australia' survey of 20,000 people,

*with a special weighting to Sydney's homosexual centre. Conducted by the Australian Research Centre in Sex, Health & Society (ARCSHS) at La Trobe University.” This research identifies:*

Nationwide statistics – 1.2% of adults identify as homosexual or lesbian.

\* 1.6% of adult men identified as homosexual and 0.8% of women as lesbian.

\* 1.4% of women and 0.9% of men said they were bisexual

Another source is United States data from The National Health and Social Life Survey referenced by Dr Lively, done by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago in 1994 as establishing a trustworthy baseline:

It found that 1% of U.S. females and 1-3% of U.S. males were homosexual (Laumann, Edward O., ..., *The Social Organisation of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2000 edition, p. 293)

Dr Lively makes a poignant assertion about the homosexual population percentage:

... because homosexuality is an acquired condition one would expect to see a rise in homosexual self-identification and behaviour in a society that legitimises it, especially among the youth [7].

## **Diversity**

The homosexual movement uses ‘diversity’ as a moral statement about the way society ought to be – a harmonious social existence of different groups in society in which each group is honoured for its contribution to the whole. This feel-good emotionalism is harnessed to obscure deeply flawed reasoning. There is no comparison between a shared system of values, beliefs and traditions passed down through generations of a group of people bounded by genetic and/or religious similarities, and a set of compulsive sexual/emotional behaviours practiced by a group of random individuals who define themselves as a community by their sexual conduct [8].

## **Discrimination**

Discrimination is a word whose political redefinition originated in human rights movements. In normal usage, discrimination is synonymous with discernment, but as used in a human rights context it means irrational bias against a person. “Irrational” is the hidden qualifier in the term that distinguishes appropriate discernment from prejudice. In an enlightened society there can be no rational basis for discrimination on criteria such as race, skin colour or ethnicity. Discrimination against harmful conduct is entirely rational, and in many cases necessary. However, in modern society discrimination is now synonymous with racial prejudice in the public mind. The ‘homosexual’ movement has exploited this association to legitimize its own claims by creating the perception that they are minority group needing to be protected by anti-discrimination laws. Discrimination has been useful to ‘homosexual’ activists because the public is deeply conditioned to associate this term only with prejudice, especially racial prejudice [9].

## **What is homophobia?**

Homophobia is an obscure psychiatric term originally coined to define ‘a persons fear of his or her own same-sex attraction.’ It has been redefined and popularised by the political strategists of the ‘homosexual’ movement to characterise *all* disapproval of homosexuality as a form of hatred and fear akin to mental illness (a phobia is an anxiety disorder). The word “homophobia” is today not a scientific term, but a propaganda tool for psychological manipulation [10].

## **Tolerance**

Tolerance means putting up with someone or something you don’t like in order to serve the greater good of preserving civility. Tolerance is therefore an essential virtue in a diverse society. In the ‘homosexual’ lexicon, however, tolerance means unconditional acceptance of homosexuality. Anyone who disapproves of homosexual conduct is labelled intolerant, even those who treat self-defined ‘homosexual’ with the utmost courtesy and respect [11].

## Taking advantage of Christians

The process of converting “conservative” Christians to a pro-homosexual mindset is not blatant but very subtle. For example, the tactical accusation by ‘homosexual’ activists that Christians hate them is used to manipulate Christians. The Christians that are weak in faith or knowledge can be led to believe that compassion for homosexuals requires acceptance of homosexuality. Even worse, some can be persuaded that God created homosexuality and that it is a positive good to be celebrated, and not a challenge to overcome [12].

## Homosexual strategy for dealing with opponents

People that make a statement disagreeable to homosexuals are likely to be called homophobic or haters of ‘homosexuals’. The reason for accusing opponents of hating them is first, to put the opponents on the defensive, second to create sympathy and gain allies among non-homosexuals (especially young people), and third to preserve their own political unity by perpetrating a climate of fear among their members [13].

Homosexual activists seek to recruit young people to be their allies by styling homosexuals as victims needing protection. Homosexual activists take advantage of the humanitarian idealism of teenagers and young adults who are too immature to recognise that they are being manipulated [13].

We have seen evidence of this strategy in Brisbane in 2011 with the Gay Condom advertisement. The advertisement was purported to be about a gay men’s health issue. However, the advertisement may have been more about a homosexual propaganda opportunity. The advertisement had a picture of two homosexual men which included two subtle features. The man behind embracing the man in front is wearing a ring on the ring finger of his left hand and the man in front has a Christian Cross hanging around his neck. What was the aim of these two subtle features – was it a deliberate affront to Christianity and marriage.

