

**Committee Secretary
Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committees
P.O. Box 610
Parliament House
CANBERRA NSW 2600**

21 April 2013

Submission in respect of the

**Sex Discrimination Amendment (sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex) Bill
2013.**

Preamble.

The validity of protection claims for homosexual orientation, epithets, marital status etc., from discrimination contingent upon whether they are true, meaningful, beneficial and based on reality, or whether they confuse *human identity with sexual activity*. The confusion between *who people are and what people do* needs careful examination since this crucially important distinction receives little or no attention from politicians or the homosexual movement.

Humanity only functions with preconceptions about reality, otherwise the world would appear a novel, random and chaotic mess without a template from which to evaluate how we behave the way we do. Without norm parameters there are no reference points to reassure ourselves that we've got anything right.

Questions concerning the intrinsic normality of homosexual behaviour can be assessed with regard to functional anatomy, biological gender design, psychological development and health parameters, although moral, ethical and theological values cannot be ignored since they represent the cultural and spiritual wisdom and experience of history and civilisation.

The Sex Discrimination Amendment (sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex) Bill 2013 (SDA Bill 2013) is concerned for the legal protection of 'homosexual' attributes and aspirations purporting to reflect their socio-sexual identity and socio-political objectives for which legislative protection is sought to insulate a same sex minority of citizens from public scrutiny and criticism.

Biology versus homosexual orientatiuon and gender identity.

Bio-genetics is the architect of human nature. Biology designs human beings, with the rarest of androgynous exceptions, *into male and female gender sexual orientations*.

Universally and undeniably, the biological paradigm is the fundamental and normative model that creates men and women with anatomically compatible, heterosexual gender such that sexual orientation and gender identity are physiologically and psychologically complementary for intimacy with the opposite, not the same, gender. By contrast, "Same sex intimacy", Nicolosi (2007) notes, "fails to match physiological and emotional design at the deepest level".

Biological science implies that same sex relationships have no cognitively coherent, sexually compatible foundation. Thus, in ethical parlance, biology creates men and

women to heterosexually fulfil and complete each other. And although genes may influence human behaviour, Satinover (1996) pointed out that, "*genetic connection, does not imply genetic causation*".

Homosexual behaviour therefore, is *learned* behaviour and not genetically-imposed according to Socarides (1996); Socio-environmental factors are the causative triggers for same sex attraction in heterosexual individuals (Satinover, 1996; Fitzgibbons, 1997; Whitehead, 1999; Nicolosi, 2000; Knight, 2000; Spitzer, 2003, et al).

Despite the collapse of the genetic origins theory for homosexuality by the end of the 20th century, the silent and unspoken assumption of being 'born that way' still influences SSA activists, the general public, politicians and media. In the 2013 TV production, *Downton Abbey*, his Lordship re-instates employee Thomas after his attempted seduction of James, on the grounds that 'Thomas couldn't help it' (*because he was born that way*)".

Whitehead (1999) tested the theory with identical Australian twins who failed the 100% concordance rate anticipated for twins sharing the same gene. Whitehead reported in 2011 that current studies report <15% concordance which is attributed to normal statistical variance.

Science provides no support for a homosexual orientation and gender identity as it does for heterosexuality. The claim is based on wishful desires to socially engineer a pseudo-identity of normality and healthiness and to capture public support. Such a claim however, is biologically fraudulent.

Reality and homosexual aspirations.

At some point during psycho-sexual development, about 2-4% of heterosexual men and women develop same sex attraction. Social science currently points to the dominance of socio-environmental causes for homosexual behaviour. (Byrd A. 2005; Nicolosi J. 1993, 2007; N.A.R.T.H, 1995; Rekers G. 2007; Whitehead N, 1999, 2011; etc.).

Socially constructed epithets and euphemisms such as gay, intersex, transsexual, homosexual etc., alleged to explain or represent a presumed homosexual orientation and gender identity status, contradict science despite the desire of activists to depict the way they *feel emotionally about themselves* and how they also wish everyone else to view them.

The rejection of biology as the determinant of sexual orientation and identity denies and defies reality and attracts serious social and personal consequences. For example, a SSA male experiencing 'sex change' surgery becomes androgynous without any clear biological orientation or gender identity. Retention of a larynx, non-functioning mammary glands, ova and emotional dysfunction ensure that the individual emerges as a socially-engineered 'transplant', sexually mutilated, gender neutered, sterile and with his/her life and gender in limbo.

