

INQUIRY INTO SAME SEX MARRIAGE LAW IN NSW

Organisation: Protect Marriage Australia

Date received: 4/03/2013

Protect Marriage Australia

One Man - One Woman  One Man - One Woman  One Man - One Woman

Protect Marriage Australia

Submission

on the

Same Sex Marriage Law in NSW

to the

Committee Director

Standing Committee on Social Issues

Legislative Council

Parliament House Macquarie Street Sydney NSW 2000

Telephone: (02) 9230 2800

Email: samesexmarriage@parliament.nsw.gov.au

Website: <http://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/samesexmarriage>

Contacts

Protect Marriage Australia

1 March 2013

Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	3
2. Mission and Vision	3
3. Abolition of Marriage through Redefinition.....	4
4. Protected Human Rights of the Natural Family and Marriage	4
5. Unintended Consequences Flow from Flawed Marriage Model	6
6. Parliamentary inquiries platform for homosexual marriage.....	7
7. No Barriers, an open door to Polygamy and e-Marriage	8
8. No Barriers, an open door to Pedophilia	8
9. Chilling effect on Religious Freedom and Expression in Public	9
10. Marriage Equality a misnomer	10
11. Equality or eradication of innate differences.....	12
12. De-gendering marriage and family	12
13. The disappearance of individual rights	13
14. Sexual Orientation, Gender Diversity.....	14
15. Christian objections	14
16. Cultural & Ethnic objections	14
17. Existing marriages	15

1. Executive Summary

The aims of the same sex marriage proponents in authoring a Bill to enact homosexual marriage in Australia, is to promote and normalise the homosexual lifestyle and destroy the foundations of the family by breaking the link between marriage and sexuality.

Protect Marriage Australia rejects any bid by the State of NSW and the NSW Government to create parallel systems of marriage in competition with the Federal Marriage Act. We reject completely the need and the push for same-sex (homosexual) “marriage” laws. We reject any marriage laws that sanction homosexual unions purporting to be equally married to heterosexual couples. We reject homosexual marriage completely as it would mean the abolition of traditional one man one woman marriage and extinction of children’s right to a mother and father.

Protect Marriage Australia has a clear understanding of the threat to personal liberty, human rights and fundamental freedoms posed by such advocacy and the leftists Marxists’ project to erode gender and personal identity in order to impose a Totalitarian State and control over individuals. This Bill represents a significant and harmful threat to the fabric of family in law and in life, and is a stepping stone to the One World Government (World parliament) espoused by Senator Bob Brown, the leader of the Greens Party. It is now a reality that the recently revised Labor party platform also poses the same threat and has the same aim of State control and global dominion over persons and all peoples.

Marriage and the natural family pre-date the State. The Government can regulate marriage but cannot legitimately alter its meaning and function. To do so is to create a legal fiction and alter the definition of Family and the whole human rights framework which evolved from the natural biological Family.

Just Discernment and Just Discrimination are good; we positively discriminate in favour of children’s best interests to have a natural family with mum and dad and should continue to do so.

Children have a right to a mother and father in conventional traditional marriage and marriage law and this right and the reciprocal rights of mothers and father to their children and each other should not be effaced by a law that defines marriage as limited to the adult relationships between two persons.

The marriage reformers are making the same mistake as the no-fault divorce reformers in using an incomplete and flawed model of marriage that points to adult relationships only where children are consequential and procreation is no longer the primary purpose of marriage for society.

2. Mission and Vision

Protect Marriage Australia is an online community of Australian citizens dedicated to the task of preserving traditional one man one woman marriage and the natural family. Our voting preferences

are strongly tied to the extent to which major political parties in Australia protect and foster the human rights and best interests of children, parents and families. We are an active group willing to lobby and take targeted political action to protect the established world wide human rights framework that emerged from the Universal Declaration of human Rights and we will take grassroots action against attempts to re-frame, re-interpret, modify or add to the accepted body of fundamental human rights. Our mission extends to appropriate action when the threat to existing human rights such as the right of men and women to marry, emanates from Government, activist courts, UN Treaty monitoring committees, internationally funded radical Marxists groups such as GetUp.org , homosexual activists, radical feminists, or from any other such radical groups trying to ideologically transform and radicalise the natural family onto an unsuspecting public.