If someone was to complain it was inappropriate to have condom advertisement at bus shelters it would be an opportunity for homosexual activists and their supporters to portray the complaint as homophobic and gay haters. Well this is what happened when a community member, a mother and grandmother who had previously instigated a campaign to make all outdoor advertising “G” rated [14] made a complaint about the condom advertisement in public view of children. This community member was berated by the usual homosexual agenda instigated propaganda. Queensland Treasurer Andrew Fraser said:

*ACL needed to get with the times. “Check the calendar, it’s 2011,” he said. “I think we should call it for what it is and this is basic homophobia.*

Queensland Premier Anna Bligh lent her support to the Rip and Roll campaign on Twitter by retweeting a comment from a Gold Coast resident who stated: “Dear #adshel, thousands of united Australians are stronger than a handful of homophobes. RT [retweet] if you agree #ripnroll.”

The attacks on the community member should be seen for what they were intended – to put her on the defensive and to create sympathy for homosexuals and manipulate the public.

The homosexual activist’s response to the complaint on the advertisement assessed by Advertising Standards Bureau appears to highlight two points made by Dr Lively, firstly that homosexual activists take advantage of the humanitarian idealism of teenagers and young adults and secondly homosexual activists are involved in the abortion industry. In the Case Report the Advertisers Response refers to:

*3 FPQ (2011) Evidence briefing: Parent’s views on sexuality and relationships education, Brisbane, Family Planning Queensland and states ... and the vast majority of young people support them (lesbian and gay rights). Queensland’s young people are leading the way in accepting lesbian and gay people and in some cases have a greater and more sophisticated understanding of sexuality than their parents do.*

In relation to the first point the homosexual activist’s response appears to suggest he is taking advantage of the idealism and vulnerability of young people. In relation to the second point I understand Family Planning Queensland is an organisation that performs abortions.

### 3. Queensland's Civil Partnerships Bill 2011 – an incremental strategy to achieving same-sex marriage

**The Queensland Civil Partnerships Bill 2011 is discussed identifying how it is part of an incremental strategy to achieve same-sex marriage, to change the definition of marriage and degrade society's morals.**

The Queensland Civil Partnerships Bill is part of the homosexual agenda to achieve same-sex marriage. The Australian Family Association submission to the Parliamentary Committee stated at item 2:

#### 2. Civil unions are part of an incremental strategy to redefine marriage

Where supporters of same-sex marriage do support civil unions, it is only as part of an incremental strategy to eventually redefine marriage. Writing in the New York Review of Books in 2009, reviewer David Cole had this to say about the decision by two US state supreme courts to redefine marriage:

*The fact that the legislature had already extended virtually all the benefits and rights of marriage to same-sex couples under the rubric of civil unions or domestic partnerships was crucial to the legal victories.*

Indeed, Cole lays out the incremental strategy in explicit terms:

*In Gay Marriage, [the authors] ... advocate a strategy focused on civil unions, although on more pragmatic grounds. Citing an article by Professor Kees Waaldjik, who helped develop the strategy behind the Netherlands' recognition of same-sex marriage, [the authors] argue that the best way forward is incremental.*

*On this view, states (or nations) are likely to recognise same-sex marriage only after a step-by-step process in which they first eliminate laws criminalising homosexual sodomy, then amend anti-discrimination laws to cover sexual orientation, then extend some government employment-related benefits to same-sex partners of civil servants, and then enact a domestic partnership or civil union law.*

Clearly here in Australia we are already some way down the incremental road. Civil unions are not a compromise destination. They are a stepping-stone to the total redefinition of marriage. If you don't think marriage should be redefined, then you simply can't support same-sex civil unions.

Reviewing the Queensland governments Civil Partnerships Bill 2011 identifies this legislation involves two paths to a union:

1. An application form is filled out by two persons and after the end of the cooling-off period the civil partnership is registered. This process is somewhat like buying a car with a cooling off period after signing a contract.
2. A declaration of a civil partnership is made in front of a notary and a witness (a form of a ceremony). The specific requirements are that each person must make a statement to each other that names both persons and acknowledges that they are freely entering into a civil partnership with each other.

Comparing the civil partnership union to marriage identifies the civil partnership union is a much lower standard form of a relationship. The Queensland government has introduced this legislation following demands from homosexual activists. The Queensland government has also noted that the civil partnerships union is an option and a benefit for heterosexual couples. However, given the lower standard of this union compared to marriage the ensuing result is likely to be the undermining of marriage and the continuing degradation of morals in our society?