Sexual confusion about society and sexuality is rampant within the homosexual sub-culture. Without the support of science, justification for the recognition of

homosexuality as an elitist social group with its own exclusive, sexuality is unrealistic and irrational nonsense. To illustrate: A client of psychotherapist Nicolosi (2007) described the homosexual dilemma with remarkable insight and accuracy when he said, "I thought I was a homosexual, but now I realise that I am a heterosexual man, with a homosexual problem". He managed to jettison his fantasy life and realistically resolves the dilemma between who a person is (*heterosexual identity*), and what a persons does (*same sex activity*). This means that individuals retain their biologically heterosexual orientation and identity as a given, despite their sexual deviance.

This logical distinction removes any necessity to artificially construct meaningless verbiage borne of irrational and emotional impulses in attempts to replace science with social engineering.

The sheer novelty of prescriptive expressions for same sex behaviour and identity guarantees confusion and flawed aspirations (e.g., same sex marriage) represents discrimination *by the sub-culture itself* and raises important questions concerning motivation, emotional maturity, personal stability and sexual transparency. One is impelled to question whether such citizens have an adequately developed capacity for coping with reality.

'Homosexuality', lesbian academic and noted American literary critic, Camille Paglia (1994. p.71) argued, 'is not normal.....it is a socio-political and revolutionary challenge to the social norm'. She condemned her same sex colleagues for, 'being so word-obsessed that they are deaf, dumb and blind to reality', while simultaneously expecting to be protected, patronised and pampered by the society they allege, oppresses them. If an influential homosexual apologist can see through the manipulative hype and propaganda of the homosexual movement, why are Australian governments and so many politicians falling over themselves to pamper a sexual minority of Australian citizens in order to legalise protection for their sexual characteristics? Are they terrified of being labelled with 'homophobia'? There is an unpleasant word that describes such political indifference.

For a minority of Australian citizens to live in a world of make-believe euphemisms, notions and questionable fantasies may be appropriate for Alice in Wonderland, but human beings live out their daily lives surrounded by reality, so that justification of homosexuality as a normal and healthy reconstruction of biological identification is unrealistic.

Some commonly expressed self-identifications include: 'This is who I am', (instead of the realistic, 'This is who *I think* I am'), or, 'I was born this way', 'God made me like this' and 'so long as I can remember I have been SSA'. More recent mantras such as 'love makes a family' and 'all family households are beneficial', reminds one of the retort by Dorothy Lessing (2007) that, "When people stop thinking, they chant slogans instead".

Activists sincerely support sexual diversity. But where is the diversity when the other side of the bed is the same as oneself? Where is the empirical evidence to support such shallow, intellectual nonsense which so sadly reflects the pathos inherent in such a fragile sub-culture?

Legalising make-believe, meaningless assumptions and euphemisms about pseudo-sexual aspirations would discriminate, as well as patronise, the homosexual sub-culture. It would also query the integrity, public responsibility and accountability of supporters and originators of the SDA Bill 2013 for encouraging recognition of a pseudo-orientation, promoting public confusion and undermining the social order.

Heterosexually-designed individuals who engage in homosexual practices, self-discriminate by rejecting their biological inheritance and the social order. Only political propaganda ensures that society does the discriminating. Thus, same sex activist demands for legislative protection reflects the ingenuity of propaganda as a deceptive defence mechanism that tends to hypnotise society and politics in the attempt to replace reality with illusory aspirations.

Much social science literature confirms that while *the largest number* of pedophiles (for example) is predictably heterosexual, *the largest proportion* (e.g., 20-40% of all adult child abuse) is committed by <2 per cent of the population – homosexual males with a smaller incidence for females (Socarides 1996. Studies by Siegel (1987); Erickson (1988); Cameron (1993); Satinover (1996) and Johnson (1997), report similar results. The discovery by homosexual researchers, Jay and Young (1979), that one in four homosexuals in their study declared a sexual preference for children under the age of consent is deeply disturbing. Protective legislation would publicly shield, if not censor such research from public scrutiny.

