

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE – A QUICK FIX

The result of the plebiscite, the changed definition of the word 'marriage', and the revised Marriage Act were the outcome of a very successful campaign waged by same-sex marriage proponents based on the twin emotions of love and equality assisted by a besotted, inept, and lazy Parliament: a guaranteed lay down misere. However it is worth noting that love is not a prerequisite for marriage and equality is clearly unsupportable when comparing the three different sexual unions.

Certainly one could hope that all human relationships would be characterised by love. However the historical definition of marriage does not include the word 'love' and simply describes a heterosexual union, the word marriage being the name chosen for that state about 1,000 years ago. That makes sense as it is not uncommon for marriages to be entered into for a number of reasons other than love: political manoeuvrings; arranged relationships; greed; convenience; sympathy; necessity; support; shared interest; security; or even lust, to name a few. One secular marriage ceremony notes the following facets of a marriage: 'love and patience; dedication and perseverance; talking and listening, helping and supporting; believing in each other; tenderness and laughter; learning to forgive; learning to appreciate differences; learning to make the important things matter'. It's not all about love. And an old adage is worth bearing in mind: 'Love is blind and marriage is an eye opener.'

Equality was always a vote winner and there is no doubt that in the emotional stakes is beats equity which is really what the same-sex marriage issue should have been about. Same-sex couples wanted their union to have the same legal recognition as had been accorded heterosexual couples for centuries: that is, they wanted legal equity. And, given the position society has arrived at such equity was overdue. Nevertheless it is a matter of fact that same-sex couples can never be equated with, or conflated with, heterosexual couples for many reasons including gender composition, intimacy practices, procreation requirements, social activities, and the nurture of children.

There are some that opine that same-sex couples and the LGBTIQ community wanted to appropriate the word 'marriage' as some emblem of equality and that may or may not be the case. After all, as noted above, the word 'marriage'

is simply a historical word denoting the definition of a heterosexual union and no more: it has no religious or other special connotations. What is unfortunate (and here we come to the culpability of the aforementioned Parliament) was that in allowing the word 'marriage' to be the central focus of the issue, Parliament opened the Pandora's box of religious freedom and freedom of speech. In fact any two words, other than 'marriage', could have been created to represent male and female same-sex unions and together with a separate Act would have saved considerable uncertainty and angst. But that was too much like hard work for a lazy and complicit Parliament. In today's climate and properly instructed, Australia, the land of the fair go, would always have accorded same-sex couples legal equity. Instead, Parliament chose to take the easy option and obliterate any recognition of humanity's primary relationship that has been in existence since the dawn of time.

In appropriating the word 'marriage' and the then existing Marriage Act to be the vehicle for the legal recognition of same-sex unions Parliament, in one fell swoop, removed a centuries old word from the English language; devalued the status of the oldest form of human relationship central to mankind's existence; created a potentially messy social and legal environment; and left heterosexual individuals and particularly those in heterosexual unions out in the cold. When one considers that heterosexual couples, religious and civil, make up some 61% of the population and same-sex couples less than 0.5% one can only be dumbfounded that a Parliament, supposedly composed of lucid and sane individuals, could allow such a risible outcome to happen.

Change can be good, but thoughtful change is much better. For example, with no definition between a heterosexual, a gay, and a lesbian union it is easy for those promoting agendas contrary to nature's natural order to confuse, intimidate and coerce vulnerable individuals, particularly the young. For the sake of future generations it is unfortunate that the changes enacted have given additional ammunition to those promoting bizarre gender theories.

For these reasons my wife and I have today submitted a Complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission alleging discrimination towards us as a heterosexual couple: A copy of the pertinent elements of the Complaint follows.

DETAILS OF COMPLAINT

Following the plebiscite on same-sex marriage, the Parliament of Australia has enacted legislation that changes the definition of the word 'marriage' by removing the phrase 'male and female' and replacing it with 'two people'. The outcomes are profound.

- The removal of gender from the historically accepted definition of the word 'marriage' has stripped the word of its very essence disregarding and disrespecting the primacy of heterosexual unions to humanity's existence past, present, and future.*
- There is now no word in the English language that defines nature's fundamental human relationship, a heterosexual union. Whilst the new genderless definition may be appropriate for same-sex unions it is belittling and meaningless for those who value the gender balance of heterosexual unions.*
- The lack of definition between a heterosexual, a gay, and a lesbian union provides those pursuing agendas contrary to the natural order the opportunity to confuse, intimidate and manipulate vulnerable individuals, particularly the young.*
- Although demonstrably different, the change has erroneously conflated and equated same-sex unions and heterosexual unions.*
- Those in heterosexual unions, or contemplating such, have been marginalised and victimised: the uniqueness of their union is no longer recognised or celebrated.*

We agree that legal recognition for same-sex unions is appropriate and timely. However the solution chosen confuses equity with equality.

As a heterosexual couple we regard the above outcomes as offensive acts of discrimination by the Parliament of Australia against us and other heterosexual couples who cherish their union and share our feelings. The value and dignity of our relationship has been erased.

The significance of heterosexual unions to mankind and this nation has been discounted rather than held in esteem and valued. We suggest that as many as 5,000,000 other Australian citizens may have similar feelings.

HOW COMPLAINT CAN BE RESOLVED

We ask the Parliament of Australia:

- 1. To create a new word to represent the definition of a heterosexual union being 'the union of a man and a woman to the exclusion of all others, voluntarily entered into for life'.*
- 2. To create a new Act to recognise, legalise and administer heterosexual unions.*

NOTE: *The word 'marriage' and the amended Marriage Act remain applicable to same-sex unions.*

Over the past few weeks I have discussed this matter with a number of acquaintances, supporters of both 'Yes' and 'No' persuasions. Almost all have said they had not given any thought to these ramifications. I suggest that the same can be said of the Parliament.