

2nd April 2012

RE: Maintain the current definition of marriage between a man and a women

To the Honourable members of the Australian Parliament,

As an Australian resident I wish to convey the importance of maintaining the current definition of marriage, of that between one man and one woman. For millennia it has been known that a union between a man and a woman is a safe and sacred sanctum for a family to flourish. Redefining the definition of marriage to being something other than a union between one man and one woman, will in effect create inequality.

Historically marriage between one man and one woman provides many benefits. Some of these benefits are: a sustainable and productive union needed for an emotionally harmonious nurturing and caring environment, and a biological necessity for procreation. Maintaining the current definition will seek to provide the Australian society with a tangible institution, which should be encouraged.

In the Netherlands, a society that has advocated strong rights for same-sex couples, the opposite is true. Same-sex marriages have not worked. The Dutch central bureau of statistics (Centrale Bureau voor de Statistiek), indicate that gay marriage has not been taken up by the mainstream gay community. The table below shows the number of same-sex marriages for the past 10 years.

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Homosexual Men	1,339	935	735	579	570	579	663	656	573	660
Homosexual Women	1,075	903	764	631	580	633	708	752	785	694

These statistics can be viewed at: www.cbs.nl [last accessed 28 March 2012]

From the Dutch experience it can be concluded that same-sex marriage is in decline. Australia should recognize that this form of hybrid marriage is not popular. The main reason for this is the waning popularity in the Gay community towards this arrangement. It in fact goes against their conscience in maintaining a 'free' or 'open' lifestyle and not wanting to be committed to a monogamous relationship.

It should be noted that Gay and Lesbian advocate groups estimate that the homosexual community in the Netherlands is anywhere between 5 to 10% of the total population (where the total Dutch population being approximately 16 million, this means that there are estimated to be between 800,000 and 1,600,000 homosexual individuals residing in the Netherlands). However there has been no official count by the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics to determine exact numbers. Relating these figures back to the table listed above, it should be noted that the same-sex marriage take-up rates have been less than 1% over the past several years.

On a sidenote it is commonly believed however, that the actual number of homosexuals residing in the Netherlands is around the 2%. This is inline with most other developed nations.

Discrimination is best overcome by living a harmonious lifestyle that is in balance with mainstream values of society. Same-sex marriage creates inequality by further stigmatising the homosexual couple. Gays and lesbians have always sought an extravagant lifestyle to express their sexual freedom. Marriage is in fact a restriction on their sexual freedom, something which goes contrary to their values system. Gay group advocates in various media outlets promote an 'open lifestyle' or an 'open relationship' as an integral part of their wellbeing. To the Gay community, monogamy as a lifestyle is non-existent. This disadvantages the homosexual as it will mean that a specific definition of marriage will need to be created for them, a definition for allowing for multiple partners. In other words this will open the gates for plural marriage or bigamy. It is not unrealistic to imagine that if this situation is applied to homosexuals that heterosexual couples will feel disadvantaged. It goes without saying that a plural marriage can potentially have a very hazardous effect on heterosexual marriages. Having the definition of a marriage between one man and one woman is an easily maintainable definition.

It is also claimed that same-sex marriages will protect the rights of the children. This argument has no basis what so ever, as there is no empirical scientific research to support this. For the protection of children, those most vulnerable in our society, it is in their best interests to be raised in a home with two parents where one is male and the other female. There is ample evidence that children raised in a home where a father and a mother are present, that the child achieves more in life. It is also the child's human right to having both a loving father and a loving mother. Absence of either one can lead to the child living in an unbalanced home that hampers their development in school and beyond. For example children raised in homosexual families are stigmatized because of their parents chosen lifestyle. The 'open' homosexual lifestyle creates more turbulence in the family home and removes the will to live a normal and peaceful life. The full consequences are yet to be realised once these individuals become adults and an actual assessment can be conducted.

It is for this reason that the government should recognise the well-established family institution of marriage between a man and a woman. Tampering with this established institution by introducing a hybrid form, will only blur the current definition of marriage. The stigmatization experienced by children who have homosexual parents, does not provide added protection. In fact it removes the child's human right of living a normal and peaceful life with a father and a mother. Studies on children raised in homosexual households are inconclusive and can therefore not be relied upon as empirical evidence. Given that same-sex marriage in the Netherlands is in decline, it is therefore not necessary to introduce the concept of same-sex marriage in Australia. The take up rates will be low because this is contrary to the homosexual's preferred lifestyle of sexual freedom. I therefore urge the entire Australian Federal Government, to vote against the introduction of same-sex marriage, and uphold the current definition of marriage of that between one man and one woman.

Sincerely,

Daniel Klop