Same sex marital equality and discrimination.

The constant mantra of homosexual activists that 'two people who love each other regardless of gender should be permitted to marry', disregards two important issues: that much more than love is involved in marriage and that no homosexual is denied marriage by the Australian Constitution or any law.

All adult Australians are obliged equally and without exception to comply with pre-marital conditions. Re-defining marriage to please a minority, discriminate the majority by granting a special and exclusive concession no one else has. If love were the sole basis of marriage, allowance would need to be made for same sex siblings to marry each other. Denial would attract discrimination charges.

Marriage has the biological imperative for love, responsibility, accountability and natural, anticipatory procreation – the ingredients for successful human fulfilment.

Even the lesbian activist Camille Paglia (1994) recognises procreation in marriage as the marital norm when noting the revolutionary homosexual challenge to the social order.

For same sex households, child adoption and access to reproductive technologies are integral to the demand for same sex marriage. But in the absence of natural procreation and child bonding, can same sex households become qualitatively equal to married, opposite gender, couples?

Same sex marriage is opposed by homosexual academic Paul Nathanson (2006), who argues that same sex marriage radically fragments society and weakens the bond between,

**individuals and communities,
parents and children,
nature and culture,
men and women,
also weakening a healthy masculine gender identity, and
weakening any healthy democracy.**

Further factors critical for healthy child development in marriage are spelt out by Popenoe (1996):

- **appropriate role-modelling is critical for children**
- **fathers tend to model competition, challenge, initiative, risk-taking and independence**
- **mothers model a care-taking role: comfort, emotional security, trust and personal safety**

Biogner and Jacobsen (1992) declared gender role-modelling as the most critical factor for child rearing:

“No man can successfully fulfil the role of a mother nor a female, the role of a father. Same sex parenting is incompatible, a contradiction”.

Homosexual partners cannot match these vital benefits for children, who are discriminated in same sex households.

Medical researcher, Cameron (1993, 1996), reported significant problems that seriously diminish child-care in same sex households.:

- **Child safety (more readily accessible to pedophiles).**
- **Emotional security (non-biological 'parent' conflict).**
- **Loss of opposite-gender parenting (child discrimination)**
- **The high risk of same sex parental transience (relational instability).**
- **Higher risk of domestic violence**
- **Lower parental life-expectancy**
- **Earlier sexualization and gender confusion**
- **Higher comparative risk of promiscuity and pedophilia in same sex partnering.**

From their review of 19 studies, Burke et al., (1999) reported that domestic violence was *pro rata* higher in same sex households – 43 versus 28 per cent and, according to Gallagher and Baker (2006), “Same sex marriages involving children [in Scandinavia], fell apart more rapidly than those without children”. The dice are

seriously loaded against same sex parenting. In his analysis of culture, Harvard sociologist Sorokin (1956) argued that no society has ever dishonoured marriage and survived.

In a five year study Kippax (1993) found Australian 'committed' male same sex partners moved in and out of their relationships in about equal numbers, while a study by Xiridou et al., (2003) reported an average of eight casual partners per year for same sex men.

Australia is not obliged to imitate other countries in legalising same sex marriage. The evidence submitted is merely the tip of an iceberg of problems within the same sex sub-culture demonstrating some potentially harmful consequences of rejecting science as the biological basis for human relationships, apart from the moral values of a civilised society.

Sadly, it is often more politically expedient to “go with the flow” than to oppose a confused and potentially harmful ideology.

Aims and objectives of the homosexual activism?

The whole thrust of the homosexual movement seems driven by cupidity rather than necessity as revealed by *Quest (1992)*, an American homosexual publication which predicted that, 'society would accept our homosexuality as normal when homosexuals gain inheritance, insurance, child custody, tax and legal benefits and the right to adopt and foster children', and added, ominously, 'the ability to silence our critics'. This alarming objective has been pursued for decades and would be realised under the SDA Bill 2013.

Where is the benefit to Australian people from 'protecting' a minority of Australians from the democratic transparency of public scrutiny experienced by other Australian minorities? Should a homosexual minority become so sacrosanct? As George Orwell (1945) famously put it, "If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear". This democratic right would vanish under the proposed SDA Bill 2013.