3. Abolition of Marriage through Redefinition

Children need a mother and father – when the State recognises homosexual marriage, it attenuates the connection between marriage and children. The role of the State in regulating marriage is diminished as it is hard to see any role in the regulation of emotional bonds; children yes, but emotions, no.

*"If same-sex partnerships were recognised as marriages, however, that ideal would be abolished from our law: no civil institution would any longer reinforce the notion that children need both a mother and father; that men and women on average bring different gifts to the parenting enterprise; and boys and girls need and tend to benefit from fathers and mothers in different ways."*¹

Redefining marriage would teach society, including children and adolescents that no relationship is better than any other for raising children and that marriage is fundamentally about adults' emotional unions, not bodily union or children. Since emotions are variable, viewing marriage as an emotional union would tend to increase marital instability and the incidence of separation and divorce.

4. Protected Human Rights of the Natural Family and Marriage

One of the greatest intellectuals of the twentieth century, French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss (28/11/1908-30/10/2009) wrote about the social institution of marriage²:

"...what we have in mind when we use the word family. It would then seem that this word serves to designate a social group offering at least three characteristics:

(1) it finds its origins in marriage;

(2) it consists in husband, wife and children born out of their wedlock, though it can be conceived that other relatives may find their place close to that nuclear group; and

¹ Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy Vol.34 Nr 245, Pg 263.

² "The Family" by Claude Levi-Strauss, from MAN, CULTURE, AND SOCIETY, REVISED EDITION by Harry L. Shapiro, copyright ©1969 by Oxford University Press

(3) the family members are united together by;

(a) legal bond,

(b) economic, religious, and other kinds of rights and obligations,

(c) a precise network of sexual rights and prohibitions, and a varying and diversified amount of psychological feelings such as love, affection, respect, awe, etc.

Clearly the origin, the genesis of the natural family is one that begets children through heterosexual marriage, that is, the exclusive union of one man and one woman in marriage, being two biologically opposite but complementary sexes.

This anthropologically true model of the family founded in marriage is protected by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which contains three explicit statements and one implicit one about the family³. For most people the family is their primary community of birth and growth, and the drafters of the Declaration were very keen on protecting this particular community.

Firstly, the third paragraph of Article 16 tells us that

(3) "The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State."

Article 16 states also states that;

(1) Men and women of full age, without any 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

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

The second paragraph of Article 25 implies protection of the family when it states that;

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Despite these profound statements of human rights, Australian Federal Governments have recently systematically worked to extinguish the language of the natural family from Federal Statutes, removing words such as “mother”, “father”, “husband”, “wife”, “man”, “woman” and “spouse” that collectively help define in law, the gendered natural family.

All Homosexual Marriage (Same-sex Marriage) Bills put before the Federal Parliament in the past 3 years have used language which actively sought to remove gender from the marriage equation to obfuscate the truth of the natural human family. Rather than protect the family as the UN Declaration implores us to do, de-gendering Marriage laws reduces the marriage contract to a contract based on the familial relationship of two persons, the union of two adults. Without mention of the exclusive union of one Man and one Woman entered into for life, Husbands and Wives, whose procreative potential for children and unique contribution as mothers and fathers is implicit in Marriage Law,

³ Articles 12, 16, 23, 25, Universal Declaration of Human Rights
Protect Marriage Australia Submission on Same Sex Marriage Law in NSW

would instead be distanced from the legal protection and definition of family by a radically de-gendered family construct of the marriage of “two persons”.

The redefinition of marriage which is the subject of this NSW parliamentary inquiry follows the same path of creating another form of marriage in conflict with the Federal Marriage Act and contrary to socially, religiously and culturally accepted understandings of marriage.

It would bode against the protection and special status afforded to the family, mothers and fathers and their children in existing Marriage laws and through the UN Declaration of Human Rights.

