

Marriage and Families in Society

Submission by

Graham & Carol Phillips

To the Senate Enquiry

on the

Marriage Equality Amendment Bill 2010

2.4.2012

Marriage and Families in Society

There has been so much written on the correct understanding of marriage, as well as the strong evidence showing its importance to the stability of society. We find it incredible that a Government, our Government, would seek to both interfere with the real meaning of marriage, and to seek to legalise further destabilising of our society.

The meaning of marriage, as recognised throughout history and in all societies is the **union of one man and one woman**, voluntarily entered into, for life, and for the establishment of a family.

Marriage forms the cornerstone of society, by forming small communities, which in turn form parts of the larger community. The destabilisation of our Australian society has already begun, where permissive sex without responsibility, easily-procured divorce, and habitual avoidance of the stabilising influence of marriage, have played havoc with our current and future generations. Pornography in the all-pervasive mass media and internet, explicit sexual content in Health Education programmes, freely-available contraception and abortion, as well as a distinct movement away from the acceptance of absolute moral values, have all led to a decline in the sexual morality of generations of citizens, within Australia. This has had a massive effect on the state of marriage and the family, in both social and economic terms.

The attempt to legalise same-sex marriage is yet another step towards this destabilisation, and is **one which can be halted**. It is **not inevitable** that marriage will be re-defined. **It is not inevitable that same-sex marriage becomes legal in Australia.** It is only inevitable that the demand for it will continue, since it is in the nature of human beings to continue to demand something that they want, whether it is needed or not.

Marriage is described – not defined – by society

It is undeniable that male-female sexuality is naturally, biologically, ordered towards the pro-creation of children. Marriage, furthermore, is naturally ordered towards the establishment of a family.

The commitment of a husband and wife to each other forms a natural bond and basis for the bringing of children into the world. Family bonds are, arguably, the strongest in the human world.

Marriage is, historically, an age-old contract, across both time and space. It is based on the biological and natural complementarity of the sexes, and has always meant one man and one woman.

- Other unions are not called 'marriage'.
- Other love-relationships are not called 'marriage'.
- Other partnerships are not called 'marriage'

Even where a man and a woman are not married to each other, but live in a sexual relationship akin to marriage, the relationship is, and was, termed "common law marriage" or "de facto marriage". This terminology points to the fact that the natural state of one man and one woman being together as a couple, or as a family unit, is deemed to be a naturally-occurring 'marriage', despite its lack of contractual sanction.

Marriage has a particular meaning that **cannot be change by society's whims, desires, and ideas**. Marriage is what it is, regardless of the opinions of those who wish it to be something else.

Society doesn't define 'marriage' at all, but actually describes something that pre-exists. Just as society doesn't define it, society also has no right to re-define it.

Marriage provides what other partnerships cannot

Marriage provides the most stable environment for the raising of children. It is universally acknowledged that children reared within a stable relationship, by both biological parents, are in the best position to achieve their potential as future citizens in society. The addition of the stability of the marriage contract/commitment adds to this advantageous position. Environments where children are raised without one, or both, parents are poised to have more social, educational, economic and psychological disadvantages. This is so well-documented as to be almost self-evident.

Moreover, this fact is so well-known that societies have, historically, actively encouraged the marriage contract. This is not to say that every marriage is ideal, or that every child raised in this situation will be an exemplary citizen. It only means that the ubiquitous nature of the marriage contract, being based on biological complementarity of the sexes, as well as the well-evidenced advantages to children, demonstrates the benefits across time and all societies. Even the Greeks, with their permissive stance on homosexuality, only assigned the term 'marriage' to the union of one man and one woman.

It seems that some of those who desire same-sex marriage also desire the facility of having and raising children. This is, in short, a social experiment. Children being raised by two co-habiting men, or women, may, or may not, be raised well. They are not, by any measure, being raised in a natural family environment, and their psycho-sexual development, so crucial to future well-being, is highly likely to be impeded. Moreover, the **risk of homosexual abuse**, where a boy is being raised by two homosexual men, should give any reasonable person pause for thought.

