

WHAT'S CHANGED IN BRITAIN SINCE SAME-SEX MARRIAGE WAS LEGALISED

by David Sergeant, Political Research Contributor at The Bow Group

Four years ago, amid much uncertainty, 400 British members of parliament voted to redefine marriage in the United Kingdom. Then Prime Minister David Cameron announced that, despite having made no mention of the issue in his party's pre-election manifesto, it would be MP's who decided the fate of marriage. Now, it's Australia's turn to choose. There's one key difference. Unlike in Britain, it will be the people who decide. This will be a decision of enormous significance. Therefore, it is sensible to analyse the consequences of the potential change, within nations in which redefinition has previously been carried out. In the United Kingdom, it has become abundantly clear that redefinition has affected many people. Across many spheres. At first glance, these spheres appeared distinct from marriage redefinition. However, subsequent changes have proved that they are entirely intertwined.

Current Conservative Prime Minister, Theresa May, has revealed proposals to abolish the need for any medical consultation before gender reassignment. Simply filling out an official form will be sufficient. A 'Ministry of Equalities' press release, explicitly announced, that the proposals were designed to: 'build on the progress' of same-sex marriage. Guardian journalist Roz Kaveney boasted that changing your gender is now: 'Almost as simple as changing your name by statutory declaration'. Manifestations of the 'British gender revolution' are not difficult to find. Transport for London, have prohibited the use of the 'heteronormative' words, such as ladies and gentlemen. Meanwhile, universities across the nation are threatening to 'mark down' students, who continue to use the words 'he' and 'she'. Instead, 'gender neutral pronouns' such as 'ze', must be uniformly applied.

Such gender-theory radicalism has delighted the UK's LGBT lobby. Their tagline: 'Acceptance without exception', can be seen on posters and adverts. Politicians, attempt to 'out-radical' one another in the next emancipatory front of 'Trans-rights'. Much was made in the UK, about supposed exemptions, designed to ensure that believers would always be allowed to stay true to their convictions. Four years later, the very same people who made 'heartfelt promises', now work tirelessly to undermine them. Equalities minister Justine Greening, has insisted that churches must be made to: 'Keep up with modern attitudes'. Likewise, the Speaker of the House of Commons had this to say: "I feel we'll only have proper equal marriage when you can get married in a church if you want to do so, without having to fight the church for the equality that should be your right".

It became clear, during this year's general election, just how militant the LGBT lobby have become, following marriage redefinition. The primary target was Tim Farron, leader of England's third largest political party, the Liberal Democrats. High-profile journalists had heard that Farron was a practising Christian. In every single interview thereafter, they demanded to know. Did he personally believe homosexual sex to be a sin? He practically begged the commentariat, to allow him to keep his personal faith and legislative convictions separate. For decades, he pointed out, he had vocally and legislatively supported the LGBT Lobby. Likewise, he had long backed same-sex marriage, voting for it enthusiastically. This simply was no longer enough.

Shortly after the election campaign, Farron resigned. He stated that it was now impossible, for a believing Christian to hold a prominent position in British politics. In a heartbreaking development and in spite of Britain's 'foster crisis', aspiring foster parents who identify as religious, face interrogation. Those who are deemed unlikely to 'celebrate' homosexuality, have had their dreams of parenthood scuppered. This month, Britain's High Court, ruled that a Pentecostal couple were ineligible parents. While the court recognised their successful and loving record of adoption, they decreed that above all else: 'The equality provisions concerning sexual orientation should take precedence'. How has Great Britain become so twisted? Practicing Jews, Muslims, Christians and Sikhs, who want to stay true to their religious teachings, can no longer adopt children.

In the lead-up to the Parliamentary vote, we witnessed almost incomprehensible bullying. David Burrows MP, a mild-mannered supporter of the 'Coalition for Marriage', had excrement thrown at his house. His children received death threats and their school address was published online. Similarly, 'Conservative' broadcaster Iain Dale promised to, 'publicly out' gay MP's, who did not vote for redefinition. Many hardworking Brits have lost their jobs. Consider Adrian Smith, sacked by a Manchester Housing Trust, for suggesting that the State 'shouldn't impose its rules on places of faith and conscience'. Or Richard Page, fired for gross misconduct after articulating, that children might enjoy better outcomes, were they to be adopted by heterosexual couples.

Simultaneously, contrary to 'steadfast' government assurances, small businesses have been consistently targeted. Courts in Northern Ireland ruled that the Asher's Family bakery had acted unlawfully. What crime committed by this tiny business? Politely declining to decorate a cake with a political message in support of same-sex marriage. The courts maintained that business owners must be compelled to promote the LGBT cause, irrespective of personal convictions. Even the National Trust, a British institution with over 4.2 million members, has decided to join the bullying LGBT crusade. A message went out. Each of the Trust's 62,000 volunteers, would be required to wear a compulsory same-sex rainbow badge. Those who said they'd rather not were told they would be 'moved out of sight' until they were prepared to publicly demonstrate inclusive tolerance.

In retrospect, the silent majority in Britain remained silent for too long. Reflecting on redefinition, Ben Harris-Quinney, Chairman of the Bow Group think tank pondered that: 'Same-sex marriage was promoted in the UK, as an issue of supposed tolerance and equality. What we have seen, is the most unequal and intolerant outcomes of any political issue in recent history'. Across the UK, 'sex education' has been transformed and disfigured. TV programmes, aimed at children as young as three, promote 'gender fluidity', as an enabler of thoughtfulness and individuality. At the same time, Ministers have denied worried parents the right to withdraw their children from primary school classes. Meanwhile, 'outside educators' teach children about sex positions, 'satisfying' pornography consumption and how to masturbate.

Concerns regarding promiscuity are derided as 'old-fashioned'. Independent religious schools are under intense scrutiny. Dame Louise Casey, a senior government advisor, has insisted that it is now: 'Not Ok for Catholic schools to be homophobic and anti-gay marriage'. Ofsted, the body responsible for school-assessment, has been wildly politicised. In 2013, prior to the redefinition of marriage, Ofsted visited Vishnitz Jewish Girls School. They passed the school with flying colours going out of their way to highlight the committed and attentive approach to student welfare and development. Four years later, Ofsted returned. This time, they failed the school on one issue alone, the inadequate promotion of homosexuality and gender reassignment. As such, it was failing to ensure: 'a full understanding of fundamental British values'. It is one of an initial seven faith schools that face closure.

When I mentioned to a good friend in the Conservative Party, that I was writing this article he expressed his genuine concern. Had I not considered the consequences? LGBT progress is an unstoppable tide. He assured me, that it was ok for me to 'privately' believe that marriage was between one man and one woman. He even privately agreed, that the stuff being taught in primary schools was too much. But to say it out loud? To actually have it in print? It would blight my career and my personal relationships. How much more important the institution of marriage and freedom of thought, religion and speech. How much more important the future of our children, than any naive career ambitions I might harbour. I urge every Aussie to examine the evidence, analysis the results and be clear about what you're voting for. If it was solely marriage, it would worth preserving. It's infinitely more than that.

Source: *by David Sergeant*