5. Unintended Consequences Flow from Flawed Marriage Model

In 1974 the Australian Federal Government under Prime Minister Gough Whitlam and Labour, reformed divorce laws, ushering in a new system of “no fault” or “easy” divorce. This so called reform effectively nullified the marriage contract, removing proper grounds for divorce such as desertion and adultery and allowing couples to walk out of their marriage agreements easily and with no redress or compensation for the aggrieved spouses who were harmed in the process. Marriage became the only partnership in law that is legally unenforceable. Unilateral divorce is the reality of this so called “reform” but was incorrectly and deliberately promoted as “no fault” to gain public acceptance and imply that low conflict, even amicable divorces would result. History shows that unilateral divorce along with the introduction of the Family Court, caused divorce in Australia to rapidly increase and continue to increase throughout the 1970’s into the present era.

The availability of no-fault divorce led to increased divorce rates and influenced the rise in the welfare state, the feminisation of poverty, increases in children born out of wedlock, children of divorce and children with no contact with one parent (usually their fathers), the advent of laws related to spousal and child support, child custody and shared parenting, and the need for Family Relationship Centres for mediating family arrangements after separation. The massive increase in fatherless children, especially affected boys and young men who make up the majority of persons incarcerated for crimes in Australia and have one trait in common, that being the absence of fathers in their lives and during their formative years.

The results of no-fault divorce were not anticipated because the reformers did not have a proper theory of marriage. They acted upon a belief that marriage is the domain of lovers instead of the domain of children and failed to account for the social and economic realities of marriage and hence were unable to predict how unilateral divorce would affect behaviour. The same mistakes made by the no-fault divorce reformers are now being made by the advocates of homosexual marriage.

The proponents of homosexual marriage use the same flawed reasoning, the same arguments and simplistic marriage models used by the no-fault divorce reformers, namely that marriage is based on ‘loving relationships’ instead of being an institution designed around and in support of ‘procreation and children’.

This prior adverse experience with liberalised divorce followed the law of unintended consequences. It should caution us all against assuming that a radical redefinition and change in the meaning in marriage will have only beneficial consequences. Past experience has shown that removing marital

norms is detrimental to society. As children fare better on most indicators of health and wellbeing when reared by their wedded biological parents, the further erosion of marital norms would adversely affect children. Redefining marriage would significantly weaken the institution and social pressure that it provides for husbands to remain with their wives and children.

Homosexual marriage advocates and reformers wish to de-gender marriage, to sever the link between organic union and reproduction that is proven to be best for children. Child centric marriage as we know now would be replaced by a model that values sexual choice and variety, cutting the link to children.

In this way homosexual marriage advocates if successful, would destroy the foundations of the family by breaking the link between marriage and sexuality and eliminate the inherent right of children to a mother and a father.

6. Parliamentary inquiries platform for homosexual marriage

A common theme runs through this NSW Legislative Council inquiry and other similar Federal Senate and House of Representatives inquiries in relation to same sex marriage Bills.

Parliamentarians are seen to be disproportionately pandering to the radical left whose project to redefine the family and the institutions of our Judeo Christian Tradition is in full swing, aided by a complaisant media, messaging that uses omission on a gross scale to conflate same sex marriage, with traditional marriage with simplistic notions of the “love of two people” wherein children are always omitted from the debate.

In responding to the on-line communities set up by leftist socialist lobby groups such as GetUp, a minority group has undue influence and is preferentially favoured over and above the views and lived experiences of married couples and families throughout all of NSW and Australia. Nearly all submissions by the GetUp group are in the form of multiple uploads and standard web forms and are heavily influenced by a youth culture that finds its expression in online group dynamics and group behaviour. The debate over marriage reform needs to look seriously at the unintended consequences to marriage, family and children that would follow, rather than be gauged by web site hits, snap polls and presses of web site ‘like’ or ‘follow me’ buttons.

On such a serious reform proposal, Australians deserve a robust and extensive debate before parliamentarians make any change to marriage and given the rise of cluster groups in the NSW and other Australian parliaments, all trying to force a change without recourse to the will of the people, Protect Marriage Australia advocates that nothing less than a national referendum is needed to consider and adjudicate the question of whether or not to abolish traditional marriage in favour of a genderless, motherless, fatherless marriage model where children are secondary and non core to marriage.

