I am writing in response to the call for evidence for the committee stage of the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Bill. I intend to respond first as a parent with children in the state education system, and then to some of the general questions about the proposed legislation.

Response as a parent

I am the father of three children under the age of six. My children are currently in the state education system, or are shortly due to be. I am concerned about the impact of this legislation on my natural rights to educate my children, and on the welfare of the society in which they will have to live.

As my children grow, I intend to teach them about marriage. I will explain to them the important nature and purpose of marriage, how authentic marriage is not an arbitrary and subjective legal, religious or political construct, but rather an objective anthropological reality, rooted in the human person. I will explain how male and female are human realities and that gender is not a construct (two facts this legislation wilfully obscures). I will explain that marriage is the sexual union of a man and a woman: that its purpose is to join a man and a woman to one another and any children they may have and to provide those children with an ordered upbringing with mother and a father united for life.

I will explain why human societies have evolved marriage to provide an ordered context for procreation and sexual activity, and that sexual activity belongs between a husband and wife within marriage. I will explain to them that sex outside marriage, including homosexual activity, is potentially harmful: socially, physically, emotionally and psychologically. I will also explain to them how the state has no purview over the substance of marriage, and that its only licit relationship to marriage is to legally recognise and protect it, because physical marriage produces mothers, fathers and children, all of whom have rights and responsibilities. Consequently, I will teach them that same-sex "marriage" is a legal fiction because it is a physical and logical impossibility, and that it is impossible to understand anything about marriage if it is confused with same-sex relationships, romantic or otherwise.

My concern is that this legislation will undermine my rights to explain these facts to my children. I am concerned that agents of the state will interpose themselves between myself and my children against my will to contradict me. I am concerned that this legislation, in conflating physical, factual marriage with same-sex relationships in a single law called "marriage", will make it very difficult for teachers, parents and others to explain what actual marriage is to children, and to give them an ordered view of human society and sexuality.

In truth, I think that this legislation will cause a great deal of conflict in schools, because the demographic that has children tends to be very different from the demographic that created this legislation and supports it. That is to say that people who have children tend to be more pro-marriage, pro-family, socially conservative, respectful of the sexual difference enshrined in authentic marriage, more religious
and often from immigrant backgrounds. For many of them, the proposed legislation is anathema, and brings the state and the democratic process into disrepute.

**Question 8 - How would you characterise your views on civil partnerships changing to marriage?**

It's physically impossible.

**Question 12 – Would you like to comment on the wider issue of protections for those in society who may have concerns about same-sex marriage?**

If the state transgresses onto civil society by creating a legal definition of marriage that conflicts with and obscures its vital pre-political, extra-legal nature and purpose, the state will enter into a state of conflict with the society it is supposed to serve. It will therefore become necessary for civil society itself to take on the responsibility of promulgating the facts about marriage, to explain how it works, what it does and why we have it. It is therefore vital that there is no legal impediment to this happening, that any legislation specifically protects the right of people in all areas of civil society; in the workplace, in schools and in other institutions, to uphold and explain what authentic marriage is and how the proposed legislation confuses, obscures and denies it, and to be able to do so without fear of prosecution or any other penalty. This is vital for society itself and for the future of the nation, as authentic marriage is essential to the health and functioning of society.

**Question 14 - Would you like to comment on any other wider issues in relation to the Bill that are not mentioned above?**

If legal marriage is separated from physical marriage, then the state will have no rational and objective criteria to assert what is and what is not "marriage". In truth, the "marriage" of two men makes no more or less sense than then "marriage" of ten men. Divorced from physical marriage and sexual complementarity, the "twoism" of marriage becomes arbitrary and baseless. Some critics claim that this debasing of legal marriage will lead to legal recognition of polygamy and "polyamory". However it is more likely that it will lead to the abandonment of legal marriage entirely, as it will become indefensible to "deny marriage" to one arbitrary group but not another. Given that legal marriage only actually exists to protect and uphold the rights of mothers and children within physical marriage, this will cause damage to the most vulnerable people in society, and will act as a disincentive to start a family in the first place.

If this legislation is well intentioned, then it is short sighted and irrational: its likely consequences have not been thought through. If, on the other hand, it has been thought through, then it is really an act of violence against the whole of society, the weak and the vulnerable especially, and it will cause enormous problems for people who seek to defend the common good by upholding marriage, the family and the rights of children. It should be stopped at committee stage - indeed it should not have been proposed at all.

It is very unclear where this legislation came from. Nobody has ever really demanded it, certainly not homosexuals, only 4% of whom have entered into Civil Partnerships. It seems probable that is it really part of a much bigger "gender
agenda”, an agenda which seeks to undermine and challenge our identity as men and women, and whose influence to this end can be seen in many other areas of life and legislation. It is therefore dishonestly motivated.
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