Since we really don't know the long-term effects of such unusual arrangements, although we already have some data that documents the damage it may cause, it beggars belief that society would allow such an abhorrent experiment on children. Playing around with children's lives, in order to show that there are no negative effects? Who would deliberately make a child an orphan in order to prove that children are just as well off with one, or neither, parent? The idea assaults reason.

Stable marriages produce stable societies

Stable marriages produce stable communities. In turn, stable communities produce stable societies. If the foundations are sound, then, so are the constructions. Society is simply the construction of larger communities from smaller communities, which in turn are constructed from natural family units. It stands to reason that the sounder the family units, the sounder the communities, and society.

Children deserve the best that society can provide

The protection of children, and their rights, should always be the major function and foundation of society's policies and laws. This has always been at the base of civilised and humane societies, and should go without saying. Where we toy with the rights of the youngest and most vulnerable, we toy with our future, at the very least. The de-humanisation of our children, already well and truly achieved through the prominence of easy-access abortion, where they can be killed at will, can only be continued in the legalisation of same-sex marriage.

The homosexual lifestyle is, in addition, much unhealthier than that of the heterosexual, and the life expectancy lower. Children in these 'families' are, therefore, likely to lose parent/parents, earlier than usual.

We know how children best develop and grow. We know how they best reach their potential. We know how marriage breakdown disrupts children's

lives. We know how disadvantaged children are when one or both parents are absent or seriously dysfunctional. Don't we, as a society, care enough to avoid causing more disruption? Isn't it obvious that our children are owed **the best that we can provide**, through the protection of our most basic, natural, institution --- marriage?

Rights of children, or desires of adults?

Fully-grown adults have no right to demand that their sexual desires and choices be attended to, at the expense of young children – the nation's children. The demand for same-sex marriage is such a demand. It does nothing to improve the lot of children and can go a long way towards degrading it.

Children have the natural right to be raised by both a mother and a father, and within the stability afforded by genuine marriage.

Yet, the children adopted by same-sex couples automatically have their human rights to both a mother and a father ignored. Further to this, the lifestyles of homosexuals are **notoriously promiscuous**, providing, for many children, therefore, not only an upbringing skewed away from the traditional mother and father paradigm, but an upbringing within a lifestyle of regular promiscuity.

Even further, there has been a recent case of a homosexual couple being arrested for **sexually abusing a child of six**, for the purposes of producing pornography, it all being part of an alleged paedophile ring. <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/gay-australian-fathers-arrested-over-child-sexual-exploitation-of-their-son/story-e6freuy9-1226284796313>

How can, how will, the rights of the children be protected, in these instances? **How will the damage caused by the abuse ever be rectified?** How could a society ever deliberately allow such gross abuses of human rights to occur?

The free-availability, and liberal-mindedness of the law towards all types of pornography (oddly enough, something that is closely tied in with paedophilia), is another disgraceful example of the rights of children, and general society, being over-ruled by the desires of some adults.

Children's human rights should always trump the wishes and desires of adults, and it is within the ambit of this Senate Enquiry to ensure that this is secured. (See also richardtwaghorne.wordpress.com/2011/04/05/gay-marriage/)

Legal implications of changes to the laws

There are already precedents for the flow-on effects of same-sex marriage legislation. Once something becomes law, it can be made mandatory to adhere to certain elements implied by that law. Once a precedent has been set, especially when set by a lobbyist agenda, it becomes inevitable that further pieces of legislation will be pushed to further the cause.

Where same-sex marriages have been legalised, in other nations, there has been the forcing of schools to provide education for younger and younger children, in the many aspects of homosexuality, mostly well beyond the appropriateness for each age-group. Parents are disallowed from removing their own children from these classes, thus violating both the rights of the children, and of the parents.

In the U.K. 'mother' and 'father' are no longer words on children's birth certificates, due to pressure from same-sex and surrogacy pressure groups. This paves the way for same-sex couples, among others, to falsify documents and deny some children the right to knowledge of both biological parents. See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1261461/Mothers-fathers-disappear-birth-certificate-allow-homosexual-couples-named-parents.html>

There has also been the push for polygamous marriage, and even the serious suggestion of the legalisation of paedophilia, through the legalisation of man-boy "marriages", etc.