On the question of parallel forms of marriage in the States and Federally existing concurrently, it is clear that the NSW Bill should it become law, would create a dual system of marriage laws in conflict with each other, either in the legal sense or through definitions and semantics, and would seriously undermine traditional marriage in Australia. This alone is reason enough not to proceed

with laws that have an activist and disruptive agenda and that would ultimately be challenged in the High Court. In such activism we see the bold face of minority groups trying to radicalise society with their single minded agenda without regard for the effect on families and children throughout our nation.

7. No Barriers, an open door to Polygamy and e-Marriage

The re-definition of marriage would obscure the goods of traditional marriage forever. It would also remove any logical argument against the future legalisation of polygamy, the marriage of three or more people. In fact when marriage is reduced to any "two people" or "two partners" there is no justification left to discriminate against three or more people, a group who want to marry.

Why then stop marriage reform at the union of any two or more people? It could be reasoned, argued and legislated to also allow "e-marriage", that is, "updating the law governing marriage formation to recognise the shift in interactions from real to virtual life⁴". Couples, triples and groups would engage in e-rituals and shop the internet across borders for multi jurisdictional internet based marriage contracts. Conceivably persons could marry anyone they wish across great distances and choose which State's laws would authorise their marriage. This "democratisation" of marriage over the internet would functionally be a disaster for children, as children would further be commoditised as one of the perks of or add-ons to marriage. E-divorce would make a mockery of true marriage and further impoverish children and grow the welfare state.

Whilst homosexual marriage proponents would welcome a permissive culture of e-marriage, it is obvious that once gendered marriage between one man and one woman is replaced by the marriage of any two people, there is no logical barrier, no line that can be drain in sand to prevent the slippery slope of further radicalisation of traditional marriage and the many unintended consequences that will result.

8. No Barriers, an open door to Pedophilia

It should be note that many same sex couples have only good willed intentions in their advocacy for "equal marriage" despite the reality that such unions could never be equal to the biological reality of the common form of marriage which underpins and propagates the natural family and culture from one generation to the next. There is however a more seriously dark side to such lobbying efforts.

The abolition of traditional marriage through homosexual marriage, like anti-bullying programs and the anti discrimination legislation advanced by the Federal Labour Government, have a deeper and more urgent relevance for the radical homosexual lobby and extreme far left groups like the Greens Party.

⁴ E-Marriage: Breaking The Marriage Monopoly, Adam Candeub and Mae Kuykendall, Michigan State University College of Law, Legal Studies Research Paper Series, No. 07-25
Protect Marriage Australia Submission on Same Sex Marriage Law in NSW

"Why would we push anti-bullying programs or social studies classes that teach kids about the historical contributions of famous queers unless we wanted to deliberately educate children to accept queer sexuality as normal?," wrote Daniel Villarreal on Queerty.com, a website that promotes the gay agenda.

"We want educators to teach future generations of children to accept queer sexuality. In fact, our very future depends on it. Recruiting children? You bet we are," he added.⁵

A Self-Styled 'Gay Revolutionary' offered this challenge to heterosexuals in America:

*"We shall sodomize your sons, emblems of your feeble masculinity, of your shallow dreams and vulgar lies. We shall seduce them in your schools, in your dormitories, in your gymnasiums, in your locker rooms, in your sports arenas, in your seminaries, in your youth groups, ...wherever men are with men together. Your sons shall become our minions and do our bidding. They will be recast in our image. They will come to crave and adore us. All churches who condemn us will be closed. Our holy gods are handsome young men. ...We shall be victorious because we are fuelled with the ferocious bitterness of the oppressed..." **Michael Swift - Boston Gay Community News - February 15-21, 1987 (From the Traditional Values Coalition Special Report, Vol. 18., No. 10)***

And further;

"All laws banning homosexual activity will be revoked [anti-discrimination ordinances, minority status based on homosexuality]. Instead, legislation shall be passed which engenders love between men [graphic "pro-gay" sex and AIDS education, mandatory "sensitivity training,"].

All homosexuals must stand together as brothers; we must be united artistically, philosophically, socially, politically and financially [the multi-faceted and powerful "gay rights" movement]. We will triumph only when we present a common face to the vicious heterosexual enemy [suppression of internecine conflicts and other negative information about homosexuals by the homosexualist dominated media].