The hypnotising effect of 'homophobia' as a manipulative device for censoring negative comments and political and public scrutiny is a dangerous weapon for demonising people and seriously constricting freedom of speech and expression. Australians value freedom to criticise ideas, ideologies, political and economic policies, TV programs etc., and to lampoon politicians, religion and public figures etc., but homosexuals appear sacrosanct, almost like adorable domestic pets in public eyes.

Apart from polarising society, protecting homosexual “attributes” as a political 'right' would discriminate society by conferring an exclusive right for homosexuals no one else has. Same sex individuals are citizens. Equality demands no special pampering or favouritism applies. George Orwell (1945) bluntly described such a situation in "Animal Farm: "All [animals] are equal but some [animals] are more equal than others".

Recovery from same sex attraction?

SSA individuals and those with similar compulsive conditions are therapeutically treatable and despite the scorn of activists that therapy is harmful, **no empirically sustainable evidence is provided.** Same sex apologists confuse *therapeutic change with outdated cure.* Recidivism, not the rehabilitative process, is the greatest obstacle to changing

sexual practices in common with other compulsive conditions. No SSA individual is obliged to *remain* SSA, contingent however, upon age, duration and motivational factors. Moberly (1993), explained why change to heterosexuality is difficult, "Homosexual relationships are *compensatory instead of complimentary*, and unable themselves, to repair the emotional damage sustained", despite which, many, like Nicolosi's client, have recovered their heterosexual identity, married and produced biological children of their own.

But where are the modifiable programs for recovery and rehabilitation governments provide for other compulsive conditions (alcoholism, smoking, drug abuse, gambling etc.). It is both hypocritical and discriminatory for politicians to ignore citizens wanting to be rid of their compulsive SSA. Governments have a case to answer for deserting these citizens, particularly when the SDA Bill 2013 seeks to maximise sexual confusion and protect reckless, high risk behaving citizens.

Potential consequences of the SDA Bill 2013..

The introduction of 'protected rights' which have no basis in science, would not only discriminate against society, but would patronise meaningless euphemisms, unrealistic aspirations and impulsive 'explanations' of homosexual characteristics that would insidiously undermine freedom of speech, information and conscience, stifle and inhibit evidence-based research reporting outcomes unfavourable to homosexuality. This provides the SDA Bill 2013 with an anti-democratic flavour. The aim of the homosexual movement is to silence its critics. The homosexual movement is skilled at demanding 'rights', but have very poor listening skills over issues of public responsibility.

In a healthy democracy, criticism of people, ideas, beliefs, published material is the norm so long as it does not abuse, malign or vilify. The SDA Bill 2013 would undermine this democratic principle.

Legislation that protects rather than discourages reckless sexual behaviour is virtually guaranteed to produce increasing personal and social health problems, escalating rates of HIV/AIDs cases, declining respect for marriage and families with incremental restrictions on political and religious freedom.

It seems odd that a minority of sexual dissidents expect their biologically abusive behaviour can somehow be 'equal' to mainstream sexuality. But as lesbian Paglia claimed, 'they [homosexuals] are deaf,dumb and blind to reality'.

Special protection for socially-engineered, characteristics of the homosexual sub-culture reflects the adoption of an anti-intellectual attitude towards science and biological orientation, humanity's template of gender orientation.

All citizens, including homosexuals, equally share fundamental civil rights, obligations and responsibilities. Apart from polarising the community and national values by discriminatory protection, Tofler (1975) warned in *"Future Shock"*, that *'diversification destabilises and fragments society by bringing about the disintegration of social consensus and national unity, that a mindless tolerance and deference, breeds a society indifferent to fundamental values of maleness and femaleness which hold it together'*.

It seems wise to remember that minorities are not always right and majorities are not always wrong.

Discriminatory protection for a fallacious homosexual orientation and gender identity would legalise fiction, legitimizing (on paper at least) sexual dissidence as a normal and healthy activity for human life. Overwhelming, empirically-based research rejects make-believe fantasising. Protective legislation would represent the first time in Australian history that unhealthy, scientifically-flawed and emotionally-based characteristics of sexual dissidence were legislated officially as 'normal and healthy' without justifying evidence. This would be a national tragedy.