Just as legalising voluntary euthanasia has led inevitably to cases of involuntary euthanasia, and that legalising abortion has led to more and more, and later and later term abortions, and now to the inevitable push for "post-birth abortions" (i.e. infanticide), so legalising an alleged right to marry someone of the same sex will lead to the push for **legalising other previously-unthinkable unions**. This is not fantasy. Once the legal recognition of the meaning of marriage is altered to include other than one man and one woman, there will be calls, in Australia, for yet other inclusions. It has already occurred overseas.

Where is the tolerance?

Religious objections to same-sex unions, held by individuals in relation to their livelihoods (such as in the U.K. case of boarding house proprietors) have been fought in courts, and lost. The human rights of religious individuals to conscientious objections have been violated. This situation can only get worse. The de-Christianisation of our society is so advanced that Christians,

or others of a religious persuasion, are ignored and maligned, and tacitly, and not so tacitly, ordered not to give their opinions. All is 'tolerated', it seems, except those who wish to object on conscientious grounds. Tolerance is only accorded those who agree with the non-religious stance.

Are homosexual persons being denied their human rights?

Homosexual persons, and same-sex couples, already have all of the basic natural human rights owed to them by society. Not only that, but they are, by and large, much **wealthier** than their married-with-children counterparts. This makes sense, since they have, mostly, "double-income-no-kids" relationships.

It is a furphy to insist that, by law, every person has a right to marry, and that, therefore, homosexual persons are being denied this right. This furphy pre-supposes that 'marriage' means that any two people who love each other are entitled to marry. This is simply untrue. People may not marry if they are married to someone else. Siblings may not marry. Parents may not marry their adult children. Children may not get married. **Why do people who have every human right afforded by society, as well as advantages that many in society do not have, seek this 'marriage' re-definition?** This, in a society where the stigma associated with 'shacking up' has been largely eliminated? Why are they not content to remain 'unmarried', but 'in a relationship', as do tens of thousands of their Australian brothers and sisters?

Is it unfair?

Is it unfair that children may not drive cars? Is it unfair that people are not free to drive on the wrong side of the road? Is it unfair that people are not allowed to marry a parent? Is it unfair that a man may not belong to a woman's netball team? Is it unfair that certain people may not hold Australian passports? Society has thousands of examples of situations, relationships, partnerships and groups where certain criteria must be met. Those who do not meet the criteria cannot join.

Homosexuals are already free to marry. They may marry someone of the opposite sex, because that is what 'marriage' means. If they choose to live in a sexual- or love-relationship with a person of the same sex, then it cannot be termed 'marriage', because it isn't marriage.

Not being allowed to marry is not being 'denied equality'. Marriage equality means that all men and woman are free to marry, but it must be within the parameters of what 'marriage' actually is. Marriage is one man, one woman,

just as a woman's netball team is a netball team for qualifying females --- certain age, certain fitness, certain skills.

Do we need Same-sex Marriage?

So many pretend that this call for same-sex marriage is a call to rectify an injustice. There is no injustice in recognising the actual meaning of marriage, but there is an injustice where children's right to both a mother and a father are trammelled, through the associated inclusion of adoption rights for legalised same-sex marriages.

Society's laws should always support the protection of the most vulnerable, and children's rights should always have more importance than the demands and desires of adults. This should be a given.

Same-sex couples don't need marriage, but children need both a mother and a father, and preferably their own, bound in genuine marriage.

Conclusion

We submit that this Senate Committee do its utmost to ensure the protection of genuine marriage, children and society. We submit that homosexual persons are **not** being denied their human rights by the upholding of the actual meaning of the term 'marriage'.

- Marriage is described – not defined – by society
- Marriage provides what other partnerships cannot
- Stable marriages produce stable societies
- Children deserve the best that society can provide

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to contribute.

(Mr and Mrs) Graham and Carol V. Phillips