If you dare to cry faggot, fairy, queer, at us, we will stab you in your cowardly hearts and defile your dead puny bodies ["hate crimes," speech codes, fines]."⁶

Already in academic circles there is agitation to decriminalise paedophilia and legitimise adult-child relationships as another valid form of human relationship. This potentially places children, boys and adolescent boys and girls at great risk as societal taboos against "child love" and incest are replaced with societal and eventually legal sanction.

9. Chilling effect on Religious Freedom and Expression in Public

In recent times there has been growing intolerance to people of faith and especially Christians in public life and the popular media. There is a growing trend to treat freedom of belief and freedom of conscience as being limited to expression only in the House of Worship, the Churches and wherever congregations convene to worship God together. In effect, Christians are being told to leave their moral views behind, at the door of their Church. This notion is totally contrary to established norms

⁵ <http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/the-real-agenda-behind-gay-anti-bullying-clubs-in-your-school/>

⁶ The Pink Swastika; <http://www.defendthefamily.com/pfrc/books/pinkswastika/html/Chapter10.htm>
Protect Marriage Australia Submission on Same Sex Marriage Law in NSW

of freedom to worship and to live according to one's faith and conscience in society, out in the world. In fact Christians are called to evangelise and spread the Word of God in society and to live their lives according to their religious and moral beliefs. Most Christians would believe that homosexuality is contrary to biblical teachings, is sinful and disordered and they would be aware of the additional health risks associated with promiscuous homosexual behaviour in contrast to monogamous relationships. They would instruct and inform their children as rightfully they are entitled to do so being the first and primary educators of their offspring.

Redefining marriage will inhibit and undermine religious freedom and the rights of parents to direct the education and upbringing of their children.”⁷

“The implications are clear: if marriage is legally redefined, believing what every society once believed about marriage – namely, that it is a male-female union – will increasingly be regarded as evidence of moral insanity, malice, prejudice, injustice, and hatred.”⁸

“the legal separation of marriage from procreation would have a chilling effect on religious liberty and the right of conscience. Once marriage is redefined as a genderless contract, it will become legally discriminatory for public and private institutions such as schools to promote the unique value of children being raised by their biological mothers and fathers.”⁹

Already in Europe, North America including Canada there has been many instances of parents being unable to protect their children from homosexual indoctrination; schools distributing homosexual material and teaching and normalising homosexuality without parental consent. Parents have experienced their religious rights and rights as primary educators of their children over-ruled by school boards and legislation in numerous jurisdictions.

Once same-sex marriage is “normalised” in law, it will be impossible for Australian parents to filter and protect their children from age inappropriate materials and ideas that are foreign to their family's beliefs and culture.

10. Marriage Equality a misnomer

The Orwellian Federal Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010 state is instructive when considering any form of homosexual marriage law:

The Federal Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010 (i):

- i. *“A Bill for an Act to amend the Marriage Act 1961 to create the opportunity for marriage equality for people regardless of their sex, sexual orientation or gender identity, and for related purposes”*

The Bill's claim of “marriage Equality” is fallacious for the following reasons:-

⁷ Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy Vol.34 Nr 245, Pg 264.

⁸ Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy Vol.34 Nr 245, Pg 265.

⁹ Washington Bishops: Gay “marriage” threat to Catholic faith, schools, Campus Notes, the blog of the Cardinal Newman Society
Protect Marriage Australia Submission on Same Sex Marriage Law in NSW

Firstly the marriage of Husbands and Wives is a relational and procreative reality and an institution that pre dates the State, laws and legal systems. It is not open to legislators to redefine this reality. Legislatures have a responsibility to protect and foster one man one woman marriage and regulation can be used for this purpose but not to redefine marriage as it has been known and accepted for centuries throughout our Judeo Christian heritage.

The natural biological family is defined through marriage and mothers and fathers, husbands and wives, and the children that are the fruits of their union. The Bill would completely re-define the family to render gender meaningless as well as displacing the unique place and role of mothers and fathers in the family, replacing them with “parents” or “progenitors”, whoever they might be. It opens the legal door for the State to one day dictate who can be *the parent* and resultant totalitarian loss of fundamental freedoms through the loss of personal identity, no longer respected as *the mother* and *the father* of the children they bore.