#### **4. Legalising same-sex civil unions/marriage will change and degrade our society**

The claims for legalising same-sex civil unions and same-sex marriage are not claims for marriage as we currently know marriage (see point 1 above), it is a claim to change marriage and to change our society.

Dr Lively identifies that the cultural war in western society includes a war over morality involving conflict between two irreconcilable views on sexuality. On one side is the natural law perspective, embodied for most people in the West by the traditional Judeo-Christian sexual ethic: monogamous heterosexual marriage and the natural family. On the other side stands the 'homosexual' ethic of sexual license. Sexual license in the simplest sense is merely the social acceptance of sex outside of marriage, but in its fullest sense it includes all forms of sexual deviance [15]. On the consequences of these views Dr Lively states:

These opposing views are entirely incompatible and contradictory. It is easy to see that the institution of marriage cannot thrive in a society where sexual indulgence has become a fundamental value. Men in such a society will have small incentive to assume the burdens associated with lifelong, faithful marriage and fatherhood, since they are surrounded by sexually promiscuous and available women. Nor will they do the hard work to make marriage and family relationships successful and deeply fulfilling to themselves, since they are distracted by a pervasive cultural message that fulfilment lies in sexual gratification alone [15].

Dr Lively identifies that to achieve sexual license the homosexual movement strategy is to replace the Judeo-Christian moral foundation of Western civilisation with an alternative morality that places no restrictions on sexual conduct [16]. He identifies the consequences of this alternative morality:

When a society embraces sexual "freedom" it severely weakens its natural-family infrastructure because many men and women who are easily tempted by nature are unable to remain faithful to their spouse and children in the absence of strong social pressure to get and stay married. The resulting disintegration of social and emotional stability increases with each generation (as we have proven by experience here in America) [16] (and also in Australia).

Dr Lively also highlights:

There are other consequences to a free people when internal moral constraint is devalued and self-gratification is exalted. In other similar ages of license, the state has grown proportionately stronger and more intrusive to compensate for the decreased will (and ability) of the people to control themselves. Such downward spirals, involving the moral, political and spiritual life of a nation, have usually ended in some form of violent social catastrophe unless their progress is checked by the emergence of moral leadership and popular reform within the nation [17].

Recognising same-sex unions/marriage will have serious implications for children directly and indirectly. Any recognition is likely to result in more children being raised by homosexual couples. In a homosexual relationship children cannot be conceived naturally and must be obtained by fundamentally dysfunctional means involving a third party and reproduction technology. Children with a homosexual couple would be denied a biological mother and/or father.

Any steps to legalise homosexual relationships is also likely to result in homosexual activists pressuring schools to teach children that a homosexual relationship is equivalent to a heterosexual relationship. In the United States the states of Massachusetts and California, are two examples where the state public school system now legitimise homosexuality to school children through official taxpayer-funded programs [18].

We have seen the commencement of the homosexual agenda's in Australian Schools. The 'Safe Schools Coalition Victoria' has produced "*Supporting Sexual Diversity in Schools: A Guide*" [19].

As mentioned above the homosexual movement has a strategy of taking advantage of the humanitarian idealism of teenagers and young adults. Dr Lively notes this tactic also serves to recruit young people into the 'homosexual' lifestyle. In relation to you people and the homosexual movement he notes:

It is fairly common for young people to experience same-sex attraction during their teenage years (studies shown as many as 25% experience this). For most, such feelings go away naturally with maturity. But if a



young person with these feelings happens to fall in with a homosexual activist group, he or she can easily begin to identify with the 'homosexual' lifestyle and enter into a homosexual relationship [20].

## 5. False claims of human rights and equality

**Claims for same-sex marriage maintain it is a human right – one section of the community being able to enjoy the same rights as others (i.e. equality)**

I will review the claims of human rights and equality by reviewing human rights as it is applied universally, by reference to a religious authority on rights and a review of equality claims.

### Universal human rights

I understand human rights are “commonly understood as inalienable fundamental rights to which a person is inherently entitled simply because she or he is a human being”

The International Bill of Human rights consists of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

I understand the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has the following articles structure:

- Articles 1-2, are the foundation blocks, with their principles of dignity, liberty, equality and brotherhood
- Articles 3-11, constitutes rights of the individual, such as the right to life and prohibition of slavery
- Articles 12-17, constitutes the rights of the individual in civil and political society
- Articles 18-21, is concerned with spiritual, public and political freedoms such as freedom of religion and freedom of association
- Articles 22-27 sets out social, economic and cultural rights
- Articles 28-30 bind the structure together

Claims are made that homosexual couples should be able to enjoy the same opportunities of heterosexual couples to marry or have legal recognition of their relationship etc. I do not see where this claim is relevant to a human right in the Articles noted above.