Although exceptions are granted under the SDA Bill 2013, we believe these would not endure for long because it resembles the political expediency of world-wide abortion legislation - "a softly, softly approach at first, until ennui sets in and exceptions are challenged and either removed or ignored".

Without a foundation in science the SDA Bill 2013 would sanitise the socially engineered misconceptions and misguided aspirations of same sex activists and thereby magnify more sexual confusion for the sub-culture and the community, ultimately weakening and fragmenting families, children and communities as well as imposing an enormous economic and medical health burden on the Australian taxpayer.

For science, homosexuality reflects a behavioural ideology without a philosophical foundation; in conflict with biological science, history, culture, therapeutic health and the social order; it disconnects gender into a discriminatory *sexual-apartheid* and a destructive potential to undermine social values and institutions.

The SSA minority may defensively respond that all their faults are also identifiable in heterosexual relationships. Quite true, except that the behavioural problems affecting homosexuals *are pro rata higher in homosexuality.*

The 20th century was dominated by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Will the 21st century be dominated by the Dictatorship of the Sexually Confused? The SDA Bill 2013 seems to be an attempt to promote such a travesty.

.....

References consulted.

- References**
- Bigner, J.J. and Jacobson, R.B. (1996). Adult responsibilities toward child behaviour and attitudes towards fathering: gay and non-gay fathering, *Journal of Homosexuality*, 23, 74-75.**
- Burke, L.K. and Follingstad, D.R. (1999). Violence in lesbian and gay relationships – Theory, prevalence and correlational factors, *Clinical Psychology Review*, 19(5), 487-512 (26).**
- Byrd, A. Dean (2005). Gender complementarity: Where tradition and science agree, *Journal of Law and Family Studies*, S.J. Quincy College of Law, University of Utah, (6), 2, 213-235.**
- Cameron, P. (1993). Child molestation and homosexuality, *Family Research Institute education publication*, Colorado Springs.**
- Cameron, P. (1993). *The gay nineties: what the empirical evidence reveals about homosexuality*, Franklin, Tennessee, Adroit Press.**
- Cameron, P. (2006). Children of homosexuals and transsexuals more apt to be homosexual, *Journal of Biosocial Science*, May 38 (3) 413-418. Cameron cites data from a USA Illinois State Child Service Office report.**
- Cameron, P., Playfair, W.L. and Wellum, S. (1993). The homosexual person. *Eastern Psychological Association seminar presentation*, 17 April 1993.**
- Cameron, P. and Cameron, K. (1996). Homosexual parents, *Adolescence*, 31, 757-776.**
- Erickson, W.D., Wallbek, N.H. and Seely, R.K. (1988). Behaviour patterns of child molesters, *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 17 (1) 77-86.**
- Fitzgibbons, Richard (1997). 'The Power of peer rejection', Interview of Dr. Richard Fitzgibbon, psychiatrist and Director of Counselling, Pennsylvania and published in *The NARTH Bulletin*, August.**
- Gallagher, M. and Baker, J. (2006). Demand for same-sex marriage: Evidence from the United States, Canada and Europe, Marriage and public Policy Brief, *Institute of Marriage and Policy Report*, Manassas, Virginia. v. 3, 1, April 2006.**
- Jay, Karla and Young, Allan. (1979). The gay report: Lesbians and gay men speak out about sexual experiences and lifestyles, New York, Summit Press, 39-346.**
- Johnson, Angella (1997). The man who loves boys: Interview with Kevin Bishop, *Mail and Guardian*, Johannesburg, South Africa, 30 June 1997.**

