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

Submission in respect of the
Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012
.
by Jack and Nanette Blair

Due to the busiest time of the year and the short time period allowed the public for submitting comments, our submission focusses mainly on attributes of sexual orientation and identity (Sec. 17).

Protection of attributes of sexual orientation and gender identity.

By Jack and Nanette Blair

Little or no national investigation of attributes
commonly claimed by the homosexual sub-culture depicting orientation and identity has been undertaken in Australia, partly we believe, from fear of being labelled 'homophobic' by same sex activists
though much evidence-based, peer-reviewed research studies are available in social science literature. Many attributes are assumed by same sex attracted individuals to describe their perceptions of themselves (e.g., gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, transgendered' etc., for which same sex apologists seek protection from alleged oppressors.

Are same sex attributes empirically based, realistic and meaningful descriptions of sexual orientation and identity - representations of human nature?. Or are they misconceptions of how some citizens wish to see themselves? Genuine attributes need no protection, but attributes based on social engineering or sexual confusion would need to justify protection.

Society has been conditioned and desensitized to take for granted the issue of sexual orientation and identity and sexual diversity over the past four decades as the reflection of a 'normal and healthy variation of human sexuality'. But where is the diversity when the other side of the bed is the same as oneself? And where is the healthiness when >80% of ALL HIV/AIDs cases in Australia are same sex attracted men comprising c2-3% of the

population? The significance of these issues is constantly ignored.

Universally and undeniably, biology designs all humanity, with the very rarest of exceptions, with male and female primary attributes of gender that are biologically, physiologically and psychologically designated to imply compatible and complementary intimacy with the opposite, not the same, gender.

Science provides no support for homosexuality (as it does for heterosexuality). The lack of scientific support is crucial to the question of protection, particularly if those attributes are socially and pretensciously engineered depictions of biological humanity since biological design implies that *there is no such identity as a homosexual person, only heterosexually-designed individuals behaving homosexually.* This rationale changes the basis of discrimination since biological science rejects the notion of a homosexual orientation and identity At some point during psychosexual-development about 2-3% of heterosexuals become same sex attracted. Social science currently points to the dominance of multifactorial and environmental causes for a homosexual condition.(*Byrd A. 2005; Nicolosi J. 1993, 2007; N.A.R.T.H, 1995; Rekers G. 2003; Whitehead N, 1999, 2011;*

For science, homosexuality reflects a behavioural ideology without a philosophical foundation; in conflict with biological science, history and the social order: it disconnects gender into a discriminatory apartheid with a weakened capacity to unite human gender and stabilize social order. We believe such an ideology is a serious social problem that needs examining, not pampering, protecting and sanitizing for rejecting humanity's biological heritage.

Some same se4x activists continue to use the silent "born that way" assumption to justify their sexual deviancy but in 1999, that theory was conclusively disproven by Whitehead *('My genes made me do it', Louisiana, Huntington Press),* with his research of Australian identical twins. He found a <15% instead of the 100% concordance rate predicted for twins sharing the same gene.

Since biological justification does not exist to support notions of same sex orientation and identity, special protection legislation would set a dangerous precedent for other minorities to discriminate society with other self-manufactured 'rights'. We note that minorities with other behavioural compulsive and addictive conditions, (smoking, drug abuse. alcoholism,

gambling etc.), *do not spurn self-made identities to protect their lifestyles.*

Australia has already enacted legislation when homosexuality was decriminalized that supported homosexual attributes which a majority of citizens find inappropriate or repulsive: anal sex (the sewerage system), oral sex (the plumbing system), of the human body, as well as other sexual practices, e.g., rimming, fisting, golden showers, sadism, masochism and pedophilia. These "attributes" can be seen and are, by many citizens, as biological abuse, potentially unhealthy and harmful. It should be noted that more people will pursue behaviour that is legalized than behaviour that is illegal.

Decriminalization also provided, unwittingly, protection for homosexual pedophilia. [Research by two homosexual psychologists in 1979, Jay and Young ("*The gay report: Lesbians and gay men speak out about their sexual experiences and lifestyle", (New York, Summit Press, pp.39-346),* found in their large study of 5,400 participants, that 1 in 4 homosexual males preferred adult/child sex, while 75% of the men claimed sexual experience with boys under the age of consent].

Same sex advocates *publicly* suppress, attack or ignore the endemic prevalence of pedophilia in the sub-culture. However, those who declare support only for homosexuals who are not pedophiles, need to explain how they distinguish the pedophile when a pedophile is only identifiable from a court conviction!.

Protecting homosexual “attributes” would polarize society and produce social inequality because it discriminates society by conferring an exclusive right for homosexuals no one else has. Same sex attracted individuals are citizens. Equity implies that they are not favoured with special pampering. George Orwell put the issue bluntly in *“Animal Farm:* “All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others”.

Introduction of new 'protected rights' which have no basis in science, would not only discriminate against society, but violate freedom of thought, speech and conscience, stifle and inhibit evidence-bases research with outcomes unfarorable to homosexuality. Special protection for socially-engineered, anti-science attributes of sexual orientation and identity implies an attitude of anti-intellectual scorn for humanity's template of opposite gender and a *subtle and subversive censorship of the freedom of informatio*n or, as George Orwell put it, “If liberty means anything at all, it means the right to tell

people what they do not want to hear”. The whole thrust of the homosexual movement is to silence critics.

We believe Sections 47 and 85 of the Bill are unconvincing and inadequate. A similar strategy occurred over abortion. At first, softly, softly and then open slather while ignoring the law.

It should be noted that no citizen is *obliged to remain homosexual.* Abundant social science evidence shows that change to heterosexuality is possible, despite the intimidation and scorn experienced by those seeking to be rid of same sex attraction. Although change is difficult and recidivism an obstacle, some succeed to become biological parents with stable families. Some suicide because they see no future and are denied help because governments discriminate in favour of other compulsive conditions, e.g., smoking, alcohol, drug addiction, gamblers etc. Where are the rehabilitative programs for those no longer wanting a lifestyle of fantasy and struggle against biological nature? Where is their protection? A Bill concerned with discrimination must incorprate protection for citizens seeking to change orientation to heterosexuality (e.g., appropriate rehabilitative programs consistent with those provided for other behavioural conditions).

All citizens, including homosexuals, equally share fundamental civil rights, obligations and responsibilities. Apart from polarizing the community and national values by discriminatory protection, Tofler (1975) warned in *“Future Shock”,* that *diversification destabilizes 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.*

The Bill places restrictions on the right of association,
freedom of speech, and virtually any activity that does not please homosexual demands for censoring society.

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 Bill would undermine this democratic principle.

We would expect governments to support citizens with harm minimization efforts based on scientific information. It is hypocritical and inconsistent to discourage smoking, compulsive gambling, binge drinking and drug abuse while encouraging the sexually confused.

“Same sex orientation and identity” should not be sanitized on a 'take it for granted basis', without rational justification by scientific reality. To do so would endanger many aspects of life currently protected by law.

Discriminatory protection for same sex sex orientation and identity would legalize a dangerous precedent of legitimating sexual confusion as a normal and healthy attribute for human life when evidence-based research, provides no support from science.

Attributes of homosexuality reflect flawed descriptions of human nature and a rejection of biological science, which provides indelible attributes of what it anticipated of human sexuality.

Any protection of attributes of sexual orientation and identity would represent the first time in Australia, that unhealthy, scientifically-flawed and emotionally-based descriptions of sexual confusion were legislated without justifying evidence.