I highlight that Article 16 (1) states: “*Men and women of full age, without limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution*” and Article 16 (3) states “*The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and State*”.

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights addresses the following core provisions:

- Principle of progressive realisation
- Labour rights
- The right to social security
- The right to family life
- The right to an adequate standard of living
- The right to health
- The right to free education
- The right to participation in cultural life

Again in relation to these provisions I am not aware on what basis that claims could be made that the homosexual community is being excluded from a fundamental right.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights addresses the following core provisions:

- Rights to physical integrity
- Liberty and security of person
- Procedural fairness and rights of the accused
- Individual liberties
- Political rights

In particular I note:

- Article 23 – That the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State. The right of men and women of marriageable age to marry and to found a family shall be recognised.

Again in relation to these provisions I understand there is no basis for claims of ‘rights’ for legal recognition of homosexual relationships.

Perhaps some of the ‘human rights claims’ of not extending marriage or legal recognition of relationships of heterosexual couples to homosexual couples relates to claims of discrimination. Discrimination has been discussed above and is considered again below.

But what is discrimination? Discrimination is deciding between choices or options. “In the context of civil rights (relevant part of human rights), discrimination means accepting or rejecting people based on criteria such as race or colour. Discrimination based on race or skin colour is morally wrong because there is no legitimate reason for it – the criteria are both morally neutral and immutable. Such discrimination springs from irrational prejudice [21]”.

I believe it is reasonable and responsible to use rational discrimination between heterosexual and homosexual relationships in regards to marriage and legal recognition of relationships. “Homosexuality involves voluntary sexual conduct that has negative personal and social consequences. It is perfectly reasonable and responsible to discriminate against homosexuality on religious, moral, sociological and public health grounds [22]”.

## **Confusion of modern society over human rights**

The human rights claims by homosexual activists highlight the confusion of modern society over human rights. The homosexual agenda which make claims to enjoy what they call the same rights as heterosexuals is not a human rights claim.

Cardinal Pell highlights in his book that confusion about rights in democratic societies stems from a fundamental confusion about freedom [23]. Pell refers to the emphasis by Pope John Paul in *Evangelium vitae* on this point:

... the prevailing concept of democratic freedom is radically individualistic, “exalt[ing] the isolated individual in an absolute way,” giving “no place to solidarity, to openness to others and service of them. Coupled with this idea of freedom as absolute autonomy is the fading of the notion of universal moral principles and the decline of binding moral truths. “Freedom negates and destroys itself, and becomes a factor leading to the destruction of others, when it no longer recognises and respects its essential link with the truth. If each individual becomes “the sole and indisputable point of reference for his own choices, [not] the truth about good and evil, but only his subjective and changeable opinion,” interest, or whim, “social life ventures on the shifting sands of complete relativism (i.e. belief in changeable standards – the belief that concepts such as right and wrong, goodness and badness, or truth and falsehood are not absolute but change from culture to culture and situation to situation.” As agreement on foundational moral principles is taken to be impossible, majority votes and the decisions of judges determine contentious issues absolutely. This is not a sufficient basis on which to safeguard the long-term public legitimacy of the law.

Pell highlights that "... modern rights are very often not human rights. They are not claims based on the truth about human good and common good. Rather, they are products of convention or fashion, based on no more than an exaggerated claim for autonomy and the chosen life-style-values of minorities [24]."

## Equality claims

Claims for 'equality' are part of the homosexual goal which has evolved over time as the movement has gained power: from tolerance, to acceptance, to favoured status.

Steps have been taken in Australia and other Western Nations to remove references to father and mother, husband and wife and replace by parent and partner. "For homosexuals claims of equality are all about eliminating all real or perceived preferences for heterosexuals. Thus for example hetero-sexist words and phrases such as "Mum and Dad," "husband and wife" are replaced by Parent (or Partner) A and "Parent (or Partner) B, and homosexual partners are allowed to adopt children [25]."

In Australia as in the United States "a reason offered for espousing the premise of equivalency is that it allows 'homosexual' activists to exploit the civil rights doctrines which would not otherwise apply to them. Discrimination, in the civil rights context, means treating equal parties unequally. If homosexuals and heterosexuals are assumed to be equal, then it is unfair to deny homosexuals all the benefits that heterosexuals enjoy [26]."