- Kippax, S., Crawford, J., Davis, M., Rodden, P. and Dowsett, G.W., (1993). Sustaining safe sex: a longitudinal study of a sample of homosexual men, *AIDS*, 7, 257-263, National Centre in HIV social research, University of NSW, Sydney.
- Knight, Robert (1992). Sexual disorientation: Faulty research in the homosexual debate, *Family Policy*, Family Research Council, Washington DC, June.
- Lessing, Doris. Interviewed by Jennifer Byrne, 24 October 2001. *ABC TV interview re-presented 26 October 2007.*
- Moberly, Elizabeth R. (1993). *Homosexuality: a new Christian ethic*. Cambridge, UK, James Clarke and Company, 1-52.
- N.A.R.T.H. (National Association for Research and Therapy of Homosexuality (1995) *N.A.R.T.H. Bulletin*, Collected Papers of the N.A.R.T.H. annual Conference, Encino, California, 29 July, 3-15.
- Nicolosi, Joseph (1993). *Healing Homosexuality*. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson Inc., 152.
- Nicolosi, Joseph (2006). The meaning of same-sex attachment, *NARTH Bulletin*, v.14, 2, 14-19.
- Nicolosi, Joseph., Byrd, A. Dean and Potts, R.W. (2000) Retrospective self-reports of changes on conversion therapy, *Psychological Reports*, 8,3, Pt.2, 1071-1088.
- Orwell, George. 1945. Preface to *Animal Farm*, Secker and Warburg, London.
- Oversey, L. (1969). *Homosexuality and pseudo-homosexuality*. New York, Science House, 28-31.
- Paglia, Camille. (1994). *Vamps and Tramps*. New York, Vintage Books, 71. (Also extracts of Paglia's comments quoted by Dr. J. Berger, (1999), American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology: 'A lesbian activists comments on homosexuality', www.dolphin.org/lesbian, website).
- Popenoe, David (1996). *Life without father*, Cambridge, USA, Harvard University Press, 144-146. *Quest*, Denver, Colorado, a homosexual publication, 20 February 1992.
- Rekers, George. (1996). Gender identity disorder. *The Journal of human sexuality*. Carrollton, Texas, Lewis and Stanley Publishers, 11-20.
- Rekers, George (2007). An empirically-supported rational basis for prohibiting adoption, foster-parenting and contested child-custody by any person residing in a household that includes a

- homosexually-behaving member, *St. Thomas University Law Review*, 18 (2) 325-424, 26 May 2007.
- Satinover, J. (1996a). *Homosexuality and the politics of Trust*, Baker Books, Dartmouth, Mass.
- Satinover, J. (1996b). The biology of homosexuality: science or politics? *Homosexuality and American public life*. Editor: Christopher Wolfe. Dallas, Texas, Spence Publishing, Dallas, Texas, 3-61,
- Socarides, Charles. (1996). Adolescence. *NARTH Bulletin*, 6 (1): 14.
- Socarides, Charles; Kaufman, Benjamin; Nicolosi, Joseph; Satinover, Jeffrey and Fitzgibbon, Richard. (1997). Don't forsake homosexuals who want help. *Wall Street Journal*, 9 January, New York.
- Sorokin, Pitirim (1956). *The American sexual revolution*. Boston, Porter-Sargent Publishing, 6, 77-105.
- Spitzer, Robert (2001). '200 subjects who claim to have changed their sexual orientation from homosexual to heterosexual', paper presented at the American Psychiatric Association Convention, New Orleans, 1 May 2001 and published in *Professional Psychology Research*, June 2002. Also published as 'Can some gay men and lesbians change their sexual orientation?', *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 32, 6, 5 October 2003. Also CNA (USA) video documentary of five ex-homosexuals discussing their re-orientation and telecast nationwide in the US., 8 October 2004.
- Toffler, Alvin (1975) *Future shock*. London, Pan Books, 58.
- Whitehead, N. (2005). A woman's mind trapped in a man's body? *NARTH Bulletin*, 13, 3, Winter 2005.
- Whitehead, N. (2006). Gay marriage in New Zealand, *NARTH Bulletin*, 14, 2, 22-29.
- Whitehead, N. and B. (1999). *My genes made me do it* . Lafayette, Louisiana: Huntington Publishers, pp. 33-48; 125-147 and 183-208 provide a clear discussion of therapeutic rehabilitation and success rates for change from homosexuality to heterosexuality.
- Xiridou, M., Kretzschmar, M., Greskus, R., de Wit, J. and Coutinho, R. (2003). The contribution of steady and casual partnerships to the incidence of HIV infection among homosexual men in Amsterdam, *AIDS* 17(7), 1029-1038, 2 May.

Young, K, and Nathanson, P. (2003). Keep it all in the family, *The Globe and Mail*, Toronto, Canada, A17, 2 May.

Young, K. and Nathanson, P. (2003). Answering gay marriage. *The Australian Family*, Journal of the Australian Family Association, 24, 2 July.