The French High Court¹⁰ has ruled that the French prohibition of same-sex marriage is in accord with the French constitution, effectively ruling that there is nothing unequal about upholding the definition of marriage as between man and woman.

“There is nothing unequal about upholding the definition of marriage as between man and woman”

“Because of the difference of situations between same-sex and heterosexual couples, the difference in treatment in family laws is justified and not in violation of the principle of equality”

“... a form of civil union that accords a plethora of legal, fiscal, and official benefits, is sufficient for a “normal family life”

A recent federal court ruling in Australia affirmed the same reality that traditional marriage does not discriminate unjustly against same sex couples.

Australia judge rules ban on same-sex marriage is not gender discrimination¹¹

SYDNEY, **Australia** — A federal court judge in Australia has ruled that the country’s ban on same-sex marriage is not gender **discrimination** since neither gay men nor lesbians are allowed to marry under the legislation, and thus both sexes are treated equally.

In her ruling Wednesday, Justice Jayne Jagot wrote, “A man cannot enter into the state of marriage as defined with another man just as a woman cannot enter into the state of marriage with another woman. “The redress for these circumstances lies in the political and not the legal arena.”

¹⁰ French High Court Affirms Traditional Marriage, Lauren Funk, C-FAM Friday Fax Vol.14 Nbr 8 original source, republished <http://www.protectmarriage.org.au/news.html>

¹¹ Article: Australia judge rules ban on same-sex marriage is not gender discrimination, San Diego Gay & Lesbian News, February 23rd, 2013. <http://sdgln.com/news/2013/02/23/australia-judge-rules-ban-same-sex-marriage-not-gender-discrimination>
Protect Marriage Australia Submission on Same Sex Marriage Law in NSW

In her decision, Jagot noted that sex discrimination depends on a comparison between the treatment of the person of one sex with the treatment of the opposite sex.

“There cannot be discrimination by reason of the sex of a person because in all cases the treatment of the person of the opposite sex is the same,” she wrote.

Under the current law known as the Marriage Act, marriage is defined as the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others.

“By statutory definition, persons of the opposite sex may marry and persons of the same sex may not,” she said

11. Equality or eradication of innate differences

Just Discernment and just Discrimination is good; we positively discriminate in favour of children’s best interests to have a natural family with mum and dad.

The false mantra claiming “equality” in marriage is nothing more than a means to eradicate differences, such as gender, male and female, that matter to marriage, procreation and child development.

The laudable eradication of discrimination per say will lead to the elimination of natural differences, replaced by a form of egalitarianism that confuses and erases personal identities.

The definition of maternity as a biological function and not as a social function that can be learned is an example of justifiable discrimination against men which shapes our social identities and capacities as people. Should we also introduce an equality bill to give men the right to be mothers or rather, is the fate of men determined by biology with the male gender unable to experience maternity?

Calls for marriage equality thus are as nonsensical as calls for men to be mothers.

12. De-gendering marriage and family

The human species is made up of two different sexes, man and woman. However same-sex marriage would eradicate gender roles and “Father” and “Mother” then become relative concepts and no longer correspond to the gender of the parties who sign the marriage (family-making) agreement.

Same sex marriage rights replace the man and woman, the couple who make up the nucleus of the family unit, with any kind of cooperative agreement between any two parties. This new family legislation does not require the parties to be a man and woman. It is enough for anybody to express a wish to reach agreements regarding a shared residence and life with someone else. The law would thus, places common-law partners on the same footing as married couples.

The Bill would empty marriage of its true significance being a child-centric institution and replace it with one defined only as the affections of two adults, any two adults.

The Homosexual activists have been careful not to talk of sex, but of love and happiness. The point of departure between established marriage and their new concept is the right to permanent happiness and limitless love, the idea of turning a romantic utopia into reality. Children are no longer a primary concern of marriage.