Some supporters of homosexual claims appear to be dismissive of arguments of religious prohibition. However, arguments of religious prohibition against homosexual conduct are on solid ground. In the words of Bible scholar Dr James De Young, as quoted by Dr Lively "Throughout Scripture, condemnation of homosexuality is consistent, universal and absolute [27]."

Some supporters of homosexual claims also assert that homosexual claims for legal recognition of their relationships will not affect others (heterosexual marriage). As indicated above I believe some of greatest concerns about legalising homosexual relationships are that it will result in a continuing lowering of morals in our society. Dr Lively states:

The 'homosexual' movement advances its agenda by promoting 'sexual freedom' in society and culture. In promoting 'sexual freedom,' the homosexual movement purposefully corrupts public morality and undermines Christian efforts to promote personal self-restraint and marital faithfulness ...

Homosexual activists also promote heterosexual immorality because every act of sexual sin by heterosexuals serves the 'homosexual' interest in lessening the public will to uphold public morality (no one wants to be called a hypocrite). An example of 'homosexual' promotion of heterosexuality immorality is seen in their aggressive defence and involvement in the abortion industry. The 'homosexual' activists know that preserving the homosexual's option to destroy unborn life is essential to maintaining "sexual freedom" as a social norm. If the heterosexual women lost their choice to legally kill their unborn offspring, the resulting inevitable shift of emphasis from self gratification to family responsibility in such a large section of the population would change the entire culture [28].

Supporters of homosexual claims are also dismissive Christian's views. Again Dr Lively captures why this is done:

The homosexual agenda seeks to discount Christians and degrade religion. Why is this done? The explanation is that homosexual activists have developed sophisticated tactics for politically neutralising Christians which is a fact lost on the most of the Church and Christians. The implicit goal of the 'homosexual' movement is the replacement of western society's Judeo-Christian sexual ethic (i.e. marriage and the natural family) with an anything-goes sexual morality and that homosexual political activism has been the main driving force behind the anti-family movement (including the abortion and porn industries) [29].

## 6. Example of misrepresented approval of the homosexual agenda

**It is disappointing that there appears to be a lack of truth involved some of the arguments for supporting legal recognition of same-sex relationships.**

Mr Kerry Shine MP Toowoomba North stated in his reasons for supporting the Queensland Civil Partnerships Bill 2011:

ref para 6 – *'Statement from Catholic Bishops of England and Wales .... believe civil partnerships successfully provide a legal protection to those in same-sex relationships ... Explaining the Church's position on gay marriage ... we are very committed to the notion of equality so that people are treated the same across all activities of life [30].'*

Before making a conclusion on the asserted Bishops statement I believe it is important to consider the context in which the asserted statement was made.

Blessed John Paul II's biographer, George Weigel told CNA on Dec 7 that [31]:

He disagrees with the Bishops of England and Wales's decision not to oppose legal recognition for homosexual unions as part of their campaign to uphold marriage. Same-sex civil partnerships became legal in the U.K. in 2004, but the issue of same-sex "marriage" has become more prominent in recent months.

In my experience in the United States, this notion of civil unions has always been kind of half way house to so called 'gay marriages'.

Weigel also notes that:

Archbishop Nichols' comments drew criticism from some high-profile Catholic commentators in the United Kingdom who pointed out that his statement seemed to contradict the 2003 advice of the Vatican's Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith which was then headed by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger.

In their document "Consideration Regarding Proposals to Give Legal Recognition to Unions between Homosexual Persons," it states that "in those situations where homosexual unions have been legally recognized or have been given the legal status and rights belonging to marriage, clear and emphatic opposition is a duty."

A Vatican Insider news item [32] titled "England, Archbishop Nichols is under attack" stated the following:

The Archbishop of Westminster, Monsignor Vincent Nichols, is accused of not respecting the Vatican's position on same-sex marriage. According to some British Catholic weekly the archbishop had "praised" 'civil partnership', an institution which has been in force across the Channel for eight years now, and recognizes same-sex couples some rights, comparable to what in Italy would have been the "Dico" (Cohabitation rights and responsibilities).

The accusation, in some ways, is surprising: Nichols, who is also president of the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, is considered one of the European bishops who is most in line with the thinking of Pope Benedict XVI and has organized the Pope's trip to British soil, which proved to be a success despite the deep skepticism expressed by the media and public opinion on the eve. Nichols has also come under attack for clearly saying 'no' to the proposal made by David Cameron's Conservative government to introduce gay marriage in England.

