



We The People

Program 207 June 13, 2016

**We the People** Marriage and Respect

Good day to you. When it comes to political correctness I am not your man. For the most part I abhor it because it usually represents the angry voice of minority groups, cloistered academics and much of the mainstream media. The once reliably neutral ABC, being the national broadcaster appears over the years to have taken on a new life of its own like a Frankenstein creation being fired by social lightning as it thunders bigotry and moral indignation if we challenge it. Exactly the same applies to the left wing ideologues and society's obdurate eccentric folk who devote their lives to insulting us for disagreeing with their demands. This unpleasant politically correct minority shout at us and call us racists, bigots and heretics if we dare disagree. Well today I intend to express a view about their unusual utopia and their unfortunate claims. Let's talk about marriage equality, whatever that is.

Now the raucous and rapacious claim that same sex marriage recognition is something which is a national necessity is utterly dishonest and the aberrant politician uses it to distract us from real national issues. My view is that same sex marriage doesn't exist and the claim is really about high jacking one of societies norms that binds us together and represent the natural world and common place morality. Marriage is the act which represents the union of a man and a woman with the promise of new life and in that the vast majority of the world's religions agree as do the majority of people. In my view, so called same sex marriage is nothing more than a distressed attempt to be seen as normal yet it violates a natural law in that it promotes a sterile union. Studies at The Mayo Clinic in the United States and elsewhere have shown elevated physiological dangers and significant harm as a result of male to male and female to female sexual intercourse, for such activity involves the body performing sexual functions for which it is not designed and which are detrimental if not dangerous. Surely that premise cannot be the basis for marriage and therefore the *'equality mantra'* cannot be substantiated.

Simply declaring its **'time for marriage equality'** does not make a case and that demand chooses to ignore what many of us might think. To deny a law which **allows** marriage between same genders is not discriminatory, in fact to allow it discriminates **against** orthodox society. It may be the case that offering supposedly 'equal' treatment is incoherent, as it is in this case. It is crucial to note that the proposed revision of marriage laws involves exactly that.....a revision of marriage. In order to offer the status of marriage to couples of the same sex, the very meaning of marriage has to be changed. In which case, what same-sex couples will have will not be the same as what different gender couples now have. Marriage is not merely the expression of a love people have for each other, it represents and celebrates a life-long union between two people who exemplify the biological duality of the human race with the openness to welcoming children into the world. Even when children do not arrive, the differentiated two-ness of marriage indicates its inherent structure. As Michael Jensen says "to remove the sexual specificity from the notion of marriage makes marriage not a realisation of the bodily difference between male and female that protects and dignifies each, but simply a matter of choice".

Now to take a moral stand which many do, then turning a moral wrong into a civil right just camouflages the issue and seeks to change the basis of the argument. To put it forcefully the advocates then claim if we disagree we are homophobes. It's a form of minority black mail and its false. We the people should not have this change thrust upon us without at least having a vote on the subject and in that Labor denies us for the sake of expediency. If two people of the same gender want legal recognition for the purpose of legal equity then let there be a recognised union but not marriage. I've worked with many homosexuals over time and many are reasonable people but they are different to the mainstream and cannot claim normality by claiming marriage as some kind of equal right. Now for goodness sake let common sense prevail, leave mainstream society alone and the arrant nonsense of marriage equality.

**Until next time this is Kent Bayley** (Acknowledgement follows)

<http://www.catholiceducation.org/en/marriage-and-family/sexuality/the-health-risks-of-gay-sex.html>  
[http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-05-28/jensen-i-oppose-same-sex-marriage-\(and-no-i'm-not-a-bigot\)/6502850](http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-05-28/jensen-i-oppose-same-sex-marriage-(and-no-i'm-not-a-bigot)/6502850)  
<http://www.webmd.com/sex/anal-sex-health-concerns> <https://www.medinstitute.org/2012/06/anal-sex-a-dangerous-trend-3-2/>  
<http://www.mayoclinic.org/healthy-lifestyle/womens-health/in-depth/health-issues-for-lesbians/art-20047202>

***The following text was replaced in the script that was broadcast above. I am including it here because it's the fact of the matter and was only removed out of a sense of respect for the listeners sensibilities. Nonetheless, it is just as factual as the stunningly decadent Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras which I believe is unsavoury and unsuitable especially for the children who are encouraged to attend. In this regard the original text removed from this narrative is hardly unsavoury in comparison and follows.***

***.....part of paragraph 3 subsequently replaced before broadcast.***

*'In my view sex between two men is repulsive and medically dangerous. The fragility of the anus and rectum, along with the immunosuppressive effect of ejaculate, make anal-genital intercourse a most efficient manner of transmitting infections and promoting cancer. '*