The intent of this Bill is clearly a clash between adult homosexual rights and their claim on marriage over and above the best interest of children, resulting in children's rights to a mother and father and natural family being extinguished in law. In our Judeo Christian history, whenever the rights of the weak and the strong clash, our societies have supported the weaker most vulnerable group and in this case it must surely be the children.

In order to achieve the often stated "right to happiness" of homosexual couples, any same-sex marriage law must remove all obstacles, all barriers and those elements that formerly constituted the foundations of commitment in marriage. It is necessary to separate love and gender and eradicate one of the most important family ties, that which links gender and marriage.

13. The disappearance of individual rights

The intention and eventual outcome of the NSW same sex marriage Bill, is to both enact into law and to teach the public that neither Father nor Mother are necessary in order to create a nuclear family or to procreate, and they are even less essential when it comes to bringing up the children.

It would create families in which gender realities are challenged by contrary legal definitions such that nobody is a man or a woman, or a father or a mother, all of which are realities that become debatable and controversial.

Homosexual marriage laws are a segue to codifying new human rights to sexual orientation and gender diversity and making the outlandish claim that these are "fundamental" rights. It is an attempt to legislate a rupture between the individual and his or her own sexuality. These new so called "rights" translate into the disappearance of individual rights. You no longer have rights, those old rights that helped you as a mother or as a man. Absolute equality then is the state of being in which your former identity has become the identity of everyone in the name of equality.

If your identity is the identity of everyone, it is not precisely the identity of anyone. In this manner, your identity, together with your freedom, remains for ever in the possession of the State.

Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them, which is the confusion caused by conflating homosexual relationships with heterosexual (true) marriage and gender identity/sexual orientation with personal inclinations towards one's sexuality rather than biological certainty, all expounded in the name of equality.

14. Sexual Orientation, Gender Diversity

An objective that is being sought through the homosexual marriage and sexual orientation/gender diversity agenda is the creation of new so called “human rights” resulting in the restriction of civil rights, with the State serving as the sole deposit and regulator of these rights.

These new human “rights” are far removed from the Declaration passed in 1948 by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Marriage Bills such as the recent Greens Senate Same Sex Marriage Bill scandalously remove words that imbue meaning to traditional marriage and the natural family, by substituting “a man and a woman” and “a husband and wife” with the words “two people”. If enacted, this would all but eliminate the natural biological family unit in Australian law and mean that children have no protected right to the mother-father parenting structure as any “two people” will be legally privileged over a child’s inalienable human right to their biological mother and father.

15. Christian objections

Christians and religious peoples of most mainstream faiths understand marriage to come from God. God is the creator and author of marriage and has a distinct plan for men and women to unite as one flesh in marriage, a unity that finds its ultimate expression in the bearing of children and their nurture. Catholics believe and practice that God is at the Apex of their marriages, and that in sacramental marriage, the married couple themselves are the living sacrament. Homosexual marriage would re-define and teach that marriage is a homosexual institution in complete conflict with Christian marriage and sensibilities. Such a law would in effect defile and obscure the traditional understanding of marriage as it is bound up in Christian faith and teachings. The law would have the effect of wounding Christian marriage and embedding tensions and divisions between Christians and other groups in society. It would create ongoing conflict between Government and Christians as Government sought to expand the homosexual agenda in law and society, making incremental changes over time and eventually forcing the celebration of homosexual marriages in a consecrated Church or House of Worship. This would signal the end of religious freedom, constrained to freedom inside the house of worship only and then even this place would not be safe from Government totalitarian intervention and coercion.

16. Cultural & Ethnic objections

Australia is migrant nation. Many families have established ideas and identity based on marriage, heritage and the traditional family. The roles of mothers and fathers are understood in the context of child rearing and raising a family. Marriage is inexorably bound up with culture, customs and traditions of many ethnic groups and nations. It has an established meaning that is at the root of many cultures and migrant groups. It is cultural vandalism and a hostile act on its own people by Government to force a re-definition of traditional marriage on these groups, which form a majority of our Australian society.

17. Existing marriages

Most married people would not want the meaning of marriage to be radically altered just to appease a vocal homosexual lobby and their activism more intent on forcing public acceptance of the homosexual lifestyle than real marriage reform for the greater public good.