The news item states the Catholic Herald accused Nichols of "supporting" civil partnerships, an accusation that Nichols subsequently dismissed. A spokesman for the archbishop when interviewed by Vatican Insider once again dismissed the accusations, stressing that:

The whole matter should be read in light of the proposal of the Conservative government to "change the legal definition of marriage": "It is to defend marriage that the archbishop acknowledged the existence of 'civil partnership' between persons of the same sex that already offer the same legal framework of marriage. He did not speak 'in defense of unions between same-sex' nor did he 'praise' them, as some have suggested. He simply acknowledged what has already been established by law (human *law, my emphasis*).

The above detail clarifies the context in which the statements were made by the Catholic Bishops of England and Wales which was clearly not relevant to Queensland Civil Partnership Bill 2011.

Noting that the submission by the John Paul II Centre for Family and Life (agency for the Catholic Archdiocese of Brisbane) to the Parliamentary Committee inquiry indicated the Civil Partnerships Bill should be rejected, any assertion of Catholic Church support for the Bill is not credible or honest.

## 7. Conclusion

I believe that homosexual activist's claims for civil partnerships and same-sex marriage are an example of what Cardinal Pell refers to "as the determined lobbies that push various 'liberation agendas' which exploit the confusion in the public mind about private and public morality, and are particularly adept at intimidating politicians with this confusion [33]."

The following quote by Cardinal Pell in the words of Finnis in his book (Law, Morality and Sexual Orientation) identifies the responsibility of the state and how the confusion is exploited [33]:

The responsibility of the state to "identify, encourage, facilitate and support the truly worthwhile (including moral virtue)" and to "discourage and hinder the harmful and evil" is treated as being equivalent to the state's using criminal sanctions against private and consensual acts between adults.

In this way, the proper instinct for the law not to intrude into private lives is used to distort and to change the entire public environment, particularly that surrounding marriage and the raising of children.

I trust this document clarifies "key truths" related to "claims" for legal recognition of same-sex relationships. The "truths" are clear - these "claims" should be rejected.



**Michael Ord**

BE Civil

Community positions - Australian Family Association, Qld President; Lone Fathers Association, Brisbane Chapter President

## References

- [1] Paper – Sex and Society, Adam G. Cooper, Australian Family Association National Conference 2008
- [2] Redeeming the Rainbow, Dr Scott Lively, p63
- [3] *ibid*, p99-101
- [4] *ibid*, p101-102
- [5] *ibid*, p3
- [6] Salt Shakers website accessed 12 February 2012: Statistics – same-sex relationships and homosexuality: <http://saltshakers.org.au/issues/homosexuality/199-statistics-homosexuality>
- [7] Redeeming the Rainbow, Dr Scott Lively, p5
- [8] *ibid*, p101-102
- [9] *ibid*, p105

- [10] ibid, p106
- [11] ibid, p107
- [12] ibid, p22
- [13] ibid, p70
- [14] Outdoor advertising 'G' rated campaign website access 12 February 2012: <http://www.wendyfrancis.com.au/2011/10/outdoor-advertising-should-be-g-rated/>
- [15] Redeeming the Rainbow, Dr Scott Lively, p57
- [16] ibid, p69
- [17] ibid, p61
- [18] ibid, p63
- [19] The 'Safe Schools Coalition Victoria' has produced "*Supporting Sexual Diversity in Schools: A Guide*" web site accessed 12 February 2012: <http://www.safeschoolscoalitionvictoria.org.au>
- [20] Redeeming the Rainbow, Dr Scott Lively, p71
- [21] ibid, p5
- [22] ibid, p6
- [23] God and Caesar, Cardinal George Pell, p18
- [24] ibid, p62
- [25] Redeeming the Rainbow, Dr Scott Lively, p63
- [26] ibid, p102
- [27] ibid, p29
- [28] ibid, p8
- [29] ibid, p19
- [30] Kerry Shine MP, web site accessed 12 February 2012: [Reasons for support Civil Partnership Bill](#)
- [31] Web site accessed 12 February 2012: <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-religion/2818397/posts>
- [32] Web site accessed 12 February 2012: <http://vaticaninsider.lastampa.it/en/homepage/world-news/detail/articolo/gran-bretagna-great-britain-gran-bretana-chiesa-church-iglesia-10572/>
- [33] p22-23, God and Caesar, Cardinal George Pell