

Submission to Senate Enquiry into Marriage Equality Amendment Bills

Biological

From a biological perspective, marriage evolved among human beings because of the fact that it provided a biological advantage for the future advancement of the genetic material of those couples that engaged in a permanent and committed relationship. The physical attributes and skills of a man and a woman complemented each other and gave them and their offspring a better chance of survival than those who mated at random and moved on, offering no reciprocal support. If the arrangement was no more than a casual partnership then there arose the potential for conflict from external suitors and would-be partners which could result in death, and therefore the termination of that person's genetic line.

This is an undeniable historical and biological fact and it still applies today. It has been shown that families that are committed to each other and their children have a better chance of high achievement, both as a group and individually than do the members of an uncommitted family.

Historical

As societies evolved socially as well as in terms of civilisation, polygamy and bigamy became less frequent. They still exist in some cultures, but these are generally the more primitive and authoritarian countries, where typically, the rights of women are suppressed.

History records many instances of liaisons between couples of the same sex. In ancient Greece young men of the ruling classes often had a male partner, whose unfortunate role without option was to be the submissive member in a sodomous relationship. While this era is well regarded in history for its mathematicians and philosophers, there is no doubt that, by modern standards, it was a very violent and undemocratic civilisation.

Contemporary Attitudes

What has changed and why should there be any formal recognition of friendships between couples of the same sex?

One thing that has changed is that it has now become common practice for activists to deliberately hijack a word and apply to it a meaning or connotation that is both novel and unrelated to its traditional and real meaning. An example is the word, "gay", the very word that many of the proponents of this bill may well apply to their relationship. When I grew up it had a totally different use and meaning. It was prevalent in nursery rhymes and children's stories and so often applied to innocent, happy, young children. Almost overnight it was hijacked and applied to those engaged in homosexual relationships, activities that could hardly be further removed from the long term, historical usage of the word.

Another example is the word, “love”, which is now so often used where the user really means “lust”. Love is not necessarily associated with a sexual relationship, yet it has come to mean that in common usage and it is so often applied by the protagonists in this debate. A man may love his wife, his children, his grandchildren, but that does not mean that he has or seeks a sexual relationship with any other than his wife.

I believe there are now numerous examples of couples, heterosexual or otherwise, living in relationships that do not involve love. We live in a democracy and if they wish to do that, our present laws allow that to happen. Is this not enough? Why should same-sex couples masquerade as being “married”?

With respect, it could be argued that the word “equality” as applied in the title of the Bill under discussion is another word being “hijacked”, for the whole question really has nothing to do with equality. As I pointed out earlier, marriage is an historical legal joining of two people to commit to each other, to produce and raise children in a stable, supportive environment. There is no law that demands that people must be married to produce or to raise children. However, if two individuals choose to enter into a same-sex relationship then they are ruling themselves out of the opportunity to produce children. It is a biological fact and it is their choice, so where is the inequality?

I would argue that same-sex marriage will do nothing other than contribute to the undermining and breakdown of traditional marriage which has been the basis for civilisation for thousands of years.

Dependants

Under traditional marriage between a man and a woman, provided both commit to that marriage, children have a far better chance of success in life. I don’t mean financial success in particular, though it may follow on. I mean growing up as socially balanced, well-adapted, motivated and caring individuals – very important attributes within a population for the long term future prospects of society and civilisation.

What are or will be the prospects of children (acquired by some legal means) raised in “marriages” of same sex couples? Little girls, in particular, but also little boys, need a mother, especially in the early years. By the same token, little boys need a father (but not two) to grow up with, to do boy things and to be a hero.

To argue that already ‘there are thousands of children growing up in one parent families and this will be no different’ is not a valid argument. It is no more than a feeble excuse. Certainly, it is a fact that this is happening, but that alone does not make it right. Society is already paying a high price in social terms for the products of single families – more teenage pregnancies, a high crime rate, a high juvenile death toll on our roads. It would be difficult to argue that we need more of that.

What will be the likely outcomes of children raised by same sex couples? I am aware that this is already happening, but I believe it is not right that it be given even more legitimacy, thereby increasing the numbers of children who are at risk. They are at risk because we do not know the consequences of this “same-sex marriage” experiment. **It is** an experiment and its failures will be recorded in the statistics relating to social failures among children from these relationships.

Outcome

Perhaps we will never know because the statistics may not be kept – just like the Chinese who do not keep stats on road deaths.

However, in fifty years time will we have a Prime Minister apologising to the “guinea pig generation” – that generation which formed part of the great social experiment of the Gillard era?

The tragedy is that these social experiments are playing with people’s lives – real live people who will do most of their suffering as real, live, innocent little children.

To continue down this road without a better indication of the likely outcomes will be nothing short of cavalier and those who make the decision to do so will be morally responsible.

Bruce Collins